



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## SENATE—Monday, March 2, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Guide us, great God, for we are pilgrims in this land. We are weak, but You are mighty. Guide us with Your powerful hands. Transform our memory so that whenever we encounter challenges, we will recall how You have blessed us in the past.

Today give our lawmakers insight to discern truth from untruth, the high from the low, and the enduring from the transient. May they discern truth through the illumination of Your sacred world. May they know the high from the low through Your Holy Spirit's guidance. And may they distinguish the enduring from the transient by numbering their days and becoming more aware of life's brevity. Strong Deliverer, continue to be a shield for America.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### THIS WEEK IN THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this week promises to be a busy one. Just across the street, an important ObamaCare case will be argued before the Supreme Court, and tomorrow, here in the Capitol, Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu will address a joint session of Congress. It is an important

speech that comes at a very important time. Iran's longstanding determination to develop nuclear capabilities poses a threat to Israel, America, and the world. It is a threat Netanyahu is singularly capable of explaining at such a critical moment in U.S.-Israeli relations.

Meanwhile, the new Senate will continue to pursue good ideas for the middle class. On the floor and in committee, both this week and in the weeks to come, we expect to see more bipartisan action on behalf of the American people on a range of issues, from human trafficking to the NLRB. For instance, we will offer Senators a chance to stand tall for basic fairness in the workplace by overturning the administration's ambush rule, which seeks to weaken workers' rights, and we will keep up the fight for sensible, bipartisan ideas such as the Keystone jobs bill.

This positive approach stands in stark contrast to the partisan posture we have seen from our friends on the other side of the aisle.

The President's veto of the bipartisan Keystone bill represents a victory for partisanship and for powerful special interests. The President's veto of the bipartisan Keystone bill represents a defeat for jobs, for infrastructure, and for the middle class. That is why Congress needs to try and overturn it.

We had hoped to have that vote tomorrow, but for some reason Democrats are actually filibustering that vote. It takes 67 votes to overcome a veto, more than the 60 required to overcome a filibuster. So there is no reason for a filibuster, other than to cause delay and gridlock simply for its own sake.

It is certainly disappointing. But the new Congress won't be deterred from fighting for jobs and the middle class. We will keep fighting for this good idea, and we will keep fighting for other good ideas.

We will also keep up our fight to fund the Department of Homeland Security. The people watched Democrats filibuster Homeland Security funding for weeks. On Friday they watched Democrats—including many who implied

they would actually do something about the President's overreach—filibuster a commonsense bill from Senator COLLINS. Now Americans are learning that Democrats might even try and prevent the Senate and the House of Representatives from reconciling their bills to get the Department funded. It just doesn't make any sense, especially when we consider the words of the minority leader himself. He said that going to conference "has been the custom in the Senate and the House of Representatives for more than 200 years." At 5:30 p.m. we will have a vote to do just that. We invite the minority leader and his party to join us in supporting this effort to go to conference.

It is interesting to see the distance between rhetoric and reality with some of our good friends on the other side—not just on conferencing bills, not just on addressing the President's overreach, but also with the use of the filibuster itself. Some of the folks who are now filibustering simply for the sake of delaying and causing gridlock are the same folks who used to denounce the use of the filibuster. It is easy to see that they really weren't very serious.

The truth is that a better way is possible for our colleagues. I invite our Democratic friends to drop all the negativity, drop all the gridlock, and join Republicans in advancing a positive agenda for the American people instead.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 240, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House Message to accompany H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal

year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House of Representatives for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, our strongest and most loyal ally in the Middle East faces a growing existential threat under the specter of a nuclear Iran. I am deeply troubled that our President's solution won't work. Rather than enforcing punitive measures that would stem Iran's nuclear progress, this administration has opted for a policy of conciliation that does nothing to curb this growing threat. All the while, the threat to Israel grows stronger every day.

Now more than ever the Congress and the American people must stand with our Israeli allies to ensure the safety and security not only of our two nations, but the Middle East as a whole. Far from being a political stunt, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's speech to a joint session of Congress provides our Nation with a vital opportunity to demonstrate our unyielding resolve to stand with Israel and oppose Iran's development of nuclear weapons.

To demonstrate our solidarity with Israel, Congress should complement the Prime Minister's address with the threat of sanctions that properly secure both of our countries against the Iranian threat. We must achieve three commonsense objectives:

First, we must prevent Iran from developing or otherwise acquiring nuclear weapons.

Second, we should reaffirm that Iran does not have an inherent right to enrichment and reprocessing capabilities and technologies under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Third, we must seek to reverse the development of Iran's illicit nuclear infrastructure and bring Iran into compliance with all United Nations Security Council resolutions.

President Obama has failed to realize that Iran poses a serious threat to the West, and our response to that threat must be equally serious. Prime Minister Netanyahu understands the precariousness of the current situation, and he is doing his best to help us here in the United States understand. As

the Prime Minister stated: "I am going to the United States not because I seek a confrontation with the president, but because I must fulfill my obligation to speak up on a matter that affects the very survival of my country."

The Prime Minister has good reason to be concerned. According to the Heritage Foundation, since the Obama administration began to relax sanctions after an interim agreement was implemented, the Iranian economy grew by an estimated 4.6 percent in the first quarter of Iran's calendar year—the first time it has grown after shrinking for the last 2 years under sanctions.

As we lose leverage by relaxing sanctions, we must not forget the most likely reason Iran agreed to negotiations in the first place was economic restrictions. When the Iranian President Hassan Rouhani is reported to have said after the announcement of the Joint Plan of Action that "the centrifuges are spinning and will never stop," should we curtail our efforts in the one area that appears to give Iran pause?

Times such as these require strength of purpose, which is why we should clearly lay out a series of sanctions that will be imposed on Iran if negotiations fail. We should provide for short but reasonable periods of time for Congress, and, therefore, the American people, to consider if the Obama administration has succeeded in accomplishing the three objectives necessary to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

Tomorrow, the Congress will hear from Prime Minister Netanyahu. In his message, I believe, he will tell us how we together can confront the growing Iranian threat. This is the time to rally as one Nation with one of our strongest allies to ensure a safe and secure world.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, tomorrow we will gather in the House Chamber to listen to an address from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. I welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu to Capitol Hill and eagerly await his speech. It is expected that he will paint a very vivid and very real picture of the danger a nuclear Iran poses not just to Israel but to the international community as a whole. This threat seems of little concern to the administration—so little, in fact, that the President almost immediately dismissed the idea of meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu while he is

in Washington. This is disappointing, to say the least.

Instead of taking the opportunity to join with us to reaffirm our support for the State of Israel, the administration has chosen to send the wrong message to our strongest ally in the region. Unfortunately, this has become a pattern. While the administration's official policy has been supportive of Israel, actions speak louder than words, and regrettably this administration's actions are often too quiet. This has not always been the case. During his first term, President Obama fought Palestinian efforts to delegitimize Israel at the U.N. He made clear that such tactics were counterproductive to the peace process and that the Palestinians would put their relationship with us in jeopardy if they sought action against Israel at the International Criminal Court.

Many Israelis are rightfully concerned that we will not have their backs when the Palestinian Authority becomes a full member of the International Criminal Court and follows through on this threat. I raised this issue with Secretary Kerry during an Appropriations Committee hearing last week, reminding him that the law explicitly prohibits funding for the Palestinian Authority if they initiate or actively support an International Criminal Court investigation into alleged Israeli war crimes. The Secretary said that the Palestinian Authority's actions amounted to a "terrible exercise in judgment" but stopped short of saying they have violated the law in a way that triggers the cutoff of aid.

Three-quarters of this body—Republicans and Democrats alike—don't see it that way. We sent the Israeli people a strong bipartisan message of support when we called on Secretary Kerry to suspend economic aid while the State Department reviews the Palestinian Authority's actions. According to Secretary Kerry's response at the hearing, the State Department will wait to see what the Palestinians do after the first of April before making a decision on economic aid. By then it might be too late.

This is exactly why the people of Israel are uneasy with the ongoing nuclear negotiations. The same administration that once spoke out forcefully against these types of tactics now plays a game of wait-and-see with the Palestinians, somehow expecting them to be an honest partner this time around.

Israel's lack of confidence in the administration's support is certainly understandable. Let's not forget that this same administration employs high-level officials who publicly disrespect our ally, including at least one willing to use derogatory language to call Prime Minister Netanyahu names during a media interview. Every time that happens, the administration carries on

as though these breaches of diplomatic protocol are irrelevant to the U.S.-Israeli relations. The administration sees these actions as having no bearing on the deteriorating state of relations between the two heads of state. Yet, if Prime Minister Netanyahu dares to speak up, the administration labels Israel a problem child—case in point: the President's National Security Adviser calling this upcoming address from Prime Minister Netanyahu “destructive of the fabric of the relationship.” Accepting an invitation from the Speaker of the House to address Congress on the severity of the nuclear threat posed by the regime in Tehran is only destructive for U.S.-Israeli relations in the President's eyes because he wants to keep Congress in the dark about the ongoing negotiations. This administration seems intent on doing just that.

Not content with the message the Prime Minister is likely to deliver, the administration has moved from actively trying to subvert his address to Congress. According to the Associated Press, the Obama administration is actively considering ways to undermine the Prime Minister's visit. Why is that? Could it be that the Prime Minister sees the flaws of any agreement the Paris talks will yield, and does the administration want to keep this from Congress?

As the talks extend on and Tehran engages in more delay tactics, it is apparent that the Obama administration is pursuing a weaker deal with Iran that will allow the country to continue its illicit nuclear program. This agreement has become a must-win for President Obama, so he is willing to concede key requirements that Congress and members of his administration have previously outlined in order to get the Iranians to sign on the dotted line. Any agreement will be a victory in the Obama administration's eyes.

Our longstanding policy that the Iranian regime must abandon its nuclear ambitions is itself being abandoned. As former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger noted in his recent testimony to the Armed Services Committee, the Paris talks have long moved from eliminating Iran's ability to enrich uranium to limiting and monitoring a smaller program that would be unable to produce the material for a warhead in less than a year's time. This is a far cry from the starting point Secretary Kerry once argued when he said: “No deal is better than a bad deal” with Iran. Now we seem to be moving the goalposts from the dismantling of Iran's nuclear program to containing it. That is not what the President told us these talks were going to accomplish. That is not what six U.N. resolutions intended to prevent. That is certainly not something this Congress should allow to happen without our say.

Nothing short of full elimination of Iran's nuclear program could honestly be considered a victory. If these talks fail to produce an agreement that requires that of Iran, Congress must have the authority to reject it.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, in an hour and a half the Senate will vote on the House request to go to conference on the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. This push by House Republicans to go to conference is the very definition of an exercise in futility. I have been very clear for days now that we will not go to conference. The majority knows that, and the Speaker of the House knows that. Senate Democrats will not support going to conference because it would be totally counterproductive.

House Republicans have no intention of using that conference to craft legislation that will pass both Houses of Congress, and in so doing they would make sure we had a shutdown of Homeland Security, and that would be very bad for the country.

House Republicans want to take a bill that they negotiated, a bill that was written by House and Senate Republicans and Democrats last December—it was a bipartisan, bicameral bill, and now they want to take that bill and turn it into something that cannot pass. That won't happen. We will not be a party to yet another charade by House Republicans because that would inevitably shut down Homeland Security and put our Nation at risk—and that is an understatement.

The Senate should reaffirm our bipartisan vote last Friday for a clean bill to prevent a shutdown. We had 68 votes. We can do it again, and we should do it again. That vote will happen at 5:30 p.m. this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Susan M. Collins, Michael B. Enzi, John Hoeven, John McCain, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, Joni Ernst, John Boozman.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, during the 2012 Presidential campaign, President Obama made a claim. His claim was: “I have Israel's back.” This week President Obama and his administration are turning their back on Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, and they are doing it right here during the Prime Minister's visit to Washington.

While he won't have a meeting in the White House, he will have a very supportive audience right here on Capitol Hill. The Prime Minister will receive a warm welcome from Members of Congress who are concerned about Israel's security and the value of this very important relationship.

In his speech to Congress tomorrow, the Prime Minister is going to address the ongoing negotiations with Iran over illicit nuclear programs. If President Obama's past negotiations with our adversaries are any guide, Israel is right to be apprehensive. The Obama administration started negotiating with Iran more than five years ago. A series of increasingly tough sanctions have damaged the Iranian economy and have finally convinced them to discuss their nuclear program seriously. In 2013 the President announced his 6-month interim agreement. The United States would suspend enforcement of some of the sanctions that had brought Iran to the table. In exchange the Iranians would freeze and reverse specific elements of their nuclear program. This

was supposed to provide time for a final agreement to be negotiated within a year. That 6-month interim agreement has now extended to 17 months.

President Obama mishandled these negotiations from the very beginning by conceding Iran's right to enrich uranium. In my opinion the President is compounding the problem as he chases the comprehensive agreement maybe to justify his Nobel Peace Prize. Information has leaked out occasionally about the negotiations. Each time there seems to be another point on which the United States has given in to the Iranian position. Iran has gotten about \$10 billion in much needed hard currency since signing the interim agreement. It has gotten additional income from the suspension of other sanctions. We have no way to stop Iran from using this money to support terrorists around the world or to prop up Bashar al-Assad in Syria.

What I heard, along with a number of Senators who went to Saudi Arabia a little over a month ago to meet with some of the Free Syrian Army, is that the freedom fighters from Syria who had come down to Saudi Arabia to meet with us said that this is exactly what Iran is doing with some of the money gained from the relief of sanctions. They are using it to prop up al-Assad and also to fund Hezbollah and Hamas.

The Obama administration has said its goal is to keep Iran 1 year away from being able to construct a nuclear weapon. That is the same level the administration said Iran was at in 2013 when sanctions were still fully in force. Apparently, the Obama administration is aiming for a final deal that suspends sanctions on Iran and does not constrain its nuclear program any more than it was before the interim agreement.

Let me be clear. If the Obama administration allows Iran to continue with its illicit nuclear program, the global community will be less safe, less stable, and less secure. Any treaty that we sign with Iran must be accountable, enforceable, and verifiable. So far, it doesn't appear to me that the Obama administration is negotiating a deal that would meet that standard.

The administration has also undermined Israeli security in other areas as well, specifically, when it comes to Middle East peace negotiations with the Palestinians. U.S. law prohibits sending any money to international organizations that admit the Palestinians as a state. The idea was to support the peace talks by letting the two sides work out their differences without others putting their thumb on the scale. So it was a problem when the Palestinians sought and received recognition as a full member state in the United Nations group UNESCO. This happened in 2012. That is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Orga-

nization. The Palestinians triggered that law, and that stopped U.S. money from going to UNESCO. In every budget request since, President Obama has tried to restore the money in spite of the law. This would excuse the Palestinians and the United Nations from the consequences of their actions. It sends a signal that the United States does not, in fact, have Israel's back.

Vice President BIDEN said: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget, and I'll tell you what you value."

By that standard, it is obvious that President Obama does not value supporting Israel in the international peace negotiations. National Security Advisor Susan Rice said just last week that Prime Minister Netanyahu's visit is too partisan and "destructive of the fabric of the relationship" Israel has with the United States.

Members of Congress disagree. We welcome the Prime Minister. We are eager to show our support, and Republicans will continue to push for additional sanctions to keep the pressure on Iran. We intend to do all that we can to ensure that the vital alliance between the United States and Israel remains strong.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time under the quorum calls this afternoon be equally divided.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Madam President, last week I came to the floor to launch what I have called Waste of the Week. I will put my prop up here. Waste of the Week is designed to provide awareness in simple ways to our colleagues here, how we can look at government spending that doesn't stack up in terms of something that is needed. Perhaps it was needed at one particular time, or perhaps it is something the taxpayers shouldn't be paying for in the first place.

I would like to raise awareness, and I am going to do that each week. This is my second week. This evening I wish to present the second Waste of the Week. Last week we talked about the \$6 billion that could be saved if we simply fixed a program that was duplicating checks to taxpayers who only qualified for payments from one of those programs, not both. If you are disabled and can't work, you can qualify for So-

cial Security disability. Alternatively, you can qualify for unemployment insurance if you can work, but you are not able to find a job. You can qualify for unemployment insurance, but you can't get both. You either can work, or you can't work. Here are two Federal programs that shockingly cost the taxpayers \$6 billion.

This is the second week of Waste of the Week, and I would like to talk about duplication in government. While it is a little harder to put a specific fiscal number on the savings, clearly we can save the taxpayer money and start this process. We can do this even in small ways to reduce our debt and deficit and not load all this debt on our children and grandchildren. We have tried the big stuff for years, and I was directly engaged as much as I possibly could be the last 4 years, all to be rejected by the President. Let's at least look at the smaller stuff and do something to get started with this process of getting us back on track to fiscal health.

What we have found is there are 52 separate programs that provide workplace training, financial instructions, and preparation for people so they can find a job—52 separate programs. You have to ask yourself, how in the world did we ever get to 52? I think some stems from good intentions. They'll say let's get a training program put together through some agency in the government that can better prepare people for employment and job opportunities.

The Small Business Administration puts one together, and the Department of Agriculture says we ought to have a training program, the Department of Commerce says we should have a training program, and then a Member of Congress says, you know, that is a good idea, I would like to propose that, too.

Over the years we have come up to 52 programs that provide workforce training. Obviously, this is ripe for reform and there should be consolidation for the benefit of the taxpayer.

I was pleasantly surprised to learn the President's 2016 budget incorporates a measure that doesn't deal with all 52, but it starts with 6 major programs and recommends consolidation. I am not often standing here on the Senate floor commending the President for taking a positive step in dealing with our debt and deficit. He refused to do that on any kind of major basis in the last 4 years. But here is his 2016 budget, we can start with six programs to consolidate that—programs that primarily do business and trade—affect business and trade agencies as well as other related programs.

I am quoting from the budget, "integrating the Government's core trade and competitiveness functions into one new Department." Well, surprise of surprises, I am here promoting something the President has put in his budget.



Let me specifically state what these consolidations would affect. It includes the Department of Commerce's core business and trade functions. It includes Small Business Administration programs, the Office of U.S. Trade Representative, the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the U.S. Trade and Development Agency. Each of these six, as outlined by the President's budget, can be consolidated into one program.

What does that save? It means saving on all the rent or the purchase or the cost of the property for the government to house six different programs with six different administrators, six different sets of employees and bureaucrats and personnel, computers, phone costs—on and on it goes. They continue to metastasize and grow.

Now let's put a price on this so I can add this to my thermometer here. We're in the process of trying to save the taxpayer \$100 billion and last week we came up with \$5.7 billion of savings. This week it is much smaller at \$200 million, though it is not chump change. It is \$200 million estimated savings by consolidating these 6 programs. Around here that is deemed a small number. To the people I represent in Indiana, that is a lot of money. We say, well, the government is spending that? No, the government is spending taxpayer money to provide duplication of programs. We think it will ultimately save a lot more as we go forward and define additional consolidations down the line.

We are going to put a little more red on the chart to represent savings. This thermometer will keep rising and rising as I come down here and present the Waste of the Week. Mr. President, \$200 million in savings can be achieved simply by consolidating programs that are duplicating each other in terms of what they are providing.

We can't solve all of our country's debt and deficit problems overnight, but we can take needed steps to identify those that the government's own accounting agencies—independent of Republicans and Democrats—have identified as wasteful money. Let's get this money back to the taxpayer. Let's eliminate this money to reduce our debt so our children and grandchildren don't have to pony up more and let's end up with a much more efficient and effective Federal Government.

With that, I finish this week's Waste of the Week and look forward to being here next week for another iteration.

I yield back my time, if there is any left.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this weekend the United States will mark the 50th anniversary of the march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama. Those of us who are not old enough to remember 50 years ago have read the history. Those of us who were old enough at that time saw what happened at that historic march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge five decades ago. Scores of courageous Americans refused to be silent about the need for equal protection under the law. This was a case where their blood, sweat, and tears helped move our Nation toward a more perfect union. One of those who actually shed blood—in fact, nearly died on that march for freedom and equality—is one of my closest friends in Congress, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia.

Last Thursday I was so proud when Congressman LEWIS came to the Senate Judiciary Committee room to see a vote on the historic nomination of Loretta Lynch to serve as our next Attorney General. He said he was compelled to come because this was no ordinary markup and this is no ordinary confirmation. When the Senate finally confirms her, Loretta Lynch will be the first African-American woman to serve our country as Attorney General.

She is extraordinarily qualified for the job. The letters and testimony I have received from law enforcement and both Republican and Democratic prosecutors attesting to how good she is, are amazing. I urge the Senate to consider her nomination immediately and confirm her this week. She has waited much longer than any modern nominee ever has for this position.

But as I urge her confirmation, I cannot help but reflect on the fact that Ms. Lynch's confirmation will be another step toward realizing Dr. Martin Luther King's dream that people in our country would be judged by the content of their character. Loretta Lynch's life epitomizes that dream.

She was born in Greensboro and was raised in Durham, NC. She is the daughter of a fourth-generation Baptist preacher and a school librarian. I have met Reverend Lynch. He is an amazing and inspiring man. Her parents instilled in her the American values of fairness and equality, even when those around them were not living up to those values. Ms. Lynch has spoken about riding on her father's shoulders as a child to their church, where students organized peaceful protests against racial segregation. The freedom songs and the church music that went hand-in-hand with those protests

undoubtedly made up the soundtrack of her childhood. The Judiciary Committee was honored to have her father, Reverend Lorenzo Lynch, with us not only at both days of her historic hearing in January but also with us last Thursday as the Committee considered his daughter's nomination.

Throughout Loretta Lynch's life, those who encountered her intelligence and tenacity have not always been prepared to accept her and her impressive accomplishments. But each time they didn't accept it, the content of her character has shone through and led her to even greater heights.

In elementary school, administrators did not believe that Loretta Lynch could score as high as she did on a standardized test. They demanded that she retake the test. She did, and she scored even higher the second time. In high school she rose to the very top of her class, which would have made her the first African-American valedictorian. School administrators, however, decided that even though she had earned the title, it would somehow be too controversial. So, they decided she must share the honor with two other students, one of whom was white, even though she was the one who scored the highest. This didn't hold her back. She kept going forward. She went on to graduate with honors from Harvard College and then earned her law degree from Harvard Law School.

This has been the story of Loretta Lynch's life. While some are not ready to embrace her distinction, she just marches forward with grace to prove that she is even stronger and more qualified than her detractors can imagine. Even though she was required to be better than those who were holding her back, she didn't let that stop her. She just kept going forward. She has dedicated the majority of her remarkable career to public service and we are fortunate as a nation that she wants to continue to serve.

The President of the United States announced that Loretta Lynch would be nominated to be our Nation's chief law enforcement official on November 8th.

Right after this announcement, Senate Republicans made clear that despite the urgent challenges facing this country, they would object to even begin consideration of her nomination during the lame duck period. So Loretta Lynch's historic nomination waited. As she prepared for her confirmation hearing, she stayed focused on her current position and continued to lead a dedicated team of prosecutors to bring terrorists and serious criminals to justice in New York.

Ms. Lynch was finally called before the Judiciary Committee at the end of January. She had more poise and credibility than any nominee I have seen in my four decades in the Senate. Any reasonable observer of her hearing,

which lasted almost 8 hours, would conclude that she was beyond impressive and that she possesses the leadership, intellect, and wisdom needed to help keep our country safe. After the hearings, Republicans submitted an unprecedented number of written questions to Ms. Lynch, even though every member had been allowed ample time to ask live questions at her hearing. Even members who had already publicly declared that they opposed her confirmation continued to submit scores of questions.

But now, 114 days have passed since Ms. Lynch was nominated. She has been made to wait longer than any one of the previous five Attorneys General—five Attorneys General in both Democratic and Republican administrations. And for what reason? So that those who have already said they oppose the nomination can try to score additional political points? When Ms. Lynch is told she must continue to wait longer than any of the modern Attorneys General, that she must wait for her confirmation vote, I am reminded that those dedicated to the fight for civil rights have long heard their detractors tell them: Just be patient. We can't give you your rights yet. Just be patient. Just wait your turn.

Well, come on. No Member of this body—of either party—would ever stand for anyone saying: Notwithstanding your qualifications, wait your turn.

Ms. Lynch grew up hearing her family's stories about the Jim Crow South. She knows the meaning of injustice. She would never compare the partisan political games being played with her nomination to the epic struggles her family faced.

But as we in this Chamber reflect this week to honor those Americans who marched in Selma and the role our Department of Justice played in the civil rights movement, it should not be too much to ask just how much longer Loretta Lynch has to wait. How much longer does this woman have to wait before she can become the next U.S. Attorney General? In these perilous times, our Nation deserves to have its chief law enforcement officer considered without further delay.

At the Judiciary Committee's markup last week, Senator DURBIN spoke passionately about the "solemn, important, and historic moment" before us in considering Ms. Lynch's nomination. His comments were moving, and they appealed to our responsibility as Senators to uphold the Constitution and provide advice and consent on the President's nominees. We can do so this week by confirming Loretta Lynch.

We have played politics with too many things already in the young days of this 114th Congress. From the spending bill the House Republicans refused to take up to fund the Department of

Homeland Security, to the nomination of this highly qualified woman to serve as the Nation's chief law enforcement officer, we can no longer put national security at risk just for the sake of a few talking points or a second or two on a television program.

So I call on my friend, the majority leader, to simply set a date for her confirmation. Do not leave the American people wondering if this extremely qualified woman will get a timely vote. Treat her like every previous Attorney General nominee. The Nation faces too many challenges to play politics with this important nomination.

Too long some in this body have told her: You have to wait. You have to wait your turn. You have to wait.

No, she has proven her qualifications. She shouldn't have to wait any more than those who went before her. Set an up-or-down vote. Let's confirm her nomination.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, here we are again where we were last Monday with about 5 days left before funding runs out for the Department of Homeland Security. So if it feels like "Groundhog Day," it is because it is "Groundhog Day," and we just can't keep playing those kinds of games with this agency's funding.

Those who are blocking action on the funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security have a clear choice: Are they going to prioritize politics or are they going to prioritize national security?

Last Friday the Senate passed a bill with 68 bipartisan votes—a bill that fully funds the Department of Homeland Security without any controversial riders attached to the bill. I am ever hopeful that the House will follow our lead and immediately take up that clean Senate bill. We cannot, we should not replay the chaos we saw last week. The brinksmanship really needs to end. It is time for Congress to pass the Department of Homeland Security funding bill.

Whether it is threats to the Mall of America in Minnesota, plots foiled by DHS and the FBI in New York City, attacks on our cyber networks, or threats at our Nation's borders, we live during a time when the safety and security of this country are at risk. We cannot play politics with the agency that is tasked with keeping us safe, and we shouldn't play politics with the funding that supports our first responders—the very people who are

there anytime something happens in our States and our local communities. What must our enemies think when they see Congress fighting over whether to keep the Department of Homeland Security open?

Last week DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson wrote a letter to the congressional leadership, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from Secretary Johnson.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF  
HOMELAND SECURITY,

Washington, DC, February 26, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
*Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Minority Leader, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,  
*Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER REID, AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: Thank you for your leadership and efforts to pass a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security. As you know, our funding expires tomorrow at midnight. I write to explain to Members of Congress the real and substantial consequences of a failure to pass a full-year appropriations bill by that deadline.

As an initial matter, it must be noted that a potential shutdown of the Department comes at a particularly challenging time for homeland security. It is stunning that we must even contemplate a shutdown of the Department in the current global context. The global terrorist threat has become more decentralized and complex. Terrorist organizations are now openly calling for attacks on Western targets. Yesterday's arrests in New York City highlight the threat of independent actors in the homeland who support overseas terrorist organizations and radical ideology. We are working hard to stay one step ahead of potential threats to aviation security. Last year at this time, the spike in migrant children began to appear at our border; we are deployed to prevent this situation from recurring, and to address it aggressively if it does. The Nation is in the midst of a very cold, harsh winter, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency is working with states impacted by record snowfalls.

Here are just some of the consequences for homeland security if the Department's funding lapses and we shut down:

First, about 170,000 employees will be required to work, but will not get paid for that work during the period of a shutdown. This includes our Coast Guard, Border Patrol agents, Secret Service agents, Transportation Security Administration officers, and others on the front lines of our homeland security. These working men and women depend on biweekly paychecks to make ends meet for themselves and their families. For them, personally, work without pay is disruptive and demoralizing. Even worse for our people are the public statements by some that make light of a shutdown, which disregards DHS employees' personal sacrifices and dedication to our Nation's security.

Second, approximately 30,000 men and women of the Department must be furloughed and sent home without pay. Our financial management, human resources, procurement and contracting, and information technology teams—the institutional backbone of the Department—will be reduced by 90 percent, from over 2,000 to just 208 people. My own immediate headquarters staff will be cut by about 87 percent. Our Science and Technology team, which is intensely focused on developing non-metallic explosive detection capabilities as well as other technologies to counter threats to aviation, will be cut 94 percent, from 448 to 26 people. Our Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, which is our Nation's primary research and development lead for development of advanced nuclear detection technologies and technical forensic capabilities, will also be cut 94 percent, from 121 to just 7 people.

Third, contracting services across the Department, including those for critical mission support activities, will be disrupted and/or interrupted altogether. Depending upon the length of a shutdown, contract awards and major acquisitions could be impacted. In the event of a shutdown, negotiations to construct the United States Coast Guard's 8th National Security Cutter will be delayed, potentially leading to an increase in costs.

Fourth, our \$2.5 billion-a-year grant-making to state, local, tribal, and territorial governments, to assist them in preventing, responding to or recovering from terrorist attacks, major disasters and other emergencies, remains at a standstill (it has already stopped because the Department is currently funded by a Continuing Resolution). Of particular note, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Emergency Management Performance Grants, which contribute 50 percent of the salaries of state and local emergency management personnel, cannot be funded.

Fifth, public assistance disaster recovery payments to communities affected by previous disasters will grind to a halt. Though these payments are funded with prior-year money, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's staff that processes them must be furloughed.

Sixth, depending upon the length of a shutdown, DHS will no longer be able to support state and local authorities with planning, safety, and security resources for special security events such as the Boston and Chicago Marathons.

Seventh, depending upon the length of a shutdown, work to complete construction of the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility in Kansas, which will replace the aging 1950s-era Plum Island facility in New York, could be disrupted.

Eighth, new hires across the Department must be halted, disrupting critical missions to secure the border, protect millions of daily airline passengers, strengthen security at the White House, and deploy new ICE investigators. Routine attrition hiring would cease across the Department, seriously undermining our homeland security frontline staffing needs. Our plans to increase CBP staffing at our ports of entry by 2,000 officers, and to maintain the Transportation Security Administration's workforce of airport screeners and air marshals will be undermined. Our plans to hire additional Secret Service uniformed officers and special agents will also be disrupted.

Ninth, without funding, all training at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers will cease. Up to 2,000 local, state, and federal law enforcement trainees from across the country will be sent home.

Finally, as I have noted many times, mere extension of a continuing resolution has many of the same negative impacts. A short-term continuing resolution exacerbates the uncertainty for my workforce and puts us back in the same position, on the brink of a shutdown just days from now.

I urge Congress, as soon as possible, to pass a clean, full-year Fiscal Year 2015 appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

The American people are counting on us.

Sincerely,

JEH CHARLES JOHNSON,  
Secretary.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, the following is a quote from the letter the Secretary wrote:

It is stunning that we must even contemplate a shutdown of the Department in the current global context. The global terrorist threat has become more decentralized and complex. Terrorist organizations are now openly calling for attacks on western targets.

The Secretary also noted how taxing the current funding crisis has been on the agency and the employees who put their lives on the line every day to protect the Nation. He said the following in his letter:

These working men and women depend on biweekly paychecks to make ends meet for themselves and their families. For them, personally, work without pay is disruptive and demoralizing.

I can't imagine anyone here thinks people should be expected to go to work—many of them putting their lives on the line—without getting paid. Last week DHS officials had to prepare shutdown plans. They had to give employees notice that they might be furloughed or they might not get paid.

At a time when resources should be spent protecting the Nation, spending them dealing with a possible shutdown just doesn't make sense. None of us would run our households that way. The private sector doesn't run business that way. We shouldn't run government that way. Instead of focusing on critical missions such as securing the border, counterterrorism efforts, and maritime security, DHS officials have been consumed with the threat of a shutdown of their agency. That is not the way we should be doing business. It is making our Nation less safe.

It is time for the House to end this brinksmanship. It is time for the House to vote on the bipartisan bill the Senate passed last week. We came together in the Senate under the leadership of Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID, and I applaud their working together across party lines to pass a bill that funds DHS for the rest of the year. That is what the American people expect of us. They expect us to work together to address the challenges facing this country. They want us to get things done, not to play politics and certainly not to jeopardize our country's safety and security.

I hope that the House will follow the Senate's lead, that they will pass a bi-

partisan bill to keep the Department of Homeland Security on the job for the remainder of this year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, this afternoon we will vote on whether to go to conference on H.R. 240. For Senators who want to return to regular order, this is their chance. Regular order is the opportunity to offer, to have debate on, and to vote on amendments.

We have already established on earlier legislation that the majority party is willing to return to regular order and to offer an open amendment process. So part of establishing that regular order process is, as I say, the opportunity to offer amendments, to have a debate, and to vote. It is that process which should and has historically produced the best legislation not only here in the Senate but in the House—in this Congress—on behalf of the American people.

Another part of regular order, though, is conference committees. When the House passes a bill and the Senate passes a bill and there are differences in the bill, how do we resolve the differences in the bill? We go to a conference committee. So that is what is before us right now. This vote is simply to send H.R. 240 to a conference committee so the House and the Senate can work on the legislation.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle filibustered H.R. 240. Only when amendments were limited to one amendment did they allow us to proceed to the bill. That is unfortunate, but clearly it was done to protect the President's Executive order on immigration.

The irony is that the President's overreach should not be a partisan issue. Our forefathers created a system of checks and balances in our Constitution to protect the rights of our citizens. The legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches all have a role to play in this system of checks and balances. When one branch exceeds its authority, the others have an obligation to check that overreach, an obligation to protect the rights of our citizens.

That is exactly what has happened in this situation. The President's Executive order on immigration exceeds his authority as the leader of the executive branch. Now a Federal district court in Texas has issued an injunction to stay the President's action, and that stay is in place while the lawsuit against the President's action which has been filed by 26 States is adjudicated. That is our role too. Just like the States stepping up when the President has overreached his authority, just like the Federal court stepping up when the President has exceeded his authority, that is our role too—to protect the legislative

power, which is solely the power of the legislative branch, solely the power of Congress.

So I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to send H.R. 240 to conference to see if we can find common ground. That is, after all, regular order for the Congress.

I again remind our colleagues that this bill provides full funding for the Department of Homeland Security. Let me once again summarize some of that funding. The bill provides \$10.7 billion for Customs and Border Protection, CBP, including record levels of personnel, tactical infrastructure, and technology in air and maritime assets. It provides \$5.96 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, and maintains a record 34,000 adult detention beds and 3,828 family detention beds. The bill strongly supports the vital missions of the Secret Service and provides for cyber security efforts. It provides more than \$10 billion for the Coast Guard for its many missions, including search and rescue. Since homeland security is a national effort, the bill continues critical funding for grant programs to State and local firefighters, emergency managers, and law enforcement. The bill also provides for research and development, TSA's aviation security screening operations, the Federal law enforcement training centers, and E-Verify, which supports businesses across the United States in hiring legal workers.

But in addition to that funding, we also need to check the Executive action of the President on immigration. That is what our system of checks and balances under our Constitution is all about. That is the opportunity we have—to send this bill to conference with the House to find a solution. Let's do that. Let's find a solution. Let's return to regular order in the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I encourage the Senate to vote to send the Homeland Security appropriations bill to conference with the House. That should be the order of business. We have been wrangling over this bill for 3 months now. The legislative maneuvering has crowded out all of the real issues before the Senate on this legislation.

We should have debated and voted on the President's actions, the Executive orders which provoked this entire situation. On multiple occasions Members on the other side of the aisle have voted unanimously to avoid having

that debate. First, four times they voted over the course of 3 weeks to refuse to even consider House-passed funding bill legislation. Their bill was passed by the other body in plenty of time to avoid the shutdown that currently consumes the Senate.

This won't be the last time during this Congress that the House and Senate disagree on an appropriations bill, but it should not be the last time the legislative branch disagrees with the executive branch and vice versa. Soon we will begin consideration of the fiscal year 2016 appropriations bills. Each of these bills will prompt differences, but we should have opportunities for robust debates on these differences. That is all I am suggesting. We can proceed to conference with the House in a timely manner on the bills. Doing so will help provide opportunities for orderly and direct resolution of differences as reported by the various committees. We have done too little of that in recent years, and it has been detrimental to the legislative process.

I urge the Senate to support the motion to accept the request for a conference committee on the Homeland Security appropriations bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Susan M. Collins, Michael B. Enzi, John Hoeven, John McCain, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, Thad Cochran, Orrin G. Hatch, Joni Ernst, John Boozman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with re-

spect to H.R. 240, an act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

#### YEAS—47

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Boozman	Flake	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Cassidy	Hatch	Rounds
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	

#### NAYS—43

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boxer	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Peters	

#### NOT VOTING—10

Blunt	McCaskill	Vitter
Brown	Nelson	Wicker
Gardner	Paul	
Kirk	Shelby	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 47, the nays are 43.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the bill is

not amendable in the Senate and we cannot take further action. Therefore, I move to table the House message, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) would have voted "nay" and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) would have voted "nay."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

#### YEAS—58

Alexander	Franken	Murkowski
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murphy
Baldwin	Graham	Murray
Bennet	Hatch	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Booker	Heitkamp	Reid
Boxer	Heller	Rounds
Cantwell	Hirono	Sanders
Capito	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Udall
Corker	Markey	Warner
Cornyn	McCain	Warren
Donnelly	McConnell	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	
Flake	Mikulski	

#### NAYS—31

Barrasso	Fischer	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Hoeben	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Moran	Tillis
Daines	Perdue	Toomey
Enzi	Portman	
Ernst	Risch	

#### NOT VOTING—11

Blunt	Kirk	Shelby
Brown	McCaskill	Vitter
Coons	Nelson	Wicker
Gardner	Paul	

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CORNYN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT—VETO

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the veto message on S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the President's veto message on S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: Veto message to accompany S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

(The text of the President's veto message is printed on page 2461 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 24, 2015.)

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the veto message.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the veto message on S. 1, an act to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Mitch McConnell, Susan M. Collins, Shelley Moore Capito, John Cornyn, David Vitter, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Daniel Coats, Mike Rounds, Dean Heller, David Perdue, Bob Corker, Mike Lee, James Lankford, Jeff Sessions, Lamar Alexander, Johnny Isakson.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

#### RECOGNIZING GALE WILLIAM FRASER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 27 years Gale Fraser has devoted to the Clark County Regional Flood Control District and his work as general manager and chief engineer for the past 22 years.

Southern Nevada is known for its dry heat and arid environment, but our rare and intense thunderstorms can create dangerous flash floods. These flash floods can cause millions of dollars in property damage and take lives in a matter of seconds. The demand to address this issue grew as the Las Vegas Valley experienced unprece-

dent development and population growth for more than three decades. The latest statistics show that more than 2 million people currently live in Clark County, and at one point in the 1990s, more than 5,000 people were relocating to the area every month of the year.

In an effort to address the risks associated with flood waters and accommodate the demands of a growing population, the Nevada Legislature authorized the creation of a flood control district in Clark County in 1985. The Army Corps of Engineers completed a feasibility report in 1992 on the flood control improvements necessary for the Las Vegas Wash and Tributaries, otherwise known as the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes. This massive project included debris basins, detention basins, miles of primary channels, and a network of lateral collector channels. Few could have shouldered such a daunting project, but Gale rose to the challenge.

The support and expertise that Gale Fraser and the regional flood control district brought to the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes projects was critical to it being authorized by Congress in the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. The first Federal appropriations to initiate the construction of the project became available through the Energy and Water Resources Development appropriations bill in October 1993. These important steps and strong partnerships contributed to the completion of the Project Cooperation Agreement, which was fully executed in February 1995.

The Clark County Regional Flood Control District and the Clark County Public Works Department were the local sponsors of the Tropicana and Flamingo Washes. Gale, as the head of the Regional Flood Control District, was instrumental in shepherding this project through the process, which has brought safety, security, and peace of mind to the residents of the Las Vegas Valley. Gale's impressive leadership has persisted. He further developed plans to improve Clark County's water infrastructure to manage destructive flood waters. To date, under Gale's leadership, 90 detention basins and approximately 590 miles of channels and underground storm drains have been constructed in Clark County.

On behalf of a grateful community, I thank Mr. Fraser for his years of dedicated service to Clark County and his work to ensure responsible flood management and public safety in southern Nevada.

Gale has also been an active member of the National Association of Flood and Stormwater Management Agencies and served as the president of the organization from August 2008 to August 2010. This organization includes many flood control districts and public works agencies across the country that are

charged with working with Federal partners, such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to help develop and implement public policies regarding storm water quality and flood plain management.

Although Mr. Fraser will be missed, his legacy will continue to benefit Nevadans and our visitors for generations to come. I congratulate Gale Fraser on his retirement and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

#### TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS BROOKS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week marked the end of Francis Brooks' tenure as the sergeant-at-arms of the Vermont State House. The position of sergeant-at-arms is one of great importance, playing a pivotal role in maintaining the order and decorum that Vermonters have come to expect of their State government. It is a job that demands a comprehensive understanding of the people who conduct the important work within the building, and the building itself.

Francis Brooks has served the people of the city of Montpelier in a number of roles. He taught chemistry and physics at Montpelier High School for 32 years; he was a State legislator for 25 years; and he has volunteered with the Montpelier Fire Department for 40 years. This level of dedication alone is worthy of appreciation and respect, but Francis's service did not stop there. For the last 7 years, Francis has served his State as sergeant-at-arms.

I have fond memories of the Vermont State House. My parents owned the Leahy Press, located just across the street, and now home to the Vermont Arts Council. From our early years and onward, my brother and sister and I were always encouraged by our parents to pay attention to what happened within those walls and to respect the building for what it represented. As a young boy I rode my bicycle through the halls of the capitol in Montpelier, sometimes wandering into the private office of the Governor, where he sat from behind his desk peering down at me. Francis upheld what I treasure most about our State's capitol—an open and welcoming building for all Vermonters. He has not only overseen the preservation and safety of the Vermont State House, but he has encouraged the public to use the space to enhance our community through events like the Farmers Night Concert Series, the U.S. Academy Nominations Ceremony, public discussion forums like the Opiate Conference, statewide high school debate competitions, and the continued involvement of young people in our State's political system through the legislative page program. Every year, Francis chose 30 eighth graders to serve at the Vermont State

House in 6-week periods. Upon these students' successful completion of the program, Francis would send them to apply for the U.S. Senate page program—and I was always impressed by the quality of students who represented Vermont in the Nation's Capitol.

Marcelle and I thank Francis Brooks for the several decades of selfless loyalty he has shown to Montpelier and to the State of Vermont. In a 2011 interview with a Vermont newspaper *Seven Days*, Francis described the role of the sergeant-at-arms by saying, "If the inside of the [State House] is considered a town, then I'm the town manager." Vermont is lucky to have such an inspiring, well-grounded and selfless public servant.

#### CONGRATULATING LAURA HARRIS AND TRINITY RICH

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to once again acknowledge the youth volunteers of my home State. I am never surprised but always impressed by what they can achieve—from reaching the rank of Eagle Scout to earning Gold Medals from the Congressional Awards program and so much more. Today I would like to share the achievements of those who are being recognized by the 20th Annual Prudential Spirit of Community Awards. I couldn't be more proud of them all for their heartfelt commitment to the future of Wyoming, the West and our Nation.

For the past 20 years, the Prudential Spirit of Community Awards has been our Nation's largest youth recognition program for volunteer service. Each year, the Prudential Spirit of Community Awards selects two volunteers who have achieved extraordinary results in their work to help those in their neighborhoods who need their support. Nominations can be made by school or community organizations or any one of several other groups. Nominees then have their accomplishments judged by a panel which is tasked with the tremendously difficult job of selecting the winners.

This year, Wyoming's two youth volunteers who are receiving this special honor are Laura Harris, 17, of Green River and Trinity Rich, 11, of Douglas. They will each receive an award, an engraved medallion and a trip to Washington, D.C.

Laura has quite a remarkable story to tell. When she was born she was diagnosed with a heart defect. Her doctors didn't expect her to see her teens, but they didn't know Laura. She dealt with her personal obstacles by showing others how precious each day and every moment of their life is. In her words, "I express my gratitude by providing hope to others."

The results she has been able to achieve speak for themselves. She has

uplifted the spirits of dozens of sick children, kept newborn infants in foster care warm with the blankets she made for them, and provided support to the veterans in her neighborhood who need help with chores around their homes. Simply put, Laura is always there with a helping hand to assure those in need that someone cares. While so many young men and women are busy looking for ways to have fun, Laura keeps busy looking for ways to be of service.

Our other volunteer champion, Trinity Rich, is in the fifth grade. She learned about the importance of reaching out to help others in need during a visit to her grandmother's apartment building. She saw that her grandmother wasn't the only one who needed a little help so that's what she began to do.

It wasn't long before Trinity's willingness to be of help and share the tremendous gift of her time and talents were making a difference all around her neighborhood. Whatever the need was, Trinity was there, giving her all to make things better.

In the process both Laura and Trinity have learned an important lesson—the more you give of yourself to help others the more you receive in the satisfaction of knowing you have made someone else's life better. It's a blessing that will stay with them as they continue to observe the changes in their town, their neighborhood and their own backyard.

Two other young Wyomingites are also being recognized as Distinguished Finalists this year and will receive engraved bronze medallions honoring them for their work. One is Adam Jones, 18, of Otto, Wyoming. Adam led the effort to complete the roofing and siding on an important facility at his local park. He was able to do so well in part because he was able to recruit 20 fellow Boy Scouts for the task at hand. I am a big supporter of Scouting because Scouts have been making a difference in their communities for 105 years with much more to come. This is just more proof of their determination to make their part of the world a better place to live.

Our other finalist, Hannah Nieslanik, is a 17 year old from Cokeville who has also been getting involved in her community. She is now a certified emergency medical responder who helps the emergency medical response team care for those facing a medical crisis.

All of these young people are winners in the important task of helping to inspire others to get more active and involved. We all have a gift to share with those who need our help. If we don't take action the change we could bring to our community will never happen. The four youth volunteers I have named here are all leaders who lead the best way—by example.

Recognition by this prestigious Community Awards program means a great



deal to all those who earned their awards this year. What means even more, I am sure, is the difference these individuals have made. The renewed sense of hope they have helped to instill in those they have helped and the smiles of appreciation they have received has made it clear how important their work is. Their efforts have shown us all what can be accomplished when our nation's young people see a problem and challenge themselves to address it—and solve it.

Congratulations, Laura, Trinity, Adam and Hannah. We couldn't be more proud to claim all of you as Wyoming's own. Keep up the good work.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on February 27, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 33) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on February 27, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 33. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the enrolled bill was signed on February 27, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the Acting President pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO).

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate hereby jointly appoint the following individual to the Congressional Budget Office for the term expiring January 3, 2019: Dr. Homer Keith Hall, Director.

The message also announced that pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2702 and the order

of the House of January 6, 2015, the Minority Leader appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Mr. John A. Lawrence of Washington, DC.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 166. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 178. A bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 617. A bill to ensure that owners of all motor vehicles in use on United States roadways are made aware of, and obtain repairs for, manufacturer-issued safety recalls in a timely manner; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 618. A bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 619. A bill to include among the principal trade negotiating objectives of the United States regarding commercial partnerships trade negotiating objectives with respect to discouraging activity that discourages, penalizes, or otherwise limits commercial relations with Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 620. A bill to clarify rules relating to nondiscriminatory employer wellness programs as such programs relate to premium discounts, rebates, or modifications to otherwise applicable cost sharing under group health plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 621. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety and effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials approved for use in the prevention and control of animal diseases, in order to minimize the development of antibiotic-resistant bacteria; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 622. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. Kaine, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. Res. 93. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the courageous work and life of Russian opposition leader Boris Nemtsov, and calling for a swift and transparent investigation into his tragic murder in Moscow on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 11

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 11, a bill to protect the separation of powers in the Constitution of the United States by ensuring that the President takes care that the laws be faithfully executed, and for other purposes.

S. 30

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 33

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 33, a bill to provide certainty with respect to the timing of Department of Energy decisions to approve or deny applications to export natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 123

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 123, a bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 182

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 182, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal education mandates, and for other purposes.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added



as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 312

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 312, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding school libraries, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 451

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 451, a bill to award grants to encourage State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools to utilize technology to improve student achievement and college and career readiness, the skills of teachers and school leaders, and the efficiency and productivity of education systems at all levels.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title

XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HATCH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 621. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety and effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials approved for use in the prevention and control of animal diseases, in order to minimize the development of antibiotic-resistant bacteria; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce the Prevention of Antibiotic Resistance Act, along with my colleague Senator SUSAN COLLINS. This bill will help to prevent the rise of antibiotic resistant pathogens by ensuring that antibiotics are used prudently and judiciously in the agriculture industry.

Antibiotic resistance is a growing public health threat. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, estimate that antibiotic-resistant bacteria cause at least 23,000 deaths and 2 million infections each year in the United States. The CDC also estimates that antibiotic resistance costs the United States \$20 billion in excess health costs each year. These statistics will only worsen if we do not take meaningful steps to reduce inappropriate and unnecessary antibiotic use.

The agriculture industry has long used antibiotics to increase and maintain animal weight gain and feed efficiency. The industry has also relied on administering antibiotics to stave off infections associated with poor biosecurity or sanitation in barns and feedlots. However, based on what we know now about antibiotic resistance, these practices no longer make sense.

I am particularly concerned about the rise of antibiotic resistance in foodborne pathogens. Foodborne illness is already a pressing public health problem, and the United States must ensure that agricultural antibiotic use practices do not lead to antibiotic resistance in foodborne bacteria.

Already, the CDC estimates that 410,000 antibiotic resistant Salmonella and Campylobacter infections occur each year. In fact, nearly 1 in 4 Campylobacter infections analyzed by the CDC is drug-resistant.

The CDC has also discovered that multidrug-resistant Salmonella results in more virulent infections, causing higher rates of hospitalization and bloodstream infections than normally expected with Salmonella infections. Clearly, more needs to be done to fight antibiotic resistance. This legislation will ensure that all medically important antibiotics approved for use in livestock feed and water pose no risk to human health due to the development of antibiotic resistance.

In 2013, the Food and Drug Administration, FDA, took a critically important first step by issuing Guidance for Industry 213, a policy that will eliminate the use of antibiotics for feed efficiency or weight gain uses in food-animal production. I am glad that the pharmaceutical and agriculture industries plan to adopt FDA's policy. This is a victory for public health, and I am eager to see this policy fully implemented.

However, FDA's judicious antibiotic use policy has a gap that must be addressed in order to fully protect public health. You see, many of the antibiotics previously approved for disease prevention and control are at high risk of abuse or misuse.

Some of these approved uses are at similar low doses as the production uses being phased out by FDA judicious use policies. Other uses do not have a defined duration of use or aren't approved at a therapeutic dose expected to treat a specific bacterial pathogen.

In fact, the FDA has informed my staff that there are likely 107 antibiotics approved for disease prevention or control that fall into these categories. This is a problem as some producers may rely on these drugs far too often as a way to maintain animal production or to prevent recurrent infections when these important issues could be solved with better sanitation, biosecurity, and animal husbandry.

This legislation would require pharmaceutical companies to submit additional information to the FDA to demonstrate that a disease prevention or control use of the drug does not pose a risk to human health due to the development of antibiotic resistance. It would apply only to antibiotics approved for disease prevention or control that are at high risk of overuse.

If there is no risk to human health, the drug sponsor would also have to provide evidence to revise the conditions of using an antibiotic for disease prevention or control to ensure the drug is only used judiciously and sparingly. These revised drug approvals would be required to specify a therapeutic dose, be shown to control a specific bacterial infection, be targeted only to the group of animals at risk of developing a specific infection, and specify a defined duration of use.

The bill also includes a sense of the Senate that all medically important antibiotics should be used only on the order of a licensed veterinarian who has a valid veterinarian-client-patient relationship with a producer.

This means that the veterinarian is familiar with the animals to which he or she is prescribing an antibiotic. Veterinary oversight is a key component of ensuring that antibiotics are not used inappropriately or unnecessarily.

This legislation, therefore, would allow for medically important antibiotics to be used to prevent or control

infections when absolutely necessary and when it does not pose a risk to human health. In addition to protecting human health, this legislation will help to preserve the efficacy of antibiotic for veterinarians, so that the drugs will continue to be effective for treating livestock and poultry when no other alternatives to these drugs exist.

Antibiotic resistance is a growing public health threat. If we do not act now, many more Americans will suffer and, in some cases, die from infections that are no longer treatable. This legislation will protect public health while allowing the agriculture sector to use antibiotics when absolutely necessary to preserve animal health. I ask my colleagues to work with me to enact this important bipartisan bill.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 622. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Family Engagement in Education Act with my colleagues Senator COONS and Senator WHITEHOUSE. I thank Representatives THOMPSON and DESAULNIER for introducing the House companion of this bipartisan bill.

Research demonstrates that family engagement in a child's education increases student achievement, improves attendance, and reduces dropout rates. A study by Anne Seitsinger and Steven Brand at the University of Rhode Island's Center for School Improvement and Educational Policy found that students whose parents support their education through learning activities at home and discuss the importance of education perform better in school. The importance of family engagement begins even before a child enters school. For example, Scholastic's recent Kids and Family Reading Report found that among children ages 6-11, 60 percent of frequent readers, those who read 5-7 days per week for fun, were read to aloud by a parent 5-7 times per week before they entered kindergarten.

Too often, however, family engagement is not built into our school improvement efforts in a systematic way. The Family Engagement in Education Act will promote and strengthen meaningful family engagement policies and programs at the national, State, and local levels to ensure that all students are on track to be career and college-ready.

Our legislation will empower parents by increasing school district resources dedicated to family engagement activities from one percent to 2 percent of the district's Title I allocation. It will also improve the quality of family engagement practices at the school level by requiring school districts to develop and implement standards-based policies and practices for family-school

partnerships. It will build State and local capacity for effective family engagement in education by setting aside at least 0.3 percent of the State Title I allocation for statewide family engagement in education activities, such as establishing statewide family engagement centers to continue and enhance the work that had been supported through the Parent Information Resource Centers. For States with Title I-A allocations above \$60 million, grants will be provided to at least one local family engagement in education center to provide innovative programming and services, such as leadership training and family literacy, to local families and to remove barriers to family engagement, and to support activities in the highest need areas of the State. Finally, at the national level, our legislation will require the Secretary of Education to convene practitioners, researchers, and other experts in the field of family engagement in education to develop recommended metrics for measuring the quality and outcomes of family engagement in a child's education.

This legislation builds on my successful efforts in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, to incorporate provisions throughout the law to strengthen and boost parental involvement. Developed with the National Family, School, and Community Engagement Working Group, which includes organizations such as National PTA, United Way Worldwide, Harvard Family Research Project, and National Council of La Raza, and endorsed by hundreds of local, State, and national organizations, this legislation represents the broad consensus that we must do a better job of engaging families in all aspects of their children's education.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Family Engagement in Education Act, and to work for its inclusion in forthcoming legislation to reauthorize and renew the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 93—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE COURAGEOUS WORK AND LIFE OF RUSSIAN OPPOSITION LEADER BORIS NEMTSOV, AND CALLING FOR A SWIFT AND TRANSPARENT INVESTIGATION INTO HIS TRAGIC MURDER IN MOSCOW ON FEBRUARY 27, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr.

MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 93

Whereas, on February 27, 2015, former deputy prime minister Boris Nemtsov was shot four times in the back within view of the Kremlin and a few short blocks from FSB headquarters in Russia's capital city Moscow;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov dedicated his life to the cause of freedom and human rights for the Russian people and sought to rid Russia's government of the corruption that fuels authoritarianism;

Whereas President Barack Obama called Mr. Nemtsov a "tireless advocate" for the rights of Russian citizens;

Whereas Prime Minister David Cameron said Mr. Nemtsov's "life was dedicated to speaking up tirelessly for the Russian people, to demanding their right to democracy and liberty under the rule of law, and to an end to corruption. He did so without fear, and never gave in to intimidation";

Whereas, on March 1, 2015, over 50,000 people representing a wide range of political parties and movements marched solemnly through Moscow to honor Mr. Nemtsov's life, many holding signs saying "I am not afraid";

Whereas, before his death, Mr. Nemtsov planned to lead a Spring March on March 1, 2015, against the Russian military's presence in Ukraine;

Whereas, in the weeks prior to his death, Mr. Nemtsov had reportedly been meeting with the families of Russian soldiers killed during Russia's military operations in Ukraine;

Whereas Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko said Mr. Nemtsov planned to release an investigative report showing proof of Russia's role in the Ukraine crisis;

Whereas, two years ago, Mr. Nemtsov led the release of a report titled, "Winter Olympics in the Sub-Tropics: Corruption and Abuse in Sochi", which implicated Russian President Vladimir Putin in the estimated \$26,000,000,000 frittered away in "embezzlement and kickbacks";

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov said on Ekho Moskvyy radio hours before his murder that President Putin was inserting Russia into the ongoing conflict by his "mad, aggressive and deadly policy of war against Ukraine," and asserted "when power is concentrated in the hands of one person and this person rules forever, this will lead to absolute catastrophe, absolute";

Whereas, according to Mr. Nemtsov's lawyer, Vadim Prokhorov, the activist reported threats to his safety to police authorities who failed to provide him with protection;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov's associates, such as leading opposition figure Alexei Navalny, stated that Mr. Nemtsov would have been under clear state surveillance as he walked toward the Kremlin shortly before his murder;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov was murdered in one of the most heavily-secured areas of Moscow;

Whereas opposition activist Ilya Yashin, commenting on the murder of Nemtsov, stated that "the atmosphere of hatred toward alternative thinkers that has formed over the past year, since the annexation of Crimea, may have played its role," referring to the surge of intense and officially endorsed na-

tionalist discourse in Russia since it annexed Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula;

Whereas President Putin called critics of his government policy "a fifth column" and "national traitors," inviting violent attacks upon them;

Whereas President Putin warned publicly in 2012, shortly after returning to the Presidency, that his opponents were planning to stage a murder of their own as a "provocation";

Whereas several prominent critics of President Putin and his government have died gruesomely since he came to power as head of the Russian National Security Service and through his current office of President;

Whereas, on September 21, 2000, Iskandar Khatloni, a reporter for the Tajik-language service of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty who had been working on stories about human rights abuses in Chechnya, was killed in his apartment by an ax-wielding assailant;

Whereas, on August 21, 2002, Vladimir Golovlyov, leader of the Liberal Russia faction in the lower house of parliament, was shot to death in a Moscow park while walking his dog after accusing President Putin of autocratic governance;

Whereas, on July 3, 2003, Yuri Shchekochikhin, a vocal opposition journalist and member of the Russian Duma investigating the 1999 apartment bombings that killed nearly 300 people, died 12 days after being hospitalized for a mysterious illness, believed to be poison, before he could travel to the United States to discuss Russian corruption cases with the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

Whereas, on October 7, 2006, journalist and human-rights activist Anna Politkovskaya, an outspoken critic of the Kremlin, was shot and killed in her Moscow apartment building;

Whereas, on November 3, 2006, Alexander Litvinenko, a former KGB officer and vocal critic of President Putin, was poisoned when radioactive polonium-210 was allegedly slipped into his tea as he met with two former Russian security services men in a restaurant in a London hotel, and British investigators have said they have evidence of Russian involvement in the murder of Litvinenko;

Whereas, on August 31, 2008, Magomed Yevloyev, owner of a news site called Ingushetiya, popular for its human rights and press freedom stories, died from a gunshot wound to the head sustained while being transported by regional Ingushetia police following his arrest at the airport in the regional capital;

Whereas, on January 19, 2009, human rights lawyer Stanislav Markelov, who defended opponents of the Government of the Russian Federation, was shot dead by a man using a pistol in the middle of the afternoon on a busy street in Moscow;

Whereas, on July 15, 2009, Russian human rights journalist and activist Natalia Estemirova was abducted in front of her home in Grozny, Chechnya, taken across the border into Ingushetia, shot, and dumped in a roadside gutter;

Whereas, on November 16, 2009, after human rights lawyer Sergei Magnitsky was jailed for uncovering \$230,000,000 in tax fraud perpetuated by Russian officials, died in prison after being beaten and enduring horrible conditions and suffering from pancreatitis that did not receive adequate medical care;

Whereas President Obama called for a "prompt, impartial, and transparent" investigation to bring the perpetrators of Mr. Nemtsov's murder to justice;

Whereas Secretary of State John Kerry stated "We hope the authorities will join the world in producing the credible, transparent investigation necessary to find out who did—who was behind this and who did it.";

Whereas Prime Minister Cameron stated that the callous murder must be "fully, rapidly and transparently investigated, and those responsible brought to justice";

Whereas suspicion of Russian authorities in Mr. Nemtsov's murder cannot be ruled out given his criticism of the regime;

Whereas far too few of those responsible in the killings cited above have been brought to justice, raising serious questions about the ability of Russian authorities to conduct a credible investigation into Mr. Nemtsov's murder;

Whereas impunity and lack of accountability prevail in the Russian Federation;

Whereas law enforcement, judicial, and investigative bodies are often used to target political opponents and civil society in the Russian Federation and thus lack the credibility to conduct an investigation themselves; and

Whereas the Russian Federation is a member of both the Organization for the Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Council of Europe, and these independent groups should be considered for investigation into Mr. Nemtsov's murder in order to lend the investigation credibility: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the courageous work of Russian opposition leader Boris Nemstov, who dedicated his life to the fight against corruption and in support of the universal and inalienable rights of the Russian people to freely choose their leaders and live according to democratic standards;

(2) calls for a swift and transparent investigation into his tragic murder using mechanisms from either the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) or the Council of Europe, including allowing willing OSCE member states to invoke the Moscow Mechanism, as was done with Belarus in 2011;

(3) encourages the public release of all surveillance tapes in the area surrounding the crime scene from different sources and angles to aid in the investigation;

(4) urges the President to add the names of persons that Mr. Nemstov requested be added to the visa ban list as provided for by the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112-208; 126 Stat. 1502) and continue to sanction human rights violators;

(5) encourages the President to send a high level United States delegation to Mr. Nemstov's funeral service; and

(6) calls on the President to significantly increase United States Government support for like-minded partners in the Russian Federation and the region to combat the flow of propaganda and the climate of hatred created by President Putin in the Russian Federation.

AWARDING A CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE FOOT SOLDIERS WHO PARTICIPATED IN BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, OR THE FINAL SELMA TO MONTGOMERY VOTING RIGHTS MARCH IN MARCH OF 1965

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 431 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 431) to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 431) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 107-252, Title II, Section 214, reappoints the following individual to the Election Assistance Board of Advisors: Dr. Barbara Simons of California.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:45 a.m. on Tuesday, March 3; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader

remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, and that the majority control the first half and the Democrats control the final half; further, that at 10:30 a.m. the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the joint meeting of Congress with His Excellency Benjamin Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel, as well as the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

#### TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate a very special day in history, particularly in Texas history, a day that inspires pride and gratitude in the hearts of all the people who call Texas home.

I rise today to commemorate Texas Independence Day, which is today. I will in a moment read a letter written 179 years ago from behind the walls of an old Spanish mission called the Alamo in my hometown of San Antonio, a letter written by a 26-year-old lieutenant colonel in the Texas Army, William Barret Travis. In doing so, I carry on a tradition started by the late Senator John Tower, who represented Texas in this body for over two decades. This tradition was upheld by his successor, Senator Phil Gramm, and by his second successor, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, after him. It is a tremendous honor that this privilege has now fallen to me.

On February 24, 1836, with his position under siege and outnumbered nearly 10 to 1 by the forces of the Mexican dictator Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, Travis penned the following letter:

To the People of Texas and All Americans in the World:

Fellow citizens & compatriots—

I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna.

I have sustained a continual Bombardment and cannonade for 24 hours and have not lost a man.

The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion. Otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken.

I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, and our flag still waves proudly from the walls.

I shall never surrender or retreat.

Then, I call on you in the name of Liberty, of patriotism and everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch.

The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily and will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in four or five days.

If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country.

Victory or Death.

Signed: "William Barret Travis."

As history reveals, in the battle that ensued all 189 defenders of the Alamo lost their lives, but they did not die in vain. The Battle of the Alamo actually brought precious time for the Texas revolutionaries, under the leadership of GEN Sam Houston, to maneuver his army into position for a decisive victory in the Battle of San Jacinto.

With this victory—the Battle of San Jacinto—Texas became a sovereign and independent republic. For 9 years the Republic of Texas thrived as an independent nation, and then in 1845 it agreed to join the United States as the 28th State. Many of the Texas patriots who fought in the revolution went on to serve in the U.S. Congress.

I am honored to hold the seat once occupied by Sam Houston, one of the first two U.S. Senators to the new State of Texas, and more broadly I am honored to have the opportunity to serve almost 27 million Texans because of the sacrifices made by these brave men 179 years ago.

May we always remember the Alamo, and may God continue to bless Texas and these United States.

I yield the floor.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:28 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 3, 2015, at 9:45 a.m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 2, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 2, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM EMMER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

### DHS FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, there is a letter from me sitting on your desk today asking you to pass a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security. All Democrats in the House have introduced and cosponsored a clean bill, and the Republican-controlled Senate has passed one as well.

Mr. Speaker, clause 2 of House rule XXI prohibits inclusion of language “changing existing law,” commonly referred to as the prohibition on legislating on appropriations bills; yet that is why the House comes in today facing another deadline that puts our national security and DHS workforce at risk—because we are trying to legislate through appropriations.

I am completely in favor of the deliberative process by which this body is supposed to conduct itself, and, while I support the President’s executive action on immigration reform, I would also support a robust debate on it in this House.

However, you know as well as I do that forcing this debate through hold-

ing hostage the funding of a critical component of our Nation’s security is not the proper way to go about having this debate.

At the beginning of the 114th Congress, you wrote an op-ed with Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL entitled “Now We Can Get Congress Going.” That is what I wrote to you and urged you to do today, Mr. Speaker.

Let’s pass a clean DHS funding bill and get going with the tough legislative choices that we have to make this year.

### FORT DRUM SEQUESTRATION AND CENTCOM CODEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. STEFANIK) for 5 minutes.

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the 10th Mountain Division, their service to Fort Drum, the 21st District of New York, our North Country community, and our Nation.

For 30 years, the brave men and women of the 10th Mountain Division have stood in harm’s way to protect and defend our country. Since September 11, 2001, the 10th Mountain Division has been the most actively deployed division to Iraq and Afghanistan. Too many of our soldiers have made the ultimate sacrifice and lost their lives in service.

As leaders in Congress, we have an obligation to protect and serve our constituents and members of our Armed Forces. We cannot repay the debt we owe these servicemembers and their families, but we can work to honor their legacy and recognize what they have done for us.

We must protect the promises we have made to these brave individuals and strengthen our Nation’s commitment to helping them as they return from combat. In Congress, I will do everything I can to protect the interests of Fort Drum and to ensure the 10th Mountain Division has the necessary resources they need to do their work.

It is critical for Fort Drum and the entire 21st Congressional District to have a voice at the table to fight on behalf of our military families and veterans.

To that end, I am honored to serve on the House Armed Services Committee as the vice chair for the Subcommittee on Readiness and as a member of the Military Personnel Subcommittee and

Intelligence, Emerging Threats, and Capabilities Subcommittee.

As a member of these subcommittees, I will work to ensure the Defense Department, our troops, and Fort Drum have the necessary tools they require to defend our Nation from those that wish to do us harm.

However, we continue to see threats to our national security increase, and reductions to our military remain due to the Budget Control Act and sequestration. These substantial budget cuts will have significant negative impacts to Fort Drum and the U.S. military.

Under sequestration, the Pentagon’s proposal states that Fort Drum could lose up to 16,000 soldiers and civilian jobs. This loss of jobs will have severe and devastating effects to the installation, the North Country community, New York, and the entire Nation.

General Dempsey and our military leaders have declared time and time again that sequestration reduces our Armed Forces’ readiness and their capabilities, and it unnecessarily puts our men and women in uniform at increased risk.

Here, we expect our servicemen and -women to protect our Nation; however, the imposed budget cuts due to sequestration inhibit their readiness and threaten our national security. It is our duty to ensure our Nation is protected and, in doing so, maintain the operational readiness of our military.

I pledge to work to preserve and strengthen our Nation’s Armed Forces and follow in the footsteps of Representative John McHugh by advocating for our troops and veterans stationed in the 21st Congressional District of New York and in our surrounding communities.

Two weeks ago, I had the honor to attend a small congressional delegation visit to Jordan, the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Iraq, and Afghanistan. On this trip, I was privileged to meet with soldiers who are based out of Fort Drum, as well as many others who have trained there.

What an opportunity it was to visit with the troops from the Resolute Support headquarters forces, USFOR-A soldiers, and counterterrorism operations forces. I thanked them for their service and discussed ways we can protect and strengthen Fort Drum for our district.

This trip was truly essential in order for me to gain a personal perspective of the circumstances under which so many of our brave soldiers from Fort Drum have served abroad.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Additionally, I was able to meet with many important foreign dignitaries, including King Abdullah of Jordan, Afghan President Ashraf Ghani, and Iraqi President Fuad Masum, to discuss issues of concern to the region. These nations and their leaders play a key role in the effort among Arab nations to combat ISIS and other terrorist organizations.

The discussions and meetings with these dignitaries were informative and useful. I believe that continued open dialogue and conversation with these leaders will be incredibly beneficial to maintain and establish our Nation's perspective on defense policy.

This trip gave me a chance to hear from our servicemen and -women on the ground and other national leaders about real solutions related to stabilizing the region, continued threats to our own national security, the readiness of our Armed Forces, and the tools they need to keep our country safe.

Serving the Fort Drum community in Congress and as a member of the House Armed Services Committee is an incredible honor. I am beyond thankful to our men and women in uniform and grateful to their families for their service to our community.

Thank you to you and your loved ones for keeping our Nation safe.

#### CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MRS. ALLIEFAIR ROGERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the milestone in the life of Mrs. Alliefair Rogers who, this week, is celebrating her 100th birthday. Mrs. Rogers is also, incidentally, a second-generation centurion, as her mother, Ida Jane, also lived to the age of 103.

Throughout her life in the past century, Mrs. Rogers has witnessed some of the most significant moments that have shaped our Nation. Born during the onset of World War I, Mrs. Rogers was only 2 years old when America entered the Great War, sending our doughboys across the Atlantic.

By the time she was 5 years old, the first radio stations were going on the air in America, prohibition was enacted, and women for the first time had the right to vote. By her 12th birthday, Charles Lindbergh had flown across the Atlantic Ocean, and the first motion picture with sound was played in theaters. At the age of 14, she witnessed the beginning of the Great Depression.

Just months before turning 25, Mrs. Rogers learned of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and, over the next 5 years, said goodbye to family members and friends as they left Walhalla, South Carolina, to fight against the Axis Powers.

Before her 31st birthday, she had witnessed the D-day invasion, the Battle of the Bulge, the Battle of Iwo Jima, the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the surrender of both Germany and Japan. By the age of 33, she witnessed the rebirth of Israel as a nation; and, at 40, America sent troops overseas to fight in Korea.

By her 50th birthday, she had lived through the building of the Berlin Wall, America's first satellite in space, the deployment of forces to Vietnam, the Cuban missile crisis, and the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

By 60 years old, Mrs. Rogers witnessed the end of the Vietnam war, the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the first human to step foot on the moon.

Within the next 15 years, by the age of 75, Mrs. Rogers experienced the first resignation of a United States President, the invention of the personal computer, the first woman Supreme Court Justice, the end of the cold war, and the beginning of the space shuttle program.

In her lifetime, Mrs. Rogers has witnessed the administration of 17 United States Presidents and a significant portion of this Nation's history.

Today, I join with the many friends and family who are celebrating the virtuous and faith-led life of my aunt Mrs. Alliefair Rogers and wish her a very happy 100th birthday.

#### ONGOING IRAN NUCLEAR TALKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my serious concerns about the ongoing Iran nuclear talks. Iran is no friend to the United States or our allies. Iran remains the foremost state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

Iran has continued to develop intercontinental ballistic missile technology. The only legitimate purpose of such technology is to deliver a nuclear payload.

Don't just take my word for it. Lieutenant General Vincent Stewart, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, recently wrote in his statement for the record to the House Armed Services Committee:

The Islamic Republic of Iran continues to threaten U.S. strategic interests in the Middle East. Iran's actions and policies are designed to further its goal of becoming the dominant regional power, as well as to enhance its strategic depth. Tehran views the United States as its most capable adversary and has fashioned its military strategy and doctrine accordingly.

In terms of nuclear capabilities, General Stewart goes on to say:

We continue to assess that Iran's goal is to develop capabilities that would allow it to build missile-deliverable nuclear weapons, should a decision be made to do so. The regime faces no insurmountable technical bar-

riers to producing a nuclear weapon, making Iran's political will the central issue.

One Arab official recently told *The Wall Street Journal*: "We prefer a collapse of the diplomatic process to a bad deal."

Since they started in 2009, the negotiations with Iran have been marked by missed deadline after missed deadline. It seems like each time details of the deal are leaked to the press, the United States is giving up more, whether it is the number of centrifuges or the length of the deal.

□ 1215

Just last week, Secretary of State John Kerry came before the House Foreign Affairs Committee and pleaded for more time and understanding as the State Department continues to hold talks about Iran's nuclear program. He asked it to sit silently while the details are negotiated in secret. He urged us to just trust him and his team.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly hard to trust an administration that continually fails at these kinds of negotiations. Look at the Bergdahl deal when he gave away five high-level al Qaeda officials. Look at the recent talks with Cuba in which the United States received very little while we released Cuban spies and pledged open trade relations. And we can't forget about President Obama telling Russian President Dmitry Medvedev that he will have "more flexibility" to deal with nuclear issues after the 2012 Presidential elections—flexibility to deal with Vladimir Putin. Far too often they give away the bank, and we get very little in return.

Tomorrow, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu will come to this Chamber to share his perspective on the threats posed by a nuclear Iran. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have complained that the speech is somehow out of line or for political purposes only. They have pledged to boycott the event, and the Vice President has refused to attend.

Mr. Speaker, I remain greatly disturbed by the way the Obama administration has treated Israel, our greatest and most important ally in the Middle East. I suspect the real reason the Obama administration is so opposed to Prime Minister Netanyahu's speech is because they are afraid of what he is going to say. They know he will speak the truth and that his statements will stand in direct contrast to what is being said by Secretary of State Kerry. Prime Minister Netanyahu won't hide the real issues. These nuclear talks threaten not only Israel, but also the Middle East and the entire world.

Last summer, I traveled to the Middle East with the Armed Services Committee. During that trip, we met with Prime Minister Netanyahu, and he really impressed me. He has a clear vision and message about his country's

defensive needs, and he is very determined to meet those needs.

Mr. Speaker, Israel is our strongest and most consistent ally in the Middle East. We should listen to what they have to say.

#### THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, today is March 2, 2015. March 2, 1836, marked the beginning of what would become the Republic of Texas. Today on that day, 59 men signed the Declaration of Independence from Mexico and created the Republic of Texas. The events of January through April of 1836 are relatively significant, and I will walk through some of this history.

I stand here today to honor the incredible events of those days and the 179 years of Texas experience that I am proud to be a part of. It is a great honor to be able to have been born in Texas and to claim a part of that incredible legacy.

One of the signature events of the Texas revolution with Mexico, of course, was the battle of the Alamo, which began on February 23, 1836, where Colonel William Barret Travis began to gather men at the Alamo.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a transcription of his letter written to the people of Texas and all Americans on February 24.

TO THE PEOPLE OF TEXAS & ALL AMERICANS IN THE WORLD: Fellow citizens & compatriots—I am besieged, by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained a continual Bombardment & cannonade for 24 hours & have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken—I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, & our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of Liberty, of patriotism & everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch—The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily & will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in four or five days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible & die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor & that of his country—Victory or Death.

WILLIAM BARRET TRAVIS,

*Lt. Col. comdt.*

P.S. The Lord is on our side—When the enemy appeared in sight we had not three bushels of corn—We have since found in deserted houses 80 or 90 bushels & got into the walls 20 or 30 head of Bees.

Travis.

Mr. CONAWAY. Travis and his other fellows stood watch at the Alamo from February 23 until March 6. As they were fighting and looking at their ultimate death, the Declaration of Independence was signed on March 2. Four days later, Santa Anna, with the Mexican Army, overran the Alamo and

killed every single one of the defenders there.

There are other events, such as the massacre at Goliad in which Santa Anna ordered the murder and execution of 400-plus Texans who had been a part of that fight. It was cold-blooded, it was ruthless, and it was unnecessary, but Santa Anna chose to take those steps specifically on his order on more than one occasion. And then, culminating on the 21st of April, the Battle of San Jacinto took place, in which Santa Anna and his entire army were surrounded by Texans in a decisive victory in which very few Texans lost their lives. Santa Anna was defeated, and the Texas experience—our independence—was secured with that battle.

Mr. Speaker, I honor today the men and women who stood that ground, that hallowed ground, at the Alamo, at Goliad, San Jacinto, and other battles across Texas. They were stouthearted; they were resolute; they were self-sufficient; they were independent; they loved freedom; they loved independence; and as a result of that, they created Texas, an experience that has now gone on for some 179 years. There were almost 9 of these years in which Texas was the Republic of Texas, becoming a part of the United States in 1846 under that proud Lone Star Flag that we still fly today.

My purpose here this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is to call attention to the Declaration of Independence, and, more importantly, call attention to the faith that the men and women had in freedom and liberty and were willing to put their lives on the line. Many of those lives were lost in the fight for freedom and to create Texas. I am proud to call myself a Texan.

I ask God to continue to bless Texas, and I ask God to continue to bless the United States of America.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

At the beginning of a new workweek, we use this moment to be reminded of

Your presence, and to tap the resources needed by the Members of this people's House to do their work as well as it can be done.

May they be led by Your spirit in the decisions they make. May they possess Your power as they steady themselves amid the pressures of persistent problems.

May their faith in You deliver them from tensions that tear the House apart, and from worries that might wear them out.

All this day, and through the week, may they do their best to find solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation. Please hasten the day when justice and love shall dwell in the hearts of all peoples, and rule the affairs of the nations of Earth.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CASS BALLENGER

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, the State of North Carolina lost one of its most generous and devoted public servants when former Congressman Cass Ballenger passed away at the age of 88.

Cass served 38 years in public office and was a beloved colleague to many who serve in this Chamber for 18 of those years. He never lost an election, which tells you plenty about the honesty and tenacity with which he lived his life.

In addition to his reputation as a straight-talking legislator who reformed the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, he was known for his extensive humanitarian efforts in Latin America, where he helped build medical clinics, supported orphanages, and delivered medical and relief supplies with his wife, Donna.

Although I never had the opportunity to serve with Cass in Congress, I considered it a great privilege to know



this remarkable man and always looked forward to seeing him when our paths crossed in North Carolina. Cass was a man of integrity who said exactly what he thought and fought for what he believed was right. He will be greatly missed.

#### DHS SHUTDOWN

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well this week in Congress it is déjà vu all over again.

Last week, instead of bringing up a clean, long-term funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security, the House again kicked the can down the road. We know that we need to keep open and keep funding the operations of the Department, and we certainly can't make this yet another manufactured political crisis this week.

We know, and everybody in this Hall knows, that there is support in the House, bipartisan support, for a clean Homeland Security bill. I don't know precisely what the numbers are, but more and more we hear from our friends on the Republican side that they would like to see a vote to fully fund DHS for the remainder of the year, and then take up in regular order the process of determining what immigration policy ought to look like in this country.

We have big problems in this Nation. We have big challenges across the globe. We need to focus our attention on getting an economy that works for everyone and not continue to fight battles over manufactured political crises intended to pander to the smallest minds in this body. That is not the way the American people want us to work. We need to get back to the business of the American people.

#### NATIONAL FFA WEEK

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, last week we celebrated National FFA Week and the national FFA organization's more than 80 years of commitment to providing students with a path to leadership and career success through agricultural education. This year's theme, "Go All Out," asks more than 600,000 students from over 7,600 local FFA chapters to "go all out for agriculture" and show their communities how they live the FFA motto: Learning to Do, Doing to Learn, Earning to Live, Living to Serve.

As a former FFA member, I have always been impressed with how well FFA helps hone certain skills and prepare students for the future. I find that FFA not only helps to advance their knowledge of agriculture and develop

community relationships, but you can always tell an FFA student by how articulate and well-spoken they are.

My own experience in FFA not only helped shape my career as a farmer but also prepared me to represent the Fourth District of Washington State.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the FFA on 80 years of commitment to agriculture and education.

#### DHS SHUTDOWN

(Mr. VARGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the millions of Americans who are concerned about the state of our national security. In today's world, we face many threats from foreign enemies who intend to do us harm. Americans expect that Congress will fulfill its duty to act in the best interests of those we serve. The question of whether or not to fund the Department of Homeland Security should never even be up for debate. I respect the difference of opinions some of my colleagues hold with respect to the President's recent executive action on immigration. But taking hostage a funding bill that is intended to keep American families safe in order to get what you want is reckless, and it is not the way this body was intended to function.

Let's pass a clean DHS funding bill, and then let's have a serious debate on immigration. We need to find a comprehensive solution to our immigration challenges, and the only way to do that is by working together to pass a bipartisan bill. Let's utilize this Chamber to debate and pass meaningful legislation, and let's start right now by approving the Department of Homeland Security funding for the remainder of the fiscal year.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF KENNETH LEHR

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a man who was dedicated to protecting and serving the public. Kenneth Lehr, the fire chief for the village of Medora in Macoupin County, Illinois, died in the line of duty earlier this month.

Chief Lehr was entering his 21st year as a member of the Medora Fire Department and had served as fire chief since 2006.

While preparing to respond to a 911 call on February 5, Chief Lehr was struck by a firetruck that was heading to the scene. This tragic event reminds

us all to never forget the selflessness and sacrifices our first responders make on our behalf, especially when many give their lives for our safety.

Earlier this month, more than 500 first responders, family, and friends packed the gymnasium at Southwestern High School in Piasa, Illinois, to pay their respects to Chief Lehr. Some firefighters traveled more than 2 hours to honor Chief Lehr.

Friends and coworkers of Chief Lehr noted his unwavering willingness to help others, both as fire chief and as a member of the Medora community. Chief Lehr is survived by his wife, one son, and three grandsons. My thoughts and this House's thoughts and prayers are with his family, friends, and the Medora community as they continue to mourn.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Friday, February 27, 2015:

H.R. 33, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1702

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO RECOUP BONUSES AND AWARDS

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 280) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 280

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO RECOUP BONUSES OR AWARDS PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 7 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**“§ 715. Recoupment of bonuses or awards paid to employees of Department**

“(a) RECOUPMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may issue an order directing an employee of the Department to repay the amount, or a portion of the amount, of any award or bonus paid to the employee under title 5, including under chapters 45 or 53 of such title, or this title if—

“(1) the Secretary determines such repayment appropriate pursuant to regulations prescribed under subsection (c); and

“(2) before such repayment, the employee is afforded notice and an opportunity for a hearing conducted by another department or agency of the Federal Government.

“(b) REVIEW.—A decision regarding a repayment by an employee pursuant to subsection (a)(2) is final and may not be reviewed by any department or agency or any court.

“(c) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“715. Recoupment of bonuses or awards paid to employees of Department.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 715 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to an award or bonus paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to an employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act may be construed to modify the certification issued by the Office of Personnel Management and the Office of Management and Budget regarding the performance appraisal system of the Senior Executive Service of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 280, as amended, is similar to a bill that I introduced last Congress. I would like to thank my friend Mr. CHAFFETZ for helping us bring this bill to the floor today. It would authorize and provide for the Secretary to have the authority to rescind a bonus or a performance award from VA employees when the Secretary deems it appropriate. To ensure a fair process, the provision would also give the employee an opportunity to hold a

hearing on the Secretary's decision to recoup that bonus.

Now, I proposed this legislation last Congress because VA had given the Committee on Veterans' Affairs conflicting statements whether or not they had the authority, and later they confirmed that they did not have that authority. So it is clear to me that this is still an authority that the Secretary still needs as more and more investigations, in fact, are being completed by the Department, the VA inspector general, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

As these investigations into falsified wait times, data manipulation, and several other issues at the VA continue, I hope this authority will be applied appropriately and that it will be utilized as yet another tool for the Secretary to use to instill true accountability throughout his agency on behalf of America's veterans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,

Washington, DC, February 26, 2015.

Hon. JEFF MILLER,  
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,  
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 280, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs. As you know, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs received an original referral and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform a secondary referral when the bill was introduced on January 12, 2015. I recognize and appreciate your desire to bring this legislation before the House of Representatives in an expeditious manner, and accordingly, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will forego action on the bill.

The Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 280 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. Further, I request your support for the appointment of conferees from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform during any House-Senate conference convened on this or related legislation.

Finally, I would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the bill report filed by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as well as in the Congressional Record during floor consideration, to memorialize our understanding.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,  
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,  
Washington, DC, February 27, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,  
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CHAFFETZ: In reference to your letter on February 26, 2015, I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 280, as amended. “To authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.”

I appreciate the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's waiver of consideration of provisions under its jurisdiction and its subject matter as specified in your letter. I acknowledge that the waiver was granted only to expedite floor consideration of H.R. 280, as amended, and does not in any way waive or diminish the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdictional interests over this legislation or similar legislation. I will support a request from the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform for appointment to any House-Senate conference on H.R. 280, as amended.

Again, thank you for your assistance with these matters.

With warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF MILLER,  
Chairman.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 280, as amended. This measure would provide the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with the authority to issue an order directing an employee of the VA to repay a bonus or a portion of the bonus provided to that employee. H.R. 280 provides the Secretary may do this if the Secretary determines that the repayment is appropriate. This authority would apply to an award or a bonus paid by the VA before, on, or after the date of the enactment of H.R. 280. The bill provides that any affected employee be provided with notice and the opportunity for a hearing conducted by another agency or department.

I support this measure, but I want to take this opportunity to address a few concerns for the RECORD.

I believe that the Secretary should have a limited authority, beyond administrative error, to recoup a bonus paid to the VA employee when the underlying basis of that bonus is false or the result of wrongdoing, fraud, or criminal conduct by the employee. I hope that the Secretary will use this broad grant of rulemaking authority provided in H.R. 280 to provide narrow and specific grounds for recoupment.

Secondly, I am concerned about the application of this authority to bonuses provided before the date of the enactment. I know that Chairman MILLER and all of us are concerned over bonuses that may have been awarded over the last number of years to VA managers who took activities, steps to cover up the delay and wait time faced by our veterans. Even though I am unhappy with their action, I would not like to see the authority provided to the Secretary under the bill to be done away with because of a constitutional challenge to this authority.

Finally, I would like to point out that if this bill is enacted, the VA will be the only Department that I am aware of where the Secretary will have the power to recoup bonuses. I hope the Secretary and those that follow this Secretary will use this authority with caution.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 280, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the First District of Michigan (Mr. BENISHEK), the subcommittee chairman of the Subcommittee on Health.

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 280, legislation to allow the VA Secretary to claw back bonuses from senior employees who were found to have manipulated veterans' care data.

Frankly, I can't believe that this wasn't already the case. No business in America would allow employees to not only stay at work, but to hold on to bonuses that they earned by cooking the books. This is exactly what the VA has done. The VA has paid more than \$380,000 in 2013 to directors and top executives at VA hospitals that were under investigation for falsifying data.

I am the father of a veteran. I know exactly the character of those who choose to serve the cause of freedom. They deserve so much better. Bonuses should be awarded only for exceptional performance. This kind of severe mismanagement has to end. I know I speak for all my colleagues when I say it will not be tolerated by this Congress.

Secretary McDonald says he is working to change the culture of the VA, and I give him credit for that. Too often the VA seems to be focusing on the health of the organization, not the health of the veteran. I agree with him that the VA must return the focus to the veteran. However, I would like to see more meaningful strides toward accountability than I have seen thus far. Congress will keep giving him the tools, but it is ultimately up to him to use them. This is a management problem, and it is best solved by good management.

I thank Chairman MILLER for his leadership on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it, but even more so, I urge Secretary McDonald to use this authority. You have a willing partner in Congress in the fight to change the culture at the VA.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has yielded back the balance of her time. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have two more speakers at this point. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), who chairs the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations.

Mr. COFFMAN. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 280 because, like most Americans, I am appalled at the bonuses awarded to officials within the Depart-

ment of Veterans Affairs despite gross mismanagement and incompetence by those very same officials.

In my home State of Colorado, a VA director conveniently announced her retirement just days after yet another secret waiting list was discovered at her hospital in Denver. Incredibly, she had received over \$100,000 in bonuses over the past 7 years.

I believe bonuses are a reward for exceptional work and not an entitlement for simply showing up at the job. However, the VA's broadly abused bonus system has spread a sense of entitlement and a complete lack of accountability.

This law gives the VA Secretary the ability to reclaim bonuses paid to corrupt VA officials. On behalf of the American taxpayer, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to help combat VA's broken culture.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Sixth District of Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), a new member of the committee, an outstanding supporter of America's veterans.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, bringing more accountability and transparency to our Veterans Affairs system is something Members of both parties can and should support. As a member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, I believe this is an area where we can make immediate and substantive reforms that are supported by both parties.

After months of being in the spotlight for scandal after scandal, after widespread and systemic lack of accountability, we all agree that we need real change in an effort to assist our Nation's veterans. H.R. 280 is one such piece of legislation that will help bring accountability to a Department where it is severely lacking.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a cosponsor of this legislation that will authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees at the Department of Veterans Affairs. The VA paid more than \$380,000 in cash bonuses to top executives at 38 hospitals that are under investigation for falsifying wait times for medical care.

At every twist and turn, these executives received a bonus, while so many of our veterans have been faced with long wait periods or failed care at VA hospitals around the country. It is disgraceful that employees would be benefiting while so many veterans are struggling.

It is only right that we would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup many of these bonuses and awards in an effort to instill more accountability at the Department. In fact, it is common sense. If you receive a bonus under false pretenses, you should have to pay it back.

I, along with so many other Americans, am asking the question, Where is the accountability? H.R. 280 will not only ensure our veterans receive the care they deserve and have earned, but it also promotes transparency and accountability where it is greatly needed.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER for his leadership and his work on this important issue.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Florida and her support, and at this point I urge all Members to support H.R. 280, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 280, a bill which authorizes the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses paid to VA executives who knowingly falsified data on the treatment of our nation's veterans.

Last year, it was discovered that a VA hospital in Phoenix, Arizona falsified waitlist records for veterans to see a doctor in order to make it appear that the facility was meeting waitlist goals.

This deliberate, and deplorable, action allowed VA executives to receive performance bonuses and awards, while veterans waited up to six months to a year for care, and it was reported that some died as a result.

To date, the VA has paid more than \$380,000 in cash bonuses to top executives at 38 hospitals that are under investigation for falsifying wait times for medical care.

In response to the waitlist scandal, many members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have called for the VA to take action to recover bonuses paid to VA officials who falsified waitlist records.

However, the VA has said it is uncertain whether it has that authority.

This bill directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to require VA employees to repay, in part or in full, bonuses or performance awards in appropriate circumstances under regulations to be established by the department.

This authority would apply to bonuses or rewards paid on or after the date of enactment and would not authorize the VA to recover previously paid bonuses.

Furthermore, under the bill, VA employees would receive notification and be given a hearing at which they could contest allegations about their performance.

The measure requires that an appeal decision would be final and not reviewable by any other agency or court.

Our nation supports more than 2 million troops and reservists, their families, and 22 million veterans, including 32,477 in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

We have a responsibility to ensure that they will be provided the quality job opportunities they have earned.

I cannot, in good conscience, allow VA executives who knowingly falsified data which kept our nation's veterans from receiving proper care, to keep bonuses that they do not deserve.

This money should be used to help those who have risked their lives to protect our freedom, not for awarding VA executives who shamefully put these veterans' health at risk.

I ask my fellow Members to support H.R. 280.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 280, legislation authorizing the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs. I would like to commend Chairman MILLER for his continued leadership on this issue. I also want to express my gratitude to the House Veterans Affairs Committee for their hard work on this bill, and for its work last year on the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014.

Last year, reports by the VA Office of Inspector General revealed widespread mismanagement, inadequate standards of care, and unnecessary delays for appointments in VA facilities across the country, including facilities in both Atlanta and Augusta, Georgia where veterans in my home district seek care. The appalling lack of responsible oversight at certain facilities led to the placement of veterans on secret waiting lists created to manipulate data in order to cover up long wait times. This was an inexcusable practice that prevented our nation's heroes from receiving the timely care that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, those responsible for overseeing those VA facilities were clearly failing at their jobs. Yet, in Fiscal Year 2013, VA issued over \$380,000 in bonuses to employees at hospitals under investigation by the VA Inspector General for falsifying records. This is unacceptable. Under no circumstances should VA employees receive a 'performance award' for purposefully fostering an environment of negligence. H.R. 280 provides the authority to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to order VA employees to pay back their bonuses so that no employee will remain rewarded for their misconduct.

We owe our veterans a great debt of gratitude, and one small way of repaying that debt is to ensure that our veterans receive the best possible care. This commonsense legislation will bring much-needed accountability to the VA system and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 280.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 280, as amended. The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1715

#### LONG-TERM CARE VETERANS CHOICE ACT

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 294) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the transfer of veterans to non-Department medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 294

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act".

#### SEC. 2. SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR PLACEMENT OF VETERANS IN NON-DEPARTMENT MEDICAL FOSTER HOMES.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1720 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h)(1) During the three-year period beginning on October 1, 2015, and subject to paragraph (2), at the request of a veteran for whom the Secretary is required to provide nursing home care under section 1710A of this title, the Secretary may place the veteran in a medical foster home that meets Department standards, at the expense of the United States, pursuant to a contract or agreement entered into between the Secretary and the medical foster home for such purpose. A veteran who is placed in a medical foster home under this subsection shall agree, as a condition of such placement, to accept home health services furnished by the Secretary under section 1717 of this title.

"(2) Not more than 900 veterans placed in a medical foster home, whether placed before or after the enactment of the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act, may have their care covered at the expense of the United States under subsection (a).

"(3) In this subsection, the term 'medical foster home' means a home designed to provide non-institutional, long-term, supportive care for veterans who are unable to live independently and prefer a family setting."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (h) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on October 1, 2015.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AWARDS AND BONUSES.—Section 705 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. 703 note) is amended to read as follows:

#### "SEC. 705. LIMITATION ON AWARDS AND BONUSES PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

"The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall ensure that the aggregate amount of awards and bonuses paid by the Secretary in a fiscal year under chapter 45 or 53 of title 5, United States Code, or any other awards or bonuses authorized under such title or title 38, United States Code, does not exceed the following amounts:

"(1) With respect to each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018, \$300,000,000.

"(2) With respect to each of fiscal years 2019 through 2024, \$360,000,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the placement of veterans in non-Department medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 294, as amended, the Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act, would authorize the Department of Veterans Affairs for 3 years, beginning October 1 of 2015, to enter into a contract or agreement with a certified medical foster home to pay for long-term care for not more than 900 eligible veterans.

An eligible veteran is defined as one who is eligible for VA-paid nursing home care and would agree to receive VA home health services. The bill would also limit the amount of awards and bonuses paid to VA employees at \$300 million for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2018.

Medical foster home care is a non-institutional, long-term care alternative for those who prefer a smaller, more homelike, and familial care setting than many traditional nursing homes are able to provide.

VA has been helping to place veterans in medical foster homes for over a decade and providing the oversight and the safeguards needed to ensure that veterans receive safe, high-quality care.

According to VA, over 900 veterans currently receive medical foster home care. However, VA does not currently have the authority to pay for the cost of medical foster home care, regardless of whether or not the veteran who chooses medical foster home care is eligible for more costly VA-paid nursing home care.

This creates a situation, Mr. Speaker, where many service-connected veterans are limited with their financial resources and are unable to access the medical foster home care that they desire because of limited financial resources; instead, these veterans often move into nursing homes at a much greater expense to VA.

With the creation of the choice program last August, Congress, on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis, agreed that our veterans deserve the right to choose for themselves where and how they receive health care that they have earned.

With today's passage of H.R. 294, as amended, we will reaffirm that right to choose for the growing population of veterans in need of long-term care services.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 294, as amended.

Providing high-quality health care to our Nation's veterans has always been

a number one priority for this committee. Ensuring that the VA is a leader in the provision of long-term care to our veterans has also been a priority.

We must work to make sure that VA provides a full range of long-term care programs, and H.R. 294, as amended, is a valuable improvement in providing veterans the choice of obtaining long-term care in a medical foster home.

H.R. 294 gives VA the authority to pay for veterans' long-term care in VA-approved medical foster homes. These homes provide care in a private home at much lower cost than nursing home care. Medical foster homes are safe, and we know through experience that many veterans prefer them to the traditional nursing home.

Older veterans also indicated that they prefer to receive care closer to home. The Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act would provide the opportunity for more veterans to take advantage of this home care setting.

I fully support this legislation and thank the chairman for introducing it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 294, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 294, as amended.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on both H.R. 280, as amended, and H.R. 294, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 203, the "Long-Term Care Veteran Choice Act", which will help expand access to healthcare for our nation's veterans.

In 2014, it was found that some VA Department employees were responsible for deliberately falsifying wait-time records for veteran's medical appointments in order to create the appearance of reaching wait-time targets.

This falsification of records even resulted in the unfortunate death of several veterans who were forced to wait unreasonably long periods of time before receiving the healthcare they unquestionably earned.

H.R. 294 is intended to prevent another unacceptable incident and to ensure our veterans receive the healthcare they deserve.

H.R. 294 allows veterans to obtain health care at non-VA health care facilities if they live more than 40 miles from a VA clinic or cannot be scheduled for an appointment at a VA clinic within 30 days.

Further, the bill increases the VA's capacity to provide health care services by providing expedited authority to hire more doctors and nurses and by providing for leases for the opening of 27 additional VA health facilities across the nation.

This bill will also propose a three year pilot program which will transfer certain veterans to non-department medical foster homes if they are unable to live independently at the cost of the VA.

It is our duty to make available only the best health care to our veterans, and I cite as an example the Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center in Houston.

The DeBakey VA Medical Center provides world-class services to almost 130,000 veterans in southeast Texas and employs over 4,000 health care professionals.

The DeBakey VA Medical Center has earned prestigious awards and accreditations for the quality of care provided, including:

Accreditation from Joint Commission for hospital, long-term care, behavioral health care, home care, and substance abuse;

Re-designation for Magnet Recognition for Excellence in Nursing Services by the American Nurses Credentialing Center;

Gold Seal of Approval in 2011 from the Joint Commission as an Advanced Primary Stroke Center; and

Specialty accreditation by the American Psychological Association Commission on Accreditation for its Clinical Neuropsychology Postdoctoral Program.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans have given this country so much and we owe it to them and to ourselves that they have the best and most accessible health care services.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 294, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 294, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 280, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Any remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### LONG-TERM CARE VETERANS CHOICE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 294) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the transfer of veterans to non-Department medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

#### YEAS—405

Abraham	Burgess	Cummings
Adams	Bustos	Curbelo (FL)
Aderholt	Butterfield	Davis (CA)
Aguilar	Byrne	Davis, Danny
Allen	Calvert	Davis, Rodney
Amash	Capps	DeFazio
Amodei	Capuano	DeGette
Ashford	Cárdenas	Delaney
Babin	Carney	DeLauro
Barletta	Carson (IN)	DeBene
Barr	Carter (GA)	Denham
Barton	Carter (TX)	Dent
Beatty	Cartwright	DeSantis
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DeSaulnier
Benishek	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bera	Chaffetz	Deutch
Beyer	Chu, Judy	Diaz-Balart
Bilirakis	Cicilline	Dingell
Bishop (GA)	Clark (MA)	Doggett
Bishop (MI)	Clarke (NY)	Dold
Bishop (UT)	Clawson (FL)	Doyle, Michael
Black	Clay	F.
Blackburn	Cleaver	Duckworth
Blum	Clyburn	Duffy
Blumenauer	Coffman	Duncan (SC)
Bonamici	Cohen	Duncan (TN)
Bost	Cole	Edwards
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Ellison
Boyle, Brendan	Collins (NY)	Ellmers (NC)
F.	Comstock	Emmer (MN)
Brady (PA)	Conaway	Eshoo
Brady (TX)	Connolly	Esty
Brat	Cook	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Cooper	Farr
Brooks (AL)	Costa	Fattah
Brooks (IN)	Costello (PA)	Fitzpatrick
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Fleischmann
Brownley (CA)	Cramer	Fleming
Buchanan	Crowley	Forbes
Buck	Cuellar	Fortenberry
Bucshon	Culberson	Foster

Foxx  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hastings  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski

LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lummis  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaull  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moonenar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Mulaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmuter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Price, Tom  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby

Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Russell  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Swallow (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder

Yoho  
Young (AK)

Young (IA)  
Young (IN)

Zeldin  
Zinke

#### NOT VOTING—27

Bass  
Castor (FL)  
Conyers  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Engel  
Fincher  
Flores  
Gutiérrez

Hartzler  
Hinojosa  
Hultgren  
Knight  
Long  
Meeks  
Nadler  
Richmond  
Roe (TN)

Rohrabacher  
Rush  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Speier  
Stutzman  
Tonko  
Valadao  
Waters, Maxine  
Wilson (FL)

#### □ 1856

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the placement of veterans in non-Department medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 107, had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

#### AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO RECOUP BONUSES AND AWARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 280) to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Miller) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's ap-

pointment, pursuant to Executive Order 12131, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the President's Export Council:

Mr. KILDEE, Michigan  
Ms. DELBENE, Washington

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission:

Mr. THOMPSON, California

#### □ 1900

#### FCC DECISION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last week, the FCC voted 3-2 on bipartisan lines to allow unprecedented government regulation of the Internet and reversing nearly two decades of bipartisan policy.

In a recent interview, FCC Commissioner Ajit Pai said, “This is a solution that won't work to a problem that doesn't exist.” Mr. Speaker, the FCC Commissioner is exactly right. Why are trying to fix a problem that simply does not exist?

This decision by the FCC represents a dangerous and reckless disregard for free market principles and is just another example of government overreach by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama's 332-page plan to regulate the Internet will lead to slower services, less investment, and more taxation.

Together with my colleagues, I will continue to fight to keep a free and open Internet.

#### WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER BINYAMIN NETANYAHU

(Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the special friendship between the United States and Israel and to welcome Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu before his address on the challenges facing our two nations.

In their campaign of unparalleled savagery, the radical Islamic terrorists known as ISIS have made the slaughter of innocent Christians a priority. In



the face of this senseless violence, Israel stands as a beacon of safety. To end this barbarism, the United States, Israel, and all our allies should develop a long-term strategy to wipe ISIS off the Earth.

The United States and Israel are also confronted with the potential emergence of a nuclear Iran. Like Israel, our government should keep all options on the table to prevent this outcome.

In facing these and future challenges, our Nation is fortunate to call Israel a friend. Israel and the United States share common ideals of freedom, justice, and fair elections by the people in a republic.

I welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu back to Congress, and I look forward to his remarks on protecting our shared values against terrorism and a nuclear Iran.

#### THE LONE STAR STATE OF THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the nation of Israel is surrounded by some mean, aggressive neighbors that want Israel destroyed. The leader of the pack of jackals is Iran. The Supreme Leader of Iran has made it clear he wants the Jewish state to vanish into the sands of time.

Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel will be here tomorrow to speak to Congress on the serious plight that Israel faces from our mutual enemy, Iran. The White House is snubbing the head of state because Congress supposedly violated protocol with the invite.

Meanwhile, the White House is blissfully working on a backroom deal with Iran regarding their nuclear weapon program, a deal that will end up to be good for Iran, with a short pause in work on its nuclear enrichment.

Mr. Speaker, Israel is the lone star state in the Middle East for freedom. So on this Texas Independence Day and on behalf of the people of the State of Texas, the Lone Star State, I want to welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu to speak candidly and openly about the true threat from the jackal of the desert, Iran.

And that is just the way it is.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO MY HOME, THE REPUBLIC OF TEXAS

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, 179 years ago, a document from home changed the world with 102 final words. These words are:

We, therefore, the delegates with plenary powers of the people of Texas, in solemn con-

vention assembled, appealing to a candid world for the necessities of our condition, do hereby resolve and declare that our political connection with the Mexican nation has forever ended and that the people of Texas do now constitute a free, sovereign, and independent republic and are fully invested with all the rights and attributes which properly belong to independent nations; and, conscious of the rectitude of our intentions, we fearlessly and confidently commit the issue to the decision of the Supreme arbiter of the destinies of nations.

Happy birthday to my home, the Republic of Texas.

#### WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER BINYAMIN NETANYAHU

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome our friend and ally Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu to the United States of America.

Tomorrow, the Prime Minister will address this Chamber as a head of state. Some are protesting and will not attend. This is shortsighted and, frankly, disheartening. We have no greater ally in the Middle East than Israel, and Israel's very existence is being threatened by its neighbors in the region.

Words like "total destruction" are being thrown around by its enemies. Iran marches towards a nuclear bomb; yet we do nothing, we say nothing. Sure, we negotiate, but we don't lead.

Mr. Speaker, the President needs to step forward and lead, tell the world that we will do what it takes to protect our Israeli friends, as we have done for over 70 years.

Prime Minister Netanyahu, welcome to the United States. I look forward to your remarks tomorrow and to our nations' continued friendship, as do the majority of Americans.

#### WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER BINYAMIN NETANYAHU

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, following my friend from Mississippi, it is important that we recognize that it is not just a person coming tomorrow to speak to us, it is the leader of Israel, our best friend in the Middle East.

You think I like to come here and get lectured about the Citizens United case by a guy that doesn't understand that case? You think I enjoy coming over here and being told, You pass my American Jobs Act right now, when he didn't even have one for a couple of weeks?

Of course not—I come and listen to the President because of the respect for the position. This is a dangerous precedent some are thinking about starting

tomorrow: Well, I am just not going to show up because I don't like the man that is leading Israel.

They are our ally, and if you want people to stop showing up for others like the President, then start that tradition.

It is a wrong move. Let's pay respect to our best friend's leader in the Middle East.

#### GOD BLESS TEXAS

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, 179 years ago, in a hamlet in what is now Grimes County, Texas, called Washington-on-the-Brazos, a handful of brave Texans voted to declare independence from Mexico. We call this day Texas Independence Day.

As those brave men were declaring their independence at a decrepit old mission in San Antonio, Texas, less than 200 patriots—led by people like Davy Crockett and William Barret Travis and James Bowie—were fending off an army of somewhere between 3,000 and 5,000 Mexican soldiers under the leadership of a General Santa Anna.

The Alamo fell on March 6, but on April 21, 1836, General Sam Houston, at a bayou called San Jacinto, led about 350 Texans in a surprise attack on the Mexican Army and won independence for Texas from Mexico.

God bless Texas, and God bless all those patriots 179 years ago for what they did.

#### BRIDGING THE DIVIDE: OBSERVATIONS ON RACE AND JUSTICE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this evening, the Congressional Black Caucus will take a moment to discuss our strong support for the confirmation of U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as the next Attorney General of the United States, and we will examine the larger issue of justice in America.

Tonight's CBC hour is entitled "Bridging the Divide: Observations on Race and Justice in America." As we reflect on the 50th anniversary of the Selma marches, the events of Bloody Sunday, and the progress that has been achieved in the years since, we must remember that the Voting Rights Act was achieved not only because of those who marched, it succeeded because of those who cared enough to get involved, a Congress that became engaged, and an active Department of



Justice that was diligent about enforcing the Voting Rights Act.

Loretta Lynch is exactly the type of active, educated, and principled character we need as our next Attorney General. Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee voted to confirm her as the next AG, paving the way for her confirmation by the full Senate. This confirmation must come soon and cannot be held up for partisan political purposes.

With experience as a frontline prosecutor, a U.S. attorney, and as someone with a strong record of service over several decades, Ms. Lynch is more than qualified to sit at the helm of the Department of Justice and protect the rights of our American democracy.

On the issue of justice, there is so much more we can discuss tonight, but right now, it is most appropriate for us to examine a few topics that so many citizens in the districts we represent want to look at.

In addition to Ms. Lynch and the Department of Justice, we would like to take time to explore the value of black lives in America and the fact that they do really matter, perceptions in minority communities regarding police treatment, the impact of black incarceration on communities, and voting rights and disenfranchisement.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from the Garden State, my good friend and anchor for this hour of action, Representative DONALD PAYNE. Congressman PAYNE has been a forceful advocate for justice issues in America and a leader in the true sense of the word.

I yield to Congressman PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlelady from Illinois who has demonstrated her leadership throughout her time here in Congress, and I am just delighted to also be working with her.

Mr. Speaker, we want to thank the Congresswoman, once again, for opening tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour. It is an honor to join with her and the other members of this caucus to speak directly to the American people and keep them up to date on our efforts.

□ 1915

We are here tonight to talk about the urgent need to ensure the nomination of Loretta Lynch as the next Attorney General of the United States of America.

Ms. Lynch has a distinguished legal career in private and public service, earning the respect of her colleagues and establishing herself as a topnotch lawyer and Federal prosecutor in the Eastern District of New York.

She has successfully prosecuted cases on far-ranging issues, including public corruption, violent crime, and terrorism. They have included a number of high-profile cases, such as United

States v. Volpe. In that case, Ms. Lynch was part of the trial team that convicted several New York police officers involved in the torture of Haitian immigrant Abner Louima in 1997. She also prosecuted the Bangladeshi man convicted of attempting to blow up the Federal Reserve Bank of New York in 2012.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Lynch's professional credentials are matched by her strength of character. Throughout her career, Ms. Lynch has demonstrated unparalleled strength of character, integrity, and independence. She has displayed an unwavering commitment to the rule of law, to public service, and to this Nation. She has proven time and time again that she is a highly capable, independent leader who carefully considers all sides of an issue and does not cave to outside influences.

These are the characteristics we look for, characteristics we should and do demand when considering nominees for U.S. Attorney General.

Ms. Lynch's professional background and outstanding character suggest she would be capable of using her position to address a number of issues that are important to achieving true equality and justice for African American communities. These include perceptions of police treatment, voting rights, and sentencing disparities, which undermine the foundations of African American communities.

There is every indication that Ms. Lynch would make an outstanding U.S. Attorney General, and it is the hope of this caucus that she can quickly be confirmed by the Senate.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD), the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Ms. KELLY for her leadership and for yielding me this time as a representative of the 46 men and women comprising the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. PAYNE, I want to thank you for all you do for our caucus and what you mean to not only the State of New Jersey, but also what you mean to all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we have set aside this hour to remark about the confirmation process for Loretta Lynch. President Obama should be commended for choosing an Attorney General nominee who is well quali-

fied in every respect. Though she lives in New York City, she is a native of Greensboro and Durham, North Carolina. She is a North Carolinian for sure.

Her father, the Reverend Leonzo Lynch, whom I have known for most of my life, is a native of Martin County, North Carolina, from the town of Oak City, which is right in the heart of my congressional district. The Lynch family has deep roots in eastern North Carolina.

Ms. Lynch has a 30-year career, distinguished legal career. She is a well-respected lawyer and Federal prosecutor in the Eastern District of New York, which serves 8 million people throughout Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, and Long Island. Loretta Lynch is consistently recognized among her peers as a tough, fair and independent lawyer who has twice headed one of the most active and effective U.S. Attorney's Offices in the country.

Ms. Lynch has a proven record of prosecuting hate crimes and cracking down on public corruption without regard to political party or affiliation. She has a reputation for being committed to protecting human rights and ensuring equal opportunity for all Americans. Ms. Lynch possesses high moral character and integrity. She has the perfect set of professional credentials to lead the U.S. Department of Justice.

She remains steadfast and unflappable when facing the court of public opinion and upholds the letter of the law in all circumstances, even when it is unpopular.

Throughout Ms. Lynch's confirmation process, Senators in both parties have lauded her qualifications and her sterling career. However, Ms. Lynch has waited longer for a confirmation vote than any U.S. Attorney General in modern history. Her nomination has been pending for more than 100 days. The politics that Republicans have played with Ms. Lynch's nomination are deplorable, and opposition to her nomination is nothing more than, in my opinion, a political ploy to once again use any means necessary to show their disdain for the President.

I am deeply disappointed, as I am sure many other North Carolinians are, at Senator THOM TILLIS' vote last week in the Senate Judiciary Committee against the nomination of one of North Carolina's own. Senator TILLIS had an opportunity to be on the right side of history in supporting her nomination, but he did not.

If confirmed, Ms. Lynch would make history as the first African American woman to serve in the role as United States Attorney General. She is an outstanding nominee and an excellent choice. The Senate should move swiftly to confirm Loretta Lynch as Attorney General for the United States of America.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Congressman BUTTERFIELD's remarks.

It is now my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), past chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus and Congressperson extraordinaire.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend for yielding. I want to thank my colleagues, PAYNE and KELLY, for leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour. You are our message team. You are the people who let all of the world, all of America know what the CBC is dealing with on a daily basis, and I thank you for your work.

Last week, Loretta Lynch's nomination to serve as the next U.S. Attorney General was finally passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee by a vote of 12-8. I use the word "finally" because there has been a significant delay with her confirmation. Why her confirmation has taken so long confounds me. I mean, what exactly is the Senate majority waiting for? What is the delay?

The fact that it took over 100 days to just get her to a committee vote is particularly troubling when one considers how long it took to actually confirm former Attorneys General: Janet Reno, 29 days; John Ashcroft, 42 days; Michael Mukasey, 53 days; and Alberto Gonzales, who had to resign as Attorney General, 86 days.

Clearly, Attorney Lynch's confirmation has been singled out for delay. Ash Carter's confirmation moved expeditiously, and he is now the Secretary of Defense. His hearing took place on February 4. He was voted out of committee on February 11, and ultimately confirmed on the Senate floor on February 12.

When testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Attorney Lynch showed grace under pressure while enduring long hours of vigorous questioning. Later, she provided answers to hundreds of questions, all on the record, resulting in more than 200 pages of testimony. Her professionalism and responsiveness are well documented.

Further, Senators in both parties have lauded Attorney Lynch's qualifications. Her record speaks for itself. Senator HATCH, one of the three Republicans—shamefully, three Republicans—who recently voted in favor of Attorney Lynch's nomination in committee, stated:

I have concluded that Ms. Lynch's full record, including but hardly limited to her hearing testimony, shows that she is qualified to serve as Attorney General.

That is all that they are trying to show to the American public. All they need to say is that she is qualified. If they had the President and the White House, they would pick who they want. But they don't have the President and

the White House, so they have to deal with who he picks. And she is qualified.

Further, Senators in both parties understand how important it is to fill the position of Attorney General. Yet she continues to be penalized by many members of the majority party for President Obama's immigration policies and a general disdain for Attorney General Holder. Here we are stopping the Attorney General nomination because of immigration, we won't fund the Department of Homeland Security because of immigration—there is a problem in the Congress of the United States. In fact, she is being judged for the actions of others, and we know that. This is nothing more than political gamesmanship.

I call on my colleagues in the other Chamber to stop the charade and get on with the confirmation. I urge the Senate to put Attorney Lynch's nomination on the floor immediately. Judge Attorney Lynch on her record and her merit, and do it now.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank Congresswoman FUDGE for her very, very pertinent remarks.

It is now my honor to yield to the freshman gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak. I want to thank Ms. KELLY from the great State of Illinois, as well as Mr. PAYNE from the great State of New Jersey for yielding me this time. I want to extend my support for the confirmation of Ms. Loretta Lynch for the position of Attorney General.

As a New Yorker, indeed a Brooklynite, a former Bronx district attorney, as well as having worked at the Justice Department, I have the utmost respect for Ms. Lynch, who has served the people of New York, and indeed this great country, is eminently qualified to be the Attorney General and should be confirmed.

#### TERRITORIAL VOTING RIGHTS

Ms. PLASKETT. I additionally, Mr. Speaker, would like to discuss another issue that is of grave importance to the people of the territories, and that is territorial voting rights.

As we commend the 50th anniversary of the March on Selma this week, and the subsequent passage of the Voting Rights Act, I want to once again call to the attention of my colleagues here in Congress that there are still American citizens today who do not have equal voting rights. While we may discuss the irrational and truly illogical mechanism which has excluded those who have been convicted of felonies from society for voting, I want to discuss another group which has been disenfranchised, that is some 4 million people to be exact. These are citizens of America's island territories—the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Northern Marianas—American citizens

who willingly risk life and limb in defense of a great nation for which they do not have a vote. American citizens who, in their great patriotism, have paid the ultimate sacrifice, the sacrifice of their lives, and in this last conflict in Iraq and Iran, have died at a rate of seven times the national average.

Citizens of the current U.S. territories have bravely fought in every American conflict, indeed, including the American Revolution, when we gave our own person in Alexander Hamilton from the Virgin Islands to fight in that war. Some have even been awarded the Medal of Honor, which is the Nation's highest military honor. Yet, these citizens who have contributed and sacrificed so much still cannot vote for their Commander in Chief.

This inability to vote has a direct correlation to the poverty and disenfranchisement in so many areas that the people of these island territories experience. Poverty in the 21st century is a shameful reality in our great Nation, and for decades it has been a serious and persistent problem in the Virgin Islands. Child poverty for us in the territories is a heartbreaking reality.

A recent report from the Community Foundation of the Virgin Islands and Kids Count says 31 percent of the children in the Virgin Islands are living in poverty. To further underscore this troubling statistic, Virgin Islands families are struggling with a very high cost-of-living, driven by the fact that much of our food supplies must be imported, along with the very high cost of electricity. We pay some of the highest prices in the Nation. And while, thankfully, the American economy is on the rebound and reports of job growth are very good news, unemployment on the islands on which I live is 15 percent or more.

□ 1930

The benign neglect of this great Nation to the territories has got to end. Each island was bought for military purposes, and now that it is believed by the country that the physical geopolitical need is not there, the people have been forgotten. Indeed, some have even questioned whether the people were ever remembered on these islands, that the lands and the resources were what this Nation wanted, not the people. But we have contributed much, and we deserve better. Not tying citizenship and the right to vote to the soil—the sovereign soil—on which an individual is born controverts the most basic English and, thus, American law.

Mr. Speaker, Virgin Islanders, who are proud people dedicated to their families, committed to their faith, and are so very willing to work hard for a better and brighter future for themselves, their children, and, indeed, this country, deserve the right to vote.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congresswoman PLASKETT, for educating our public on the challenges

people on the Islands face. Your words are so pertinent as we go to Selma to remember the events of 50 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it is now my distinct honor to call to the podium the gentleman from New York, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois for yielding, and of course I want to thank Congresswoman KELLY and Congressman PAYNE for their wonderful leadership in creating this opportunity for members of the Congressional Black Caucus to speak directly to the American people on an issue of great significance, the justice system generally, but specifically, the urgent need to confirm Loretta Lynch as our next Attorney General.

Let me say parenthetically that it feels good to be in the presence of my two classmates, R. KELLY and D. PAYNE. I feel like I am in the midst of celebrity. Certainly, they have done a tremendous job in calling us all together.

We have got a serious issue that we need this Capitol to confront. In the midst of terrorists who are all across the world who want to strike at our homeland, not only are we dealing with a dynamic where some in the House of Representatives refuse to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security because of an unnecessary obsession with the President's executive action on immigration—let me note, of course, though individuals may differ on its legality, every President since Dwight Eisenhower has taken executive action on immigration. It has occurred 39 times since the 1950s.

President Eisenhower did it; President Nixon did it. President Ford did it; President Reagan did it; President George Herbert Walker Bush did it; and President George W. Bush did it. Every President since Eisenhower has taken executive action to provide some form of immigration relief. But, of course, when President Obama steps forward to deal with our Nation's current problems, a constitutional crisis has been provoked.

What also seems to be interesting, Mr. Speaker, is that the effort to address the issues that some may have with President Obama's executive action has crossed over into trying to stop, delay, and obstruct Loretta Lynch from becoming our Nation's next Attorney General. Some over on the Senate side have even said as such: Well, we are concerned that she has got a supportive attitude as it relates to President Obama's executive action.

Well, many of my good friends on the other side of the aisle are so-called strict constructionists. They believe in the sanctity of original intent as it relates to the Constitution. Well, the Constitution had an article I legislative branch, an article II executive branch, and an article III judicial

branch. And the Founders suggested that if there are issues that need to be worked out, it is the court's job to do it. So there is a lawsuit right now pending in Texas challenging the legality and the constitutionality of the President's executive action on immigration. Let the courts do their job. Stop holding hostage our Nation's safety and security, and stop holding hostage the confirmation of Loretta Lynch.

If you take a look at her resume, no reasonable person could argue that she is not exquisitely qualified. Her resume reads like the American Dream: a Southern girl born in North Carolina, raised by a school librarian mother and a Baptist preacher father. She excelled in her elementary and high school studies so much so that she went off to college at Harvard University and then got a law degree from that same institution, one of the best law schools in the world.

She then joined a high-powered litigation law firm in New York, excelled there, but then after several years took, I believe, what was a 75 percent cut in salary and left the private sector so she could go work as a Federal prosecutor and do some good. In that office, she quickly rose through the ranks, tried high-profile cases in the rough and tumble of New York City with grace and with dignity, always making sure that she was guided by the law and the facts—not politics, drama, and hyperbole.

Loretta Lynch was confirmed twice, I believe, by the United States Senate unanimously. The American people recognize that this is a Congress that can't agree on basic things, yet unanimously Loretta Lynch has been confirmed twice as the lead prosecutor in the Eastern District of New York.

By the way, she is a proud Brooklyn resident now, and I had the honor and privilege of representing Ms. Lynch when I was in the State legislature. She has excelled as the consummate law enforcement professional. She is fair, she is equitable, she is tough, and she is just.

So we are here today simply to say it is time to confirm her. The President has made the observation: You can't stand Eric Holder. The easiest way to get rid of him is to confirm Loretta Lynch.

What is the hold up? Allow her to take the helm over these final 20 or so months so that we have some stability at the all-important Department of Justice. We need all hands on deck right now as it relates to the war on terror. We need the FBI, the CIA, the NSA, and the Department of Homeland Security. We have got to be correct 100 percent of the time. Terrorists only have to be right once. It seems to me that if you have a confirmation pending of a clearly qualified individual to head the Department of Justice, the re-

sponsible thing to do is to act, and to act now.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my good friends R. KELLY and D. PAYNE for giving me this opportunity to spend a few moments on behalf of a tremendous Brooklynite, by way of North Carolina, who is clearly qualified to be our Nation's next Attorney General. It is time to bring the confirmation to the floor and to allow her to serve the American people.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you kindly to the gentleman from New York, Congressman HAKEEM JEFFRIES, a man of much wisdom and truth.

Congressman PAYNE, we have heard from a number of Members why Loretta Lynch would be a great Attorney General. Hopefully, we can move on this and she will be confirmed very soon.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to introduce one of my freshman colleagues, the woman from the great State of Ohio, Congresswoman extraordinaire JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my classmate and colleagues for hosting us this evening for the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, during the past month, we honored the great achievements and rich history of African Americans and the African American community. We reflected on an unfortunate journey through slavery and segregation, prejudices and discrimination. Though we bring Black History Month to a close, the Congressional Black Caucus will continue to fight for justice. Tonight our Special Order hour is Bridging the Divide: Observations on Race and Justice in America.

Our attention to the divides in our society, however, does not end because we entered a new month. We must remain focused on how we can bridge the divides in our society and how we can bring our Nation closer together. The divides are striking, and we know them all too well: the school-to-prison pipeline, education disparities, health disparities, the injustices in our justice system.

It is well established in fact that students of color face harsher punishments in schools than their White peers, leading to a higher number of youth of color in detention, suspension, and, yes, expelled. Mr. Speaker, African American students are arrested far more often than their White classmates. Black and Hispanic students represent more than 70 percent of those involved in school-related arrests or referrals to law enforcement. Currently, African Americans make up two-fifths and Hispanics one-fifth of confined youth today.

Disparities are found not only in how we punish behavior in schools, but also how we fund education. Mr. Speaker, this is true in K-12. It is also true in

higher education. And we know that a college degree is a path to a middle class life. As African American students graduate with more debt than their White classmates, the cuts to Pell grants are threatening African American access to a better education. Without the Pell grant program, hundreds of thousands of young African Americans would not be able to afford college.

The disparities in access to health coverage are startling. The infant mortality rate among African Americans is 2.3 times that of non-Hispanic Whites, and African American infants are four times more likely than non-Hispanic White infants to die, mostly due to complications related to birth weight.

Mr. Speaker, we must confront these prejudices and these injustices in our Nation head-on. The Congressional Black Caucus is committed to resolving these challenges. The Congressional Black Caucus has fought to ensure funding the Pell grant. Pell grants are contained in each year's appropriations bills. We have worked hard to make sure that the maternity and newborn care are part of health care plans under the Affordable Care Act. Over 390,000 African American women in the individual market alone are projected to gain maternity coverage thanks—yes, thanks—to the Affordable Care Act. Our task force on the elimination of sentencing disparities is moving the ball on how Black men and women are treated in the judicial system.

As we have been working here in Congress, our partners, the Deltas, my sorority, Delta Sigma Theta sorority, held their annual Delta Days in the Nation's Capital today with thousands of women from across this Nation gathering and advocating for these same disparities and injustices.

As Deltas were uniting in their efforts today in our Nation's Capital, my sorors and I were also uniting for one of our very own—nominee Loretta Lynch. Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee voted 12-8 to approve the confirmation of Loretta Lynch as the next United States Attorney General, bringing her confirmation to the full Senate for consideration.

I remember it all too well a couple weeks before that when we were in that hearing room. It looked like a sea of red as Deltas marched in and lined up one after another wearing our colors, crimson and cream. Deltas lined the outside of the hearing room. Mr. Speaker, we did that because, prior to entering that room, media and some of my colleagues on the other side had tried to make it a bad thing that she organized and was a founder of her college chapter of Delta Sigma Theta sorority.

□ 1945

What we were able to do was to show them when we work together, whether

that is Democrats and Republicans or sorority members or nonsorority members, when it is the right thing to do, we can make a difference.

I was so proud last week to sit there on the front row with my other colleagues—with our chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman G. K. BUTTERFIELD; with the 100th woman sworn into the United States Congress, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS; to be there with the 21st national president of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE.

We sat there next to Loretta Lynch's father, Reverend Lorenzo Lynch of North Carolina, while the Judiciary Committee favorably reported the nomination on a vote that was closer than it needed to be.

Ms. Lynch's nomination is well deserved and historic. Ms. Lynch testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee for nearly 8 hours, and she responded to nearly 900 written questions, which is unprecedented. Many of the written questions, Mr. Speaker, were from Senators who had already declared their opposition to her nomination.

Ms. Lynch's nomination has now been pending far longer than any recent Attorney General's nomination which, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is shameful. She deserves to be voted our next Attorney General. If Senators have a reason to vote against her nomination, they should make their case public. Yes, hiding behind procedural tactics does not help our Nation.

As the Senate has an opportunity to unite behind a well-qualified nominee for a critical position, Congress Members will have an opportunity to be united this weekend when Democrats and Republicans will travel to Alabama to march to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Selma marches.

Fifty years ago, people marched for equal voting rights. Out of those marches, we got the Voting Rights Act. However, disparities remain, and the Voting Rights Act has been eroded.

We can end this divide, Mr. Speaker, of who votes if my Republican colleagues would bring up the Voting Rights Amendment Act, H.R. 885. Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker. We can end the divide of who can vote if my Republican colleagues would bring up the Voting Rights Amendment Act, H.R. 885.

How long will it take? How long must we wait to have equal rights and justice? It is well past time that we deliver to all Americans what they deserve.

Like we did 50 years ago in Selma, we must do so again today and stand united arm in arm, as my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues and I did recently in Ferguson and as we will do tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow.

Together, united, we can bring an end to the disparities that hold our

hardworking families back from achieving the middle class dreams and the dreams of all Americans: that we should be equal.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio. You have done a great job describing the challenges and sharing the progress that has been made thus far for our constituents of color. You have given us a call to action.

Mr. Speaker, once confirmed, Loretta Lynch will replace Eric Holder as Attorney General. In that role, she will be in charge of managing and directing the policies of our Nation's law enforcement officers.

Ms. Lynch, as we have heard, is uniquely fitted to serve that role for our Nation, especially at this critical point in our national discourse. As U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York, Ms. Lynch currently serves as the chief Federal prosecutor for Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, and Long Island.

The death of Eric Garner this past July occurred on Staten Island, within Ms. Lynch's jurisdiction. Eric Garner's death—followed by the death of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, this past August—stirred a national discussion on use of force by police. Unfortunately, this discussion has produced increased animosity and distrust between law enforcement officers and the communities they serve. This is especially true in communities of color.

This is not the right approach, Mr. Speaker. This is not the way to move our country forward. We cannot afford distrust between law enforcement and the communities they are tasked with protecting. What we need is increased compassion, increased understanding, and increased trust between police and communities, and Loretta Lynch understands this.

In her opening statement before the Senate Judiciary Committee last month, Ms. Lynch stated:

Few things have pained me more than reported tensions and division between law enforcement and the communities we serve. If confirmed as Attorney General, one of my key priorities will be to work to strengthen the vital relationships of courageous law enforcement personnel in the communities we serve.

My family members have served and do serve in law enforcement. I have many friends in law enforcement. I have been fortunate enough to have many positive experiences with the law enforcement community. I understand just how courageous and brave the men and women who dedicate their lives to keeping us safe truly are.

However, I also understand the fear many citizens in communities of color have toward law enforcement following these tragic events. Nobody should live in fear of the institutions put in place to protect them. To move forward, we must change the conversation from law enforcement versus community to law enforcement and community.

Essential to advancing this cooperative and mutually beneficial relationship is the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, or COPS office, within the Department of Justice. COPS is tasked with building trust and mutual respect between police and their communities.

Increasing trust is essential to advancing public safety. A citizen who trusts their local police office and understands their mission is less likely to engage in antisocial and unlawful behavior; and a police officer who can empathize with the fears, sensibilities, and concerns of community members will be less likely to take rash, unwarranted, or disproportionate responses to those unlawful actions.

These focused efforts allow for law enforcement agencies and communities to work together and, instead of simply addressing immediate concerns, address systemic issues plaguing communities, many of which serve as the root cause of the violence and crime that occurs.

The COPS program's motto is: "Building Relationships, Solving Problems." For the past 20 years, COPS has done just that. COPS grants have given billions of dollars to State and local law enforcement agencies to hire police officers, provide technical assistance, and conduct training programs teaching collaboration skills, increasing shared understanding, and advancing sensitivity training.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better person to lead our Justice Department and further advance the efforts of the COPS program than Loretta Lynch. Ms. Lynch is exactly right in her desired focus of prioritizing improving relationships between law enforcement and communities. Her vision is exactly what the Justice Department and the COPS program, in particular, need at this critical point in time.

I fully understand the frustration, anger, and deep concern felt in communities across the country; however, it is simply unsustainable to have a dynamic where police fear communities and communities fear the police.

In order to ensure that all State and local law enforcement agencies and the entire justice system treat all Americans fairly and value all American lives equally, we must hold law enforcement to high professional standards and provide them with necessary training to effectively protect and police diverse communities.

Mr. Speaker, this month, we recognize the 50th anniversary of the March on Selma, Alabama. The brave men and women who marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge that day and the countless others through the Jim Crow South were on the receiving end of horrendous and unspeakable actions of police brutality.

We have come a long way over the 50 years, Mr. Speaker; however, much

work remains. I can think of no better person to lead that charge than Loretta Lynch. I look forward to her service as our Nation's Attorney General and the robust COPS program she will advance.

I yield to my great partner from the great State of New Jersey.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for her concise assessment of the nomination of an outstanding prosecutor, outstanding attorney, and outstanding American.

As it was stated by one of my colleagues, Ms. Lynch has followed and been a part of the American Dream, coming from meager beginnings, having a mother and father who cared for her and nurtured her, allowed her to get a good education and move on to—as it was stated—one of the best schools in our Nation and in the world and also to get her law degree from that same school.

Now, it appears to me, based on the hearings that I saw, Ms. Lynch has one problem. Is it her qualifications? No. Is it her demeanor? No. Has she done everything that she has been asked to do as a prosecutor in the Eastern District of New York? Yes.

Well, why is she not qualified? Well, no one is saying that she is not qualified. There is a political issue in the way, and that political issue is that she is the nominee of President Barack Obama, and that is her only issue, as I see it.

She has done everything that a good American should do: played by the rules all her life, pulled herself up by her bootstraps, got a good education, went into the private sector and then decided, Do you know what, I am going to go be a Federal prosecutor at a 75 percent decrease in salary.

Now, if that is not an American committed to this Nation, I don't know what is, so her only violation is that she was nominated by this President. Immigration continues to be the issue that is the rub. That is why we don't have funding for the Department of Homeland Security: because of immigration, because my colleagues on the other side don't agree with what the President did.

This is outrageous, this is absolutely outrageous, that a person that has done everything that they are supposed to do gets to this point and was confirmed twice by the Senate—now, I don't know if President Obama nominated her either one of those times, but now that he is nominating her for this position, well, she just doesn't cut it, there are issues.

They are not her issues. They are issues with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and their disdain for their President at times, absolute disdain. It is a matter of you are better off not saying that you are involved with the President the way it is going

around here. It makes no sense. It absolutely makes no sense.

Now, here is a woman that has allowed herself to go through this process and knew it was going to be rigorous, knew there were going to be challenges, knew she would be challenged, and came through the committee 12-8. But people initially that were going to support her, Mr. Speaker, had decided, Well, now, there is something wrong.

I mean, what happened? What happened in 2 weeks, in the space of 3 weeks, that has made you anti-Loretta Lynch?

□ 2000

We have issues all over this Nation, Mr. Speaker, that we need to be dealing with, and the Department of Homeland Security is one of them. We need to fund the Department of Homeland Security. It is interesting. I hear my colleagues' interest and concern about immigration and people coming across the border.

If you don't fund the Department of Homeland Security, how do you think that work continues? If you think it is bad now, don't fund the Department. You have people listening—the terrorists. You don't think terrorists are listening to this? You don't think this is a great opportunity for them to decide to maybe go rogue, to come out of their lone wolf status and do what they need to do because they know no one is minding the store because we decided to furlough people? You are concerned about this Nation and its security? It doesn't make sense to me.

We have many issues in the African American community, and we are here every other Monday night to express them—criminal justice, the issue around "Black lives matter," and the perceptions of police treatment in the African American community. I can tell you a personal story about my interaction, as a youngster, with a member of the police force back in my home in Newark, New Jersey.

It was a horrendous, horrendous episode in my life, but I got a break because the officer realized that my father was a member of the city council of that town. Prior to seeing my name on my driver's license and learning that, he told me that, if I didn't produce the papers that he wanted, they would throw me so far under the jail that they would never find me. But once I produced this document that said that I was all of a sudden somebody—I am a person; I am relevant—then he became nurturing. He said: Don't you know that making a U-turn is dangerous? and became paternal, but prior to that, it was that they would throw me so far under the jail that they would never find me.

So I stand here, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all of the people who wouldn't have gotten that break. It is my obligation to make sure that the playing

field is level, not because you are related to someone, not because you know someone, not because you have connections. Every American should be afforded the opportunity I was afforded that day.

In closing, I would just like to thank the gentlewoman, ROBIN KELLY, for her leadership in leading tonight's Congressional Black Caucus hour. These Special Orders give us the opportunity to speak directly to the American people about the work on their behalf and the issues that we care about. This is something that we do, and we are honored to be able to do it.

I would also like to thank the people at home who have tuned in tonight. It is our point to engage in an ongoing and meaningful dialogue, and I hope that they will continue to join us on Monday nights.

We began by discussing the nomination of Loretta Lynch as the next U.S. Attorney General. Ms. Lynch's nomination has been slow-walked by the Republicans, who would rather make it more about the President's immigration policy than about Ms. Lynch's qualifications and strength of character. Ms. Lynch has earned a number of outside endorsements, including from the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and her record is impeccable. It is the hope of this caucus that the full Senate comes to realize the urgency of her nomination and confirms her immediately.

Ms. Lynch's professional record suggests that she will embrace the vision of the Department of Justice, whose mission is to advance the cause of justice and equality for all Americans.

This is absolutely critical to the African American community, whose needs are not currently being met by our criminal justice system. Today, we see a criminal justice system that does not treat all Black lives as though they matter. From Staten Island to Ferguson, unarmed Black men have been the victims of excessive, deadly force by law enforcement. This creates and perpetuates a distrust in our communities, and it makes it increasingly difficult to have a meaningful dialogue between law enforcement and the communities they are charged with protecting.

These negative perceptions of police treatment are compounded by a number of other factors, including the disturbing gaps in incarceration rates. African Americans are incarcerated at a rate that is seven times higher than that of our White counterparts. These individuals are removed from the workforce often for drug-related crimes during their prime working years. They struggle to reenter society, having difficulty finding jobs and becoming productive members of their communities. Instead of immediately incarcerating those who commit drug-related, nonviolent crimes, more effort should be devoted to rehabilitation.

At the same time, we need to reevaluate the effectiveness of the war on drugs, a war that disproportionately affects African Americans and devastates African American and minority communities. When ex-felons reenter society, we need to ensure that our criminal justice system avoids purely punitive measures against them, including ex-felon disenfranchisement.

Finally, there is the reforming of our criminal justice system so as to eliminate disparities in sentences. According to the National Urban League, mandatory minimums and disparities in crack cocaine sentencing incarcerated countless numbers of African Americans for an inhumane length of time and had the U.S. as the world leader in prison population. This has created a modern-day caste system in America. When we address these issues, we will make significant progress toward a criminal justice system that reflects our values of full equality for all Americans.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues, Congressman DONALD PAYNE, JR. and Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY, in support of the CBC Special Order Hour entitled: "Bridging The Divide: Observations on Race and Justice in America." And as I reflect on some of the issues affecting the intersection of race and justice that still plague this country, I am deeply saddened.

Just on the other side of the Capitol, the Republican-led Senate has delayed the confirmation of Loretta Lynch as our next Attorney General, forcing her to wait for a vote longer than any other attorney general nominee in the last three decades. Despite this long delay, the Senate was able to quickly confirm the nomination of our new Defense Secretary Ashton Carter. Critics in the Senate have called into question Ms. Lynch's qualifications, dismissing her as "just another Eric Holder," choosing to ignore her exceptional academic record and impressive career accomplishments.

In the past few months, this nation has been rocked by the deaths of black men at the hands of police, and the fiery nationwide protests in response. The lost lives of Tamir Rice, Eric Garner, Mike Brown, and so many others have only contributed to the painful perception that black life is devalued in America. Many pundits have observed these tragedies and the various responses to them as proof that race relations in this country have regressed.

There are currently more black men behind bars in 2015 than there were enslaved in 1850, and these sentencing disparities have far reaching consequences. Among democratic nations, the United States enforces some of the world's most restrictive disenfranchisement laws for felons, keeping millions of men and women from ever being able to fulfill their civic duty. We ask them to pay their debt to society, we require them to re-enter society as productive adults, yet we strip them of such a basic democratic freedom. Without question, these laws disproportionately affect African

Americans, and Mr. Speaker, it is time for a change.

While the picture I have briefly painted may seem bleak, I remain encouraged by the resolve of so many Americans around the country Nationwide protests by people of all backgrounds have forced local lawmakers to confront their policies and make sure that they reflect the communities they govern. But as we all know, there is a long road ahead. And as the conscious of the Congress, it is the responsibility of the Congressional Black Caucus, to ensure that this august chamber addresses these issues essential to the quality of life for all Americans.

#### WILL THE U.S. AND THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY ALLOW IRAN TO DEVELOP A NUCLEAR WEAPON?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I am honored tonight to lead this Special Order on what is one of the most critical issues facing our Nation in generations. Now, I know that sounds dramatic and that it sounds like it is a statement that is just designed to capture people's attention, but it is actually true. This is a question that will define our safety and our security for generations to come.

The question we face and the issue that we want to address tonight is: Will the U.S. and the international community allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapon?

For generations, it has been the policy of Republican and Democratic administrations that we would not allow that to happen. It is critical to the security of our friends and allies in the region that we are successful in denying them this. It is critical to our own national security, to the interests at home, and to our interests abroad that we not allow Iran to nuclearize their weapons program. So we come to this question: Will we allow that to happen?

Tonight, I stand here, along with many of my colleagues, to express my great concern about what the President is doing and the state of the negotiations as they are now. Tomorrow, we get to hear from the Prime Minister of Israel. I look forward to hearing his comments. He certainly has, as they say, a dog in this fight, but so do we. Let me begin by telling you a little bit about my background.

I spent 14 years as a pilot in the Air Force. I flew the B-1. At one point, I was the pilot rep for the implementation of the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, or START I and START II, implementing a treaty that we had with the former Soviet Union. This was a very interesting experience. I learned a lot from this. I certainly learned of the



details and the necessity of following through with every tiny detail of these treaties and of implementing them. Our Russian counterparts could show up at our base at any time with only a few-hours' notice. They had access to the most highly sensitive areas. They would measure; they would observe; they would talk; they had incredibly sophisticated ways of verifying that we were complying with elements of the START Treaty, as we did with Russia.

These elements, in my opinion, are one of the keys to making sure that this treaty that the President is negotiating is successful, which brings us then to, really, one of our central questions, because I learned from my own experience that, for a treaty as sophisticated as this would have to be successful, there has to be a modicum of trust, an element of trust, between the two parties—a grain, a core of trust—where they both want the treaty to succeed. I don't know if we have that now.

I had the opportunity to address this concern with Secretary Kerry just last week. I asked him very simply: Can you name me a single example where the United States or our allies for generations have had a positive, constructive experience with Iran? Can you show me any example of how they have worked with us in a positive manner? He could not provide me with a single example.

Once again, this is one of the central questions that we have to address, so let's ask this question: Can we trust Iran? Let me explain to you why I think the answer to that is "no."

You see this map beside me. This indicates Iran's range of influence around the world, and it reaches, as you see, from North Korea, through central Asia, through the Middle East, through parts of Europe, to South America and to Mexico. Iran has been a state sponsor of terrorism for more than 30 years. They, by themselves, have developed an extensive military complex—the Defense Industries Organization, as they call it. The DIO is able to supply Iran with all of the materials that they need in order to carry out their terrorist activities around the world—all of the ammunition, all of the equipment, all of the weapons.

In fact, Iran is the primary supplier of the weapons and ammunition of two other officially recognized state sponsors of terror—Sudan and Syria. It is the primary sponsor of a number of listed foreign terrorist organizations, including Hezbollah and Hamas and numerous Shi'a militias in Iraq.

Iran has directed the terrorist activities of numerous of these Shi'a militias, and let me point out this fact: over the last dozen years or so, these Iranian-backed militias have been responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers working in the theater. Hundreds of American soldiers

have lost their lives due to the direct activities of Iran.

As I mentioned, and as you can see on the map, they engage in narcotics trafficking and human smuggling in Mexico. In the tri-border area of Brazil and Argentina and Paraguay, Hezbollah has a safe haven for recruiting, training, and fundraising. Even Venezuela is, similarly, a safe haven. In India, they provide support for Syed Kalbe Jawad, who is recruiting Shi'a militias to fight in Iraq and Syria. They cooperate with North Korea in cyber warfare. The list of their interventions in a negative and a destructive way around the world is, indeed, very long.

□ 2015

They are a strategic ally of Russia and China. They provide port facilities. They are a strategic ally of North Korea. They have cooperated with North Korea to develop ballistic missiles.

So, once again, let me come back to my conversation with the Secretary of State, where I ask him: Can you give us a single example of a positive or constructive alliance or agreement or partnership that we have had with this Nation of Iran?

And the answer has, once again, been no.

Iranian leaders have stated their objective is to destroy Israel and, of course, the great Satan, the U.S. In fact, I can show you.

Look at this picture, and you may wonder what it is. It is not something taken from World War II or from another war. This actually happened last week, where Iran completed a successful exercise in a simulated attack on a U.S. aircraft carrier. Does that sound like the activity of a potential partner?

Hezbollah has stockpiled approximately 60,000 surface-to-surface rockets in Lebanon. Hamas has stockpiled approximately 10,000 surface-to-surface rockets in Gaza. Iran is, of course, the primary supplier of both of these, and their stated purpose is to destroy Israel, to wipe it off the map.

As the current Iranian President Rouhani said: "The Zionist regime has been a wound in the body of the Islamic world for years, and the wound should be removed."

The former President said, in 2012, that Iran has no roots in the Middle East and that it would be eliminated.

So let me conclude my part of this hour by emphasizing once again that Iran has demonstrated several generations now of destructive, war-like, deadly activities around the world designed to destroy Israel, designed to weaken or destroy the United States, killing American soldiers overseas, and this is the partner that we think we can trust with one of the most critical issues of our day. I hope the President realizes the danger that we would face

if they prove not to be a reliable partner.

I will let others share in my time today. First, I would like to invite my friend, DENNIS ROSS from Florida, a member of the Financial Services Committee, to speak.

Mr. ROSS. I thank my good friend from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Madam Speaker, on November 4, 1979, the American Embassy in Tehran was seized and Iranians held 50 American hostages for more than 444 days. Each year, on November 4, Iranians celebrate Death to America Day to commemorate the 1979 seizure of our Embassy. So while we are celebrating Thanksgiving, President's Day, Martin Luther King Day, Memorial Day, and Labor Day, for the last 35 years, Iran has been celebrating, once a year, Death to America Day. The party with whom we are negotiating nuclear capabilities celebrates Death to America Day.

In 1983, two car bombs exploded in Beirut, killing 300 United States marines. Iranian-backed Hezbollah militants claimed responsibility for this mass murder.

Make no mistake, Iran is the lead sponsor of radical Islamic terrorism throughout the world today, including sleeper cells in the United States.

As Mr. STEWART just pointed out, last week, Iran's Revolutionary Guard staged war games in the Strait of Hormuz. When they blew up that mock U.S. aircraft carrier, Iran's Supreme Leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei, proclaimed that "Americans are ready to be buried at the bottom of the water"—the supreme commander, leader of the party with whom we are negotiating a nuclear capabilities deal.

Madam Speaker, my point is that Iran has a ruthless track record of terrorizing the West, including the United States. Let's be perfectly clear: Iran wants to destroy America, as they claim every November 4, and as they demonstrated last week in the Strait of Hormuz. Iran is a nuclear threshold state.

Recently, just 2 weeks ago, I had the privilege of traveling to Israel and meeting with Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. During my visit, the Prime Minister and I discussed in great detail the threat posed by Iran to Israel and the region. Iran openly declares its intention to destroy the State of Israel.

Today, Iran has the largest and most diverse missile arsenal in the Middle East. The missiles are capable of carrying nuclear and chemical weaponry within a range of 1,500 miles. With bared teeth, Iran, in conjunction with North Korea, is developing a longer range missile capable of reaching the United States. In just a few years, they will have that technology.

I am deeply concerned about the current round of negotiations between



President Obama and Iran. The current deal coming out of the White House would allow Iran to develop nuclear weapons after 10 years. A long-term deal that allows Iran to develop nuclear capabilities only strengthens the hand of Iran and fortifies their determination to destroy Israel, dominate the Middle East, the Muslim world, and the entire globe, including the United States.

Iran says its nuclear program is entirely for peaceful purposes and not aimed at developing nuclear weapons. However, Madam Speaker, history is replete with examples that argue quite the opposite. Iran is not our friend. Iran should never be allowed to develop nuclear weapons.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to hearing Prime Minister Netanyahu detail his opposition to this agreement that would grant Iran a license to develop nuclear weapons.

President Obama cannot unilaterally implement this dangerous plan. Congress has the responsibility to prevent this foreign policy disaster from ever occurring. We must stand firmly with Israel. Unless Iran is willing to forgo its entire nuclear program, the United States should not ease sanctions and should allow Iran to become a nuclear state.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. ROSS, for your comments tonight and for your defense of these concerns that we have.

I would ask the question, to emphasize something that you said, sir: Why is Iran building ICBMs?

As Charles Krauthammer pointed out in the last few days in an article, he said: You don't build ICBMs to deliver dynamite.

It is very clear what their intentions are, I would think. And although we will come back to this, I would like to follow up with one other point that you made. But before we do that, let me turn the time now to my friend, Mr. ROGER WILLIAMS from Texas. He also serves on the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Madam Speaker, on Tuesday, Israel's Prime Minister will make a direct appeal to the American people. His plea will not be made in front of cameras at a press conference. They will not be made from his home country 6,000 miles away. Tomorrow morning, Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu will stand right here behind me at this podium to address this Congress.

The Prime Minister will speak before us to directly petition Congress and the American people because, sadly, he has, like so many, lost faith in the abilities of our Commander in Chief. The Prime Minister has lost faith in an administration whose foreign policy summarized the President's guiding advice: Don't do stupid stuff.

He no longer trusts this American President, whose aides slander his

name to the press. He is skeptical about the State Department's trust above all else policy with Iran, whose leaders have publicly proclaimed their desire for Israel to be wiped off the map. He regrets the President's inability to outright condemn Hamas, a U.S.-designated terrorist organization, without blaming Israel in the same sentence.

Mr. Netanyahu has rightly questioned America's once unwavering commitment to his homeland, Israel—Israel, our partner, our ally, but most importantly, our friend.

Madam Speaker, we have responsibility—no, we have a commitment—to watch over and protect our greatest advocate in the Middle East. To my colleagues in this body that do not believe in the United States' moral obligation to watch over Israel, I remind them about the United States' strategic obligation. Israel's interests are closely aligned with ours. Israel benefits from a secure America, just as America benefits in having a secure, stable, and trustworthy ally in a very volatile, dangerous region.

Despite my personal beliefs that America has a moral obligation to ensure Israel's peace and prosperity, I cannot disregard the obvious strategic benefits our relationship has brought us. The Obama administration's inability to realize this twofold bond between the United States and Israel illustrates how out of touch they really are.

Mr. Prime Minister, I welcome you to the Chamber of the United States House of Representatives.

Mr. President, you and your supporters who refuse to meet with our friend, I must remind you of your foreign policy advice. Simply, you said: Don't do stupid stuff.

In God we trust.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. WILLIAMS.

I can't let the moment pass without reemphasizing something you said: Don't do stupid stuff.

Is it stupid to trust Iran? Is it stupid to negotiate an agreement that is fatally flawed? And I have deep concerns about this agreement in that it is fatally flawed.

For example, and perhaps most glaringly, there is this provision that allows for a sunset. We are not precluding Iran from developing nuclear weapons. In the very best case scenario, we are simply delaying them from developing nuclear weapons.

How in the world is it within the interest of the United States or our allies in the region or others in the area, as well, to simply say we are going to stop you from developing nuclear weapons for 10 years, which is reportedly one of the provisions of this agreement?

That doesn't stop them. It delays them. It delays them only if it assumes that they adhere to the agreement,

something that many of us are very skeptical about.

I could elaborate, but let me turn the time now to my friend, ROBERT PITTENGER from North Carolina. We came to Congress together. He is active in the foreign affairs community, and, I am proud to say, he is the chairman of the Congressional Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare.

Mr. PITTENGER.

Mr. PITTENGER. Thank you, my good friend, Congressman STEWART, for your leadership tonight on the very important timing of this, precluding the important meetings we will have this week.

Madam Speaker, I am here tonight to pay tribute and gratitude to Prime Minister Netanyahu for taking the time to come to the United States to express his grave concern over the perilous threat that he sees for the United States and for Israel.

Since 1948, with the inception of Israel, they have been a steadfast, loyal, democratic ally for the United States. They have stood strong as a surrogate on our behalf, fighting terrorism, Hamas, Hezbollah, and al Qaeda.

Being there in Israel last week, in the Golan Heights, I saw young men and women, 20 and 21 years old, in the tank division prepared for battle. They were courageous. Down in Gaza, the same type of commitment. They had the recognition of the realities of those missiles firing across, those missiles that are funded by Iran.

I met with the Prime Minister and I asked him the same question I asked him a year ago: Mr. Prime Minister, at such time that you need America, will America be there for you?

The best answer he could say was: Congressman, I hope so.

What a sad commentary on a relationship that we have with our most important ally in the Middle East.

The footprint of the terrorism of Iran is throughout the Middle East and, yes, throughout the world. They have been the primary funding agent for terrorism for the last 35 years. Every incident that you have seen in Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon, Yemen and other parts has their hand of funding and commitment.

□ 2030

The Prime Minister understands the critical role that is played in addressing this threat. Like Winston Churchill, he is coming to America to awaken the world to this perilous threat, a threat that Winston Churchill saw, that he spoke of time and again. While the world allowed Germany to take Austria and Czechoslovakia, we deferred, we appeased, we thought nothing else would happen.

We have given concession after concession after concession to Iran, \$12 billion in repatriated oil profits have been

remunerated back to Iran. We have fueled their economy, sustaining their economy, enabling them to go forward.

You know, in any negotiation—and I have been involved in many—you succeed with your adversary when you tighten the screws, not when you loosen them. We have had an inverse effect in this entire communication and dialogue with Iran.

What we have done has created an entity that is willing and able to continue this further negotiation because we have sustained their economy. Yes, the oil prices have come down, but what if we had kept the screws on them?

You know, the Soviet Union came to the table back in the late 1970s and the early 1980s and through the 1980s. Why did that happen? Because we had sustained economic pressure, sustained political pressure, sustained military pressure, sustained human rights pressure—we kept the pressure on.

We have relieved the pressure from Iran; and, as a result, we are faced with the consequences now where they have changed the entire narrative. The narrative in the beginning was: Should Iran have nuclear materials? Now, the narrative is: What level of nuclear materials should we allow Iran to have? That is how much we have lost in this process.

This is no time to be weak-kneed. This is a time to work with our allies in the Middle East. I have been and sat down with the Crown Prince in United Arab Emirates. I have sat down with the Emir in Qatar and with President el-Sisi. They all understand the gravity of terrorism. They all understand the issue of Iran. The world sees this threat. This is no time to appease; this is no time to defer.

This is the time to be strong. Ronald Reagan was strong. The world knew America was strong—yet he never fired a shot, and the Wall came down. When America is strong, the world is at peace. God help us to understand the gravity of this hour, the importance of the message that will come from Prime Minister Netanyahu.

Mr. STEWART. I thank Mr. PITTENGER for his remarks and for the great work that he does as the chairman of the Task Force on Terrorism and Unconventional Warfare.

I have to interject here for just a moment something that others have alluded to as well, and that is this idea of a sunset provision. We have to recognize what a dramatic change in policy that is.

It is no longer our policy that we would not allow Iran to have nuclear weapons. It is simply our policy if that provision is agreed to that we would delay them from having nuclear weapons.

The sunset provision allows them to grow their economy. It lifts the sanctions. They can sell their oil. They can

continue to finance terror operations around the world, all under the understanding that, in 10 years, they could resume their nuclear program. Again, that assumes that they don't cheat in the interim which is, in my opinion, likely that they will.

Let me ask this question: Why a sunset provision? Do you think the world is going to be more stable in 10 years than it is now? Will Iran become our trusted friend and ally over the next 10 years? Will they lose all of their regional ambitions? It will lead inevitably to a dangerous and chaotic and destabilizing arms race in the region.

Let me quote our own President. In an interview with *The Atlantic* about 3 years ago, he said: "It will not be tolerable to a number of States in that region for Iran to have a nuclear weapon and them not to have a nuclear weapon . . . and so the dangers of an Iran getting nuclear weapons that then leads to a free-for-all in the Middle East is something that I think would be very dangerous for the world."

Mr. President, I could not agree more, which is why it makes no sense for your agreement to contain anything close to a sunset provision that allows them to develop their nuclear weapons a few years down the road.

I would like to turn the time now to the gentleman from New Jersey, my friend TOM MACARTHUR. He serves on the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as the Committee on Natural Resources. He is one of the bright, young Members of the Congress.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today with so many of my colleagues to not only reaffirm our friendship with the State of Israel, but to express my deep appreciation for it.

Our two countries share an unbreakable commitment to the democratic ideals of individual, religious, and economic freedom. Israel stands as a beacon of democracy in a region characterized by political repression. For that, she should be honored and protected.

Our friendship with Israel should not be a political talking point. It shouldn't be a friendship of convenience. We can't settle merely for maintaining the relationship between our two countries. We must strengthen it. Too often, we talk about the threats to Israel or what is in Israel's interest.

Madam Speaker, a threat to Israel is a threat to us. Israel's interest is our interest. As our closest ally in a highly unstable part of the world, Israel faces countless threats and challenges to her very existence. Without qualification or hesitation, the United States must stand by Israel's right to defend herself against terrorism and aggression by those who would do her harm.

The rise of the Islamic State and the growing instability in the region remind us that we cannot take our ally for granted. We must stand against a

nuclear-capable Iran, as we have heard tonight, a very real and imminent threat that would jeopardize not only our ally, not only this region, but the freedom Israel deserves and the stability of the world.

The partnership between the United States and Israel is strong. Our shared history of cultural exchange and collaboration has enriched countless lives. Our open lines of trade have benefited not just Israel, but both of our great countries.

This is a friendship that will endure for generations, but we have to commit ourselves to it. If we continue our robust military aid and cooperation to Israel to ensure her security in the region, then the United States and Israel will continue to stand together as shining examples of democracy and freedom in the world.

Mr. STEWART. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, Mr. MACARTHUR.

I now recognize another friend, someone who I have come to respect tremendously from the tireless work that she does on the House Committee on Armed Services and has become a leader among her peers here in Congress, the gentle lady from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI).

Mrs. WALORSKI. I thank the gentleman from Utah, and I commend those of my colleagues tonight who are here as well talking about the existential threat of a nuclear Iran.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest concern over the growing threat of a nuclear Iran and the threat it poses to the rest of the world. Satellite images show that Iran's nuclear weapons can reach the eastern seaboard of the United States.

If Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, achieves nuclear weapons capability, the effects would be catastrophic. While it is certain that a rogue Iran would target Israel as a one-bomb country, it is also certain that the U.S. is their target and final target.

News from last week's nuclear negotiations with Iran is troubling. Iran will be allowed the right to enrich, retain thousands of centrifuges—which they don't deserve—and build a plutonium reactor, which they should never have practical need of; yet during these talks, they continue to obstruct inspectors, who reported last week about the possible existence in Iran of undisclosed development of a nuclear payload for a missile.

What is more disturbing is that amidst of a hurting economy and harsh sanctions, Iran still managed to find a way to build, develop, and test their nuclear weapons capability.

Can you imagine the possibility of their capability if the current administration were to even lift those sanctions? One thing is very clear. We have made too many compromises since trying to broker a deal with Iran, and

there have been too little consequences for their unwillingness to cooperate.

Past administrations were adamant that our position was zero enrichment and zero centrifuges. Under President Obama, this has been abandoned as being unrealistic. Negotiations began with an offer to end Iranian enrichment. Now, today, the deal is a temporary arrangement that allows a strong, internationally authorized nuclear program.

If we lift sanctions and legitimize their nuclear developments, we are sending a signal to the rest of the world that a rogue state can disobey all rules, maintain their supply of illegal enrichment, and still get international leaders to approve an enrichment program.

A nuclear-armed Iran would dramatically change the balance of power in the Middle East and threaten freedom and peace for the rest of the world. They would clearly spark a nuclear arms race in the Middle East and destabilize the entire region.

Other nations, like Egypt, Turkey, and others will have no choice but to develop their own nuclear programs to protect their countries from the threat of Iran, not to mention that Iran will likely share their nuclear technology and know-how with extremist groups hostile to not only the United States, but also to our allies in the West.

If there is to be any hope of reaching a peaceful deal and if Iran wants prosperity and success for its own people, it must stop its pursuit of a nuclear weapon, sponsorship of terrorism, and human rights abuses.

If they truly want to move forward, they must give inspectors unfettered access to covert facilities. Iran has to cooperate and stop obstructing inspectors. Preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability is the surest way to prevent war and preserve peace.

As this unrest continues, the United States must maintain our rich partnership with our allies, including Israel, who is our closest ally in the Middle East. I welcome Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu to the people's House tomorrow.

Mr. STEWART. Mrs. WALORSKI and the other speakers bring up many good points. Let me emphasize just a few of them if I could.

The New York Times reported just last week that the IAEA said Iran was still refusing to answer questions regarding its previous weapons program. Even in the midst of negotiating with the administration, they are still refusing to answer questions about their previous nuclear weapons program.

I think the administration, even now, has refused to release the full text of the deal. It has even been reported that there is an informal side deal that is something like a 30-plus page text.

These facts prevent observers, like myself and others, who are interested

and concerned, from determining what constitutes cheating by the Iranians. There are so many other reasons that we are concerned about this.

Let me just mention one more very quickly. It was reported that Iran can still produce enough nuclear material to fuel a bomb in as little as 2 months. In as little as 2 months, they would be a breakout nation that would keep the region—and, in fact, the entire world—on a knife's edge, wondering if they would make the decision to weaponize and to break out. Those are some of the concerns that we have.

Let me recognize my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, BRAD WENSTRUP. He is a past Army Reserve officer—thank you, sir, for your service. He is a doctor. He serves with me on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, as well as he serves on the Committee on Armed Services.

Dr. WENSTRUP.

□ 2045

Mr. WENSTRUP. Thank you, Congressman STEWART. I thank you for your service to our Nation in the Air Force and your service to our Nation here in Congress. I thank you for organizing this event here on the floor tonight.

As my colleagues have highlighted this evening, on the eve of Prime Minister Netanyahu's address to Congress, we stand with Israel and the Israeli people, shoulder to shoulder, in the face of growing Islamic extremism. The United States was the first country to recognize Israel upon its founding in the years after World War II.

Madam Speaker, it took us just 11 minutes to recognize the new nation cradled along the Mediterranean, in the land of Judea. Time and time again since then, Israel has been besieged, but our relationship has always stood firm, and that is because our friendship is built on the shared values of democracy, free enterprise, respect for life, and a commitment to a lasting peace.

Madam Speaker, I contend that when your very existence is in question and your neighbors vow to wipe you off the map, it is more than helpful to have a committed ally; it is necessary for your very survival.

Whether by the threat of terror tunnels and rocket barrages or the looming nuclear aspirations of Iran, now is not the time to turn away from our friend Israel.

In these challenging times, I am disappointed when I hear disparaging comments coming from our own government directed towards our friends in Israel. I am disappointed when an anonymous senior Obama administration official describes the Prime Minister with words I can't repeat in this Chamber.

I am disappointed when National Security Adviser Susan Rice calls the visit of our ally "destructive." I am

disappointed when my colleagues publicly turn their back on our ally and boycott the Prime Minister's speech.

To them, I say: "Let us make it clear that we will never turn our backs on our steadfast friends in Israel, whose adherence to the democratic way must be admired by all friends of freedom." These aren't my words, Madam Speaker. These are the words of John F. Kennedy 56 years ago, and they still ring true today.

In stark contrast to the resolute JFK, the President is asking Congress to stand silently to the side in his quest to negotiate with Iran. I cannot do that. In these perilous times, we can't afford silence. Iran's unhindered quest for a nuclear weapon and support for global terrorism threatens the stability of the Middle East, the security of our allies in the region, and the very existence of Israel.

Just last week, Iran conducted military drills to sink a replica Nimitz class aircraft carrier. While it made for some great propaganda film, I can't say it builds my confidence in Iran as negotiating in good faith. These hostile actions shouldn't be rewarded with further appeasement.

Madam Speaker, I daresay that this administration is more willing to negotiate with Iran than with Congress. If this administration was as firm in negotiating with Iran as with veto threats, we might actually stop Iran from getting the bomb.

We have a close ally in a dangerous region of the world and must stand strong. We are seeing too vividly the threat of radical Islam as its depravity sweeps across the Middle East. There is no more urgent of a time than right now for Congress to unequivocally stand with Israel.

Tomorrow, Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu will be in this very Chamber speaking to Congress. The subject matter is timely: the threat of a nuclear Iran. In recent years, I have heard the leaders of Ukraine and South Korea address Congress, and we will soon hear from leaders of Afghanistan and the Vatican as well.

I understand that President Ashraf Ghani of Afghanistan was invited in exactly the same manner as Prime Minister Netanyahu. It is curious as to why we don't hear the same roar of disapproval.

We know that a nuclear Iran would tilt the balance of power across the region and across the world, throwing weight to the ill intentioned and the evil terrorist actors. This is a message that bears repeating again and again, whether by me or by the Prime Minister of Israel or by anybody who recognizes the threat.

As steadfast allies in our commitment to freedom, democracy, and peace, I welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu tomorrow.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Dr. WENSTRUP.

So we conclude our time tonight. Do you sense, do you understand, those of you who are listening and watching, do you see that we have legitimate and deeply-held concerns about the direction that this administration is moving? There are so many questions. Can we trust Iran?

You have seen and heard example after example of how they have worked against our interests, how they have been a destructive influence in so many parts of the world.

We ask the question, as I asked Secretary Kerry last week: Can you give me a single example of them partnering with us or any of our allies in any positive way? The answer was no.

Are we being true to our allies? Israel is our only friend and ally in a chaotic part of the world. They recognize and respect human rights, including minority rights, including the rights of women.

They have called this an existential threat. There is a reason they call Israel a one-bomb nation. That is all it would take to destroy their entire country. Could we allow ourselves to be put in a position where that might be their reality? Is this in agreement with our own national interest?

Remember the map that I showed you, North Korea, throughout Asia, the Middle East, Central and South America, even on our borders of Mexico.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I hope the President understands our concerns. I hope he isn't so determined to add a feather in his legacy cap that would conclude an agreement that endangers our allies or our own national interest.

I sit on the House Select Committee on Intelligence. I am reminded almost daily in the briefings that we have that we live in a dangerous and chaotic world. It is unpredictable. It is becoming more so. It is dark and chaotic.

As Abraham Lincoln said, we are the "last best hope of Earth." That was true when he said it. It is true when I taught my children that. It will still be true when my children teach my grandchildren, but it will only be true if we stand by those principles that allow us to secure our own freedom and to protect the interests of our allies to whom we have made meaningful and important promises.

With that, we conclude this time, asking the President to listen to our concerns and to address them as he moves forward with this critically important issue.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2130

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX) at 9 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 749, PASSENGER RAIL REFORM AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 6, 2015, THROUGH MARCH 13, 2015

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-36) on the resolution (H. Res. 134) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 749) to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from March 6, 2015, through March 13, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of travel delays due to inclement weather.

Mr. TONKO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of attending a funeral.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker on Friday, February 27, 2015:

H.R. 33. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 3, 2015, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

614. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report, pursuant to Pub. L. 106-569; to the Committee on Financial Services.

615. A letter from the Deputy Director, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Head Start Program (RIN: 0970-AC46) received February 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

616. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, CCHIO, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2016 [CMS-9944-F] (RIN: 0938-AS19) received February 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

617. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2013 Performance Report to Congress for the Office of Combination Products, as required by the Medical Device User Fee and Modernization Act of 2002; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

618. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Final Report to Congress on the Implementation of Section 3507 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

619. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Use of Mandatory Recall Authority", submitted pursuant to Sec. 206f of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, Pub. L. 111-353; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

620. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Homeland Defense and Global Security, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2016, in accordance with Sec. 1341, 1342 and 1343 of the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act (50 U.S.C.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

621. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Assistance to Foreign Atomic Energy Activities (RIN: 1994-AA02) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

622. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination, pursuant to Sec. 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

623. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-146, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

624. A letter from the Chief Information Security Officer, Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's FY 2014 Federal Information Security Management Act Report and Privacy Management Report, as directed by Pub. L. 107-347; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

625. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia

Auditor, transmitting a report entitled “The District of Columbia Board of Elections Election Day Preparation and Administration Can Be Improved”; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

626. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; 2006 Consolidated Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fishery Management Plan; Amendment 7; Correction [Docket No.: 120328229-5064-03] (RIN: 0648-BC09) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

627. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120328229-4949-02] (RIN: 0648-XD672) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

628. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD750) received February 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

629. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustments to 2015 Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 141002820-5113-01] (RIN: 0648-XD536) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

630. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD744) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

631. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD725) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

632. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Pot Catcher/Processors in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD758) received February 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

633. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Trip Limit Reduction [Docket No.: 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XD717) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

634. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD728) received February 24, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

635. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties for the second quarter of FY 2014, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1(f); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s final rule — Foreign Tax Credit Splitting Events [TD 9710] (RIN: 1545-BK50) received February 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

637. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Work Opportunity Tax Credit (WOTC) Extension for 2014 [Notice 2015-13] received February 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

638. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Round 2 of Section 48A Phase III Program under the Qualifying Advanced Coal Project Program [Notice 2015-14] received February 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

639. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Applicable Federal Rates — March 2015 (Rev. Rul. 2015-4) received February 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

640. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Small Business Modifications to Tangibles Method Changes (Rev. Proc. 2015-20) received February 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

641. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service’s IRB only rule — Excise Tax on High Cost Employer-Sponsored Health Coverage [Notice 2015-16] received February 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

642. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department’s report entitled “Report to Congress on the Administration, Cost and Impact of the Quality Improvement Organization (QIO)

Program for Medicare Beneficiaries for Fiscal Year 2011”; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans’ Affairs. H.R. 280. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; with an amendment (Rept. 114-32, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1029. A bill to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 1030. A bill to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible (Rept. 114-34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans’ Affairs. H.R. 294. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the transfer of veterans to non-Department medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently; with an amendment (Rept. 114-35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 134. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 749) to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from March 6, 2015, through March 13, 2015 (Rept. 114-36). Referred to the House Calendar.

## DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 280 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 1188. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to provide certain credit unions with the authority to make additional member business loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 1189. A bill to clarify rules relating to nondiscriminatory employer wellness programs as such programs relate to premium discounts, rebates, or modifications to otherwise applicable cost sharing under group health plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BUCK, Mr. TROTT, Mr. RIGELL, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DENT, Mr. ROSS, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. PERRY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. HARPER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SALMON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. BARR, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BLUM, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LATTI, Mr. YODER, Mr. LONG, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AMASH, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. STEWART, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. BERA, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MARINO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr.

YOHIO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. COOK, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. HILL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. REED, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1190. A bill to repeal the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act providing for the Independent Payment Advisory Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1191. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WHITFIELD, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. NEAL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RUSH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LONG, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HIMES, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 1192. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. TITUS, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. GABBARD,

Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COLE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. PETERS, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1193. A bill to prohibit any reduction in the amount of the per diem allowance to which members of the uniformed services or civilian employees of the Department of Defense are entitled based on the duration of temporary duty assignments or official travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 1194. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PITTENGER (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 1195. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish advisory boards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1196. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify rules relating to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida (for herself and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina):

H.R. 1197. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1198. A bill to extend the right of appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board to certain employees of the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas):

H.R. 1199. A bill to prevent undue disruption of interstate commerce by limiting civil actions brought against persons whose only role with regard to a product in the stream of commerce is as a lawful seller of the product; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT:

H.R. 1200. A bill to provide for health care for every American and to control the cost



and enhance the quality of the health care system; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Oversight and Government Reform, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Ms. BASS, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1201. A bill to combat human trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1202. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia):

H.R. 1203. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency does not have the authority to disapprove a permit after it has been issued by the Secretary of the Army under section 404 of such Act; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1204. A bill to extend to the Mayor of the District of Columbia the same authority over the National Guard of the District of Columbia as the Governors of the several States exercise over the National Guard of those States with respect to administration of the National Guard and its use to respond to natural disasters and other civil disturbances, while ensuring that the President retains control of the National Guard of the District of Columbia to respond to homeland defense emergencies; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 1205. A bill to end membership of the United States in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1206. A bill to prohibit the hiring of additional Internal Revenue Service employees until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that no employee of the Internal Revenue Service has a seriously delinquent tax debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITTMAN:

H.R. 1207. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to require the Secretary of Commerce to develop a plan to conduct stock assessments for all stocks of fish for which a fishery management plan is in effect under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 132. A resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House

of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. JONES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BUCK, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. SANFORD):

H. Res. 133. A resolution relating to consideration of the bill (H.R. 240) appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H. Res. 135. A resolution encouraging people in the United States to recognize March 2, 2015, as Read Across America Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H. Res. 136. A resolution recognizing Linemen, the profession of Linemen, and the contributions of these brave men and women to protect public safety, and expressing support of designation of April 18, 2015, as National Lineman Appreciation Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

11. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to House Memorial 281, urging the President of the United States to issue final approval for construction and completion of the Keystone XL pipeline project; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 1188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 1189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The repeal of this provision is consistent with the powers that are reserved to the States and to the people as expressed in Amendment X to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 1193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18; and including, but not solely limited to the 14th Amendment.

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H.R. 1195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause 1 which states "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States." In addition, Congress has the authority to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section VIII, Clause 3 which states "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H.R. 1197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 and Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 1199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3, 9, and 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Ms. GRANGER:

H.R. 1201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 1202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have



power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. NORTON:  
H.R. 1204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. ROGERS of Alabama:  
H.R. 1205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States."

By Mr. ROUZER:  
H.R. 1206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debt and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. WITTMAN:  
H.R. 1207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the authority to enact this bill.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 130: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.  
H.R. 219: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
H.R. 232: Ms. TSONGAS.  
H.R. 235: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. DESANTIS.  
H.R. 248: Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 294: Mr. NORCROSS.  
H.R. 304: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H.R. 353: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H.R. 356: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. YOHO.  
H.R. 359: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr.

SWALWELL of California, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 393: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 394: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. FATTAH.  
H.R. 402: Mr. SALMON.  
H.R. 470: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 509: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 537: Mr. BURGESS.  
H.R. 559: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
H.R. 578: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 592: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BOST, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 602: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 663: Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 703: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 708: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.  
H.R. 747: Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 768: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
H.R. 769: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 775: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 776: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.  
H.R. 793: Mr. PETERSON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 802: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. HASTINGS.  
H.R. 816: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 823: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 824: Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. GARRETT.

H.R. 825: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. YODER, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 846: Ms. DELAURO, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 855: Mrs. BEATTY.  
H.R. 860: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 863: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 868: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 913: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 923: Mr. BENISHEK.  
H.R. 928: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ASHFORD, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 944: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
H.R. 951: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 960: Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 970: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 985: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 1021: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1024: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. FOSTER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1025: Ms. MOORE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 1031: Mr. SABLAN and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1032: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1063: Mr. REED, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 1078: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1086: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1091: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1092: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1093: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1094: Mr. YOHO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1095: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1098: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1133: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 1142: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1147: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 1148: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1149: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 1153: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.J. Res. 9: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KILMER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H. Res. 11: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H. Res. 28: Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 54: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SIREN, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRAYSON.

H. Res. 112: Mr. WALZ.

H. Res. 120: Mr. COHEN and Mr. CICILLINE.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING WOMEN'S HISTORY  
MONTH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise today in observation of Women's History Month and its 2015 theme: Weaving the Stories of Women's Lives. Each year, the National Women's History Project selects a unifying theme to recognize and promote Women's History Month. This year's theme recounts the individual and collective narratives that have been woven into the history of our nation and celebrates the important economic, cultural, political, and social contributions women have made to our history and their continued impact on our future. This year also marks the 35th anniversary of the National Women's History Project.

Women have played a crucial and unique role throughout America's history by providing the majority of the volunteer labor force in the country. American women of every race, class, and ethnic background have served as early leaders in every major progressive social change movement including the abolitionist movement, the emancipation movement, the industrial labor movement, the civil rights movement, and the peace movement. These remarkable women were leaders and organizers who not only secured their own rights and access to equal opportunity, but also served as a voice for many disenfranchised and undervalued populations.

Throughout our nation's history, there are many examples of women who have worked diligently to uncover these stories of leadership and have succeeded in writing women into the pages of our nation's history. Strong role models such as Delilah L. Beasley, the first African American woman to be regularly published in a major metropolitan newspaper, and Eleanor Flexner, whose groundbreaking 1959 book, *Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States*, brought to light the adversity women overcame in the workplace and the voting booth. These women pioneered the way for other great journalists, historians, educators, and anthropologists such as Lynn Sherr, a broadcast journalist and author who advocated for women's equal access to healthcare and social change both on screen and in print. Because of these courageous trailblazers women today are empowered to share their stories of achievement, leadership, courage, and strength, and to speak out against injustice, prejudice, and inequality.

These revolutionary women have retold their own personal tales of struggles and successes, as well as the tribulations and triumphs of other women. These accounts of the lives of individual women are pivotal because

they not only acknowledge strong female role models who share an unlimited vision of what a woman can accomplish, but they also challenge stereotypes and social assumptions about who women are and what women can achieve today. Numerous female scholars, authors, and social activists, both past and present, serve as outstanding examples who reflect the 2015 theme, Weaving the Stories of Women's Lives.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in celebrating Women's History Month and to recognize that after decades of dedication, perseverance, contributions, and advances, the stories of American women from all cultures and classes are being printed, spoken, recognized, and celebrated. In an effort to illustrate the many courageous and dedicated women throughout America's history, we remember and recount the tales of our ancestors' talents, sacrifices, and commitments that serve as an inspiration to today's generation of both women and men. I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in celebrating the many ways that women's history has become woven into the fabric of our national story.

IN HONOR OF MAE CAROL  
JOHNSON

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great American. I had the honor of knowing Mae Carol Johnson of Seaside, California, for many years. Mae was the Monterey Peninsula's super mom. She dedicated her life to service. No matter who you were, she wanted to help. She combined the world's biggest heart with its biggest smile. She lit up every room she entered and when she spoke everybody wanted to listen. She died on February 24, 2015 at the age of 82. Her passing has left a huge hole in the fabric of our community.

Mae lived a full life. She was born in Columbus, Georgia. She moved to the Monterey Peninsula in 1954 and after her divorce in 1962, she took on the responsibility of raising her daughter and 5 sons as a single parent. She worked as a domestic by day and took college courses at night to earn a teaching credential which launched her career as an educator.

During her impressive 35-year career, she served as a teacher, counselor, dean, vice principal and principal. Her reading and thinking programs, developed under her leadership at Martin Luther King, Jr. Middle School received state recognition. In 1987, she was a recipient of the Milken Family Foundation Educator Award. She served on several boards including the Community Hospital of the Mon-

terey Peninsula, the Community Foundation of Monterey County, and The Village Project. Mae was a founding member of the Delta Sigma Theta, Sorority, Inc. Monterey Peninsula Alumnae Chapter and a member of Friendship Baptist Church.

Mae earned her Masters Degree from the Monterey Institute of International Studies. She embraced her role as a leader and her campuses were training grounds for several top Monterey Peninsula Unified School District principals. She challenged others to always strive for excellence.

Mae enjoyed poetry, the performing arts and family gatherings. She is predeceased by her daughter, Roselyn Johnson. She is survived by her brother, Cleotis Webb, Coleman, GA, sister, Cheryl Lawrence, Chicago, IL, sons Andre and Ronald Johnson of Monterey, Edwin Johnson of Las Vegas, Kenneth Johnson of Tracy and Robert (Bobby) Johnson of Los Angeles, 9 grandchildren, and her beloved friend and companion, Martin Taylor.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in sharing our condolences with Mae's children, grandchildren, extended family, and countless friends. We owe them a debt of gratitude for sharing such a remarkable woman with our nation. The world is a better place because of Mae's journey with it.

A TRIBUTE TO NOLAN  
HELLICKSON IN THE FIRST SES-  
SION OF THE 114TH CONGRESS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Nolan Hellickson of Southeast Polk High School for winning the Class 3A 126 pound bracket at the Iowa High School State Wrestling tournament on February 21, 2015.

Iowa has a long and proud history of strong wrestling programs in our state, producing college and Olympic champions for years. Winning a state championship is the culmination of years of hard work and commitment, not only on the part of Mr. Hellickson, but also his family, teammates, and coaches.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this student-athlete demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent him and his family in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Nolan on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing continued success in his education and wrestling career.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 104TH  
BIRTHDAY OF ANNE THEROUX

**HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Anne Theroux, a resident of Harwich, who today celebrates her 104th birthday.

Anne was born on March 4, 1911. Anne is a mother of seven successful children, many grandchildren and great grandchildren. Anne, a dedicated and caring mother of strong faith, also helped support her family by working as a school teacher for many years in Massachusetts.

Anne, a woman of many talents, is an avid reader, daily solver of crossword puzzles and finds time to pursue her artistic talents in painting, stained glasswork and woodcarving. She has an unflinching positive outlook and is a wonderful example to her family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor Anne Theroux on this joyous occasion of her 104th birthday. I ask that my colleagues join me in wishing her many more years of health and happiness.

TRIBUTE TO LEONARD NIMOY

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Leonard Nimoy of Los Angeles, California, who passed away on the morning of February 27, 2015, at the age of 83.

Leonard Nimoy, best known for his iconic role as Mr. Spock in the popular science fiction television series and motion picture franchise Star Trek, was born on March 26, 1931 in Boston, Massachusetts, to Dora and Max Nimoy, Orthodox Jews and Ukrainian immigrants.

Leonard began his acting career at 8 years old performing in local plays and continued acting through his high school years. After coming to Hollywood, he landed small parts in the movies *Zombies of the Stratosphere*, *Queen for a Day* and *Rhubarb* and in 1952, had his first starring movie role with *Kid Monk Baroni*. During the early 1950's, Mr. Nimoy enlisted in the United States Army Reserves where he spent nearly two years, writing, narrating, and emceeding shows for the Army Special Services branch.

After leaving the military, he returned to California, and achieved wide visibility appearing on television shows such as *Rawhide*, *Perry Mason* and *Wagon Train*, until he landed the role in 1966 of the half-Vulcan Mr. Spock in *Star Trek*, for which he garnered three Emmy nominations. It was in this role that he became a folk hero, helping create Vulcan culture such as the Vulcan salute and Vulcan neck pinch. The incredibly popular original series spawned an animated television show, various new television series, movies

and sparked a devoted following of *Star Trek* that exists to this day. After the original *Star Trek* series ended in 1969, Leonard continued acting in movies and television, performed voice-over work and acted in stage plays. In 1979, he returned as Mr. Spock in the movie *Star Trek: The Motion Picture* and in 1982's *Star Trek II: The Wrath of Khan*, directed the movies *Star Trek III: The Search for Spock* and *Star Trek IV: The Voyage Home* and appeared in the 2009 and 2013 *Star Trek* movies.

In addition to being an actor, producer and director, Mr. Nimoy was also a prolific poet, writer, photographer and singer, who often lent his talents to charitable organizations. He and his wife, Susan Bay-Nimoy were generous supporters of the arts, educational programs and public astronomy. They provided substantial assistance to the Hammer Museum in Los Angeles through their Leonard and Susan Bay-Nimoy Family Foundation, the esteemed The Thalia Theater in New York was renamed the Leonard Nimoy Thalia Theater, and they were major supporters of the Griffith Observatory in Los Angeles' historic 2002-2006 expansion, where the Leonard Nimoy Event Horizon theater shows the Leonard Nimoy-narrated documentary film *The Once and Future Griffith Observatory* about the history, recent renovation, and future of the Observatory.

Leonard is survived by his wife, actress and director Susan Bay-Nimoy, his children, Adam and Julie Nimoy, stepson Aaron Bay Schuck, six grandchildren, one great-grandchild, and his brother Melvin.

I would like to convey my deepest sympathies to Leonard's family and friends, as well as extend my heartfelt thanks for his many contributions to the arts and science. The entire global community will greatly miss Mr. Spock, who indeed lived long and prospered.

RECOGNIZING THE 27TH ANNIVERSARY OF VIOLENCE AGAINST THE ARMENIAN COMMUNITY IN SUMGAI, AZERBAIJAN

**HON. KATHERINE M. CLARK**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, February 27 marked the 27th anniversary of harrowing violence against the Armenian community in Sumgait, Azerbaijan.

I am proud to stand today with the Armenian-American community, including many of my constituents in Massachusetts, in remembrance and mourning of this unspeakable tragedy.

In February of 1988, anti-Armenian rallies through Azerbaijan gave way to waves of ethnically-motivated violence, death and destruction. In the aftermath of these terrible events, Azerbaijan's Armenian community all but disappeared, with thousands displaced, culminating in a war against the people of Nagorno Karabakh.

That war resulted in almost 30,000 dead on both sides. Hundreds of thousands of refugees were forced to flee their homes. And to

this day, those who lost their lives or were displaced by this violence still seek resolution and justice.

Many displaced Armenian families have sought refuge in America, and are now making vital contributions in the Fifth District of Massachusetts. Proudly, our diverse District is home to one of the largest Armenian communities in the nation. Together, our community is a thriving example of strength and perseverance in the face of extreme adversity.

Like the persecution of too many others before it, the lessons of the Sumgait Pogrom must not be forgotten.

We have a moral obligation to promote tolerance and justice, and we have a duty to recognize the atrocities that have kept us from our common goal.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK W. BERLIN  
IN THE 1ST SESSION OF THE  
114TH CONGRESS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Frank W. Berlin III on the occasion of his 70th birthday.

After graduating from Valley High School in West Des Moines, Class of 1963, Mr. Berlin enlisted in the United States Army, 173rd Airborne Brigade. From 1965 to 1967, Private First Class E3 Berlin served with undeniable valor while deployed to the Republic of Vietnam. In fact, while serving as gunner on a UH-1D PFC helicopter during an emergency extraction, PFC Berlin, with utter disregard for his own safety, stationed himself on the landing skid of the aircraft and counter-attacked the enemy below, saving his flight crew and the extraction team. For his actions, PFC Berlin was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for heroism on December 7, 1966.

Following Vietnam, Mr. Berlin returned to Iowa to get married, start a family and with the entrepreneurial spirit of that generation, establish a successful insurance agency under his namesake. That legacy continues on today.

Mr. Berlin is an Iowan of whom we can all be proud. We must never forget those who have served this nation and fought for our freedoms. Mr. Berlin continues to proudly support our Department of Defense military service men and women. His efforts benefit military families through local, state and national charities.

It is with great honor that I, along with his five grandchildren—Isabelle, Emma, Gretta, Evan and Frank—recognize his patriotism on his 70th birthday. I know that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring his accomplishments. I thank him for his service and wish him and his family all the best moving forward.

**SHEETZ—500 AND COUNTING: HONORING SHEETZ AND THE BEST SANDWICHES IN THE COUNTRY**

**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of the Sheetz family and their all-American story of business success. Once a small family operated dairy store in Altoona, Pennsylvania, the Sheetz brand has grown into one of the most well loved brands in the country, with 14,500 employees and 437 locations across six states. Their business has changed with the demands of the country, and they have brought us innovations like MTO sandwiches and touch screen ordering, which was first installed in Altoona back in 1993. Recently, the Sheetz family proudly opened their 500th store in Thomasville, North Carolina—over 400 miles away from where the business was first born 63 years ago in Central Pennsylvania.

Originally called Sheetz Kwik Shopper, the company's success is a wonderful example of what makes this nation great. It all started when Bob Sheetz purchased one of his father's dairy stores. After hiring his brother, Steve, the pair's original business plan was to open one store a year by 1972. With 500 stores currently open across Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, and North Carolina, their plan was a resounding success. Five members of the Sheetz family serve on the company's executive committee including Bob's son as president, and Steve, as Chairman of the board. Despite all of their growth and expansion, it remains a family business to this day.

That is why it is no surprise that the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development and Team Pennsylvania Foundation have named Sheetz one of the best places to work in Pennsylvania for the last 13 consecutive years. I want to thank the Sheetz' family for their dedication to the community, and their friendly service to the thousands of families that visit their stores each day.

I would also personally like to congratulate Sheetz on opening their 500th store. Their effort to turn the business into one of the fastest growing family operated convenience store chains in the world is remarkable, but is also no surprise to anyone who has met a member of the Sheetz family. With plans to open 1,000 total stores in the future, Sheetz is not slowing down. I am extremely proud to represent the Altoona area, and to be able to tell all of my colleagues on Capitol Hill that the 9th District is the birthplace of some of the best sandwiches in the country.

**RECOGNIZING MRS. KAREN BURCH AS THE 2016 SANTA ROSA COUNTY, FLORIDA, TEACHER OF THE YEAR**

**HON. JEFF MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Mrs. Karen Burch as the 2016 Santa Rosa County, Florida, Teacher of the Year. Mrs. Burch has proven to be a truly exceptional educator whose impact extends far beyond her students, and I am proud to recognize her success and outstanding achievements.

Mrs. Burch began her education career as an Exceptional Student Education (ESE) para professional, working to ensure that ESE students received the instruction and attention needed to thrive in the classroom. Her commitment to serving the ESE student population led her to enroll in the University of West Florida's Para to Teacher program, and after graduation from UWF, Mrs. Burch began working as an ESE teacher at S.S. Dixon Primary School. During her seven years as a teacher at S.S. Dixon, Mrs. Burch's determination and patience have helped her provide exceptional education to ESE students from kindergarten to second grade.

Constantly striving to lead by example, Mrs. Burch demonstrates her leadership skills outside of the classroom as the head of the school's Positive Behavior Committee and as a mentor to other teachers and student teachers currently enrolled at the University of West Florida.

Prior to her professional career in education, Mrs. Burch honorably served our Nation as a member of the United States Air Force. During her military service, Mrs. Burch worked as a Training Manager in a Civil Engineering Squadron and maintained top secret materials and information for the F-15 Fighter Training School. The leadership skills and commitment to service that Mrs. Burch developed while in the Air Force have proven to be integral to her success working with students with emotional and behavioral needs and inspiring them to reach their full potential.

Mr. Speaker, teachers are amongst our most valuable public servants, and they play an integral role in shaping the future of our Nation. The Santa Rosa County Teacher of the Year award is a true reflection of Mrs. Burch's steadfast dedication to the students of Santa Rosa County. She has proven to be among the many exceptional teachers in our Nation, and on behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize Mrs. Karen Burch for her accomplishments and her continuing commitment to excellence. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating Mrs. Burch as the 2016 Santa Rosa County, Florida Teacher of the Year and thanking her for her dedication to serving the students, teachers, and families of the Northwest Florida community. We wish her all the best for continued success.

**OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT**

**HON. MIKE COFFMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,149,752,816,959.60. We've added \$7,522,875,768,046.52 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

**HONORING GRACEWORKS MINISTRIES ON THEIR 20TH ANNIVERSARY**

**HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate GraceWorks Ministries on their 20th anniversary of success. GraceWorks Ministries is a Christian non-profit that cares for struggling citizens in need in the Tennessee Seventh Congressional District.

Each of us has a duty to be good stewards to our fellow citizens. Whether that means serving in Washington, on the battlefield or in our local communities and homes. Beginning in 1995, a handful of concerned residents based in Williamson County, Tennessee recognized a growing number of their fellow residents were struggling to meet basic physical, emotional and spiritual needs. These residents banded together to provide financial assistance, food, faith, friendship and relief.

Twenty years later, thousands of Tennesseans continue to volunteer from community congregations, businesses and organizations to further the mission of GraceWorks Ministries, "by God's grace, to provide immediate and long-term resources to neighbors in need." In 2014 alone, GraceWorks helped well over 40,000 people by providing nutritious food, holiday baskets, gifts, clothing, home goods, educational programs and family counseling. These services not only rescue those in need, but also encourage participants to gradually move toward self-sufficiency.

I urge my colleagues to join me in commending Graceworks for their magnificent and generous service, which has enriched the lives of Tennesseans for the past twenty years.

**A TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL ZACHARY IN THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 114TH CONGRESS**

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Michael

Zachary of Dowling Catholic High School for winning the Class 3A 132 pound bracket at the Iowa High School State Wrestling tournament on February 21, 2015.

Iowa has a long and proud history of strong wrestling programs in our state, producing college and Olympic champions for years. Winning a state championship is the culmination of years of hard work and commitment, not only on the part of Mr. Zachary, but also his family, teammates, and coaches.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this student-athlete demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Michael and his family in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Michael on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing continued success in his education and wrestling career.

**HONORING THE LIFE AND DEDICATED SERVICE OF MAJOR JOSEPH REYNES, JR., UNITED STATES AIR FORCE RETIRED**

**HON. JEFF MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of Northwest Florida's beloved Major Joseph Reynes, Jr., United States Air Force Retired, who passed away on February 23, 2015. Major Reynes was a decorated veteran, committed public servant, and a loving family man, who served our Nation with honor and distinction. The Northwest Florida community mourns the loss of a great and compassionate man.

Born on March 1, 1934, in Medina, New York, to Joseph and Alice Jay Reynes, Major Reynes developed a fascination for fighter aircraft as a young child growing up on Long Island. While attending the State University of New York at Buffalo, Major Reynes pursued his passion for flying and was commissioned in the United States Air Force in January 1955. Within months, Major Reynes pinned on his wings and was assigned to the 774th Troop Carrier Squadron at Ardmore Air Force Base, Oklahoma, where he would meet his future bride, LaRita Dawn Foster.

In 1960, upon completion of advanced fighter training at Nellis Air Force Base, Major Reynes received his orders as a fighter pilot in 44th Tactical Fighter Squadron, based at Kadena Air Force Base, Okinawa, and then in 1962, was assigned to the 481st Tactical Fighter Squadron at Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico. Major Reynes deployed during the Vietnam War to DaNang Air Base, where he flew the A1E/H and T-28. During a combat support mission in September 1965, his plane was shot down. Major Reynes was rescued and later assigned to Luke Air Force Base as a F-100 Instructor Pilot. In 1968, he was promoted to the rank of Major, and in 1969, he joined the "Iron Hand" support missions flying over North Vietnam. Major Reynes completed his final tour at 5th Air Force Headquarters in Tokyo as the Chief of Standard Evaluation.

Throughout his distinguished Air Force Career, Major Reynes earned and was bestowed

multiple honors including the Distinguished Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross with two Oak Leaf Clusters, Air Medal with eighteen Oak Leaf Clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal, Purple Heart, National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Service Star, Republic of Vietnam Service Medal, Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross, Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal, Air Force Longevity Service Award with four Oak Leaf Clusters, Combat Readiness Medal, and the Armed Forces Reserve Medal.

Upon his retirement from the Armed Forces, Major Reynes continued his service to our Nation as an active member of the local community. In 1980, he was first elected as Mayor of Gulf Breeze, Florida and served two terms. He also served as Deacon of Pensacola Beach Community Church and volunteered his time to assist local area veterans.

Some of his greatest moments, however, were spent coaching his son Joe's and grandson Harrison's baseball teams, as well as the Chofu High and Gulf Breeze High track teams, alongside his children. To his family and friends, Major Reynes will always be remembered as a loving husband, devoted father of three, and proud grandfather of six, and his contributions to our Nation and Northwest Florida will not be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize the life and dedicated service of Major Joseph Reynes, Jr. My wife, Vicki, joins me in extending our deepest prayers and condolences to his wife LaRita Foster Reynes; children, Major General Joseph Reynes, Jr., Lisa Marie Reynes, Jeannette Prochaska; grandchildren; and the entire Reynes family.

**THE PASSING OF J. MICHAEL LENIHAN**

**HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember a Rhode Island leader whose example can remind us all of why we pursued public office in the first place. Former State Senator J. Michael Lenihan was the very definition of a public servant. He was an honest man and a charismatic leader, and he always put the needs of his constituents first.

Mike was a fierce advocate for transparency and open government, and his strong moral compass defined his distinguished career in government. A three-time recipient of Common Cause's Public Service Achievement Award, Mike was first elected to the East Greenwich Town Council and then went on to serve for 20 years in the Rhode Island State Senate. He fought for what he thought was right, no matter how difficult or unpopular it was. Mike wasn't afraid of making enemies, although he seldom did thanks to his kindness and genuine personality. You could always trust Mike to be honest and fair, and he was a valued advisor to so many Rhode Island leaders over the years.

A teacher by profession, Mike taught us all a lesson in how to be the best possible elected official.

I am so grateful that the Lenihan family was willing to share Mike with us, and I know how proud they are of his lifetime of service to Rhode Island. My deepest condolences go out to Mike's wife Patricia, his daughter Meghan and his grandchildren, Victoria and Bryanna, and I know my colleagues will join me in extending our sympathy to the entire Lenihan family.

**TRIBUTE TO STATE SENATOR DOROTHY S. "SUE" LANDSKE**

**HON. TODD ROKITA**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor State Senator Dorothy S. "Sue" Landske, a woman who was fully committed and dedicated to public service for close to a half century. She was known as a woman of warmth who gave indefatigably to those she represented and served.

Sue began her career in public service in 1978 when she was elected Lake County's Township Assessor. She held that position until 1984 when her effort to represent the people of Indiana's 6th Senatorial District proved successful.

While in the State Senate, Sue wrote and ushered to passage several significant pieces of legislation including bills to give free tuition to Purple Heart recipients, establish objective guidelines for creating legislative and congressional districts, and promote women entering the engineering field. In the final years of her senatorial tenure, Sue served as assistant president pro tempore and chair of the Senate Elections Committee.

It was in the election law and administration capacity that I, as Indiana's 59th Secretary of State, worked most closely with her, particularly on Indiana's best in the nation Photo ID at the polls law and the groundbreaking Vote Centers law. She was an excellent lawmaker and a good friend.

She was also a fellow "Regionite," one of several colorful names given to residents of our shared home area of Lake County, in the northwest corner of Indiana.

Service to the community extended beyond her elective service however. A veteran and Colonel of the National Guard Reserves, Sue also remained active in several community organizations. Her commitment to community service was widely recognized and she was a two-time recipient of the prestigious Sagamore of the Wabash Award, a high civilian honor granted only by the Governor. She received that award in both 1980 and 1983. She was also named Outstanding Republican Senator, Lake County Republican of the Year, Jay Cee's Citizen of the Year, and Business and Professional Woman of the Year.

Despite her extraordinary service and recognition, Sue's true source of pride remained her loving family. She and her husband William, who also devoted his life to public service, celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary in 2007. She leaves her husband, daughters Cathy, Jackie, Pam and Cheryl, and cherished grandchildren. I offer to all of them, their extended families, and all Hoosiers who share

the grief of her loss, my sincerest condolences.

A TRIBUTE TO JAKE MARNIN IN  
THE FIRST SESSION OF THE  
114TH CONGRESS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Jake Marnin of Southeast Polk High School for winning the Class 3A Heavy Weight bracket at the Iowa High School State Wrestling tournament on February 21, 2015.

Iowa has a long and proud history of strong wrestling programs in our state, producing college and Olympic champions for years. Winning a state championship is the culmination of years of hard work and commitment, not only on the part of Mr. Marnin, but also his family, teammates, and coaches.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this student-athlete demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Jake and his family in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Jake on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing continued success in his education and wrestling career.

STEPHEN L. CALDWELL  
COMMENDATION

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Stephen L. Caldwell, a recently retired Director of the Government Accountability Office's Homeland Security and Justice team. Steve and his team have provided indispensable support to Congressional Committees and individual Members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate throughout his long service to Congress, and to this nation.

As a past Chairman, and now Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I have had the pleasure of working with Steve on many crucial security issues over the years. His experience, knowledge, and professionalism have made him a significant contributor to improving homeland security programs, domestically and abroad.

In his more than 30 years with the GAO, Steve has led the production of innumerable reports, and his work for our Committee has covered issues ranging from protecting our critical infrastructure to promoting resiliency in federal programs and in our civil society at large.

His astonishing thoroughness and dedication while working at GAO, one of our most essential independent agencies, has created a legacy that is respected in Congress, and certainly among his peers.

In recent years Steve has contributed to a number of GAO audits of particular interest and help to me as Chairman of the Committee, and now as Ranking Member, and has testified numerous times before our Committee and many others in both the House and Senate. He is known nationally and internationally as an expert regarding the security of the maritime global supply chain and critical infrastructure protection, and has spoken on these issues at innumerable conferences. His articles appear regularly in academic and industry journals.

Of particular importance, Steve has contributed to a number of recommendations that have led to significant changes in The Customs and Border Protection's programs that have improved the security of the maritime supply chain, among other issues, not only in the United States but around the world.

Personally, I will miss Steve's commitment, know-how, and enthusiasm, and I am sure I speak for the other Members of the Committee on Homeland Security, when I say that I am deeply in his debt. I sincerely thank him and his devoted family, and wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing Stephen L. Caldwell for his remarkable career. He has served well the Government Accountability Office, the Committee on Homeland Security, and countless others in the Federal Government, and especially the citizens of our nation who have benefited from his expertise and dedicated effort. Steve, we will surely miss your hard work, good humor, and sage advice.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NA-  
TIONAL GUARD HOME RULE ACT

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill that would give the mayor of the District of Columbia authority over deploying the D.C. National Guard, after consultation with the Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard, with the President retaining authority on federal matters. In local emergencies, including natural disasters and civil disturbances unrelated to national or homeland security, the mayor of the District should have the same authority that governors exercise over the National Guard in their states. Each governor, as head of state, has the authority to mobilize the National Guard to protect his or her state, just as local militia did historically.

The National Guards in the 50 states operate under dual federal and local jurisdiction. Yet only the President and the Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard currently have the authority to deploy the D.C. National Guard for local and national purposes, respectively. Today, by far the most likely need for the D.C. National Guard here would be for natural disasters, such as hurricanes and floods, and to restore order in the wake of civil disturbances. The mayor, who knows the city better than any federal official and who works closely with federal security officials, should be

able to call on the D.C. National Guard for local natural disasters and civil disturbances, after consultation with the Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard. The President should be focused on national matters, including homeland security, not local D.C. matters. Homeland security authority, with respect to the D.C. National Guard, would remain the sole province of the President, along with the power to nationalize the D.C. National Guard for federal matters at will. It does no harm to give the mayor this authority for civil disturbances and natural disasters. However, it could do significant harm to leave the mayor powerless to act quickly. If it makes sense that governors would have control over the mobilization and deployment of their National Guard, it makes equal sense for the mayor of the District, with a population the size of a small state, to have the same authority.

The mayor of the District, as head of state, should have the authority to deploy the D.C. National Guard in instances that do not rise to the level of homeland defense activities. My bill permits the mayor to only deploy the D.C. National Guard after consultation with the Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard. The bill is another important step toward completing the transfer of full self-government powers to the District. Congress began with the passage of the Home Rule Act of 1973, when it delegated most of its authority over District matters to an elected mayor and Council. The bill follows that model.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

A TRIBUTE TO ETHAN ANDERSON  
IN THE FIRST SESSION OF THE  
114TH CONGRESS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ethan Anderson of Southeast Polk High School for winning the Class 3A 220 pound bracket at the Iowa High School State Wrestling tournament on February 21, 2015.

Iowa has a long and proud history of strong wrestling programs in our state, producing college and Olympic champions for years. Winning a state championship is the culmination of years of hard work and commitment, not only on the part of Mr. Anderson, but also his family, teammates, and coaches.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this student-athlete demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Ethan and his family in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Ethan on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing continued success in his education and wrestling career.

RECOGNIZING MR. SAMUEL  
JOSEPH SIMON, SR.

**HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK**  
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Samuel Joseph Simon, Sr. for his 60 years of volunteer service to the Pennndel Fire Company. Sam is a remarkable individual of the highest moral character, and it is my pleasure to honor him today.

Sam's duty with the Pennndel Fire Company dates all the way back to 1955—after he served honorably in the U.S. Army during the Korean War. Over the years, no one has been more dedicated to the fire company than Sam. He has held almost every office imaginable: Pennndel Fire Chief, Pennndel Borough Fire Marshal, Assistant Chief, Captain, Lieutenant, Trustee, and Chairman of the Hall Committee. And, in each of these roles, Sam played an integral part in helping the fire company perform, save lives and grow as a unit.

Sam's true nature is volunteerism, a quality he has instilled in the future generations of his family. Over the years, Sam would routinely close his local automotive repair shop in order to respond to fire calls or drive an ambulance for the local emergency squad. Taking care of the people in his community was always his top priority.

In addition to his work at the fire company, Sam has given back to the people of Bucks County as a cofounder of the Bucks County Chapter of the Korean War Veterans Association, where he helped obtain the funds and oversaw the construction of the Korean Veterans Memorial in Doylestown, Pennsylvania—a site for all to see. Sam's passion for community service and devotion to helping people is unmatched. It is people like Sam that keep our neighborhoods thriving day after day. It is an honor to serve you in Congress, Sam. Thanks for all you've done for us.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY  
OF AMERICORPS VISTA

**HON. ADAM SMITH**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the 50th Anniversary of AmeriCorps VISTA. AmeriCorps VISTA has been on the front lines in the fight against poverty in America for 50 years. Every year, more than 8,000 Americans—serving at 1,100 projects nationwide—dedicate their skills, talents and passion in efforts to overcome poverty.

Since 1965, VISTA members have served in some of our nation's most impoverished urban and rural areas. As a result of their dedication, they continue to make a tangible difference in the lives of more than 46 million Americans who live in poverty. VISTA focuses on providing structural support for low-income communities in order to fight illiteracy, improve health services and foster economic development.

In Washington's 9th Congressional District, VISTA members work with several service organizations in the community. In partnership with the United Way of King County, volunteers help mentor students, advocate for the homeless and provide families with social services. Through their selfless service, VISTA members and volunteers have improved the quality of life for many in our community and continue to be a vital force in the fight against poverty.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I recognize AmeriCorps VISTA for its fifty years of service to our nation. VISTA members have set the standard for meaningful volunteer mobilization. I look forward to hearing about the future progress and success of VISTA for many years to come.

CATHERINE "KAY" SANTANGELO  
NEST

**HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Catherine "Kay" Santangelo Nest who will celebrate her 80th birthday and be honored for a lifetime of dedicated community service and accomplishments tomorrow, Tuesday, March 3, 2015 at the Fort Lee Senior Center in Fort Lee, NJ.

Kay Nest was born and raised in West New York, NJ, where she learned the value of community and fighting for a greater cause. Kay's father was an attorney who often donated his services to those who couldn't afford them and her mother worked for the West New York Board of Health for over 50 years. Kay's parents devoted much of their time volunteering for charitable and political causes and always lending a helping hand to those in need, so it does not come as a surprise that Kay has become the outstanding individual that she is today.

I am proud to say that Kay and I share the same alma mater, Fordham University, where she graduated with a Bachelor's Degree in Education. Soon after, she married her husband Richard A. Nest, the late Mayor of Fort Lee, and they had their first and only child, Richard B. Nest.

Kay has been a past president of UNICO, Palisades General Hospital Women's Auxiliary, the Friends of Fort Lee Public Library, and the Lions Club. She also served as a Trustee on the Board of Palisades General Hospital, the Chairperson of the Fort Lee Democratic Municipal Committee, Vice Chairman of the Bergen County Democratic Organization, Chairperson of the Fort Lee Parking Authority, Director of Fort Lee Citizen Council, and Chairperson of Fort Lee Housing Authority. Moreover, while taking up leadership positions in different organizations Kay still found the time to help all people in need, regardless of their stature in society.

Kay's love for helping others is what motivated her to enter life in politics. However, she did not intend to go into politics herself but rather, to make sure that those who were elected to office provided new programs that

helped those who were less fortunate and served the people who elected them. Kay was the passionate voice that brought Fort Lee its first two Senior Citizen Housing Apartments and a fully operational Senior Citizen Center along with it, ensuring that the elderly receive the proper care they deserve.

Kay exhibits the qualities of an individual we all strive to be more like. Her philanthropic work in her community has been recognized and led to her being named the 2006 Person of the Year by the Fort Lee Rotary Club in honor of her dedicated and outstanding service to her community at large over the years.

Kay is someone everyone in society can aspire to emulate. I have known Kay Nest for many years as a friend and as a fellow public servant. I have always admired Kay and she has truly brightened our world with her compassion and kind nature.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating the achievements of individuals such as Kay Nest.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Kay's coworkers, family and friends, all those whose lives she has touched, and me, in recognizing the work of Mrs. Catherine "Kay" Santangelo Nest.

THE AMERICAN HEALTH SECURITY  
ACT OF 2015

**HON. JIM McDERMOTT**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the American Health Security Act of 2015, legislation to provide comprehensive health coverage to every American and recognize that health care is a human right.

The Affordable Care Act was a dramatic step forward in improving the health security of the American people. This landmark law has expanded access to coverage, improved the solvency of our public programs, and made numerous reforms that have saved consumers billions of dollars. As we look for ways to build upon and strengthen the law, we must recognize that millions of Americans continue to fall through the cracks in the private health insurance market. The only way to truly ensure that access to quality health care is a right enjoyed by every American is through a single-payer system.

The American Health Security Act builds upon the success of the Affordable Care Act by providing universal health coverage to all Americans. It creates a framework that allows states to administer their own universal health insurance systems, subject to rigorous federal standards. Benefits would be comprehensive, costs would be contained, and patients would have full choice of doctor and hospital. This universal model would put an end to the inequities that continue to plague our system and jeopardize the health security of American families.



A TRIBUTE TO MARK BAUDLER IN  
THE FIRST SESSION OF THE  
114TH CONGRESS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mark Baudler for being awarded the Prudential Spirit of Community Award.

Mark was selected for this honor because of his diligent work on a greenhouse for the Nodaway Valley High School. He planned, organized, fundraised and supervised the construction for separate Eagle Scout and FFA projects.

The Prudential Spirit of Community Award is a nationwide program honoring young people for outstanding acts of volunteerism. I am proud to see such a strong volunteer spirit in the youth of the 3rd district of Iowa and applaud his parents, Ron and Susan Baudler, teachers and community members that have exemplified volunteerism to Mark.

I know that all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating him on being recognized with this award, and I wish him continued success in his future education.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. GENE GREEN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to have it noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that I was unable to vote on the Homeland Security Department Continuing Resolution last Friday night due to previously scheduled events held in my district in Houston.

One of my biggest priorities as a Member of this Chamber is being present for every vote. I hope that the majority will make sure that future votes are held during scheduled times.

If I had been available Friday evening, I would have voted "yea."

UNEQUIVOCAL SUPPORT FOR  
ISRAEL—AND NO ILLUSIONS  
ABOUT IRAN'S MURDEROUS INTENTIONS

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank my colleague, Mr. STEWART, for reserving this time to send a message of vigorous, unequivocal, and unflinching U.S. support for Israel.

Mr. Speaker, on the eve of Prime Minister Netanyahu's historic address, we have to join his efforts to set the focus on the existential, genocidal threat Iran poses to Israel.

We have to be realistic about Iranian President Rouhani because many in the media—

and some in the administration—have been reluctant to do that. Rouhani has a long history of murderous anti-Semitism and anti-Americanism. The corpses are all over the globe.

Rouhani chaired Iran's National Security Council from 1989 to 2005—the years when Iran plotted the 1994 bombing of the AMIA Jewish cultural center, which killed 85 people in Buenos Aires. The 1996 attack on the Khobar Towers was also under his tenure—this one killed 19 U.S. servicemen in Saudi Arabia. He continues to support the global terrorism of Hezbollah.

Likewise, Rouhani's defense minister, Hossein Dehghan, participated in plotting the 1983 U.S. Marine barracks bombing in Beirut—this crime took the lives of 241 Americans, including Paul Innocenzi from my district. His Justice Minister, Mostafa Pour-Mohammadi, played a role in 1988 and 1998 in the summary executions of Iranian political prisoners and killings of intellectuals, as well as assassinations abroad.

Mr. Speaker, this is the man that our government and Prime Minister Netanyahu are dealing with. For 16 years Rouhani ran Iran's nuclear program. He has boasted openly of his success in using negotiations as a tool to buy time to advance his program.

The question before us is whether the agreement President Obama is trying to close with Rouhani is yet another deal favorable to the Iranian government, allowing it to move the hand on the nuclear clock yet closer to midnight.

There are many signs that this is the case. Most reports on the negotiations are that the administration is not trying to prevent a nuclear Iran, but only to preserve some "break-out time"—yet will not require the kind of transparency to make even that a remotely reliable measure. Even worse, it seems the administration is prepared to accept a "sunset clause"—a date after which Iranian nuclear arms would be completely legitimated. And the deal being crafted reportedly ignores Iran's ballistic missile program.

All this amounts to a potential catastrophe. Unfortunately, the administration seems to have telegraphed its determination to get a deal with Rouhani—almost any deal—and to shut Congress out. This is why I am concerned, and why we in Congress and the American people need to hear all the more from Prime Minister Netanyahu.

Let's let the Prime Minister know that Congress and the American people stand with Israel, without any 'ifs,' or 'buts,' or 'so long as,' or any other qualifiers, and without any illusions about the murderous and manipulative intentions of Rouhani. I'd like to close by thanking Speaker BOEHNER for inviting Prime Minister Netanyahu.

A TRIBUTE TO ALEX THOMSEN IN  
THE FIRST SESSION 114TH CONGRESS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Alex

Thomsen, a freshman at Underwood High School for winning the Class IA 113 pound bracket at the Iowa High School State Wrestling tournament on February 21, 2015.

Iowa has a long and proud history of strong wrestling programs in our state, producing college and Olympic champions for years. Winning a state championship is the culmination of years of hard work and commitment, not only on the part of Mr. Thomsen, but also his parents Aric and Debbie Thomsen, his family and coaches.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this student-athlete demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent him and his family in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Alex on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing continued success in his education and high school wrestling career.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY  
OF BROWNSVILLE  
INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

**HON. FILEMON VELA**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th Anniversary of Brownsville Independent School District (BISD).

In March 1915, the Texas House of Representatives and Senate both approved a measure transferring control of the city's public education to the newly created BISD. Prior to the establishment of a school board, the City of Brownsville maintained control of the school system. The Brownsville Board of Trustees met for the first time on March 25, 1915, and was presided by Board President Dr. J.L. Wortman.

The newly established Brownsville Independent School District included Brownsville High School, City Grammar School, the Blalack School, the Las Matanzas School, the Media Luna School, the Nopalita School, the Linerro School, and the West Brownsville School. Superintendent of Schools Lizzie M. Bardour and several trustees continued their service as the schools transitioned from city to board control, and the board instituted a new curriculum that included the creation of a department of domestic economy and an improved science department complete with a full skeleton.

Today, BISD is made up of 58 schools serving 50,000 students and employing 7,200—making the school district the largest employer within a 95-mile radius in the Rio Grande Valley. Of the 58 schools, there are 7 high schools, 11 middle schools, 37 elementary schools, and 3 alternative schools. One of the schools, Filemon B. Vela Middle School, was named after my father who was a Brownsville native and served as a U.S. District Court Judge for the Southern District of Texas. The school district maintains a rich cultural heritage and prepares graduates to pursue higher education and careers including medicine, engineering, science, technology, mathematics, and law enforcement.

BISD is also an active member of the U.S. Chess Federation, and is nationally recognized as one of the top chess programs in the nation. Several years ago, BISD students were featured on HBO's "Real Sports" with Bryant Gumbel showcasing the program. The school district is a powerhouse, taking students of all grade levels to compete in tournaments around the nation.

Through rigorous academic programs such as early college high school, extracurricular activities ranging from band to estudiantina to actors guild, and highly competitive sports—whether football, soccer or swimming—BISD is leading its students, faculty and staff to new heights. BISD is a trailblazer in its own right and worthy of recognition as it reaches this important milestone.

The continued growth in the student population and number of schools has not changed the original mission of BISD, which is to help students become better stewards of society. Mr. Speaker, this month Brownsville Independent School District celebrates its 100th Anniversary and prepares for the next 100 years with continued dedication to providing all students with a high quality education.

A TRIBUTE TO CHASE SHILTZ IN  
THE FIRST SESSION OF THE  
114TH CONGRESS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Chase Shiltz of Creston, Iowa, for winning the Class 2A 160 pound bracket at the Iowa High School State Wrestling tournament on February 21, 2015.

Iowa has a long and proud history of strong wrestling programs in our state, producing college and Olympic champions for years. Winning a state championship is the culmination of years of hard work and commitment, not only on the part of Mr. Shiltz, but also his parents John and Dorie Shiltz, his family, and coaches.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this student-athlete demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent him and his family in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating Chase on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing continued success in his education and high school wrestling career.

CONGRATULATING THE PORT HUENEME CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

**HON. JULIA BROWNLEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize and congratulate the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce on the

occasion of its 75th anniversary. Since its inception on September 24, 1956, the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce has played a vital role in the growth and advancement of the City of Port Hueneme's business community.

The Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce is a nonprofit California corporation, organized for the purpose of advancing the commercial, industrial, civic, and general interest of the City of Port Hueneme, the Oxnard Harbor District, and surrounding trade areas. One of the Chamber's earliest and most important accomplishments includes its fundamental role in the incorporation of the City of Port Hueneme in 1948.

Among its many services and programs, the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce answers inquiries regarding city matters, promotes community activities and engagement, monitors legislation affecting the business community, provides networking opportunities at events and meetings, and publishes a Business Directory for the City of Port Hueneme.

The Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce continuously fosters working relationships and collaborations with many different stakeholders within Port Hueneme. Through its strong membership, varied community programs and special committees, the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce pays tribute to the history and diversity of its community.

I am honored to recognize the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce on the celebration of its 75th anniversary. I applaud and thank the Port Hueneme Chamber of Commerce for the essential role it has had and continues to have in the enrichment and successful growth of the City of Port Hueneme.

A TRIBUTE TO ISAIAH PATTON IN  
THE FIRST SESSION OF THE  
114TH CONGRESS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Isaiah Patton of Dowling Catholic High School for winning the Class 3A 170 pound bracket at the Iowa High School State Wrestling tournament on February 21, 2015.

Iowa has a long and proud history of strong wrestling programs in our state, producing college and Olympic champions for years. Winning a state championship is the culmination of years of hard work and commitment, not only on the part of Mr. Patton, but also his family, teammates, and coaches.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this student-athlete demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Isaiah and his family in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating Isaiah on competing in this rigorous competition and wishing continued success in his education and wrestling career.

CELEBRATING THE 2015 PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION CENTENNIAL

**HON. NANCY PELOSI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 2, 2015*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, with great pride I join my constituents and all San Francisco Bay Area residents in celebration of the 2015 Panama-Pacific International Exposition Centennial—our yearlong civic celebration to commemorate the Exposition's historic significance and reflect on its legacy.

One hundred years ago San Francisco welcomed nearly 20 million visitors from across the nation and around the world to witness its rebirth after the devastating 1906 Earthquake and fire and its emergence as a global city.

Six hundred acres along the western waterfront of the Marina District became the site for the "Jewel City". Eleven Beaux-Arts Palaces were built that contained 21 international pavilions. Beyond the impressive architecture were exhibitions of the new technologies of the day—cars, airplanes, telephones, motion pictures.

Most beloved of the surviving structures is the Palace of Fine Arts—an exquisite and sublime Greco-Romanesque rotunda designed by celebrated architect Bernard Maybeck. Other surviving landmarks include a Municipal Auditorium, known today as the Bill Graham Civic Auditorium that instilled great civic pride and optimism in a dispirited population.

The Panama-Pacific International Exhibition established our City as an economic and cultural powerhouse, illustrating our leadership in science, industry and innovation. It was a grand showcase of human achievement in the sciences, engineering, architecture and the arts. It was a monumental display of, not only San Francisco's vision, imagination and innovation, but its confidence and faith in the future.

San Francisco today is still regarded as an optimistic and audacious city, a city of dreamers and innovators, much like the pioneers and visionaries of 1915. And as we celebrate the centennial of this great moment in our city's history, we are overjoyed that more than thirty-five Bay Area cultural, civic and business organizations will participate in the centennial's events, exhibitions and activities.

Congratulations and our deepest gratitude to The California Historical Society, the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, the Maybeck Foundation, Innovation Hangar, and all the other contributing partners and sponsors for this historic commemoration and extravaganza.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily

Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 3, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED MARCH 4

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of the Interior.

SD-124

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security

To hold hearings to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on oversight and reform of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

SR-253

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Business meeting to consider an original bill entitled, "Inspector General Empowerment Act of 2015", S. 280, to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, H.R. 460, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, H.R. 615, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, an original bill entitled, "Federal Improper Payments Coordination Act", an original bill entitled, "Presidential Library Donations Act", an original bill entitled, "Federal Vehicle Repair Costs Savings Act", S. 546, to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evalua-

tion (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, S. 242, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide leave to any new Federal employee who is a veteran with a service-connected disability rated at 30 percent or more for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disability, S. 86, to amend title 44 of the United States Code, to provide for the suspension of fines under certain circumstances for first-time paperwork violations by small business concerns, and S. 136, to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine whistleblower retaliation at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, focusing on improving protections and oversight.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SD-G50

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Navy and Marine Corps.

SD-192

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine wasteful duplication in the Federal government.

SD-608

2 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation

To hold hearings to examine Russian aggression in Eastern Europe.

SD-419

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-192

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Personnel

To hold hearings to examine the Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian personnel programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine S. 438, to provide for the repair, replacement, and maintenance of certain Indian irrigation projects.

SD-628

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President 2015.

SD-106

3:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine United States nuclear weapons policy, programs, and strategy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

#### MARCH 5

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the postures on the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine opportunities for the United States to build on its status as an Arctic nation for the betterment of the nation and those who live in the Arctic.

SD-366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine America's health information technology (IT) transformation, focusing on translating the promise of electronic health records into better care.

SD-430

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation from the American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Military Officers Association of America, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, Vietnam Veterans of America, Blinded Veterans Association, and the National Council on Aging.

CHOB-345

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD-192

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

3 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Secretary of the Senate, the Senate Sergeant at Arms, and the Capitol Police.

SD-138

#### MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions  
To hold hearings to examine continuing America's leadership in medical innovation for patients.  
SD-430
- MARCH 11
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings to examine a nationwide public safety wireless broadband network.  
SR-253
- MARCH 12
- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.  
SD-G50
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine S. 556, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting.  
SD-366
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces  
To receive a closed briefing on missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal
- year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SVC-217
- MARCH 17
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine the state of technological innovation related to the electric grid.  
SD-366
- MARCH 18
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Veterans' Affairs  
To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation from multiple veterans service organizations.  
SD-G50
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission.  
SR-253
- MARCH 19
- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. Strategic Command, U.S. Transportation Command, and U.S. Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SD-G50
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. crude oil export policy.  
SD-366
- MARCH 24
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine management reforms to improve forest health and socioeconomic opportunities on the nation's forest system.  
SD-366
- MARCH 25
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces  
To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-222
- MARCH 26
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine the Administration's Quadrennial Energy Review.  
SD-366
- CANCELLATIONS
- MARCH 5
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on the Judiciary  
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.  
SD-226

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 3, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 3, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN NEWHOUSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Loving God, You are compassionate and merciful. We give You thanks for giving us another day.

This morning, the House welcomes the Prime Minister of Israel. May he find a welcome here, and may the partnership of our two countries continue into a future of mutual respect and security among the community of nations.

There are many issues which press upon our Nation now, and more lie upon the legislative horizon. Pour forth an abundance of wisdom, knowledge, and understanding upon the Members of Congress and upon Your people so that, together, solutions for the betterment of our Nation might be forged.

Bless us this day and every day. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. MCSALLY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 3, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 3, 2015 at 9:32 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 431.

Appointments:

Election Assistance Board of Advisors.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be per-

mited on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, February 26, 2015, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

### JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY BINYAMIN NETANYAHU, PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o'clock and 48 minutes a.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the left of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER);

The gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS);

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX);

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN);

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN);

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL);

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER);

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS);

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH);

The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN); and

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ); and

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN.)

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, His Excellency Hersey Kyota, the Ambassador of the Republic of Palau.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for him.

At 11 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, Paul D. Irving, announced His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel.

The Prime Minister of Israel, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

Prime Minister NETANYAHU. Thank you, Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER, President Pro Tem Senator ORRIN HATCH, Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, House Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI, and House Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY.

I also want to acknowledge Senator and Democratic Leader, HARRY REID. HARRY, it is good to see you back on your feet. I guess it is true what they say, you can't keep a good man down.

My friends, I am deeply humbled by the opportunity to speak for a third time before the most important legislative body in the world, the U.S. Congress. I want to thank you all for being here today.

I know that my speech has been the subject of much controversy. I deeply regret that some perceive my being here as political. That was never my intention.

I want to thank you, Democrats and Republicans, for your common support for Israel year after year, decade after decade. I know that no matter on which side of the aisle you sit, you stand with Israel.

The remarkable alliance between Israel and the United States has always been above politics. It must always remain above politics because America and Israel, we share a common destiny, the destiny of promised lands that cherish freedom and offer hope.

Israel is grateful for the support of America's people and of America's Presidents, from Harry Truman to Barack Obama.

We appreciate all that President Obama has done for Israel. Now, some of that is widely known, like strengthening security cooperation and intelligence sharing, opposing anti-Israel resolutions at the U.N.

Some of what the President has done for Israel is less well known. I called him in 2010 when we had the Carmel forest fire, and he immediately agreed to respond to my request for urgent aid.

In 2011, we had our Embassy in Cairo under siege, and again, he provided vital assistance at the crucial moment. Or his support for more missile interceptors during our operation last summer when we took on Hamas terrorists. In each of those moments, I called the President and he was there.

Some of what the President has done for Israel might never be known because it touches on some of the most sensitive and strategic issues that arise between an American President and an Israeli Prime Minister. But I know it, and I will always be grateful to President Obama for that support.

And Israel is grateful to you, the American Congress, for your support, for supporting us in so many ways, especially in generous military assistance and missile defense, including Iron Dome.

Last summer, millions of Israelis were protected from thousands of Hamas rockets because this Capitol Dome helped build our Iron Dome. Thank you, America. Thank you for everything you have done for Israel.

My friends, I have come here today because, as Prime Minister of Israel, I feel a profound obligation to speak to you about an issue that could well threaten the survival of my country and the future of my people, Iran's quest for nuclear weapons.

We are an ancient people. In our nearly 4,000 years of history, many have tried repeatedly to destroy the Jewish people.

Tomorrow night, on the Jewish holiday of Purim, we will read the book of Esther. We will read of a powerful Persian viceroy named Haman, who plotted to destroy the Jewish people some 2,500 years ago.

But a courageous Jewish woman, Queen Esther, exposed the plot and gained for the Jewish people the right to defend themselves against their enemies. The plot was foiled. Our people were saved.

Today, the Jewish people face another attempt by yet another Persian potentate to destroy us. Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, spews the oldest hatred, the oldest hatred of anti-Semitism with the newest technology.

He tweets that Israel must be annihilated. He tweets. In Iran there isn't exactly free Internet, but he tweets in English that Israel must be destroyed.

For those who believe that Iran threatens the Jewish state but not the Jewish people, listen to Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of Hezbollah, Iran's chief terrorist proxy. He said: If all the Jews gather in Israel, it will save us the trouble of chasing them down around the world.

But Iran's regime is not merely a Jewish problem, any more than the Nazi regime was merely a Jewish problem.

The 6 million Jews murdered by the Nazis were but a fraction of the 60 million people killed in World War II. So, too, Iran's regime poses a grave threat, not only to Israel, but also to the peace of the entire world.

To understand just how dangerous Iran would be with nuclear weapons, we must fully understand the nature of the regime.

The people of Iran are very talented people. They are heirs to one of the world's great civilizations. But in 1979, they were hijacked by religious zealots, religious zealots who imposed on them immediately a dark and brutal dictatorship. That year, the zealots drafted a constitution, a new one for Iran. It directed the Revolutionary Guards not only to protect Iran's borders but also to fulfill the ideological mission of jihad. The regime's founder, Ayatollah Khomeini, exhorted his followers to export the revolution throughout the world.

I am standing here in Washington, D.C., and the difference is so stark. America's founding document promises "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Iran's founding document pledges death, tyranny, and the pursuit of jihad. And as states are collapsing across the Middle East, Iran is charging into the void to do just that. Iran's goons in Gaza, its lackeys in Lebanon, its Revolutionary Guards on the Golan Heights are clutching Israel with three tentacles of terror. Backed by Iran, Assad is slaughtering Syrians. Backed by Iran, Shiite militias are rampaging through Iraq. Backed by Iran, Houthis are seizing control of Yemen, threatening the strategic straits at the mouth of the Red Sea. Along with the Strait of Hormuz, that would give Iran a second choke point on the world's oil supply.

Just last week, near Hormuz, Iran carried out a military exercise, blowing up a mock U.S. aircraft carrier—that is just last week—while they are having nuclear talks with the United States. But unfortunately, for the last 36 years, Iran's attacks against the United States have been anything but mock, and the targets have been all too real.

Iran took dozens of Americans hostage in Tehran; murdered hundreds of American soldiers, marines in Beirut, and was responsible for killing and maiming thousands of American servicemen and -women in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Beyond the Middle East, Iran attacks America and its allies through its global terror network. It blew up the Jewish community center and the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires; it helped al Qaeda bomb U.S. Embassies in Africa; it even attempted to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador right here in Washington, D.C.

In the Middle East, Iran now dominates four Arab capitals—Baghdad, Damascus, Beirut, and Sana'a. And if Iran's aggression is left unchecked, more will surely follow.

So at a time when many hope that Iran will join the community of nations, Iran is busy gobbling up the nations.

We must all stand together to stop Iran's march of conquest, subjugation, and terror.

Now, 2 years ago, we were told to give President Rouhani and Foreign Minister Zarif a chance to bring change and moderation to Iran—some change, some moderation. Rouhani's government hangs gays, persecutes Christians, jails journalists, and executes even more prisoners than before.

Last year, the same Zarif who charms Western diplomats laid a wreath at the grave of Imad Mughniyah. Imad Mughniyah is the terrorist mastermind who spilled more American blood than any other terrorist besides Osama bin Laden. I

would like to see someone ask him a question about that.

Iran's regime is as radical as ever, its cries of "Death to America," that same America that it calls the great Satan, as loud as ever. Now this shouldn't be surprising because the ideology of Iran's revolutionary regime is deeply rooted in militant Islam, and that is why this regime will always be an enemy of America.

And don't be fooled. The battle between Iran and ISIS doesn't turn Iran into a friend of America. Iran and ISIS are competing for the crown of militant Islam. One calls itself the Islamic Republic; the other calls itself the Islamic State. Both want to impose a militant Islamic empire, first on the region, and then on the entire world. They just disagree among themselves who will be the ruler of that empire.

In this deadly game of thrones, there is no place for America or for Israel; no peace for Christians, Jews, or Muslims who don't share the Islamist medieval creed; no rights for women; no freedom for anyone.

So when it comes to Iran and ISIS, the enemy of your enemy is your enemy. The difference is that ISIS is armed with butcher knives, captured weapons, and YouTube; whereas, Iran could soon be armed with intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear bombs.

We must always remember—I will say it one more time—the greatest danger facing our world is the marriage of militant Islam with nuclear weapons. To defeat ISIS and let Iran get nuclear weapons would be to win the battle but lose the war. We can't let that happen. But that, my friends, is exactly what could happen if the deal now being negotiated is accepted by Iran. That deal will not prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons. It would all but guarantee that Iran gets those weapons, lots of them.

Let me explain why.

While the final deal has not yet been signed, certain elements of any potential deal are now a matter of public record. You don't need intelligence agencies and secret information to know this. You can Google it.

Absent a dramatic change, we know for sure that any deal with Iran will include two major concessions to Iran. The first major concession would leave Iran with a vast nuclear infrastructure, providing it with a short breakout time to the bomb. "Breakout time" is the time it takes to amass enough weapons-grade uranium or plutonium for a nuclear bomb.

According to the deal, not a single nuclear facility would be demolished. Thousands of centrifuges used to enrich uranium would be left spinning. Thousands more would be temporarily disconnected but not destroyed. Because Iran's nuclear program would be left largely in tact, Iran's breakout

time would be very short—about a year by U.S. assessment, even shorter by Israel's. And if Iran's work on advanced centrifuges—faster and faster centrifuges—is not stopped, that breakout time could still be shorter—a lot shorter.

True, certain restrictions would be imposed on Iran's nuclear program, and Iran's adherence to those restrictions would be supervised by international inspectors. But here is the problem, you see: inspectors document violations; they don't stop them.

Inspectors knew when North Korea broke to the bomb, but that didn't stop anything. North Korea turned off the cameras, kicked out the inspectors; and, within a few years, it got the bomb.

Now, we are warned that within 5 years, North Korea could have an arsenal of 100 nuclear bombs. Like North Korea, Iran, too, has defied international inspectors. It has done that on at least three separate occasions, 2005, 2006, and 2010.

Like North Korea, Iran broke the locks and shut off the cameras. Now, I know this is not going to come as a shock to any of you, but Iran not only defies inspectors, it also plays a pretty good game of hide-and-cheat with them.

The U.N.'s nuclear watchdog agency, the IAEA, said again yesterday that Iran still refuses to come clean about its military nuclear program. Iran was also caught—caught twice, not once—twice operating secret nuclear facilities in Natanz and Qom, facilities that inspectors didn't even know existed. Right now, Iran could be hiding nuclear facilities that we—the U.S. and Israel—don't know about.

As the former head of inspections for the IAEA said in 2013: "If there is no undeclared installation today in Iran, it will be the first time in 20 years that it doesn't have one." Iran has proven time and again that it cannot be trusted, and that is why the first major concession is a source of grave concern.

It leaves Iran with a vast nuclear infrastructure and relies on inspectors to prevent a breakout. That concession creates a real danger that Iran could get to the bomb by violating the deal.

But the second major concession creates an even greater danger that Iran could get to the bomb by keeping the deal because virtually all the restrictions on Iran's nuclear program will automatically expire in about a decade.

Now, a decade may seem like a long time in political life, but it is the blink of an eye in the life of a nation. It is the blink of an eye in the life of our children. We all have a responsibility to consider what will happen when Iran's nuclear capabilities are virtually unrestricted and all the sanctions will have been lifted. Iran would then be free to build a huge nuclear capacity



that could produce many, many nuclear bombs.

Iran's Supreme Leader says that openly. He says that Iran plans to have 190,000 centrifuges—not 6,000 or even the 19,000 that Iran has today, but ten times that amount—190,000 centrifuges enriching uranium. With this massive capacity, Iran could make the fuel for an entire nuclear arsenal and this in a matter of weeks once it makes that decision.

My longtime friend John Kerry, Secretary of State, confirmed last week that Iran could legitimately possess that massive centrifuge capacity when the deal expires. Now, I want you to think about that. The foremost sponsor of global terrorism could be weeks away from having enough enriched uranium for an entire arsenal of nuclear weapons—and this with full international legitimacy.

By the way, if Iran's intercontinental ballistic missile program is not part of the deal—and, so far, Iran refuses to even put it on the negotiating table—well, Iran could have the means to deliver that nuclear arsenal to the far-reaching corners of the Earth, including to every part of the United States.

You see, my friends, this deal has two major concessions: one, leaving Iran with a vast nuclear program; and, two, lifting the restrictions on that program in about a decade. That is why this deal is so bad. It doesn't block Iran's path to the bomb; it paves Iran's path to the bomb.

Why would anyone make this deal? Because they hope that Iran will change for the better in the coming years or they believe that the alternative to this deal is worse.

Well, I disagree. I don't believe that Iran's radical regime will change for the better after this deal. This regime has been in power for 36 years, and its voracious appetite for aggression grows with each passing year. This deal would only whet Iran's appetite for more.

Would Iran be less aggressive when sanctions are removed and its economy is stronger? If Iran is gobbling up four countries right now while it is under sanctions, how many more countries will Iran devour when sanctions are lifted?

Would Iran fund less terrorism when it has mountains of cash with which to fund more terrorism? Why should Iran's radical regime change for the better when it can enjoy the best of both worlds: aggression abroad and prosperity at home?

This is a question that everyone asks in our region. Israel's neighbors—Iran's neighbors—know that Iran will become even more aggressive and sponsor even more terrorism when its economy is unshackled and it has been given a clear path to the bomb. Many of these neighbors say that they will respond by racing to get nuclear weapons of their own.

This deal won't change Iran for the better; it will only change the Middle East for the worse. A deal that is supposed to prevent nuclear proliferation would instead spark a nuclear arms race in the most dangerous part of the planet.

This deal won't be a farewell to arms. It would be a farewell to arms control, and the Middle East would soon be crisscrossed by nuclear tripwires. A region where small skirmishes can trigger big wars would turn into a nuclear tinderbox.

If anyone thinks this deal kicks the can down the road, think again. When we get down that road, we will face a much more dangerous Iran, a Middle East littered with nuclear bombs, and a countdown to a potential nuclear nightmare.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have come here today to tell you we don't have to bet the security of the world on the hope that Iran will change for the better. We don't have to gamble with our future and with our children's future. We can insist that restrictions on Iran's nuclear program not be lifted for as long as Iran continues its aggression in the region and in the world.

Before lifting those restrictions, the world should demand that Iran do three things: first, stop its aggression against its neighbors in the Middle East; second, stop supporting terrorism around the world; and, third, stop threatening to annihilate my country, Israel, the one and only Jewish state.

If the world powers are not prepared to insist that Iran change its behavior before a deal is signed, at the very least, they should insist that Iran change its behavior before a deal expires.

If Iran changes its behavior, the restrictions would be lifted. If Iran doesn't change its behavior, the restrictions should not be lifted. If Iran wants to be treated like a normal country, let it act like a normal country.

My friends, what about the argument that there is no alternative to this deal, that Iran's nuclear know-how cannot be erased, that its nuclear program is so advanced that the best we can do is delay the inevitable, which is, essentially, what the proposed deal seeks to do?

Well, nuclear know-how without nuclear infrastructure doesn't get you very much. A race car driver without a car can't drive; a pilot without a plane can't fly; without thousands of centrifuges, tons of enriched uranium, or heavy water facilities, Iran can't make nuclear weapons.

Iran's nuclear program can be rolled back well beyond the current proposal by insisting on a better deal and keeping up the pressure on a very vulnerable regime, especially given the recent collapse in the price of oil.

Now, if Iran threatens to walk away from the table—and this often happens

in a Persian bazaar—call their bluff. They will be back because they need the deal a lot more than you do. And by maintaining the pressure on Iran, and on those who do business with Iran, you have the power to make them need it even more.

My friends, for over a year, we have been told that no deal is better than a bad deal. Well, this is a bad deal, it is a very bad deal. We are better off without it.

Now we are being told that the only alternative to this bad deal is war. That is just not true. The alternative to this bad deal is a much better deal, a better deal that doesn't leave Iran with a vast nuclear infrastructure in such a short breakout time, a better deal that keeps the restrictions on Iran's nuclear program in place until Iran's aggression ends, a better deal that won't give Iran an easy path to the bomb, a better deal that Israel and its neighbors may not like but with which we could live, literally. And no country, no country has a greater stake, no country has a greater stake than Israel in a good deal that peacefully removes this threat.

Ladies and gentlemen, history has placed us at a fateful crossroads. We must now choose between two paths.

One path leads to a bad deal that will, at best, curtail Iran's nuclear ambitions for a while, but it will inexorably lead to a nuclear-armed Iran whose unbridled aggression will inevitably lead to war.

The second path, however difficult, could lead to a much better deal that would prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, a nuclearized Middle East, and the horrific consequences of both to all of humanity.

You don't have to read Robert Frost to know you have to live life, to know that the difficult path is usually the one less traveled, but it will make all the difference for the future of my country, the security of the Middle East, and the peace of the world, the peace that we all desire.

My friends, standing up to Iran is not easy; standing up to dark and murderous regimes never is. With us today is Holocaust survivor and Nobel Prize winner Elie Wiesel. Elie, your life and work inspires to give meaning to the words "never again." And I wish I could promise you, Elie, that the lessons of history have been learned. I can only urge the leaders of the world not to repeat the mistakes of the past, not to sacrifice the future for the present, not to ignore aggression in the hopes of gaining an illusory peace. But I can guarantee you this: the days when the Jewish people remain passive in the face of genocidal enemies, those days are over. We are no longer scattered among the nations, powerless to defend ourselves. We have restored our sovereignty in our ancient home, and the soldiers who defend our home have boundless courage.

For the first time in 100 generations, we, the Jewish people, can defend ourselves. This is why, as Prime Minister of Israel, I can promise you one more thing. Even if Israel has to stand alone, Israel will stand. But I know that Israel does not stand alone. I know that America stands with Israel, I know that you stand with Israel. You stand with Israel because you know that the story of Israel is not only the story of the Jewish people but of the human spirit that refuses again and again to succumb to history's horrors.

Facing me right up there in the gallery, overlooking all of us in this august Chamber, is the image of Moses. Moses led our people from slavery to the gates of the Promised Land. And before the people of Israel entered the land of Israel, Moses gave us a message that has steered our resolve for thousands of years.

I leave you with his message today:

Be strong and resolute. Neither fear nor dread them.

My friends, may Israel and America always stand together, strong and resolute. May we neither fear nor dread the challenges ahead. May we face the future with confidence, strength, and hope.

May God bless the State of Israel, and may God bless the United States of America.

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you all. You are wonderful. Thank you, America. Thank you.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m., His Excellency Binyamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps from the Chamber.

#### JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1232

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PALAZZO) at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the pro-

ceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 749, PASSENGER RAIL REFORM AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 6, 2015, THROUGH MARCH 13, 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 134 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 134

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 749) to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-9. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from March 6, 2015, through March 13, 2015—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 4. At any time through the legislative day of March 13, 2015, the Chair may postpone further consideration of a measure in the House to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy hearing the Reading Clerk read the work of the Rules Committee. I always look around to see how many folks are fixated on those words because words matter, and we spend a lot of time trying to craft the rules to be just right.

But as proud as I am of the work we do in the Rules Committee, I confess that coming down here to this floor just moments after the Prime Minister of Israel delivered the speech that he just delivered—wow, you talk about words that matter.

I knew I was going to learn something in that speech, Mr. Speaker. I knew I was going to feel something in that speech. And just here moments after, what I came away with was, number one, we can learn a lot from the Prime Minister about leadership, about saying what you mean and meaning what you say. When the stakes are high, when the results impact all the families that we serve, it matters.

We care a lot about people in this Chamber. Sometimes we have a crisis of leadership. Sometimes we have a crisis of followership. It is tremendously meaningful to me to see the leadership that was on display here, not just for America but for the world.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had a lesson for us all about class. He spent the first 5 minutes of that speech talking about his affection for President Obama, talking about his respect for President Obama, talking about the relationship between the United States of America and how President Obama had played a meaningful role in keeping Israel safe.

We are not always in that place down here. And oftentimes, we find politics gets under our skin. Oftentimes, when there is a big debate surrounding a serious issue, we take it as a personal affront. And sometimes when we come back down to the House floor, we don't talk to one another with the mutual

respect that, I would argue, every single Member of this Chamber has earned. We don't talk to each other across the aisle, I think, in ways that would always make our constituents back home proud.

It meant a lot to me, given the emotion that surrounded the invitation of the Prime Minister to be here, that he spent his first moments of that speech not talking about frustrations, not talking about who did what to whom, but talking about his deep respect for the leader of the United States of America and what President Obama had meant to the safety and the security of Israel. I value that.

It kind of makes what we are going to talk about next, Mr. Speaker, seem a little small, but it is not small. We are talking about passenger rail in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this rule, H. Res. 134, allows us to bring up H.R. 749, the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act. They call it PRRIA. And it passed unanimously out of the Transportation Committee. I have the great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of serving both on the Rules Committee and the Transportation Committee, and rail isn't one of those you think about as being a unanimous issue.

In my great State of Georgia, Mr. Speaker—and I have taken the train from Atlanta down to New Orleans, so I know we have some great stops on Amtrak in the great State of Mississippi. But if you want to take the train from Atlanta to Columbia, South Carolina—it is about a 3-hour drive right across the way—that train is going to leave tonight, out of Atlanta at 8 o'clock, and not tomorrow but 2 days from now, that train is going to arrive in Columbia, South Carolina, having connected through the city of Washington. It makes no sense whatsoever, but that is just where the rails are. That is where the rails are.

Now, you contrast that—the complete meaninglessness that rail has for me, that Amtrak has for me in the great State of Georgia, since it takes me absolutely nowhere I want to go, at a speed that I desire, at a price that I can afford—contrast that with what is going on in the Northeast corridor.

My friend from Massachusetts, I wonder if he ever gets on a plane to fly back home. If I lived in New York City and worked in Washington, D.C., I wouldn't even have a Delta frequent flyer number. I would be on the train every single trip. Why? Because it provides reliable, fast, inexpensive service for the most densely populated population corridor in the United States of America.

That has always confounded this body, Mr. Speaker. How do we balance the needs of that northeastern transportation corridor, where Amtrak is so meaningful, so valuable to so many people—I don't think the roads and the

bridges could handle the crush of humanity in the absence of Amtrak—how would we balance that success story, the only profitable corridor on the Amtrak route, with what, I would argue, is a tremendous failure in the rest of the country, where I can fly to Jacksonville, Florida, 48 hours faster than I can ride the train there, and at a lower price?

This bill is about reform, Mr. Speaker. And I am not even going to argue that we, in the Transportation Committee, got it exactly right. We worked awfully hard on it. There was a lot of leadership provided by Members on both sides of the aisle.

But on the outside chance that we didn't get it exactly right, the Rules Committee came together yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and made amendments in order. One of the great parts of this process is that you don't have to be on the committee of jurisdiction in order to have an impact on legislation. Any Member of the House can come to the Rules Committee and ask for an amendment to be made in order. This rule today makes in order seven such amendments to improve this bill. Four of those amendments come from Democratic Members. Three of those amendments come from Republican Members. Again, we were trying to maintain that collegial, bipartisan spirit that we had in the Transportation Committee on the underlying bill. We tried to continue that in the Rules Committee again last night.

I don't know how those amendments are going to shake out down here today, Mr. Speaker. And I am glad that I don't know how they are going to shake out. I don't think having a predetermined destination on this floor is what our constituents sent us here to do. I don't think that is what being a representative democracy is. I think what you want are folks to be able to come down here and express their opinions. I have the great pleasure of serving on the Rules Committee, which enables that to happen.

One of the great changes in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is we take those dollars that American citizens are paying to ride Amtrak on that northeastern corridor, that profitable corridor, and we leave those dollars there so that that route can expand and improve. The population continues to grow there. Transportation needs continue to expand there. And we create a partnership with States in those areas to say, Mr. Speaker, if you have a priority, as a Governor, as a State legislature, if you want to partner with the Federal Government to make your train service more effective, more efficient, we want to partner with you.

But if your idea of a transportation plan is to do nothing locally but rely on the Federal Government to do it all for you, we have no money for you. That seems fair. The Federal Govern-

ment is not a piggy bank that State and local communities can come to and withdraw from for their needs. What it is is a partner that, for these large transportation projects, for these projects of national significance, States and localities can partner with to make those a reality.

I don't know that we will ever get the kind of Amtrak service in your or my part of the world, Mr. Speaker, that we have in the Northeast corridor. And candidly, I don't know that our constituencies will ever clamor for that service. But it is meaningful to me that even though we have different views on the issue of rail, even though we have different views on the future of rail, that we were able to come together, again, in a unanimous way to put forward a bill that will celebrate and fund those parts of the rail system that are successfully serving America and that will reform and, in some cases, eliminate those unprofitable parts of the rail system that I don't think any member of our constituency would be enthusiastic about funding with their hard-earned tax dollars.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we support the rule, and we support the underlying bill.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I told a group of constituents just a moment ago—I don't know if I look a little wet up here. It is not perspiration from running back to the House floor. I feel obligated to tell my friends that. It is dripping a little bit outside, and that is the fastest way to get here from my office.

But I was back in my office with constituents from AIPAC. Sixteen thousand men and women from AIPAC came into town this week to make their voice heard. Now, I couldn't find anybody who was here on paid vacation, and I couldn't find anyone else that had someone else foot the bill. What I saw was 16,000 people who put their money where their mouth is to come and petition the government, to come and try to make us better.

I bring that up, Mr. Speaker, because what I told those men and women today of AIPAC was that there were grumpy faces on the floor of the House yesterday. I remember seeing a few. In fact, I might have been one. I will go ahead and confess, Mr. Speaker, I was one. We have some serious problems here, some serious challenges, and some serious disagreements. In the now almost 1 hour since the Prime Minister

finished speaking, I have seen more smiles; I have seen more collegiality; and I have seen more Members enjoying each other and working together in just that 1 hour than I have seen in the entire month of February.

I bring that up, Mr. Speaker, because the gentleman from Massachusetts and I have been working on rules for a long time together—a long time together—and I don't think it would offend the gentleman if I were to say that he and I often disagree about the way a rule ought to be crafted. We often disagree about the underlying legislation. Here we are on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, but we may spend an hour or 2 or 3, sometimes longer, debating the merits of the underlying legislation. So to come here 1 hour after that spectacular come-together-for-things-that-matter speech the Prime Minister just gave and to find agreement with my friend on the Rules Committee—not just on the rule but, I daresay, on the underlying bill—I hope it is a sign of things to come—not just a thing to come in the regular relationship between my friend from Massachusetts and me, because that relationship is strong, but a relationship across the board.

We have passed and sent to the President lots of bills this Congress, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I think we have passed something like 40 bills out of the U.S. House of Representatives. I don't know if I went home and asked my constituency that they can name two. I think they would know the XL pipeline bill, because that is something everyone has been focused on. But I don't think, as a population, they could name two.

I hope this is the start of a success that the Rules Committee is going to have together over the next 18 months. I hope this is going to be the start of the kinds of agreements that we can create together, Mr. Speaker.

I thank my friend from Massachusetts for being part of, again, making today a little bit better than yesterday was.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman for his comments. We support the rule and the underlying bill, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 134.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while we talk about agreements here on the floor, I think

sometimes folks back home are concerned that we are agreeing on the little things, things that don't matter, that we are talking about renaming a post office. While that is important to that community and while that is important to the man or woman being honored, I would argue it doesn't necessarily advance the cause of freedom and democracy. I can't tell you with a straight face that what we are doing on passenger rail today is going to advance the cause of freedom and democracy. If you want to advance the cause of freedom and democracy, you needed to be here 2 hours ago when the Prime Minister came to deliver his message to the United States Congress. Freedom and democracy lived there.

What we are advancing on this passenger rail bill, Mr. Speaker, is just common sense. It is just common sense. I don't want to get in the weeds of all the exciting things that go on in there, Mr. Speaker. I serve on the Transportation Committee. Of course it is exciting to me. Of course I am going to be involved in the minutia. I don't know that my other colleagues are quite as enthusiastic about that.

I would encourage folks to go to [transportation.house.gov](http://transportation.house.gov), Mr. Speaker. The Transportation Committee, like all committees on Capitol Hill, has a Web page, and on that Web page you can get deep into the weeds. If you are a policy wonk like I am and you want to dig down into the minutia and find out what subparagraph (f) says about clause 2, you can absolutely do it. But there are some top line numbers there, too.

And again, I want folks to have something to celebrate here. I want folks to be able to be enthusiastic about their representative body. I would argue, as the Prime Minister argued, that the greatest deliberative body, the greatest bastion of freedom on the planet, if you want to know what is going on, go to that Transportation Committee Web site. You are going to find—well, you are going to find all sorts of information. You will find something like this one-pager right here, whether you are a high school student who cares about passenger rail or whether you are a transportation engineer leading your local Department of Transportation, all of those details can be found there.

I will give you one example.

Could you believe—you come from a constituency much like I do, Mr. Speaker, but can you believe that in the United States of America today, in the era of sequester—in the era of sequester—that not one Member of this body would say isn't having an impact on our social safety net, where not one Member of this body wouldn't say isn't having an impact on our national security, in this era of sequester, Amtrak subsidizes food and beverage service—subsidizes food and beverage service. It

is a loss-leading part of the transportation funding on Amtrak.

I will just tell you, I have ridden Amtrak to New York a time or two. I didn't have any beverage service. It is not like my friends on Delta who will bring me a Coca-Cola product on my flight to Washington, D.C., here. You have to go down to the beverage car. Now, if you would like to bring your own lunch on Amtrak, you absolutely can. If your husband or wife wants to make you a sack at home, you can bring it on in and eat it right there on the train. Yet the American taxpayer, as we sit here right now—this isn't prospective. This is as we sit here right now. The American taxpayer is funding—subsidizing—food service for those men and women who happen to ride Amtrak every day.

Again, for your and my constituencies, Mr. Speaker, that is worth nothing. That is worth nothing. But even for those constituencies that ride Amtrak to work every single day, don't you think in this time of budget cutting, of trying to end the \$18 trillion of borrowing from our children and grandchildren, this time of trying to balance our national security needs with our social safety net needs, don't you think that one of the things we could agree on is we don't need to subsidize snack food for train riders?

The truth is, Mr. Speaker, I say that like it is a rhetorical question, that I am going to start to get out my sharp stick and poke the other side. I am not. It happens to be one of the things that we agree on.

How many years have you and I been in Congress, Mr. Speaker, trying to get rid of silly stuff that the Federal Government does? Well, for you and me, the answer is 4. For 4 years we have been working on trying to get rid of silly stuff that the Federal Government does; subsidizing Twinkies, part of that silly stuff. I am not picking on Twinkies. I have great respect for Twinkie eaters. But I don't want my tax dollars subsidizing that habit.

Unanimously, on the Transportation Committee, Mr. Speaker, we have come together to say: I don't know why we didn't do this a long time ago, I don't know why the other previous Congress hadn't gotten it done, but the buck stops here. We are going to work together and do that.

Where are those dollars going to go instead, Mr. Speaker? They are going to go to improving quality of service. Find me that constituent back home; find him in Atlanta; find him in Mississippi; find those constituents back home who wouldn't make that trade with their tax dollars every day of the week. We are doing it. We are doing it together, and we are doing it in a way I hope the Senate will act on it. If they can't take wisdom as we have defined it, I welcome a conference, and I hope we will be able to get this bill on the President's desk.

All of these great ideas that we have come together, that we have done in a collaborative way, Republicans and Democrats on the committee, Republicans and Democrats here on the floor of the House, the seven amendments that we are going to be considering today, all of these things we have done collaboratively, Mr. Speaker, mean nothing—mean nothing—if they don't go to the President's desk for his signature. This is but a first step, but it is a proud first step.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again, we agree with the rule, and we agree with the underlying bill. If the gentleman would like more time, I am happy to yield to him because I always enjoy hearing him speak in the Rules Committee, and I think our colleagues could benefit from his speaking on the House floor. But I don't know what else to add except we are all in agreement, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the accolades of my friend from Massachusetts, the truth is I am not an expert on this bill. The Transportation Committee is staffed with those experts at a staff level and at an elected Member level.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), who has been a leader on the Transportation Committee, not looking for Republican solutions and not looking for Democratic solutions, but looking for commonsense solutions and then selling those to his colleagues on both sides.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to touch on a few of the great things on this reform bill. Make no mistake, this will reform passenger rail as we know it today in many different areas.

First of all, we expect that Amtrak will be utilized more often in a more efficient way and in a more transparent way operating more like a business, a business that will give results back to its customers.

This is going to be a bill that sets up different lines of business. So if you are on the Northeast corridor and you are paying a ticket that is high priced, you don't want to subsidize Amtrak across the Nation, your money is now going to stay on the Northeast corridor so you have not only improved infrastructure, but a smoother ride, a more efficient ride, and a quicker transit time.

We want to fix rail across the Nation. We want to make sure that we are doing it in a fiscally responsible manner. On the Northeast corridor, we are going to see significant improvements and jobs created at the same time.

We are going to see in other areas of the country, in areas like mine where

you have got rail that we want to extend further, we want to be able to utilize RIF loans. RIF loans have been a great program that has been sorely underutilized. You talk to companies out there that want to use RIF loans, it is amazing that they won't even apply for them because they know they will slow their projects down. The wait time in actually getting them approved to release that capital will shut your project down, so they just don't apply. We streamline that process so that we can actually unleash that capital not only for Amtrak to improve its lines of business, but for other rails across the entire country to improve theirs as well.

We also introduced competition. This leverages the private sector to reduce Amtrak's subsidies and uses our stations and right-of-way as actual income streams. Amtrak should be utilizing every income stream available to them and utilizing their right-of-way for signage, for cellphone towers, and utilizing their stations to actually generate a larger profit.

Mr. Speaker, let me just touch on one other area that I am very, very passionate about, one that hasn't been talked about a lot on this floor but one that is getting a great deal of press across the entire country. To those families that have a pet at home, to those families that have to make a decision "Do I leave my dog or cat at home, or I am actually able to travel with them on a train?" right now they have to make a decision to either take a car or take an airplane.

It is amazing to me to find out, as somebody from California, when I travel back and forth with my dog, I can put them on a plane, but yet I can't put them on a train to go up the Northeast corridor or anywhere else across the country. This is something that will allow new riders that didn't previously want to ride the train before because they couldn't take their pet on there to do so, but also a new revenue generation with paying for those pets the same way that our airplanes across the country are paid for taking their pets as well.

Now, this is a great, bipartisan bill, one that I am very proud that we reached across both aisles. We whipped every Member of the Transportation Committee to make sure that we had true results across the entire country to get not only bipartisan support, but unanimous support. You talk about the right way to get a bill done, this is it, by encouraging Members of both parties to actually work together for real reforms that move America forward. This rail bill does just that. It will create jobs; it will create a more efficient passenger rail; and this is going to give new opportunities to those that never were able to ride rail before the opportunity to be greater involved.

Let me just touch on one last point. Across the entire country, our pas-

senger rail oftentimes rides on our freight rail system. They have to share the same tracks.

□ 1300

Well, one of the challenges is we have bottlenecks across the entire country. As we expand that new infrastructure, as we create these new jobs, as we create greater efficiencies, we need to be able to do it in a timely and cost-effective manner.

What we have done is cut a lot of red tape and streamlined the process. There are both environmental and historic review that we actually put time periods on. We want to do the reviews. We want to make sure that it still remains historic and that we are being environmentally sensitive.

We are just saying: Let's streamline the process so we can get the projects done quickly, getting people to work, and getting a rail system that is like no other across the entire globe.

We have great improvements here. I am very proud of this bill and the work that we have done here, and I am looking for full passage this afternoon.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my great pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), a member of the committee and a leader on transportation issues.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time.

I rise in very strong support of this legislation for all of the reasons that were just stated by Chairman DENHAM, who has been a great chairman of the Railroad Subcommittee.

This is a major reform bill that I think every Member should be very proud to support. It is especially a very fiscally conservative bill. It will save \$2.3 billion over the next 4 years, and it is moving this Congress and this legislation in a new direction, a better direction, from a fiscal standpoint.

It also is going to save a very substantial amount of money on food service. According to The New York Times, train food service lost \$800 million over the last 10 years. This bill will, in a graduated way, remove the subsidy for train food service until it gets on a self-supporting basis, so it is fiscally conservative and commonsense legislation in that respect also.

It speeds up the environmental review process. This is an area that we try to do in all of our transportation bills because we have been doing all of our major transportation projects in such a convoluted, complicated bureaucratic way that we have always taken about three times as long as any other developed nation to do the things to improve our infrastructure that needs to be done.

This bill also introduces opportunities for competition. This is another

good thing about this bill because, if we really believe in the free market and in free enterprise, we need to give more companies and more people a chance to get into these businesses and make all of our industries have greater ease of entry.

Another thing that I think is good about this legislation—this major reform bill—is that it empowers States to get involved by setting up a new State-supported route advisory committee. This has the potential of creating new train service in States, such as mine in Tennessee, that don't have passenger train service at this time.

For all these reasons and for all the reasons that Congressman DENHAM—Chairman DENHAM—just mentioned, I think this is a bill that deserves the support of all the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, we support the rule and the underlying bill. I want to thank everybody involved. This is a bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to reiterate the partnership that went on here not just with the underlying bill, but with the amendment process that is happening here, seven amendments available for our colleagues this afternoon.

If you don't want to see Amtrak subsidized by the Federal Government—a lot of folks would have kept your voice silent—this amendment process allows your voice to be heard.

If you want to make sure that all the folks doing contracting with Amtrak are focused on veterans and veteran-owned small businesses—you want that included in the underlying bill—we have an amendment process today that allows you to add that language.

If you are concerned about the inspector general's reports and what they are looking at and how they are calculating it, we give you a chance to make those changes.

Issue after issue after issue, Mr. Speaker—again, three Republican ideas, four Democratic ideas—we allow those to come to the floor in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, passenger rail is an example of one of those things that divides this country. If you live in California, as the chairman does, you have a spectacular rail system. If you live in the Northeast corridor, you have a spectacular rail system.

If you live in the State of Georgia, you can ride your horse to your next destination faster than you can take the train. That is not an inequity that we are going to solve in this bill; and, arguably, we don't even need to solve that inequity.

I am happy for my friends in the Northeast corridor to have spectacular service. It is profitable. Folks want it, folks need it, folks use it, and folks are willing to dig into their pockets to pay for it.

In fact, there is an amendment that is going to be offered here today, Mr. Speaker, that would allow competitive private train service in that corridor. Now, that is going to be up to the body to decide whether or not they think that is a good idea.

Imagine that, imagine that, Mr. Speaker, that before us today you have your choice of: Do you want the bill as the committee has crafted it, saving money, as my friend from Tennessee described? Do you want to eliminate Amtrak subsidies altogether and say, We do not have a national interest in rail, and our budget will reflect that? Or do we want to allow even more rail service by allowing private competition on some of these Amtrak-owned routes?

Mr. Speaker, that is why I came to this body. I am not going to try to twist any arms on this floor about which amendments they ought to vote for and which they don't. Folks have their own set of a million constituents back home, and they ought to represent those interests.

What I will twist arms on this floor to do, Mr. Speaker, is to support the rule that allows for this kind of open debate. As I think my friend from Massachusetts would agree, we have not always had the open debates on important issues that I think we would all agree should be had. It is a process, and today, we got that process right.

This rule is worthy of the support of all of my colleagues: Republicans, Democrats, north, south, east, and west.

Mr. Speaker, House Report 114–36, the report to accompany H. Res. 134, the special rule governing consideration of H.R. 749, contains an inaccurate summary of Amendment #6 offered by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California. The summary should read as follows:

The amendment eliminates all Federal assistance for Amtrak.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagree to the request for conference by the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses to the bill (H.R. 240) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes."

□ 1315

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

*the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, namely:*

#### TITLE I

##### DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

##### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

*For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, \$132,573,000: Provided, That not to exceed \$45,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That all official costs associated with the use of government aircraft by Department of Homeland Security personnel to support official travel of the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary shall be paid from amounts made available for the Immediate Office of the Secretary and the Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary: Provided further, That not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a comprehensive plan for implementation of the biometric entry and exit data system required under section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b), including the estimated costs for implementation.*

##### OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT

*For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701 through 705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341 through 345), \$187,503,000, of which not to exceed \$2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$4,493,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations at the Nebraska Avenue Complex; and \$6,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for the Human Resources Information Technology program: Provided further,*



That the Under Secretary for Management shall include in the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a Comprehensive Acquisition Status Report, which shall include the information required under the heading "Office of the Under Secretary for Management" under title I of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74), and shall submit quarterly updates to such report not later than 45 days after the completion of each quarter.

#### OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), \$52,020,000: Provided, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the Future Years Homeland Security Program, as authorized by section 874 of Public Law 107-296 (6 U.S.C. 454).

#### OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, \$288,122,000; of which \$99,028,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which \$189,094,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security.

#### ANALYSIS AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for intelligence analysis and operations coordination activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$255,804,000; of which not to exceed \$3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which \$102,479,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$118,617,000; of which not to exceed \$300,000 may be used for certain confidential operational expenses, including the payment of informants, to be expended at the direction of the Inspector General.

#### TITLE II

#### SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS

#### UNITED STATES CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of laws relating to border security, immigration, customs, agricultural inspections and regulatory activities related to plant and animal imports, and transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens; purchase and lease of up to 7,500 (6,500 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; and contracting with individuals for personal services abroad; \$8,459,657,000; of which \$3,274,000 shall be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for administrative expenses related to the collection of the Harbor Maintenance Fee pursuant to section 9505(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 9505(c)(3)) and notwithstanding section 1511(e)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 551(e)(1)); of which \$30,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2016, solely for the purpose of hiring, training, and equipping United States Customs

and Border Protection officers at ports of entry; of which not to exceed \$34,425 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which such sums as become available in the Customs User Fee Account, except sums subject to section 13031(f)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(f)(3)), shall be derived from that account; of which not to exceed \$150,000 shall be available for payment for rental space in connection with preclearance operations; and of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security: Provided, That for fiscal year 2015, the overtime limitation prescribed in section 5(c)(1) of the Act of February 13, 1911 (19 U.S.C. 267(c)(1)) shall be \$35,000; and notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to compensate any employee of United States Customs and Border Protection for overtime, from whatever source, in an amount that exceeds such limitation, except in individual cases determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, to be necessary for national security purposes, to prevent excessive costs, or in cases of immigration emergencies: Provided further, That the Border Patrol shall maintain an active duty presence of not less than 21,370 full-time equivalent agents protecting the borders of the United States in the fiscal year.

#### AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses for United States Customs and Border Protection for operation and improvement of automated systems, including salaries and expenses, \$308,169,000; of which \$446,075,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017; and of which not less than \$140,970,000 shall be for the development of the Automated Commercial Environment.

#### BORDER SECURITY FENCING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TECHNOLOGY

For expenses for border security fencing, infrastructure, and technology, \$382,466,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

#### AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for the operations, maintenance, and procurement of marine vessels, aircraft, unmanned aircraft systems, the Air and Marine Operations Center, and other related equipment of the air and marine program, including salaries and expenses, operational training, and mission-related travel, the operations of which include the following: the interdiction of narcotics and other goods; the provision of support to Federal, State, and local agencies in the enforcement or administration of laws enforced by the Department of Homeland Security; and, at the discretion of the Secretary of Homeland Security, the provision of assistance to Federal, State, and local agencies in other law enforcement and emergency humanitarian efforts; \$750,469,000; of which \$299,800,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which \$450,669,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017: Provided, That no aircraft or other related equipment, with the exception of aircraft that are one of a kind and have been identified as excess to United States Customs and Border Protection requirements and aircraft that have been damaged beyond repair, shall be transferred to any other Federal agency, department, or office outside of the Department of Homeland Security during fiscal year 2015 without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: Provided further, That funding made available under this heading shall be available for customs expenses when necessary to maintain or to temporarily increase operations in Puerto Rico: Provided further, That

the Secretary of Homeland Security shall report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on any changes to the 5-year strategic plan for the air and marine program required under the heading "Air and Marine Interdiction, Operations, and Maintenance" in Public Law 112-74.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND FACILITIES MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses to plan, acquire, construct, renovate, equip, furnish, operate, manage, and maintain buildings, facilities, and related infrastructure necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to customs, immigration, and border security, \$288,821,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019.

#### UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for enforcement of immigration and customs laws, detention and removals, and investigations, including intellectual property rights and overseas vetted units operations; and purchase and lease of up to 3,790 (2,350 for replacement only) police-type vehicles; \$5,932,756,000; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available until expended for conducting special operations under section 3131 of the Customs Enforcement Act of 1986 (19 U.S.C. 2081); of which not to exceed \$11,475 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$2,000,000 shall be for awards of compensation to informants, to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Secretary of Homeland Security; of which not less than \$305,000 shall be for promotion of public awareness of the child pornography tipline and activities to counter child exploitation; of which not less than \$5,400,000 shall be used to facilitate agreements consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)); of which not to exceed \$40,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, is for maintenance, construction, and lease hold improvements at owned and leased facilities; and of which not to exceed \$11,216,000 shall be available to fund or reimburse other Federal agencies for the costs associated with the care, maintenance, and repatriation of smuggled aliens unlawfully present in the United States: Provided, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of \$35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes and in cases of immigration emergencies: Provided further, That of the total amount provided, \$15,770,000 shall be for activities to enforce laws against forced child labor, of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That of the total amount available, not less than \$1,600,000,000 shall be available to identify aliens convicted of a crime who may be deportable, and to remove them from the United States once they are judged deportable: Provided further, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall prioritize the identification and removal of aliens convicted of a crime by the severity of that crime: Provided further, That funding made available under this heading shall maintain a level of not less than 34,000 detention beds through September 30, 2015: Provided further, That of the total amount provided, not less than \$3,431,444,000 is for detention, enforcement, and removal operations, including transportation of unaccompanied minor aliens: Provided further, That of the amount provided for Custody Operations in the previous proviso,



\$45,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019: Provided further, That of the total amount provided for the Visa Security Program and international investigations, \$43,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided further, That not less than \$15,000,000 shall be available for investigation of intellectual property rights violations, including operation of the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue a delegation of law enforcement authority authorized under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1357(g)) if the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General determines that the terms of the agreement governing the delegation of authority have been materially violated: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be used to continue any contract for the provision of detention services if the two most recent overall performance evaluations received by the contracted facility are less than "adequate" or the equivalent median score in any subsequent performance evaluation system: Provided further, That nothing under this heading shall prevent United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement from exercising those authorities provided under immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))) during priority operations pertaining to aliens convicted of a crime: Provided further, That without regard to the limitation as to time and condition of section 503(d) of this Act, the Secretary may propose to reprogram and transfer funds within and into this appropriation necessary to ensure the detention of aliens prioritized for removal.

#### AUTOMATION MODERNIZATION

For expenses of immigration and customs enforcement automated systems, \$26,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

#### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

##### AVIATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to providing civil aviation security services pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), \$5,639,095,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016; of which not to exceed \$7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That any award to deploy explosives detection systems shall be based on risk, the airport's current reliance on other screening solutions, lobby congestion resulting in increased security concerns, high injury rates, airport readiness, and increased cost effectiveness: Provided further, That security service fees authorized under section 44940 of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and shall be available only for aviation security: Provided further, That the sum appropriated under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2015 so as to result in a final fiscal year appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$3,574,095,000: Provided further, That the fees deposited under this heading in fiscal year 2013 and sequestered pursuant to section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), that are currently unavailable for obligation, are hereby permanently cancelled: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 44923 of title 49, United States Code, for fiscal year 2015, any funds in the Aviation Security Capital Fund established by section 44923(h) of title 49, United States Code, may be used for the procurement and installation of explosives detection systems

or for the issuance of other transaction agreements for the purpose of funding projects described in section 44923(a) of such title: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, mobile explosives detection equipment purchased and deployed using funds made available under this heading may be moved and redeployed to meet evolving passenger and baggage screening security priorities at airports: Provided further, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any recruiting or hiring of personnel into the Transportation Security Administration that would cause the agency to exceed a staffing level of 45,000 full-time equivalent screeners: Provided further, That the preceding proviso shall not apply to personnel hired as part-time employees: Provided further, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a detailed report on—

(1) the Department of Homeland Security efforts and resources being devoted to develop more advanced integrated passenger screening technologies for the most effective security of passengers and baggage at the lowest possible operating and acquisition costs, including projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next 5 years or until project completion, whichever is earlier;

(2) how the Transportation Security Administration is deploying its existing passenger and baggage screener workforce in the most cost effective manner; and

(3) labor savings from the deployment of improved technologies for passenger and baggage screening and how those savings are being used to offset security costs or reinvested to address security vulnerabilities:

Provided further, That not later than April 15, 2015, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a semiannual report updating information on a strategy to increase the number of air passengers eligible for expedited screening, including:

(1) specific benchmarks and performance measures to increase participation in Pre-Check by air carriers, airports, and passengers;

(2) options to facilitate direct application for enrollment in Pre-Check through the Transportation Security Administration's Web site, airports, and other enrollment locations;

(3) use of third parties to pre-screen passengers for expedited screening;

(4) inclusion of populations already vetted by the Transportation Security Administration and other trusted populations as eligible for expedited screening;

(5) resource implications of expedited passenger screening resulting from the use of risk-based security methods; and

(6) the total number and percentage of passengers using Pre-Check lanes who:

(A) have enrolled in Pre-Check since Transportation Security Administration enrollment centers were established;

(B) enrolled using the Transportation Security Administration's Pre-Check application Web site;

(C) were enrolled as frequent flyers of a participating airline;

(D) utilized Pre-Check as a result of their enrollment in a Trusted Traveler program of United States Customs and Border Protection;

(E) were selectively identified to participate in expedited screening through the use of Managed Inclusion in fiscal year 2014; and

(F) are enrolled in all other Pre-Check categories:

Provided further, That Members of the United States House of Representatives and United

States Senate, including the leadership; the heads of Federal agencies and commissions, including the Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Homeland Security; the United States Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, and the United States Attorneys; and senior members of the Executive Office of the President, including the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall not be exempt from Federal passenger and baggage screening.

#### SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to surface transportation security activities, \$123,749,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

#### INTELLIGENCE AND VETTING

For necessary expenses for the development and implementation of intelligence and vetting activities, \$219,166,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016.

#### TRANSPORTATION SECURITY SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to transportation security support pursuant to the Aviation and Transportation Security Act (Public Law 107-71; 115 Stat. 597; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note), \$917,226,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives—

(1) a report providing evidence demonstrating that behavioral indicators can be used to identify passengers who may pose a threat to aviation security and the plans that will be put into place to collect additional performance data; and

(2) a report addressing each of the recommendations outlined in the report entitled "TSA Needs Additional Information Before Procuring Next-Generation Systems", published by the Government Accountability Office on March 31, 2014, and describing the steps the Transportation Security Administration is taking to implement acquisition best practices, increase industry engagement, and improve transparency with regard to technology acquisition programs: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$25,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Headquarters Administration until the submission of the reports required by paragraphs (1) and (2) of the preceding proviso.

#### COAST GUARD

##### OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for; purchase or lease of not to exceed 25 passenger motor vehicles, which shall be for replacement only; purchase or lease of small boats for contingent and emergent requirements (at a unit cost of no more than \$700,000) and repairs and service-life replacements, not to exceed a total of \$31,000,000; purchase or lease of boats necessary for overseas deployments and activities; minor shore construction projects not exceeding \$1,000,000 in total cost on any location; payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97-377 (42 U.S.C. 402 note; 96 Stat. 1920); and recreation and welfare; \$7,043,318,000, of which \$553,000,000 shall be for defense-related activities, of which \$213,000,000 is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress; of which

\$24,500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which not to exceed \$15,300 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That none of the funds made available by this Act shall be for expenses incurred for recreational vessels under section 12114 of title 46, United States Code, except to the extent fees are collected from owners of yachts and credited to this appropriation: Provided further, That to the extent fees are insufficient to pay expenses of recreational vessel documentation under such section 12114, and there is a backlog of recreational vessel applications, then personnel performing non-recreational vessel documentation functions under subchapter II of chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, may perform documentation under section 12114: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$85,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Coast Guard Headquarters Directorates until a future-years capital investment plan for fiscal years 2016 through 2020, as specified under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" of this Act, is submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism may be allocated by program, project, and activity, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act: Provided further, That, without regard to the limitation as to time and condition of section 503(d) of this Act, after June 30, up to \$10,000,000 may be reprogrammed to or from Military Pay and Allowances in accordance with subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 503.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the environmental compliance and restoration functions of the Coast Guard under chapter 19 of title 14, United States Code, \$13,197,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019.

#### RESERVE TRAINING

For necessary expenses of the Coast Guard Reserve, as authorized by law; operations and maintenance of the Coast Guard reserve program; personnel and training costs; and equipment and services; \$114,572,000.

#### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, renovation, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; \$1,225,223,000; of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)); and of which the following amounts shall be available until September 30, 2019 (except as subsequently specified): \$6,000,000 for military family housing; \$824,347,000 to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve vessels, small boats, and related equipment; \$180,000,000 to acquire, effect major repairs to, renovate, or improve aircraft or increase aviation capability; \$59,300,000 for other acquisition programs; \$40,580,000 for shore facilities and aids to navigation, including facilities at Department of Defense installations used by the Coast Guard; and \$114,996,000, to remain available until September 30, 2015, for personnel compensation and benefits and related costs: Provided, That the funds provided by this Act shall be immediately available and allotted to contract for the production of the eighth National Security Cutter notwithstanding the availability of funds for post-production costs:

Provided further, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a future-years capital investment plan for the Coast Guard that identifies for each requested capital asset—

(1) the proposed appropriations included in that budget;

(2) the total estimated cost of completion, including and clearly delineating the costs of associated major acquisition systems infrastructure and transition to operations;

(3) projected funding levels for each fiscal year for the next 5 fiscal years or until acquisition program baseline or project completion, whichever is earlier;

(4) an estimated completion date at the projected funding levels; and

(5) a current acquisition program baseline for each capital asset, as applicable, that—

(A) includes the total acquisition cost of each asset, subdivided by fiscal year and including a detailed description of the purpose of the proposed funding levels for each fiscal year, including for each fiscal year funds requested for design, pre-acquisition activities, production, structural modifications, missionization, post-delivery, and transition to operations costs;

(B) includes a detailed project schedule through completion, subdivided by fiscal year, that details—

(i) quantities planned for each fiscal year; and

(ii) major acquisition and project events, including development of operational requirements, contracting actions, design reviews, production, delivery, test and evaluation, and transition to operations, including necessary training, shore infrastructure, and logistics;

(C) notes and explains any deviations in cost, performance parameters, schedule, or estimated date of completion from the original acquisition program baseline and the most recent baseline approved by the Department of Homeland Security's Acquisition Review Board, if applicable;

(D) aligns the acquisition of each asset to mission requirements by defining existing capabilities of comparable legacy assets, identifying known capability gaps between such existing capabilities and stated mission requirements, and explaining how the acquisition of each asset will address such known capability gaps;

(E) defines life-cycle costs for each asset and the date of the estimate on which such costs are based, including all associated costs of major acquisitions systems infrastructure and transition to operations, delineated by purpose and fiscal year for the projected service life of the asset;

(F) includes the earned value management system summary schedule performance index and cost performance index for each asset, if applicable; and

(G) includes a phase-out and decommissioning schedule delineated by fiscal year for each existing legacy asset that each asset is intended to replace or recapitalize:

Provided further, That the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall ensure that amounts specified in the future-years capital investment plan are consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Coast Guard in the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code: Provided further, That any inconsistencies between the capital investment plan and proposed appro-

priations shall be identified and justified: Provided further, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall not delay the submission of the capital investment plan referred to by the preceding provisos: Provided further, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall have no more than a single period of 10 consecutive business days to review the capital investment plan prior to submission: Provided further, That the Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives one day after the capital investment plan is submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives when such review is completed: Provided further, That subsections (a) and (b) of section 6402 of Public Law 110-28 shall hereafter apply with respect to the amounts made available under this heading.

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

For necessary expenses for applied scientific research, development, test, and evaluation; and for maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment; as authorized by law; \$17,892,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, of which \$500,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2712(a)(5)): Provided, That there may be credited to and used for the purposes of this appropriation funds received from State and local governments, other public authorities, private sources, and foreign countries for expenses incurred for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

#### RETIRED PAY

For retired pay, including the payment of obligations otherwise chargeable to lapsed appropriations for this purpose, payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plans, payment for career status bonuses, concurrent receipts, and combat-related special compensation under the National Defense Authorization Act, and payments for medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, \$1,450,626,000, to remain available until expended.

#### UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Secret Service, including purchase of not to exceed 652 vehicles for police-type use for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of motorcycles made in the United States; hire of aircraft; services of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Director of the United States Secret Service; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia, and fencing, lighting, guard booths, and other facilities on private or other property not in Government ownership or control, as may be necessary to perform protective functions; payment of per diem or subsistence allowances to employees in cases in which a protective assignment on the actual day or days of the visit of a protectee requires an employee to work 16 hours per day or to remain overnight at a post of duty; conduct of and participation in firearms matches; presentation of awards; travel of

United States Secret Service employees on protective missions without regard to the limitations on such expenditures in this or any other Act if approval is obtained in advance from the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives; research and development; grants to conduct behavioral research in support of protective research and operations; and payment in advance for commercial accommodations as may be necessary to perform protective functions; \$1,615,860,000; of which not to exceed \$19,125 shall be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$100,000 shall be to provide technical assistance and equipment to foreign law enforcement organizations in counterfeit investigations; of which \$2,366,000 shall be for forensic and related support of investigations of missing and exploited children; of which \$6,000,000 shall be for a grant for activities related to investigations of missing and exploited children and shall remain available until September 30, 2016; and of which not less than \$12,000,000 shall be for activities related to training in electronic crimes investigations and forensics: Provided, That \$18,000,000 for protective travel shall remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided further, That \$4,500,000 for National Special Security Events shall remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided further, That the United States Secret Service is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from Federal agencies and entities, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, for personnel receiving training sponsored by the James J. Rowley Training Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available under this heading at the end of the fiscal year: Provided further, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to compensate any employee for overtime in an annual amount in excess of \$35,000, except that the Secretary of Homeland Security, or the designee of the Secretary, may waive that amount as necessary for national security purposes: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be made available for the protection of the head of a Federal agency other than the Secretary of Homeland Security: Provided further, That the Director of the United States Secret Service may enter into an agreement to provide such protection on a fully reimbursable basis: Provided further, That none of the funds made available to the United States Secret Service by this Act or by previous appropriations Acts may be obligated for the purpose of opening a new permanent domestic or overseas office or location unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such obligation: Provided further, That not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the United States Secret Service shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a report providing evidence that the United States Secret Service has sufficiently reviewed its professional standards of conduct; and has issued new guidance and procedures for the conduct of employees when engaged in overseas operations and protective missions, consistent with the critical missions of, and the unique position of public trust occupied by, the United States Secret Service: Provided further, That of the funds provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation for Headquarters, Management and Administration until such report is submitted: Provided further, That for purposes of section 503(b) of this Act, \$15,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, may be transferred between

#### Protection of Persons and Facilities and Domestic Field Operations.

##### ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for acquisition, construction, repair, alteration, and improvement of physical and technological infrastructure, \$49,935,000; of which \$5,380,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019, shall be for acquisition, construction, improvement, and maintenance of the James J. Rowley Training Center; and of which \$44,555,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, shall be for Information Integration and Technology Transformation program execution.

##### TITLE III

#### PROTECTION, PREPAREDNESS, RESPONSE, AND RECOVERY

##### NATIONAL PROTECTION AND PROGRAMS DIRECTORATE

##### MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for the National Protection and Programs Directorate, support for operations, and information technology, \$61,651,000: Provided, That not to exceed \$3,825 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, shall be detailed by office, and by program, project, and activity level, for the National Protection and Programs Directorate.

##### INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND INFORMATION SECURITY

For necessary expenses for infrastructure protection and information security programs and activities, as authorized by title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), \$1,188,679,000, of which \$225,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016: Provided, That if, due to delays in contract actions, the National Protection and Programs Directorate will not fully obligate funds for Federal Network Security or for Network Security Deployment program, project, and activities as provided in the accompanying statement and section 548 of this Act, such funds may be applied to Next Generation Networks program, project, and activities, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act.

##### FEDERAL PROTECTIVE SERVICE

The revenues and collections of security fees credited to this account shall be available until expended for necessary expenses related to the protection of federally owned and leased buildings and for the operations of the Federal Protective Service: Provided, That the Director of the Federal Protective Service shall submit at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a strategic human capital plan that aligns fee collections to personnel requirements based on a current threat assessment.

##### OFFICE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTITY MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses for the Office of Biometric Identity Management, as authorized by section 7208 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (8 U.S.C. 1365b), \$252,056,000: Provided, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$122,150,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017.

##### OFFICE OF HEALTH AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Health Affairs, \$129,358,000; of which \$26,148,000 is for salaries and expenses and \$86,891,000 is for BioWatch operations: Provided, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$16,319,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for biosurveillance, chemical de-

fense, medical and health planning and coordination, and workforce health protection: Provided further, That not to exceed \$2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

##### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, \$934,396,000, including activities authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act of 2000 (division C, title I, 114 Stat. 583), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 404, 405), Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), the National Dam Safety Program Act (33 U.S.C. 467 et seq.), the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-53), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-295; 120 Stat. 1394), the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-141, 126 Stat. 916), and the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-89): Provided, That not to exceed \$2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided further, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$35,180,000 shall be for the Urban Search and Rescue Response System, of which none is available for Federal Emergency Management Agency administrative costs: Provided further, That of the total amount made available under this heading, \$30,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for capital improvements and other expenses related to continuity of operations at the Mount Weather Emergency Operations Center: Provided further, That of the total amount made available, \$3,400,000 shall be for the Office of National Capital Region Coordination: Provided further, That of the total amount made available under this heading, not less than \$4,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for expenses related to modernization of automated systems.

##### STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other activities, \$1,500,000,000, which shall be allocated as follows:

(1) \$467,000,000 shall be for the State Homeland Security Grant Program under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605), of which not less than \$55,000,000 shall be for Operation Stonegarden: Provided, That notwithstanding subsection (c)(4) of such section 2004, for fiscal year 2015, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall make available to local and tribal governments amounts provided to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under this paragraph in accordance with subsection (c)(1) of such section 2004.

(2) \$600,000,000 shall be for the Urban Area Security Initiative under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604), of which not less than \$13,000,000 shall be for organizations (as described under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such code) determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security to be at high risk of a terrorist attack.

(3) \$100,000,000 shall be for Public Transportation Security Assistance, Railroad Security Assistance, and Over-the-Road Bus Security Assistance under sections 1406, 1513, and 1532 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11

Commission Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–53; 6 U.S.C. 1135, 1163, and 1182), of which not less than \$10,000,000 shall be for Amtrak security and \$3,000,000 shall be for Over-the-Road Bus Security: Provided, That such public transportation security assistance shall be provided directly to public transportation agencies.

(4) \$100,000,000 shall be for Port Security Grants in accordance with 46 U.S.C. 70107.

(5) \$233,000,000 shall be to sustain current operations for training, exercises, technical assistance, and other programs, of which \$162,991,000 shall be for training of State, local, and tribal emergency response providers:

Provided, That for grants under paragraphs (1) through (4), applications for grants shall be made available to eligible applicants not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that eligible applicants shall submit applications not later than 80 days after the grant announcement, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall act within 65 days after the receipt of an application: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 2008(a)(11) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 609(a)(11)) or any other provision of law, a grantee may not use more than 5 percent of the amount of a grant made available under this heading for expenses directly related to administration of the grant: Provided further, That for grants under paragraphs (1) and (2), the installation of communications towers is not considered construction of a building or other physical facility: Provided further, That grantees shall provide reports on their use of funds, as determined necessary by the Secretary of Homeland Security: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 509 of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may use the funds provided in paragraph (5) to acquire real property for the purpose of establishing or appropriately extending the security buffer zones around Federal Emergency Management Agency training facilities.

#### FIREFIGHTER ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants for programs authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), \$680,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2016, of which \$340,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 33 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229) and \$340,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 34 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

#### EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE GRANTS

For emergency management performance grants, as authorized by the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), \$350,000,000.

#### RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM

The aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2015, as authorized in title III of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (42 U.S.C. 5196e), shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by the Department of Homeland Security necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year: Provided, That the methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees: Provided further, That fees received under this heading shall be deposited in this account as offsetting collections and will become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2015, and remain available until expended.

#### UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the United States Fire Administration and for other purposes, as authorized by the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.) and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.), \$44,000,000.

#### DISASTER RELIEF FUND (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$7,033,464,494, to remain available until expended, of which \$24,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations related to disasters: Provided, That the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives the following reports, including a specific description of the methodology and the source data used in developing such reports:

(1) an estimate of the following amounts shall be submitted for the budget year at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code:

(A) the unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the prior fiscal year to the budget year;

(B) the unobligated balance of funds to be carried over from the budget year to the budget year plus 1;

(C) the amount of obligations for non-catastrophic events for the budget year;

(D) the amount of obligations for the budget year for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State;

(E) the total amount that has been previously obligated or will be required for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State for all prior years, the current year, the budget year, the budget year plus 1, the budget year plus 2, and the budget year plus 3 and beyond;

(F) the amount of previously obligated funds that will be recovered for the budget year;

(G) the amount that will be required for obligations for emergencies, as described in section 102(1) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(1)), major disasters, as described in section 102(2) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(2)), fire management assistance grants, as described in section 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5187), surge activities, and disaster readiness and support activities; and

(H) the amount required for activities not covered under section 251(b)(2)(D)(iii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(D)(iii); Public Law 99–177);

(2) an estimate or actual amounts, if available, of the following for the current fiscal year shall be submitted not later than the fifth day of each month, and shall be published by the Administrator on the Agency's Web site not later than the fifth day of each month:

(A) a summary of the amount of appropriations made available by source, the transfers executed, the previously allocated funds recovered, and the commitments, allocations, and obligations made;

(B) a table of disaster relief activity delineated by month, including—

(i) the beginning and ending balances;

(ii) the total obligations to include amounts obligated for fire assistance, emergencies, surge, and disaster support activities;

(iii) the obligations for catastrophic events delineated by event and by State; and

(iv) the amount of previously obligated funds that are recovered;

(C) a summary of allocations, obligations, and expenditures for catastrophic events delineated by event;

(D) in addition, for a disaster declaration related to Hurricane Sandy, the cost of the following categories of spending: public assistance, individual assistance, mitigation, administrative, operations, and any other relevant category (including emergency measures and disaster resources); and

(E) the date on which funds appropriated will be exhausted:

Provided further, That the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's Web site not later than 5 days after an award of a public assistance grant under section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172) the specifics of the grant award: Provided further, That for any mission assignment or mission assignment task order to another Federal department or agency regarding a major disaster, not later than 5 days after the issuance of the mission assignment or task order, the Administrator shall publish on the Agency's website the following: the name of the impacted State and the disaster declaration for such State, the assigned agency, the assistance requested, a description of the disaster, the total cost estimate, and the amount obligated: Provided further, That not later than 10 days after the last day of each month until the mission assignment or task order is completed and closed out, the Administrator shall update any changes to the total cost estimate and the amount obligated: Provided further, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$6,437,792,622 shall be for major disasters declared pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): Provided further, That the amount in the preceding proviso is designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### FLOOD HAZARD MAPPING AND RISK ANALYSIS PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, including administrative costs, under section 1360 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4101), and under sections 100215, 100216, 100226, 100230, and 100246 of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, (Public Law 112–141, 126 Stat. 916), \$100,000,000, and such additional sums as may be provided by State and local governments or other political subdivisions for cost-shared mapping activities under section 1360(f)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4101(f)(2)), to remain available until expended.

#### NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 (subtitle A of title II of division F of Public Law 112–141; 126 Stat. 916), and the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–89; 128 Stat. 1020), \$179,294,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2016, and shall be derived from offsetting amounts collected under section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)); which is available for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations; and floodplain management and additional amounts for flood mapping: Provided, That of such amount, \$23,759,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations and \$155,535,000 shall be available for flood plain

management and flood mapping: Provided further, That any additional fees collected pursuant to section 1308(d) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4015(d)) shall be credited as an offsetting collection to this account, to be available for flood plain management and flood mapping: Provided further, That in fiscal year 2015, no funds shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund under section 1310 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4017) in excess of:

- (1) \$136,000,000 for operating expenses;
- (2) \$1,139,000,000 for commissions and taxes of agents;
- (3) such sums as are necessary for interest on Treasury borrowings; and
- (4) \$150,000,000, which shall remain available until expended, for flood mitigation actions and for flood mitigation assistance under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4104c), notwithstanding sections 1366(e) and 1310(a)(7) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4104c(e), 4017):

Provided further, That the amounts collected under section 102 of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a) and section 1366(e) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 shall be deposited in the National Flood Insurance Fund to supplement other amounts specified as available for section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, notwithstanding section 102(f)(8), section 1366(e), and paragraphs (1) through (3) of section 1367(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)(8), 4104c(e), 4104d(b)(1)–(3)): Provided further, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 4 percent of the total appropriation: Provided further, That \$5,000,000 is available to carry out section 24 of the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 4033).

#### NATIONAL PREDISASTER MITIGATION FUND

For the predisaster mitigation grant program under section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133), \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER

To carry out the emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.), \$120,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3.5 percent of the total amount made available under this heading.

#### TITLE IV

#### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, AND SERVICES

##### UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

For necessary expenses for citizenship and immigration services, \$124,435,000 for the E-Verify Program, as described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note), to assist United States employers with maintaining a legal workforce: Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds otherwise made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may be used to acquire, operate, equip, and dispose of up to 5 vehicles, for replacement only, for areas where the Administrator of General Services does not provide vehicles for lease: Provided further, That the Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services may authorize employees who are assigned to those areas to use such vehicles to travel between the employees' residences and places of employment.

##### FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, including mate-

rials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; the purchase of not to exceed 117 vehicles for police-type use and hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses for student athletic and related activities; the conduct of and participation in firearms matches and presentation of awards; public awareness and enhancement of community support of law enforcement training; room and board for student interns; a flat monthly reimbursement to employees authorized to use personal mobile phones for official duties; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code; \$230,497,000; of which up to \$54,154,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2016, for materials and support costs of Federal law enforcement basic training; of which \$300,000 shall remain available until expended to be distributed to Federal law enforcement agencies for expenses incurred participating in training accreditation; and of which not to exceed \$7,180 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: Provided, That the Center is authorized to obligate funds in anticipation of reimbursements from agencies receiving training sponsored by the Center, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year: Provided further, That section 1202(a) of Public Law 107–206 (42 U.S.C. 3771 note), as amended under this heading in division F of Public Law 113–76, is further amended by striking “December 31, 2016” and inserting “December 31, 2017”: Provided further, That the Director of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center shall schedule basic or advanced law enforcement training, or both, at all four training facilities under the control of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to ensure that such training facilities are operated at the highest capacity throughout the fiscal year: Provided further, That the Federal Law Enforcement Training Accreditation Board, including representatives from the Federal law enforcement community and non-Federal accreditation experts involved in law enforcement training, shall lead the Federal law enforcement training accreditation process to continue the implementation of measuring and assessing the quality and effectiveness of Federal law enforcement training programs, facilities, and instructors.

##### ACQUISITIONS, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND RELATED EXPENSES

For acquisition of necessary additional real property and facilities, construction, and ongoing maintenance, facility improvements, and related expenses of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, \$27,841,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019: Provided, That the Center is authorized to accept reimbursement to this appropriation from government agencies requesting the construction of special use facilities.

##### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

##### MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology and for management and administration of programs and activities, as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), \$129,993,000: Provided, That not to exceed \$7,650 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

##### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, ACQUISITION, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for science and technology research, including advanced research projects, development, test and evaluation, acquisition, and operations as authorized by title III of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 181 et seq.), and the purchase or lease of not to exceed 5 vehicles, \$973,915,000; of which

\$538,926,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2017; and of which \$434,989,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019, solely for operation and construction of laboratory facilities: Provided, That of the funds provided for the operation and construction of laboratory facilities under this heading, \$300,000,000 shall be for construction of the National Bio- and Agro-defense Facility.

##### DOMESTIC NUCLEAR DETECTION OFFICE

##### MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

For salaries and expenses of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, as authorized by title XIX of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 591 et seq.), for management and administration of programs and activities, \$37,339,000: Provided, That not to exceed \$2,250 shall be for official reception and representation expenses.

##### RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for radiological and nuclear research, development, testing, evaluation, and operations, \$197,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

##### SYSTEMS ACQUISITION

For necessary expenses for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office acquisition and deployment of radiological detection systems in accordance with the global nuclear detection architecture, \$72,603,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017.

#### TITLE V

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### (INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. Subject to the requirements of section 503 of this Act, the unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be transferred to appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this Act, may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts, and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 503. (a) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2015, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that:

- (1) creates a new program, project, or activity;
- (2) eliminates a program, project, office, or activity;

(3) increases funds for any program, project, or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted by the Congress;

(4) proposes to use funds directed for a specific activity by either of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a different purpose; or

(5) contracts out any function or activity for which funding levels were requested for Federal full-time equivalents in the object classification tables contained in the fiscal year 2015 Budget Appendix for the Department of Homeland Security, as modified by the report accompanying this Act, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided by this Act, provided by previous appropriations Acts to the agencies in or transferred to the Department of Homeland Security that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2015, or

provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees or proceeds available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for programs, projects, or activities through a reprogramming of funds in excess of \$5,000,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that:

(1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities;

(2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity;

(3) reduces by 10 percent the numbers of personnel approved by the Congress; or

(4) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel that would result in a change in existing programs, projects, or activities as approved by the Congress, unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(c) Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Homeland Security by this Act or provided by previous appropriations Acts may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by such transfers: Provided, That any transfer under this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under subsection (b) and shall not be available for obligation unless the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(d) Notwithstanding subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section, no funds shall be reprogrammed within or transferred between appropriations based upon an initial notification provided after June 30, except in extraordinary circumstances that imminently threaten the safety of human life or the protection of property.

(e) The notification thresholds and procedures set forth in this section shall apply to any use of deobligated balances of funds provided in previous Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 504. The Department of Homeland Security Working Capital Fund, established pursuant to section 403 of Public Law 103-356 (31 U.S.C. 501 note), shall continue operations as a permanent working capital fund for fiscal year 2015: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Homeland Security may be used to make payments to the Working Capital Fund, except for the activities and amounts allowed in the President's fiscal year 2015 budget: Provided further, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be available for obligation until expended to carry out the purposes of the Working Capital Fund: Provided further, That all departmental components shall be charged only for direct usage of each Working Capital Fund service: Provided further, That funds provided to the Working Capital Fund shall be used only for purposes consistent with the contributing component: Provided further, That the Working Capital Fund shall be paid in advance or reimbursed at rates which will return the full cost of each service: Provided further, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives shall be notified of any activity added to or removed from the fund: Provided further, That the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit a quarterly execution report with activity level detail, not later than 30 days after the end of each quarter.

SEC. 505. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2015, as recorded in the financial

records at the time of a reprogramming request, but not later than June 30, 2016, from appropriations for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2015 in this Act shall remain available through September 30, 2016, in the account and for the purposes for which the appropriations were provided: Provided, That prior to the obligation of such funds, a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives for approval in accordance with section 503 of this Act.

SEC. 506. Funds made available by this Act for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2015 until the enactment of an Act authorizing intelligence activities for fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 507. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) make or award a grant allocation, grant, contract, other transaction agreement, or task or delivery order on a Department of Homeland Security multiple award contract, or to issue a letter of intent totaling in excess of \$1,000,000;

(2) award a task or delivery order requiring an obligation of funds in an amount greater than \$10,000,000 from multi-year Department of Homeland Security funds;

(3) make a sole-source grant award; or

(4) announce publicly the intention to make or award items under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) including a contract covered by the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(b) The Secretary of Homeland Security may waive the prohibition under subsection (a) if the Secretary notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives at least 3 full business days in advance of making an award or issuing a letter as described in that subsection.

(c) If the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that compliance with this section would pose a substantial risk to human life, health, or safety, an award may be made without notification, and the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 5 full business days after such an award is made or letter issued.

(d) A notification under this section—

(1) may not involve funds that are not available for obligation; and

(2) shall include the amount of the award; the fiscal year for which the funds for the award were appropriated; the type of contract; and the account from which the funds are being drawn.

(e) The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall brief the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5 full business days in advance of announcing publicly the intention of making an award under "State and Local Programs".

SEC. 508. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no agency shall purchase, construct, or lease any additional facilities, except within or contiguous to existing locations, to be used for the purpose of conducting Federal law enforcement training without the advance approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, except that the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center is authorized to obtain the temporary use of additional facilities by lease, contract, or other agreement for training that cannot be accommodated in existing Center facilities.

SEC. 509. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for expenses for any construction, repair, alteration, or acquisition project for which a prospectus otherwise required under chapter 33

of title 40, United States Code, has not been approved, except that necessary funds may be expended for each project for required expenses for the development of a proposed prospectus.

SEC. 510. (a) Sections 520, 522, and 530 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2008 (division E of Public Law 110-161; 121 Stat. 2073 and 2074) shall apply with respect to funds made available in this Act in the same manner as such sections applied to funds made available in that Act.

(b) The third proviso of section 537 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2006 (6 U.S.C. 114), shall not apply with respect to funds made available in this Act.

SEC. 511. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the applicable provisions of the Buy American Act. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term "Buy American Act" means chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to amend the oath of allegiance required by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1448).

SEC. 513. Not later than 30 days after the last day of each month, the Chief Financial Officer of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives a monthly budget and staffing report for that month that includes total obligations of the Department for that month for the fiscal year at the appropriation and program, project, and activity levels, by the source year of the appropriation. Total obligations for staffing shall also be provided by subcategory of on-board and funded full-time equivalent staffing levels, respectively, and the report shall specify the number of, and total obligations for, contract employees for each office of the Department.

SEC. 514. Except as provided in section 44945 of title 49, United States Code, funds appropriated or transferred to Transportation Security Administration "Aviation Security", "Administration", and "Transportation Security Support" for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 that are recovered or deobligated shall be available only for the procurement or installation of explosives detection systems, air cargo, baggage, and checkpoint screening systems, subject to notification: Provided, That semiannual reports shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives on any funds that are recovered or deobligated.

SEC. 515. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to process or approve a competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 for services provided by employees (including employees serving on a temporary or term basis) of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services of the Department of Homeland Security who are known as Immigration Information Officers, Contact Representatives, Investigative Assistants, or Immigration Services Officers.

SEC. 516. Any funds appropriated to "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements" for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 for the 110-123 foot patrol boat conversion that are recovered, collected, or otherwise received as the result of negotiation, mediation, or litigation, shall be available until expended for the Fast Response Cutter program.

SEC. 517. The functions of the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center instructor staff shall be classified as inherently governmental for the purpose of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (31 U.S.C. 501 note).

SEC. 518. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report not later than October 15, 2015, to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security listing all



grants and contracts awarded by any means other than full and open competition during fiscal year 2015.

(b) The Inspector General shall review the report required by subsection (a) to assess Departmental compliance with applicable laws and regulations and report the results of that review to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than February 15, 2016.

SEC. 519. None of the funds provided by this or previous appropriations Acts shall be used to fund any position designated as a Principal Federal Official (or the successor thereto) for any Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) declared disasters or emergencies unless—

(1) the responsibilities of the Principal Federal Official do not include operational functions related to incident management, including coordination of operations, and are consistent with the requirements of section 509(c) and sections 503(c)(3) and 503(c)(4)(A) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 319(c) and 313(c)(3) and 313(c)(4)(A)) and section 302 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5143);

(2) not later than 10 business days after the later of the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security appoints the Principal Federal Official and the date on which the President issues a declaration under section 401 or section 501 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170 and 5191, respectively), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a notification of the appointment of the Principal Federal Official and a description of the responsibilities of such Official and how such responsibilities are consistent with paragraph (1) to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(3) not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall provide a report specifying timeframes and milestones regarding the update of operations, planning and policy documents, and training and exercise protocols, to ensure consistency with paragraph (1) of this section.

SEC. 520. None of the funds provided or otherwise made available in this Act shall be available to carry out section 872 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 452).

SEC. 521. Funds made available in this Act may be used to alter operations within the Civil Engineering Program of the Coast Guard nationwide, including civil engineering units, facilities design and construction centers, maintenance and logistics commands, and the Coast Guard Academy, except that none of the funds provided in this Act may be used to reduce operations within any Civil Engineering Unit unless specifically authorized by a statute enacted after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 522. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services to grant an immigration benefit unless the results of background checks required by law to be completed prior to the granting of the benefit have been received by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, and the results do not preclude the granting of the benefit.

SEC. 523. Section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Until September 30, 2014,” and inserting “Until September 30, 2015,”; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “September 30, 2014,” and inserting “September 30, 2015,”.

SEC. 524. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall require that all contracts of the Department of Homeland Security that provide award fees link such fees to successful acquisition outcomes (which outcomes shall be specified in terms of cost, schedule, and performance).

SEC. 525. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds provided in this or any other Act shall be used to approve a waiver of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 501(b) for the transportation of crude oil distributed from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve until the Secretary of Homeland Security, after consultation with the Secretaries of the Departments of Energy and Transportation and representatives from the United States flag maritime industry, takes adequate measures to ensure the use of United States flag vessels: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives within 2 business days of any request for waivers of navigation and vessel-inspection laws pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 501(b).

SEC. 526. None of the funds made available in this Act for United States Customs and Border Protection may be used to prevent an individual not in the business of importing a prescription drug (within the meaning of section 801(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) from importing a prescription drug from Canada that complies with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act: Provided, That this section shall apply only to individuals transporting on their person a personal-use quantity of the prescription drug, not to exceed a 90-day supply: Provided further, That the prescription drug may not be—

(1) a controlled substance, as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802); or

(2) a biological product, as defined in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262).

SEC. 527. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to reduce the United States Coast Guard's Operations Systems Center mission or its government-employed or contract staff levels.

SEC. 528. The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives of any proposed transfers of funds available under section 9703.1(g)(4)(B) of title 31, United States Code (as added by Public Law 102-393) from the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund to any agency within the Department of Homeland Security: Provided, That none of the funds identified for such a transfer may be obligated until the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives approve the proposed transfers.

SEC. 529. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for planning, testing, piloting, or developing a national identification card.

SEC. 530. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to conduct, or to implement the results of, a competition under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 for activities performed with respect to the Coast Guard National Vessel Documentation Center.

SEC. 531. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), and 30 days after the date on which the President determines whether to declare a major disaster because of an event and any appeal is completed, the Administrator shall publish on the Web site of the Federal Emergency Management Agency a report regarding that decision that shall summarize damage assessment infor-

mation used to determine whether to declare a major disaster.

(b) The Administrator may redact from a report under subsection (a) any data that the Administrator determines would compromise national security.

(c) In this section—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and

(2) the term “major disaster” has the meaning given that term in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122).

SEC. 532. Any official that is required by this Act to report or to certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives may not delegate such authority to perform that act unless specifically authorized herein.

SEC. 533. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this or any other Act may be used to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions Khalid Sheikh Mohammed or any other detainee who—

(1) is not a United States citizen or a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(2) is or was held on or after June 24, 2009, at the United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the Department of Defense.

SEC. 534. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for first-class travel by the employees of agencies funded by this Act in contravention of sections 301–10.122 through 301–10.124 of title 41, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 535. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to employ workers described in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)).

SEC. 536. (a) Any company that collects or retains personal information directly from any individual who participates in the Registered Traveler or successor program of the Transportation Security Administration shall hereafter safeguard and dispose of such information in accordance with the requirements in—

(1) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–30, entitled “Risk Management Guide for Information Technology Systems”; and

(2) the National Institute for Standards and Technology Special Publication 800–53, Revision 3, entitled “Recommended Security Controls for Federal Information Systems and Organizations”; and

(3) any supplemental standards established by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration (referred to in this section as the “Administrator”).

(b) The airport authority or air carrier operator that sponsors the company under the Registered Traveler program shall hereafter be known as the “Sponsoring Entity”.

(c) The Administrator shall hereafter require any company covered by subsection (a) to provide, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to the Sponsoring Entity written certification that the procedures used by the company to safeguard and dispose of information are in compliance with the requirements under subsection (a). Such certification shall include a description of the procedures used by the company to comply with such requirements.

SEC. 537. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay award or incentive fees for contractor performance that has been judged to be below satisfactory performance or performance that does not meet the basic requirements of a contract.

SEC. 538. In developing any process to screen aviation passengers and crews for transportation or national security purposes, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that



all such processes take into consideration such passengers' and crews' privacy and civil liberties consistent with applicable laws, regulations, and guidance.

SEC. 539. (a) Notwithstanding section 1356(n) of title 8, United States Code, of the funds deposited into the Immigration Examinations Fee Account, \$10,000,000 may be allocated by United States Citizenship and Immigration Services in fiscal year 2015 for the purpose of providing an immigrant integration grants program.

(b) None of the funds made available to United States Citizenship and Immigration Services for grants for immigrant integration may be used to provide services to aliens who have not been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

SEC. 540. For an additional amount for the "Office of the Under Secretary for Management", \$48,600,000, to remain available until expended, for necessary expenses to plan, acquire, design, construct, renovate, remediate, equip, furnish, improve infrastructure, and occupy buildings and facilities for the department headquarters consolidation project and associated mission support consolidation: Provided, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall receive an expenditure plan not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Act detailing the allocation of these funds.

SEC. 541. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Homeland Security to enter into any Federal contract unless such contract is entered into in accordance with the requirements of subtitle I of title 41, United States Code, or chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless such contract is otherwise authorized by statute to be entered into without regard to the above referenced statutes.

SEC. 542. (a) For an additional amount for financial systems modernization, \$34,072,000 to remain available until September 30, 2016.

(b) Funds made available in subsection (a) for financial systems modernization may be transferred by the Secretary of Homeland Security between appropriations for the same purpose, notwithstanding section 503 of this Act.

(c) No transfer described in subsection (b) shall occur until 15 days after the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives are notified of such transfer.

SEC. 543. Notwithstanding the 10 percent limitation contained in section 503(c) of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security may transfer to the fund established by 8 U.S.C. 1101 note, up to \$20,000,000 from appropriations available to the Department of Homeland Security: Provided, That the Secretary shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives 5 days in advance of such transfer.

SEC. 544. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that specific United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement Service Processing Centers or other United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities no longer meet the mission need, the Secretary is authorized to dispose of individual Service Processing Centers or other United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities by directing the Administrator of General Services to sell all real and related personal property which support Service Processing Centers or other United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement owned detention facilities, subject to such terms and conditions as necessary to protect Government interests and meet program requirements: Provided, That the proceeds, net of the costs of sale incurred by the General Services Administration and United States Immigration and Customs

Enforcement, shall be deposited as offsetting collections into a separate account that shall be available, subject to appropriation, until expended for other real property capital asset needs of existing United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement assets, excluding daily operations and maintenance costs, as the Secretary deems appropriate: Provided further, That any sale or collocation of federally owned detention facilities shall not result in the maintenance of fewer than 34,000 detention beds: Provided further, That the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall be notified 15 days prior to the announcement of any proposed sale or collocation.

SEC. 545. The Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection and the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement shall, with respect to fiscal years 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018, submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, at the time that the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2016 is submitted pursuant to the requirements of section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, the information required in the multi-year investment and management plans required, respectively, under the headings "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses" under title II of division D of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74); "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Border Security Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology" under such title; and section 568 of such Act.

SEC. 546. The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure enforcement of all immigration laws (as defined in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17))).

SEC. 547. (a) Of the amounts made available by this Act for "National Protection and Programs Directorate, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security", \$140,525,000 for the Federal Network Security program, project, and activity shall be used to deploy on Federal systems technology to improve the information security of agency information systems covered by section 3543(a) of title 44, United States Code: Provided, That funds made available under this section shall be used to assist and support Government-wide and agency-specific efforts to provide adequate, risk-based, and cost-effective cybersecurity to address escalating and rapidly evolving threats to information security, including the acquisition and operation of a continuous monitoring and diagnostics program, in collaboration with departments and agencies, that includes equipment, software, and Department of Homeland Security supplied services: Provided further, That continuous monitoring and diagnostics software procured by the funds made available by this section shall not transmit to the Department of Homeland Security any personally identifiable information or content of network communications of other agencies' users: Provided further, That such software shall be installed, maintained, and operated in accordance with all applicable privacy laws and agency-specific policies regarding network content.

(b) Funds made available under this section may not be used to supplant funds provided for any such system within an agency budget.

(c) Not later than July 1, 2015, the heads of all Federal agencies shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives expenditure plans for necessary cybersecurity improvements to address known vulnerabilities to information systems described in subsection (a).

(d) Not later than October 1, 2015, and semi-annually thereafter, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the Director of the Office

of Management and Budget a report on the execution of the expenditure plan for that agency required by subsection (c): Provided, That the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall summarize such execution reports and annually submit such summaries to Congress in conjunction with the annual progress report on implementation of the E-Government Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-347), as required by section 3606 of title 44, United States Code.

(e) This section shall not apply to the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government and shall apply to all Federal agencies within the executive branch except for the Department of Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

SEC. 548. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

SEC. 549. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by a Federal law enforcement officer to facilitate the transfer of an operable firearm to an individual if the Federal law enforcement officer knows or suspects that the individual is an agent of a drug cartel unless law enforcement personnel of the United States continuously monitor or control the firearm at all times.

SEC. 550. None of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be obligated to implement the National Preparedness Grant Program or any other successor grant programs unless explicitly authorized by Congress.

SEC. 551. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide funding for the position of Public Advocate, or a successor position, within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

SEC. 552. (a) Section 559 of division F of Public Law 113-76 is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f)(2)(B) is amended by adding at the end: "Such transfer shall not be required for personal property, including furniture, fixtures, and equipment."; and

(2) Subsection (e)(3)(b) is amended by inserting after "payment of overtime" the following: "and the salaries, training and benefits of individuals employed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to support U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers in performing law enforcement functions at ports of entry, including primary and secondary processing of passengers".

(b) Section 560(g) of division D of Public Law 113-6 is amended by inserting after "payment of overtime" the following: "and the salaries, training and benefits of individuals employed by U.S. Customs and Border Protection to support U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers in performing law enforcement functions at ports of entry, including primary and secondary processing of passengers".

(c) The Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection may modify a reimbursable fee agreement in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act to include costs specified in this section.

SEC. 553. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay for the travel to or attendance of more than 50 employees of a single component of the Department of Homeland Security, who are stationed in the United States, at a single international conference unless the Secretary of Homeland Security, or a designee, determines that such attendance is in the national interest and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the

House of Representatives within at least 10 days of that determination and the basis for that determination: Provided, That for purposes of this section the term “international conference” shall mean a conference occurring outside of the United States attended by representatives of the United States Government and of foreign governments, international organizations, or non-governmental organizations.

SEC. 554. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to reimburse any Federal department or agency for its participation in a National Special Security Event.

SEC. 555. With the exception of countries with preclearance facilities in service prior to 2013, none of the funds made available in this Act may be used for new United States Customs and Border Protection air preclearance agreements entering into force after February 1, 2014, unless—

(1) the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, has certified to Congress that air preclearance operations at the airport provide a homeland or national security benefit to the United States;

(2) United States passenger air carriers are not precluded from operating at existing preclearance locations; and

(3) a United States passenger air carrier is operating at all airports contemplated for establishment of new air preclearance operations.

SEC. 556. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to implement, administer, or enforce, in abrogation of the responsibility described in section 44903(n)(1) of title 49, United States Code, any requirement that airport operators provide airport-financed staffing to monitor exit points from the sterile area of any airport at which the Transportation Security Administration provided such monitoring as of December 1, 2013.

SEC. 557. In making grants under the heading “Firefighter Assistance Grants”, the Secretary may grant waivers from the requirements in subsections (a)(1)(A), (a)(1)(B), (a)(1)(E), (c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(4) of section 34 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a).

SEC. 558. (a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall not—

(1) establish, collect, or otherwise impose any new border crossing fee on individuals crossing the Southern border or the Northern border at a land port of entry; or

(2) conduct any study relating to the imposition of a border crossing fee.

(b) BORDER CROSSING FEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “border crossing fee” means a fee that every pedestrian, cyclist, and driver and passenger of a private motor vehicle is required to pay for the privilege of crossing the Southern border or the Northern border at a land port of entry.

SEC. 559. The administrative law judge annuitants participating in the Senior Administrative Law Judge Program managed by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management under section 3323 of title 5, United States Code, shall be available on a temporary reemployment basis to conduct arbitrations of disputes arising from delivery of assistance under the Federal Emergency Management Agency Public Assistance Program.

SEC. 560. As authorized by section 601(b) of the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112-42) fees collected from passengers arriving from Canada, Mexico, or an adjacent island pursuant to section 13031(a)(5) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(5)) shall be available until expended.

SEC. 561. None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act shall be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who prepare or submit appropriations language as part of the President's budget submission to the Congress of the United States for programs under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Subcommittees on the Department of Homeland Security that assumes revenues or reflects a reduction from the previous year due to user fees proposals that have not been enacted into law prior to the submission of the budget unless such budget submission identifies which additional spending reductions should occur in the event the user fees proposals are not enacted prior to the date of the convening of a committee of conference for the fiscal year 2016 appropriations Act.

SEC. 562. (a) The Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to the Congress, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, beginning at the time the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2017 is submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a comprehensive report on the purchase and usage of weapons, subdivided by weapon type. The report shall include—

(1) the quantity of weapons in inventory at the end of the preceding calendar year, and the amount of weapons, subdivided by weapon type, included in the budget request for each relevant component or agency in the Department of Homeland Security;

(2) a description of how such quantity and purchase aligns to each component or agency's mission requirements for certification, qualification, training, and operations; and

(3) details on all contracting practices applied by the Department of Homeland Security, including comparative details regarding other contracting options with respect to cost and availability.

(b) The reports required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in an appropriate format in order to ensure the safety of law enforcement personnel.

SEC. 563. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used for the environmental remediation of the Coast Guard's LORAN support in Wildwood/Lower Township, New Jersey.

SEC. 564. None of the funds made available to the Department of Homeland Security by this or any other Act may be obligated for any structural pay reform that affects more than 100 full-time equivalent employee positions or costs more than \$5,000,000 in a single year before the end of the 30-day period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to Congress a notification that includes—

(1) the number of full-time equivalent employee positions affected by such change;

(2) funding required for such change for the current year and through the Future Years Homeland Security Program;

(3) justification for such change; and

(4) an analysis of compensation alternatives to such change that were considered by the Department.

SEC. 565. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to subsections (b) and (c), post on the public Web site of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives in this Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises homeland or national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been

made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days except as otherwise specified in law.

SEC. 566. Section 605 of division E of Public Law 110-161 (6 U.S.C. 1404) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 567. The Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency may transfer up to \$95,000,000 in unobligated balances made available for the appropriations account for “Federal Emergency Management Agency, Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program” under section 2(a) of the Community Disaster Loan Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-88; 119 Stat. 2061) or under chapter 5 of title I of division B of the Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 110-329; 122 Stat. 3592) to the appropriations account for “Federal Emergency Management Agency, Disaster Relief Fund”. Amounts transferred to such account under this section shall be available for any authorized purpose of such account.

SEC. 568. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Gerardo Ismael Hernandez, a Transportation Security Officer employed by the Transportation Security Administration who died as the direct result of an injury sustained in the line of duty on November 1, 2013, at the Los Angeles International Airport, shall be deemed to have been a public safety officer for the purposes of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.).

SEC. 569. The Office of Management and Budget and the Department of Homeland Security shall ensure the congressional budget justifications accompanying the President's budget proposal for the Department of Homeland Security, submitted pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, include estimates of the number of unaccompanied alien children anticipated to be apprehended in the budget year and the number of agent or officer hours required to process, manage, and care for such children: Provided, That such materials shall also include estimates of all other associated costs for each relevant Departmental component, including but not limited to personnel; equipment; supplies; facilities; managerial, technical, and advisory services; medical treatment; and all costs associated with transporting such children from one Departmental component to another or from a Departmental component to another Federal agency.

SEC. 570. Notwithstanding section 404 or 420 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c and 5187), until September 30, 2015, the President may provide hazard mitigation assistance in accordance with such section 404 in any area in which assistance was provided under such section 420.

SEC. 571. That without regard to the limitation as to time and condition of section 503(d) of this Act, the Secretary may propose to reprogram within and transfer funds into “U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses” and “U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Salaries and Expenses” as necessary to ensure the care and transportation of unaccompanied alien children.

SEC. 572. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, grants awarded to States along the Southwest Border of the United States under sections 2003 or 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604 and 605) using funds provided under the heading “Federal Emergency Management Agency, State and Local Programs” in division F of Public Law 113-76 or division D of Public Law 113-6 may be used by recipients or sub-recipients for costs, or reimbursement of costs, related to providing humanitarian relief to unaccompanied alien children and alien adults accompanied by an alien minor where they are encountered after entering the United States, provided that such costs were incurred during the award period of performance.

## (RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 573. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Homeland Security, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts: Provided, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99-177):

- (1) \$5,000,000 from unobligated prior year balances from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Border Security, Fencing, Infrastructure, and Technology";
- (2) \$8,000,000 from Public Law 113-76 under the heading "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Air and Marine Operations" in division F of such Act;
- (3) \$10,000,000 from unobligated prior year balances from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Construction and Facilities Management";
- (4) \$15,300,000 from "Transportation Security Administration, Aviation Security" account 70x0550;
- (5) \$187,000,000 from Public Law 113-76 under the heading "Transportation Security Administration, Aviation Security";
- (6) \$2,550,000 from Public Law 112-10 under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";
- (7) \$12,095,000 from Public Law 112-74 under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";
- (8) \$16,349,000 from Public Law 113-6 under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";
- (9) \$30,643,000 from Public Law 113-76 under the heading "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";
- (10) \$24,000,000 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Predisaster Mitigation Fund" account 70x0716; and
- (11) \$16,627,000 from "Science and Technology, Research, Development, Acquisition, and Operations" account 70x0800.

## (RESCISSION)

SEC. 574. From the unobligated balances made available in the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund established by section 9703 of title 31, United States Code, (added by section 638 of Public Law 102-393), \$175,000,000 shall be rescinded.

## (RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 575. Of the funds transferred to the Department of Homeland Security when it was created in 2003, the following funds are hereby rescinded from the following accounts and programs in the specified amounts:

- (1) \$1,317,018 from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses";
  - (2) \$57,998 from "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";
  - (3) \$17,597 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Office of Domestic Preparedness"; and
  - (4) \$82,926 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Predisaster Mitigation Fund".
- SEC. 576. The following unobligated balances made available to the Department of Homeland Security pursuant to section 505 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76) are rescinded:
- (1) \$463,404 from "Office of the Secretary and Executive Management";
  - (2) \$47,023 from "Office of the Under Secretary for Management";
  - (3) \$29,852 from "Office of the Chief Financial Officer";
  - (4) \$16,346 from "Office of the Chief Information Officer";
  - (5) \$816,384 from "Analysis and Operations";

(6) \$158,931 from "Office of Inspector General";

(7) \$635,153 from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Salaries and Expenses";

(8) \$65,195 from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Automation Modernization";

(9) \$96,177 from "U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Air and Marine Operations";

(10) \$2,368,902 from "U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Salaries and Expenses";

(11) \$600,000 from "Transportation Security Administration, Federal Air Marshals";

(12) \$3,096,521 from "Coast Guard, Operating Expenses";

(13) \$208,654 from "Coast Guard, Reserve Training";

(14) \$1,722,319 from "Coast Guard, Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements";

(15) \$1,256,900 from "United States Secret Service, Salaries and Expenses";

(16) \$107,432 from "National Protection and Programs Directorate, Management and Administration";

(17) \$679,212 from "National Protection and Programs Directorate, Infrastructure Protection and Information Security";

(18) \$26,169 from "Office of Biometric Identity Management";

(19) \$37,201 from "Office of Health Affairs";

(20) \$818,184 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Salaries and Expenses";

(21) \$447,280 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, State and Local Programs";

(22) \$98,841 from "Federal Emergency Management Agency, United States Fire Administration";

(23) \$448,073 from "United States Citizenship and Immigration Services";

(24) \$519,503 from "Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, Salaries and Expenses";

(25) \$500,005 from "Science and Technology, Management and Administration"; and

(26) \$68,910 from "Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, Management and Administration".

## (RESCISSION)

SEC. 577. Of the unobligated balances made available to "Federal Emergency Management Agency, Disaster Relief Fund", \$375,000,000 shall be rescinded: Provided, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: Provided further, That no amounts may be rescinded from the amounts that were designated by the Congress as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 578. The explanatory statement regarding this Act, printed in the House of Representatives section of the Congressional Record, on or about January 13, 2015, by the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, shall have the same effect with respect to the allocation of funds and implementation of this Act as if it were a joint explanatory statement of a committee of conference.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015".

Mr. SIMPSON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the Senate amendment.

Mr. MASSIE. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

□ 1330

Mr. MASSIE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

## MOTION TO RECEDE AND CONCUR

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a privileged motion under clause 4 of rule XXII at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Simpson moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein.

## MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the Senate amendment on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 140, nays 278, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

## YEAS—140

Abraham	Griffith	Pearce
Aderholt	Guinta	Perry
Allen	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Amash	Harper	Pompeo
Babin	Harris	Posey
Barletta	Hartzler	Price, Tom
Barr	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Renacci
Billirakis	Hice, Jody B.	Ribble
Bishop (UT)	Hill	Rice (SC)
Black	Holding	Roby
Blackburn	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Huelskamp	Rohrabacher
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Rooney (FL)
Brat	Hultgren	Roskam
Bridenstine	Hunter	Ross
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Rothfus
Buck	Issa	Rouzer
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Salmon
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Scott, Austin
Chaffetz	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Clawson (FL)	Jordan	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Shuster
Culberson	King (IA)	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Labrador	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Stewart
Duffy	Lamborn	Stutzman
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Walberg
Farenthold	Love	Walker
Fleischmann	Lummis	Walorski
Fleming	Marchant	Weber (TX)
Flores	Marino	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Massie	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	McClintock	Westerman
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Westmoreland
Garrett	Mica	Williams
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Goodlatte	Mullin	Woodall
Gosar	Mulvaney	Yoder
Gowdy	Neugebauer	Yoho
Graves (GA)	Nugent	Young (IA)
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Palmer	

## NAYS—278

Adams	Beatty	Beyer
Aguilar	Becerra	Bishop (GA)
Amodei	Benishke	Bishop (MI)
Ashford	Bera	Blumenauer

Bonamici	Grothman	Pascarell
Bost	Gutiérrez	Paulsen
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hahn	Payne
Brady (PA)	Hanna	Pelosi
Brooks (IN)	Hardy	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Peters
Brownley (CA)	Heck (NV)	Peterson
Buchanan	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Bucshon	Higgins	Pittenger
Bustos	Himes	Pitts
Butterfield	Honda	Pocan
Calvert	Hoyer	Poliquin
Capps	Huffman	Polis
Capuano	Hurd (TX)	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Israel	Quigley
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Reed
Carter (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Reichert
Cartwright	Jolly	Rice (NY)
Castor (FL)	Joyce	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Rigell
Chu, Judy	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Cicilline	Keating	Rokita
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Kildee	Royce
Cleaver	Kilmer	Ruiz
Clyburn	Kind	Ruppersberger
Coffman	King (NY)	Russell
Cohen	Kinzinger (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cole	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (WI)
Collins (NY)	Kline	Sánchez, Linda T.
Comstock	Knight	Sánchez, Loretta
Conaway	Kuster	Sarbanes
Connolly	Lance	Scalise
Conyers	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cook	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Schock
Costa	Lawrence	Schrader
Costello (PA)	Lee	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Levin	Scott, David
Cramer	Lewis	Serrano
Crawford	Lieu, Ted	Sewell (AL)
Crenshaw	Lipinski	Sherman
Crowley	LoBiondo	Shimkus
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Simpson
Cummings	Lofgren	Sinema
Curbelo (FL)	Lowenthal	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Slaughter
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Stefanik
DeFazio	Luetkemeyer	Stivers
DeGette	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Delaney	(NM)	Takai
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
DelBene	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Denham	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Dent	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Thornberry
Deutch	Carolyn	Tiberi
Diaz-Balart	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Dingell	Matsui	Tonko
Doggett	McCarthy	Torres
Dold	McCaul	Trott
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Tsongas
Duckworth	McDermott	Turner
Edwards	McGovern	Upton
Ellison	McHenry	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Van Hollen
Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Vargas
Engel	Rodgers	Veasey
Eshoo	McNerney	Vela
Esty	McSally	Velázquez
Farr	Meehan	Visclosky
Fattah	Meng	Wagner
Fincher	Messer	Walden
Fitzpatrick	Miller (MI)	Walters, Mimi
Foster	Moolenaar	Walz
Fox	Moore	Wasserman
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Schultz
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Fudge	Murphy (PA)	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Nadler	Welch
Gallego	Napolitano	Whitfield
Garamendi	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Gibson	Newhouse	Womack
Graham	Noem	Yarmuth
Grayson	Nolan	Young (AK)
Green, Al	Norcross	Young (IN)
Green, Gene	Nunes	Zinke
Grijalva	O'Rourke	
	Olson	
	Pallone	

## NOT VOTING—14

Bass	Johnson (GA)	Smith (MO)
Brady (TX)	Long	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Danny	Meeks	Smith (WA)
Granger	Roe (TN)	Speier
Hinojosa	Rush	

□ 1405

Mrs. CAPPS, Messrs. PITTS, EMMER of Minnesota, LUETKE-MEYER, WHITFIELD, BUCSHON, VALADAO, and OLSON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HARPER, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to table was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 108 I inadvertently voted “nay” when I intended to vote “yay”.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, Tuesday, March 3, 2015, I was detained in a meeting and unable to be present for the first recorded vote of the day. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall vote No. 108 (on the motion to table the Senate amendment to H.R. 240).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes on the motion.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if both managers support the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman from New York opposed to the motion?

Mrs. LOWEY. No, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Kentucky opposed?

Mr. MASSIE. I am, yes. I am opposed to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today with a motion that will move us forward to ensure the security of our Nation by keeping the Department of Homeland Security funded until the end of the fiscal year.

Funding for the Department of Homeland Security will expire this week. To allow a shutdown of these critical functions would be an abdication of one of our primary duties as Members of Congress.

It is the constitutional duty of this body to provide funding for the Federal Government, all of the Federal Government, and this should be without the threat of shutdowns or the lurching uncertainty of continuing resolutions.

The House acted in January to fund DHS for the year and has extended short-term funding several times in order to maintain the critical security activities that keep our Nation safe. The Senate has now done all it can do, given their unique procedural constraints.

It is clear that the legislation before us, while not exactly what the House wanted, is the only path forward to avoid a potentially devastating shutdown and to provide stable, continuous funding for the agencies and programs tasked with defending the home turf.

Let us remember that the underlying legislation—and this is important—is a great bill. The security of our homeland is one of our highest priorities, and this bill provides \$39.7 billion for that purpose. It will assure that we can defend our Nation against threats of terrorism and that the men and women on our front line remain well-equipped and trained.

We are now nearly halfway into the fiscal year, and it is imperative that we get this bill enacted. At the same time, Congress must continue to fight the President's executive actions on immigration that I do not support and the American people do not support. We must continue this vote, but we must also allow funding for critical security functions to move forward.

These two priorities are not mutually exclusive. We can and should do both. For now, the President's executive actions have been stopped in court. This is where we must focus our efforts and continue to battle against this unconstitutional overreach.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time to act to provide responsible, adequate funding for the Department of Homeland Security to protect the people who elected us and to defend this great Nation.

I urge an “aye” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to recede and concur and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion to recede and concur.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I have to tell you that the only reason we are here is because of the unique procedural posture that the Senate finds itself in, and that unique posture is a perversion of the democratic principles upon which our Republic was based.

We would not be here if it weren't for the modern filibuster and cloture rule which requires 60 votes to do anything. Last week, HARRY REID made it clear that he would not support going to conference.

Jefferson was very clear when he set up the procedures for this place. Each House makes an independent decision,

then you get together in conference and work out your differences; but, because of the unique position of the Senate's processes, that cannot happen in these circumstances.

We should not reward the Senate for their bad behavior. We should reject this motion and force a new discussion on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that all we are doing is rewarding the Senate for having bad rules and bad process.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS).

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, I hear that we just need to let the courts work their will to defend the Constitution, as if we don't have an independent obligation to do that. We took the oath that we would support it. We didn't say we would be in Congress, pass bills, and let the courts support and defend the Constitution.

Here is the problem, though, beyond just that basic insight. If I were representing the Department of Justice in front of the fifth circuit to try to get this injunction overturned, the first sentence in my brief would be that the United States Congress has voted, knowing this program was in existence, to fully fund all operations. Courts, you should step out of this dispute. It is between the political branches, and they have settled it.

It is not just waiting for the courts. In fact, the action today, if this bill were to pass, I believe it would actually harm the case in the courts, and I think it makes it more difficult for those States to make the case that what the President did was unconstitutional if the one branch whose powers were invaded decided that they were not going to bite back effectively.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON).

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very, very sad day when we have to make a Hobson's choice of either funding our national security or standing for the Constitution.

We actually took an oath just a few short weeks ago to defend this Constitution from all enemies, foreign and domestic. That is our role; that is our responsibility. If not now, then when? It is never going to be easy. It is never going to be easy. It has never been easy to stand up for freedom.

I have heard some people say: Well, you Republicans, you just need to learn how to govern. If it was just about governing, then I think that the American people can just close shop and let the President just run everything, but we actually have a Constitution that we have to adhere to.

□ 1415

Despots all over the world, they govern. They keep the trains running on time.

But we stand for something different. We stand for a constitutional republic, where we have three coequal branches that all have an equal say. The Founding Fathers gave us a tool to deal with a time just like this. It is called the power of the purse. If we relegate that responsibility and dropkick it to the courts, as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS) just said, then they have nothing else than to assume that we just basically folded to the pressure.

I believe this is a sad day for America. I believe America deserves better. If we are not going to fight now, when are we going to fight?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the privileged resolution and encourage my colleagues to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 240 in order to pass the fiscal year 2015 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

It is time for us to move forward and demonstrate our true capacity to govern to the American people and to those tasked with the arduous work of defending our borders, protecting our communities, and manning the front lines when confronted by natural disasters or acts of terrorism.

I had the distinct privilege and pleasure of working on the underlying appropriations bill as a member of the House Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, and I can assure my colleagues that this is a good bill. It is a darn good bill. It is a bipartisan bill. Among the bill's many highlights, it would support the largest operational force of Border Patrol agents and CBP officers in history.

If you are concerned about illegal immigration, vote for this bill. It fully funds E-Verify. If you are concerned about illegal immigration and interior enforcement, vote for this bill. It provides an increase of almost \$700 million for Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 34,000 detention beds, and an increase in family detention beds by 3,732 beds. Again, if you are worried about illegal immigration, vote for this bill.

It fully funds FEMA's disaster relief programs and the first responder grant programs that are critical to so many State and local departments. It takes important steps toward implementation of a biometric entry and exit data system, which is critical to maintaining interior enforcement in this country. The bill helps us thwart cyber attacks, and, of course, it helps maintain our Coast Guard.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the House to move past the corrosive pattern of self-imposed cliffs and shutdowns and get to the work that the American people expect us to address—issues like tax reform, trade, transportation and infrastructure, things that are going to help create American jobs and improve

our economy. It is time to move forward and stop playing these silly games.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DENT. At these times of global uncertainty and brutal acts of terrorism, it is imperative that we maintain persistent vigilance against the numerous threats facing our homeland.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is the right bill. It is a bill that we supported last summer with strong overwhelming support on both sides of the aisle. It deserves that same kind of support here today.

Let's prove to the American people that we are serious about protecting this homeland and that we have the capacity to govern. These cliffs are disastrous for all of us. It is time to move on.

Mrs. LOWEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. CLAWSON).

Mr. CLAWSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is America. Everybody matters in America. I grew up with somebody who seemed to have bad luck from day one. Where I seemed to catch breaks, he could get none. And recently, mid-last year, because of a move, he needed to find a job. He went months without finding full-time employment, never got benefits, never got the stability that he looked for for him and his wife. And I love him very much.

When the President made his edict, he called me on the phone. He said: CURT, I don't understand what y'all are doing in Washington. I want to know if what is going on right now is going to help me get a job or not.

And I said: Unfortunately, you have got a lot of new competitors in the labor force.

I say, this is America, and everybody matters. I say, the unemployed folks, the 18 million underemployed and unemployed, they haven't been a part of this conversation like they needed to be. I say that unilateral actions by a leader who doesn't take all stakeholders into account makes those that aren't taken into account not matter. I say we need to have this conversation again.

This is America. Everybody matters, not just those that came over the border legally but those that have been here looking for jobs for long periods of time. I say we can do better. I say we can have a broader conversation. I say everybody matters.

You all know these people that are unemployed. They are in your family. They are your close friends. They are the people you see every day doing the jobs that some of us wouldn't want to do. I say, those people matter.

I say, Mr. President, before you do a cram-down of the law for the benefit of

one group of our society, I say all the other groups in this society, particularly the unemployed, also matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) said, Why are we here? She got all upset.

Let me tell you why we are here: because the President of the United States violated the constitutional separation of powers. Regardless of how you feel about immigration or immigration reform or even amnesty, surely you believe in the United States Constitution that you swore an oath to. Surely you believe in this institution that we are debating in today.

He said 22 times that he did not have the power to unilaterally make law or change the law, yet that is, in fact, what he did. That is why this debate is so important today. It really has nothing to do with DHS funding, amnesty, or immigration. That is the vehicle that we are using, sure. But it has everything to do with the United States Constitution and the sacred separation of powers that says the executive branch executes the laws. We make the law in this Chamber. We are the only ones to have the constitutional authority to do that.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, remember why we are here: 22 times the President said he couldn't do what he turned around and did, something legal scholars have said is unconstitutional; more importantly, something a Federal judge has said is wrong.

Six weeks ago, we sent a bill to the United States Senate to fund DHS at the levels the Democrats agreed to. We just said, don't have any money be used for something unconstitutional and that the Federal judge ruled was wrong. For 6 weeks, they said, we can't bring the bill up. We can't debate it, amend it, pass it. And then at the last hour, at the eleventh hour on the last day, they bring it up, debate it, amend it, and send it back—without the language stopping the unconstitutional activity and something the only court to rule on it has said is wrong.

This is unconstitutional. We all know it. This is the wrong way to go.

Fund DHS. Don't let this wrong action the President took in November—something he said he couldn't do—don't let it stand.

But more importantly, or as importantly as, the unconstitutional nature is the unfair nature of the action. It is unfair to taxpayers that illegal, non-

citizens are going to be able to get tax refunds.

It is unfair to seniors that illegal noncitizens are going to be able to participate in our Social Security system.

It is unfair to voters, as our Secretary of State testified, that now they will have the documents that will potentially make it much easier for 4 to 5 million people to participate in our election process.

And most importantly, Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to legal immigrants who did it the right way, who followed the law, who came here and want to be a part of this great country, the greatest Nation of the world, as we just heard Prime Minister Netanyahu talking about how great this country is—it is unfair to legal immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, this is unconstitutionally wrong. Most importantly, it is unfair.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I share the outrage of my friends over the President's actions because I don't think there is any question that is why we are here. The President did something that most of us, I think, on our side of the aisle believe was unconstitutional, illegal, and ill-advised.

Secondly, I share my friend's anger at the United States Senate. I think it is reprehensible not to pick up a bill and act on it, not to go to conference. That is exactly the way we are designed to work. We know that, frankly, the Democratic now minority, thankfully, in the Senate has operated that way for 4 years. I am not surprised, having operated that way in the majority, that they continue to operate that way in the minority.

But every now and then, you need to take a step back and recognize we are not the only place where these issues get thrashed out, and we are not the only players in this drama.

Indeed, we have been very fortunate on our side of this debate. We have been joined by 26 State attorneys general who hold exactly the same view that we do and have taken the President of the United States and the administration to court and have prevailed in the first court case, as my friends have pointed out. In addition, they have won an injunction so that the President cannot do the very things my friends are concerned about that he wants to do.

So we not only have the court, at least to this point, on our side, but we

have it in a venue where you actually can win in the end.

We are not likely to be able to do that in the Congress, given the Democratic control of the filibuster in the other body and the Presidential veto at the end of the process. In the courts, you can actually win. It is a constitutional issue. It ought to be settled constitutionally through a judicial process.

Since we have stopped the President, since we are prevailing in court, it seems to me the logical thing to do is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) suggested and look at a bipartisan compromise bill that protects the American people from real and physical harm and danger at the moment that we are sorting out our constitutional political differences in the appropriate format. That is all this bill is about. It was agreed to in a bipartisan fashion. It was agreed to in a bicameral fashion. The reasons why we were concerned about it or used it have now been addressed by the courts.

So I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, let's set aside our differences. They are going to be resolved in the appropriate way, in the appropriate fashion, and in the right forum. And let's do the right thing for the American people, pass this legislation, and make sure that our fellow citizens stay secure.

Mrs. LOWEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY).

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania who spoke earlier was absolutely right. The people back home want us to do things. So I think the important thing to do now is to find out, why aren't we able to do anything? And I lay the blame firmly at the feet of the seven Democrats in the Senate who have said to their voters, they thought what the President did was wrong, yet they have voted time and again to continue the filibuster. That is wrong. And those are the people who are preventing the country from moving forward.

Beyond that, to the extent those seven Senate Democrats continue to want to abuse the rules, it is incumbent upon our conservative Republican colleagues in the Senate to change the rules.

Conservative Republicans, Mr. Speaker, who have been very quick to try to tell the House what to do should now be over there right now making the case that if the Senate Democrats are going to use a rule to undermine the Constitution, then the rule needs to change.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).



Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, last December, we were told that the best way to approach the matter—despite some of us thinking to the contrary—was to fund everything but DHS. We were told, This is the play.

Well, some of us were afraid that if we did that, that we would come to this point and totally cave and would allow at least a congressional statement that we are not going to take action to defund illegal, unconstitutional amnesty.

So I stand with those veterans who believe that they should get health care before people who came illegally, that they should get a hotline to call before those who came illegally. I stand with the seniors who believe they deserve the Social Security they paid into, rather than people who have come illegally and are even going to get tax refunds, when they didn't put any taxes in.

□ 1430

I stand with the Speaker of the House of Representatives—at least where he was last week.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the issue before us today is, in fact, security. As a Member of Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey, my constituents in New Jersey, like most Americans, understand the devastating impact of a lack of security in certain areas. We live in the shadow of the Twin Towers and understand when security is not a paramount interest of this government. But with that said, an equal responsibility of this Congress and this government is to the security as being a nation of laws and abiding by the fundamental law of this country, which is the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, we can achieve both of those: be a secure nation by funding Homeland Security, which this House has done twice now, and we can also become a nation by following the rule of law and following the Constitution which this body has done twice now by sending full funding of Homeland Security to the Senate and simply asking them to do what all Americans want Washington to do today—conference on these issues, discuss these issues, and come to a resolution where the Constitution is upheld, the rule of law is upheld, and homeland security is upheld as well.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, constitutional attorney Jonathan Turley once said that, since Roosevelt, we have made the executive branch stronger and stronger and stronger. But they have actually had a

dance partner, and that is us—that is us, the legislative branch, both the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, when are we going to stand up for the rule of law? How do I go back to Arizona where they defy the rule of law, where we allow anybody to pass go, collect \$200, and go to the front of the line? How do we accomplish that without standing up for something? This is that time. This is the time to stand up and not leave everything to the courts.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Kentucky ready to close?

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I have more speakers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MASSIE. At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, there was a comment about this is about governing. It really is. It is about governing constitutionally. We are no longer three separate but equal branches of government. The abuse of the executive order has diminished Congress, and the abuse of the Senate rules has diminished this House. We are now reduced to passing what the Senate will allow us to pass, and the Senate is reduced to passing what the President will not veto.

This is about the Constitution. We have 3 more days in which we can consider legislation that upholds the rule of law and that restores the balance of powers. We should take those 3 days.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a day that we will remember for the rest of our lives. The country is looking to us right now to make a decision whether or not we will uphold our oath of office. I call upon every Member of this House to be an oath keeper.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho (Mr. LABRADOR).

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky.

This fight today is not about immigration. This fight today is about the separation of powers. Any person who votes for this deal today is voting to cede some of our power to the Executive. Any person who votes for this deal today is voting to allow the President to make decisions like this on taxation, on EPA, and on any other agency that this President decides that he has the executive authority to take over the powers of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, today we all sat here, and I think every Republican stood up when Bibi Netanyahu talked about leadership. When he talked about what it was important for a leader to do, he said that we are being told that the

only alternative to this bad deal—speaking about the deal on Iran—is war. That is just not true. The alternative to this bad deal is just a better deal. Every one of our Republicans stood up when he said that.

But today we are being told by our leadership that the only alternative to this bad deal is a government shutdown. That is not true. The alternative to this bad deal today is a better deal. It is to force the Senate to actually go to conference so both the House and the Senate can speak the will of the American people.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I think everyone in this body knows what it means to run for office. We each represent 700,000 people, and we each take that job very seriously. So it is a sad day today. Everybody in this body has fought very hard to try to come to agreement. Unfortunately, Members in the other body have not allowed us to do that. The fault lies in the U.S. Senate.

We have asked and we have trusted our leadership to come up with a strong fight, strong messaging, whatever we can do to solve this constitutional problem for the last 2 months, and at the last minute of the day, the Senate has delayed, delayed, and delayed. So what is really going on is they are not standing up and representing their people at home. We in this body owe it to the American people to represent their views, and the Senate will not even allow a vote to bring up a debate.

Mr. Speaker, I implore everyone back at home and in my district and across the country to ask your kids; ask your ninth graders, your college kids, ask everybody. It is fairly simple. The Congress and the Senate have to work together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. BRAT. I think the truth in ethics is often pretty easy to see. Go to your kids. Go to your ninth graders in high school civics class and ask them how these bodies are supposed to operate. Ask them to investigate.

I think when our kids go home and investigate and we investigate what has been going on in the last few months, they will find the answer, and that is that the Senate will not do its job in representing their people.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, thank you to my friend from Kentucky.

All right, for my friends on the left, you are going to support this unconstitutional expansion of power. When



there is a Republican President, are you going to sit there and continue to applaud, saying, "Yes, we did not support the separation of powers when we had the chance" and look the other way?

One of my heartbreaks here is I believe there were creative things we could have done, but we are completely devoid of the willingness to try.

Mr. Speaker, this is about trying to defend the U.S. Constitution that we all raised our hands to uphold, and yet are we going to allow a vote to go forward to walk away from that fight?

This should break everyone's heart in this body.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I want to look around this body. What are we asking to do? We are asking to fund DHS 100 percent. We are asking to put safeguards in there so that we don't move with an executive order that has been deemed illegal by a Federal judge. That is all we are asking. And we need to have that language in this bill.

I don't know anybody in here who doesn't want to fund DHS.

Mr. Speaker, for us to vote for this without that funding or without that language in there blocking what this President wants to do, and if we vote for that, we are voting against our Constitution. Article I, section 8 is very clear that we have the authority for naturalization, and I say we vote against funding without that safeguard.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, we are in this predicament and in this mess because of the unconstitutional and unilateral decisions from the President to ignore our Constitution, and the only thing standing in the way of that progressing is a stay from the courts. As thankful as I am for the courts, the reality is we must stand up and defend our Constitution. It is a constitutional issue, Mr. Speaker, and we have the responsibility to stand for that cause.

This is not a time to watch this body be obstructed from multiple attempts to make it dysfunctional. It is a constitutional issue. This is a time to stand upon the Constitution, and I urge this body to do so.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MASSIE. What order is the closing when there are three speakers and only one opposed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members in reverse order of opening speeches.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

We have no other speakers, and we are prepared to close.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky will be first to close.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the Congress and, in particular, the House of Representatives has the power of the purse. Our Constitution gives this power to the legislative branch, not the executive branch. This means that the President cannot fund his illegal executive actions on immigration unless we, the House of Representatives, let him.

If today we agree to just give the President all the taxpayer funds he wants so that he can implement his illegal actions, why should the American people ever trust us again? They will realize that all our bluster about border security is just that, bluster. They will realize that we don't actually care about the best interests of the American people and that, instead, we just care about going along to get along, even if that means going along with the unconstitutional and illegal actions of the executive branch.

Today we heard Mr. Netanyahu say this is the most powerful legislative organization in the world. I would say it is—except for when the Senate decides that it is not. We need to stand up, use the power of the purse, and exercise our constitutional duty to fund only legal and constitutional activities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote today in the best interests of the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to recede and concur, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the spirited debate we have had, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with many of the comments made by my colleague from Kentucky and the people that have spoken during his time. The problem is I don't see a path to victory with what they are looking at. What they want to do will not result in defunding the President's actions, because there is no funding in this bill for

the President's actions. There is no funding in this bill for the President's actions. Everybody knows that, don't we? What it will lead to is a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security. And that is not a victory. That is dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference of opinion between the Republicans and Democrats and between the administration and Congress as to whether the actions that the President made were constitutional or not.

I have actually voted for something in this body several years ago that I thought was perfectly legal and perfectly constitutional. The court later found out it was unconstitutional and told us it was unconstitutional. That is why you have a court. When there are differences of opinion as to what is constitutional and what is not constitutional, a court makes that determination. It has happened since the Founders who wrote our Constitution disagreed about what they had written—*Marbury v. Madison*. It was up to the courts to make the determination of what the Constitution said.

As for voting for this hurting our case—it is not our case; it is the Attorney General's case of the States—that is before the courts currently, if this voting to defund Homeland Security that doesn't have any funding for the President's action hurts our case, then I would say that any law that passes Congress can't be declared unconstitutional because we all voted for it. That is not reality. Again, let the courts do their job.

Now, it is true that a majority in this Congress and in the Senate voted to defund the President's actions, but because of the Senate rules, it didn't pass.

□ 1445

We didn't even get to go to conference because of the Senate rules. Some people suggest maybe we ought to change the Senate rules. We ought to insist that the Senate change their rules.

For the last 4, 8 years, I was kind of glad the Senate rules were the way they were. They prevented what I believed to be a lot of bad stuff from coming over here from the Senate.

I don't know that I would go that way because, remember, at some point in time in history—I hope it is not soon—but at some point in time in history, my party is going to be in the minority over there, and it is going to be nice to be able to control some of the agenda.

Let's remember, the underlying bill is a darn good bill, and we need to pass it, and we need to pass it for the security of the American people, and for the employees that work at the Department of Homeland Security, so that those that are considered essential don't have to go to work without

pay. That is irresponsible. That is us not doing our job.

I will fight with anyone, and I will stand on their side—as long as they can show me a path to potential victory. Let's get this bill passed. It is a good bill. I encourage all my colleagues to vote for this.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. I request a recorded vote—the yeas and nays—on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman asking for the yeas and the nays on ordering the previous question?

Mr. MASSIE. I withdraw that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request is withdrawn.

The previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 257, nays 167, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—257

Adams	Cohen	Fattah
Aguilar	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Ashford	Collins (NY)	Poster
Beatty	Comstock	Frankel (FL)
Becerra	Connolly	Frelinghuysen
Benishkek	Conyers	Fudge
Bera	Cooper	Gabbard
Beyer	Costa	Gallego
Bishop (GA)	Costello (PA)	Gibson
Bishop (MI)	Courtney	Graham
Blumenauer	Crowley	Granger
Boehner	Cuellar	Grayson
Bonamici	Cummings	Green, Al
Bost	Curbelo (FL)	Green, Gene
Boyle, Brendan F.	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Guinta
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Gutiérrez
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Hahn
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Hanna
Buchanan	Delaney	Hardy
Bustos	DeLauro	Hastings
Butterfield	DelBene	Heck (NV)
Calvert	Denham	Heck (WA)
Capps	Dent	Higgins
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Himes
Cárdenas	Deutch	Honda
Carney	Diaz-Balart	Hoyer
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Huffman
Carter (TX)	Doggett	Hurd (TX)
Cartwright	Dold	Israel
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael F.	Jackson Lee
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Jeffries
Chu, Judy	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Ciilline	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Clark (MA)	Ellmers (NC)	Jolly
Clarke (NY)	Emmer (MN)	Kaptur
Clay	Engel	Katko
Cleaver	Eshoo	Keating
Clyburn	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Coffman	Farr	Kennedy
		Kildee

Kilmer	Moulton	Scott (VA)
Kind	Murphy (FL)	Scott, David
King (NY)	Murphy (PA)	Serrano
Kinzing (IL)	Nadler	Sewell (AL)
Kirkpatrick	Napolitano	Sherman
Kline	Neal	Shimkus
Knight	Noem	Simpson
Kuster	Nolan	Sinema
Lance	Norcross	Sires
Langevin	Nunes	Slaughter
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Smith (NJ)
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Lawrence	Pascarella	Stefanik
Lee	Paulsen	Stivers
Levin	Payne	Swalwell (CA)
Lewis	Pelosi	Takai
Lieu, Ted	Perlmutter	Takano
Lipinski	Peters	Thompson (CA)
LoBiondo	Peterson	Thompson (MS)
Loeback	Pingree	Thompson (PA)
Lofgren	Pittenger	Tiberi
Lowenthal	Pitts	Titus
Lowe	Pocan	Tonko
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Poliquin	Torres
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Polis	Trott
Lynch	Price (NC)	Quigley
MacArthur	Rangel	Tsongas
Maloney, Carolyn	Reichert	Turner
Maloney, Sean	Rice (NY)	Upton
Matsui	Richmond	Valadao
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Van Hollen
McCaul	Ros-Lehtinen	Vargas
McCollum	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
McDermott	Royce	Vela
McGovern	Ruiz	Velázquez
McHenry	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
McMorris	Ryan (OH)	Walden
	Ryan (WI)	Walters, Mimi
	Sánchez, Linda T.	Walz
	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman Schultz
	Sarbanes	Waters, Maxine
	Scalise	Watson Coleman
	Schakowsky	Welch
	Schiff	Wilson (FL)
	Schock	Yarmuth
	Schrader	Young (IN)

NAYS—167

Abraham	Fortenberry	Lucas
Aderholt	Fox	Luetkemeyer
Allen	Franks (AZ)	Lummis
Amash	Garrett	Marchant
Amodei	Gibbs	Marino
Babin	Gohmert	Massie
Barletta	Goodlatte	McClintock
Barr	Gosar	McKinley
Barton	Gowdy	Meadows
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Messer
Bishop (UT)	Graves (LA)	Mica
Black	Graves (MO)	Miller (FL)
Blackburn	Griffith	Mooney (WV)
Blum	Grothman	Mullin
Boustany	Guthrie	Mulvaney
Brady (TX)	Harper	Neugebauer
Brat	Harris	Newhouse
Bridenstine	Hartzler	Nugent
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Olson
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Palazzo
Bucshon	Hice, Jody B.	Palmer
Burgess	Hill	Pearce
Byrne	Holding	Perry
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Poe (TX)
Chabot	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Chaffetz	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Clawson (FL)	Hultgren	Price, Tom
Collins (GA)	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Conaway	Hurt (VA)	Reed
Cook	Issa	Renacci
Cramer	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble
Crawford	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)
Crenshaw	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Roby
DeSantis	Jones	Rogers (AL)
DesJarlais	Jordan	Rohrabacher
Duffy	Joyce	Rokita
Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Duncan (TN)	King (IA)	Roskam
Farenthold	Labrador	Ross
Fincher	LaMalfa	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Lamborn	Rouzer
Fleming	Latta	Russell
Flores	Loudermilk	Salmon
Forbes	Love	Sanford

Schweikert	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Scott, Austin	Walberg	Wittman
Sensenbrenner	Walker	Womack
Sessions	Walorski	Woodall
Shuster	Weber (TX)	Yoder
Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)	Yoho
Smith (TX)	Wenstrup	Young (AK)
Stewart	Westerman	Young (IA)
Stutzman	Westmoreland	Zeldin
Thornberry	Whitfield	Zinke
Tipton	Williams	

NOT VOTING—9

Bass	Long	Rush
Garamendi	Meeks	Smith (MO)
Hinojosa	Roe (TN)	Speier

□ 1514

Messrs. BUCSHON and BRADY of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GRAYSON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 240 was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 109 I am a “yes” vote. I could not return from a White House meeting in time to meet the rollcall.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 108—“aye,” rollcall No. 109—“nay.”

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor on behalf of a lot of colleagues who can't be here right now and on behalf of our colleagues who are going to speak to talk about the budget of the United States Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon after our legislative business for the day because it is the concern of many of us—and perhaps it is the concern of all of us who ran for office, who got elected, who honorably serve in this body—to say—to make sure, perhaps—that our priorities are in order.

And, Mr. Speaker, if you simply look at any number of “debt clocks” that run on all kinds of different Web sites, including one that continues live in my office, you see perhaps—I hope it is clear to you, Mr. Speaker—that our priorities are not in order. We are over \$18 trillion in debt as I take the microphone right now.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the half of it. Over the next several decades we are scheduled to have over \$100 trillion in debt. And that is not acceptable. In fact, I can’t think of too many things that are more immoral than the present-day majority, than our present-day citizens leaving this burden to future citizens, people who do not yet exist. Talk about taxation without representation. But that is what we are faced with. That is what we do every day around here when our budget is not in balance and our priorities remain out of order.

To be clear, Mr. Speaker, we are able to get to this point, as very few other countries are, because of the fact we are the world’s reserve currency, because of the fact that we continue to be able to print money, and because of the fact that, despite all our problems, when compared in a relative fashion to all the other countries of the world, we simply aren’t as bad yet. But over time, that can very easily change, Mr. Speaker.

The solution to this isn’t all that complicated. We have to stop spending more than we take in. We have to keep growing our economy. We have to simplify our Tax Code so that it can actually generate more revenue than it is doing right now. Of course, we have to reform what is driving the debt, and that is our spending. That is what the Republicans—in this Chamber, at least—are trying to achieve. We are trying to put our priorities back in balance.

Washington doesn’t have a revenue problem, Mr. Speaker; Washington has a spending problem. In terms of revenue, we take in over \$2 trillion a year—and these are rough figures—but we spend generally over \$3 trillion. That is simply not sustainable. That simply can’t go on if we are to have any credibility on this issue and if we are going to remain a strong country, best of nations in the 21st century, and continue to win.

So the House Budget Committee, and specifically the Republicans on the House Budget Committee, are about getting our priorities in order. And frankly, to our credit, for the last 4 years, Mr. Speaker, we have done just that.

Every year since 2010, we have proposed balanced budgets that, if followed, would have led us on a path to prosperity, would have made it clear that we are best of class in the world again and the best investment going. All we had to do is take the steps out-

lined in that budget and it would have become so.

This year, we are going to try again. We are going to balance this budget. We are going to have a markup in a week or so. We are going to propose and present ideas to the American public. Most of these ideas they have seen before over the last 4 years. There may be some new ones. We are still writing our budget. We are still taking input from Members and non-Members alike.

But one thing the American people can count on: it will be an honest budget, it will be credible, it will balance, and it will fulfill the promise we explicitly and implicitly made over and again to future generations that their generation will be better off than the generation before it. Isn’t that what we are all about? Isn’t that what we are supposed to be about?

But as I speak with you here today, the facts tell a different story. In fact, the current generation is the first one in American history that is destined and will, by any objective measure, leave the next one worse off. It has never happened before in American history. It is happening now.

I know several of us on the Budget Committee refuse to let that happen on our watch, and so we come to you tonight with several ideas.

I want to first recognize a very good friend of mine, a professional who came from the private sector and practiced accounting as a certified public accountant for over 25 years. He has added tremendous value to all the work we are doing on the Budget Committee. Aside from budget issues, he is a tremendous asset to nearly every issue that is debated on the floor of the House. I yield the floor, Mr. Speaker, to my good friend, Congressman RICE of South Carolina.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding. South Carolina thanks you.

What an honor it is to stand here before this group to talk about the Federal budget. These were a couple of slides that were actually handed out to the Budget Committee that illustrate very wonderfully the challenge that we face.

The total revenue for the Federal Government for fiscal year 2014 is \$3.02 trillion, most of it from individual income taxes. And then social insurance is the payroll taxes we pay for Social Security and Medicare, and then we have the spending. You can compare the two.

Revenues are \$3.02 trillion. Spending is \$3.5 trillion. Our deficit is half a trillion dollars, roughly, projected this year. That sounds terrible. Of course, 3 years ago, just before I was elected to Congress, it was a \$1.4 trillion deficit. So it has, in fact, been cut well down. It is about 40 percent of what it was. And I will take all the credit for that.

Actually, it has come down dramatically. But we are still on an

unsustainable path, and it is projected to rise, largely because of demographics. The baby boomers are retiring, and the need for social insurance is going to rise in the coming decades. It will overwhelm us if we do not prepare for it.

Republicans, Democrats, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget, and any known economist will tell you that if we don’t deal with this issue, it will overwhelm us. We are on an unsustainable path. We are piling billions and billions of dollars in debt on our children and our grandchildren every year.

Right now, we stand at \$18 trillion in debt. On our current path, I believe the number \$25 trillion is what they are projecting at the end of 10 years if we don’t do something to deal with it.

If you look at the spending, you can see the red areas are what they call entitlement spending or mandatory spending. Social Security being the biggest part of that, and Medicare, Medicaid. Then interest on the debt is here at \$229 billion a year. And then other mandatory, which would be unemployment, welfare; the ObamaCare insurance subsidies will be in that. You can see that red area is about two-thirds of our total spending of \$3.5 trillion.

□ 1530

The blue area is what they call discretionary spending. Discretionary spending is the only part that Congress has a play or a say in every year. If you break that down further, the discretionary spending, defense is this part here in dark blue that is about half of it, and nondefense discretionary is the remainder.

Nondefense discretionary is the thing most people think of as government; the FBI, the CIA, the White House, the Department of the Interior, Park Service, EPA, Army Corps of Engineers, all these things are in nondefense discretionary. People think: Well, gosh, we should cut the Department of Education, we should cut the EPA.

Well, that is great. If you cut every dime of nondefense discretionary spending out of the budget, every cent of it, we would still have a deficit. If you eliminated every part other than defense, we would still have a deficit, so you see how severe the problem is.

Another thing people don’t understand is, because of the sequester, defense and nondefense discretionary have been whittled down over the last several years; and, in fact, nondefense discretionary spending is below 2008 levels right now.

It is as low as it has been since President Barack Obama has been in office because of the sequester spending. Defense spending has been cut to the bone. It is below levels that the Pentagon is telling us are necessary to

maintain our readiness in this troubled world.

Now, there is always waste, and there is always further room to cut. The point of all that is, with these things having been whittled as low as they have, it is very obvious that we will not be able to handle our budget problems.

We will never be able to reach a balanced budget unless we deal with this area in red, what is called mandatory spending, the entitlement programs. There is no way to fix this problem without dealing with those.

Now, you say: Well, why don't we just raise taxes? Right now, we are taking in, I believe it is, about 17 percent of our gross domestic product in tax revenues. It is more money in real dollars than this government has ever received.

We are getting more revenue than we ever have, and it is a higher percentage of our gross domestic product than has been received on average over the last 40 years. We are already at a higher level of revenue. Revenue is not the problem. The problem is that spending is out of control.

For the last 3 years, the House Committee on the Budget has issued its own budget. It has been called the Ryan budget. It has been called the House Committee on the Budget budget. It has been called the Path to Prosperity. That budget takes reasonable steps to balance the budget over a 10-year period.

Now, the President issued his own budget this year. The way this is supposed to work is the President is supposed to issue his budget by the end of January. This is the first time since he has been in office that he has actually done that. We actually got it on time.

The House is supposed to issue its budget, I think it is, about March 15th. It goes over to the Senate; they do their version. The House and the Senate conference, and then we send it to the President.

For the first time since the President has been in office, we are on track to actually have a budget. It is an amazing fact to me that, since President Barack Obama has been in office, we have not had a budget.

You can't run your household without a budget, you can't run a bakery without a budget, and here we are, trying to run the most complex institution on Earth without a budget. It is not just a lack of long-term planning; it is a lack of even planning for the current year. You have to have a budget.

Anyway, we are on track to have a budget. The House Committee on the Budget has put one out for the last 3 years. The President has issued his budget now. The House Committee on the Budget's budget over the last 3 years would have balanced in 10 years.

I anticipate we will do the same thing this year. We will put forth a

budget that has reasonable adjustments and balances in 10 years and stops piling mounds of debt on our children and our grandchildren.

The President's budget, on the other hand, increases spending from \$3.5 trillion a year to a little over \$4 trillion a year. It adds \$2 trillion in taxes over the next 10 years, and it never balances, ever. It continues to pile debt on our children and grandchildren. The House Committee on the Budget's budget doesn't raise taxes, and it does balance in 10 years.

This is the projection by the Congressional Budget Office—nonpartisan, not Democrat, not Republican—of the path that we are currently on. The cutoff of the blue area there is where we are today.

You can see with the demographics and with the burden that we are going to be placing on our social safety net and our entitlement programs—Social Security and Medicare—right now, where we are, if you look back in history—this goes back to 1941—never in the history of the United States has the debt as a percentage of our gross domestic product been as high as it is right now.

The debt is about 70 percent of our gross domestic product, the debt held by the public. The only other time that it was this high was in World War II.

We can adopt changes. We have time. We can adopt some modifications to bring this back under control; but, if we do not, you can see the mushrooming effect of the additional debt, interest rates climbing, the interest that we pay on our debt rising, the effect of the entitlement programs, running our debt to over 100 percent of our gross domestic product, which will make it difficult for us to recover from.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman, and I thank the gentleman for showing not only Members of Congress, but the American people, this chart that you have right there. I think you are hitting the nail on the head. This is exactly the problem.

If I could just add a few things to it?

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I wish you would.

Mr. ROKITA. Well, if you go back to World War II, the gentleman rightly points out, Mr. Speaker, you see that our debt level crescendoed, obviously as a result of that war.

What is different about that period in our history from our current situation is the fact that, as the gentleman knows, World War II, one way or the other, was going to be a one-time event.

Thankfully, because of this country's courage and the men and women who served for our country, it ended the right way. As a result, the event ended, and we immediately began paying down our debt.

Some might say: Well, we have been there before. What is different this

time? Why can't we solve the problem this time?

Well, we can solve the problem because, number one, we are Americans, but what makes the situation different, Mr. Speaker, and what the gentleman alludes to is what is driving our debt.

What drove the debt in World War II, again, was a one-time event. What is driving the debt now is not scheduled to end, has no end really in sight, unless we reform the programs that are driving it. That is one of the things that is strikingly different in terms of the current path we are on from where we have been before, and that is why we have to arrest what is driving the debt, and that is our social entitlement programs.

There is also another difference between now and World War II, and it is exemplified in this chart that I have, and that is who owns our debt. Of course, back in World War II, the gentleman will remember the bond posters that you could see all over the country, where we asked our private citizens to finance the war.

Now, as you can see from this chart, the people we are asking to finance our debt not only are our own citizens but—increasingly and alarmingly more so—other countries, who by the very definition of being other nations don't have our best interests top of mind.

That makes this a very different situation as well. We are increasingly, over time, becoming beholden to other countries to finance our spending problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue yielding to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. ROKITA, were you aware that by the year 2030, according to CBO's projections, that our spending just on Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and our interest, just those four things will take up the entire revenue of the United States Government, leaving nothing for other mandatory programs, like welfare, like unemployment, like food stamps, like all those things?

It will also leave nothing for other discretionary spending like the FBI, like the Park Service, like border security, and like the CIA; but even more importantly, it will leave nothing for defense, nothing for the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, nothing to buy the first bullet.

By 2030, just those four programs—Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and the interest on our debt—will take up every dime that the United States Government brings in if we don't change something.

Now, the President's budget adds \$2 trillion in taxes, but it adds even more than that in spending. What does he spend the money on? It is a lot of additional programs. He adds a little bit to defense, he adds a little bit across the

board to other discretionary, but he throws in a lot of other programs—for example, his proposal to pay for community college, which is a nice idea, a wonderful idea—but the problem is that we can't pay for the promises we have made already.

Mr. Speaker, shouldn't we, before we make new promises, find a way to pay for the promises that we have already made?

The President's budget, in addition to more taxes, more spending, and more government programs, it is just another big growth of government, which we have seen over and over again during this administration. From Dodd-Frank to ObamaCare and other things, you have seen a huge explosion in government.

Now, what has the effect of that been? The President loves to say, Mr. Speaker, that he is for the middle class, but I want to show you an interesting graph.

This blue line here going down is the median household income in the United States. This is the middle class that the President is always saying he is for. You can see from 2008—when he took office—until today, that blue line has gone down 8.7 percent.

Median household income in the country has dropped 8.7 percent—more government programs, bigger government, more intrusion on government in your life, more intrusion of government in our national economy—and you can see the stifling effect that it has on our economy.

I think we had 2 percent growth last quarter. Here we are, 7 years after the Great Recession. We should have had a huge snapback. All we are doing is muddling along, trying to swallow this giant addition of Big Government that is being created. Middle class income is down 8.7 percent.

Look at this, Mr. Speaker. This purple line here represents the consumer price index for medical care. Over that same time, it is up over 10 percent. This red line represents the consumer price index for gasoline, which is now turning down, but it is still above where the President took office.

This green line is the consumer price index for food and beverages because, you see, gasoline and heating oil and electricity all go into the cost of food. You have to fertilize it, you have to prepare the seed, you have to transport it. All those things go into the cost of food.

So, you see, food has gone up 20 percent, gasoline has gone up 10 percent, health care has gone up 15 percent—all these additional costs on the middle class.

□ 1545

At the same time, the median household income has dropped by 8.7 percent. When the President gets up and talks about how the stock market is doing

and how the economy has recovered, I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, you can look at this chart and very easily see why the average middle class family doesn't feel it. They don't agree with it.

The President's proposed budget, by adding more taxes and more government programs, will do nothing but exacerbate this problem, the middle class squeeze. We are going to squeeze the middle class until there is nothing left. I cringe when the President says he is for the middle class. Don't listen to what he says; look at what he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in the House Budget Committee's budget that balances in 10 years, that makes responsible adjustments to our social safety net, that makes responsible adjustments to our discretionary programs, and that brings our budget into balance in 10 years.

When I came to Congress, I thought our debt was the biggest problem we faced. I no longer believe that. I know we can handle it. I have been through the budget committee. All we have to do is start now to make responsible adjustments. The longer we wait, the more difficult it becomes.

My tenure in Congress is and will continue to be focused on American competitiveness. I think we have given away a lot of our competitive edge to the rest of the world. I think, if we decide we want to compete, that nobody can stop us. The only people stopping us is us.

We have tied a noose of tax and regulation around our own neck, and we are running our businesses and our jobs overseas. That is my focus. We cannot fix this problem with our budget unless we have growth, and the way to increase growth is to increase our competitive status in the world.

This is a list of things created by a Harvard economist and a good friend named Michael Porter. He has been to Congress more than once. He has talked to over 100 Congressmen about how to make this country more competitive.

These are eight items. One of them is—in fact, the most important one is to create a sustainable Federal budget because you see, my friends, without a sustainable budget—now, you remember, the Office of Management and Budget that works for the White House says we are on an unsustainable course. Congressional Budget Office, we are on an unsustainable course.

Step number one to make this country competitive and to bring jobs back to this country: create a responsible Federal budget. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the President's budget fails miserably in that regard. Just as his policies are failing the middle class miserably, this budget will make us less competitive in the world.

Second, it says simplify the corporate Tax Code. Simplify and streamline regulation. The House budget as-

sumes many of these things that make this country more competitive in adopting its budget.

Mr. ROKITA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman again. The gentleman hits the nail right on the head. Middle class economics is a term, and it is just that.

Watch what the President does to see how he affects the middle class.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Not what he says.

Mr. ROKITA. Not what he says, exactly right.

I also want to draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to what the gentleman said on his poster board there about the eighth point, create a sustainable Federal budget, and the gentleman talked very articulately about the need for that.

It seems obvious, quite frankly, I would think, to every American family that must do this inside the walls of their own dwellings, but for some reason, it escapes the Federal Government.

I draw the House's attention, the Speaker's attention, to the wording that appears after that comma. It says, "including entitlement reform"—"create a sustainable budget, including entitlement reform." We touched on this a little bit earlier in the hour that we have.

At this point, I am worried, Mr. Speaker, that some who are watching this discussion may think: Well, wait a minute. Wait a minute. I put my hard-earned money into these programs, being Medicare and Social Security, primarily, every 2 weeks or whenever my paycheck comes, and I see the government taking out a lot, and that is my money. That is my property. What is Congress thinking? What are these two gentleman from South Carolina and Indiana and others who are going to speak here in a minute saying when they said entitlement reform? I put in; therefore, I should get out.

I want to take just a minute to address that because, of course, in a very real sense, that is what every working American has done. In another equally real and more important sense, we haven't. We haven't, and that is what is driving our debt.

Now, the gentleman had a pie graph up earlier that easily showed—and he will put it back up—the fact that most of our spending at the Federal Government level is on programs that are on autopilot. Right?

We, as Congressmen, can't vote on these priorities through the budget mechanism itself. We have to affect the underlying law. That is to say Congressman RICE and Congressman ROKITA don't get to determine, through the budget process, year after year, what someone's Social Security check

is going to be, what Medicare services people are going to get or not get. That is not done necessarily through the budget.

We talked about the need to reform those programs in the budget document, but it is not done through the budget language only. You have to reform that underlying law. Two-thirds of our budget, again, as the chart shows, is on autopilot. It goes year after year and gets worse after worse, and that is what is driving our debt.

Now, to my point about have we paid for those programs or not, this is a chart that describes the average American working couple. This is a Medicare example, so this is not Social Security. This is Medicare.

It shows that a couple making a combined \$71,500 a year, on average, over a lifetime, has put in roughly about 30 percent of what they are taking out of Medicare.

Let me say that again. They are putting in 30 percent. We are putting in, the average American couple, putting in 30 percent of what we are going to take out of Medicare. The rest, Mr. Speaker, goes on the deck, and that is the crux of the problem.

If you go to the second set of bars, you see that the problem only gets worse, as a percentage of the amount we are putting in is only going to go down. That is what makes this a moral situation, a moral case that we are making the children of tomorrow pay, so that we can have more on our plate now, quite frankly.

It is just not Medicare. Social Security is in a much better position than this, but it is on the same trend. It is not just our health care and our social entitlement programs. It is the highway trust fund, for example, which I hope we address, not only in our budget document, but throughout this Congress. To date, the President hasn't done that. So that is really the problem here.

I yield briefly back to my good friend from South Carolina, Congressman RICE, and then move swiftly to Mr. WOMACK from the great State of Arkansas.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. In closing, my friend, I just wanted to point out what the House Budget Committee does to bring the budget within balance within 10 years, and it is not all this but three major things.

One, it repeals ObamaCare, which costs \$2.1 trillion over the next 10 years.

Two, it initiates what is called premium support for Medicare, what you are just talking about, and it doesn't do away with Medicare, and it doesn't affect anybody who is either retired or retiring within 8 years.

What it does for people that are outside that window, Medicare is still offered, and they will allow four other in-

surance companies to bid for Medicare coverage.

The government won't pay for the cheapest; it will pay for the second cheapest. If you want to buy a cheaper policy, you can, but it brings private industry in it. If you want to buy a cheaper policy, you can, and you will get money.

If you want to buy a more expensive policy, you can, and you will have to pay a little bit more for it. That is a huge savings in Medicare and something that we have to do.

So premium support for Medicare, repeal ObamaCare, and, third, it doesn't cut discretionary spending, defense and nondefense, but it slows the growth a little. Those three things go 80 percent of the way to bringing our budget within balance within 10 years.

Let me tell you, my friends, we don't have a choice. We are piling debt on our children and grandchildren. CBO, OMB, they will all tell you, Social Security trust fund, it will be broke in 2030 or thereabouts. Medicare trust fund will be broke in 2030 or thereabouts.

You know the problem with Federal trust funds? They are not funded, and you can't trust them. Other than that, they are great.

Mr. ROKITA, I appreciate you allowing me to participate in this.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

The gentleman is exactly right. If we act now, no one who is on or near to be on any of these programs has to be affected. We can easily take care of the promises that were made and that these folks, again, who are on these programs or near to be on these programs have rightly relied on, and that is because we are still the world's reserve currency. We are not Greece.

If we make these reforms now, we are talking about the reforms affecting folks a generation ago, those in my age bracket or younger, who would have time to prepare for the new situation.

People who are having kids today, who will live probably past 100, they will have the time, under a new program that reflects the realities of living in the 21st century and, frankly, how long we live in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a good friend of mine, the former mayor of Rogers, Arkansas, a decorated military officer who is also a great friend and a great leader in this Congress.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman, first of all, for his great leadership on this subject.

The gentleman from the Hoosier State and I came in together. Back in 2010, we were elected to this Congress, and I can't speak necessarily for the gentleman, I can only speak for myself, but I would almost bet that my friend from Indiana would agree that we came up here to tackle the Nation's biggest problems.

Mr. Speaker, the Framers of our country were visionaries. They got it right on the formation of the country and the established government that guides our every decision. They not only had the foresight to establish constitutional principles and processes that addressed the challenges of the day, but that sustain and guide our Nation now 2¼ centuries later.

What you have just heard in the last few minutes, and I have been witness to the presentation made by my friend from South Carolina, with commentary from the gentleman from Indiana, I am going to present many of the same arguments in the time that I have before you today because I think they are worth repeating, and my chart may show it a little bit differently.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress and was immediately placed on the Appropriations Committee. As a member of that committee, one of my jobs is to look after the discretionary piece of the Federal budget. As has already been mentioned, the discretionary piece of the Federal budget is getting squeezed.

There was a time in the not too distant past that discretionary spending was the largest share of spending and, as was mentioned by my friend from South Carolina, things that you recognize your Federal Government for. He articulated a number of those.

When you look at this particular chart, this end of the chart would represent 1962. The other end of the chart is just about 3 years from now, in 2018, you can see—in case you have trouble seeing, let me just go through the color coding here.

The purple at the top is the amount of money that we have to pay, year in and year out, to service our debt. Those of you at home, Mr. Speaker, that have a credit card bill that comes in every month, there will be a category there or a block there that says minimum payment due.

The minimum payment is usually the reflection of interest due on that account and not necessarily a reduction in the principle amount owed. That is exactly what this purple is. That is the minimum payment due, year and in and year out, that we have to make in order to satisfy the creditors, the people that have given money to this country, loaned money to this country for governmental purposes.

□ 1600

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, this chart shows that that area in purple has grown through the years. It tightened up a little bit back a few years ago. But now, if you look at that last piece of it, from right here, you will notice that it is taking a dip. And if we extended that chart out for many more years, it gets progressively worse.

The next color is red, and that is the reflection of mandatory spending,

talked about by the gentleman before me, that constitutes how much money we have to spend year in and year out to pay for the programs that people all across this country are entitled to. The biggest driver of the long-term consequences of mandatory spending would be Medicare. There are many charts that will show you the glide path Medicare is on.

Mr. Speaker, something happened last night at midnight that affects the ongoing cost of that piece of mandatory spending. That is, 11,000 people celebrated a birthday as we rolled into the new day; 11,000 people aged into that program. Now, Mr. Speaker, tonight at midnight, something else is going to happen that is going to influence the growth of that area in red; and that is, another 11,000 people, or thereabouts, are going to age into this program that they automatically qualify for when they turn 65. Thankfully, more and more people are living well beyond 65, and I am glad for that.

If you look at that red, coupled with the purple, you can see that since 1962, it has commanded a much larger share of Federal spending, and it is putting a tremendous squeeze on the programs that people like me, as an appropriator, have to work with to fund the other essential forms of government.

In fact, I have a lot of people say to me when I go home: You know, Mr. WOMACK, you are an appropriator. You are in charge of all this spending. You ought to be able, with your vote and with your leadership on that committee, you ought to be able to see that the books of the Federal Government are balanced.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the last two colors—the green, which is nondefense spending, and the blue, which represents defense discretionary spending—these two colors have gotten smaller and smaller and smaller, so small now that they represent about a third of our spending. And you do the math.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROKITA. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for raising what I think is such a fundamental point with regard to government spending. It really raises the crossroads I think that we are at as a society. Because in my mind, I keep going out to about 2025, which you well illustrate on that chart. And at that point, we are only going to have enough money for interest and entitlements and nothing else, without either raising taxes substantially, cutting benefits substantially, or running very large deficits going forward. And ultimately, there comes a point of no return, as you correctly point out with your charts, wherein the world financial markets won't lend you anymore.

So I think you are on to a remarkably important theme, and I think it underscores the degree to which we are going to have an important debate in this Chamber in really the next month because what the President has essentially said is that I am not going to deal with this.

If you look fundamentally at the White House budget, at the core, it abandons this notion of financial discipline. I mean, it adds \$2.2 trillion of new taxes. It adds \$8.5 trillion of new debt. It goes from running structural \$500 billion deficits to \$1.1 trillion deficits, with no end in sight to the deficits that continue to grow.

So this theme that you are getting on with regard to the mandatory component and the interest component of government spending I don't think can be underscored enough. And I don't want to interrupt you, but it just hit me as you were talking.

Mr. WOMACK. Well, I am glad the gentleman did interrupt.

And to carry our colloquy just a little bit further, the gentleman from South Carolina is a former Governor of South Carolina, so he has had some experience dealing with balanced budgets and having to live within your means, as a former chief executive of a State, one of the 50 States in our country. So you have a great appreciation for how important it is to be able to craft budgets that live within your means and address the major drivers of what could be deficit spending at the State level.

Mr. SANFORD. Just on that point, though, it is so interesting that ultimately it is not just about balancing budgets, because I think that a lot of people from across this country look at the carrying on and the going on of Congress, and they say, You know, it is about green eye shades, and it is about trying to balance some numbers. No. It is about sustaining this Republic.

Admiral Mike Mullen, when asked, What is the biggest threat to the American society? he didn't answer "China," he didn't answer "Russia." His answer was: The biggest threat to the American way of life is the national debt.

If you were to look at a whole host of different folks across recent history—I mean, Paul Kennedy wrote I think an excellent book entitled "The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers," and its premise was that economic supremacy was the precursor to military supremacy, for a civilization to be able to continue to project force.

I think it is so interesting that the Prime Minister of Israel was here earlier today. We heard Prime Minister Netanyahu lay out his concerns with regards to some things happening in the Middle East. But America's variability, whether it is in engaging with an ally like Israel or whether it is engaging in a whole host of other conflicts that are innumerable and guaran-

teed across the next 25 years or so, our ability to impact those things will be driven, frankly, by these economic numbers.

I think it has been maligned, but Reinhart and Rogoff, a professor from the University of Maryland and a professor from Harvard, wrote a book entitled, "This Time Is Different." They chronicled 800 years of financial history, and there have been some questions about how they got to some of their numbers. But the larger premise was in that title, "This Time is Different."

What you are pointing out is that, no, it is never different; math always works. And there is something fundamental about our civilization's need for not just a balanced budget for balanced budget's sake but to be able to sustain our ability to project power and maintain a way of life that we love, I think, that is underlined in these very charts that you are showing.

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, I just want to say, before I go to my next chart, that this isn't an option for us, to allow this to continue on this path without the interaction of this Congress and solutions offered by this Congress, many of which are going to be big deals because when you get this far along into a problem, the solutions to the problem get much larger. They are going to require a lot more political courage. But we have to address it because if we don't, in just a few years beyond the 2018 timeframe that this chart shows, there will be no money left for the items that you see in green and blue.

And let me hasten to remind you that the items in blue are national defense.

Mr. SANFORD. On that point, I love keeping strange jotted notes in my office.

Again, the number that you are getting at—because you are now touching on national defense—you know, Habsburg defaulted on all or part of its debt 14 times between 1557 and 1696. Pre-revolutionary France saw 62 percent of its royal revenue going to interest payments alone. Britain, between World War I and World War II, saw interest payments climb to 44 percent of the British budget. In the Ottoman Empire, interest payments and amortization rose from 15 percent of its budget in 1860 to 50 percent in 1875.

In other words, this music has been played before with disastrous consequences, and that is why I think it is relevant.

Keynes actually quoted Lenin, of all folks, and Lenin's quote was this: "There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose."



What you are laying out with the chart which you so appropriately lay before the Congress is the very formula that Lenin, himself, was talking about in things that will challenge not only defense but the way in which a government sustains itself.

Mr. WOMACK. I appreciate the gentleman's perspective.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to show you this one.

I was fortunate to get elected in 2010 by a significant majority of the people in the Third District of Arkansas. I consider that area of our State to be the most dynamic in all of our State. It has got a lot going for it. It has got great jobs, great health care, wonderful educational institutions, effective governments, the University of Arkansas Razorbacks. I mean, there are a lot of great things you can say about the area that I represent. And it is different than a lot of places around our country, I will submit to that.

While I made a promise to the people that elected me, the biggest promise that I made, the one that I hold closest to my heart and the promise that drives all of the decisions that I make, particularly to my friends that have joined me here in the Chamber today regarding budgets, deficits, debt, long-term spending, and those kinds of things, are the promises I made to these two young men right here. This is Liam. He is 8. And that is Kaden. Kaden is not even 2 yet. They are cousins. These are my grandkids.

When I look into the eyes of these two precious little boys, I see the innocence of youth, but I also see something that they can't see. I see a tremendous burden that is growing every day, every week, every year that these two kids have had nothing to do in creating, and that is a mountain of debt and interest payments for borrowed money that go as far as the eye can see.

Mr. SANFORD. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. WOMACK. I will.

Mr. SANFORD. Again, I think you are capturing, in essence, the totality of this debate because there is a guy up at the University of Boston called Laurence Kotlikoff, and he wrote a book called "The Coming Generational Storm." Its premise is really built around your two grandkids because he says that the imputed tax for a child born into America today is about 84 percent, 84 percent.

I mean, our civilization won't work. A market-based economy doesn't work with an 84 percent tax rate. Yet that is what he said is coming those two young children's way in the event that nothing is done to change the course and the trajectory of the way that Washington is spending money. He says that the total debt really amounts to around \$200 trillion. So it hit me, as I was looking into your two grand-

children's eyes there in the photograph.

Mr. WOMACK. I want to give you some perspective before I close, Mr. Speaker.

The only budget that we have laying out there right now is the President's budget. It arrived on time. It never balances—never—and continues to add a lot of taxes and a lot of debt and a lot of interest burdens on the generations of these two kids right here.

But here is what is inescapable: the net interest on the debt that we will pay this year—and I might need some help on this, Mr. ROKITA—I think it is around \$250 billion?

Mr. ROKITA. Yes.

Mr. WOMACK. Around \$250 billion. It is a lot of money. We could build a lot of roads and bridges, educate a lot of people, pay for a lot of things with that \$250 billion, give or take.

The President's budget, if you rolled it out for 10 years, in the 10-year window before this young man can vote and before this young man turns 12, the net interest on the debt will rise to \$785 billion a year. That is not a sustainable path, and that is why I was pleased to accept the appointment to the Budget Committee as one of the three appropriators assigned to this committee. That is why I enjoy the work that I do. That is why I appreciate so much my friend from Indiana, my friend from Georgia, my friend from South Carolina, and the others that will parade down here and talk about these issues. They are the most serious things that affect domestic America today.

And out of deference to these two young men and to their parents—Will and Amanda, and Kayle and Philip—it is my hope and my prayer that we will find the courage to support the solutions, as large as they may be, to save America's next greatest generation.

□ 1615

Mr. ROKITA. Well, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, you see why he was elected mayor of Rogers, Arkansas. You see why he has been a leader in our U.S. military, and you see how and why he leads on the floor of this House.

I want to, again, thank Congressman TOM RICE from South Carolina for speaking today, and Congressman MARK SANFORD, former Governor of South Carolina, now Congressman of the First District, for speaking today. Again, I thank Congressman STEVE WOMACK.

With the time we have remaining, I yield to a good friend of mine who came in at the same time as STEVE WOMACK and I in a wave of 87 new Congresspersons, the new crew, as I call it, my good friend, ROB WOODALL, also a member of the Budget Committee, to put some icing over what we have learned over the past hour.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend from Indiana for yielding, and I appreciate

his leadership. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you have thought about it—you have not been in this institution very long. You came here with a lot of hopes and dreams. The gentleman from Indiana, the vice chairman of the Budget Committee, has been here 4 years. He has been here 4 years. What I have loved about this institution the 4 years I have served here is that what was once a seniority-based institution, what was once if you could just hold on to your little piece of power long enough, you might one day rise to a place where you can be influential.

When we came in that big class of 2010 and a new leadership structure was swept in here, folks said: No more. They said: We want to find folks who have talents and skills and who have the ability to lead, and we are going to put them in places where they can do that. I am so proud the gentleman from Indiana is able to fill that role for me. I sit on the Budget Committee, too, and I get to take advantage of his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas was down here earlier, and I don't think I am telling secrets out of school—I am sure the vice chairman will correct me if I am—but he raised his hands in one of these closed-door meetings and he said: I want to do the big things. I want to do the big things. I don't want to nibble around the edges. I don't want to just rearrange the dollars here and there. He said: I want to solve the problem once and for all, and I will do whatever it takes to make that happen.

I know that has always been the philosophy that the gentleman from South Carolina has brought to bear, that I want to do the big things. Let the political chips fall where they may. It is a funny thing. It turns out, Mr. Speaker, that if you do the right things for the right reasons, sometimes elections take care of themselves. You can spend all your time worrying about elections or you can worry about doing the right thing for the right reason.

Mr. Speaker, I brought this chart here so you can see it, too. The blue line charts the revenue in this country. The red line charts the spending in this country. It is there as a percentage of GDP. There is no set of circumstances where revenue will ever match spending, Mr. Speaker. The President didn't provide that leadership; my friend from Indiana is. That is why I am so proud to be on the floor with you today.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### THE BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California

(Mr. COSTA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, my name is Congressman JIM COSTA from Fresno, California. Since I was first elected over 10 years ago, I have been a member of the Blue Dog caucus. This afternoon, members of the Blue Dog caucus that stretch the width and the breadth of this great country of ours are going to speak about what brings us together, about the passions that they have and the people that they advocate for and why they believe that their efforts at being a constructive and a very positive member of the Blue Dog caucus adds value to their ability to represent their constituencies and to the vision that I think we, as Americans, all share together, which is to make our Congress, to make our representative democracy, a more functioning system. Because clearly today, the American public, in poll after poll after poll, demonstrate their frustration with the inability of the United States Congress to come together and to work on common solutions for our country, solutions that share our common values but also involve the art, the art of the political compromise, too often I believe an art that has become lost here in our Nation's Capital in Washington, D.C.

So among the first of the members of our caucus that will speak is the gentlewoman from Arizona's Ninth District, KYRSTEN SINEMA, a colleague of mine who always is advocating for her constituency in the most positive ways.

Ms. SINEMA. Thank you, Mr. COSTA, and thank you today for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important opportunity for us to come together and show how bipartisanship can fix our broken system.

At home in Arizona, I hear from everyone that Washington is broken. There is too much time spent playing political games and too little time spent working together to get things done. Most people are sick and tired of Congress' failing to do its job because of partisan politics. That is why I joined the Blue Dog Coalition, because they prioritize the people they represent more than their party leadership.

Everybody knows that Congress is not working effectively, and the Blue Dogs are trying to change that. They are focused on ending political polarization, reforming Congress, stopping reckless government spending, and creating economic opportunity for Americans who have been left behind by this recession.

Mr. Speaker, I come to work every single day to get things done for Arizona. I have a proven record of reaching out to members of both political parties to find common ground on

issues ranging from jobs and the economy to reducing spending and government waste. As a cofounder of the United Solutions Caucus and a No Labels Problem Solver, I have worked with members of both parties to get things done. At home, Congressman MATT SALMON and I work together to help Arizona veterans get the care they deserve, and I have worked with Congressman MICHAEL MCCAUL to introduce legislation that puts an end to automatic pay raises for Members of Congress.

Neither party is always right. In fact, both parties are often wrong. It is time for us to listen to each other and work together to grow our economy, help our country's families, and honor our veterans. Recently, we came together to pass bipartisan legislation to prevent veteran suicide and improve access to mental health care and health services for veterans. Just this week, we agreed on legislation to expand college savings plans and make higher education a reality for students and their families. We need more of these kinds of accomplishments in Congress.

In Arizona, the voters established an independent redistricting commission that allows for an open and transparent process and creates competitive districts where neither party has a monopoly. We Blue Dogs have proposed similar reforms to create impartial, fairly drawn districts across the country to cut back on the polarization that cripples our system.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve leaders who do whatever it takes to come up with practical, common-sense solutions that help us move forward. It is time for us to focus on areas of common ground and come up with real answers to our country's most pressing problems. So let's put aside the finger pointing and the fighting. Let's roll up our sleeves and get back to work.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, our next Blue Dog colleague who will speak is a gentleman whom I have served with both in the California State Legislature as well as here in Congress. He and I are good friends. We both represent wonderful parts of California, and he is one of the longer serving members in the Blue Dog caucus, the gentleman from northern California, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON from California's Fifth District.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman, and my friend, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Members, I came down to the floor this afternoon to join my Blue Dog colleagues in calling for all of us in Congress to come together and do the work that we have been asked to do, the work that we have been sent to Washington, sent to Congress to do on behalf of the people that we represent.

I came to Congress to get things done, to get things done for the people that I represent, and to get things done for the great country that we are all so privileged to live in and to participate in.

As Mr. COSTA mentioned, he and I served together in the State legislature in California, and I am very proud of the work that we did there. We were able to get a lot of things done. In the time that I was there, the majority of the time, I chaired the Senate Budget Committee. That was one of the reasons why I was so proud to be a Blue Dog, although the common thread that holds all Blue Dogs together is the issue of fiscal responsibility.

In my time in Sacramento chairing the Budget Committee, we always had a balanced budget. Fiscal responsibility was important, and it is equally as important here in Congress. Nobody likes the fact that we have huge deficits or huge debts. We understand that some things are unavoidable, but there has to be an understanding of and an intentional effort on the part of all us to make sure that we are fiscally responsible and that we manage that debt, we manage that deficit, and we bring it down to a level that won't burden our children and our grandchildren in the years to come.

So I was stunned when I came to Congress and found out that it was very, very difficult to get anything done, to get people to work together. As JIM pointed out, I am one of the longer serving Members, so I was stunned a long time ago in what you can probably refer to today as "the good old days," when we were actually able to work together and get things done, but we didn't have a high level of that cooperation even back then.

Last week, I was with the Aspen Institute on a trade conference. Anybody who is familiar with them knows that they are able to bring together a bipartisan and bicameral representation of Congress, Members from the Senate and Members from the House, Democrats and Republicans. They also bring together some of the most famous scholars to talk about whatever the issue of the conference is. I was struck, at this trade conference, when one of the new Members that we serve with, now starting his sophomore term, after the scholars spoke and he was recognized, said: I came to Congress to involve myself in this type of problem solving, when people came together, talked about issues, talked about problems, and talked about solutions. He said: And this is the first time since I have been here that we have been able to engage in that type of dialogue.

That is not right, Members, and we all know that. We are here to work on the problems that face our great country, and we need to get down and do that work.

Mr. COSTA. I appreciate your explaining your experience in the California Legislature because we not only worked together in a bipartisan fashion, but we also worked together with the lower house and the State senate, because you could never get anything done if you didn't work together with both houses. Of course, that is part of our problem here today.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. That is how the legislative process works. You don't just punt something over to the other Chamber and then say, "We have done our job"; because you haven't done your job until the President, in the case of Congress, signs his name on the line making that bill or that job come to fruition, making it the law.

You are right. In the State capitol, we did that. We knew we had to work together because the same piece of legislation had to pass both houses and had to meet there for the Governor's signature in order to become law. The same thing happens here.

I know it can be done. One of the things that I did in some of my earlier years here, Mr. Speaker, is I was successful in getting a wilderness bill passed, a wilderness bill that protected into perpetuity 350,000 acres in my district in California. Wilderness bills have passed before, so that, in itself, was not the biggest thing that has ever happened here. But I am particularly proud because I was in the minority then.

The chair of Natural Resources was Richard Pombo from California, someone whom I consider a friend, although not a political ally. He was not someone who was favorable to approving wilderness legislation. But I worked with him and his committee. He had the bill up in for a markup. We had it on the floor. We passed it. I compromised; he compromised. That bill went through the House. The companion bill went through the Senate, as Mr. COSTA was explaining has to be done, and it went to then-President George W. Bush, who signed it into law.

So it is incongruent with the way we work today. Today you would just start by saying: An unfriendly chairman, an unfriendly President, we can't get anything done. That is just absolutely not true.

If we come together and if we work together, we can find solutions to the problems that we face. There are any number of issues that need to come together and need to be put on this floor for a vote. You can look at immigration reform, tax reform, gun violence prevention, and certainly one that everyone can agree with is an infrastructure bill.

□ 1630

There is not a person that any one of us represents who doesn't know that

we need to invest in America's infrastructure—in our roads, in our highways, in our broadband, in our overpasses, in our bridges. And now with the new Panama Canal coming on line and the bigger ships coming into this country, we have huge investments that need to be made in our ports and our harbors. These are investments that not only put Americans to work generating more revenue, but put better jobs and make our economy stronger than it has ever been before.

I submit, Members, that these are things that we can do. As has been said before, the things that bring us together, the things that bring us together as Americans, are far greater than the things that divide us. I will plead, let's get together, let's roll up our sleeves, let's work together on addressing the major issues that face America.

I thank you, Mr. COSTA, for bringing us here today.

Mr. COSTA. I thank the Congressman from California.

Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, I think, expressly indicated why he is a Blue Dog and, over the years, his efforts to bridge the gap, to reach across the aisle, to get something done; because he recognizes, as do all of us Blue Dogs, that the political dysfunction that is occurring here in our Nation's Capital is real. It has measurable costs, and it is preventing our country, sadly, from solving the problems that our constituents send us here to solve, whether it is the economic recovery that could be stronger, whether it is fixing our Nation's deficit, whether it is fixing a broken immigration system, or an array of other issues that are pressing, that are important to the people back home.

The next gentleman who would like to address our Congress is the gentleman from the great State of Illinois, Congressman DAN LIPINSKI, my colleague and classmate from Illinois' Third District.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. COSTA for putting this together today.

The reason I came to Congress, the reason I ran for Congress, was to get things done. I think that is what all our constituents are expecting us to do.

Unfortunately, when I am at home, I am constantly reminded that my constituents are wondering why we don't get more done, what is happening in Washington. When I am shopping at Menards or at Jewel, people come up to me and say: Why can't everyone work together there in Washington?

They know that I have been doing that. That is why I am part of the Blue Dog coalition, because we want to bring people together here in Washington—in the House, the Senate—bring everyone together to work out the many, many problems that our Nation has.

We just had Mr. THOMPSON talking about a transportation bill. Everyone talks about the need to fix our transportation infrastructure. We have roads and bridges that are crumbling. Our public transit also has infrastructure that is crumbling. We all need a good transportation system to get wherever we need to go during the day.

Our Nation, for the sake of having an efficient economy, needs a good transportation system. We can put people to work immediately fixing our transportation system, yet we haven't been able to come together to solve this problem. That is one thing that we need to do, and it is something I think that we can do.

We have just seen all the trouble that we had run into here with the Homeland Security bill, an issue that should be easy. We all want to protect our homeland. We all know the threats that we are facing. And although we may have disagreements on many issues, protecting our Nation is not one of those. Yet, unfortunately, we do run into issues, and we really need to instead focus on what can we work together on and what is possible.

We have a divided government now. It used to be that after an election, everyone would come together, look around and say: Okay. This is who is the majority in the House, the majority in the Senate, who is in the White House. What can we agree upon? How can we work together to solve problems? Where can we find our agreement? Instead, we seem to focus on how our party can get control of everything in the next election. Mr. Speaker, this is not the way that the American people want us to work. They want us to come together.

Now, some of the previous speakers talked about electoral reform and redistricting reform. Those can certainly help. Those are things that we support and that the Blue Dogs are working to get done. But even before we get those things done, we can work together and accomplish great things here. The American people aren't demanding that of us. They are demanding that we change the way that Washington is working right now. That is what the Blue Dogs are doing.

That is the only way we are going to be able to face so many of the problems that we face, including the issue that is really at the heart of the Blue Dogs, has always been, and continues to be: dealing with our fiscal situation. We need to be fiscally responsible. The American people understand this. They know we need to make the tough choices here in Washington to get our fiscal House in order.

The Blue Dogs have always led on that. We continue to lead on that, but it is going to take bipartisan cooperation to get that done because we have a divided government. But we need to do it. We need to take care of these

issues. The Blue Dogs continue to work on these things. We really need the support of everyone to come together here in Washington and across the country to solve these great problems that we have, that we face.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are people who may be out there watching this on C-SPAN, and probably a lot of people who are just so happy to finally turn on C-SPAN and hear people talking about working together, not talking about what is wrong with the other side, how I am right and the other side is wrong, but the need to work together. That is what the Blue Dogs are about. That is what it continues to be about, and that is the way that we are going to make America the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth—but a Nation that faces, as we all understand, many issues, many problems, just as our families are facing many issues right now. By working together, we can make our Nation even greater, and only by working together will we get there.

I am very happy to join my Blue Dog colleagues here tonight and every day working to help make America a better place to live. So let us all come together, Mr. Speaker, and work on some of these problems. “Compromise,” I know, sometimes is a dirty word. You don’t have to give up your principles to compromise. Stick to your principles, but compromise. Get done what we can get done, and make this Nation a greater place.

I thank my Blue Dog colleagues very much. Thank you, Mr. COSTA, for this. We are going to continue to bring the message to the American people and get things done.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois, my classmate, for his good words. Clearly, I think he speaks on behalf of not only the Blue Dogs, but the majority of Americans who believe that we need to be working together to solve problems, whether it is our budget, our fiscal deficit, or whether it is our transportation system, as the gentleman from Illinois so succinctly pointed out. It can never be “my way or the highway,” because if that is the case, we will never get anything done, as has been witnessed here for the last couple of months. But when we do work together, as the compromised bipartisan vote that we saw this afternoon on Homeland Security, we can get something done.

My next friend and colleague is the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman SANFORD BISHOP, from the Second District. He has distinguished himself over the years and has been a member of not only the Blue Dog caucus, but he represents some of the best parts of Georgia—Fort Benning and agriculture, like I represent.

SANFORD, we are glad to have you here this afternoon to tell us the thoughts of the people of Georgia’s

Second District on the terrific job you do on their behalf.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for putting together this Special Order, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Martin Luther King, Jr., once said: “Ultimately a genuine leader is not a searcher for consensus but a molder of consensus.”

Debate is a natural consequence of representative democracy. Gridlock, on the other hand, is not.

Sitting down with those across the aisle is not just an act of placing faith in political or ideological adversaries, but an act of placing faith in our egalitarian democratic system, a system, as it was, founded on the art of creating consensus in order to move forward.

All of us here speaking from the well this hour believe in working together for better government, working for responsible government, working for transparent government. The moderate Blue Dogs are here not only to find common ground between lawmakers, but to forge an understanding of what it is to truly work together.

The Blue Dog Coalition is dedicated to a core set of beliefs that transcend partisan politics. We represent the center of the House of Representatives and appeal to the mainstream values of the American public. The coalition develops substantive proposals and positions distinct from those advocated by the extremes in both parties. Needless to say, we Blue Dogs are less swayed by the leadership of either party and more persuaded by the needs and the concerns of mainstream Americans.

But this is nothing new. Twenty years ago, the Blue Dog Coalition was formed following the 1994 election. Over the past 20 years, many of our proposals have been praised as fair, responsible, and positive additions to a Congressional environment too often marked as partisan and antagonistic.

Throughout those years, the Blue Dogs have been dedicated to solving problems based on five principles of political leadership: tell the truth; govern for the future; put the country first; be responsible; work together.

My job is to represent the interests and the values of the people in my district in middle and southwest Georgia. As a Blue Dog Democrat, I push for commonsense measures that will make government work better for my constituents.

The people of Georgia’s Second Congressional District, like all Americans, deserve a government that puts their needs ahead of partisan politics. We seek to use the legislative process to create a higher, better quality of life for all of our citizens. Eliminating government waste and inefficiency are crucial to achieving this goal.

We work with our colleagues on the right and the left, on both sides of the aisle, to pass commonsense reforms

that will make government work for the people of our great Nation. As Members of Congress, it is our responsibility to ensure that government works for the American people.

I am committed to working together with my colleagues to pass legislation that eliminates Federal waste and inefficiency. If we can do this, it will give us a better chance at getting things done. That is how we rebuild trust with the American people, by showing them that we are doing the job we were sent here to do.

Today, many folks might suppose that bipartisanship is dead. The Blue Dogs have been here and are still here to say that it is not dead. We are committed to working—not to finger point, not to fight, but to fix. I believe that problem solving together across both sides of the aisle we can make that happen.

So I am delighted that my colleague, Mr. COSTA, and my colleagues from the Blue Dog Coalition have come together with this Special Order so that we can say to each other, say to the American people, that we cry out for a government that will work for the people to get the needs, the common goals, the common hopes, and their common aspirations addressed.

We may have differences, but we have more similarities than we have differences. If we find those common denominators of experience that combine us, we can get the job done for the American people.

I thank you for this time.

□ 1645

Mr. COSTA. Congressman BISHOP, my friend, I could not have said it better: for the people and by the people.

Mr. Speaker, for those who are watching on C-SPAN this afternoon, we welcome your input, and we welcome your comments. For those of you who are interested, please sign onto our Web site, which is [www.bluedog.schrader.house.gov](http://www.bluedog.schrader.house.gov), as a way by which you can communicate with us. We all have our Web sites. Obviously, not only our constituents from our respective districts but people from throughout the country, we would urge you to weigh in. Let us know how you feel, which is an appropriate segue for our next speaker.

The Blue Dogs every 2 years select three leaders to represent them and to organize our agenda. We have a policy individual who will be speaking in a moment, Congressman JIM COOPER. We have the communications director, which is the position I serve, and then we have our chairperson. Our chairperson is a gentleman whom I have the honor and privilege to serve with. He is my friend, and he is doing an excellent job, the gentleman from Oregon’s Fifth District, Representative KURT SCHRADER.

Mr. SCHRADER. Thank you very, very much. I want to thank my friend,

the gentleman from California, for hosting this particular Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for America to realize that we all don't hate one another. We actually get along pretty well on a personal level, and there are those of us on both sides of the aisle who want to work together to solve our country's problems. You have heard a little bit about that already.

I think, at this time, more than ever, it is important for Congress to come together. The little debate we had last week or a week and a half ago on the Department of Homeland Security, I think, drives that point home. Oftentimes, within families, there are disagreements. Whether it is a Republican family or a Democratic family, we are not going to agree on all of the issues all of the time. That doesn't make one side wrong and the other side right. What it does mean is there is an honest difference of opinion. In the way our forefathers set the system up, we are supposed to work through that. There are checks and balances. No one party, no one Chamber, no one individual is supposed to have ultimate veto over the rights of everyday, Main Street Americans.

What we in the Blue Dog Coalition try to do is to bridge those differences, to provide a forum to find ways to agree, not to disagree with the other team. As for the Homeland Security bill, whatever you think about some of the attachments to the bill or about some of the actions by the President of the United States, it is important to fund Homeland Security more now than ever. With the stuff that has gone on overseas that could possibly threaten our own shores, it makes it imperative that we work together. I am actually proud, despite the sausage-making look of it in the media and, perhaps, to a lot of Americans, that there were Republicans and Democrats who came together to solve that problem.

We will live to fight another day on immigration reform and on some of the other issues which we have genuine, legitimate differences of opinion on, but it should not be lost on the American people that it was Democrats and Republicans coming together to solve a very basic problem that our Congress and Nation are charged to solve, which is to provide for the security of the American people.

The Blue Dogs have been doing this for years. You heard of our inception after the 1994 elections, when the Blue Dogs felt we were getting choked. We were regular Southern Democrats, if you will, at that time. It has branched out, like Mr. COSTA has indicated, to include the whole country now. Yellow Dog Democrats were getting "choked blue" by their rather liberal leadership that they felt did not respect or, frankly, represent some of their interests, so out of that came the Blue Dogs.

The body has grown and decreased in numbers with every election cycle. There has been a consistent drumbeat, however, for folks like us in moderate districts, not just on the Democratic side, but on the Republican side. We actually have quarterly meetings with a Republican group called the Tuesday Group, where we try and get together and share ideas about things we can work together on—not in opposition to but work together on. Boy, I wish leadership would work in that same vein. We would be a lot better off.

Mr. COSTA. We have talked a lot about this among our fellow Blue Dogs, but I think the point that you raise there is worth repeating because, frankly, I think there are a lot of Members on both sides of the aisle who, if they had the opportunity, would like to figure out how they could work together. I know, as the chair of the Blue Dog Caucus, it is your desire to reach out and continue to make that effort. I just want to applaud you for that.

I also want to ask: Are there other ways in which constituents can make their Congresspeople feel more comfortable about doing that? With this notion of "it is my way or the highway," I think the majority of my constituents wonder what is going on there. I mean, "What are you folks thinking in Washington? because that is not the way we do it at home."

Mr. SCHRADER. I totally agree with the gentleman from California.

I think, sometimes, there is that bubble we operate under here in Washington, D.C., and we forget that the people back home, frankly, are sometimes not watching C-SPAN. They are busy trying to put food on their tables, seeing if their kids can get great educations. Frankly, in recent times, they are just trying to keep their bloody jobs. So I think it is important for us to relate to the people who are paying our salaries. This is their Chamber—this is their building—not a bubble of Washington, D.C., types. It is important for us to sit down and represent what they are talking about.

When I went home in this last election cycle and, frankly, in every election cycle, the big issue for Americans in the Congressional Fifth District in the great State of Oregon—the Willamette Valley-central Oregon coast—is not any one issue. It is: "Will you please work together." This is complicated stuff—some of these bills are pretty darned complicated—but I think everyday Americans understand. "Okay. That is why I hired you. Work it out. Figure it out." To their credit, they don't give me a lot of room for excuses.

"Well, gee. I am not in the majority. I don't control it."

"Kurt, I elected you. I want you to figure out a way of how to work with folks."

We can do that. The farm bill in the last Congress was a classic example of

how we actually worked together, Republicans and Democrats. You could not tell a Democrat or a Republican based on what they were talking about, because they were representing different districts, different geographies around this country, lobbying hard for their farming interests or nutritional programs that they felt passionately about. That is the way Congress is supposed to work. That is what the Blue Dog Coalition is all about—building those relationships.

If you have noticed in the 114th Congress, in the first 2 months, while DHS, the Affordable Care Act, and sometimes choice or abortion have gotten a lot of the headlines from the media, I would urge you to look at the votes for the big, important bills that have come forward. There are a number of bills that leadership—and I give the Republican leadership credit for this—brought forward that moderate Democrats had voted for in past Congresses or had expressed interest in, and they got overwhelming and sometimes significant Democrat support. That is not talked about by the media, folks.

You have got to realize that there are many opportunities like that that go below the radar screen. It may not be the sexiest topic in the world, but it is stuff like making sure the Affordable Care Act works, making sure that small businesses are able to function properly, making sure that the Dodd-Frank financial reform actually is workable and respects the interests of the different members of the community out there, even the Keystone vote. I mean, we have to be thoughtful about it, and Democrats and Republicans need to work together and find areas they can agree on. We have tried to do that time and again. It is the heartbeat of the Blue Dog Coalition.

Basically, what we are standing for, as you have heard, is fiscal reform and fiscal responsibility. It has been a hallmark of the Blue Dogs over the last 20 years. We are generally a government efficiency organization. We believe government is not evil, but it could sure work a heck of a lot better. Every one of the folks out there in America understands that some government rule is making a problem for them, and it shouldn't have to happen. We as Blue Dogs try and cut through that government regulation.

We are also business friendly. Yes, Democrats can be business friendly, believe it or not. They are called "Blue Dogs." There is another group called New Democrats. There is another group growing outside this that wants to include all Americans, which is called No Labels. Most Blue Dogs are, frankly, members of No Labels. There is another group that works together, Democrats and Republicans. Yes, folks. There are a lot of different people in this Congress who are very interested in trying to work together to make

your Congress work and deal with your lunch bucket issues that mean the most to you—job creation, educational reform, infrastructure—as was alluded to. These are values, I think, every American holds dear, and those are the issues we should be working on.

Senator Lieberman said at one point that it is kind of ironic that everyone is interested in bipartisanship, but if you don't agree with somebody 100 percent of the time, you don't agree with them any of the time. The real world is: life is complicated, and you are going to have times when you agree and times when you disagree. One of the basic axioms of politics is: you don't have enemies or friends; you have allies and adversaries at the end of the day because issues change over time, and you will find that the ebb and flow of interests will conflate with party, geography—all of those issues.

The Blue Dog Coalition is dedicated to trying to bring people together across this country—Republicans and Democrats, business interests, individuals—trying to make your government more responsible and more efficient with electoral reform, congressional reform, getting back in this great, august Chamber to regular order—to where your interests are represented through the committees, through the elected Representatives you have. That is what is important here, and that binds Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives and moderates, like us. That is the hallmark of the Blue Dog Coalition.

I won't belabor the point. I thank the gentleman for bringing us to the floor here. I think it is important for America to be a little inspired that there are people who care about this country, who cut through the partisan politics and even go against our respective leaderships to try and solve the problems you want us to solve. I think, at the end of the day, that is where America is. To get back to a greatness, which was alluded to before, it is going to require more members of the Blue Dog Coalition and of the Tuesday Group on the other side of the aisle to be elected to Congress and hope America gets mad as hell and starts to hold their Members accountable for working together and making America great again.

Mr. COSTA. I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon for his leadership as the chair of the Blue Dog Coalition.

Your efforts to reach out to the Tuesday Group and to the No Labels Caucus and your efforts to take difficult positions and cast hard votes, I think, are all examples of political profiles in courage, and we commend you for your leadership and your efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the next Blue Dog Coalition member who will speak is one of our newest members. He hails from the great State of Nebraska, and we are honored to have him as one of our new-

est members of the Blue Dog Coalition. He is BRAD ASHFORD from Nebraska's Second District. A lot of agriculture and a lot of good people Congressman BRAD ASHFORD has the opportunity to represent, and we appreciate the fact that he is here.

Mr. ASHFORD. Thank you, Mr. COSTA. I am privileged to have the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Speaker, you mentioned, just briefly, the concept of "Profiles of Courage." John Kennedy, in writing that book, wrote about a great Nebraskan, George Norris. George Norris was a Senator from Nebraska, and prior to that time, he served in this House. In 1908, he led a bipartisan effort in the House to change the rules of the House in order to make the House more transparent and more accountable to the American people.

□ 1700

In that regard, in John Kennedy's book he wrote about Congressman Norris, and then, subsequently, Senator Norris. In the 1930s, Senator Norris, who had worked to create the Tennessee Valley Authority, worked across the aisle with FDR—he was a Republican—to pass the Rural Electrification Act that electrified the country. He did so working across the aisle.

And in the 1930s—and 1934, specifically—he reached out to the people of Nebraska and said to them: We can do better. We can have a more transparent government. We can have a bipartisan, nonpartisan government that will address the tough issues of Nebraska in the Depression of the 1930s. And he recommended to the voters: Look, let's do this. Let's have a unicameral, nonpartisan legislature.

And the lobbyists and the special interests said: George, you should go back to Washington. This isn't going to work in Nebraska.

Well, the voters of Nebraska, in 1934, voted for a unicameral, nonpartisan legislature, and I am proud to say that we have such a legislature today.

I am so proud and honored to be here. There was a discussion earlier by prior speakers about relationships. And what is so interesting to me and amazing to me—not amazing, really, but gratifying—are those relationships, are the relationships that I have been able to achieve through my association with the Blue Dogs and relationships with Republicans and Democrats alike. It is very, very gratifying that that exists. That is what I am used to in Nebraska.

When I first arrived here, I went to a Democratic Caucus. I served in the Nebraska unicameral legislature for 16 years. I never went to a caucus in my life. I didn't really know exactly what a Democrat or Republican really was. I suppose I would have to look, but of the 49 members of the Nebraska Legislature, I would have to think long and hard about what party they belonged to.

And in the 16 years that I served there, we had many tough issues. In fact, one of the toughest issues we had in the State was the pipeline issue, and that was referenced earlier—the TransCanada pipeline. Well, it goes through Nebraska. As originally routed, it would have gone through some of the most sensitive areas of our State, the Sandhills area and the Ogallala Aquifer.

We spent a year together, the 49 of us. Not every day. We would kill each other if we spent every day together, but we spent a lot of time. At the end of the day, we came up with a process to reroute the TransCanada pipeline to move it away from the most sensitive parties of the Ogallala Aquifer. We did it with a vote of 49-0, environmentalists and those on the other side of the issue coming together to pass a routing bill.

So the idea that George Norris had was, number one, be transparent. Let the people of Nebraska know exactly what you are doing.

What is interesting about the 16 years that I was there—and, quite frankly, if you do count Republicans and Democrats in the unicameral legislature, you will find that there are a lot more Republicans, traditionally, than there are Democrats, at least during the 16 years I was there, and I don't think that at any time I was there, any year, any legislative session I was there, that there were not an equal number of committee chairs that were Republican and Democrat. There was nothing magic about that. It was just the way we balanced things out in our State. We did it and do it intuitively. We do it intuitively.

I don't suggest that we are going to decide tomorrow or even next year or 10 years from now to have a unicameral, bipartisan, nonpartisan legislature, but the lessons that I learned there are the lessons that I have brought here. And when I had the opportunity, Mr. COSTA, to meet the Blue Dogs, it reminded me of home. It reminded me of the Nebraska Legislature and the idea that Republicans and Democrats make that decision for themselves.

But as my good friend and former Senator from Nebraska Ed Zorinsky used to say, there are no Republican Senators or Democratic Senators. There are only American Senators, U.S. Senators. It is in the water in Nebraska. That is how we think. That is how we are. And what is great about this place is those same relationships, those same committed people are there to make those kinds of relationships work in a bipartisan way. We have heard examples of that today.

When I ran for this office, I said to the voters of the Second Congressional District of Nebraska, Sarpy County and Douglas County, Nebraska, the two most populace counties: I'm going to

go to Washington, and I'm going to make 25 friends. Because in Nebraska, if you make 25 friends, you get 25 people to vote for a bill, it passes.

You know what? I found more than 25 friends. I found a lot of friends, a lot of great people who sit in this body, this place, every single day, Republicans and Democrats.

I just got back—and then I will conclude, Mr. COSTA—from a trip to Afghanistan, Iraq, Jordan, the Emirates, and Kuwait. I went with three other Members: ELISE STEFANIK, who is a freshman Republican from New York; JOE WILSON, who is a veteran Member from South Carolina; and SETH MOULTON, who is a freshman from Massachusetts. What great people. What great committed Americans to have gone on that trip.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Blue Dogs to the country, to those that are watching, in furtherance of the old tradition of transparency and working together and making things happen.

Mr. COSTA. During your visit, on a bipartisan basis, in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Jordan, you were visiting some of the most challenging hotspots in the world today, and I suspect you got an opportunity to visit and see American men and women serving abroad and the heroic and difficult jobs that they are doing and the great sacrifices of their families. I suspect you had an opportunity to tell them that in Washington we are trying to do all we can to support them.

Mr. ASHFORD. Thank you for the comment. Yes, I was fortunate enough to visit with Nebraskans who were serving in Iraq and serving in Afghanistan. I was on a C-130. We were traveling over the Strait of Hormuz area. The navigator in the C-130 said to me: Sir—because he had to call me “sir”; that is the protocol—get behind us. We're doing the best we can over here, and we need your support.

And they are going to get our support and have our support. Thank you for the question. I was so deeply appreciative of the opportunity to meet with my fellow Nebraskans who were there as well.

Mr. COSTA. Well, I have made that trip several times, and we can never say thank you enough to the American men and women who serve in our Nation's military.

I would just ask you, every week, I know you go back to your district and the good people in Nebraska—and that good water you are drinking there, bring more of it here to Washington because I think, if we can drink some more of that water, it certainly wouldn't hurt us here in our Nation's Capital.

I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his good words.

As I prepare to close, I want to thank my fellow Blue Dog colleagues for coming down to the well of the House of

Representatives this afternoon to talk about the common interests that we as Blue Dog Coalition members have, the efforts that we are making to reach across the aisle, the efforts that we are making to work with the No Labels group, as well as others, on a call to service to repair the engagement of civic dialogue, understanding that, frankly, if we tone down our rhetoric and we have a better understanding of how the different congressional districts that we all represent are, we can find the common threads, the common bonds to bring together solutions that we can agree upon for all of America. After all, we all believe that is what we have been sent here for, I believe, in one way or another.

Another effort that the Blue Dog Coalition is engaged in with No Labels and others is congressional reform. Clearly, many Americans, when they look at Washington and they see the news of the evening, they think: Jeez, there must be something broke there. It ain't working right. It's not working the way we read in our textbooks.

We are trying to restore efforts in congressional form in terms of regular order, in terms of our budget process and producing all 11 budget bills every year and go to a conference as we are supposed to do. We haven't done that in 12 years in Congress, whether it is the Democrats in the majority or the Republicans in the majority, so there is a lot of fixing. Obviously, finger-pointing doesn't fix the problem.

In addition to that, we have electoral reform. I think we all know that last year, last November, we had the lowest recorded turnout in America since 1942. What does that tell you? What does that tell you when the majority of Americans, regardless of whether they are registered as Republicans or Democrats, identify themselves as Independents?

It tells you that America is looking toward people in Washington to provide the leadership to solve problems. They don't expect us to solve all of them—they are not unrealistic—but they would like us to prioritize on getting a budget on time, getting our fiscal house in order, on trying to fix a broken immigration system, produce a 5-year transportation bill, improve government accountability, and transparency. That is what they would like us to work on.

As I said when I began earlier this afternoon, I am Congressman JIM COSTA. I represent the 16th Congressional District in California, including all of Merced County, half of the flat land of Madera County—a lot of agriculture in both Merced and Madera Counties—and Fresno County. Fresno is, of course, my home.

The wonderful people that are part of the San Joaquin Valley that I have had the honor and privilege to represent over the years are what all Americans

are like. They are some of the best and brightest. They are tenacious. They are hard working. They represent the story of America.

What is that story? Immigrants past, immigrants present—people come in from all over the world, striving to have a better life, a better opportunity for themselves and for their families.

That is why we are working to solve the water problems in the San Joaquin Valley—because, if we can solve the water problems in California and in the West, with the planet clicking 7 billion people last year and soon to have 9 billion people by the middle of this century, our solutions to water problems in California can be a template to solving water problems around the world because where water flows, food grows.

Clearly, we know that that is a daunting challenge, just like our energy problems are—but guess what. We are making progress on our energy problems. When I first came to Congress 10 years ago, we imported over 60 percent of our energy needs. Today, we import a little over 40 percent.

If we continue on the current path, in the next 10 years, we will be importing around 20 percent or less by using all the energy tools in our energy toolbox, just as we must use all the water tools in our water toolbox.

There is a lot to do. I would like to thank my colleagues in the Blue Dog Coalition for their time today, and their continued efforts over the year. Clearly, we have a lot of work to do together, and we want to reach out to work with everybody in the House of Representatives, the people's House.

The Blue Dog Coalition is ready and willing to work with everyone. We look forward to creating bridges, not cul de sacs, working with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance commonsense policies that are physically sound, that benefit our entire Nation.

You could also call the Blue Dog Coalition the commonsense caucus because we reject the notion of gridlock in Washington. It is embarrassing; it is inexcusable.

Every day, when we put politics ahead of policy, we put our Nation at risk, and we stand to lose. Therefore, Congress must come together to address the critical issues as I said before: tax reform, immigration reform, and ways to further our Nation's economic recovery.

□ 1715

There is no problem in America, if we work together, that we cannot solve. We are here to represent and advocate for our constituents.

Please, for those of you who enjoyed the comments made by my fellow Blue Dog Coalition members this afternoon, you can go to [www.bluedog.schrader.house.gov](http://www.bluedog.schrader.house.gov) for more information.



The Blue Dog Coalition will continue to work to make a difference by advocating for sound legislation and working together with our colleagues on a bipartisan basis. That is what I have always done.

Today, as with my Blue Dog Coalition partners, we have the honor and the privilege to represent our constituents from throughout the land; and I would ask that my colleagues continue to make that effort because I think, at the end of the day, that is what all Americans want us to do.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1029, EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1030, SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. COSTA), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-37) on the resolution (H. Res. 138) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1029) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1030) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ZIMBABWE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-13)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a na-

tional emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2015.

The threat constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 2015.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-14)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622 (d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2015.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and

contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, as well as the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 2015.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Joint Economic Committee:

Mr. DELANEY, Maryland  
Ms. ADAMS, North Carolina  
Mr. BEYER, Virginia

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SMITH of Missouri (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

#### PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATIONS AND OTHER APPROPRIATE LEVELS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET RESOLUTION RELATED TO H.R. 240, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2015

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the aggregate budget levels and committee allocations set forth pursuant to H. Con. Res. 25 as deemed in force by H. Res. 5. The revision is for new budget authority and outlays for provisions designated as disaster relief, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, contained in H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015. A corresponding table is attached.

This revision represents an adjustment for purposes of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. For purposes of such Act, these revised allocations and aggregates are to be considered as included in the levels of the budget resolution, pursuant to section 101 of H. Con. Res. 25, as adjusted.

BUDGET AGGREGATES  
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year	
	2015	2015–2024
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority .....	3,033,228	(1)
Outlays .....	3,027,646	(1)
Revenues .....	2,535,978	31,206,399
Adjustment for H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015:		
Budget Authority .....	91	(1)
Outlays .....	40	(1)
Revenues .....	0	0
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority .....	3,033,319	(1)
Outlays .....	3,027,686	(1)
Revenues .....	2,535,978	31,206,399

<sup>1</sup> Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 2016–2024 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2015
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA .....	1,021,550
OT .....	1,144,061
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending:	
BA .....	91
OT .....	40
Global War on Terrorism:	
BA .....	85,357
OT .....	39,981
Total Discretionary Action:	
BA .....	1,106,998
OT .....	1,184,082
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA .....	868,410
OT .....	861,637

BILL PRESENTED TO THE  
PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 27, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 33. To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 138. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1029) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1030) to prohibit the

Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible (Rept. 114–37). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1208. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 1209. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the designation of maternity care health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BLUM, Mr. DOLD, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. GUINTA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. TIPPON, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota):

H.R. 1210. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to provide a safe harbor from certain requirements related to qualified mortgages for residential mortgage loans held on an originating depository institution's portfolio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1211. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. OLSON, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. BURGESS):

H.R. 1212. A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from reclassifying broadband Internet access service as a telecommunications service and from imposing certain regulations on providers of such service; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1213. A bill to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1214. A bill to amend the Small Tracts Act to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange small parcels of National Forest System land to enhance the management of the National Forest System, to resolve minor encroachments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. GROTHMAN):

H.R. 1215. A bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old children employed in logging or mechanized operations from child labor laws; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1216. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a pilot program to examine maker-taker pricing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ESTY, Mr. DOLD, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1217. A bill to protect Second Amendment rights, ensure that all individuals who should be prohibited from buying a firearm are listed in the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and provide a responsible and consistent background check process; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1218. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1219. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and appurtenances of the Arbuckle Project, Oklahoma, to the Arbuckle Master Conservancy District, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 1220. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina (for herself, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. WENSTRUP):

H.R. 1221. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOK,

Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JONES, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 1222. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1223. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the retroactive claim of the earned income tax credit after issuance of a social security number; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 1224. A bill to require the exercise of clean-up call options under securities issued by the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation and to prohibit any new mortgage-backed securities issued by such Corporation or the Federal National Mortgage Association from containing provisions for a clean-up call option, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1225. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow certain hospitals in Puerto Rico to qualify for incentives for adoption and meaningful use of certified EHR Technology under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1226. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to clarify the maintenance of effort requirement for local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. COOK, and Mr. MULVANEY):

H.R. 1227. A bill to authorize a pilot program in the Department of Defense to enhance efforts to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members of the National Guard and Reserves and veterans of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1228. A bill to limit United States assistance to Bosnia and Herzegovina until Bosnia and Herzegovina is in compliance with the state borders established by the Conference on Yugoslavia Arbitration Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1229. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to provide guidance and limitations regarding the integration of unmanned aircraft systems into United States airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1230. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to adjust the calculation of average pay for purposes of Federal civilian annuities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BEYER, and Mrs. COMSTOCK):

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OLSON:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. ESTY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FARR, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KIND, Ms. TITUS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KEATING, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. VALADAO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COSTA, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. TORRES, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H. Res. 137. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Women's History Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. MORRIS RODGERS, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H. Res. 139. A resolution condemning violence against religious minorities in the Middle East and any actions that limit the free expression and practice of faith by these minorities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAMALFA (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 140. A resolution expressing support for designation of August 2015 as "Blue Star Mothers of America Month"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. MOORE):

H. Res. 141. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

# PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. DAVIS of California introduced a bill (H.R. 1231) for the relief of Flavia Maboloc Cahoon; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight, Clause Three "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 1211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 1212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 "necessary and proper" clause.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 1213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the authority to make laws governing the commerce among several states, including employment discrimination laws.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 1215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the authority, "To Regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 6

The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1218.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 1219.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8 which allows Congress to regulate trade amongst the Indian Tribes.

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 which grants Congress the power to make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting . . . Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 1220.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 1221.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 1222.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1223.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority for this bill is pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 1224.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1225.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make

rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1226.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1227.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TURNER:

H.R. 1228.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1229.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 1230.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 1. General Welfare Clause.

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1231.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 93: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 156: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 213: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 223: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 228: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 239: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. SIRE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. WALZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ESTY, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. LEE, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr.

NADLER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. PETERS, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 284: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 335: Mr. BEYER and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 348: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 531: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 546: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 572: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 579: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 592: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 624: Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 625: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 650: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 662: Mr. BLUM, Mr. BARR, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 699: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 700: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 707: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 721: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BOST, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SIREs, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 756: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 767: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 769: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 774: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 775: Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 776: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 835: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 836: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 842: Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 843: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 846: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 855: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 869: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 874: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 879: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 882: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 885: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 887: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 893: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. YODER, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. BLACK, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 921: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 928: Mrs. ROBY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 932: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 935: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 940: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HARDY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 953: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 955: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 971: Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 975: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 976: Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1000: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1051: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1062: Mr. JONES, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1063: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1077: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1078: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1094: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1095: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1105: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. HULTGREN,

Mr. STEWART, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BLUM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1142: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1143: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1148: Mr. ISSA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1149: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1162: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1173: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1185: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1188: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 1198: Ms. KUSTER.

H.J. Res. 22: Miss RICE of New York.

H.J. Res. 29: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.J. Res. 32: Mr. OLSON.

H. Res. 12: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CARDENAS.

H. Res. 15: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 28: Mr. LEWIS and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Res. 102: Mr. PETERSON and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 109: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. BURGESS.

H. Res. 122: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative GRAYSON, or a designee, to H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative DONNA F. EDWARDS, or a designee, to H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

## SENATE—Tuesday, March 3, 2015

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, let the moments and hours of this day reverberate with the sounds of Your unfolding providence. May our Senators hear You working throughout their deliberations, transforming the discordant into the harmonious. May Your unseen presence enable them to discern the direction that they should take, as they seek to heed Your instructions and follow Your commands. As they fellowship with You, give them discomfort with easy answers, half truths, and superficial relationships. Lord, inspire them to believe that they can make a difference in this world.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The majority leader is recognized.

### AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Benjamin Netanyahu into the House Chamber for the joint meeting at 11 a.m., on Tuesday, March 3, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later this morning, the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu will deliver an important address to Congress. Members of both parties extend a warm welcome to him.

This leader is a great friend of our country, and his visit comes at a critical moment in the relations between our countries.

The Prime Minister's address coincides with an increasingly aggressive Iranian campaign to expand its sphere of influence across the Middle East. It represents a threat to both of our countries, it represents a threat to moderate Sunni allies, and it represents a threat to the international community at large.

That is why Prime Minister Netanyahu is here today. He is ideally suited to explain the multitude of challenges this presents—including the threat of an Iran with nuclear weapons capability—and how our countries can address them jointly.

So we are glad the Prime Minister is here with us today. We will be listening closely to what he has to say.

I hope the Obama administration will be listening, too, because this visit isn't about personalities, it is about doing what is best for both of our countries, and here some context is important.

As it has been since its founding, Israel is in a constant state of existential crisis. It is continuously threatened by terrorists, such as Hezbollah and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad, who work every day to see a democratic Israel destroyed. Israel's leaders wake every morning knowing that with just one wrong decision, it could be their last in an open and tolerant democracy. That is the frame through which the Israelis approach their national security policy.

Here is the frame the Obama administration uses: It formulates policy with two objectives in mind—fulfilling political campaign promises made back in 2008 and pursuing politically expedient solutions to whatever stands in the way of the first objective. We can see the basis for tension right there.

For me, there are two bookends that define President Obama's foreign policy.

The Executive orders that attempted to close Guantanamo without a credible plan for what to do with its detainees, and to essentially end our ability to capture, detain, and interrogate terrorists, regardless of the threats that remain for our country, represent one bookend.

The President's push to withdraw all combat forces from Iraq and Afghanistan by the end of his term, regardless of the threats posed by the Taliban or the senior leadership of Al Qaeda, represents the other bookend.

The politics-above-policy approach mystifies allies such as Israel. You can

see it in many other decisions too—for instance, the President's failure to negotiate an agreement with Iraq for a residual military force that may have prevented the assault by ISIL. Instead, as threats from Al Qaeda and affiliated groups metastasized, the President focused on unwinding or reversing past policies through Executive order. Uprisings in North Africa and the broader Middle East resulted in additional ungoverned space in Syria, Libya, and Yemen. The capital of Yemen is now occupied by the Houthi militia, and the Yemenis are no more ready to detain the terrorists at Guantanamo today than they were in 2009.

What has the President's response to all this been? To draw down our conventional forces and capabilities.

Even as China and Russia have grown more belligerent, the President sees no need to reverse the harmful damage of the defense cuts he has insisted upon. He sees no need to rebuild our conventional and nuclear forces.

He sees no need to accept that leaving behind residual forces in Iraq and Afghanistan represents an effective means by which to preserve the strategic gains we have made over the years, through tremendous sacrifice.

The President has always assumed the role of Commander in Chief with great reluctance. That is particularly true of his dealings with Iran. For years, Iran has continued to enrich uranium. For years, Iran has refused to come clean to the IAEA. But ending Iran's nuclear weapons program has never fit neatly between the administration's policy bookends.

The President believed he could extend a hand of friendship and bring the Supreme Leader to the table. Even though that approach failed, the President now seems determined to conclude an agreement with Iran that would leave it with a threshold nuclear capability. It is an agreement that could allow Iran to retain thousands of centrifuges, master the nuclear fuel cycle, advance ballistic missile research and testing, and keep secret any possible military dimensions of nuclear development that have already occurred.

The administration has pursued these negotiations not as part of an overall strategy to end Iran's nuclear program, but as a stand-alone matter of litigation where a settlement must be reached. This negotiation should not be about getting the best deal that the Iranians will agree to, it should be about the strategic objective of ending Iran's nuclear weapons program. To do this, the administration must be committed to using force if negotiations fail.

The strategic ambiguity of leaving “all options on the table” has never been convincing, and the administration refused to work with Congress on developing a sanctions and declaratory military response should negotiations fail. It is unlikely that this Congress could be convinced to lift sanctions absent a complete disclosure on the part of the Iranians of all previous research conducted in pursuit of a nuclear device.

And this gets back to the differences between the perspective of the Israeli government concerning Iran’s nuclear capability and those of the Obama administration.

Iran is pursuing full spectrum warfighting capabilities to wage war against Israel, the United States, and our Sunni allies in the region.

Iran is developing cyber capabilities to harass and harm its adversaries, ballistic missile capabilities, and conventional capabilities to deny United States warships access to the Persian Gulf.

Iran remains a state sponsor of terror.

Tehran also continues to push ever deeper into Iraq.

In its fight within Iraq, Iran’s proxy Shia militias have gained valuable combat experience on the ground to add to the terrorist tactics of employing IEDs that were perfected against United States forces. The withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq not only led to the abandonment of the Sunni tribes which had allied with us in Anbar Province, it led to a greater reliance upon the Iranians by the Baghdad government.

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and the Qods Force are expanding their command and control and combat capabilities in Iraq and Syria and gaining valuable warfighting lessons.

The Qods force and Hezbollah are mastering an expeditionary fighting capability that should concern Israel, the United States, and our Sunni allies. The Iranians are natural allies of the Houthi militias in Yemen.

Setting aside the nuclear program, from a perspective of strategy, the Iranians are advancing across the region in all other aspects of warfighting. All of this has occurred while sanctions have been in place and the price of oil has declined.

From the perspective of any Israeli Prime Minister, Iran’s advances have occurred while the terrorist presence in the Sinai has grown, the Nusrah front and ISIL are present in Syria, and Libya has become a terrorist training ground.

Because the administration has all but conceded the Iranian nuclear enrichment capability, Israel has grown more isolated. It has come to understand that it may have to act alone. Yet rather than ending Iran’s nuclear

weapons program, President Obama’s objective seems to be to defer any decision about the use of force to one of his successors. That may be politically expedient, but it is inconsistent with the national security requirements of Israel.

I say all this to underline the importance of the Prime Minister’s address this morning.

We have seen the results of a politics-above-all foreign policy now for several years: It leaves our Nation strategically weaker, and will make challenges faced by the President’s successor all the more difficult.

Israel has seen this too. Israel knows it may well be the first to suffer if the Obama White House makes another flawed political decision, but Americans should understand it is not just Israel that needs to worry. We should be concerned by a nuclear Iran. The whole world should be concerned by a nuclear Iran, and the Prime Minister is going to help explain why that is. For Israel’s sake and ours, I for one am very glad he is.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today marks the 115th day since President Obama announced he was nominating Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General of the United States. That makes her the longest pending Attorney General nominee in more than four decades.

The Senate Judiciary Committee reported her nomination favorably last week. So what is the wait? Why can’t we get this woman approved? It appears we are not going to this week.

She has a spotless record and credentials that are above reproach. There is absolutely no reason she should have to wait any longer for confirmation. Our Nation needs an Attorney General. Each day that passes without Ms. Lynch’s nomination being confirmed is yet another testimony to Republicans’ inability to govern.

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last December, rightfully, the National Labor Relations Board voted to make important changes to union election procedures. Their rule changes are good for workers and businesses. They modernize the election process and help prevent delays and frivolous litigation.

I am sure there are some businesses that oppose this, but I haven’t found them. This is simply a problem that has been engendered by the Repub-

licans in the Senate. They are trying to roll back these reforms instead of supporting the rights of workers. The reforms they made are so basic, such as using email and using other processes such as a fax machine and using the employers’ records, not the unions’ records.

Later this afternoon the Senate will consider a Republican-introduced resolution of disapproval which seeks to undo the NLRB’s rules changes. This is yet another sad reminder of how little regard Republicans have for the American worker.

Last year we saw Republicans vote against an increase in the minimum wage, as well as legislation that would ensure American women get the same pay for doing the same work as men. Republicans in Congress I don’t think get it.

We are in this building, in this Chamber, to help the American people and want to work to make sure businesses are prosperous, but we also can’t lose sight of the fact that workers are what makes the businesses profitable.

So if you are for American workers and the families they support, then prove it with your vote on this resolution.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, and the majority controlling the first half.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I understand the time is equally divided between now and 10:30. Is there sufficient time for the Republican Senator to use 20 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time would be 18 minutes on each side.

Mr. DURBIN. Then I have no objection to how the Senators choose to use that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WELCOMING PRIME MINISTER NETANYAHU

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I am here this morning to engage in a colloquy with the good Senator from South Carolina. We will be joined by



the Senators from New Hampshire and Kentucky and perhaps the Senator from Arizona.

The purpose of the colloquy is to welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu this morning—who will be speaking in front of Congress—and to talk about why it is so important he is joining us today.

In a few moments we will hear remarks from Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in the House Chamber and welcome him to Congress to affirm the friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Israel and to assess the threats facing our two democracies.

Actually, today's speech is not unusual. This is the 115th time that a foreign leader has addressed a joint session of Congress. This is the seventh time an Israeli Prime Minister will address a joint session of Congress. It is Prime Minister Netanyahu's third address to Congress.

It is not surprising we are hearing from the leader of our ally, Israel. Israel is a democracy in a neighborhood of authoritarian governments. Prime Minister Netanyahu speaks the language of freedom with us today. There can be no doubt of his passion on behalf of the people he represents and that makes us take his message very seriously.

So this joint session is not unusual nor surprising, but that does not mean that it is unimportant. In fact, today's speech is profoundly important. The partnership between the United States and Israel is critical for the security of the Middle East and the world. We need a strong U.S.-Israeli partnership to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. We need a strong U.S.-Israeli partnership to stand against the extremism that is ripping apart nations across the Middle East. We need a strong U.S.-Israeli partnership to demonstrate the value of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law for societies that are no longer satisfied with dictatorships.

For all of these reasons it is good to have Prime Minister Netanyahu here today. It is good to reaffirm the bond between Israelis and Americans, and it is good to join hands again with an ally to stand against tyranny and extremism. I look forward to hearing from the Prime Minister because views directly from Israel are extremely important.

Since its birth in 1948, Israel has faced one security threat after another. Israel's strength and vitality in the face of these threats are a testament to the ability of its people and its leaders to head off threats to security before they become impossible to overcome. There is no substitute for the Israeli view of security in the Middle East and the Iranian threat in particular.

So today represents an important moment to learn how Israel sees its own security and understand the next steps for the U.S.-Israeli partnership.

I now turn to my colleague from South Carolina and ask for his comments about this important speech from the Prime Minister of Israel today.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I appreciate being on the floor with the Senator from North Dakota who has been very involved in trying to secure America against a variety of threats.

I will get to the heart of the matter. Some people feel the Prime Minister should not be here at this time because in a couple weeks there will be an election in Israel. They have a parliamentary system. They do things differently—they vote for parties, not people—and they are having a real contest over there about who should be in charge and what coalitions will lead Israel.

I have a very simple comment: That is for Israelis to decide. They decide who they want to run their country. They can vote for the party or groups of people who they think best represent their view of Israel. That is their business, not mine. My business is to try to find out what is best for America when it comes to defending our Nation. That is why all of us are on the floor today.

I don't think I can adequately do my job if I don't hear from the Prime Minister of Israel, if he is willing to talk to me. Some people may be able to do that. God bless you.

If someone feels as though now is the time to boycott this speech, if they want to send a message about politics in Israel, be my guest. I am going to be at this speech to try to learn what to do regarding America and Israel concerning the nuclear threat.

Why do I think it is important for me to be there? I can't think of a better voice to tell me what would happen in the region if we get a bad deal with the Iranians.

Israel is in the crosshairs of the Iranian ayatollahs—has been for decades—threatening to destroy the State of Israel. I want to hear from the people on the ground, Israel in particular, as to what a good deal would look like and what a bad deal would look like. I want to hear from the Prime Minister of Israel the consequences of a bad deal.

As to me, I do not trust this administration to negotiate a good deal, but maybe I am wrong; and the best way to find out is for Congress to look at the deal. If it is a good deal, I will vote for it, because the Arabs and Israelis will tell us if this is something we can live with. At the end of the day a good deal is a blessing for the world, and a bad deal is a nightmare.

(Mr. COTTON assumed the Chair.)

So to the good Senator from North Dakota, I not only welcome the Prime Minister of Israel to speak to Congress, I am looking forward to it, because I hope to learn something that would make me a better Senator regarding

our own national security. The only thing I can tell the American people without any hesitation—ISIL is a threat to us, a threat to the region. They are the most barbaric terrorist organization roaming the globe today. They represent a direct threat to our homeland. But the threat they represent is a distant second to Iran having a nuclear weapon. That ought to tell you a lot about how I feel. If I can watch TV, as you do every night, and see what ISIL is doing to Christians and others throughout the region and say that is secondary to Iran, I hope that means something. It means a lot to me. Because if Iranians get a nuclear weapon, then every Arab in the region who can afford one is going to get a nuclear weapon, and we are on our way to Armageddon.

North Korea in the making is what I worry about. The same people who are negotiating this deal were negotiating the North Korean deal. Congress was absent. Now it is time for Congress to be involved and say whether this is a good deal. I have legislation with Senator CORKER and six Democrats and six Republicans asking that Congress review any deal, and I would be curious to see what the Prime Minister thinks about that.

So in summary, this would be the most important decision we make as a body, how to deal with the Iranian nuclear threat. This will be the most important issue I will deal with as a U.S. Senator, and I have been here almost 20 years. The consequence of a bad deal is an absolute nightmare.

If you were to relieve the sanctions tomorrow and gave the Iranians the money they were due under sanction relief, do you think they would build schools and hospitals or would they continue to pour money into their military to disrupt the region and continue to build ICBMs? As I speak, without a nuclear weapon Iran is leading an offensive today in Iraq. And I know the Presiding Officer of the Senate was a ranger, an infantryman in Iraq. Could you ever imagine in your wildest dreams that the Iraqi security forces are marrying up with Shia militia and Suleimani, the head of the Revolutionary Guard is on the ground in Iraq leading the efforts, and we are sitting on the sidelines? You talk about a screwed-up foreign policy.

Are we going to let eight guys negotiate with Iran—the people who brought you Iraq and Syria and the mess you see in the region? You feel good enough about them doing a deal with the Iranians that you don't even look at the deal yourself? This is beyond screwed up, and the worst is yet to come. A bad deal. But, maybe the best is yet to come, a good deal. I don't know. But I want to hear what Israel believes a good deal would look like. And if you don't want to hear that, then, boy, we are on different planets

as to the consequences of what is going on in the world today.

With that, I would ask a question to the Senator from New Hampshire, who has been watching the Iranian behavior on the ground throughout the Middle East and the missile program in particular, and ask her what are her concerns about Iran with extra money coming into the coffers in sanction relief?

Ms. AYOTTE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from South Carolina.

As I look at where we are right now—first of all, our support for Israel and our friendship with Israel—this has been a very strong bipartisan issue, and it is an issue that rightly crosses party lines because we share the same values, the relationship is very important, we share technology, we share intelligence, and we share the concern that we do not want the world's most destructive weapon, and that is the Iranian regime.

So I want to welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu to the Congress and very much listen to what he has to say, because he comes to us in a very important time where the administration is negotiating a potential agreement with Iran. What we want most of all is that that agreement will end Iran's nuclear program and be a real, verifiable, transparent agreement, because a good agreement is a blessing, a bad agreement is a nightmare. We have to hear from the Prime Minister of Israel, and I look forward to hearing what he has to say today about what a good agreement looks like.

But make no mistake about why we must stop the Iranian regime from having a nuclear weapon. Because what they are doing around the world right now—they are the largest State sponsor of terrorism in the world. They have essentially destabilized the Government of Yemen through their support of the Houthis there. They have been supporting Hezbollah, a terrorist organization. They have been helping the Assad regime murder its own people. They have been participating in cyber attacks against our interests. This is a regime that has said they want to wipe Israel off the map. I can understand—and I want to hear from the Prime Minister of Israel—why the people of Israel would say “never again” when they hear those words.

But make no mistake, this is not just about the security of Israel; this is about our security in the United States of America. They have called us “the great Satan,” and this is an issue that represents a threat to our core national security interests, to allow state-sponsored terrorism to obtain the most destructive weapon in the world. That is a danger we cannot afford in our country. It is one of concern. It is important that we share with our

strong ally, Israel. We need to do everything we can in this Congress on a bipartisan basis to ensure that never happens. That is why I am honored to be a sponsor of bipartisan legislation that would give the Congress a say on this very important issue, because we worked together to put together some of the toughest sanctions that actually brought the Iranians to the negotiating table. We should not lift the sanctions that have been put together on a bipartisan basis without ensuring that this is a good agreement that will end their nuclear program. When I say end it, I don't mean end it for a decade, I mean end it permanently, because Iran has been engaged in terrorist activity for longer than a decade. So this is something we have to make sure is a transparent, verifiable agreement.

I would also add we cannot have a situation where we have a splitup. There has been a discussion about a year breakout period in this agreement. I would like to hear what the Prime Minister thinks about that, because my concern about that is this will lead to the situation my colleague from South Carolina talked about, where we have a Sunni-Shia nuclear arms race in the Middle East, where everyone seeks to enrich uranium and to have a breakout period. That results in more proliferation of nuclear weapons in a way that makes the world less safe and endangers the United States of America.

So today we welcome Prime Minister Netanyahu. I very much look forward to listening carefully to what he has to say. This is a bipartisan issue. This is about the security of the United States of America. This is obviously about our strong friendship with Israel. We are aligned in ensuring that Iran does not have a nuclear weapon and ensuring that we work together to stop their support of terrorism around the world, that we work together to end their ICBM program, which the estimates are they could hit the east coast of the United States of America by 2015 if they continue on this path. This is about us, this is about our relationship with Israel, and I very much look forward to hearing the Prime Minister today.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank our colleague from New Hampshire and I would like to return to the Senator from South Carolina and pose a question.

I have been a supporter of the strong sanctions the Senator put in place with the Kirk-Menendez legislation the Senator from South Carolina was very involved with. During these negotiations those sanctions have been relaxed by the administration, which I think is of great concern. I think the biggest deterrent to Iran pursuing a nuclear weapon is the sanctions we put in place with our allies.

So now as the administration negotiates this agreement, my colleague

from South Carolina and others on a bipartisan basis have put forward legislation requiring that that agreement would come to this body for an up-or-down vote. I would like him to describe that effort and why it is so important and why the speech today with the Prime Minister goes to the heart of that very important matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the legislation the Senator from North Dakota described is the most important thing we will do this year. The sanctions against Iran, congressionally created, were 100 to 0. Every Member of the Senate believed the Iranians needed to be sanctioned for the mischief they have created and for their nuclear ambitions to stop their march toward a nuclear weapon.

The administration objected, but 100 Members of this body voted for those sanctions. If there is a deal with the Iranians, and I hope there is a good deal, the diplomatic solution to this problem is preferred by everyone. It is a simple concept. Before the sanctions Congress created can be lifted, Congress has to look at the deal and have a say. Under the 1, 2, 3 sections of the Atomic Energy Act there is a provision that allows for Congress to approve commercial nuclear deals between the United States and another country when nuclear technology is shared. We have done that 24 times, but Congress had to approve nuclear deals between the United States and other nations, including Russia, China, Argentina, and that rogue country called Canada. I can't imagine wanting to look at a deal with Canada but not wanting to take a look at a deal with Iran.

This bipartisan legislation is very simple. Any deal negotiated with the P5+1 will come to the Senate and the House to be disapproved—not approved. Now I did that to accommodate my Democratic colleagues. There is concern that with 54 Republicans that we hate Obama so much we would just reject the deal because we don't like him. Well, I am not in that camp. I don't like President Obama's foreign policy, but I hope I am smart enough to understand that a good deal is a blessing. I would like to think I have some track record of doing what I think is best for the country. So if it is a good deal, Israel and the Arabs will tell us, and I will gladly vote to approve it. But the construct, I say to Senator HOEVEN, is that to disapprove the deal, you have to get 60 votes. That means some Democratic colleagues have to join with Republicans to say this is not good enough, go back and try again. It is not that we want to end negotiations; we don't want to legitimize an industrial-strength nuclear program that is on the verge of a breakout such as North Korea in the making. We are not going to sit on the sidelines where a deal is negotiated where they have thousands of centrifuges and the only

thing between them and a nuclear breakout is the United Nations. That did not work well in North Korea. We are not going to do that again.

So we are going to look at the deal. I think every Senator should want to look at the deal, and it allows your constituents to have a say. Not one person is having any input regarding the P5+1 talks. But if it comes back to the Congress, you have a person you can call. You can pick up the phone and call your Member of the House and Senate. You can say something about the deal because you are affected. It is not just Israel that is in the crosshairs of these people, it is us, the United States.

I worry they would share the technology with a terrorist organization and it would work its way here. Name one weapon they developed that they haven't shared with terrorists. This bipartisan approach is sound. It is consistent with what we have done 24 different times with other nations, and I hope we can have an overwhelming vote here soon.

Do your best job. Let us look at it. If it is a good deal, we will vote yes, and if it is a bad deal we will vote no, and try harder to get another deal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority's time has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds to wrap up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. I wish to thank my colleagues from South Carolina and New Hampshire. This is a bipartisan effort to join with the administration, and on a matter of this importance I believe Congress must be involved. So, again, we appeal to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join with us on this effort.

I will conclude by saying we look forward very much to having the Prime Minister speak to us this morning.

Thank you, Mr. President.

#### APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the Chair makes the following announcement:

The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, pursuant to the provisions of section 201(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, have appointed Dr. Homer Keith Hall as Director of the Congressional Budget Office, effective April 1, 2015, for the term expiring January 3, 2019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

#### THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, at 11 a.m. this morning there will be a his-

toric joint session of Congress. Usually a leader from some other country speaking at a joint session of Congress doesn't make history. It has happened over 100 times. I have attended many of those during the time I have served in the House and the Senate. What is historic about this session is that it was called unilaterally by the Republican Speaker of the House, JOHN BOEHNER. Usually and consistently, joint sessions of Congress have been called on a bipartisan basis and in most cases involve the administration and executive branch. In this case Speaker BOEHNER made history his own way by saying he would announce a joint session of Congress welcoming the Prime Minister of Israel.

I also checked with the Senate Historian, and it turns out there is another piece of history being made today. He can find no precedent where Members of Congress came forward from both the House and the Senate and announced publicly they would not attend a joint session of Congress, and that has happened today.

That is a personal and private decision by each Member of Congress as to whether they wish to attend the joint session this morning. I am going to attend it primarily because of my respect for the State of Israel and the fact that throughout my public career in the House and Senate, I have valued the bipartisan support of Israel which I found in both the House and the Senate.

I am proud that it was President Harry Truman—a Democrat—who was the first Executive in the world to recognize the nation of Israel. I am proud that throughout history Democratic and Republican Presidents alike have supported the State of Israel, and I have tried to do the same as a Member of the U.S. House and Senate.

This meeting with Prime Minister Netanyahu comes at an awkward moment. He is 2 weeks away from a national election in Israel. Some have questioned the timing of this. I will not raise that question because I don't know the political scene in Israel. I don't know if this visit helps him or hurts him, but it is, in fact, 2 weeks away from this important election.

What we all agree on, I hope, both Democrats and Republicans, is one starting point: A nuclear Iran is unacceptable. We have to do everything we can to stop that possibility because it would invite an arms race in the Middle East—many other countries would race to become nuclear powers, and that would be destabilizing—and also because we know the agenda of Iran. It has been engaged in terrorist activities throughout the Middle East and around the world. Putting a nuclear weapon in the hands of a country that is dedicated to terrorism is the kind of concern that I hope all of us share when we look to the future.

As Democrats and Republicans gather for the joint session, we are in com-

mon purpose: to stop the development of a nuclear Iran. What troubles me greatly is the criticisms I have heard on this floor and in the past week or two about the Obama administration and this issue. President Obama has made it clear from the start that he is opposed to having a nuclearized Iran. In fact, it was President Obama, using his power as President, who has really brought together the sanctions regime that is working to bring Iran to the negotiating table. He didn't do it alone, as one of my colleagues from South Carolina noted. There were times when Congress wanted to push harder than the President. But we have to concede the obvious: Were it not for the President's dogged determination, we would not have this alliance, this coalition imposing sanctions on Iran today that have made a difference and brought Iran to the negotiating table. Give President Obama credit for that. Whether it is Prime Minister Netanyahu or the Republicans, who are generally critical of the President, at least acknowledge the obvious. The President made his position clear that he opposes a nuclear Iran, and he made it clear that he would put his resources and energy into building a coalition to stop that possibility.

Secondly, it is this President's leadership which has created the Iron Dome defense—the missile defense—which has protected Israel. That has been a very effective defense mechanism. I know that as chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, we appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for that protection. President Obama initiated—if not initiated, was an early supporter of this effort and has funded it throughout his Presidency, and now it has kept Israel safe. I hope the Republicans and Prime Minister Netanyahu will give the administration credit for that effort to keep their nation safe.

I will also say about negotiations that here is the reality: We have countries around the world joining us in a regime to impose sanctions on Iran in order to bring Iran to the negotiating table, and they are there. The negotiations are at a delicate moment—literally weeks away from seeing whether we can move forward. I hope they are successful. The President has said at best there is a 50/50 chance of success. It is just that challenging. But let's consider what the alternative will be if negotiations fail.

First, if we can reach an agreement, we have to verify it. We can't take the word of Iran. We need to make certain that when they promise they will destroy certain equipment, they will not go forward in developing a nuclear weapon, we can verify that. Without verification, the agreement is worthless, and the President has said as much.

Let's assume the worst case: Either the negotiations break down or the

verification proves Iran did not negotiate in good faith. What then is the alternative? Well, if the coalition that imposed the sanctions believes we made good-faith efforts to bring Iran to a peaceful place and they failed, then we can continue the sanctions regime and put more pressure on them to move forward to a good solution. But if there is a feeling among our coalition that we have not negotiated in good faith, that we didn't make an honest effort to find common ground with Iran that avoids nuclearizing, we could lose the sanctions regime, and then it would become next to impossible to put the pressure on Iran to make them change.

What the President is trying to do is to achieve through negotiations a peaceful end to this global challenge and secondly to make sure the sanctions regime—the countries that have joined us, P5+1 and others—will continue to believe we are operating in good faith and continue to support us. The alternative is to allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapon. That is unthinkable. If it starts to occur, there will be a military response, and it will be deadly. I don't know the scope or nature of it. There is no way to guess. But we understand what it would mean if military action is taken against Iran because of the development of these nuclear weapons.

Let me also say that I am considering and reviewing the so-called Corker-Menendez proposal that the Congress will review any agreement that is reached with the Iranians. I have not reached a decision yet because I think it raises a serious and important question of policy and the Constitution. We know that if we are dealing with a treaty, it is up to the Senate to step forward and approve such a treaty. But this is not a treaty; this is in the nature of an agreement. We have had nuclear arms agreements in the past that were not subject to congressional approval. We have had agreements on the environment and other issues that were not subject to congressional approval. I need to look and review carefully whether the Corker-Menendez legislation that has been proposed is a reasonable assertion of congressional authority.

I will also add that it is obvious—and I wish to state it because it was raised as a question in the earlier comments—any congressionally imposed sanctions will require congressional action to suspend them. Ultimately, Congress has the last word on sanctions we have put into law. I don't think there is any question about that. Those sanctions imposed by the executive branch the President may remove or change by Executive order should he choose, but the congressional authority to continue sanctions or even propose new ones is not diminished by any agreement which is reached by the President.

Earlier I listened to the majority leader as he came to the floor and spoke about a number of issues. I would like to address one of the issues he raised in criticism of the President. He criticized the President for proposing the closure of Guantanamo as a prison for those who we suspect are engaged in terrorism. The President's position on this has been very clear, and I have supported it for two reasons. First, we know Guantanamo has become a symbol around the world—a symbol which has been used against the United States when they want to recruit terrorists to attack our country. I think Guantanamo has outlived its usefulness and should be closed.

The second point is one that is very obvious. We have over 300 convicted terrorists currently serving their time in the existing Federal prison system. In Federal prisons across this Nation, including my State of Illinois, we have convicted terrorists who are reporting to their cells every day and are no threat to the community at large. They are being handled in a professional, thoughtful way by the men and women who work for the Bureau of Prisons, and there has never been any question as to whether the terrorists in this system are somehow a threat to this country. In fact, they are well contained and have been for a long time.

The alternative at Guantanamo is one that even fiscal conservatives ought to think about twice. We are currently spending up to \$3 million per Guantanamo prisoner each year to incarcerate them—almost \$3 million a prisoner. What does it cost to keep the most dangerous prisoners in the Federal prison system in the maximum security prisons? No more than \$60,000 a year—\$60,000 to keep them in the Federal prison system and \$3 million to keep them in Guantanamo. It is 50 times the cost, if my calculations are correct. That suggests to me a horrible waste of money—money that could be better spent to keep America safe rather than maintain this symbol of Guantanamo.

Secondly, an argument was made by the majority leader earlier that we made the mistake of bringing our troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan. I disagree. This notion of a permanent army of occupation by the United States in the Middle East is certainly not one that I welcome. We need to encourage those countries—Iraq and Afghanistan—to develop their own capacity to protect their own countries. The United States can be helpful. We can provide support. But ultimately we have to call on these countries to step forward and to defend themselves with our support so long as they are fighting the forces of terrorism.

I see my colleague Senator MENENDEZ is on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate my distinguished colleague yielding some time to me.

I rise in anticipation of the speech of our ally and our partner, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel, to the soon-to-be joint meeting of Congress.

I agree with many of my colleagues that the political timing of the Prime Minister's speech to the Congress is a challenging one and one that didn't derive itself under the best of circumstances. But I also think very clearly that it is important to listen to what the elected leader of the people of Israel—the one true democracy in the Middle East, a major trading partner of the United States, a major security ally of the United States, and the one country most likely to be voting with us in common cause in international forums—has to say.

There is a history here that I think drives the leader of the Jewish people to the circumstances in which he feels so passionately about the security of his country. If you traveled to Israel, as I have, and I think many Members here have as well, here is a country in which you can go from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem on a good day in 45 minutes. It is a country which—if you fly its width, it would take just a couple of minutes. It is a country which has its back to the sea and which is surrounded by neighbors who, generally speaking, are hostile. It is a country whose people have a history in which there are those who have sought to annihilate them. Maybe we cannot fathom those challenges, but those are the challenges of the people of Israel. So when you have an issue such as Iran's march toward nuclear weapons, you have an understanding of why the people of Israel have a concern for the existential threat that Iran, if it achieves nuclear weapons, is ultimately capable of creating.

I have worked as hard as anyone else. As a matter of fact, I started my focus on Iran when I was in the House of Representatives and found out that the United States was sending voluntary contributions to the International Atomic Energy Administration beyond our membership dues to do what? To create operational capacity of the Bushehr nuclear facility—not in the national interest and security of the United States, not in the interest of our ally, the State of Israel, and I led a drive to stop those voluntary contributions.

Since then—it has been almost 20 years now—I have been following Iran's march toward nuclear power, not for peaceful purposes—because, let's be honest, a country that has one of the world's largest oil and other reserves doesn't need nuclear power for domestic consumption, and because of what we clearly believe was the militarization of its efforts at Parchin that, in

fact, there were purposes that were not benign.

We all hope for a deal. Although today when Foreign Minister Zarif said in response to President Obama's comments that 10 years should be the minimum timeframe for a deal, he—Foreign Minister Zarif—said that is unacceptable, illogical, and excessive, that is a problem.

So I look forward to listening to what the Prime Minister has to say about the challenge to all of us—our national security and to Israel's national security—and to understand all of the dimensions, historical and otherwise, so we can conclude and make our own judgments. If Prime Minister Cameron can come here and lobby the Congress on sanctions, which is fine with me, then I think it is also fair to listen to what the Prime Minister of Israel has to say, and I look forward to hearing what he has to say.

With that, I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

##### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:30 a.m., took a recess, and the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Julie E. Adams; the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, James Morhard; and the President pro tempore (ORRIN G. HATCH), proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address delivered by His Excellency Benjamin Netanyahu, Prime Minister of Israel.

(The address delivered by the Prime Minister of Israel to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

At 2:15 p.m., the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 625

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 625) to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating

to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning Prime Minister Netanyahu laid out the threat posed by a nuclear Iran in very clear terms—not just to Israel, not just to the United States, but to the entire world. He reminded us that no deal with Iran is better than a bad deal with Iran.

That seems to run counter to the Obama administration's thinking on the issue, which is worrying enough. What is also worrying is its seeming determination to pursue a deal on its own, without the input of the people's elected representatives. Remember, it was Congress that helped bring Iran to the table by putting sanctions in place, actually against—against—the wishes of the administration.

Congress was right then. And Congress and the American people need to be a part of this discussion too. That is why I am acting to place this bipartisan bill on the legislative calendar. It is legislation crafted by Members of both parties that would ensure the American people have a say in any deal. Senators CORKER, GRAHAM, and others worked on similar legislation, and they will mark that bill up in committee.

Congress must be involved in reviewing and voting on an agreement reached between this White House and Iran, and this bill would ensure that happens.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, pursuant to the provisions of the Congressional Review Act, I move to proceed to S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

This motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk (Sara Schwartzman) called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 66 Leg.]

##### YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Rubio
Coats	Hoeven	Sasse
Cochran	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

##### NAYS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

##### NOT VOTING—2

Blunt                      McCaskill

The motion was agreed to.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now report the joint resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the Congressional Review Act, there will now be up to 10 hours for debate, equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to discuss the Congressional Review Act resolution that Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, Senator ENZI, the Senator from Wyoming, and I have filed to

stop a new National Labor Relations Board rule. Last December, the National Labor Relations Board issued a final rule that shortened the time between when pro-union organizers ask an employer for a secret ballot election and when that election actually takes place.

I refer to this as the “ambush election rule,” because it forces a union election before an employer has the chance to figure out what is going on. Even worse, it jeopardizes employees’ privacy by requiring employers to turn over employees’ personal information, including email addresses, phone numbers, shift hours, and locations to union organizers.

This action by the National Labor Relations Board, which increasingly has become a union advocate instead of umpiring disputes between employees and employers, has attracted enormous attention across this country. I have letters from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Coalition for a Democratic Workplace, the National Council of Chain Restaurants, the National Retail Federation, the Retail Industry Leaders Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, the American Lodging and Hotel Association, HR Policy Association, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Society for Human Resource Management, the Associated General Contractors of America—173 total organizations that have registered their deep concern about this ambush election rule.

Senator ENZI is already on the floor. He has for many years fought this battle. We want the American people to understand why the ambush election rule is such a bad idea, why it is so unfair to employers, forcing them to have a union election before they can figure out what is going on. For the same reason, it is unfair to employees. Employees have to vote in a union election before they have a chance to hear both sides.

Here is how the procedure will work. If a majority of the Senate approves this resolution, it will then go to the House for a vote. If it passes both chambers, the President can veto the resolution. It will take two-thirds of the Senate to override that veto.

If the NLRB’s new rule is disapproved, the Board cannot issue a substantially similar rule without congressional approval. The question I would ask is: What is the rush? What is the problem here? Today, more than 95 percent of union elections occur within 56 days of the petition filing. But under this new rule, elections could take place in as few as 11 days. This rule will harm employers and employees alike. If you are an employer that is ambushed by that 11-day election, here is how it works. On day 1, you get a faxed copy of an election petition that has been filed at your local NLRB regional office stating that 30 percent of your employees support a union.

The union may have already been quietly trying to organize for months without your knowledge. Your employees have only been able to hear the union’s point of view. By day 2 or 3, you must publicly post an election notice in your workplace. If you communicate to your employees electronically, you have to publish the notice online as well. By noon on day 7 you must file with the NLRB what is called a statement of position. This is a comprehensive document in which an employer sets out legal positions and claims in writing. Under the NLRB’s new rule, you waive your rights to use any legal arguments not raised in this document. So it should be pretty obvious that by day 7 you will have to have a lawyer on hand. You probably need that lawyer on hand on day 2, and hopefully on day 1, because if you make any mistakes in the lead-up to the election, the NLRB might set aside the result and order a rerun election. Worse, if a bigger mistake is made, it could require an employer to automatically bargain with the union.

Now think about the real world. At our hearing before the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, a representative of the National Federation of Independent Businesses testified. She said there are 350,000 independent business owners in the NFIB, with an average of 10 employees. So you have small businesses all over America. They do not sit around with labor lawyers; they do not have money to hire labor lawyers. They are expected to know in a day or two exactly what to do about a complicated petition before the NLRB because of this ambush election rule that could cause the election to happen within 11 days.

On day 7, you must also present the union and the NLRB with a list of prospective voters as well as their job classifications, shifts, and work locations.

Now if you are a business with five, six, seven, eight employees, you are going to be spending your time working on this union matter. Your customers might want your services. They might want on-time deliveries. All of a sudden, you are running around trying to find a labor lawyer, trying to avoid making mistakes, so you can deal with this ambush election.

On day 8, a pre-election hearing is held at the NLRB regional office and an election day is set. By day 10, the employer must present the union with a list of employee names, personal email addresses, personal cell phone numbers, and home addresses. You have to hand this information over, even if the employees object.

Day 11 is the earliest day on which the NLRB can conduct the election under the new rule. The union has the power to postpone an election by an additional 10 days, but the employer has

no corresponding power. The union has ambushed the employer and has the power to postpone the election, but the employer has no similar right.

Under this new NLRB rule, before the hearing on day 8, an employer will have less than 1 week to do the following things:

Figure out what an election petition is. For most of those hundreds of thousands of small businesses with five, six, eight employees, they might have no idea what it is.

Find legal representation. Finding a lawyer is not just a matter of looking in a phone book, it is a matter of finding a lawyer with whom you are comfortable, whom you trust, and whom you know has some ability. That may take a while, particularly if you are not a large company and you are not accustomed to labor relations litigation.

Determine legal positions on the relevant issues—learning what statements and actions the law permits and prohibits.

Communicate with employees about the decision they are making.

Correct any misstatements and falsehoods that employees may be hearing from union organizers.

As I mentioned earlier, making even the slightest mistake in the lead-up to an election can result in the NLRB setting aside the results and ordering a rerun election, or worse, when a bigger mistake is made, the Board could require an employer to automatically bargain with the union.

But it is the employees who stand to lose the most under the new rule. First, some of the employees may know what is going on before the union files its notice of an election. But all of the employees do not have a chance to hear both sides of the issue in an ambush election.

Second, because of the ambush, employees may have only heard half the story. Only 4.3 percent of union elections occur more than 56 days after the petition is filed. The current median number of days between the filing of an election is 38 days. These figures are well within the NLRB’s own goals for timely elections.

The unions won 64 percent of elections in 2013. In recent years the union win rate has actually been going up. What is the rush? Why is 38 days too long? It is well within the NLRB’s own goals and unions are winning more elections than they lose.

Let’s turn to 1959, when a former Member of this body, Senator John F. Kennedy, warned against rushing employees into elections in a debate over amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. This is what he said:

There should be at least a 30-day interval between the request for an election and the holding of the election in which both parties can present their viewpoints.

Senator John F. Kennedy, April 21, 1959.

If Senator Kennedy thought 30 days was approximately right, if 38 days is the mean today, and if that is within the NLRB's own goals, why the rush? Why the push for an ambush election? Why have an election that can be set in 11 days before employers and employees know what is going on?

When a workplace is unionized, especially in a State that has no right-to-work law, employees have dues money taken out of every paycheck whether they like it or not. They lose the ability to deal directly with their employers to address concerns or ask for a promotion or a raise. Instead, employees have to work through the union. Important considerations, such as which of their fellow employees will be included in a bargaining unit, will no longer be determined before the election. As the two dissenting members of the NLRB put it when this rule was decided: Employees will be asked to "vote now, understand later."

I wish to emphasize what the employees are losing, in addition to the opportunity to fully understand the election before them. Employees are losing their privacy, because the rule requires employers to hand over employees' personal email addresses, cell phone numbers, shift hours and locations, job classifications, even if the employees have made clear they do not want to be contacted by union organizers.

Some on the other side say: It is the modern age. But I would say that in the modern age our privacy is assaulted from every side. We should be even more careful about rushing an election and releasing personal information. Employers should not have to hand over employees' personal email address, cell phone numbers, shift locations, and job classifications just because a petition is filed by 30 percent of the employees. Many employees may have no interest in creating a union.

This rule appears to be a solution in search of a problem. It is clear to see it is wrong, and that is why Senators ENZI, MCCONNELL, and I are asking the Senate to disapprove it today and prohibit the NLRB from issuing any similar rule.

I will come back to the floor during our debate time to talk about how this rule is part of the National Labor Relations Board's attempt to become more advocate than umpire. That is the reason Senator MCCONNELL and I have introduced legislation that would change the National Labor Relations Board back from an advocate to an umpire by doing three things. First, it would end partisan advocacy by creating a six-member board of three Republicans and three Democrats where a majority would require both sides to find middle ground. Second, the legislation would rein in the general counsel. Businesses and unions would be able to challenge complaints filed by the general counsel in Federal district court. Third, it

would encourage timely decisions. Either party in a case before the Board may appeal to the Federal court of appeals if the Board fails to reach a decision within 1 year.

When I come back to the floor I will also talk about the joint employer standard and the NLRB's decision to destroy more than 700,000 American franchise businesses. These men and women operate health clubs, barber-shops, auto parts shops, childcare centers, neighborhood restaurants, music stores, cleaning services, and much more.

Combine the attack on franchises with the ambush election rule and an NLRB decision allowing micro-unions—where unions target small units in a large company—and we see there is a consistent trend by unions and their friends in the NLRB to tip the balance in ways never intended by the creators of the National Labor Relations Act.

The National Labor Relations Board is supposed to be an umpire, not an advocate. If there ever was an example of unfairness and tipping the balance in a single direction, it would be the ambush election rule. The rule allows union organizers to ambush an unsuspecting company and force an election in 11 days—before the employer and its employees have time to figure out what is going on.

In conclusion, I think Senator Kennedy's advice is good advice to follow. Much has changed since 1959, but fairness, balance, and giving everyone a chance to have an opportunity to know what is going on have not. Senator Kennedy thought 30 days was about right, and 38 days is the mean today. This ambush election rule would reduce it to 11.

That is the wrong thing to do, and I hope the majority in the Senate agrees with me on that. I hope the House agrees with us on that. I hope the President will agree with us on that. If he vetoes it, as he has said today he will, then I hope a majority of both parties will speak up for employers and employees in the United States and say no ambush elections for us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe that real long-term economic growth is built from the middle out, not from the top down, and our government has a role to play in investing in working families, making sure they have the opportunity to work hard and succeed and offering a hand up to those who want to climb the economic ladder and provide a better life for themselves and their families. Our government and our economy should be working for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

Thankfully, we have had the opportunity to put some policies into place

over the past few years that have pulled our economy back from the brink and have started moving us in the right direction. We are not there yet, but across the country businesses have now added almost 12 million new jobs over 59 straight months of job growth, including almost 1 million manufacturing jobs. The unemployment rate is now under 6 percent. Health care costs are growing at their lowest rate in almost 50 years, while millions more families have access to affordable coverage. The Federal budget deficit has been reduced by more than two-thirds since President Obama took office. Although some Republicans are now threatening to bring this back, we have been able to move away from the constant tea party-driven crisis and uncertainty that was destroying jobs and holding our economy back.

We are headed in a good direction, and I am proud of the policies we fought for that helped us get here, but we have a whole lot more to do. Over the past few decades, working families have seen their incomes stagnate while the cost of living and health care and education has continued to go up. For most workers, wages have stayed flat or have fallen over the past five decades. According to the National Employment Law Project, from 2009 to 2013 hourly wages declined by 3.4 percent. During that time low- and mid-wage workers experienced greater declines than higher wage workers. That means that across our country today too many families are struggling to make ends meet on rock-bottom wages and poor working conditions on the job.

While the middle class's share of America's prosperity is at an alltime low, the biggest corporations have posted record profits. Congress should be working on ways to build an economy that works for all of our families, not just those at the top. Unfortunately, once again, instead of standing up for workers, my Republican colleagues are rushing to the defense of the biggest corporations that have an interest in keeping wages low and denying workers a voice to improve their workplace.

Workers have a right to decide whether they want union representation. To ensure they are able to exercise that right, the National Labor Relations Board—or the NLRB—helps to make sure workers have a fair up-or-down vote.

Unfortunately, too often big corporations take advantage of loopholes in the current election process to delay a vote on union representation. Unnecessary litigation and excessive delays threaten the rights of workers who want to have a free and fair election. In too many cases big corporations take advantage of every possible opportunity and wasteful legal hurdle—



sometimes on small technicalities—just to delay a vote.

Sometimes the confrontation and hostility during the election process can be extreme. A study from the Center for Economic and Policy Research found that among workers who openly advocate for a union during an election campaign one in five is fired. Bureaucratic delays make the problem worse. Another study—this one from UC Berkeley—found the longer the delay before an election, the more likely the NLRB will charge employers with attempts to tamper with the vote.

What is clear from that research is that delays only create more barriers that deny workers their right to organize a union. The NLRB was absolutely right to carry out its mission to review and streamline its election process and to bring down those barriers for workers to get a fair vote because it is clear the current system is outdated and vulnerable to abuse.

As I have mentioned, the current election process is overburdened by unnecessary and wasteful litigation which drags out elections and puts workers' rights on hold. Not only that, the election process for one region of the country can be substantially different from another region, and that adds to inefficiencies and a lot of confusion.

Workers have the right to vote on union representation in elections that are efficient and free from unnecessary delays and wasteful stall tactics. So after a very rigorous review process, in December of last year, the NLRB made reforms to their election procedures. These updates will make modest but important changes to modernize and streamline the process. They will reduce unnecessary litigation on issues that will not affect the outcome of the election. The new reforms will bring the election process into the 21st century by letting employers and unions file forms electronically. They will allow the use of more modern forms of communication to employees through their cell phones and their emails.

It is important to note that in many regions the NLRB has already adopted some of these much needed reforms to the election process, so we know this can work. These reforms will simply standardized the best practices for the election process across regions, which will help all sides—all sides—know what to expect during the process to promote uniformity and predictability.

These changes aren't just good for the workers, but they are good for employers by streamlining the process when workers file a petition to have an election on whether to join a union, and the reforms will make sure all sides have the information they need.

I have laid out the improvements the new reforms will make, but let's talk about what these guidelines will not do. The new process does not require

elections to be held within any specific timeframe. I want to repeat that because it is important. Contrary to what some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are arguing, these new guidelines do not require elections to be held within any specific timeframe. Not only that, but this rule does not in any way prevent companies from communicating their views about unionization. Employers are able to communicate extensively with their employees about union issues, and these reforms do nothing to stop that. Employers would still be able to talk with their workers about what a union would mean for their company.

The reforms simply make some commonsense updates to create a fair opportunity for workers to decide if they want union representation, but some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take great offense to these modest changes. Instead of standing up for workers across the country who are struggling with stagnant wages and poor working conditions, Republicans have chosen to challenge these commonsense reforms with a resolution of disapproval, and that is why we are here today.

Instead of talking about how to create jobs and help working families who are struggling, Republicans would rather roll back workers' rights to gain a voice at the bargaining table. The Republicans' attempt to stop this rule through a resolution would have major consequences for businesses, for unions, and workers who want a fair election process.

Passing the resolution would not only prevent the NLRB from implementing these commonsense reforms, but this resolution would take the drastic step of also preventing the NLRB from adopting any similar election rules in the future. So the outdated election process that leads today to frivolous litigation and delays would remain frozen in time without further congressional action.

Let us be clear. This rule is simply about reducing unnecessary litigation and allowing the use of cell phones and email. I have heard some of my colleagues call this frontier justice. Everyone else calls it the 21st century.

By law workers have the right to join a union so they can have a voice in the workplace. That is not an ambush, it is their right. It is guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act and by the First Amendment of our Constitution. So when workers want to vote on whether to form a union, they aren't looking for special treatment, they are simply trying to exercise their basic right. We, as a nation, should not turn our back on empowering workers through collective bargaining, especially because that is the very thing that has helped so many workers climb into the middle class. Workers having a seat at the bargaining table is very

critical to America's middle class. When more workers can stand up for their rights or wage increases or making sure their workplaces are safer or they have access to health care, those things get better for them.

In short, Americans are better able to share in the economic prosperity they have earned through their hard work. It is no coincidence that when union membership was at its peak in the middle of the last century, America's middle class grew strong. Collective bargaining is what gave workers the power to increase their wages. Unions helped workers get the training they needed to build their skills so they could advance on the job. They helped to make sure men and women had safe work places, and through collective bargaining access to health care rose. Workers shared in our country's prosperity. All of those benefits strengthen economic security for the middle class and for those working hard to get there.

In Congress, we need to continue to work to expand economic security for more families. That should be our mission, to help move our country forward. This resolution would simply be a step backward. So instead of attacking workers who just want a voice in the workplace, I hope my colleagues will reject this resolution. Instead, I really hope Republicans will join with Democrats and work with us to protect workers rights and increase wages and grow our Nation's middle class. I truly hope we can break through the gridlock and work together on policies that create jobs, expand our economic security, and generate a very broad-based economic growth for our workers and our families, not just for the wealthiest few.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to object to another administrative overreach. As I travel the country and Wyoming, that is what I hear about—the way this administration keeps overreaching. Fortunately, there is a mechanism for us to object to the overreach; it is the Congressional Review Act. Very seldom can it be used. This is one of those instances where it can. When it is published as a final rule, we have an opportunity to circulate a petition. If we get enough signatures on it, we can have what we are having today, which is 10 hours of debate, with a vote up or down on whether that rule is what Congress intended—not what the administration intended but what Congress intended.

Unfortunately, when this rule was written, there was a provision that it went to the President. The President doesn't assign rules. Congress assigns rules, so Congress ought to have the final voice on whether a rule is appropriate. We don't. But we have a chance

to voice it because we are going to get 10 hours of debate to talk about this proposed rule by the National Labor Relations Board—a totally appointed board, not an elected board, three Democrats, two Republicans. If this were as modest a change as we just heard, there would have been some common ground that would have brought one or both of the Republicans along. That has been a thing of the National Labor Relations Board in the past but not anymore. Now the Republican members of this National Labor Relations Board are ambushed as well, and we come up with what we call the ambush elections rule.

So I rise to encourage my colleagues to support the Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval of the National Labor Relations Board ambush elections rule. I again thank my friend Senator ALEXANDER, the chairman of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, for leading this resolution. Oversight of Federal agencies is one of the most important duties of a committee chair, and I appreciate his work and the way he goes about it.

The National Labor Relations Board has proposed a rule that would drastically alter the way union elections are held.

A union election is one of the most significant decisions employees will have to decide at their workplace. It fundamentally alters their relationship with their employer, with the men and women they work with every day, and with the community. A union election means that small business employers have to meet unfamiliar and complicated legal obligations, with serious consequences for failing to meet deadlines, file specific documents, or assert their rights in the process.

The current process for holding union elections is both fair and timely. It ensures that businesses and employers have the necessary time to fully meet their legal requirements. It gives employees time to educate themselves about what unionization will mean for them and their families and to investigate the union that would be representing them to ensure that it is consistent with their values and priorities.

Under the current process, the average time between when an election petition is filed and ballots are cast is only 38 days. That is under 6 weeks. And more than 95 percent of union elections are held within 2 months of an election petition.

The rule the National Labor Relations Board is pushing would squeeze union elections into as few as 11 days. No, it doesn't require 11 days; it can shorten the time to as few as 11 days. That is just 11 days for employees to learn about the union that would have overwhelming influence on the future of their work conditions and to learn about what unionization would mean in their workplace and what dues they

would have to pay. That is 11 days for employers to learn about their rights and requirements during the election, to collect information about employees that must be submitted, to draw up the final documents, to ensure that they haven't missed anything, and to make their position clear to their employees—all that while running their business. It is not enough time. The smaller the business, the more critical it is.

It is important to point out that a union that wants to organize in the workplace isn't subjected to that timeline at all. A union can start its campaign months in advance, maybe even years. Professional union organizers can start making their pitch long before they intend to petition for an election. Organizers have plenty of time to figure out which employees are union supporters and which employees might be on the fence but could be convinced. A union can take its time to create a narrative and build its case to workers, and it can do so without the business ever knowing. And then when the union decides the time is right, it can petition for the election when it is most advantageous for the union.

This is why we call it the ambush election rule—because if this rule goes into effect, after a union has had months to build its case in its favor, a business will only have a few days to respond. That is only a few days to figure out what union officials have told employees; to determine if there are any misstatements, falsehoods, or misconceptions that need to be addressed in what employees have been told; to make the employer's position clear and answer any questions employees might have; and to meet all their legal obligations under the union election process. But it is not so simple because under the rules, employers must follow specific guidelines about what they can and cannot say and even who can say it.

I don't know any entrepreneurs who started a business because they were excited about understanding the ins and outs of the National Labor Relations Act. That is why it is important to maintain the current system, which includes sufficient time for employers to study election procedures, understand their legal requirements, and ensure they are meeting their obligations to their employees. The National Labor Relations Board's rule will deny employers the necessary time to do their due diligence.

This would be especially true for small businesses that don't have in-house lawyers or human resources departments. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy, and staying competitive means that small business owners have to take on a whole range of responsibilities. They have to be accountants. They have to be janitors. They have to play dozens of different roles every day to keep their business

going. The rule we are debating today would mean they would suddenly have to become labor lawyers too.

Most small business owners are not familiar with the complex business laws that determine what they can and cannot do during a union election. They might not know that if they make certain statements or take certain actions, the National Labor Relations Board can impose a bargaining obligation on them even without a secret ballot election. Let me repeat that. They might not know that if they make certain statements or take certain actions, the National Labor Relations Board can impose a bargaining obligation on them without a secret ballot election. They might not know that they have certain rights but that they have to exercise those rights at a certain point in the process or they forfeit them.

Under the current system, they have time to learn. More importantly, they have time to work with their employees and even with the union organizers. One of the ways the current system succeeds is that it allows businesses, employees, and unions that would want to hold an election to work together through the election process. Many of the union elections that happen in less than the 38-day average are able to move forward so quickly because all sides can come to an agreement on the issues, efficiently resolve any disagreements, and hold an election without any holdup. Businesses have enough time to understand the process, and that allows them to work cooperatively. If a business can be confident that it doesn't need to file unnecessary paperwork or hold unnecessary meetings, it can move forward without unnecessary delays. That won't be the case under the new rule where businesses—especially small businesses—don't have the time to get comfortable enough with the process. And I predict that the number of elections where unions and businesses can work cooperatively to hold elections more efficiently will fall significantly.

Under the new rule, a small business is going to have two options—either go into an election blind and hope they don't make any mistakes and hope everything comes out OK or take every precaution, hold every hearing, and fully exercise every right to make sure they don't miss anything important.

I believe small business owners want to work in good faith with unions through this process, but the ambush election rule is going to make it harder for them to do that. Efficient elections are better for everyone. Businesses can get back to work faster, unions can hold an election sooner, and employees get a fair and timely vote. But this rule is going to make it harder for that to be the case.

The National Labor Relations Board says it is making this rule because the

process needs to be streamlined and updated. But what the Board is doing in a very partisan way simply doesn't make sense in light of the fact that the average time for a union election is 38 days—which means many elections happen sooner than that—and that nearly all elections are completed in less than 2 months.

The Board says these rules are meant to address problems with some elections that have been held up for months or years. That would really affect these mean numbers, so that can't be much of the case. If that is the case, why did they write a rule that is going to undermine a system that already provides for timely elections and gives businesses the time they need to work cooperatively with unions? When an agency makes a rule, it is supposed to be solving a specific problem, and that rule is supposed to be targeted at fixing this problem. In this case, NLRB's rule has not targeted the problem they want to fix. What is worse, this rule is going to undermine a system that meets the needs of businesses, unions, and employees in all but a handful of cases.

This rule doesn't make sense, and the way the Board is pushing this rule doesn't fit with how labor laws should be updated and improved. The National Labor Relations Act is a carefully balanced law that hasn't been changed very often. When changes have been made, it has been the result of careful negotiation, input from stakeholders, and thoughtful debate. Unfortunately, it looks as though the only stakeholders in the room when the Board wrote this ambush elections rule were the unions.

The Board also says that its rule is intended to update the elections process to account for new technology, such as email and cell phones. Unfortunately, the rule fails to take into account the key concerns about data privacy and security that we face today. It undermines employees' privacy at a time when identity theft, computer crimes, and cyber security are serious issues.

Under current law, an employer is required to turn over employees' names and addresses within 7 days once an election is set. The proposed rule would not only expand the type of personal information that must be turned over, but would require that information be handed over to the union within 2 days. The expanded information the Board wants employers to give to the unions includes all personal home phone numbers, all cell phone numbers, and all email addresses that the employer has on file. It would also require work location, shift information, and employment classification. All of that can be used to harass the employee whether they want to be contacted or not, whether they want information or not.

Now keep in mind that under the new rule, the question about which workers

are eligible to unionize or to participate in the vote isn't determined until after the election. What? They are not going to know which workers are eligible to unionize or to participate in the vote until after the election. That is a strange rule. The ambush election rule would require employees to hand over personal information on their employees to unions without confirming which employees should or should not be on that list. That is part of the process that gets left out.

The purpose of requiring the information, of course, is so the union organizers can come to your home, call you whenever they want, email you, find you after work and intercept you before or after your shift. There is no time limit to how many times union organizers can contact you or at what time. There is no opt-out for employees who simply don't want to be contacted. That could turn into a serious invasion of privacy for any employee, but for an employee who isn't eligible to participate in the election but has his or her information turned over to the union anyway, that is a serious breach of privacy.

I think it is important to point out how this rule undermines employee privacy, particularly when we frequently hear about news of data breaches, stolen credit card numbers, and identity theft. Protecting personal information is not something that can be taken lightly. Union elections can be very intense, an emotional experience for employees, employers, and union organizers alike. The last thing this rule should do is create a situation where an employee's personal information is used as a tool for harassment or intimidation.

The National Labor Relations Board is supposed to be an impartial body that hears cases, weighs the facts, and makes fair, unbiased decisions according to the law. Although the Board's decisions set precedents that determine how labor laws are applied going forward, it has not traditionally been a rulemaking agency. It has issued only a small number of rules, especially compared to other departments and agencies. Unfortunately, the Board has gone too far with the ambush elections rule. It has taken upon itself to impose new regulations that would hurt businesses, undermine a sensitive process that has already provided fair and timely elections, give up employee privacy, and bend carefully balanced labor laws in favor of the unions. Congress needs to tell the National Labor Relations Board this rule is out of bounds.

The Congressional Review Act gives Congress a tool to rein in agencies that use the Federal rulemaking process in ways Congress never intended. When an agency goes beyond what Congress has authorized or tries to issue regulations that would be harmful, the Congressional Review Act ensures that Con-

gress can intervene and hopefully prevent that rule from going into effect. Congressional Review Act resolutions can't be held up by the usual procedural delay tactics, although today we saw a historic event. For the first time the Congressional Review Act had to have a cloture motion for it. That is privileged, so the cloture motion only required 51, but I have done several of these, and that is the first time I ever remember having to do a cloture motion. That is a filibuster. That is a delay on an inevitable discussion of the actions taken by a board.

So at the end of the day the Senate has to vote. That is important because it means Congress's oversight responsibilities over executive branch overreach has a real and immediate effect when we use the Congressional Review Act. But it goes further than that, because the Congressional Review Act also says once Congress has disapproved a rule, it cannot be reissued by the agency. That is important in this case, because this isn't the first time the National Labor Relations Board has issued this rule. The rule we are debating today is nearly identical to the rule the Board proposed in 2012, which was overturned by the courts because the Board failed to follow its own procedures when it issued the rule.

We need to pass this Congressional Review Act resolution, not just to roll back the National Labor Relations Board's unnecessary and harmful rule, but to make it clear to the Board that Congress has the final word on this rule and any other rule, and that the issue is closed.

It will also be a lesson to other boards and agencies proposing rules without finding common ground, without looking at some of the common sense, and without looking out for the hard-working taxpayers.

The Board has already issued this rule twice, and we should make sure this is the last time. Congress should make it clear that unnecessary regulations that hurt small business and undermine the fair and timely elections process are nonstarters.

I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval. We need to remind the National Labor Relations Board and other boards and agencies that their duty is to consider the facts of specific cases, to treat parties in those cases fairly, and to make impartial decisions according to the law. The Board's role is not to try to stack the system against one side or tip the scales in favor of the other, which is what this rule does. This rule makes it harder for businesses to meet their obligations in good faith. It denies employees the time they need to be able to make informed decisions, and it undermines the fair and timely process for union elections that is currently in place.

As you heard a number of times, John F. Kennedy, when he was a Member of the Senate, said 30 days was a pretty good time. Moving it down to 11 days—I don't think he would approve of that.

This is one of the most important votes on labor issues we will have this year, and I urge my colleagues to put a stop to this burdensome rule.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally allocated to the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 638 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, on a separate topic, I would like to urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 8, the joint resolution of disapproval under the Congressional Review Act of the National Labor Relations Board's final rule regarding union representation election procedures.

As we heard today, it is often called the ambush election rule. It gained its namesake because it shortens the time between when a union files a petition for an election and the holding of that election.

As a cosponsor of this resolution and a signer of the discharge petition to bring it before us for consideration, I believe this rule needs to be stopped before it takes effect on April 14.

According to NLRB data for the last 10 years, the median time before the union election was 38 days. This proposed rule could shorten that timeframe to as few as 11 days. The rule gives employers only 7 days to find legal counsel and appear before an NLRB regional office at a preelection hearing. Prior to that hearing, the employer must file a Statement of Position, which raises any and all legal challenges they may use later on. This is particularly burdensome for small businesses that typically don't have inhouse legal counsel. They have little time to get advice on what is permitted during this process.

There are also privacy issues with this rule's requirement that employers must hand over employees' personal information—including cellphone numbers, personal email addresses, shift times, and locations—to unions. With more than 95 percent of these elections occurring in less than 2 months, it is hard to understand why this onerous ambush election rule is even necessary.

Instead of burdening small businesses with complicated legal work and increased regulations, this administration and the NLRB should be focusing their efforts on increasing job growth and improving the economy.

I encourage my colleagues to support this resolution of disapproval.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democrats control the time between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. and the majority control the time between 5 p.m. and 6 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, tomorrow morning the Supreme Court is going to hear oral arguments in *King v. Burwell*. The Supreme Court's ruling could have sweeping consequences for the well-being of millions of Americans and for our Nation's entire health care system.

The issue at hand is whether Americans who receive the opportunity to buy quality health insurance, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, can get assistance in paying for that care. The law gives our States a choice. Our States can design and manage an insurance exchange on their own or they can allow their citizens to shop on a federally run exchange. Furthermore, the law created tax credits to help Americans afford the cost of health insurance.

Thirty-six States took the Federal option. Eighty-seven percent of the people who signed up in those States get some measure of assistance so as to better afford coverage. However, the petitioners in *King v. Burwell* argue that those Americans should be denied any assistance.

In my view, the answer is simple. Let's help those who are in need. Let's not go back to that time in America when health care was for the healthy and for the wealthy.

If one flips on C-SPAN and listens to the Congress debate and question the administration, one might hear something wildly different. Some Members

of Congress seem to be rooting for Americans to lose their subsidies and consequently their access to affordable health coverage. In fact, Members of Congress have filed briefs with the Supreme Court making essentially that argument. At the same time, they have asked how the Obama administration would clean up the aftermath. To me, that is like pouring gasoline on a fire and then indignantly demanding that somebody else go put it out.

There is no question the law's implementation has at times been a challenge. That is true of all major legislation. It is clear there ought to be bipartisan interest in continuing to improve the law. But the reality has been what we have had is a wornout, 6-year-old fight over the Affordable Care Act. The act's core purpose, which has been clear from the outset, is to help as many of our people get affordable, high-quality health insurance as possible, and the tax credits are absolutely key to making that work. In this case, those tax credits are in question.

To make their argument, the King petitioners scoured the text of the law and plucked out one obscure phrase buried in the text. That phrase is "established by the State," relating to how the tax credits are calculated. According to the petitioners, those four words—that one small phrase—is enough to put millions of Americans in danger of losing their health insurance. The petitioners are arguing, against common sense and the actual text and intent of the Affordable Care Act, that the intent was supposed to deprive millions of struggling families and individuals of affordable health care coverage.

In my view, this should not be a difficult case for our Supreme Court to decide. Looking at the law itself, the text is clear. To cite some examples, when a State declines to establish an exchange, the Federal Government is directed to fill in and establish "such exchange." This makes sure insurance coverage and tax credits become available to any "applicable taxpayer," regardless of where that taxpayer might live. Furthermore, the information used to calculate the subsidies is gathered from everybody who buys an insurance plan. That would be unnecessary if Americans in only some States were eligible for the tax credits.

On top of that, it is a firmly established principle of statutory construction that when interpreting a provision of a law, a court should read the provision in context, not in isolation. It should consider how the part fits into the whole. As the Supreme Court has said, it is a "fundamental canon of statutory construction that the words of a statute must be read in their context and with a view to their place in the overall statutory scheme."

Here, looking at the overall statutory scheme, in my view there is only one plausible explanation. States have

the option of establishing exchanges. If they decline, the Federal Government will establish an exchange for them. It was written that way so everyone who needs assistance and meets the relevant qualifications can receive that assistance. In my view, we just can't reach any other conclusion. Without the broadest possible access to health insurance—and financial assistance for those who need it—the system would simply be at risk.

The interpretation made by the petitioners makes absolutely no sense in the context of the overall statutory approach. It would contradict the fundamental purpose of the Affordable Care Act which, as stated in the title, is to provide “quality, affordable health care for all Americans.”

Finally, a statute should be interpreted under the assumption that as the Court has said: “Congress . . . does not . . . hide elephants in mouseholes.” Congress does not slip major rules, which have huge ramifications, into obscure corners of the law. In this case, Congress would not slip a major rule denying tax credits to millions—what would in effect be a poison pill—the Congress would not slip that deep into a line that simply defines the term “coverage month.”

Furthermore, there is no evidence in the legislative history to support what I consider to be a warped reading of the law by the petitioners. If the Congress intended for the tax credits to help only some Americans, the Congress would have said that. The issue would have come up in committee hearings and markups and press conferences or in debates in the Senate or in the other body. It would have been reflected in fact sheets and in press releases that were made available to the public. It would have come up in committee reports that accompanied the bill's long journey through the Congress. It never did, not even once. The only way to get to the petitioners' view is by cherry-picking and contorting a four-word phrase.

Look at the long record of analysis provided by the trusted nonpartisan staffs of the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation. We rely on them. They are bipartisan. They are nonpartisan. It was their job to do the math, to score the bills and figure out exactly what the economic impacts would be. In every analysis and in every communication the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation had with the Congress, they correctly presumed that tax credits would be available to all who qualified. The tables and reports prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation are all online. So what I have said can be backed up, and anyone can read those materials.

In my view, the petitioner's argument in this case is weak and the text

of the law and congressional intent is clear. But, still, the wrong decision could make quality health insurance suddenly unaffordable for millions of Americans from one end of the country to the other. The negative effects of that ruling would radiate throughout our health care system. Recent studies of this case have suggested that the cost of insurance could soar upward for more than 7 million Americans. Only those most in danger of needing serious medical assistance would remain insured. The cost of insurance premiums, particularly in the individual market, would skyrocket for all. As a result, a crisis that would begin with 7 million people could grow to affect 8, 9 or 10 million and perhaps even more. In my view, it would send our country back to those dark days when health care in America was for the healthy and the wealthy. That is what the Affordable Care Act is intended to prevent. That is not what the American people want.

The Federal Government, independent health care organizations, and those whose insurance is at stake all agree—the tax credits are meant for all. Even America's Health Insurance Plans, the trade association representing the Nation's largest insurers, takes that view. It wrote in a brief filed with the Court that eliminating the subsidies “would leave consumers in those states with a more unstable market and far higher costs than if the ACA had not been enacted. . . .”

The only groups that argue otherwise are essentially political partisans that want to see the Affordable Care Act brought down at any cost. These arguments, in my view, are baseless, and they pose a serious danger to the health of millions of Americans—those in our country who went far too long without access to quality, affordable health care and who have it now with the Affordable Care Act.

I strongly hope the Supreme Court will take a conservative approach in its ruling—a conservative approach—and reject the challenge to the law. Then Congress can get on with the important business of bringing both sides together to improve the law where it needs to be improved and address the other important needs of America's health care system.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose this resolution which would overturn modest but vitally important updates to the process that enables workers to exercise their rights

to join a labor union. Today's attack on the NLRB's rule to modernize its election process is misplaced and misguided.

Today middle-class families are struggling with wages that aren't keeping up with expenses, while large corporations make record profits, and those at the top are doing better and better. But our economy doesn't grow from the top down; it grows from the middle out. Our economy is strongest when we have a thriving middle class with a strong voice in the workplace.

That is why we should be talking about how to restore basic workplace fairness to middle-class Americans and to those aspiring to be in the middle class. To me, that means if you work full time, you shouldn't have to live in poverty. It means making sure that moms and dads don't have to choose between keeping their jobs and taking a few hours to take their sick child to the doctor. Those are the things we should be focusing on. In fact, if we want to accomplish those things, we need to strengthen the voices of regular Americans in the workplace. The NLRB representation rule takes a small but important step toward strengthening those voices. That is why the resolution before us today is not only misplaced, it is also misguided. This resolution would do the opposite of empowering workers.

The purpose of this resolution is to block rules that will modernize a broken election process. Because that election process is broken, it is preventing workers from exercising a basic right they are supposed to have in the workplace—the right to have a seat at the bargaining table.

Too often, loopholes are being exploited to prevent workers from having the freedom to decide whether they want to form a union. Today, 35 percent of the time that workers file a petition for a union election, they never even get to have an election. The 10 percent of litigated cases that this rule targets for reform take over 6 months on average to get to an election, and some elections can be delayed for years. That is why workers need this rule to ensure a fair, effective process that is free of excessive delays.

Some of the updates in the rule simply standardize best practices that are already used in some parts of the country. For example, in some regions of the country hearings are regularly scheduled to be held 7 days after the petition is filed and petitions are accepted by fax. Also, under the representation rule workers and companies can file documents electronically, bringing the process up to date with 21st-century technologies. It also increases transparency in the election process. Everyone involved—from workers petitioning for an election, to companies, to the NLRB itself—has to provide information to the other parties earlier

in the process and in more complete form.

Nothing in this rule will change an employer's right to express its support for or opposition to a union. Nothing in the rule will change an employer's ability to communicate with workers from their very first day on the job. If the employer opposes collective bargaining in the workplace for better wages and working conditions, the company has the right to do that from the very beginning.

Modernizing and streamlining the process by which workers exercise their rights to join a union should not be controversial. Under the National Labor Relations Act, our laws explicitly recognize the rights of employees to engage in collective bargaining through representatives of their own choosing. That is the law.

As a member of three unions myself, I have seen firsthand how important it is for workers to have a voice in their workplace. The evidence shows that being a member of a union can have a tremendous impact on the lives of real people and their families. Workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement are paid more on average than those not covered. Unionized workers are more likely to have health care, retirement benefits, and paid leave benefits than other workers.

So, again, the changes made by the election rule are just commonsense updates that will support these important objectives. I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution so that these commonsense reforms will be able to ensure a fairer election process for everyone.

I yield to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his outstanding remarks.

I want to rise to make one thing clear in this debate. My friends on the other side of the aisle once again have taken up the cause of special interests at the expense of hard-working Americans. Once again they are using their new majority in the Senate to find ways to keep the rules rigged against American workers.

Let's look at this. The bottom line is very simple. Middle-class incomes are declining. One of the main reasons middle-class incomes are declining is the decline of unions. That is what just about everybody who studies it says. We are now 11 percent unionized. We were 30 percent, private sector only 6 percent. The bottom line is we had a lot of poor Americans in the 1920s.

Laws that were enacted by this Congress allowed unions to organize and workers, through collective bargaining, were able to gain some of the wealth from their labor. We had broad prosperity as America was unionized in the

1950s and 1960s and 1970s and 1980s. What happened was that corporate America learned how to both prevent new unions from occurring in new industries and breaking old unions.

As a result now, middle-class incomes are declining. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, once again, they talk they want to help the middle class, but in all the obvious ways to help the middle class—and unions do, whether the management likes it or not, they manage to give the workers more money—they do not walk the walk.

These NLRB changes are simple. There have not been substantial updates to the NLRB election process since the 1970s. The new changes pull the process into the 21st century, letting unions and employers file electronically and using modern forms of communications such as cell phones. Our colleagues are opposed to this. They want to undo it. My God, the changes will modernize union elections, prevent delays, reduce frivolous litigation, something even the Republican Board members on the NLRB supported in principle in their dissent.

Right now big corporations can use delays in labor elections to try and take advantage to postpone and even deny workers' rights to vote. This is what my friends on the other side of the aisle are rising up against: workers whose incomes are declining trying to get a little more money when corporate profits are at a record. The other side says, nope, side with the corporate profits over middle-class wages. That is what they are saying. That has been the theme in this Congress. It is going to continue to be the theme.

We will make it clear to the American people who is on their side. The congressional review process on these changes allowing employers and unions to file forms electronically, and we have to invoke this unique process, streamlining the process so workers are not kicked around with an army of lawyers?

It is disappointing that my friends across the aisle have made such a mountain out of a molehill with these rules. At the beginning of this Congress, I was hopeful my colleagues were ready to join us and go to work for working families who have experienced a lost decade of economic advancement, whose real wages have declined.

In an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal this year Leaders MCCONNELL and BOEHNER said one of their primary goals was helping struggling middle-class Americans who are clearly frustrated by a lack of opportunity and a stagnation of wages. If their only answer is to reduce regulations on corporations, lower corporate taxes, lower the taxes of the wealthy, and that is going to help the middle class, I have news for them, that is not going to fly.

I feel in my heart deeply that the decline of middle-class wages is a decline

of America. I feel we have to do something about it, but we certainly should not regress. My colleagues, with this motion, it will make it harder for the middle class to grow wages, make it easier to say even a larger share of productivity goes to capital and a smaller share to labor, despite their rhetoric and despite the problems we face.

I see my dear friend from Tennessee. I hate to oppose him in such strong language because I think he is a fine gentleman, but on this issue we disagree.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to talk about protecting the middle class.

I am on the side of an economy that works for everyone and building a stronger middle class to bring opportunities to families across the Nation.

What is an economy that works for everyone? It means that if you work hard and play by the rules, you deserve a fair shot at the American dream.

An economy that works for everyone also means giving workers the right to organize, negotiate, and exercise their rights under the law in a timely way. I believe this can be done in a way that also enables businesses to prosper and to create jobs.

Unions raise wages, improve working conditions, and ensure fair treatment on the job. In many jobs they make the difference between living in poverty and making ends meet or the difference between just getting by and making enough to make a better life for a family. The right to unionize and collectively bargain helped grow the middle class.

When workers are choosing whether to unionize or not, they need a process that is fair, predictable, and efficient. But unfair rules, lax enforcement, and insincere negotiating has crippled union organizing and threatened the middle-class lifestyle that was once the economic pride of our country.

The main role of the National Labor Relations Board is to manage the relations between unions, employees, and employers in the private sector. The primary functions of the Board are to prevent or resolve unfair labor practices and to supervise union elections so that they are done accurately and fairly.

Now, the NLRB has put out rules that make modest updates to the election process that make sense in the 21st century. The rules would eliminate needless delays that slow the election process to a halt and modernize the process for sharing contact information to allow the use of email to communicate about the election.

But this and other commonsense updates are under attack in Congress. Under this Congressional Review Act resolution, the whole rule would get tossed out. There is limited debate and there is no chance for offering amendments. Middle-class workers deserve better than this.

Currently, workers organize themselves by signing a document saying they want to join a union. Once a majority of workers sign up, they can ask their employers to be recognized as a union and collectively bargain for a contract.

However, some employers delay, delay, delay—refusing to recognize the union and requiring workers to go through an intimidating antiunion campaign that ends in an unfair election. Workers should be protected from these kinds of stall tactics and intimidation.

It is common sense that communication should be allowed to take place over email. These rules would allow for that. Documents should be allowed to be submitted electronically. These rules would allow for that, too. This creates a more efficient process that benefits workers.

I want workers to make more money. When families have more money in their paychecks, it is good news for the middle class and it is good news for our Nation's economy. When workers have a seat at the table, it means they have a better chance at getting the wages and the protections at the workplace they deserve. I want to grow our middle class by giving more workers this critical seat at the table. But they won't get it if Congress pulls the chair out from underneath them by throwing out this rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I know we are in Democratic time right now. So if a Member of the other side shows up, I will sit down. I appreciate the courtesy of my colleagues on the other side allowing me to continue my remarks. I will not take more than 7 or 8 minutes.

My good friend from New York just spoke. We have worked together on a number of things. He talked about the middle class. I think he is right to talk about the middle class and the effect of the National Labor Relations Board on the middle class.

Let me give a little bit different perspective on it. My problem with this NLRB is that it is not acting like an umpire between employers and employees, it is acting like an advocate for the unions. It did so in 2011 with the micro-union decision. It is doing so with the ambush elections rule, going against the advice of Senator John F. Kennedy in 1959, who said 30 days seemed like a fair time to give employees to consider whether to have a union.

They are ambushing employers—it's like riding through a canyon and suddenly people start shooting at you. In just 11 days—we have hundreds of thousands of small businesses across the country that are trying to work, sell their goods, make a living, improve their status. That is the middle class we talked about.

Say you have five employees, say you are down in Maryville, TN, or Wichita, KS, the last thing on your mind is a labor lawyer. Here comes an election in 11 days. Suddenly small businesses have to find and pay a labor lawyer. They need legal advice at every step because in as few as 11 days they might have an election. There is no need to rush into an election that rapidly other than to give union organizers an opportunity to force a union election before the employer and its employees know what is going on.

Let me give one more example of the assault on the middle class that I see from this NLRB and our friends on the other side. In every community in America, there are lots of franchisees. These are the men and women who operate health clubs, barber shops, auto parts shops, childcare centers, neighborhood restaurants, music stores, cleaning services, and much more.

We had some franchisees testify before the labor committee the other day. These franchisees could have worked for a big corporation, but they said: I would like to run my own business. Franchisees can own a Ruby Tuesday, a Rainbow Station, or an auto parts franchise. They own that business. They run that business.

They use that brand name to help it succeed. They use brand names like Planet Fitness, Merry Maids, or Panera Bread. They might work 12 hours a day serving customers, meeting a payroll, or cleaning. This is hard work, but 700,000 Americans do it because it is their way up the economic ladder. It is their way to say: I have my own business. I do not work for the big guys. I am a little guy working my way up.

Successful franchisees are one of the most important ways to climb the economic ladder of success. Yet this NLRB, the same one that wants to have ambush elections, has a pending decision that would threaten franchisees' very way of life. It is called the joint employer standard, which since 1984 has required a business to hold direct control over the terms and conditions of a worker's employment.

Through broad language, the NLRB is saying to McDonald's or Ruby Tuesday that they are part of the parent company, and anything they do at their store has to be accepted by the parent company.

What are the consequences if that happens? The parent companies are going to say: We are not going to take that risk. We are going to own all of our stores. So we will own all of the Rainbow Stations. The parent company will own all of the McDonald's stores, or all of the Ruby Tuesdays.

What will that do? That might protect the parent company because it can hire a team of labor lawyers. It can instruct its employees what to do and what not to do to avoid problems. But

it takes away the middle-class opportunity of moving up the economic ladder from these 700,000 franchisees. That is what this NLRB is doing. The ambush election rule is nothing more than speeding up the time that it takes between when pro-union organizers ask an employer for a secret ballot election, and when that election actually takes place.

Every step you take has to be perfect according or else you might have to have a rerun election or be ordered to negotiate with the union. That jeopardizes the fairness in our system. The National Labor Relations Act was intended to create an environment of balance and fairness among employers and employees. Senator Kennedy said in 1959 that 30 days would be a reasonable amount of time between when a union organizer files a petition and when an election is held.

Senator McCONNELL and I have another bill to restore the balance in the National Labor Relations Board. It is absolutely fair. The Board would be three Democrats, three Republicans. If the general counsel's complaint is outside the law, the aggrieved party can take it to Federal court. If the NLRB takes longer than 1 year to decide a case, either party can take it to Federal court. That is fair. That is the kind of umpire we need in labor relations today. So this is about the middle class. This is about moving up the economic ladder. This is about the kind of actions that give 700,000 Americans their franchise business. This is about the hundreds of thousands of Americans, with 4, 5, 6, 10, 15 employees, who do not need to be ambushed as they try to earn a living, pay their bills, sweep the floor, make a profit, pay employees, and create the American dream.

The stakes are high. We are right to say let's return the National Labor Relations Board to an umpire.

Let us hope the House agrees. Let us hope the President agrees. It's time to return fairness and balance to labor-management relations in this country. I yield the floor.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, are we in a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, I rise to speak and to commend the chairman of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, Senator ALEXANDER, for this resolution that is on the floor to rescind and overturn the ambush election rule the NLRB has asked to go in effect on April 14. It is just dagdum wrong. It is a solution in search of a problem.

We don't have a problem in terms of labor relations. Ninety-five percent of all the elections for unionization take place within 56 days. The median term is 38 days. That is 1½ months to 2 months. That is all it takes. This would compress that period of time



from the average now of 38 days to 11 days.

Is 11 days enough time for a worker to get all the information they need to find out whether they want to become unionized? No, it is not. Is it fair to an employer to give him only 11 days to defend himself against a union organization trying to take him to a union shop? No, it is not. Does it do anything for the middle class? No, it does not. This is a solution for an issue, as I said, that doesn't exist, a problem that doesn't exist. It is time we stood up for American business and American workers.

I ran a sub S corporation, which is a small business in Georgia. Most everybody thinks this is a big business issue. It is not; it is a small business issue. It is a repeat effort by the NLRB to continue to meddle and tilt the playing field between labor and management.

Everybody knows that during the Industrial Revolution this country overlooked the worker. We had child labor, we had workers working too long, and we didn't have good safety rules. We all know labor unions came about because businesses failed to address their needs. But that was 100 years ago. Today we have good labor law, we have fair labor law, and we have opportunities for people to be unionized if they want.

Of all the elections called in the last 2 years, 64.2 percent have gone to a unionized shop—64.2 percent. In other words, the law we have now today works. It works for the worker and it works for the union. But it doesn't work to compress that time period to 11 days. That would cause confusion, it would cause discord, it would cause a terrible burden on the employer and terrible pressure on the employee.

Included in the rule are, in my opinion, privacy violations by the organizers. It will require the company to turn over cell phone numbers, private information and all of that, so the unions can harass them to try to get them to sign a petition for a clarification and certification. It is just downright wrong.

The chairman of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee is exactly right: This is an unfair rule. It has no place being passed and adopted. We have every right to rescind it, which I hope this Senate will do.

Let's remember who the middle class really is. Let's remember who small business really is. Let's remember why we have unions and why we have a National Labor Relations Board. We have it for fair and equitable treatment of labor law. We don't have it to tilt the playing field in favor of labor or in favor of management. We have it to be fair, so everybody gets a fair shake and a fair notice and a fair time to have their say.

So I rise to commend the chairman for his efforts and what he has done. I support his effort and what he has

done, and I hope the Members of the Senate will vote in favor of rescinding this rule before it goes into effect. It would be a terrible one-two punch to have this rule go into effect on April 14 and the IRS's tax day be April 15. That is too much punishment for one period of time. It is just not the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, my Democratic colleagues and I come to the floor all the time talking about how we grow a middle class, how we help middle-class families, and how we make sure we have a strong economy because we have a strong middle class. Yet what we are seeing on the floor right now is an effort by our Republican colleagues to fight to keep a system which is rigged against American workers being able to get a livable wage, to have a voice in the workplace.

We know what we ought to be doing is looking for every possible way to support those who are working hard every day, to have a wage that allows them to care for their family, to send their children to college and achieve the American dream. They should have a voice in the workplace around safety issues, around other issues that are important for working men and women. We have in front of us a National Labor Relations Board rule change that was made to basically modernize the system around employee elections so that people have a fair shot to have their voice heard in the workplace.

It is pretty interesting to me that we are talking about simple changes that allow the use of email communications or fax communications—not exactly radical things in the world we live in. Without this modernization by the NLRB, we actually have a situation where people are denied the ability to communicate through email; to be able to talk about forming a union and communicate with each other through email, which is pretty crazy when you think about it. This particular vote would stop folks from using email or faxes.

The NLRB rule change was to modernize the election process, to eliminate certain paperwork hurdles that didn't make any sense, so an employer could not delay the ability for folks to vote as to whether they want to be part of a union. That is what is in front of us now.

What I wish was in front of us is the agenda we have been pushing, which is to actually strengthen the middle

class. Instead, what we have in front of us is a vote about keeping the system rigged against American workers. There is no mistake about it. A "yes" vote, which eliminates this modernization process, is a vote to keep the system rigged against men and women who are working hard every day in the workplace and who just want a fair shot to make it.

Interestingly, this only affects about 10 percent of union elections, because 90 percent of elections are done through agreement with employers and employees. That is a testament to the fact that the majority of folks can work together, if 90 percent of them are working out agreements.

What we really ought to be talking about on the floor is equal pay for equal work and how we enforce that. I am stunned that we have the Republican majority fighting to keep the system rigged against American workers and then turning around and saying, well, we are not going to pass laws that enforce equal pay for equal work, or we are not going to pass laws that create a livable wage so people who are working are out of poverty, so that we reward work by having a livable wage. That is not what is on the floor. What is on the floor is an effort to roll back the modernization of a process that would make sure the system is not rigged against workers.

Why are we not talking about equal pay or raising the minimum wage or talking about the cost of going to college? The majority of people today, who are playing by the rules, trying to do the right thing, trying to get the skills they need to be responsible citizens and work in the workplace, come out of college buried in debt—buried in debt—but we are not talking about that. We are not spending our time on that.

We are not talking about protecting pensions earned by workers over a lifetime, who are counting on those to be protected. We are not talking about how we strengthen and expand and guarantee Social Security for the future, or any number of things we could be talking about. If we just made sure that equal pay for equal work wasn't a slogan but actually a reality of this country, we would jump-start the middle class. We would jump-start the economy if women were earning dollar for dollar what men are earning. That alone, along with any number of other things, affects middle-class families.

It is not about creating an economy by giving to those at the top and having it trickle down and hoping someday, somehow, it will affect the majority of Americans. We believe you start with the middle, you grow the economy from the middle out. It is a middle-class economy that lifts everyone up and addresses the strength of our country.

So I am very concerned that when we look at precious floor time and what

the priorities are, we are debating a rollback on the modernization of rules with the National Labor Relations Board that will basically keep in place a rigged system. Without that modernization it is just one more mark against workers who are trying to have a voice and are trying to lift themselves up and improve their wages and ability to be successful and be rewarded for their work.

There is a lot more we could and should be doing. We are going to continue to raise the issues that middle-class families care about. We are going to continue to fight for middle-class families every single day, and we are going to continue to oppose those who want to keep a rigged system against the middle class.

So I urge a “no” vote on this particular resolution, and hopefully we can stand together and actually create jobs and a better standard of living by doing those things that are going to help middle-class families across America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, would you advise me what the time allotment now is for debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority controls the time from 5 until 6.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it is interesting, when we get on the topic of unions, how we all come to this with such a different point of view. I come to it as a person who grew up in a household where every member of my family was a member of a union. My father and mother, who each had eighth grade educations, belonged to railroad unions in East St. Louis, IL. Because of that, there was bargaining for their wages and benefits—which I didn’t understand as a kid, but I do now—that resulted in the quality of life we enjoy in our family. We weren’t wealthy, but we were comfortable. I never went hungry, and I thought we lived a pretty good life. Mom and dad were hard workers. If you were a hard worker in those days and had the benefit of union representation, you could make a decent living. And we did.

If we study history, we will find that is what has gone on in America. Primarily after World War II, we saw two things happening: a rise in unionism—people who belonged to organized unions—and a rise in the middle class. In other words, employees who were able to bargain for their wages and benefits and retirement ended up with enough money to raise their families and to build the middle class in America.

In that period from post-World War II until the 1960s, the United States really took its place on the map in terms of our position in the economy. Ex-

actly the opposite has been true since. Unionism—those who belong to organized unions—has been going down in most sectors except for government employment, and we have also seen a decline in the middle class. I don’t think that is a coincidence; I think that is an indication that when workers do not have a voice in the workplace, they lose that bargaining ability to get a just wage, a good wage, a living wage, and the benefits that should come with it.

The irony is that American workers are still the best in the world. If we just look at the issue of productivity of American workers, there is no reason for us to apologize. Our workers know how to create profit for the people they work for. Sadly, though, when it comes to this, we don’t find that the companies that employ them reward their productivity with more wages and benefits. They don’t. As a result, workers are working harder, making more profits for their company than ever, and yet they aren’t seeing any real growth in their wages.

So there comes a time when workers should have the power to make a choice in their lives, and that is when they decide whether they want representation—an election to form a union where they work. That is what this bill is all about.

The National Labor Relations Board came up with a process that said: If you are going to have an election in the workplace so that workers can decide whether they want to belong to a union, let’s at least make it fair, make sure that employers and employees and the unions have enough information. They can tell the workers their point of view, and the workers can decide.

I come to the floor today in support of the National Labor Relations Board’s rule for modernizing and streamlining the election process for the workers. There is a wide divergence of opinions on both sides of the aisle here in terms of the value of unions. I value them. Some do not. But I think the ability of workers to organize and bargain collectively is about the only way to level the playing field and to create a growing middle class, which we need in America.

Last December the National Labor Relations Board came up with a rule, after a long process, to modernize the election process—the first time in almost 50 years. Fifty years ago they wrote the rules, and they said: You know, there are a few things that have changed in 50 years.

Here is what they said: The rule moves preelection problems, such as the 25-day waiting period and review, and consolidates options for delay and appeal into a single appeals process. In a nod to modern communications, the rule says employers and unions can file election petitions electronically rather than by fax or mail. This does not

strike me as radical thinking. Think of all the things we do electronically today, from paying our bills each month, to communicating with one another, to gathering information. Bringing this to the labor situation, the choice of a union, is certainly not radical. And it requires employers to provide unions with the employees’ personal email and phone numbers in addition to the existing requirement for names and addresses—personal email and phone numbers. When is the last time you filled out an application on the Internet when they didn’t ask you for your email address or your phone number? It is routine, and we want to make this routine part of the process for unions and employers to get in contact with employees.

Republicans have called this an “ambush rule.” They say it deprives employers of the time they need to explain why the worker should vote against a union. They also claim the rule limits an employer’s ability to pursue adequate representation. But that is not a fair claim. Union elections are only triggered when 30 percent of the workers sign a petition favoring an election. Almost one out of three needs to sign it saying: We want an election. Employers talk to their employees all the time when the employees are being asked whether they want to sign up to be part of the 30 percent, so the employers have constant access in the workplace. And employers can still require workers to meet one-on-one with supervisors, and about two-thirds of the employers actually do that. Nine out of 10 employers require workers to watch anti-union videos before an election. The new rule doesn’t change that at all.

Under the new rule employers have time to talk to their workers; they just have fewer options to delay the actual election. It looks to me as if it is an advantage to employers going in, and the changes by the NLRB are really not that substantial.

Last year at this time workers at the Rock River Academy and Residential Center in Rockford, IL, wanted to form a union. Rock River provides mental health and educational services for young girls with emotional disabilities. The workers didn’t like the working conditions in the workplace, the short staffing and stagnant wages. They wanted to work together to address these problems and to do a better job. They quickly signed up a majority of their coworkers and filed a petition with the NLRB office in Peoria. From the outset, the workers felt the employers at the facility were trying to do everything they could to stop this election. The delay in finalizing a union gave the residential center time to wage an aggressive anti-union campaign.

There was a hearing eventually at the NLRB, but it was nearly 3 weeks

after the petition was filed. On the first day the employer's attorneys claimed that all the workers at the residential center were nonprofessional, even though they included registered nurses, licensed special education teachers, and licensed therapists and social workers. The following day they reversed their position and argued that all the employees at the facility should be considered professional—this was the next day—even though many employees lacked a college degree. That stretched the hearing out for 4 days. When it comes to these elections, delay is really the tool that is used to stop a final decision.

The regional director at the NLRB ruled in favor of the union's position and ordered an election held 82 days after the petition was filed in which more than a majority of the workers said they wanted an election. Eighty-two days later they actually got an election. During that time the employer hired two anti-union consultants to wage an anti-union campaign that included threats and interrogation and even the installation of a video surveillance system to monitor employees at all times throughout the workplace. Pro-union workers saw their hours cut, while non-union workers were given all the overtime they wanted. Worst of all, the employer terminated or laid off six employees in what they believe was retaliation.

Despite the delays and discomfort the employers created, a slim majority of employees still voted to form the union. But the employer continues to raise objections and intimidate the workers. Is that really what we want to see—the majority of the workers want the election, it takes 82 days to have the election, and then the recriminations and problems that follow? It doesn't seem as if this is workplace democracy, the way it was designed.

So I support this NLRB rule, and I am going to vote no on the efforts on the other side of the aisle to overturn it. This brings the election process into the 21st century and lets employers and unions communicate with employees. It doesn't encourage or discourage unionization; that is still up to the workers.

Some Republicans take offense to these changes and call it an ambush. Instead of standing up for workers, they have chosen to challenge these commonsense reforms. This rule is about reducing unnecessary delay and litigation and giving the workers the last word. That is what we are supposed to do.

This case in Illinois isn't unique. In some extreme cases, workers have been forced to wait 13 years for the simple right to organize. In many others, the delays have eventually led to a situation in which there was never a vote. Fifty-eight percent of workers want representation in their workplace, but

the delays and challenges to the election process through NLRB discourage organizing.

These proposed changes by themselves neither encourage nor discourage unions. The proposed rule will apply the same way to workers attempting to decertify a union as it does to workers trying to form a union. The only real impact of the rule changes is, after 50 years, to recognize the existence of email and telephones, for goodness' sake. That is considered radical business by some on the other side of the aisle, but for most it is just common sense.

So oppose this effort to overturn this NLRB rule. Give the workers a chance to vote one way or the other on whether they want a union.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, we are here today because the NLRB has once again overstepped the line. I am not sure it is a red line, but I do know this—that the Board has become a hyperpartisan, pro-union entity, and that does not benefit the American people.

We saw it in my home State of South Carolina, in my hometown of North Charleston, when the NLRB and the IAM attempted to destroy what was at the time 1,100 jobs at Boeing. Boeing represents more than 8,000 jobs in North Charleston because of the success of South Carolina's pro-business, pro-employee—I want to emphasize "pro-employee"—environment. But the NLRB and the President simply decided that didn't fit their tastes. So after more than a year, when we saw the NLRB's general counsel joke about destroying the American economy and call Members of Congress names, they finally relented when they realized South Carolina and the American people would not stand for it.

But since then, the NLRB has continued to push policies loved by union bosses, even though it was created to be an unbiased arbiter. So today we are taking a very rare step—invoking the Congressional Review Act—because the NLRB decided to do union bosses one more favor.

The ambush elections rule, which the Board has now finalized, will allow as few as 10 days to pass between employees filing a petition to unionize and a vote occurring. This rule is perhaps the most pro-Big Labor action taken by the current administration, which is quite a fete for this administration. Ambush elections hurt the ability of employees to make a well-informed choice on joining a union as it gives limited time to hear both sides of the debate. The rule also requires unprecedented amounts of employees' personal information to be given to union representatives, such as personal cell phone numbers and email addresses.

The NLRB is also now placing burdensome requirements on employers that unions do not have to follow themselves, providing an unfair advantage to union organizers.

In South Carolina we have seen the potential ramifications that come as a result of a widely partisan NLRB, and this rule simply reinforces the fact that the Board must return to acting as the neutral arbiter it was intended to be. But since that does not seem likely anytime soon, as my friends on the left resist efforts that Senator ALEXANDER and I and others have introduced to reform the Board, we find ourselves here today.

I will leave you with just a few quotes. One is from Brian Hayes:

The principal purpose for this radical manipulation of our election process is to minimize, or rather, to effectively eviscerate an employer's legitimate opportunity to express its views about collective bargaining.

I urge my colleagues to vote to disapprove of the ambush elections rule and return workplace decisions to employees—not to Big Labor and a partisan administration.

Just a few weeks ago we had a hearing in the HELP Committee. Sometimes when we have this conversation about what is good for employees versus what is good for employers, we find a way of taking these two groups of folks and trying to put them in competing categories. I asked a very simple question at one of the hearings, and I wish to take a few minutes to walk through what we are expecting of employers as we engage in this new process of ambush elections. I think we will see very clearly why we call them ambush elections.

For the last 13 or 14 years, before entering Congress, I was a small business owner, an entrepreneur. I thought I had found the American dream. We were making a profit. We were moving forward. We were hiring people. And now, as I think it through, if I were still in business today, what are we asking employers to do in as short a window as 10 days?

With less than two dozen employees and no in-house legal counsel, I am expected in as few as 10 days to understand what an election position is; to find a labor attorney in Charleston with NLRB experience, and hopefully, NLRB expertise; to learn what can and cannot be said to employees; to figure out which employees are eligible to vote; to submit to the union names of eligible employees, their addresses, personal emails, their cell phone numbers, their work location, shift information, employee classifications; and to ensure all legal arguments are raised at this point in time so that I do not waive my right to use those arguments in the future. All of this must be done with amazing haste and great precision.

Meanwhile, the clock is ticking. The clock is ticking on my right to talk

with my employees before an election. My business is being neglected. Bear in mind that employers and entrepreneurs start businesses so that we can actually accomplish a task, not necessarily to defend ourselves in this process. So while we are neglecting our business and incurring substantial legal costs, I have to ask myself one very simple question—and I think many people are going to ask themselves the same exact question—and it is simply this: How does this lead to a fair election for any employee or any employer? It seems to me that it simply cannot and it will not.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this morning we were fortunate enough to hear Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu address a joint meeting of Congress. I was disappointed the Vice President and a number of Democratic Members of Congress chose not to attend this event. They missed a powerful speech, and they missed an opportunity to demonstrate America's commitment to our strongest ally, Israel.

In his speech before the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee yesterday, Prime Minister Netanyahu spoke about Israel's alliance with the United States to, as he put it, "defend our common civilization against common threats." He spoke of "values that unite us . . . values like liberty, equality, justice, tolerance, and compassion." These are the values that unite us. They are the values both our Nations are committed to defend. It is an area of the world where respect for liberty and equality is often nonexistent. Israel stands up for these most essential principles. America is proud to be her ally.

The Prime Minister spoke this morning about the dangers of a nuclear-armed Iran. I scarcely need to enumerate the reasons why Iran possessing a nuclear weapon is such a dangerous prospect.

First and foremost, Iran is a state sponsor of terrorism. That rather bureaucratic phrase obscures the full horror of what it signifies—that Iran's Government helps advance the activities of those who have made violence their mission and have kept millions of ordinary men, women, and children in the Middle East from living in stability and peace.

Iran has fomented hostility toward the State of Israel, and its leaders have

publicly stated the desire to wipe the entire Nation of Israel off the map. As Iran spreads violence and oppression abroad, it also uses the same tactics against its people at home. Iran's Government is hostile to freedom of any kind, whether it be freedom of speech or freedom of religion, and thousands of its own citizens have been tortured and imprisoned and executed for daring to stand up for their human rights. Keeping such a regime from developing a nuclear weapon must be a priority.

Unfortunately, since November of 2013, when the Obama administration first reached an interim nuclear agreement with Iran, all we have seen from these negotiations are delays and extensions while Iran has received an easing of sanctions. We hear it repeated that "no deal is better than a bad deal." Yet while Israel has made it clear that an agreement which recognizes Iran's right to enrich uranium is unacceptable, our own administration has yet to clearly state what a good deal would look like.

When the Senate made efforts to set out the parameters for an acceptable final agreement by introducing the bipartisan Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act of 2015, which I cosponsored, the President announced that he would veto such a bill without even waiting to see what it would look like after being fully debated and amended.

Last week two of my colleagues introduced the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which would give Congress 60 days to approve or disapprove any final agreement. It will be telling if the President threatens to veto this bill as well. It is essential that any final agreement on Iran's nuclear capability be acceptable to the American people, and congressional review is therefore indispensable.

I am eager to work with the White House and my colleagues across the aisle to provide the American people and our allies abroad with the assurance that Iran will not be allowed to arm itself with a nuclear weapon. However, I am concerned that if the President continues his go-it-alone approach, Americans may not like the deal that emerges.

KING V. BURWELL

Mr. President, I wish to pivot to an issue that is being considered over in the Supreme Court this week. Tomorrow the Supreme Court is going to hear oral arguments in the case of King v. Burwell, which challenges the extension of ObamaCare subsidies to States with Federal exchanges.

The President's health care law states that individuals who enroll through "an exchange established by the State" are entitled to receive subsidies to help with their premium payments.

ObamaCare architect Jonathan Gruber made it clear this was intended to give States an incentive to create

their own exchanges. At an event in 2012, he told the audience:

[W]hat's important to remember politically about this is if you're a state and you don't set up an exchange, that means your citizens don't get their tax credits—but your citizens still pay the taxes that support this bill.

That is from ObamaCare architect Jonathan Gruber back in 2012.

In the wake of the health care law's passage, however, States made it clear they were reluctant to take on the costs and burdens associated with ObamaCare. More than two-thirds of the States declined to set up their own exchanges, and the Obama administration provided the subsidies to those enrolled on Federal exchanges despite there being no authority in the law for it to do so, and despite the concerns expressed by members of the President's own administration who were doubtful about the legality of such a move.

The administration's decision to push forward with the subsidies despite the lack of legal authority could have serious consequences for millions of Americans. If the Supreme Court finds the Obama administration overstepped its authority, 5 million Americans could lose their ObamaCare subsidies.

I recently joined several of my colleagues in sending a letter to the head of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Treasury Secretary to ask what the administration's plan is for dealing with the aftermath of an unfavorable Supreme Court ruling. The administration's answer: Nothing. That is right. Health and Human Services Secretary Sylvia Mathews Burwell told us the administration has no administrative plans for what it would do in the event of an unfavorable decision by the Supreme Court.

In fact, the administration declined to even warn Americans enrolling this year of what could happen if the Supreme Court found the administration was illegally providing subsidies.

Clearly the millions of Americans who could lose their health care premium subsidy, thanks to the administration's abuse of its authority, need a solution, and Republicans have been working on solutions. The junior Senator from Nebraska has put forward a plan to use the 1985 COBRA law to extend temporary health care assistance to these Americans for 18 months.

Other Republicans—Senator HATCH from Utah, Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee, Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming—have offered their own plan which would also provide temporary financial assistance to affected Americans while they recover from the loss of the subsidies.

The chairmen of the House Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce Committees have released a roadmap for replacing ObamaCare with market-based

solutions. Their plan allows States to opt out of many ObamaCare mandates while maintaining protections for Americans. It would also make refundable tax credits available to Americans who lost their subsidies.

All of these plans seek to replace the broken ObamaCare system with real health care reform that would lower costs, expand access to care, and to put patients, not the government, in charge of their health care decisions.

We don't need this court case to demonstrate that ObamaCare has been a massive failure. We already had the unexpected tax bills, the higher premiums, the loss of doctors and hospitals, the health care plans Americans were not allowed to keep, the law's negative effect on employment, and I could go on and on.

This court case underscores what all the other law's problems have demonstrated: ObamaCare is not fixing the health care challenges facing our country. If anything, it is making them worse. ObamaCare has been tried, and it has been found wanting. It is time to repeal this law and to replace it with health care reforms that will actually fix the problems in our health care system and improve affordability and access for all Americans. Five years of ObamaCare is long enough.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the National Labor Relations Board representation case procedures rule, which is set to go into effect April 14.

This rule unfairly expedites union elections and squelches individual self-determination, democratic decision-making, and freedom of expression. It is also a blatant attempt to circumvent Congress's legitimate constitutional role in how—if at all—to reform the National Labor Relations Act. It is a clear case of regulatory overreach, and it is an abuse of power.

The National Labor Relations Act seeks to create equity—or a “level playing field,” so to speak—in labor relations. Now, I believe the NLRA is far from perfect. In fact, I have introduced multiple pieces of legislation over the years to amend the NLRA. Nevertheless, any reform must be openly debated and enacted by Congress, not decided unilaterally by an unaccountable bureaucracy.

I am concerned because this National Labor Relations Board case representation rule clearly favors the unions. I am not anti-union. I oppose this rule

because I am a champion for both workers and businesses, for employee groups and the employer community. This rule hurts both. I oppose this rule not because I am against a worker's right to join a union but because this rule is detrimental to both employers and employees.

The NLRA guarantees the right to engage in union activities. It also ensures the right to refrain from such activities. This rule dramatically shortens the period of time that exists between a union filing an election petition and the actual election. Shortening this time period undermines an employer's ability to hold a lawful exchange with its employees on whether to select union representation. It also deprives workers of their right to receive key information from all sides, as the NLRB currently provides—a system that allows for a full and robust debate between unions, employees, and employers.

Moreover, there is simply no need for the rule.

Both businesses and workers deserve a process that is free of unnecessary delays. Nearly 95 percent of all elections take place within 2 months after a petition has been filed, and the unions have won more than two-thirds of these elections during that time. No one can claim that this process is fraught with unnecessary delays.

Unions favor this rule because it rigs the system by allowing them to campaign without the employer's knowledge. While some argue that employers are free to talk to their employees about unionization at any time, employers are unable to rebut a union's argument if they are unaware the arguments are even being made. This rule leaves employers with insufficient time to respond to a union's arguments—and they know that. That is what is wrong with this legislation. Once again, this hurts both the worker and the employer.

While my main objection to this rule is that it precludes workers and employers from necessary and protected information sharing, I also oppose the rule because it is likely to throw many elections into chaos and confusion.

Under this rule, voter eligibility would be deferred to postelection procedures. Employees would be asked to vote on joining a union without knowing which employees will ultimately make up the bargaining unit. Simply put, unions are trying to win representation elections without defining whom they are representing.

Furthermore, there are serious due process concerns surrounding the initial hearing and Statement of Position requirements. It is particularly burdensome to small employers to collect the required information following the filing of the petition in this drastically shortened timeframe.

Lastly, we cannot ignore that with this rule the NLRB is invading employ-

ees' privacy and exposing them to potential identity theft by mandating that employers turn over employees' personal telephone numbers and email addresses to the unions. That is outrageous. The rule tramples on workers' individual liberties by allowing unions to unfairly obtain an employee's private information.

The NLRB should be a neutral arbiter—an impartial overseer of the process—working to enforce the law, and to stop violations, and to intervene in attempts to sway benefit from one side or the other. It should not be an advocate for organized labor. Rather than approaching the situation from the neutral perspective, this rule makes a value judgment that favors unions based on false assumptions.

The NLRB should properly be safeguarding labor relations processes. I urge us all to support workers' personal liberties by providing them ample opportunity to make up their own minds. I urge all of my colleagues to support employers in preserving due process while cultivating constructive dialogue between businesses and workers.

I thank Senators ALEXANDER and ENZI for leading this action under the Congressional Review Act. I am proud to stand with the majority of my Senate colleagues today in preventing the NLRB's abuse of regulatory power by supporting this resolution of disapproval.

I am well aware of these types of tactics by the union movement. I am one of the few people in this body who was really raised in the union movement, who actually learned a skilled trade, who actually worked as a union member for 10 years in the building and construction trade unions as a metal lather.

I have to tell my colleagues that some of these people in the NLRB and others have been trying to get quickie elections through for a long time, and of course, the purpose of it is to slant everything in their favor, when they win a majority of the NLRB votes anyway. No, they just want to win all of them without giving the employees the necessary information to be able to make wise decisions as to whether to join a union, and then they cloud it up by making it almost impossible to know which part of the union or which methodology they are going to go into.

We have stopped quickie elections for years. We have had good Democrats and good Republicans vote against quickie elections. It is not fair to slant the system totally against employers, which is what this bill will do.

Frankly, it is time we quit pulling these dirty tricks. It really never ceases to amaze me. When Republicans appoint—and they are in the majority—people to the NLRB, as a general rule, they try to make things more fair. They try to look at both sides and

be fair. When Democrats do it—when Democratic Presidents do it—they try to pull tricks such as this that really are unworthy of the type of considerations that really are involved in these union elections. I don't mind unions winning, but they ought to win fair and square. They shouldn't win because they stacked the deck against the businesses. There are enough rules to give unions advantages in union elections as it is. But to have quickie elections so that the owner of the business or the owners of the business don't have a chance to answer the questions that come up or even speak to their employees is just wrong. I am opposed to it, and I hope everybody in this Senate is opposed to it as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, the Keystone XL Pipeline means opportunity for the American people. The President is standing in the way of jobs. He is standing in the way of affordable energy. He is standing in the way of our Nation's energy security. His recent veto threat and now carrying through with the veto sent a clear message that he is more concerned with political games than increasing opportunity for the American people.

We are here today to send a strong message that this fight is far from over.

The Keystone XL Pipeline is a lifeline for many Montana communities. In fact, the Keystone Pipeline enters the United States through Montana, and that is why I will keep fighting to get this project moving forward.

In fact, in our State of Montana alone, the Keystone Pipeline means \$80 million to Montana counties and schools per year. Now, \$16 million per year of that goes directly to our Montana university systems. This is how we continue to fund our infrastructure, our schools, and our teachers.

A couple of weeks ago I got a call from Rion Miles. He is the business manager for the Operating Engineers Local 400 in Montana. He told me the Keystone XL Pipeline will create 300 good-paying jobs for his union members in Montana alone. Like most Montanans, Ryan is scratching his head. He doesn't understand why the President is standing in the way of these good-paying union jobs.

A while back, I was in my pickup traveling in eastern Montana in the town of Glasgow. I stopped by the NorVal Co-Op. This co-op supplies electricity to a few thousand Montana families in northeast Montana. They told me over a cup of coffee that morning

that they will keep electric rates flat for the next 10 years if the Keystone Pipeline is approved. Why is that? That is because the NorVal Co-Op is supplying the electricity to a couple of the pump stations on the Keystone Pipeline. That extra volume of electricity will help keep costs down for everybody.

I asked: What happens if the Keystone Pipeline is not approved? They said electric rates would go up about 40 percent over the next 10 years. That is nearly \$500 a year of increase per family. These are hardworking Montana families living month to month. These are senior citizens living on fixed incomes, where we can hold their utility rates, electric rates flat for the next 10 years by passing the Keystone Pipeline bill.

What about North American energy independence? Up to 830,000 barrels a day of oil will be transported through this pipeline. Contrary to what the President has said, 100,000 barrels a day from the Bakken, which is shared between North Dakota and Montana, will be put into that pipeline close to Baker, Montana.

The President was just given four Pinocchios by the Washington Post yesterday for claiming that the Keystone Pipeline bypassed the United States.

I would like to have the President come to Montana. I will pick him up in Billings, and we will drive in my pickup. I will show him where the proposed siting is for the Baker onramp where 100,000 barrels a day of made-in-Montana and made-in-North Dakota oil will enter the Keystone Pipeline. The people of Montana and the people in the Bakken region know the President's claim is absolutely false.

With gas dropping under two bucks a gallon where I am from, that has been a welcomed change for many, many hard-working Montana families. Why are gas prices dropping? It is because we are seeing more made-in-America energy. Again, this lowering in gas prices will result in approximately \$750 a year of savings for the average American household. That is a good thing. But rather than hitting pause on our energy production, it is time to encourage it.

Just this morning we were reminded by Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu that we are living in an increasingly dangerous world. Our energy security isn't just about jobs and low energy prices. It is directly tied to our national security. Whether it is ISIS, whether it is Boko Haram in Nigeria and Chad, whether it is the Russian aggression in Eastern Europe or the growing threat of a nuclear Iran, it is vitally important we move forward with more made-in-America energy because many of these regions that are filled with turmoil supply much of the world's oil and natural gas.

I remember just a year ago when we were having some challenges and we looked at the numbers of what is going on in Ukraine. Nearly 40 percent of the natural gas that is supplied in Europe comes through pipelines going through Ukraine. Thankfully, as the United States becomes the world's largest oil producer this year, surpassing both Russia and Saudi Arabia, these are positive steps forward towards a more secure future for our children and grandchildren. We need more made-in-America energy, not more made-in-the-Middle East oil. The Keystone Pipeline will help us do just that.

Looking forward, the President's veto isn't the end. This week we will vote to override the President's veto. I hope we can get three or four more Senators onboard for this veto vote, and we can do it in the Senate. I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It was encouraging to see a good bipartisan vote in the Senate and in the House in support of the Keystone Pipeline. Let's stand together, and let's stand with the American people and override the President's shortsighted veto. Regardless of the vote, the fight is not over.

This week the President himself said he would make a final decision on this pipeline. I hope he does. You realize it took the Canadians just 7 months to approve the Keystone Pipeline—7 months. It has now taken our President over 6 years without approving the pipeline. We must keep the pressure on this administration. We must continue to fight for American jobs, American opportunity, American energy independence, and low energy prices.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

##### REMEMBERING MINNIE MINOSO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on Sunday, America lost a baseball legend when Saturino Orestes Armas Minoso Arrieta passed away. We knew him as the Cuban Comet, as Mr. White Sox, as the heart and soul of Chicago baseball on the South Side, and a beacon of hope for Cuban athletes everywhere. It is with great sorrow that Chicago loses its South Side White Sox champion only days after the North Side Cubs lost their champion, Ernie Banks.

Before Minnie was Major League Baseball's first black Latino star, he was the son of a sugarcane plantation worker in Perico, Cuba. He started his professional baseball career in Cuba, playing for \$2 a game with the Ambrosia Candy team in Havana for the 1943 season. He also worked in the company garage for \$8 a week. But within a couple of years, he made it to Havana's

Marianao team, making \$150 a month, which soon became \$200 a month to keep him from moving even more quickly in his career.

By 1946, Minnie's talent couldn't be kept away from bigger leagues. He signed a \$300 deal to play for the New York Cubans of the Negro National League. Minnie played third base for the Cubans, batted .294, played in the All-Star Game, and helped them win the pennant. They would beat the Cleveland Buckeyes in the World Series.

The Cleveland Indians hired Minoso in 1949, but the Indians barely used him. He spent the next 2 years in the minor leagues. In 1951, the Indians made a three-team trade with the White Sox and Philadelphia Phillies, and Minnie arrived in Chicago.

Minnie Minoso was the first Black player to wear a Chicago White Sox uniform. His first at-bat was a home run. That first year, the fans gave him his own day, and he was selected for the All-Star Game. He drove opponents mad with his ability to get on base and steal bases. He unabashedly crowded the plate and was hit by a pitch 192 times—just so he could steal second.

Minnie Minoso played 12 seasons with the White Sox over five decades. The seven-time All-Star was The Sporting News Rookie of the Year in 1951, he won three Gold Gloves in left field, and finished in the top four in American League MVP four times. His number was retired in 1983. Minnie had a wonderful career. He is one of two players ever to appear in a major league game in five decades. During the 1950's, two players had 100 homeruns, 100 stolen bases, and batted .300. Those two were the legendary Willie Mays and Minnie Minoso.

But his life was bigger than numbers. He brought optimism to all those around him. Nothing made him happier than when the White Sox won the World Series in 2005 with fellow Cubans Jose Conteras and Orlando Hernandez playing pivotal roles.

Minnie Minoso was a great treasure to Chicago. He used to cruise the Chicago streets in his big car with a White Sox flag flying and his dog Jewel on the front seat. Through all the decades he spent in Chicago, he helped make the town, the White Sox, and the sport of baseball a joy for thousands of fans. He will be missed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today the House adopted the Department of Homeland Security funding bill without poison pill riders. The bill passed the Senate on Friday, and will fund the Department of Homeland Security through September 30, 2015—the end of fiscal year 2015.

I am glad Congress finally put partisanship aside and funded the security

of the American people. And, I want to thank all those who protect our country, from the Coast Guard to the Secret Service, to cyber security professionals and intelligence analysts. Your funds are secure.

The mission of the Department of Homeland Security is to protect America from terrorism and help communities respond to all threats, including those from terrorists and natural disasters. This is a good bill and there was no disagreement on the funding. In December, working with Senator COATS and Senator Landrieu, and our House colleagues, we agreed that vital funding for the Department of Homeland Security would total \$46 billion—over \$1 billion more than a continuing funding resolution.

I am glad this responsible bill to fund the mission of the Department of Homeland Security and its employees is heading to the President's desk. DHS employees are on the job every day. The Coast Guard is literally breaking ice to keep the economy flowing. The Secret Service is protecting the President and fighting credit card fraud. Border Patrol and Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents are securing our borders and enforcing our immigration laws. The Federal Emergency Management Agency is preparing for and responding to disasters, including hurricanes and blizzards. There are cyber warriors securing our networks. And through grant programs the funding supports State and local law enforcement, fire fighters, and EMS. Now, after 5 months, we have done our job to put the resources into the hands of the workers who defend America.

It is my hope that with passage of the homeland security funding bill, Congress can end the era of divisive shutdown politics. The millions of men and women serving in our military and the civil service, who work every day to make this a better Nation, deserve respect and the resources to do their jobs.

Looking ahead, I look forward to working across the aisle and across the dome to debate and complete all 12 fiscal year 2016 appropriations bills in an orderly way, without poison pill riders.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for yesterday's vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to go to conference on the House message to accompany H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. I would have voted nay.

As well, I was necessarily absent for yesterday's vote on the motion to table the request to go to conference on H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act. I would have voted aye.

#### TRIBUTE TO DAN HAMMER

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a great friend and gifted wordsmith, Dan Hammer, who is retiring after a long and distinguished career in public service.

Born and raised in San Jose, Dan attended UC Santa Cruz before moving to Boston to manage an antiwar printing press. He returned to the San Francisco Bay area soon afterwards, where he cut his editing teeth as a typesetter for Rolling Stone magazine.

I first crossed paths with Dan during my 1992 Senate campaign. Dan stopped by my San Diego campaign office after work one day, and his immense talents immediately caught the attention of my local campaign manager. Dan quickly became one of my hardest working volunteers, doing everything from writing memos and news advisories to helping manage my public events. After I won the election, I knew I had to have Dan on my team. Although it took some convincing, he joined my San Diego district office in 1994.

Dan has held many positions in my offices over the years. As a San Diego-based field representative, he served as my eyes and ears on the ground, keeping me apprised of critical issues in southern California. As my deputy press secretary based out of my Washington, DC office, Dan worked many late nights writing press releases and staffing me at events. As my constituent communications director, Dan moved my entire legislative correspondence operation from DC to southern California, managing the full operation with discipline and precision. Under his leadership, my legislative correspondence team answers 200,000 letters and emails every month, and he uses his exceptional communications skills every day to share my work with the constituents I serve. Through it all, he has helped teach a generation of young staffers how to effectively communicate about the most important issues and ideas of our time.

Outside of work, Dan selflessly gives his time to the causes he believes in. Whether volunteering with environmental organizations like the Planning and Conservation League, working for other elected officials including Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, or joining the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary, Dan has always been dedicated to making his community a better place to live.

For more than 20 years, Dan has been a trusted ally, advisor, and friend. As he begins his retirement and embarks on the next exciting chapter of his life, I send him, his wife Shelley, and their entire family my best wishes, deep affection, and abiding gratitude.



## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

## CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13660 ON MARCH 6, 2014, AS MODIFIED BY THE ORDER OF DECEMBER 19, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO UKRAINE—PM 8

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2015.

The actions and policies of persons that undermine democratic processes and institutions in Ukraine; threaten its peace, security, stability, sovereignty, and territorial integrity; and contribute to the misappropriation of its assets, as well as the actions and policies of the Government of the Russian Federation, including its purported annexation of Crimea and its use of force in Ukraine, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13660 with respect to Ukraine.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 2015.

## CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13288 ON MARCH 6, 2003, WITH RESPECT TO THE ACTIONS AND POLICIES OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ZIMBABWE AND OTHER PERSONS TO UNDERMINE ZIMBABWE'S DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES OR INSTITUTIONS—PM 9

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, with respect to the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions is to continue in effect beyond March 6, 2015.

The threat constituted by the actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Zimbabwe and other persons to undermine Zimbabwe's democratic processes or institutions has not been resolved. These actions and policies continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the foreign policy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue this national emergency and to maintain in force the sanctions to respond to this threat.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 2015.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 280. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

H.R. 294. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the placement of veterans in non-Department medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2 of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 715a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

The message further announced that pursuant to Executive Order No. 12131, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the President's Export Council: Mr. KILDEE of Michigan and Ms. DELBENE of Washington.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 280. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to recoup bonuses and awards paid to employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 294. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts and agreements for the placement of veterans in non-Department medical foster homes for certain veterans who are unable to live independently; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 625. A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

\*Jeffery S. Hall, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring October 13, 2018.

\*Dallas P. Tonsager, of South Dakota, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring May 21, 2020.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 623. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 624. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 625. A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 626. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 627. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 628. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the designation of maternity care health professional shortage areas; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 629. A bill to enable hospital-based nursing programs that are affiliated with a hospital to maintain payments under the Medicare program to hospitals for the costs of such programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 630. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 631. A bill to exempt National Forest System land in the State of Alaska from the Roadless Area Conservation Rule; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 632. A bill to strengthen the position of the United States as the world's leading innovator by amending title 35, United States Code, to protect the property rights of the inventors that grow the country's economy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 633. A bill to prohibit certain assistance to the Palestinian Authority; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 634. A bill to prohibit the Federal Emergency Management Agency from recouping certain assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 635. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to provide guidance and limitations regarding the integration of unmanned aircraft systems into United States airspace, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 636. A bill to reduce prescription drug misuse and abuse; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 637. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 638. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to exceptional event demonstrations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LEE, Mr. COATS, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 639. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to include in any proposed rule that limits greenhouse gas emissions and imposes increased costs on other Federal agencies an offset from funds available to the Administrator for all projected increased costs that the proposed rule would impose on other Federal agencies; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. COATS, Mr. LEE, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 640. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 641. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the employer wage credit for activated military reservists; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 642. A bill to aid human trafficking victims' recovery and rehabilitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 643. A bill to amend titles I and II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen connections to early childhood education programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 644. A bill to resolve title issues involving real property and equipment acquired using funds provided under the Alaska Kiln Drying Grant Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 645. A bill to assist States in providing voluntary high-quality universal prekindergarten programs and programs to support infants and toddlers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 646. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health screening before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 647. A bill to repeal title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for cooperative governing of individual health insurance coverage offered in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Finance.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 94. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 95. A resolution designating March 3, 2015, as "World Wildlife Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. NELSON, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Con. Res. 7. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 51

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 51, a bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 228

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 228, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide for congressional and State approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments.

S. 259

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 280

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 317

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 317, a bill to improve early education.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 373

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 388

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr.

REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require humane treatment of animals by Federal Government facilities.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 440

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 440, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness.

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day.

S. 499

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 499, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent concurrent receipt of unemployment benefits and Social Security disability insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 588

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 588, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish a consumer product safety standard for liquid detergent packets to protect children under the age of five from injury or illness, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from

Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 615

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 87, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism.

S. RES. 88

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 88, a resolution celebrating Black History Month.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 625. A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 625

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015".

### SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN RELATING TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 134 the following new section:

#### "SEC. 135. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND OVERSIGHT OF AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.

"(a) TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN AND VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT WITH RESPECT TO SUCH AGREEMENTS.—

"(1) TRANSMISSION OF AGREEMENTS.—Not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees—

"(A) the text of the agreement and all related materials and annexes;

“(B) a verification assessment report of the Secretary of State prepared under paragraph (2) with respect to the agreement; and

“(C) a certification that—

“(i) the agreement includes the appropriate terms, conditions, and duration of the agreement’s requirements with respect to Iran’s nuclear activities and provisions describing any sanctions to be waived, suspended, or otherwise reduced by the United States, and any other nation or entity, including the United Nations; and

“(ii) the President determines the agreement meets United States non-proliferation objectives, does not jeopardize the common defense and security, provides an adequate framework to ensure that Iran’s nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and ensures that Iran’s nuclear activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose.

“(2) VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT REPORT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall prepare, with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), a report assessing—

“(i) the extent to which the Secretary will be able to verify that Iran is complying with its obligations under the agreement;

“(ii) the adequacy of the safeguards and other control mechanisms and other assurances contained in the agreement with respect to Iran’s nuclear program to ensure Iran’s activities permitted thereunder will not be used to further any nuclear-related military or nuclear explosive purpose, including for any research on or development of any nuclear explosive device or any other nuclear-related military purpose; and

“(iii) the capacity and capability of the International Atomic Energy Agency to effectively implement the verification regime required by the agreement, including whether the International Atomic Energy Agency has the required funding, manpower, and authority to do so.

“(B) ASSUMPTIONS.—In preparing a report under subparagraph (A) with respect to an agreement described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall assume that Iran could—

“(i) use all measures not expressly prohibited by the agreement to conceal activities that violate its obligations under the agreement; and

“(ii) alter or deviate from standard practices in order to impede efforts to verify that Iran is complying with those obligations.

“(C) CLASSIFIED ANNEX.—A report under subparagraph (A) shall be transmitted in unclassified form, but shall include a classified annex prepared in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—The requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) shall not apply to an agreement defined in subsection (i)(4).

“(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 60-day period following transmittal by the President of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a), the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review such agreement.

“(2) LIMITATION ON ACTIONS DURING PERIOD OF REVIEW.—Notwithstanding any other pro-

vision of law, except as provided in paragraph (3), during the period for review provided in paragraph (1), the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).

“(3) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition under paragraph (2) does not apply to any deferral, waiver, or other suspension of statutory sanctions pursuant to the Joint Plan of Action if that deferral, waiver, or other suspension is made—

“(A) consistent with the law in effect on the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; and

“(B) not later than 45 days before the transmission by the President of an agreement, assessment report, and certification under subsection (a).

“(c) EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION WITH RESPECT TO NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to an agreement subject to subsection (a) or the Joint Plan of Action—

“(A) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b)(1), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does favor the agreement;

“(B) may not be taken if, during the period for review provided in subsection (b)(1), the Congress adopts, and there is enacted, a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the agreement; or

“(C) may be taken, consistent with existing statutory requirements for such action, if, following the period for review provided in subsection (b)(1), there is not enacted any such joint resolution.

“(2) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this subsection, the phrase ‘action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States’ shall include waiver, suspension, reduction, or other effort to provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to, Iran under any provision of law or any other effort to refrain from applying any such sanctions.

“(d) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT OF IRANIAN COMPLIANCE WITH NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall, within 10 days of receiving credible and accurate information relating to a potentially significant breach or compliance incident by Iran with respect to an agreement subject to subsection (a), submit such information to the appropriate congressional committees.

“(2) MATERIAL BREACH REPORT.—Not later than 10 days after submitting information about a potentially significant breach or compliance incident pursuant to paragraph (1), the President shall make a determination whether such potentially significant breach or compliance issue constitutes a material breach and shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees such determination, accompanied by, as appropriate, a report on the action or failure to act by Iran that led to the material breach, actions necessary for Iran to cure the breach, and the status of Iran’s efforts to cure the breach.

“(3) SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after entering into an agreement described in subsection (a), and not less fre-

quently than once every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on Iran’s nuclear program and the compliance of Iran with the agreement during the period covered by the report, including the following elements:

“(A) Any action or failure to act by Iran that breached the agreement or is in non-compliance with the terms of the agreement.

“(B) Any delay by Iran of more than one week in providing inspectors access to facilities, people, and documents in Iran as required by the agreement.

“(C) Any progress made by Iran to resolve concerns by the International Atomic Energy Agency about possible military dimensions of Iran’s nuclear program.

“(D) Any procurement by Iran of materials in violation of the agreement.

“(E) Any centrifuge research and development conducted by Iran that—

“(i) is not in compliance with the agreement; or

“(ii) may substantially enhance the enrichment capacity of Iran if deployed.

“(F) Any diversion by Iran of uranium, carbon-fiber, or other materials for use in Iran’s nuclear program in violation of the agreement.

“(G) Any covert nuclear activities undertaken by Iran.

“(H) An assessment of whether any Iranian financial institutions are engaged in money laundering or terrorist finance activities, including names of specific financial institutions if applicable.

“(I) An assessment of—

“(i) whether, and the extent to which, Iran supported acts of terrorism; and

“(ii) whether Iran directly supported, financed, planned, or carried out an act of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world.

“(4) ADDITIONAL REPORTS AND INFORMATION.—

“(A) AGENCY REPORTS.—Following submission of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a) to the appropriate congressional committees, the Department of State, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense shall, upon the request of either of those committees, promptly furnish to those committees their views as to whether the safeguards and other controls contained in the agreement with respect to Iran’s nuclear program provide an adequate framework to ensure that Iran’s activities permitted thereunder will not be inimical to or constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

“(B) PROVISION OF INFORMATION ON NUCLEAR INITIATIVES WITH IRAN.—The President shall keep the appropriate congressional committees fully and currently informed of any initiative or negotiations with Iran relating to Iran’s nuclear program, including any new or amended agreement.

“(5) CERTIFICATION.—After the review period provided in subsection (b)(1), the President shall, not less than every 90 days—

“(A) determine whether the President is able to certify that—

“(i) Iran is transparently, verifiably, and fully implementing the agreement, including all related technical or additional agreements;

“(ii) Iran has not committed a material breach with respect to the agreement or, if Iran has committed a material breach, Iran has cured the material breach;

“(iii) Iran has not taken any action, including covert action, that could significantly advance its nuclear weapons program;

“(iv) Iran has not directly supported or carried out an act of terrorism against the United States or a United States person anywhere in the world; and

“(v) suspension of sanctions related to Iran pursuant to the agreement is—

“(I) appropriate and proportionate to the specific and verifiable measures taken by Iran with respect to terminating its illicit nuclear program; and

“(II) vital to the national security interests of the United States; and

“(B) if the President determines he is able to make the certification described in subparagraph (A), make such certification to the appropriate congressional committees.

“(e) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event the President does not submit a certification pursuant to subsection (d)(5) or has determined pursuant to subsection (d)(2) that Iran has materially breached an agreement subject to subsection (a), Congress may initiate within 60 days expedited consideration of qualifying legislation pursuant to this subsection.

“(2) QUALIFYING LEGISLATION DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualifying legislation’ means only a bill of either House of Congress—

“(A) the title of which is as follows: ‘A bill reinstating statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran.’; and

“(B) the matter after the enacting clause of which is: ‘Any statutory sanctions imposed with respect to Iran pursuant to \_\_\_\_\_ that were waived, suspended, reduced, or otherwise relieved pursuant to an agreement submitted pursuant to section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 are hereby reinstated and any action by the United States Government to facilitate the release of funds or assets to Iran pursuant to such agreement, or provide any further waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief is hereby prohibited.’, with the blank space being filled in with the law or laws under which sanctions are to be reinstated.

“(3) INTRODUCTION.—During the 60-day period provided for in paragraph (1), qualifying legislation may be introduced—

“(A) in the House of Representatives, by the Speaker (or the Speaker’s designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader’s designee); and

“(B) in the Senate, by the majority leader (or the majority leader’s designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader’s designee).

“(4) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—Qualifying legislation introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the House of Representatives to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

“(5) DISCHARGE.—If the committee of either House to which qualifying legislation has been referred has not reported such qualifying legislation within 10 session days after the date of referral of such legislation, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such legislation and the qualifying legislation shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

“(6) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After each committee authorized to consider qualifying legislation reports it to the House of Representatives or has been discharged from its consideration, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the qualifying legislation in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has

disposed of a motion to proceed on the qualifying legislation. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

“(B) CONSIDERATION.—The qualifying legislation shall be considered as read. All points of order against the qualifying legislation and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the qualifying legislation to its passage without intervening motion except 2 hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the qualifying legislation shall not be in order. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, qualifying legislation shall be in order.

“(C) APPEALS.—All appeals from the Chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to the qualifying legislation shall be decided without debate.

“(7) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the committee authorized to consider qualifying legislation reports it to the Senate or has been discharged from its consideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of qualifying legislation, and all points of order against qualifying legislation (and against consideration of the qualifying legislation) are waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the qualifying legislation is agreed to, the qualifying legislation shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

“(B) DEBATE.—Debate on qualifying legislation, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the qualifying legislation is not in order.

“(C) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the qualifying legislation and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

“(D) RULINGS OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to qualifying legislation shall be decided without debate.

“(E) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to qualifying legislation, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such qualifying legislation, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

“(8) RULES RELATING TO SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

“(A) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If, before the passage by one House

of qualifying legislation of that House, that House receives qualifying legislation from the other House, then the following procedures shall apply:

“(i) The qualifying legislation of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

“(ii) With respect to qualifying legislation of the House receiving the legislation—

“(I) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no qualifying legislation had been received from the other House; but

“(II) the vote on passage shall be on the qualifying legislation of the other House.

“(B) TREATMENT OF JOINT RESOLUTION OF OTHER HOUSE.—If one House fails to introduce or consider qualifying legislation under this section, the qualifying legislation of the other House shall be entitled to expedited floor procedures under this section.

“(C) TREATMENT OF COMPANION MEASURES.—If, following passage of the qualifying legislation in the Senate, the Senate then receives a companion measure from the House of Representatives, the companion measure shall not be debatable.

“(f) RULES OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—Subsection (e) is enacted by Congress—

“(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

“(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

“(g) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the section shall be construed as—

“(1) modifying, or having any other impact on, the President’s authority to negotiate, enter into, or implement appropriate executive agreements, other than the restrictions on implementation of the agreements specifically covered by this Act;

“(2) allowing any new waiver, suspension, reduction, or other relief from statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law, or allowing the President to refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a) during the period for review provided in subsection (b)(1);

“(3) revoking or terminating any statutory sanctions imposed on Iran; or

“(4) authorizing the use of military force against Iran.

“(h) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

“(1) the sanctions regime imposed on Iran by Congress is primarily responsible for bringing Iran to the table to negotiate on its nuclear program;

“(2) these negotiations are a critically important matter of national security and foreign policy for the United States and its closest allies; and

“(3) it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity to consider and, as appropriate, take action on any agreement affecting the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) AGREEMENT AND ALL RELATED MATERIALS AND ANNEXES.—The term ‘agreement and all related materials and annexes’ means the agreement itself and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes,

appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ has the meaning given that term in section 14 of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note).

“(3) IRANIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ‘Iranian financial institution’ has the meaning given the term in section 104A(d) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513b(d)).

“(4) JOINT PLAN OF ACTION.—The term ‘Joint Plan of Action’ means the Joint Plan of Action, signed at Geneva November 24, 2013, by Iran and by France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the People’s Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and the United States, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Plan of Action, including the technical understandings reached on January 12, 2014, the extension thereto agreed to on July 18, 2014, the extension agreed to on November 24, 2014, and any extension that is agreed to on or after the date of the enactment of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015.

“(5) MATERIAL BREACH.—The term ‘material breach’ means, with respect to an agreement described in subsection (a), any breach of the agreement that substantially—

“(A) benefits Iran’s nuclear program;

“(B) decreases the amount of time required by Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon; or

“(C) deviates from or undermines the purposes of such agreement.

“(6) NONCOMPLIANCE DEFINED.—The term ‘noncompliance’ means any departure from the terms of an agreement described in subsection (a) that is not a material breach.

“(7) P5+1 COUNTRIES.—The term ‘P5+1 countries’ means the United States, France, the Russian Federation, the People’s Republic of China, the United Kingdom, and Germany.

“(8) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8511).”.

This act shall become effective 1 day after enactment.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 630. A bill to establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise on behalf of myself and Senator BOXER to introduce legislation to establish a National Heritage Area in the California Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. This legislation will create the first Heritage Area in California.

This bill was first introduced in 2011 and has been the subject of Energy and Natural Resources Committee hearings in both the 112th and 113th Congresses. Since then, the Delta Protection Commission has completed a feasibility study, as required, and endorsed the legislation. Additionally, the National Park Service has confirmed that the study is consistent with the agency’s

interim National Heritage Area Feasibility Study Guidelines.

I was pleased to have had the opportunity to work with Senator BOXER, Representative JOHN GARAMENDI, and the County Supervisors from the five Delta Counties to develop this legislation and look forward to continuing to partner with them as well as local, State and Federal agencies to care for and improve the Delta.

This bill will establish the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta as a National Heritage Area. The purpose of the heritage area is to conserve and protect the Delta, its communities, its resources, and its history.

The Delta Protection Commission, created by California law and responsible to the citizens of the Delta and California, will manage the Heritage Area. It will ensure an open and public process, working with all levels of Federal, State, and local government, tribes, local stakeholders, and private property owners as it develops and implements the management plan for the Heritage Area. The bill authorizes \$10 million in Federal assistance over the next 15 years to provide technical assistance and matching grants to local governments and nonprofit organizations to implement the management plan to conserve and protect the delta’s natural, historical and cultural resources.

It is also important to understand what this legislation will not do. It will not affect water rights. It will not affect water contracts. It will not affect private property. It will not affect fishing or hunting.

Nothing in this bill gives any governmental agency any more regulatory power than it already has, nor does it take away regulatory from agencies that have it.

In short, this bill does not affect water rights or water contracts, nor does it impose any additional responsibilities on local government or residents. Instead, it authorizes Federal assistance to a local process already required by State law that will elevate the Delta, providing a means to conserve and protect its valued communities, resources, and history.

The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta is the largest estuary on the West Coast. It is the most extensive inland delta in the world, and a unique national treasure.

Today, it is a labyrinth of sloughs, wetlands, and deepwater channels that connect the waters of the high Sierra mountain streams to the Pacific Ocean through the San Francisco Bay. Its approximately 60 islands are protected by 1,100 miles of levees, and are home to 3,500,000 residents, including 2,500 family farmers. The Delta and its farmers produce some of the highest quality specialty crops in the United States.

The Delta offers recreational opportunities to the two million Californians

who visit the area each year for boating, fishing, hunting, visiting historic sites, and viewing wildlife. It provides habitat for more than 750 species of plants and wildlife. These include sand hill cranes that migrate to the Delta wetland from places as far away as Siberia. The Delta also provides habitat for 55 species of fish, including Chinook salmon, some as large as 60 pounds, that return each year to travel through the Delta to spawn in the tributaries.

These same waterways also channel fresh water to the Federal and State-owned pumps in the South Delta that provide water to 23 million Californians and three million acres of irrigated agricultural land elsewhere in the State.

Before the Delta was reclaimed for farmland in the 19th Century, the Delta flooded regularly with snow melt each spring, and provided the rich environment that, by 1492, supported the largest settlement of Native Americans in North America.

The Delta was the gateway to the gold fields in 1849, after which Chinese workers built hundreds of miles of levees throughout the waterways of the Delta to make its rich peat soils available for farming and to control flooding.

Japanese, Italians, German, Portuguese, Dutch, Greeks, South Asians and other immigrants began the farming legacy, and developed technologies specifically adapted to the unique environment, including the Caterpillar Tractor, which later contributed to agriculture and transportation internationally.

Delta communities created a river culture befitting their dependence on water transport, a culture which has attracted the attention of authors from Mark Twain and Jack London to Joan Didion.

The National Heritage Area designation for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta will help local governments develop and implement a plan for a sustainable future by providing federal recognition, technical assistance and small amounts of funding to a community-based process already underway.

Through the Delta Heritage Area, local communities and citizens will partner with Federal, State and local governments to collaboratively work to promote conservation, community revitalization, and economic development projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 630

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Establishment Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **HERITAGE AREA.**—The term “Heritage Area” means the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Heritage Area established by section 3(a).

(2) **HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “Heritage Area management plan” means the plan developed and adopted by the local coordinating entity under this Act.

(3) **LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.**—The term “local coordinating entity” means the local coordinating entity for the Heritage Area designated by section 3(d).

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of California.

**SEC. 3. SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA HERITAGE AREA.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the “Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Heritage Area” in the State.

(b) **BOUNDARIES.**—The boundaries of the Heritage Area shall be in the counties of Contra Costa, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, and Yolo in the State of California, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area Proposed Boundary”, numbered T27/105,030, and dated October 2012.

(c) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The map described in subsection (b) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service and the Delta Protection Commission.

(d) **LOCAL COORDINATING ENTITY.**—The local coordinating entity for the Heritage Area shall be the Delta Protection Commission established by section 29735 of the California Public Resources Code.

(e) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

(1) **AUTHORITIES.**—For purposes of carrying out the Heritage Area management plan, the Secretary, acting through the local coordinating entity, may use amounts made available under this Act to—

(A) make grants to the State or a political subdivision of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

(B) enter into cooperative agreements with, or provide technical assistance to, the State or a political subdivision of the State, nonprofit organizations, and other interested parties;

(C) hire and compensate staff, which shall include individuals with expertise in natural, cultural, and historical resources protection, and heritage programming;

(D) obtain money or services from any source including any that are provided under any other Federal law or program;

(E) contract for goods or services; and

(F) undertake to be a catalyst for any other activity that furthers the Heritage Area and is consistent with the approved Heritage Area management plan.

(2) **DUTIES.**—The local coordinating entity shall—

(A) in accordance with subsection (f), prepare and submit a Heritage Area management plan to the Secretary;

(B) assist units of local government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in carrying out the approved Heritage Area management plan by—

(i) carrying out programs and projects that recognize, protect, and enhance important resource values in the Heritage Area;

(ii) establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits and programs in the Heritage Area;

(iii) developing recreational and educational opportunities in the Heritage Area;

(iv) increasing public awareness of, and appreciation for, natural, historical, scenic, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(v) protecting and restoring historic sites and buildings in the Heritage Area that are consistent with Heritage Area themes;

(vi) ensuring that clear, consistent, and appropriate signs identifying points of public access, and sites of interest are posted throughout the Heritage Area; and

(vii) promoting a wide range of partnerships among governments, organizations, and individuals to further the Heritage Area;

(C) consider the interests of diverse units of government, businesses, organizations, and individuals in the Heritage Area in the preparation and implementation of the Heritage Area management plan;

(D) conduct meetings open to the public at least semiannually regarding the development and implementation of the Heritage Area management plan;

(E) for any year that Federal funds have been received under this Act—

(i) submit an annual report to the Secretary that describes the activities, expenses, and income of the local coordinating entity (including grants to any other entities during the year that the report is made);

(ii) make available to the Secretary for audit all records relating to the expenditure of the funds and any matching funds; and

(iii) require, with respect to all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the organizations receiving the funds make available to the Secretary for audit all records concerning the expenditure of the funds; and

(F) encourage by appropriate means economic viability that is consistent with the Heritage Area.

(3) **PROHIBITION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.**—The local coordinating entity shall not use Federal funds made available under this Act to acquire real property or any interest in real property.

(4) **COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—The Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out using any assistance made available under this Act shall be 50 percent.

(f) **HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the local coordinating entity shall submit to the Secretary for approval a proposed Heritage Area management plan.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Heritage Area management plan shall—

(A) incorporate an integrated and cooperative approach to agricultural resources and activities, flood protection facilities, and other public infrastructure;

(B) emphasize the importance of the resources described in subparagraph (A);

(C) take into consideration State and local plans;

(D) include—

(i) an inventory of—

(I) the resources located in the core area described in subsection (b); and

(II) any other property in the core area that—

(aa) is related to the themes of the Heritage Area; and

(bb) should be preserved, restored, managed, or maintained because of the significance of the property;

(ii) comprehensive policies, strategies and recommendations for conservation, funding, management, and development of the Heritage Area;

(iii) a description of actions that governments, private organizations, and individuals have agreed to take to protect the natural,

historical and cultural resources of the Heritage Area;

(iv) a program of implementation for the Heritage Area management plan by the local coordinating entity that includes a description of—

(I) actions to facilitate ongoing collaboration among partners to promote plans for resource protection, restoration, and construction; and

(II) specific commitments for implementation that have been made by the local coordinating entity or any government, organization, or individual for the first 5 years of operation;

(v) the identification of sources of funding for carrying out the Heritage Area management plan;

(vi) analysis and recommendations for means by which local, State, and Federal programs, including the role of the National Park Service in the Heritage Area, may best be coordinated to carry out this Act; and

(vii) an interpretive plan for the Heritage Area; and

(E) recommend policies and strategies for resource management that consider and detail the application of appropriate land and water management techniques, including the development of intergovernmental and interagency cooperative agreements to protect the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the Heritage Area.

(3) **RESTRICTIONS.**—The Heritage Area management plan submitted under this subsection shall—

(A) ensure participation by appropriate Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies, including the Delta Stewardship Council, special districts, natural and historical resource protection and agricultural organizations, educational institutions, businesses, recreational organizations, community residents, and private property owners; and

(B) not be approved until the Secretary has received certification from the Delta Protection Commission that the Delta Stewardship Council has reviewed the Heritage Area management plan for consistency with the plan adopted by the Delta Stewardship Council pursuant to State law.

(4) **DEADLINE.**—If a proposed Heritage Area management plan is not submitted to the Secretary by the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the local coordinating entity shall be ineligible to receive additional funding under this Act until the date that the Secretary receives and approves the Heritage Area management plan.

(5) **APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL OF HERITAGE AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of receipt of the Heritage Area management plan under paragraph (1), the Secretary, in consultation with the State, shall approve or disapprove the Heritage Area management plan.

(B) **CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.**—In determining whether to approve the Heritage Area management plan, the Secretary shall consider whether—

(i) the local coordinating entity is representative of the diverse interests of the Heritage Area, including governments, natural and historic resource protection organizations, educational institutions, businesses, and recreational organizations;

(ii) the local coordinating entity has afforded adequate opportunity, including public hearings, for public and governmental involvement in the preparation of the Heritage Area management plan; and

(iii) the resource protection and interpretation strategies contained in the Heritage



Area management plan, if implemented, would adequately protect the natural, historical, and cultural resources of the Heritage Area.

(C) **ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.**—If the Secretary disapproves the Heritage Area management plan under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

- (i) advise the local coordinating entity in writing of the reasons for the disapproval;
- (ii) make recommendations for revisions to the Heritage Area management plan; and
- (iii) not later than 180 days after the receipt of any proposed revision of the Heritage Area management plan from the local coordinating entity, approve or disapprove the proposed revision.

(D) **AMENDMENTS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall approve or disapprove each amendment to the Heritage Area management plan that the Secretary determines make a substantial change to the Heritage Area management plan.

(ii) **USE OF FUNDS.**—The local coordinating entity shall not use Federal funds authorized by this Act to carry out any amendments to the Heritage Area management plan until the Secretary has approved the amendments.

(g) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act affects the authority of a Federal agency to provide technical or financial assistance under any other law.

(2) **CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION.**—The head of any Federal agency planning to conduct activities that may have an impact on the Heritage Area is encouraged to consult and coordinate the activities with the Secretary and the local coordinating entity to the maximum extent practicable.

(3) **OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.**—Nothing in this Act—

(A) modifies, alters, or amends any law or regulation authorizing a Federal agency to manage Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Federal agency;

(B) limits the discretion of a Federal land manager to implement an approved land use plan within the boundaries of the Heritage Area; or

(C) modifies, alters, or amends any authorized use of Federal land under the jurisdiction of a Federal agency.

(h) **PRIVATE PROPERTY AND REGULATORY PROTECTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), nothing in this Act—

(A) abridges the rights of any property owner (whether public or private), including the right to refrain from participating in any plan, project, program, or activity conducted within the Heritage Area;

(B) requires any property owner to permit public access (including access by Federal, State, or local agencies) to the property of the property owner, or to modify public access or use of property of the property owner under any other Federal, State, or local law;

(C) alters any duly adopted land use regulation, approved land use plan, or other regulatory authority of any Federal, State or local agency, or conveys any land use or other regulatory authority to the local coordinating entity;

(D) authorizes or implies the reservation or appropriation of water or water rights;

(E) diminishes the authority of the State to manage fish and wildlife, including the regulation of fishing and hunting within the Heritage Area; or

(F) creates any liability, or affects any liability under any other law, of any private

property owner with respect to any person injured on the private property.

(2) **OPT OUT.**—An owner of private property within the Heritage Area may opt out of participating in any plan, project, program, or activity carried out within the Heritage Area under this Act, if the property owner provides written notice to the local coordinating entity.

(i) **EVALUATION; REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years before the date on which authority for Federal funding terminates for the Heritage Area, the Secretary shall—

(A) conduct an evaluation of the accomplishments of the Heritage Area; and

(B) prepare a report in accordance with paragraph (3).

(2) **EVALUATION.**—An evaluation conducted under paragraph (1)(A) shall—

(A) assess the progress of the local coordinating entity with respect to—

(i) accomplishing the purposes of this Act for the Heritage Area; and

(ii) achieving the goals and objectives of the approved Heritage Area management plan;

(B) analyze the Federal, State, local, and private investments in the Heritage Area to determine the leverage and impact of the investments; and

(C) review the management structure, partnership relationships, and funding of the Heritage Area for purposes of identifying the critical components for sustainability of the Heritage Area.

(3) **REPORT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Based on the evaluation conducted under paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary shall prepare a report that includes recommendations for the future role of the National Park Service, if any, with respect to the Heritage Area.

(B) **REQUIRED ANALYSIS.**—If the report prepared under subparagraph (A) recommends that Federal funding for the Heritage Area be reauthorized, the report shall include an analysis of—

(i) ways in which Federal funding for the Heritage Area may be reduced or eliminated; and

(ii) the appropriate time period necessary to achieve the recommended reduction or elimination.

(C) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—On completion of the report, the Secretary shall submit the report to—

(i) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(ii) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(j) **EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.**—Nothing in this Act—

(1) precludes the local coordinating entity from using Federal funds made available under other laws for the purposes for which those funds were authorized; or

(2) affects any water rights or contracts.

#### SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$10,000,000, of which not more than \$1,000,000 may be made available for any fiscal year.

(b) **COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.**—The Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act shall be determined by the Secretary, but shall be not more than 50 percent.

(c) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—The non-Federal share of the total cost of any activity under this Act may be in the form of in-kind contributions of goods or services.

#### SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If a proposed Heritage Area management plan has not been sub-

mitted to the Secretary by the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Heritage Area designation shall be rescinded.

(b) **FUNDING AUTHORITY.**—The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this Act terminates on the date that is 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 631. A bill to exempt National Forest System land in the State of Alaska from the Roadless Area Conservation Rule; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, rise today to introduce legislation that I have cosponsored for a number of years, that will remedy the problems that have been created by this administration's decision to apply the, Inventoried, Roadless Area Conservation Rule to Alaska, especially in Southeast Alaska's Tongass National Forest, and also in the Chugach National Forest of Southcentral Alaska. I am joined today in introducing that bill by my Alaska colleague Senator DAN SULLIVAN.

Back in 2001 the Clinton administration promulgated the Nationwide Inventoried Area Roadless Conservation Rule. Initially the rule did not cover the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, which has been the subject of congressional review and special legislation twice in the past 35 years, first in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act in 1980, which reduced the allowable timber harvest in the 16.9-million acre forest from nearly 1 billion board feet a year to a 450 million board foot harvest level, and later by the Tongass Timber Reform Act of 1990, which further reduced the allowable harvest level to 267 million board feet annually. Congress in 1980 created 5.75 million acres of wilderness by creating 14 wilderness areas in the forest, and in 1990 further reduced the lands available for timber harvesting by creating five additional wilderness areas totaling 296,000 acres and 12 Land Unit Designation 11 areas of 727,700 acres that increased the protected acreages in the Tongass to more than 6.4 million. With the passage of the Sealaska lands bill in 2014, total protected acreage in the Tongass has risen to 6.55 million acres.

Lands classified for potential timber production have been drastically reduced since the 1980 Act's passage. In the Tongass Land Management Plans, TLPM, crafted after ANILCA's passage, 13.3 million acres of the forest, nearly 80 percent, have been restricted from resource development. Of the 9.5 million acres of commercial timber lands in the Tongass only 3.4 million were open for development after 1980 and only 800,000, including previously logged areas, were permitted/planned for harvest over a prospective 100-year timber rotation, harvesting limited to

about 8,250 acres a year—4 percent of the total land area. That included about 400,000 “new” acres of new timber lands over a century on top of the roughly 425,000 acres harvested since modern timber activities in Southeast Alaska began in the 1950’s and allowed in part for reentry in the future. Since passage of the Tongass Timber Reform Act, and since imposition of the Inventoried Roadless Rule, potential harvesting has dropped even further.

The 2001 Inventoried Roadless Areas in the Tongass include 9.5 million acres, 57 percent of the entire forest, while 5.4 million acres, 99 percent, of the Chugach National Forest in Southcentral Alaska were placed in protected status. In the Tongass 7.4 million acres are in the highest protected status of inventoried roadless meaning that not only can’t roads be built for forestry, but that access is not allowed for other uses such as renewable energy development. Overall, between the Inventoried Roadless Rule and other land protections, fewer than 176,000 acres of “new” timber lands are planned for harvest over the next 100 years, cutting the allowable sale quantity below 267 mmbf. The drop in employment in the region has been chilling. According to the Forest Service, total direct timber sector employment fell from a high of 3,543 average annual employees in 1990 to 402 in 2007. Tongass employment in logging and sawmilling has declined from 409 in 2001, the first year of the roadless rule, to 114 by 2007. The drop off in timber activity would actually be higher except the State of Alaska, to the degree that it could, increased State timber sales. In 2002, for example, 73 percent of all timber cut in Southeast came from Federal forest lands, while by 2007 the percentage stood at barely half coming from Federal lands.

Without changes in the roadless rule to allow some additional timber harvest areas and other energy and mineral development, no more than about 3 percent of the Nation’s largest forest will ever be developed and Southeast Alaska will be forced to depend solely on fisheries and tourism as economic engines, potentially returning the region to its impoverished economy of the 1940s.

Today I am introducing legislation to simply exempt Alaska from the Inventoried Roadless Rule. That will not permit economic development on all 9.5 million acres of IRA lands in the Tongass or many of the lands in the Chugach. They will continue to be protected by the terms of the national forest plans for both forests. What it will do is permit land planners the flexibility to propose more rational land planning decisions in the future. It would allow the Forest Service the ability to permit road and electric transmission lines to be placed to tap the region’s huge hydroelectric poten-

tial—there being 300 megawatts of hydropower available from known sites, if distribution lines can be built at reasonable cost to get the power to markets.

Adding some timber back to the timber base would allow a timber industry to again help the region’s economy. But that would not harm the environment and wildlife. Already of the 537,451 acres of productive old-growth, POG, trees left in the Tongass, 437,000 are in permanent conservation areas—81 percent.

The roadless rule may make sense in the contiguous states since there are at least some roads and utility lines that cross those States’ national forests. In Southeast Alaska, however, there is no transportation network except a marine ferry system, and no permitted electrical transmission system. It simply made no sense in 2001 for the Inventoried Roadless Rules to apply to Alaska. The rule is not needed since by existing plans and regulations, even without IRA’s, 96 percent of the Tongass will remain protected. An exemption from the rule will simply allow Alaskans an opportunity to make thoughtful decisions on development in a region 18 times larger than the state of Delaware, but with 1,300 miles of road in the entire region, 1/10 of the road miles of tiny Delaware.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 638. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to exceptional event demonstrations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I thought I would rise to discuss legislation designed to address the bureaucratic overreach in the Environmental Protection Agency’s air regulations.

Since I last introduced these bills in June of 2014, EPA’s failures in this area have become even more glaring. At present, air regulations are stifling to both businesses and private citizens, and they are negatively impacting our economy.

Let me say from the outset, we all want clean air. We are always in favor of protecting the environment and the air we breathe. I think we are not in favor of an EPA that places real regulations over common sense.

Today I am introducing S. 638, S. 639, and S. 640, the CLEER Act, the ORDEAL Act, and the Agency PAYGO for greenhouse gases.

The CLEER Act eases the regulatory burden on States, including desert States such as Arizona that are home to so-called exceptional events such as dust storms.

Dust storms in Arizona are not caused by man. They are naturally occurring events, just like tornadoes or

blizzards in other parts of the country. When these dust storms occur in Arizona, they can cause a spike in the dust, or the PM-10 level. This is nothing the State can control. Yet this blip can cause Arizona and other affected States to fall out of compliance with Federal air quality standards. Again, this is through no fault of their own. It can lead to a loss of transportation dollars, even from the Federal Government.

Thanks to EPA rules, States end up wasting vast amounts of manpower, countless work hours, and lots of taxpayer dollars on reviews and appeals for events they cannot control or avoid.

For example, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, the Maricopa Air Quality Department, and the Maricopa Association of Governments in 2011 and 2012 spent \$675,000 and 790 staff hours just to prove a spike in PM-10 levels was caused by a dust storm, not pollution.

These EPA reviews are arbitrary, cumbersome, and costly. They lack an appeals process that further defies common sense. The EPA has continually assured me it would issue a rule to help ease the burdens on States, all the States that have to weather forces of nature such as this. Yet despite these promises, the EPA has continued to backtrack and shift deadlines, and to date has not issued a workable proposed rule.

My legislation on the CLEER Act would require the EPA to move forward with a rulemaking, and it would require decisions on such events be based on a preponderance of evidence, and will accord deference to States’ own findings of when such events happen.

It would also require the EPA to review the States’ exceptional-event documentation within a reasonable time period of 90 days instead of dragging out the process. Part of the cost is due to the fact that the EPA drags out the process. These practical fixes will alleviate the undue hardship States are having to deal with and when we have to deal with the effects of these natural events.

Secondly, the ORDEAL Act is an attempt to overhaul the EPA’s unnecessary ozone standard reduction until 2018. When the EPA reduced permitted ozone standards in 2008, counties across the country that were in nonattainment were forced to enact expensive and complicated compliance plans.

Relying on a dubious scientific basis, the EPA has proposed lowering the ozone emissions standards even further to 65 parts per billion, while accepting comments on lowering it to 60 parts per billion. By some estimates, this proposal to lower the ozone level may be the most expensive regulation in EPA history—and that is saying something—costing as much as \$1.7 trillion.

Lowering ozone standards from 75 parts per billion to 65 parts per billion will cost a whopping \$140 billion annually. Yet EPA's own science advisers disagree on the very basis upon which this regulation is built.

The ORDEAL Act will stop shaky facts and assumptions from being used as a basis for long-term public policy, and will give States the flexibility and the time to implement their own innovative and proactive measures.

The bill would also extend air quality standards reviews, including ozone, to a 10-year timeline instead of the current 5 years.

Third, Agency PAYGO. This administration has set its sights on reducing carbon emissions, most recently putting draconian regulations on existing powerplants, despite the inevitable job losses and spikes in energy costs. It has placed a mandate on Arizona to reduce 52 percent of its carbon emissions by 2030. This is unattainable, unless Arizonans are forced to greatly reduce their standard of living.

The Agency PAYGO Act I am introducing would simply give the EPA a taste of its own medicine by requiring the Agency to offset the Federal cost of any greenhouse gas rules to an equivalent reduction in Agency spending. If the EPA proceeds without offsetting these costs from its own budget, the final greenhouse gas rule must be approved by Congress, simply saying if you cannot do this as an offset within your own budget, bring it to Congress and let's approve it. This bill specifically forbids the EPA from denying costs to Federal agencies by passing on costs to the Federal agency's ratepayers. If capital costs are imposed by a greenhouse gas rule, the EPA must offset those costs or get Congress's approval.

The EPA has a history of implementing costly and stringent standards for negligible and even questionable benefit. All three of these bills—the CLEER Act, ORDEAL Act, and Agency PAYGO Act—provide more certainty than presently exists to States and counties and businesses that have to deal with the EPA and will hold the Agency accountable for its decision-making process.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting these measures.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 94—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following res-

olution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 94

Whereas a competitive global economy requires workers trained in skilled professions;

Whereas according to a report by the National Association of Manufacturers, 80 percent of respondents indicated a moderate to severe shortage of qualified skilled production employees, including front-line workers, such as machinists, operators, craft workers, distributors, and technicians;

Whereas career and technical education is a tried and true solution to ensure that competitive skilled workers are ready, willing, and capable of holding jobs in high-wage, high-skill, and in-demand career fields, such as science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (commonly known as “STEM”) disciplines, nursing, allied health, construction, information technology, energy sustainability, and many other fields that are vital to keeping the United States competitive in the global economy;

Whereas career and technical education helps the United States meet the very real and immediate challenges of economic development, student achievement, and global competitiveness;

Whereas 14,000,000 students are enrolled in career and technical education, which exists in every State and includes programs in nearly 1,300 public high schools and 1,700 2-year colleges;

Whereas 10 of the 20 fastest growing occupations in the United States require an associate's degree or a lesser credential, 13 of the 20 occupations in the United States with the greatest number of projected new jobs require on-the-job training and an associate's degree or certificate, and nearly all occupations in the United States require real-world skills that can be mastered through career and technical education;

Whereas career and technical education matches employability skills with workforce demand and provides relevant academic and technical coursework leading to industry-recognized credentials for secondary, post-secondary, and adult learners;

Whereas career and technical education affords students the opportunity to gain the knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to secure careers in growing, high-demand fields;

Whereas secondary school students participating in career and technical education are significantly more likely than students not participating in career and technical education to report that they had developed skills during high school in problem solving, project completion, research, mathematics, applying to colleges, work-related contexts, communication, time management, and critical thinking;

Whereas students at schools with highly integrated rigorous academic and career and technical education programs have significantly higher achievement in reading, mathematics, and science than students at schools with less integrated programs; and

Whereas the Association for Career and Technical Education has designated February as “Career and Technical Education Month” to celebrate career and technical education across the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month;

(2) recognizes the importance of career and technical education in preparing a well-educated and skilled workforce in the United States; and

(3) encourages educators, counselors, and administrators to promote career and technical education as an option for students.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 95—DESIGNATING MARCH 3, 2015, AS “WORLD WILDLIFE DAY”

Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 95

Whereas wildlife has provided numerous economic, environmental, social, and cultural benefits during the course of human history, and wildlife preservation will secure these gifts for future generations;

Whereas each plant and animal species plays an important role in the stability of diverse ecosystems around the world, and the conservation of this biodiversity is critical to maintain the delicate balance of nature and keep complex ecosystems thriving;

Whereas observation of wild plants and animals in their natural habitat provides individuals with a more enriching world view and a greater appreciation of the wonders of the natural environment;

Whereas tens of millions of individuals in the United States strongly support the conservation of wildlife, both domestically and abroad, and wish to ensure the survival of species in the wild, such as rhinoceroses, tigers, elephants, pangolins, turtles, seahorses, sharks, ginseng, mahogany, and cacti;

Whereas the trafficking of wildlife, including timber and fish, comprises the fourth largest global illegal trade, after narcotics, counterfeiting of products and currency, and human trafficking, and has become a major transnational organized crime with an estimated worth of approximately \$19,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas increased demand in Asia for high-value illegal wildlife products, particularly elephant ivory and rhinoceros horns, has recently triggered substantial and rapid increases in poaching of these species, particularly in Africa;

Whereas trafficking of wildlife is the primary threat to many wildlife species, including elephants, rhinoceroses, and tigers;

Whereas many different kinds of criminals, including some terrorist entities and rogue security personnel, often in collusion with corrupt government officials, are involved in wildlife poaching and the movement of ivory and rhinoceros horns across Africa;

Whereas wildlife poaching presents significant security and stability challenges for military and police forces in African nations that are often threatened by heavily armed poachers and the criminal and extremist allies of such poachers;

Whereas wildlife poaching negatively impacts local communities that rely on natural resources for economic development, including tourism;

Whereas penal and financial deterrents can improve the ability of African governments to reduce poaching and trafficking and enhance their capabilities of managing their resources;

Whereas assisting institutions in developing nations, including material, training, legal, and diplomatic support, can reduce illegal wildlife trade;

Whereas wildlife provides a multitude of benefits to all nations, and wildlife crime has wide-ranging economic, environmental, and social impacts;

Whereas the number of elephants killed by poachers in Kenya increased by more than 800 percent from 2007 to 2012, from 47 to 387 elephants killed;

Whereas the number of rhinoceroses killed by poachers in South Africa increased by more than 7000 percent between 2007 and 2013, from 13 to 1004 rhinoceroses killed;

Whereas the number of forest elephants in the Congo Basin in central Africa declined by approximately two-thirds between 2002 and 2012, placing forest elephants on track for extinction within the next decade;

Whereas as few as 3200 tigers remain in the wild throughout all of Asia;

Whereas approximately 100,000,000 sharks are killed annually, often targeted solely for their fins, and unsustainable trade is the primary cause of serious population decline in several shark species, including scalloped hammerhead sharks, great hammerhead sharks, and oceanic whitetip sharks;

Whereas the United States is developing measures to address the criminal, financial, security, and environmental aspects of wildlife trafficking;

Whereas Congress has allocated specific resources to combat wildlife trafficking and address the threats posed by poaching and the illegal wildlife trade;

Whereas in December 2013, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed March 3 as World Wildlife Day to celebrate and raise awareness of the wild fauna and flora around the world;

Whereas March 3, 2015, represents the second annual celebration of World Wildlife Day; and

Whereas in 2015, World Wildlife Day commemorations will “celebrate the many beautiful and varied forms of wild fauna and flora, raise awareness of the multitude of benefits that wildlife provides to people, and raise awareness of the urgent need to step up the fight against wildlife crime, which has wide-ranging economic, environmental, and social impacts”: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 3, 2015, as “World Wildlife Day”;

(2) supports raising awareness of the benefits that wildlife provides to people and the threats facing wildlife around the world;

(3) supports escalating the fight against wildlife crime, including wildlife trafficking;

(4) applauds the domestic and international efforts to escalate the fight against wildlife crime;

(5) commends the efforts of the United States to mobilize the entire Government in a coordinated, efficient, and effective manner for dramatic progress in the fight against wildlife crime; and

(6) encourages continued cooperation between the United States, international partners, local communities, nonprofit organizations, private industry, and other partner organizations in an effort to conserve and celebrate wildlife, preserving this precious resource for future generations.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO AWARD THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO THE WORLD WAR II MEMBERS OF THE DOOLITTLE TOKYO RAIDERS

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr.

NELSON, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. CON. RES. 7

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO WORLD WAR II MEMBERS OF DOOLITTLE TOKYO RAIDERS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on April 15, 2015, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, collectively, in recognition of the military service and exemplary record of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

#### NOTICES OF HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on March 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “America’s Health IT Transformation: Translating the Promise of Electronic Health Records Into Better Care.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-1409.

##### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “Continuing America’s Leadership in Medical Innovation for Patients.”

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-1409.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 3, 2015, at 2:15 p.m., in the President’s Room of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 3, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 3, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Federal Reserve Accountability and Reform.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 3, 2015, at 9 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining the FY 2016 Budget Requests for the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Department of Transportation.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 3, 2015, at 9 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Fairness in Taxation.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 3, 2015, at 4 p.m., to conduct a classified brief entitled “Update on the Campaign against ISIS.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 3, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services: Ensuring Agency Priorities Comply with the Law.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Emily O’Neill,

a detailee with the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the consideration of S.J. Res. 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 94, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 94) supporting the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, the key to America's continued success lies in improving our Nation's educational system. Career and technical education, CTE, programs are a critical component to every student's education, creating diverse pathways into further education and careers. Today, these programs serve 94 percent of all high school students and 12 million postsecondary students. In both rural and urban communities, CTE plays a vital role in building student engagement, continuing our Nation's economic competitiveness, and building the skills of our workforce to meet and adapt to the needs of the 21st century.

Further, approximately 30 percent of jobs by 2018 will require some college or a 2-year associates degree, a need that can be met by improved access to CTE programs. By increasing these opportunities to obtain postsecondary skills training and meaningful credentials, CTE equitably distributes economic opportunity to all students who are willing to work for it. According to the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Career, Technical and Adult Education, the average high school graduation rate for students concentrating in CTE programs is 93 percent, compared with the national average of 80 percent.

This is why today, with my Senate CTE Caucus cochairs Senator PORTMAN, Senator BALDWIN, and Senator ISAKSON and other colleagues in the Senate, I am submitting a bipartisan resolution to designate February as Career and Technical Education, CTE, Month. CTE Month provides a chance for students and educators alike to learn more about the educational opportunities available in their communities, and to become more engaged in their studies today so they can plan for their future.

Our Nation's economic competitiveness relies on the skill of the American workforce and its ability to meet and

adapt to the 21st century economy. By formally recognizing CTE Month through this resolution, it is our hope that we can build support in Washington and across the country for strengthening access to and expanding CTE programs.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination on today's Executive Calendar: Calendar No. 48, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and Navy. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

##### IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

Lt. Gen. Kenneth E. Tovo

##### NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

PN96 AIR FORCE nomination of Mark E. Heatherly, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN97 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning KARIS K. GRAHAM, and ending MARVIN WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN98 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning JESUS A. FLORES, and ending ROBERT C. GOLDTRAP, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN99 AIR FORCE nominations (17) beginning ERICA R. AUSTIN, and ending RICHARD G. STEPHENSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN100 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning GERARD IRVELT BAZILE, and ending

FREDERICK L. YOST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN101 AIR FORCE nomination of Stephen L. Nelson, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN102 AIR FORCE nominations (8) beginning MARY J. ABERNETHY, and ending KAREN B. STEINER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN103 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning MICHAEL D. AYRES, and ending MICHELLE L. WAGNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN104 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning LAURA J. MCWHIRTER, and ending GREGG E. WENTWORTH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN105 AIR FORCE nomination of Nicholas J. Zimmerman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN106 AIR FORCE nomination of Eric M. Chumbley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN107 AIR FORCE nomination of Scott L. Wilson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN133 AIR FORCE nomination of Kirsten E. Delambo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN134 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning Salvatore Pelligra, and ending Rebecca A. Bird, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN135 AIR FORCE nomination of Dell P. Dunn, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN136 AIR FORCE nomination of Latrise P. Searson-Norris, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN171 AIR FORCE nomination of Jeffrey B. Krutoy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 4, 2015.

##### IN THE ARMY

PN108 ARMY nomination of John P. Hartke, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN137 ARMY nomination of Fred J. Burpo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN138 ARMY nomination of Paul A. Brisson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN139 ARMY nomination of Mikelle J. Adamczyk, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN140 ARMY nomination of Robert G. Hale, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN141 ARMY nomination of John M. Gillis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN142 ARMY nomination of Andre M. Takacs, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN143 ARMY nomination of Ines H. Berger, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

PN94 COAST GUARD nominations (260) beginning GEORGE F. ADAMS, and ending ANDREW H. ZUCKERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

#### IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN112 MARINE CORPS nominations (3) beginning JERMAINE M. CADOGAN, and ending AUSTIN E. WREN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN113 MARINE CORPS nominations (7) beginning ANTHONY K. ALEJANDRE, and ending JONATHAN R. RISSER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN114 MARINE CORPS nominations (4) beginning PAUL M. HERLE, and ending ROBERT W. PUCKETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN116 MARINE CORPS nominations (2) beginning JAY B. DURHAM, and ending ANDREW K. LAW, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN117 MARINE CORPS nominations (6) beginning DANIEL H. CUSINATO, and ending WILLIAM C. VOLZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN118 MARINE CORPS nomination of Ryan M. Cleveland, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN119 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning NICHOLAS K. ELLIS, and ending KOLLEEN L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN120 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jonathan L. Riggs, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN121 MARINE CORPS nominations (657) beginning BRETT D. ABBAMONTE, and ending JASON E. ZELLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN123 MARINE CORPS nomination of David C. Walsh, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN124 MARINE CORPS nomination of Scott W. Zimmerman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

#### IN THE NAVY

PN109 NAVY nominations (37) beginning ALYSSA B. Y. ARMSTRONG, and ending KARI E. YAKUBISIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN144 NAVY nomination of Rachel A. Passmore, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN145 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JUSTIN R. MILLER, and ending JAMES R. SAULLO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN146 NAVY nomination of Candida A. Ferguson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN149 NAVY nomination of Richard R. Barber, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN178 NAVY nomination of Benigno T. Razon, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN179 NAVY nomination of Donna L. Smoak, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN180 NAVY nomination of Fabio O. Austria, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN182 NAVY nomination of Shawn D. Wilkerson, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN183 NAVY nomination of Budd E. Bergloff, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S.J. Res. 8, with 2 hours of debate remaining, equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Tomorrow Senators should expect two rollcall votes at approximately 11:30 a.m. on passage of the resolution of disapproval on ambush elections, followed by cloture on the Keystone veto message.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following up to an hour of debate controlled by Senator MURRAY or her designee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUB- MITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—Con- tinued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the National Labor Relations Board and the reforms that have been proposed in the new rule. I rise first of all to provide by way of a predicate or background what happened in 1935 when the National Labor Relations Act was passed. There is a lot to talk about in that act, but just like when a major piece of legislation passes, we have findings that undergird the statute itself.

I will not go through all of those today, but I think some of the language in there is especially appropriate for what we are talking about. The findings and summary spoke to the benefits of collective bargaining—the benefits of organizing and collectively bargaining, and asserted at one point very early in the statute, in the findings, the first couple of paragraphs of the findings that experience—I am paraphrasing this but I will get to specific words in a moment.

But experience has shown that collective bargaining and organizing—and these are the exact words—“safeguards commerce from injury, impairment or interruption.” It goes on to talk about why it was better—why they believed it was better to pass a statute to resolve labor-management disputes instead of the old way, which was constant conflict, conflict fighting, in some cases even violence.

So we did the right thing in 1935 as a country. We have had some history since then to draw from. The National Labor Relations Board, of course, is the entity that gives meaning to what we intend when we pass laws such as the National Labor Relations Act.

Now we are having a dispute here in this body and in the other body as well about what these rules ought to be. What are the rules that govern the National Labor Relations Board, but in particular, what are the rules that govern elections?

With all of the challenges we are facing in the country right now—the middle class has nowhere near recovered from the last—the great recession. Wages have been declining over a generation, or at least not increasing at the level that costs have been increasing.

So with all of that pressure on families, you could think this could be an area of common ground, but it is not. With all of those challenges facing middle-class families, it is disappointing that Republicans in the Senate have chosen to focus on rolling back the National Labor Relations Board modest and commonsense reforms, to help workers get a seat at the table, so they can increase their wages and their economic security.

Democrats are fighting to increase wages and we are also fighting for economic security, at the same time Republicans seem to be constantly fighting to increase corporate profits while



making workers pay the price. All of us, whether we are Democrats or Republicans, should be coming together to expand workers' voices at the table and not attacking workers' right to collectively bargain.

We are talking about something fundamental here, the opportunity to have an election in a workplace, and the benefits that flow from that. That is really about empowering workers. I believe that is one of the reasons why we passed the National Labor Relations Act, not just to have a board that can settle disputes, but to actually empower workers in ways they have not been empowered up to that point in our history.

Empowering workers is an important part of building a stronger economy that works not just for those individual workers in that worksite, but in an economy that works for all families, not just the wealthiest few. When the workers have a seat at the bargaining table, our economy prospers and the middle class thrives. I have always believed that if we did not have unions and collective bargaining and organizing since World War II and even since the 1930s, we would have a much less robust middle class. Some people believe there would not be a middle case. But I am at least willing to assert that the right to organize and collectively bargain is not just good for that worker and his or her family, but it is also good for the economy as well.

Those workers are the ones who drive the economy, not just the work they do, but the expenditures they make on behalf of their family. So even though workers are more productive in the United States than ever before, workers are still struggling with those stagnant wages. Today the middle class accounts for the smallest share of the Nation's income since World War II. Hard to believe that the middle class has been so devastated.

We know from our history that when workers have a voice in the workplace through collective bargaining, wages increase, workplace safety improves, and workers have increased retirement and health security. All of those benefits have helped grow America's middle class. Labor unions helped workers share in that economic prosperity that they have helped to create through their own hard work.

One of the great moments I have had as a Senator from Pennsylvania is when you go to a manufacturing plant and they take you on a tour. I am sure the Presiding Officer has done this a number of times. They take you on the tour not just to show how they are producing something, how they manufacture something, they are making something, but they are also very proud of the way they interact with and relate to and work with their employees. They go out of their way to point to a bulletin board or point to a data point

in their record to say we have very few injuries, or zero injuries in a certain point of time. They take great pride in that because they know that if they have fewer injuries, they are going to be more productive. If they have fewer injuries, they are going to have employees who can produce on their behalf.

One of the reasons they have fewer injuries over time in our economy and in those businesses is because workers have rights. Workers have rights they did not have in the early part of the 1900s. So we know from our history that this works, this process of making sure workers have a seat at the table.

Now let's go to the National Labor Relations Board, their election reforms. These particular reforms make modest but, I would argue, very important updates to both modernize and streamline the election process, to prevent delays and reduce litigation. The current system is vulnerable to litigation that will drag out for a long period of time, drag out the election process and put workers' rights on hold.

Those reforms will reduce unnecessary litigation that is not relevant to the outcome of the election. In the past, employers and unions had to send information about the election process to the Post Office, which would cost time and money. The new rule brings this election process into the 21st century—which is 15 years old now—by letting employers and unions file forms electronically.

I think that is the least that can happen. You would think in this era we are living in, when everything that is done—most everything is done electronically, in banking and in other industries, that at a minimum we should have information transmitted about an election—something valuable in a workplace. We hold elections with great regard and we believe in the sanctity of elections. So the least we could do is make sure those workers have the benefits of something that would transmit the information electronically. Sending that information in that fashion makes all of the sense in the world.

The rule also allows the use of modern forms of communications through cell phones and emails. That is not asking too much, to be able to transmit information to prepare workers for an election by the use of email or cell phones.

The reforms are commonsense steps to make sure the NLRB, the Board, is using its taxpayer dollars efficiently and effectively.

These changes, as I referred to earlier, are not just good for workers, they also help businesses by streamlining the whole process, the elections process in this case. Right now the election process varies from region to region. Streamlining the process will provide certainty for both employers and work-

ers themselves. The new rule allows businesses and unions to file forms electronically, as I mentioned, instead of using postage. This will save every one time and money. So modernizing—this is what we are talking about here—modernizing election rules allows businesses and unions to use these basic forms of communications in a way that promotes common sense.

The rule will at long last level the playing field for small businesses. Right now the biggest corporations can exploit the system with long and costly litigation to deny workers, if they choose to do that, a fair up-or-down vote on joining a union. By making the election process more consistent and transparent, the Board's reforms level the playing field for the smaller businesses that already play fair.

The NLRB, the Board itself, the representation rule, are in need of kind of basic updates. There have not been substantial updates to this NLRB election process since the 1970s. Today that leads to inefficiencies and delays. Right now big corporations take advantage of those inefficiencies to postpone and even deny workers the right to vote on union representation.

Often, in the face of employer tactics, workers give up hope. In fact, one in three will never even get to have an election. That is not something the National Labor Relations Act intended. I do not think that is what anyone intended when it comes to these elections or the possibility of an election. So these amendments, these updates, these modernization reforms help restore balance and fairness to the election process. I am perplexed why this is the subject of so much controversy, because these are basic reforms to help people exercise their right to vote in the workplace, which is consistent with our values, consistent with our history, and also consistent with our efforts not just to move that worker and his or her family forward, and their business forward, but also to move the American economy and the middle class forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today with strong support of the National Labor Relations Board's new effort to make workplace union elections more efficient and more effective. I come to the floor today in opposition to Republican efforts to preserve a broken system. Today, instead of raising minimum wages for millions of struggling families, or letting people refinance their student loans, or making sure women get equal pay for equal work, instead of implementing policies that strengthen the middle class, Republicans are pressing a bill to stop a government agency from modernizing its procedures because it might help—yes, help—American workers.



Coming out of the Great Depression, America's labor unions helped build America's strong middle class. For half a century, as union membership went up, America's median family income went up. You know, that was true for families whether they were part of a union or not. As our country got richer, our families got richer. As our families got richer, our country got richer.

Since 1935, Congress has required the National Labor Relations Board to oversee the workplace elections in which workers decide whether to be represented by a union. According to NLRB data, more than 90 percent of time this works out just fine. For most of the cases that make it to an election, employees and employers agree about the process and an election is held without a dispute. Done.

But in the remaining handful of cases, the rules on how to resolve these concerns have turned into a mess. Over time, a hodgepodge of different rules for resolving these dispute has emerged in each of the country's 26 NLRB regions. To fix this, the NLRB recently finalized one national set of rules that sets out clear procedures for resolving these issues. In other words, the NLRB is trying to make dispute resolution clearer, more efficient, and more consistent from region to region.

Trying to make government work better should not be controversial. But it is controversial. Why? Because some employers simply oppose union votes altogether. They do not want the NLRB to work. They do not want union elections to happen at all. So they are lobbying against those new rules, and congressional Republicans are standing up for them, advancing a proposal to stop the NLRB from implementing its final rules and doing the job Congress gave it 80 years ago.

Republicans claim they were concerned about workers being able to ambush their employers with workplace elections. That is just plain nonsense. Employers are always notified at the beginning of the election process, and according to Caren Sencer, a top labor attorney who testified a few weeks ago in the HELP Committee hearing, there is nothing—nothing—in the new rule that would stop an employer from having its relevant concerns heard and addressed prior to an election.

Let's be honest. The only ambush here is the Republican ambush on workers' basic rights. According to a 2001 study from the Berkeley Center for Labor Research and Education, long election delays correspond with higher rates of labor law violations. A delay gives any union employer more time to retaliate against a union organizer, and to intimidate workers and delay work.

According to NLRB data, nearly one-third of the time when employees file a petition to request an election, they never actually get one. Employers who

want to keep their workers out of a union prefer a broken, inefficient system that gives them room to manipulate the process and to block workers from organizing. But that is not the law. The NLRB doesn't answer to them. Federal law directs the NLRB to make sure election disputes can be resolved fairly between employers and employees, and that is exactly what the NLRB is doing.

Throughout our history, powerful interests have tried to capture Washington and rig the system in their favor, but we didn't roll over. At every turn, in every time of challenge, organized labor has been there fighting on behalf of the American people. Labor was on the frontlines to take children out of factories and to put them in schools. Labor was there to give meaning to the words "consumer protection" by making our food and our medicine safe. Labor was there to fight for minimum wages in States across this country. In every fight to build opportunity in this country, in every fight to level the playing field, in every fight for working families, labor has been on the frontlines.

Powerful interests have attacked many of the basic foundations of this country—the foundations that once built a strong middle class—and too many times those powerful interests have prevailed. So it comes down to a question I have asked before: Whom does this Congress work for? Republicans say government should keep on working for powerful CEOs who don't like unions and who have figured out how to exploit a tangled system. Republicans complain about government inefficiencies, but then they introduce a bill that is specifically designed so a broken, inefficient system will stay broken and inefficient, even when we know how to fix it.

Well, we weren't sent here just to represent CEOs who don't like unions. We were sent here to support working people who just want a fighting chance to level the playing field. I urge my colleagues to vote against this Republican resolution and let the NLRB do its job.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor to express my disappointment that the majority leader is asking to rule XIV the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

I must ask the majority leader, what happened? Where is the bipartisanship

part? Where is the bipartisanship that we have expressed and that I expressed this morning on the floor and last night at AIPAC? I ask again, what happened to putting aside political posturing and partisanship? What happened to the majority leader's pledge in January to "decentralize power in the Senate" and "open up the legislative process"?

"We need to return to regular order," he said. I agree with him. Let's do it. Let's return to regular order.

Frankly, this is not what was intended, and it is certainly against my better judgment, against procedure, against any understanding we might have had to take the politics out of our effort to establish congressional oversight of any nuclear agreement with Iran. I am more than disappointed; I am pretty outraged.

I said last night and again this morning that I join Chairman CORKER and Senators GRAHAM, KAINE, DONNELLY, HEITKAMP, KING, NELSON, AYOTTE, RUBIO, MCCAIN, and RISCH in introducing bipartisan oversight legislation to ensure that Congress has a chance to review the deal before it goes into effect and to oversee its compliance after it goes into effect. And now, putting any bipartisanship aside, we are back to politics as usual. The only way to make this work is to work together.

The provisions of the bill itself are good ones. It would require the President to submit an agreement to Congress within 5 days of reaching it. It would give Congress 60 days to consider the agreement before sanctions relief could be provided. It would outline consequences should Congress decide to disapprove the agreement. And in terms of oversight, it would require information on potential breaches to be promptly reported to Congress, along with a comprehensive report every 180 days of any Iranian action inconsistent with the agreement. It would require a report every 90 days from the President on Iran's compliance, informing us of any actions that might advance Iran's nuclear weapons program, that it has not supported or financed or carried out any acts of terrorism, and that any sanctions relief is both appropriate and proportionate to Iran's efforts under the agreement. Of course, it would have here in the Senate a 60-vote threshold, so that means it would have to be a bipartisan determination.

We in good faith agreed to introduce this legislation and take it through the committee process and to the floor so that Congress—which was responsible for bringing Iran to the table in the first place to negotiate—would have a role in reviewing the agreement before it goes into effect, whether to provide sanctions relief, and overseeing implementation and Iranian compliance after it goes into effect because, as I said last night, a deal cannot be built on trust alone. Now, I was talking

about Iran; I did not know that I was talking about our deal to pass a bipartisan review act.

So let me conclude. I can't imagine why the majority leader would seek to short-circuit the process, unless the goals are political rather than substantive. And I regret to say these actions make clear an intention that isn't substantive, that it is political. On a day that has been defined by serious discourse about Iran's illicit nuclear weapons program, at a moment when legislators contemplate the most serious national security issue of our time, I am disappointed that the leader has chosen to proceed outside of regular order. By bringing the Corker-Menendez legislation directly to the floor for debate, the majority leader is singlehandedly undermining our bipartisan efforts.

Nobody in Congress has worked harder on this issue, and I certainly don't take a backseat to anyone in pursuing Iran's nuclear weapons program and standing up for Israel, but I sincerely hope that we can restore regular order and that this bill can be fully considered by all the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in due time.

Finally, there is no emergency. This deal—if there is one—won't be concluded until the summer, so there is plenty of time to wait until March 24, find out whether we have a deal, and then act to be able to be in a posture to opine on that deal and to deal with it accordingly. There is no reason to accelerate this process in this way, to go outside of regular order, bypass the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and come directly to the floor.

I know I cannot object to the rule XIV process under the rules, but I say to my colleagues, if this is the process, then I will have no choice but to use my voice and my vote against any motion to proceed. I hope that is not the case. I have worked too hard to get to this moment. But if that is the way we are going to proceed, then I will certainly have to vote against proceeding at that time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to oppose S.J. Res. 8, a misguided resolution that targets workers' right to organize and hurts working families in Hawaii and around the country.

Union election rules haven't been updated since the 1970s. The National Labor Relations Board—or NLRB—is trying to bring union election rules into the 21st century, but today's Senate resolution will block the NLRB's commonsense updates.

The right to organize is a crucial part of our democracy. Unions have helped build the middle class in Hawaii and nationwide. It is disappointing that instead of working to create jobs

or help the middle class get ahead, today we are debating whether to make it harder to join a union.

Workers wishing to join a union already face many barriers. For example, companies have significant opportunities to make their case to employees about why they should oppose a union. Meanwhile, unions are not allowed to visit the worksite to make their case for joining a union, and they do not have access to modern contact information such as emails and cell phone numbers—unbelievable as that may sound—to contact workers.

In addition, companies can delay union elections with what amounts to frivolous litigation and appeal after appeal. Nationwide, in contested cases workers already have to wait an average of 4 months to vote whether to join a union.

While most employers in Hawaii want to support their workers, there have been those rare cases of companies exploiting the current system to prevent workers from having a voice in the workplace.

Let me share a situation that happened in Hawaii where workers had not been given a raise in 6 years. They asked a local union for help in organizing their union. In the runup to the union elections, the workers were forced to attend one-on-one or group meetings on work time where their management could convince workers to vote against the union. This company hired a private security firm and posted security guards outside the voting area during the vote. Workers felt intimidated.

The company appealed election results and NLRB rulings over and over again, adding delay after delay and revote after revote. In July 2005, 40 months after a petition was first filed to hold an election, the NLRB finally certified a union for the workers. Still, the company continued to offer appeal after appeal of the election results and even fired 31 union supporters in 2007. Finally, at the end of 2012, 10 years later, the certified union reached its first union contract.

Remember, I noted that where most workplaces are organized, things are done in 4 months. That is not always the case. The NLRB's updated union election rules would help reduce this kind of intimidation and delay, which happens all too often, and would allow organizers to contact workers by email and cell phone. It is pretty astounding that we had to have a rule change in order to make this kind of commonsense change available to organizers—which, by the way, this resolution which I ask my colleagues to vote against disallows.

The rule will make it easier for small businesses to follow labor election laws. Currently, big corporations can use expensive lawyers to litigate and prevent union elections, while small

businesses don't have those kinds of resources.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these modest, commonsense updates to NLRB rules and voting no on the resolution. Let's stand with working men and women in this country and support the middle class.

I want to end with a quote from one of our labor organizers and leaders in Hawaii, Hawaii Laborers' business manager Peter Ganaban. In a recent piece in Pacific Business News, Mr. Ganaban explained that "Hawaii's union climate is an extension of our local culture of helping each other and caring for our communities."

Allowing workers a fair choice and a fair chance to join a union is the least we can do for our workers in the middle class.

I yield my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WORLD WILDLIFE DAY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 95, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 95) designating March 3, 2015, as "World Wildlife Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—Continued

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am here for the main purpose of vigorously opposing S.J. Res. 8, and to support the National Labor Relations

Board's recent rule to modernize the process that workers use if they decide they want to form a union and bargain collectively.

The new NLRB rule makes modest but highly important changes to improve the overall consistency and efficiency of the election process, allowing workers to vote for or against the creation of a union in a fair and timely way. This rule is long overdue, and in Connecticut I have seen—and in my personal experience with the NLRB—how important it is.

As I go around Connecticut, I consistently hear of problems when workers seek to gain representation to form a union. It is cumbersome, costly, time consuming, and is prone to needless delays. It involves needless litigation, and it creates uncertainty for all involved. This rule change—this new rule—is not only good for working men and women, it is also good for businesses by reducing—and in some cases eliminating—the cost, time, and uncertainty that are aggravating and expensive. It is a small step toward a level playing field and a guarantee that companies respect workers' rights to organize and gain the benefits of union membership.

Very simply, here is what the rule does: It removes obstacles to forming unions and requires businesses to postpone litigation over member eligibility issues until after workers join a union. It cuts down on lengthy litigation that could cause union formation to drag on for a year or more. It modernizes the election process. And, very importantly, it allows for the electronic filing and transmission of petitions for union elections. Believe it or not, previously all of it had been done by fax or mail—not exactly the latest or least expensive technology—and it ensures that unions and employees have enough information about each other so they can communicate in advance of the election.

It streamlines the NLRB's procedures, and with all due respect to the NLRB, what is needed there is practices that are uniform throughout the regional offices so that organizers can better interact with the agency. Its effect is not only on unions and businesses but also on the NLRB in speeding and streamlining and improving the way it works.

Its effects are seen in other areas too. The opponents of this measure forget to mention that these new rules apply equally to both elections seeking to certify a union. These more efficient procedures will help not only workers who want to choose a union, it will help workers who want to get rid of an existing union. It is a level playing field, fairness, efficiency, less cost, and less time.

The rule still gives employers the opportunity to inform workers about the

drawbacks of having a union so that workers have a fair opportunity to decide if they want union representation. This is the epitome of fair and balanced and more efficient kinds of rules.

The people in this body know that the simple fact is—and folks across America know it—the majority of American workers want representation. Fifty-three percent of workers want a union in their workplace, but because of the broken election process, fewer than 7 percent of workers are represented. That is a stark fact. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stubborn things." Thirty-five percent of the time that workers file a petition for a union election, they never even get to an election.

The current election process is full of delays and costs, and unfortunately in many cases litigation gives way to outright discrimination.

According to a 2011 University of California-Berkeley study, the longer the delay between the filing of a petition and the election date, the more likely it is that the NLRB will issue complaints charging employers with illegal activity. In other words, basically the election process is drawn out and leads to growing dissatisfaction and contempt and thereby damages everyone.

This rule is a necessity and will have a real impact on real people. In Connecticut, I have spoken to people and heard the stories of individuals who have been deprived or inhibited in exercising their right to vote in the election process. This process is broken.

The new NLRB will prevent frivolous litigation from delaying an election. I have spoken to workers who wanted the election to be held on a date that was beyond the allowed waiting period. They told me that they were told if they didn't back down, the employer would "make sure the process would be lengthy and difficult."

The new rule will itself push back on intimidation. In the face of these kinds of tactics, some have persevered, but only through tremendous resolve. They triumphed in a seriously flawed and failed NLRB election process.

In short, these rules are an important step in the right direction. They provide for free choice that is fair and will protect both sides. They will reduce costs and time and litigation.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this measure as ill-conceived and ill-considered, and I hope we will preserve the NLRB's new rule.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:25 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 3, 2015:

### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

#### To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH E. TOVO

### IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MARK E. HEATHERLY, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KARIS K. GRAHAM AND ENDING WITH MARVIN WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESUS A. FLORES AND ENDING WITH ROBERT C. GOLDTRAP, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERICA R. AUSTIN AND ENDING WITH RICHARD G. STEPHENSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GERARD IRVELT BAZILE AND ENDING WITH FREDERICK L. YOST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF STEPHEN L. NELSON, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY J. ABERNETHY AND ENDING WITH KAREN B. STEINER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL D. AYRES AND ENDING WITH MICHELLE L. WAGNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAURA J. MCWHIRTER AND ENDING WITH GREGG E. WENTWORTH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS J. ZIMMERMAN, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ERIC M. CHUMBLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF SCOTT L. WILSON, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF KIRSTEN E. DELAMBO, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SALVATORE PELLIGRA AND ENDING WITH REBECCA A. BIRD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 29, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DELL P. DUNN, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF LATRISE P. SEARSON-NORRIS, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JEFFREY B. KRUTOY, TO BE MAJOR.

### IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN P. HARTKE, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF FRED J. BURPO, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PAUL A. BRISSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MIKELLE J. ADAMCZYK, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ROBERT G. HALE, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN M. GILLIS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ANDRE M. TAKACS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF INES H. BERGER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

### IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERMAINE M. CADOGAN AND ENDING WITH AUSTIN E. WREN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY K. ALEJANDRE AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN R. RISSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL M. HERRLE AND ENDING WITH ROBERT W. PUCKETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAY B. DURHAM AND ENDING WITH ANDREW K. LAW, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL H. CUSINATO AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM C. VOLZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF RYAN M. CLEVELAND, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS K. ELLIS AND ENDING WITH KOLLEEN L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JONATHAN L. RIGGS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRETT D. ABBAMONTE AND ENDING WITH JASON E. ZELLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE

AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF DAVID C. WALSH, TO BE COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF SCOTT W. ZIMMERMAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

#### IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALYSSA B. Y. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH KARI E. YAKUBISIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RACHEL A. PASSMORE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JUSTIN R. MILLER AND ENDING WITH JAMES R. SAULLO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 29, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CANDIDA A. FERGUSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RICHARD R. BARBER, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BENIGNO T. RAZON, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DONNA L. SMOAK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF FABIO O. AUSTRIA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SHAWN D. WILKERSON, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BUDD E. BERGLOFF, TO BE CAPTAIN.

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE F. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH ANDREW H. ZUCKERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## AN ATTRIBUTE TO INTERNATIONAL INTERN EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

## HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the different international internship programs that I have had the pleasure of experiencing this year. These programs represent a brilliant method of cultural and educational exchange not only for the bright young leaders of some of our closest partners but also for myself and many of my colleagues.

Thus far, I have had the pleasure of having two Australian interns and one German intern within my office. They are the beneficiaries of different programs and have each had an unique and rewarding time here.

Mr. Joshua Sprake is an Australian student studying a combined Bachelor of Commerce and Arts at the University of Sydney Business School. He is participating in an exchange program called the International Placement Program between his university and the University of California, District of Columbia. This allows him to study in the evenings and work during the day in our office. He has excelled in managing his different commitments and has been able to apply his skills to look outside of the box in many of the tasks that have been assigned to him. As a political science major he has also been able to provide useful and different perspectives to many different discussions within the office.

Mr. Mathias Weber is a German intern who has come to us through the Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange for Young Professionals program. During this time Mathias has applied himself with German efficiency becoming well known for his diligence and precision. Mathias has shown why the German economy prides itself on its efficiency as our office could not have asked for more dedication in whatever task he was assigned.

Mr. Samuel Edwards is our final Australian intern and has participated in the Uni-Capitol Washington Internship Program. Samuel is a student of the University of Canberra. Samuel has also shown himself to also be very intelligent and hard working. He easily slid into life at the office and was always available to help in any way he could whether that was answering phone calls from constituents or drafting office correspondence.

Finally Mr. Speaker, I want to reflect upon how these programs will only strengthen and preserve the relationships our countries enjoy. As these future leaders grow and move on through their lives, I hope they look fondly back upon their time here and are able to take back some knowledge and American values with them, throughout their life.

## HONORING THE HON. PAUL VOLCY

## HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the late Paul Volcy, a former Buffalo City Court Judge and decorated Vietnam veteran. Throughout his lifetime, Mr. Volcy sought out adventure and faced the challenges soon wrought by life's thrills with an enterprising spirit and "can-do" attitude.

Mr. Volcy was born and raised in the South Bronx, before moving back to his mother's homeland of Puerto Rico. After completing a semester at the University of Puerto Rico, Mr. Volcy soon realized his current pursuits were boring and unfulfilling. This realization led him to join the U.S. Army in 1966. He began his tour in Vietnam as a first lieutenant, but was soon promoted to captain. His bilingual ability and training in the Vietnamese language helped him function as a troubleshooter for his colonel in Saigon, and when supplies diminished, he had a unique ability to fill up shortages. At the end of his tour, which also included field duty, he was awarded a Bronze Star.

After his military discharge, Mr. Volcy completed his Bachelor's Degree at the University of Puerto Rico and then returned to the United States to earn his law degree from the University at Buffalo. Post-graduation, he briefly worked in private practice before recognizing his call to public service.

Mr. Volcy became an attorney in the office of Buffalo's corporation counsel, working there for five years on civil rights cases, and then an additional two years in the New York State Attorney General's Office. In 2001, then-Mayor Anthony Masiello appointed Mr. Volcy as a City Court judge. After completing his term, Mr. Volcy returned to the Attorney General's Office in Buffalo, where he spent 10 years in the Court of Claims, specializing in defending against medical malpractice and in personal injury cases. He retired as an Assistant Attorney General in 2011.

Complementing his passion for service was his knack for organizing and community activism. Mr. Volcy was a leader in the Buffalo Hispanic community and helped to found the Western New York Hispanic and Friend's Civic Association, an organization committed to social justice and empowerment of Buffalo's growing Hispanic community. Mr. Volcy was admired for his dedication to and tireless efforts toward empowering the Hispanic community.

He enjoyed a wonderful life with his wife Susan and his daughter Suzanne.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to celebrate the life of Mr. Paul Volcy. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mr. Volcy and his contributions to the Buffalo community.

## HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS. MILDRED PARISH MASSEY

## HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my Colleagues, Congressman PETE AGUILAR, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, Congressman XAVIER BECERRA, Congressman AMI BERA, Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPES, Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS, Congresswoman JUDY CHU, Congressman JIM COSTA, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, Congressman MARK DESAULNIER, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, Congressman SAM FARR, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, Congresswoman JANICE HAHN, Congressman MIKE HONDA, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congressman TED LIEU, Congressman ALAN LOWENTHAL, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI, Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY, Congresswoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, Congressman SCOTT PETERS, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congressman RAUL RUIZ, Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ, Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, Congressman BRAD SHERMAN, Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, Congressman ERIC SWALWELL, Congressman MARK TAKANO, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, Congresswoman NORMA TORRES, Congressman JUAN VARGAS, and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, to honor the extraordinary life of Mrs. Mildred Parish Massey. Mrs. Massey was a beloved mother, grandmother, great-grandmother, sister, and friend. With her passing on February 16, we look to Mrs. Massey's personal legacy of leadership, service, and the outstanding quality of her life's work.

Born on June 6, 1924 in El Paso, Texas, Mrs. Massey attended Douglass Elementary and High School in El Paso. She won a scholarship to Tillotson College in Austin, Texas and transferred to Southern University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana to study Business Administration. Mrs. Massey continued her education at Texas Western College (now the University of Texas at El Paso) and was one of seven students to integrate the University.

Throughout her life, Mrs. Mildred Massey broke many racial barriers in the workplace. She began her career in the United Services Organization and was the first African-American clerical worker at Ft. Bliss in Texas. In 1960, she moved to San Fernando and served as the first African-American to work at the Raymond Lamp Company, Assistant Manager of Lerner Dress store in Panorama City, California, Manager of the Rembrandt Sign Co. in San Fernando, California and as Administrative Assistant at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Sylmar, California.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

In 1975, Mrs. Mildred Massey moved to Oakland, California and worked for the Social Security Administration until her retirement in 1986. Upon her retirement, she helped found and manage the WC Parish Co., DBA Lee Associates until her second retirement in 1998 when she moved to Sun City, Arizona until 2010.

In addition to her prolific career, Mrs. Mildred Massey broke barriers and was a dedicated civil rights advocate. Among her efforts, she worked with Mary McLeod Bethune to come to Southern University in Baton Rouge to change her University's discriminatory policy surrounding sorority pledging. Mrs. Massey was also an active member of the Easter Star Lodge, Phyllis Wheatley Club, the NAACP, and Myrtle Avenue Methodist Church.

Mrs. Massey enjoyed traveling and visited Greece, Italy, Spain, Hawaii, the Bahamas, Mexico, Grenada, St. Maarten, the Virgin Islands, Cuba and Martha's Vineyard, among her many trips. She was intrigued with the beauty of butterflies and had a wonderful collection of butterfly ornaments and personal items, which brought her a lot of joy.

As Mildred's daughters Barbara Lee, Mildred Whitfield, and Beverly Hardy mourn her death, they celebrate her life well-lived. They remember their mother as a kind and gentle soul, yet a strong woman who taught them to be confident, to be kind and to live life to its fullest.

At 90 years of age, Mildred stayed connected with her family and friends through texting and the use of technology. She played bridge, was very independent, and determined to "do it her way" even while struggling with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD).

Today, The California Democratic Congressional Delegation salutes and honors an outstanding civil servant and individual, Mrs. Mildred Parish Massey. Her dedication and efforts have impacted so many lives. We join all of Mrs. Massey's loved ones in celebrating her incredible life. She will be deeply missed.

#### HONORING THE BOROUGH OF KUTZTOWN'S BICENTENNIAL

#### HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to rise today and congratulate my constituents residing in the Borough of Kutztown on the occasion of their Bicentennial.

Kutztown, located in Berks County, Pennsylvania, was incorporated as a borough on April 7, 1815. Kutztown is the second oldest municipality in Berks County, after only the City of Reading.

Kutztown's roots can be traced to the purchase of 130 acres of land made by Mr. George Kutz on June 16, 1755. In 1779 Mr. Kutz laid out plans to turn his acreage into a town and began selling lots.

Like many communities founded during the 18th and 19th centuries, Kutztown was ideally situated along a key road, in this case, the Easton Road. The area served as a conven-

ient lodging place for those making the then two-day trip between Allentown and Reading.

Settled largely by people from the Palatinate region of Germany, an area bordering the Rhine River, Kutztown enjoyed growth and prosperity. The Borough's vibrant Germanic heritage remains an important part of the community and is on full display during the Kutztown Folk Festival.

Over the years the Borough fostered numerous industries. The Borough gave rise to the Kutztown Iron Company, a brickyard, bottling companies, and even competing cigar companies.

In 1866 the Borough saw the founding of the Keystone Normal School, the forerunner of Kutztown University. Today the University has an enrollment of nearly 9,500 students.

Situated in the East Penn Valley, nestled between the Blue and South Mountains, the Borough of Kutztown and its people continue to thrive. Kutztown is an outstanding American town. Kutztown remains a great place to work, raise a family, to earn an education and to enjoy the beauty of the surrounding countryside.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House and my colleagues, I congratulate the people of Kutztown on the occasion of the Borough's Bicentennial. God bless them and may they know continued prosperity.

#### CONGRATULATING ZACH BENNER

#### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Zach Benner, of the Fulton High School Hornets Wrestling team, on his win in the 195 Class 2 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Zach Benner for a job well done.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF MR. THOMAS A. MASSARONE

#### HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life, and mark the passing, of an outstanding individual and a decorated World War II veteran, Mr. Thomas A. Massarone of Lexington, Kentucky.

As a young man, Mr. Massarone began his service in the United States Navy and quickly rose to the rank of Petty Officer Third Class. Mr. Massarone entered the war in 1944 by fighting within the U.S. Pacific fleet and did not stop until the Allies achieved victory.

Mr. Massarone participated in combat operations while assigned to the Navy's Southern

Attack Force 'ship-to-shore' detail, within the III Amphibious Corps (MA), in order to help liberate Guam. He was assigned a dangerous mission to search for and capture Japanese soldiers still at large on the island and then to guard the captured Japanese prisoners of war.

In addition, Mr. Massarone was assigned the task of securing the Japanese Type C submarines located on the island of Guam.

After helping the Allies achieve victory, he was honorably discharged from military service in 1948 and returned home to begin a successful 40-year career with IBM. Mr. Massarone became one of the original members of IBM's electric typewriter division and was instrumental in creating the "Selectric" typewriter, which helped pave the way for the use of typewriter keyboards as the primary method for people to interact with computers.

Mr. Massarone spent his life giving back to his community. He helped form the first Little League baseball teams to play at the IBM Park in Lexington. He was particularly active with his parish, St. Paul Catholic Church, where he served as council president, chairman of the school board, and later became the oldest serving member of his church.

Rising to the leadership position of Grand Knight within the Knights of Columbus in Lexington, Mr. Massarone devoted much of his time raising money for charities and helping others in need. As a member of the American Legion, Mr. Massarone committed himself to supporting local programs to mentor youth and provide support for service members and fellow veterans.

Mr. Massarone embodied the best of America's ideals, values, and ingenuity. His bravery and that of his fellow men and women in uniform liberated the world from tyranny and secured our American freedoms for future generations. He was truly an outstanding American and an inspiration to us all.

#### RECOGNIZING NATIONAL DRESS IN BLUE DAY

#### HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March 6, 2015 as National Dress in Blue Day, which was created to bring greater awareness to colon cancer during National Colon Cancer Awareness Month. During Dress in Blue Day and the month of March, patients, survivors, caregivers and advocates unite to spread colon cancer awareness by wearing blue, holding educational events, and spreading the word about screening.

Colon cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death in the United States. Sadly, 1 in 20 people will develop colon cancer and every 10 minutes a life is lost to the disease. This year alone, 137,000 new cases of colon and rectal cancer will be diagnosed in America and over 50,000 deaths are expected to result from the disease.

A simple screening test is recommended to individuals over age 50 and those with a family history to help combat the disease. Education and increased awareness can help inform the public about methods of prevention

and the early detection of colon cancer. Through recommended screenings, this cancer can be caught early when treatment is most effective.

National Dress in Blue Day will help bring greater awareness to the disease and the importance of regular screenings. I ask my colleagues to please join me in recognizing March 6, 2015 as National Dress in Blue Day.

#### CONGRATULATING KYRAN HAGAN

### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kyran Hagan, of the Eureka High School Wildcat Wrestling team, on his win in the 120 Class 4 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Kyran Hagan for a job well done.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL PEACE CORPS WEEK

### HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and the over 6,800 Peace Corps volunteers around the globe in commemorating National Peace Corps Week which coincides with the 54th Anniversary of the Peace Corps. Since its beginning in the Kennedy Administration, nearly 220,000 Americans have served in 140 developing nations around the world.

These volunteers serve as teachers, health care service providers and educators helping to bring needed care to communities that lack access. Their vision and commitment to bettering the world around them has helped make enduring contributions in agriculture, education, health and HIV/AIDS, youth, and technology in developing countries. Additionally, returned Peace Corps volunteers are the type of leaders we need in all sectors of our society to help face the many challenges in our own country.

And as a strong reminder that growing numbers of young Americans want to go and make a difference in this world, in 2014, the Peace Corps received a 22-year high of 17,336 applications. But it is not only young Americans making a difference in the Peace Corps. A growing number of volunteers are over age 50.

A total of 5,800 volunteers from my home state of Wisconsin have served in the Peace Corps since its founding, including my distinguished former colleague from Wisconsin, Congressman Tom Petri. On a per capita basis, Wisconsin ranked 9th in the nation in sending Peace Corps Volunteers in 2013 with

the University of Wisconsin-Madison among the tops in the nation among large colleges and universities in sending Peace Corps volunteers overseas.

Over 200 Wisconsinites are currently serving. I want to personally thank the seven volunteers from my district who are currently serving in the Peace Corps. Caitlin Connolly, Adam Coonen, Sarameera Hassan, Casimir Korducki, Jodi Lemmer, Daniel Pologe, and Lindsey Powell. From Belize to Zambia, these young people are representing the best of Milwaukee and of America. I am very proud of them.

As a representative for the great state of Wisconsin, I strongly support the goals of the Peace Corps and the passion and commitment of its volunteers on behalf of the United States. I am pleased that the President's FY2016 request includes \$30 million increase in funding to help increase the number of volunteers serving.

As our world continues to struggle with natural disasters, diseases such as Ebola, conflict and instability, fledgling transitions to democracy, and poverty and hunger, the Peace Corps will be a vital part of the U.S. diplomatic and development response and a sign of our nation's long term commitment to helping alleviating suffering around the globe.

I congratulate the Peace Corps and their volunteers on this momentous occasion. It is an excellent example of the type of program we need to invest in as part of our efforts to promote development, peace, and stability around the globe.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. DAVID P. ROE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote yesterday because of a serious illness in my family. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call #107—YEA.

#### CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF FATHER THEODORE HESBURGH

### HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to praise a great man, Father Theodore Hesburgh, on whom Congress proudly bestowed the Congressional Gold Medal in 2000. On Thursday, February 26, America lost a dedicated member of the clergy, an exceptional educator, a caring humanitarian, a civil rights champion, and one of the most outstanding leaders of our era: Reverend Theodore Martin Hesburgh, former president of the University of Notre Dame, who passed away last week at the age of 97. Father Hesburgh leaves behind a towering legacy that inspires all of us to keep fighting for a world that honors the spark of divinity in each one of us.

Father Hesburgh encouraged those he encountered to "be the kind of person who not only understands the injustices of this life, but is also willing to do something about them." He lived his life by that standard—never failing to answer the call to serve in any capacity.

Throughout his life, Father Hesburgh was called to serve and advance the cause of human dignity and justice in our society. He was named to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. He marched arm-in-arm with Dr. Martin L. King, Jr. He was an insistent champion for the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964, and his contributions to that effort earned him the Medal of Freedom from President Lyndon Baines Johnson. Time and again, he stood up and spoke out for peace, justice and equality for all people—and as former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Andrew Young once said, "If Father Hesburgh was for you, you didn't care who was against you."

Father Hesburgh was first called to serve his faith and his fellow Catholics. After undergraduate school at Notre Dame, Hesburgh traveled to Rome to study at the Gregorian University. When war broke out, he returned home and, in 1943, Father Hesburgh fulfilled his childhood dream when he was ordained at his alma mater as a priest in the Congregation of Holy Cross—a day he described as "the happiest" of his life. He would go on to earn a doctorate of theological studies at the Catholic University of America, but he returned to his beloved Notre Dame where he first served as chaplain following World War II and would continue to say Mass throughout his whole life.

Father Hesburgh was called to serve the future of our country as a brilliant educator and administrator. He ministered to the Notre Dame community as a professor, chairman of the Department of Religion, and executive vice president, and in 1952, at the age of 35, Father Hesburgh became the 15th President of the University of Notre Dame. Under his historic 35 years of leadership, Notre Dame opened its doors to women, increased workforce diversity, doubled its enrollment, expanded its endowment, and cemented its place as one of the greatest universities in the world.

Yet President Hesburgh's imprint extended further than a single campus. He demonstrated how to transform Catholic universities into exemplary institutions of higher education in modern times. He championed academic freedom and the pursuit of academic excellence. In recognition of his extraordinary leadership, he was entrusted with 16 presidential appointments, including service on the Presidential Clemency Board, the National Science Board, and as ambassador to the United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development. He served as the Holy See's permanent representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency under three popes. In 1999, he received his 150th honorary degree, more than any other person in history.

In every position, after every honor, Father Hesburgh never lost sight of his purpose. As he once told a group of graduates, "We will not be judged by our degrees, but by our lives." By any standard, President Hesburgh was exceptional.



Father Hesburgh's career illustrates the quote attributed to St. Francis of Assisi, "preach the Gospel and sometimes use words." As a patriot of our country, as a leader of his church, as a teacher and mentor, he lived the Gospel each and every day of his storied life.

On the streets, in classrooms, and in boardrooms, Father Ted—as he was known by his friends and his students—was courageous enough to speak out against injustice, compassionate enough to bring healing to the downtrodden, and creative enough to propose ideas that improved the lives of all people. Today and forever more, the legacy of Father Ted will live on in the lives he touched, the institutions he influenced, the Church he loved, and the nation he was proud to call home. We are grateful for his courage, in awe of his leadership, and humbled by his generosity of spirit. May it be a comfort to all who loved Rev. Hesburgh that so many share in their grief during this sad time.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. SHEILA GREGORY

**HON. DAVID W. JOLLY**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues of the passing of a dear friend and a friend of this body, Mrs. Sheila Gregory, a Florida native and former employee of the House of Representatives.

Sheila was a woman of many talents, having worked as a journalist, an educator, a financial planner, and a realtor. It was, however, in her many years of service to several members of Congress that Sheila found her greatest passion. She loved the history of the House, the legislative process, the politics of this great institution and took great pride in her opportunity to humbly serve the public. It was here in the House that she met many members of Congress, a number of whom still serve here today. And it was here that she met her former husband Douglas Gregory.

Sheila leaves behind three adult daughters, Angela Oler, Nancy Gregory, and Jennifer Gregory, all of whom were in her loving company at the time of her passing last Wednesday, February 25, 2015 in Fair Oaks, Virginia. In addition to Doug and her daughters, Sheila leaves behind five grandchildren, Alexis, Jordan Douglas, Sasha, Jack, and Mya, as well as two sisters.

Sheila Isabel was born on May 30, 1947 and raised in Clewiston, Florida. She moved to Northern Virginia in 1979 to begin her Congressional service. She was a devoted mother and grandmother who will be greatly missed by her family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, Sheila Gregory was one of the many people that have come here to serve our colleagues in Congress and in turn help us serve the American people. Even though she left this House to pursue many other varied careers, she never lost her love for Congress and the legislative process. Please join me in sharing our deepest condolences to the Gregory and Isabel families on their tremendous loss.

CONGRATULATING JOSH MCCLURE

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Josh McClure, of the Fulton High School Hornets Wrestling team, on his win in the 138 Class 2 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Josh McClure for a job well done.

A TRIBUTE TO ALLISON GREGG IN THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 114TH CONGRESS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Allison Gregg, a second grade teacher at Sidney Elementary School. Ms. Gregg received the STEM Education Award for Inspired Teaching.

This award, sponsored by Kemin Industries, a Des Moines-based nutritional ingredient manufacturer, celebrates teachers whose leadership and dedication to Iowa's STEM initiative increases student interest in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Ms. Gregg said she found courses on NASA online where they could hold Iowa Communications Network classes with a NASA educator that opened the children's eyes. She is also always looking for ways to not only incorporate technology into her teaching, but also to make learning fun.

I applaud and congratulate Allison for her award and for providing the youth in Iowa's 3rd district the education that they will need to be successful in the future. I am proud to represent her, her fellow teachers and students in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating Allison Gregg and wishing her well and continued success in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. VICKY HARTZLER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 2, 2015, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On roll call no. 107, YEA.

CONGRATULATING CALEB GOSSETT

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Caleb Gossett, of the Francis Howell Central High School Spartans Wrestling team, on his win in the 285 Class 4 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Caleb Gossett for a job well done.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BARBARA LEE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call votes 100–106 due to a family emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted no on #100, no on #101, no on #102, no on #103, no on #104, yes on #105, and yes on #106.

CONGRATULATING TRENTON CLINES

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Trenton Clines, of the Fulton High School Hornets Wrestling team, on his win in the 145 Class 2 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Trenton Clines for a job well done.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TEXAS COUNTY FOOD PANTRY

**HON. JASON SMITH**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 25th anniversary of the Texas County Food Pantry in Houston, Missouri. For twenty-five years the wonderful staff of this pantry has embodied the spirit of generosity by providing food, shelter, healthcare, and clothing for our neighbors. The Texas

County Food Pantry has partnered with several organizations over the years to establish new connections for programs in nutrition, job research services, medical prescriptions, emergency assistance and homeless prevention.

The Texas County Food Pantry was formed after the Ministerial Alliances of Cabool, Houston, and Licking consolidated their many church pantries in order to help ease poverty in Texas County. In March of 1990, this non-profit corporation was formed and began its role assisting those suffering in poverty. Texas County Food Pantry staff and volunteers have continuously been committed to providing exceptional care for the people of Texas County.

For the many years of service and commitment to helping others, it is my pleasure to recognize the Texas County Food Pantry before the United States House of Representatives.

RECOGNIZING GENNORO "HANK"  
MASCOLO AND JACK HAMMETT

**HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the recent passing of two Veterans of the Second World War; one a Pearl Harbor Survivor of the U.S. Navy and the other a Reservist in the Coast Guard, a branch of the service which has just celebrated its 74th Anniversary.

Gennoro "Hank" Mascolo passed away at the age of 92 this January, after battling lung cancer for several months. Hank, the youngest of seven children born to Italian immigrants, began serving our country by enlisting in the U.S. Coast Guard in 1942. After his service, he opened his own barbershop in 1955 in the City of Orange, where he remained the Town's barber for 60 years. An active Elk and Vice President of the famous Orange International Street Fair for over 20 years rightly earned him the title, "Mr. Orange." Along with his skill with a pair of shears, Mr. Hank Mascolo will be remembered for the friendship he offered and the good advice he gave. He will be deeply missed by the community of the City of Orange.

Jack Hammett, a Pearl Harbor survivor, passed on in December last year at 94 years-old. After serving in the Navy for 22 years, Jack served decades on the Costa Mesa City Council, The Costa Mesa Chamber of Commerce, the City planning commission, the Costa Mesa Police Reserves, and eventually Mayor of Costa Mesa. Jack lived his whole life in service to his country and community. As a member of the Freedom Committee, Jack was committed to educating youth on the stories of our veterans, giving innumerable presentations on his experiences in the war. His legacy will be felt for many years to come.

Both of these men, Hank Mascolo and Jack Hammett, served as role models to all those around them. They showed steadfast and unwavering commitment to their families and their communities. They don't come better than Hank Mascolo and Jack Hammett.

CONGRATULATING SIDNEY OLIVER

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Sidney Oliver, of the Holt High School Indians Wrestling team, on his win in the 113 Class 4 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Sidney Oliver for a job well done.

SUPPORT H. RES. 56, AFFIRMING  
THE SUPPORT OF THE UNITED  
STATES FOR MACEDONIA'S AC-  
CESSION TO NATO

**HON. CANDICE S. MILLER**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Chair of the Congressional Caucus on Macedonia and Macedonian-Americans, and as someone who represents a district home to the largest community of Macedonian-Americans in our nation, to introduce H. Res. 56, affirming strong U.S. support for Macedonia joining NATO, and recognize the strategic U.S. partnership with our friend and ally Macedonia.

The U.S.-Macedonia relationship is one of critical importance in today's increasingly volatile world. Macedonia is strategically located in Southeast Europe, providing a unique gateway for rapid deployment to the Middle East, North Africa, and Eastern Europe in order to maintain regional stability as various national security challenges arise. Our friendship with Macedonia has never been more critical.

The U.S. has a vested interest in the stability and security of Macedonia and Southeast Europe. In the 1990s, we sent troops to the northern border of Macedonia to ensure stability in the aftermath of the breakup of Yugoslavia. Due in part to this American commitment, Macedonia was the only nation to peacefully declare independence without any bloodshed. Since then, the U.S. has assisted Macedonia on its path to partnership in Europe and across the Atlantic alike, with a track record of military, economic, and political support ever since.

In 1999, Macedonia opened its borders to 400,000 refugees from Kosovo and hosted the NATO Logistical Support Center for Kosovo Forces. In 2001, Macedonia was one of the first countries to offer support to the United States after the horrific attacks of September 11, abiding by the words of the late Macedonian President Boris Trajkovski that "an attack on the United States is an attack on Macedonia."

Since 2002, Macedonia has contributed greatly to the U.S. and ISAF mission in Af-

ghanistan. Macedonia has patrolled ISAF headquarters in Kabul, was the fourth and fifth largest ISAF troop contributor per capita, contributed troops to the NATO-led ISAF mission, and engaged in combat operations side-by-side with American troops. Currently, Macedonia has been recognized as an operational partner in the new "Resolute Support" Mission in Afghanistan to train, advise, and assist our Afghan partners.

For their participation in U.S. and NATO-led missions, Macedonian soldiers have received 120 medals and military honors from the United States. Furthermore, Macedonia has been an active participant—and the first state partner—with the Vermont National Guard for the past 20 years, and, since 1995, more than 3,000 Macedonians and Vermonters have shared their expertise in more than 800 events as the partnership has developed, including a joint military embedment in Afghanistan in 2011.

I have long noted that Macedonia can protect the tent of NATO in places like Afghanistan, but it cannot sleep in the tent so long as it is not a member of the Treaty Organization. This is not right.

With what is happening in the world today, now is not the time to back down on supporting our allies. H. Res. 56 calls on the Administration, Department of State, and European allies to work with Greece and NATO allies to ensure that bilateral disputes do not impede Macedonia's NATO accession for the sake of regional stability in light of the current situation with Ukraine and elsewhere.

Time and again, Macedonia has shown steadfast support for the efforts of the United States to restore and maintain global stability. Macedonia is one of America's best friends in Southeast Europe.

But, Macedonia needs our support. It is long overdue that we use our diplomatic strength to reinforce our allies, and including Macedonia in the greatest military alliance in history is an important step in securing U.S. interests and maintaining this crucial partnership well into the future.

I encourage my colleagues in this House to support H. Res. 56 and affirm strong U.S. support for Macedonia joining NATO.

HONORING THE CAREER OF  
MAJOR GENERAL THOMAS R.  
MOORE

**HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and accomplishments of Major General Thomas R. Moore, Assistant Adjutant General of the Georgia Air National Guard. On March 7th, 2015, General Moore will celebrate his retirement after 33 years of distinguished service.

In 1981, General Moore commissioned through the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at the University of South Carolina. Throughout his career, he has commanded at the squadron, group and wing levels. General Moore also served twice as the Commander

for the 416th Air Expeditionary Group in Karshi-Khanabad Air Base, Uzbekistan. A master navigator, General Moore has earned more than 3,500 flying hours. In his current role, General Moore serves as the Assistant Adjutant General of the Georgia Air National Guard at Clay National Guard Center where he acts as a direct supervisor over the entire Georgia State Air Guard staff. His duties also include the command of 2,900 Georgia Air Guard members serving in two flying wings, seven geographically separated units and the nation's first Air Dominance Center.

General Moore's dedication and many contributions to our country, have been recognized with the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal (with 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), the Meritorious Service Medal (with 2 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), the Air Force Commendation Medal (with 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), and the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award (with "V" device, 1 Silver Oak Leaf Cluster and 3 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters). However, these medals do not stand alone. General Moore is an honored recipient of many awards and decorations. General Moore has earned a great deal of respect from his colleagues, and will always be noted for his outstanding character, commitment and allegiance.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to honor the many accomplishments of Major General Thomas R. Moore during his career and for his service to our country. I am pleased to join his wife, Paula, his two sons, Capt. Tyler Moore and Rhett Moore, family and friends in congratulating him in his retirement. I wish General Moore continued happiness in his future endeavors.

#### CONGRATULATING CHANCE COOPER

#### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Chance Cooper, of the Timberland High School Wolves Wrestling team, on his win in the 195 Class 4 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Chance Cooper for a job well done.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. VICKY HARTZLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, February 27, 2015, I was unable to vote. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: On roll call no. 106, YEA.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. PAUL TONKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 107, I was absent while attending a funeral in New York. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

#### CONGRATULATING COLBY SMITH

#### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Colby Smith, of the Holt High School Indians Wrestling team, on his win in the 126 Class 4 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Colby Smith for a job well done.

#### OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

#### HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,155,853,840,783.67. We've added \$7,528,976,791,870.59 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt that our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

#### A TRIBUTE TO WAYNE AND GEORGIE GOODVIN IN THE FIRST SESSION OF THE 114TH CONGRESS

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Wayne and Georgie Goodvin on the very special occasion of their 75th wedding anniversary. Their milestone took place Saturday, February 28, 2015.

Wayne and Georgie eloped on a rainy day in 1940 and have resided on a farm outside of Carbon since 1951 where they raised their two children, Max and Carolyn. They now have four grandchildren and nine great-grandchildren. And every year on their anniversary,

they tell their family about the day they got married. The Goodvins continue to be a visible and important part of their community, and it is an honor to represent them in the United States Congress.

Georgie and Wayne's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa's values. I salute this lovely couple on their 75th year of life together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

#### CONGRATULATING CONNOR FLYNN

#### HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Connor Flynn, of the Francis Howell High School Vikings Wrestling team, on his win in the 160 Class 4 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Connor Flynn for a job well done.

#### MOTION TO RECEDE AND CONCUR IN SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 240

#### HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in urging that we reject this motion to concur in the Senate amendments. The Senate removed the House-passed provisions that would prevent the President from acting unilaterally on immigration.

The President said on twenty-two occasions that he lacked the authority to act unilaterally on amnesty, but that is exactly what he did.

A vote against this motion is a vote for the rule of law. Yes, we are a nation of immigrants but we are also a nation of laws. Any changes to our immigration laws should be done legislatively. They should not be done unilaterally by the Administration, nor should they be changed by the courts.

We have millions of Americans who are still looking for work. We have others on the lower rungs of the economic ladder that want to climb higher, to earn more money, and to support their families with a higher wage.

If the Administration's amnesty plan is allowed to go into effect, the plight of these millions of American workers and the families they support will be harmed.

The House passed a bill to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security and also ensure that this money is not used to implement amnesty. The Administration rejected that, has refused to negotiate and has promised to veto any bill that includes provisions that uphold the rule of law.

I am committed to fighting for the rule of law and restoring the balance of power between the Executive and the Legislative branches of government.

**MOTION TO RECEDE AND CONCUR  
IN THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO  
H.R. 240**

**HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE**

OF TEXAS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 240, the Clean Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill, as it provides full funding of the Department of Homeland Security, including support for important federal cybersecurity initiatives, disaster relief and recovery programs, and essential law enforcement activities that are critical for ensuring the Department can help keep our Nation safe from harm.

I encourage support of this bill as it does not contain any of the "poison pill" amendments designed to constrain the President's authority to defer deportation of undocumented immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to highlight the pointlessness of the actions of House Republicans to use the funding of the Department of Homeland Security as a bargaining chip to extract concessions from the President.

Threatening to not fund a Department, especially one as crucial to the protection of our homeland, just to get your way does not belong in American politics.

It is childish, Mr. Speaker, and the time that House Republicans have wasted playing politics with DHS could have been better served passing legislation that actually serves the American people.

The full and unconditional funding of the Department of Homeland Security is essential not only to the 18th district, not only to the state of Texas, it is essential to all Americans.

I want to point out, specifically, what programs were placed in danger by House Republicans had they gotten their way:

1. \$39.7 billion in regular discretionary appropriations for Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in fiscal year 2015;

2. \$12.6 billion for Customs and Border Protection (CBP); DHS would be required to accelerate the hiring of CBP officers;

3. \$5.96 billion for Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) plus an additional \$345 million from the agency's fee funded accounts, bringing the total to \$6.3 billion;

4. \$553.6 million in funding to manage the influx of unaccompanied alien children, or "UAC," entering the U.S.; the funding would be used to interdict migrants, care for and transport approximately 58,000 undocumented children to the custody of Health and Human Services (HHS), and facilitate the movement of undocumented families through removal proceedings after crossing the U.S. border;

5. \$1.9 billion for both domestic and international investigations, including increases to combat human trafficking, child exploitation, cyber-crime, and drug smuggling, and to expand visa vetting capabilities;

6. \$4.8 billion for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA);

7. \$10 billion for the U.S. Coast Guard;

8. \$753.2 million for cybersecurity operations in the National Programs and Protection Directorate to fund and sustain improvements to the Federal Network Security and Network Security Deployment programs;

9. \$1.7 billion for the U.S. Secret Service—an increase of \$80.5 million above the fiscal year 2014 enacted level—to begin preparation and training for candidate protection for the 2016 presidential election and to address crit-

ical failures in communications and training at the White House Complex;

10. \$7 billion for disaster relief—fully funding FEMA's stated requirement; and

11. \$1.1 billion for Science and Technology, \$32.1 million above the President's request.

I would hope that House Republicans will have learned from this debacle that this tactic of playing political football with an entire Department will not work to further your own ideological agenda.

I applaud Speaker BOEHNER for finally coming to his senses in allowing a vote on a clean bill, one that the Senate passed two weeks ago and one that could have already been signed into law.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in sending a clean Homeland Security funding bill that will receive the presidential signature needed to become law and provide the resources needed to keep our homeland safe.

**CONGRATULATING DALTON  
VOYLES**

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
*Tuesday, March 3, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dalton Voyles, of the Pacific High School Indians Wrestling team, on his win in the 182 Class 3 2015 State Wrestling Championship match.

This student and his coach should be commended for all of their hard work throughout this past year and for bringing home the state championship to their school and community.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing Dalton Voyles for a job well done.

**SENATE—Wednesday, March 4, 2015**

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Father in Heaven, holy is Your Name. You brought light from darkness and order from chaos. You can bring order to our Nation and world. Thank You for the gift of this day and for our borrowed heartbeats. Thank You also for the privilege to serve You by serving our great country.

Use our lawmakers to do Your will. May they become Your merciful hands to reduce the pain and pathology in our world. Lord, use their daily experiences of joy and sorrow, pleasure and pain, victory and defeat for Your glory. Protect them with the shield of Your love as You fill their hearts with Your peace.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, March 4, 2015.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

**MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 625**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 625) to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

**KEYSTONE BILL**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, construction of the Keystone Pipeline would pump billions into our economy, it would support thousands of jobs, and a bipartisan majority in both the House and Senate voted to support it.

Today the Senate will vote to support American jobs and infrastructure one more time. It should be a no-brainer. For a long time, projects like Keystone basically were no-brainers. They were often approved without much controversy at all. But that was before powerful special interests and ideological extremists decided to embark on a quixotic crusade.

The implication that building Keystone would result in some sort of apocalyptic cataclysm has always flown in the face of science. Even the assertion that Keystone would have significant impact on global climate ignores the scientific findings of President Obama's own State Department; it said the environmental impact would be minimal.

The reality is that the energy resources in question are almost certainly going to come out of the ground whether or not Keystone is built. The real question here is whether we are going to allow Keystone's energy to help support middle-class jobs in America or whether we will allow those jobs and energy to potentially be sent to high-polluting countries such as China. Deep-pocketed leftists and extremists appear to prefer the latter option.

By vetoing the bipartisan Keystone jobs bill, President Obama sided with those moneyed special interests over the middle class, and it is still unclear why. It can't be about protecting the climate because vetoing the bipartisan bill would hardly have an effect. It

can't be about protecting a broken review process the President himself broke long ago because this bipartisan bill seeks to fix the review process. And it can't be about giving the President more time because he has delayed this decision for years on end. Here is the only serious explanation I can think of: President Obama is signaling to extreme special interests that his party is turning away from workers and toward them.

We have seen how the President's veto has outraged some in the labor union community. I know it makes some of our Democratic colleagues pretty uncomfortable as well. I suspect that includes Democrats who didn't support the Senate's initial passage of Keystone. I suspect it also includes Democrats who might otherwise support their leadership's unprecedented filibuster of a veto-override motion.

I am urging every Democrat who still believes their party should be about workers, not deep-pocketed special interests and extremists, to join us. Vote for cloture. Vote to override. Keystone's bipartisan coalition in the Senate is only a few votes shy of the two-thirds majority we would need to override this partisan veto and bring Keystone's jobs here to America. And it is not too late to stop your party from venturing down a path even further afield from the interests of American workers and the middle class. So join us. Together, let's support Keystone's American jobs and infrastructure.

**KING V. BURWELL**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, across the street the Supreme Court will hear arguments today in an important case. King v. Burwell is the latest reminder of a law that is as unwieldy as it is unworkable—ObamaCare.

ObamaCare has been one rolling disaster after another for middle-class Americans. First, it attacked seniors by raiding Medicare to finance more government spending. Then it canceled health plans for many who had been told they would be able to keep the plans they liked. And who could forget the Web site debacle? The hits have kept on coming ever since—fewer choices, higher costs, increased tax burdens borne by the middle class, and even more headaches at tax time. In fact, we now know that the Obama administration sent inaccurate ObamaCare tax information to nearly 1 million people. America's middle class deserves a lot better than the hurt of ObamaCare.

We have heard a lot of predictions about what might happen if the Court

finds for the plaintiffs in this case, but we have also seen Republican ideas about how to help Americans who may be harmed again by ObamaCare's broken promises. For instance, Republicans think it is better to give Americans and States the freedom to choose what is right for them rather than trying to impose costly mandates from Washington such as ObamaCare.

Regardless of how the Supreme Court rules, I look forward to continuing to work with my Republican colleagues because while ObamaCare is a law that is all about higher costs and broken promises, Republicans think health care should be about helping middle-class Americans instead.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, most of the issues that come before this body are complex and nuanced. Rarely are we faced with simple issues. But today we have a very simple, clear-cut issue before us. It is as straightforward and clear-cut as any one question could be. Do you support American workers or do you not support American workers? Under our law, workers have the right to unionize and have their voices heard in the workplace. Through elections, workers choose for themselves whether to form a union.

Last year the National Labor Relations Board took important steps to modernize and streamline union election procedures—commonsense, simple advancements. Rule changes are good for workers and good for businesses.

This whole fight isn't about business versus workers. We would have to search long and hard to find a business that opposes what the NLRB did. It is all the anti-union rhetoric of the Republicans here in the Senate.

The reform that the NLRB pushed forward allows employers and unions to file forms electronically—kind of the modern world in which we all live. It also allows communications with workers by email and cell phone—pretty reasonable, it sounds like to me. Yet today Senate Republicans are trying to roll back rule changes instituted by the NLRB.

Later this afternoon we will vote on a resolution of disapproval to undo these commonsense reforms. Republicans think they are striking a blow against labor unions with votes like today's, but what they are really doing is undermining American families.

American workers and their families have come to rely on many of the benefits provided by collective bargaining:

higher wages, safe working conditions, decent health care. It is no surprise that some of the most prosperous times in American history—namely, the middle 20th century—came about in times of record union membership. Even today in my home State of Nevada, unions protect wages for casino employees on the Las Vegas Strip, up at Lake Tahoe, and all over the State. We ensure through the unions safe working conditions—certainly for miners in Elko and around the State—and also, with rare exception, quality health coverage for educators statewide.

So I want to be very clear. This is about whom the Republicans really are attacking, and it is the middle class. Each time Republicans throw roadblocks for workers to organize, they are weakening the middle class.

I support American families. I support American workers. I support the middle class. Senate Democrats support the middle class. We do not support this Republican attack on unions. We will vigorously fight any attempt to weaken worker protections, including today's resolution vote.

#### OBAMACARE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will briefly comment on my friend the Republican leader further trying to come to the floor once again to try to minimize the disastrous attacks on ObamaCare.

The House has voted 57 times to repeal that law. Each time, the result is the same. As Albert Einstein said, the definition of insanity is someone who does something over and over again and gets the same results. So it is insane what they have done in the House, and it is really insane what they are trying to do here in the Senate.

There is no question about the case before the U.S. Supreme Court. The language is clear. Almost 10 million people will lose health insurance. And we have seen in the press the last few days that very terrible things would happen to families if they lost their health care. What my friend the Republican leader is talking about doing is turning it back to the insurance industry. If you had a preexisting disability, no insurance. They set arbitrary limits as to how much they would pay. It was a time of dread for families who were trying to insure their boys and girls, mothers and fathers.

So I hope the Supreme Court will listen to the will of the American people and the will of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives which passed this law. We all knew the intent of Congress. We still do. The law is very clear, and the Supreme Court should follow the law.

Mr. President, will the Chair announce the business of the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 8, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate remaining, equally divided in the usual form.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the minority and the majority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the median time today between when a union files an organizing petition and when employees vote on whether to unionize is 38 days, or just slightly over one month. Some 95 percent of all organizing elections take place less than 2 months after the date an organizing petition is filed, and approximately 70 percent of these elections are won by unions. All in all, I think anyone would agree that unions are doing pretty well and that this is a pretty fair process.

In fact, the current median time between union organizing petitions and union elections surpasses the goal set by the National Labor Relations Board itself. One would think it would be a classic case of "if it ain't broke, don't fix it."

Apparently the Obama nominees on the National Labor Relations Board don't agree. They proposed a new rule which will go into effect next month and that will drastically shorten the time between the initial organizing union petition and the union elections to anywhere from 11 to 22 days.

While the current situation, if anything, gives an advantage to unions, it also provides adequate time for employers to express any concerns and for employees to hear the pros and cons of

the union proposal. The new NLRB rule would remove these protections.

Businesses would have to respond to the union organizing petition within 7 days of its being filed, which would leave employers scrambling to research any arguments they want to bring up at the union organizing hearing. Small businesses, which frequently lack experience dealing with unions or in-house counsel to provide advice, would be hit particularly hard by this rule.

But it is not just businesses that would suffer. Under the new rule employees would have very little chance to research and consider the benefits and drawbacks of joining a union. They would be forced into a hasty decision with little opportunity to change their minds later on.

In addition, the rule also presents substantial privacy concerns for employees. Under the current system, employers already have to give unions employees' names and home addresses. The new rule would expand that disclosure requirement to include employees' cell phone numbers, email addresses, work schedules, and shift locations. Worse, the rule contains no additional requirements for safeguarding that information or disposing of it appropriately. Given the ever-growing concerns about privacy, it is astonishing that any employer would be forced to give up so much sensitive information without the explicit permission of his employees.

This new rule is unfair to employers and it is unfair to workers. There is a reason it is called the ambush elections rule. It would ambush employers and employees alike. Unions would have unlimited time to organize, while employers would be given almost no time to present their concerns and exercise their free speech and due process rights. Employees would be pushed into making the long-term decision about whether to join a union without all the facts.

Government should not be in the business of tilting the playing field in favor of unions at the expense of workers and businesses. The NLRB's ambush elections rule is unfair and undemocratic. I hope Congress will pass the joint resolution of disapproval we are considering today, and I hope the President will sign it. The rights of American workers and businesses should not be sacrificed to the demands of unions.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to support S.J. Res. 8. I thank

my friend and colleague from Tennessee for bringing the resolution to the floor to disapprove the rule that the National Labor Relations Board has proposed that basically creates what are commonly referred to as ambush elections for votes to create labor unions in workplaces.

The concerns I have with this NLRB mandate is that it is another draconian example of what I consider to be the hyperpartisan business and labor environment the National Labor Relations Board has created over the last several years. The NLRB is advancing a pro-union agenda nationwide in the guise of government policy. The NLRB's proposed policy is simply not necessary, particularly in light of the fact that some 70 percent of union organizing elections already succeed under the NLRB's current policy. Clearly the pro-union majority of the National Labor Relations Board is not satisfied with unions winning 70 percent of the time. They now want to run up the score so the unions win 100 percent of the time.

Many people, when they think about labor unions and organizing, think about big business, but I am here to talk about the negative effect this proposal will have on small businesses. A 50-employee operation or a 250-employee operation, is a business that does not have the legal, financial, or administrative resources that a big business has to be able to react in the short timeframe the NLRB wants to mandate.

Today the median time for holding elections on labor union organizing petitions is about 38 days. This rule would bring that down to just 8 days before an election would be required to be held. This would make it virtually impossible for the vast majority of America's small businesses to respond to the unionization effort and many of the employees themselves who may not want to be unionized would be swept aside by the compressed timeframe as well.

We have several examples of this in North Carolina, but rather than get into a lot of details, I will just explain why this new ambush election rule is not needed.

The petitions to unionize workplaces are already handled expeditiously. As I said, the average or median time for holding a vote is now 38 days. And again, the success rate for the unions is 70 percent. Let me say that again, 70 percent of the elections that are held under the NLRB's current rules result in employees being unionized.

By turning elections into this sort of ambush will put small businesses at a severe disadvantage against the powerful unions targeting them. For instance, take one small trucking company down in Greensboro, NC, that would suffer serious economic consequences if this rule goes into effect. Guy M. Turner, Inc. was founded by

two brothers in 1924 and 90 years later it is still a family owned business employing less than 250 people, clearly it is not a mega-corporation. Yet, if the NLRB imposes this new rule, this family business will have: little time to obtain competent counsel to counter union targeting of the company, little time to answer questions, marshal facts, or prepare arguments to share with their employees regarding the potential consequences and effects of unionization.

And if that were not bad enough, under the NLRB's new proposal, employers would also be prohibited from expressing any views regarding the unionization effort—thus essentially eliminating the employer's right to free speech regarding the potential adverse effects of unionization on the workplace and the company's future viability. However, the NLRB's new rule would impose no such restrictions on a big union's right to speak in favor of unionization or the future benefits they promise it will deliver.

A little common sense and a hard look at reality clearly demonstrates that the regulations enforced today are working not only effectively, but in favor of large unions most of the time. I hope Senators will support Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee chairman LAMAR ALEXANDER, and the thousands of businesses and hundreds of thousands of employees, who oppose this regulation because it is an unnecessary and ill-advised effort to tilt the playing field in the workplace totally in favor of the large labor unions and their efforts to unionize the American workplace.

I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, what is the pending order for the morning?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on S.J. Res. 8 with divided time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Chair.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this morning I rise, along with the women of the Senate, to speak about the issue of human trafficking.

We are 4 days from International Women's Day, and all of the women of the Senate have taken up the issue of human trafficking. Many of us wish to speak about it today. We are all working on it. Many have been leaders on



this issue. My colleagues will see Republican and Democratic women coming to the floor.

As the senior woman and senior Democratic woman, I have convened over the years a dinner among the women of the Senate. The purpose of the dinner was to create a zone of civility, to create camaraderie, as well as to see where we could work across the aisle to focus on a particular issue.

The women of the Senate do not have a caucus. There is no lockstep. We discuss our different views on budgets and bottom lines and other issues. We discuss questions such as, What is the best way to approach the deficit? What are all of the deficits in our country we are facing, not only the fiscal deficit, but the deficit in research and development, and other deficits?

At one of our dinners we said, What is it that we want to work on together in this particular Congress? What is the issue that brings us all together across party lines that would have an impact on what we do at home, what would have an impact in our global community, and what would have an impact particularly on women and children, girls and boys, around the world? That is what we decided we wanted to work on—the despicable, vile issue of human trafficking. Human trafficking. That means a whole organized network and networks to buy and sell human beings as if they are a commodity, to buy and sell girls and to buy and sell little boys for the whole purpose of sexual exploitation.

This is an enormous issue. Many of our colleagues in the Senate have been working on authorizing legislation, and a great deal of it is pending in the Judiciary Committee. We have joined together and asked the Judiciary Committee to hold a hearing on the major trafficking bills, and we thank Chairman GRASSLEY and Ranking Member LEAHY for holding the hearing, as well as for joining with us in moving legislation.

This is not just a woman's issue; this is a human rights issue. So we have a Klobuchar-Cornyn bill. We have a Collins-Leahy effort. We are all working on this together. But it is we, the women of the Senate, who continue to be a force to make sure we will focus on it within our own government and around the world. We will be looking at what are the most significant efforts we can take.

The numbers are startling and discouraging. Twenty-one million people are trafficked globally every year—21 million people. It is the third largest global crime—right up there with the selling of weapons of mass destruction, and right up there with selling drugs, and drug cartels. In fact, in many instances, it is the same organized crime network. If someone is willing to sell a person and treat them as a commodity, they are willing to sell drugs, they are

willing to sell guns, they are willing to sell nuclear fissionable material. They are willing to do anything.

This isn't just about recruiting girls in Asia or girls and women in Central Europe; this is in our own country, where 800,000 people are trafficked each year.

When I met with my FBI agents in Maryland and the U.S. Attorney's Office to discuss this issue, they told me that the I-95 corridor is a corridor for violence and trafficking and that we are a hotspot for trafficking activities, because we have a seaport, we have a major interstate highway, and we have big sporting events. Can my colleagues imagine such activity at sporting events such as the big games? The playoffs that we so enjoy in Baltimore are also part of trafficking.

But we know our local law enforcement and our FBI are on the job. We have programs such as Operation Cross Country. Last year, the FBI helped recover close to 170 children who had been forced into prostitution, with simultaneous raids, and they put 281 pimps in jail.

We are going to take the first step. There are many bills pending where the women of the Senate have really thought about this, worked on this, taken leadership on this, and they will talk about their various legislative initiatives.

As the chair of the Appropriations Committee, I wanted to look at not only the great work my colleagues were doing in authorizing, but what we could do now for the money. Last year, in the 2015 omnibus, with the full concurrence of then-Vice Chairman SHELBY—a really strong advocate on this issue—and then across the aisle with HAL ROGERS in the House, we put \$42 million in the Justice Department to make sure we were fighting trafficking. We included a \$28 million increase for programs that provide grants that are lifesaving, as well as life-rescuing services to victims. These funds were to ensure that law enforcement could enforce the law and make sure victims had emergency shelters and counseling, supporting a true rescue mission.

We also made sure the FBI had additional resources to find those criminals and bring them to justice, and to focus on efforts such as a program called “Innocence Lost” that focuses on the trafficking of children. We funded human trafficking prosecution by adding more money for civil rights attorneys to identify the large trafficking rings to do it.

I don't want to sound like an accountant; I want to sound like one of the women of the Senate who thinks about these women who have been recruited around the world and the children who are being nabbed and grabbed, and the exploitation of lost children, sometimes runaway youths.

We want to say to them that our Federal dollars are working hard, and we are going to look at how authorizers and appropriators really work together. We want to pass some of this new, fresh thinking on how to attack and deal with this problem. We are going to look at the Appropriations Committee across all subcommittees to see what we can do.

The women of the Senate are going to be a voice and a vote on this, and we know we have good men of the Senate who also work with us and support us. So working shoulder to shoulder, we can do something to make it safer for our communities and have a big impact around the world. We will do it because we took the time to listen to each other and figure out ways we can work together. Let's get it done, and let's get it done now.

I would now like to yield time for someone who has been a real leader on this issue, and a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who has brought some new, fresh thinking and fresh approaches but also has been wise and prudent for her taxpayers and, I might also add, a former attorney general in the State of Minnesota. She is a great warrior, and she has made sure that she has some new ideas. Senator KLOBUCHAR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge Senator MIKULSKI and her leadership. Anyone who wondered how hard she was going to keep working after she announced she wasn't running again for the next year—I think we just saw the answer right here. She hasn't slowed down one bit. She is already here advocating for some incredibly important bills, and I am also glad to see that Senator SHAHEEN and Senator HIRONO are here. They are going to speak shortly.

Given I have been able to talk about this at length on the Committee on the Judiciary, I will be brief and say this: I have an important bill with Senator CORNYN, and it is a bill, a version of which has already passed the House, a bipartisan bill, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. Also, Senator CORNYN has a bill with me and a number of other people called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. My bill passed through the Committee on the Judiciary last week after the hearing that Senator MIKULSKI referred to, 20-0, on a vote. And Senator CORNYN's bill, which I have also cosponsored, passed on a near-unanimous vote. Senator LEAHY and Senator COLLINS, as was mentioned by Senator MIKULSKI, have an important bill—the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. We are hopeful we can get these done, along with what Senator FEINSTEIN is doing, and many others, in the coming days on the Senate floor.

I think the first message here is this is bipartisan. I don't think any sex

trafficker wants to hear we are doing some tougher stuff to go after them, but we are. It is very important that this be bipartisan.

I give you one example of a case charged last week out of Minnesota. A 12-year-old girl—not even old enough to get a driver's license, not even old enough to go to her first prom—gets a text. She goes to a parking lot at McDonald's. She thinks there is a party. A guy puts her in a car and drives her to Rochester, MN—the Twin Cities—rapes her and then takes pictures of her and puts it on Craigslist. The next day two other men buy her off of Craigslist and rape her.

That happened in Minnesota. That is happening all over the country, where 83 percent of the victims are not from other countries, 83 percent of the victims are from our own country. This is the third biggest criminal enterprise—international criminal enterprise—in the world. Only after illegal drugs and illegal guns comes selling young girls and young boys for sex. This is going on in the oil patch in North Dakota. It is going on in the city streets in Baltimore. It is going on in small towns in Minnesota. That is what we are seeing happening across our country.

I appreciate all the support of my Democratic and Republican colleagues. What this bill does that we passed 20-0 out of the Committee on the Judiciary—the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act—is it takes this model that has been really successful in Minnesota. We just got a 40-year sentence last year against someone running a ring who basically says, are you going to prosecute the 12-year-old? No. That 12-year-old is a victim.

When you start thinking like that and you start thinking of these victims as actual victims, then you give them services. Then they turn their lives around, and then they testify against the guys who are running these rings. That is how you make the cases. If you prosecute them, my guess is they are going to go right back to that pimp who brought them into this world in the first place.

That is why this has been adopted already in 15 States, and 12 States are looking at it. What our bill does is simply takes an existing grant program and creates incentives so that other States will adopt this as well.

We also have the ability for these victims to access programs that help people get jobs.

Finally, the national sex trafficking strategy. We do not have one in this country. That is in this bill as well. You can see why it got widespread support.

I am excited about these bills because finally we are working on something together. I would like to get them done as soon as possible. There are a lot of bills that have passed in the House. We are going to have to co-

ordinate all these efforts, as Senator MIKULSKI said. But this is the moment in time where we can finally say not just to the rest of the world but to girls in our own country that we are going to stand up for them and we are going to stand up against these people running the rings.

Why has this gotten worse in the last few years? We love the Internet, but people are advertising on the Internet. They are getting away with it, and we have to make sure we are sophisticated, more sophisticated than the perpetrators who are committing these crimes.

I see that our great Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN, is here. I yield the floor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for 1 minute?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I will.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I want to say this is not a Democratic women's issue. We are in this on a bipartisan basis. I want to note that the Democratic women are here because the Republican women are chairing committees and subcommittees. I know the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE, will be on the floor shortly. The distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, is at a very important Navy appropriations committee hearing. So when my colleagues see us, don't assume it is just Democratic women. It is all of us together. But their responsibility has them at another duty station right this minute. I wanted to explain where we are.

I yield the floor back to Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I wish to echo what my colleagues Senator MIKULSKI and Senator KLOBUCHAR have said about this being a bipartisan issue. This is an issue that affects everybody in this country—Republicans, Democrats, Independents. It is a critical issue for the Senate. It is a critical issue for the House. It is a critical issue for State legislatures across the country.

I am so pleased to be able to join my colleagues and thank Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership for such a long time on this issue and so many others, and commend Senator KLOBUCHAR for everything she is doing to address this issue. I am so pleased to join Senator HIRONO as well this morning, and look forward to seeing my colleague from New Hampshire coming to the floor shortly.

This Sunday, March 8, nations across the globe will observe International Women's Day. It is an annual occasion to celebrate the achievements of women across the globe. But it also recognizes the obstacles that still stand in the way of equal rights and opportunities for women. Over the last

century, women have fought for equal rights and opportunities, and we made enormous advances in much of the world. Humanity has learned that women's rights are human rights, and those rights include being respected as full and equal partners in all aspects of the economy and society. We have learned that when women succeed, families succeed, communities succeed, and nations succeed.

However, as my colleagues have pointed out so eloquently, across the globe countless millions of women continue to face not only the denial of basic human and civil rights, but outright violence and bondage. We would like to think of slavery as a thing of the past, particularly here in America. But the tragic reality is that this scourge continues to thrive in the 21st century. We are here this morning to shine a spotlight on the modern slave trade and to encourage all of our colleagues here in the Senate to work with us to end it.

An estimated 27 million people are trapped in the multibillion dollar marketplace that trafficks in slaves. Victims include forced migrant laborers, bonded laborers, and sex slaves, including women forced into marriages as de facto slaves. Tragically, as we have heard, children account for the majority of modern slaves, many of them trafficked and sexually exploited.

Let's be clear. As Senators KLOBUCHAR and MIKULSKI pointed out, modern-day slavery is not confined to impoverished and backward countries. I was recently briefed on a human trafficking case investigated in my home State of New Hampshire. This case involved forced prostitution. Fortunately, three arrests have already been made. The investigation is still ongoing, so I can't talk about the specifics of the case, but fortunately several of the victims have been rescued.

I want to state the obvious and point out what Senator KLOBUCHAR also pointed out: If modern slavery can exist in communities in New Hampshire, in Minnesota, in Maryland, it can exist anywhere in the world.

I am proud the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, led by Chairman CORKER and our Ranking Member MENENDEZ, is spearheading new legislation which I have cosponsored to fight the modern slave trade on a global scale. Our bill is titled the Ending Modern Slavery Initiative Act of 2015, and it was unanimously reported out of committee last week.

It would authorize the creation of a nonprofit foundation to be known as the End Modern Slavery Initiative Foundation. This new foundation would fund projects to rescue victims of modern slavery and to prevent individuals from being victimized by slavery. In addition, it would pursue the strict enforcement of laws to punish individual and corporate perpetrators of modern slavery.

I want to again commend the work of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary under the leadership of Chairman GRASSLEY and Ranking Member LEAHY, as well as the work that Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR are doing. The Committee on the Judiciary advanced three bipartisan bills to crack down on criminals involved in human trafficking and to assist victims with the rehabilitation.

As we are talking about the prevalence of human trafficking, I think this picture of the areas of human trafficking shows while it is stronger in particular regions of the country—up the I-95 corridor—it is all over the country. The Presiding Officer's home State of Arkansas—a small state like New Hampshire—is one of those States where we see a big red hotspot for human trafficking. We see it all across the country. It is why we need to do everything we can nationally to respond to this scourge.

As we look forward this week to celebrating International Women's Day on Sunday, let us also remember the millions of women who have been left behind, who are being exploited by traffickers and trapped in modern slavery, who are desperate to have their humanity recognized and rescued. I urge all of our colleagues here in the Senate to join us in supporting legislation that will combat and hopefully ultimately end modern slavery, the scourge of human trafficking.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, we also are joined today by Senator HIRONO, who for many years served with me on the Committee on the Judiciary. She is now on the Intelligence Committee, but has been very active in this issue as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and we thank her for being here today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I want to start by thanking Senator MIKULSKI for her leadership on this issue as well as on so many other important issues.

I rise today with many of my fellow women Senators from both parties in drawing awareness to the terrible crime of human trafficking, and not just drawing awareness, but to call upon all of us to take action to stop this crime.

According to the International Labour Organization, there are an estimated 21 million victims of trafficking globally, something that Senator MIKULSKI has already mentioned. That is 21 million people. That is more than the total population of 48 States, including Hawaii, who are trafficked every single year. Only Texas and California have more than 21 million people.

The most recent estimates available show that between 14,500 and 17,500 people were trafficked into the United States in 2005. That is why I am working to enhance our ability to protect human trafficking victims seeking refuge in our country. Right now, many families are torn apart at the border because current law requires adult men to be transferred to a border location hundreds of miles away from where they were intercepted.

Meanwhile, their families, who are often with them, are sent back across the border at the place where they were intercepted with no money and no idea of where their husbands or fathers were taken. The situation leaves women and children vulnerable to trafficking, sexual violence, and other dangers.

I have also sought to place independent child welfare professionals at Border Patrol stations to provide basic humanitarian assistance to unaccompanied children held in our border stations. This would ensure appropriate screening of children to identify victims of persecution or trafficking. It also would ensure that children are not held for longer than necessary in U.S. Custom and Border Protection facilities.

At the peak of our attention to the crisis of unaccompanied minors last year, nearly 50,000 children arrived at our Nation's southern border. Much of our attention in this body was paid to dealing with these children once they reached our border. These children from noncontiguous border countries not only deserve protection but are required by U.S. law to receive certain protections.

But what about the children who might not have reached the relative safety of our border stations? Who knows how many fell victim to traffickers? How many were diverted to other places with even less protection than what they might have received in the United States? Throughout the past year, we have heard stories about children and young women who never made it to the Texas border. We know that criminals have taken advantage of this crisis in Central America by enticing families and children who are looking for a way to escape extreme violence.

When I visited the Rio Grande Valley last year, I heard heartbreaking stories from advocates who all too often saw children and young women fall victim to trafficking. Advocates even saw instances where vulnerable girls were preyed upon by criminal traffickers even after they were released from U.S. Government custody. We must continue working together to protect these young people who are seeking a better life away from the violence of their country.

Domestic trafficking is also an issue. Last year I met with the Hawaii Juve-

nile Justice State Advisory Council and learned of their important work with police, prosecutors, and other personnel to better identify minors who have been trafficked into prostitution rings. These minors are victims. They are not criminals. Like Hawaii, other States are turning their attention to stopping domestic trafficking.

There are a number of Senate bipartisan bills on domestic trafficking, as mentioned. For example, I joined Senator KLOBUCHAR on her bill, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. I also joined Senator LEAHY in his Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act to better assist these vulnerable youth in receiving the services they need to return to some sense of normalcy in their lives.

We are working in both the international and domestic arenas to better address, combat, and eliminate human trafficking. This is an issue that crosses country borders. It is certainly an issue that crosses partisan lines. We can find common ground to get something meaningful done in Congress.

I see that I am joined by my colleague from North Dakota. I also saw my colleague from New Hampshire.

I yield my time for the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Hawaii. This is such an incredibly important issue. It is an honor to see my colleague from North Dakota as well. This is a great example of an incredibly important issue that is a bipartisan issue. Unfortunately, human trafficking, sex trafficking—this is something that impacts everyone. This is something that the women of the Senate have been very focused on, but it crosses all party lines. We want to work together to end this modern day slavery. Unfortunately, the funding for this is really supporting criminal syndicates and so many other crimes. It is also supporting terrorism.

So working together, we hope to make meaningful progress to end this slavery that is happening for too many young people in this country who are vulnerable. But let's make no mistake. This happens in every single community in this country. I had the opportunity to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee last week, along with Senators MIKULSKI, COLLINS, and GILLIBRAND, regarding the importance of legislation to fight sex trafficking and ensure, most of all, that we understand that the victims of these horrific, horrific crimes need our support.

We need to ensure that we can get them back on their feet, help them get the support they need and make sure they can lead productive lives—and hold the traffickers accountable. Those who are participating in trafficking need to understand that we are going

to work together to ensure they are held fully accountable and the victims do not get blamed for these crimes.

The Judiciary Committee heard from experts who are dedicated to changing lives and helping victims. Their work is incredibly important. In my State of New Hampshire, the Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, which I had the privilege of working with as attorney general, has done some tremendous work in supporting victims and also in bringing attention to the trafficking in New Hampshire and across this country.

What we know is that sex trafficking is something that is devastating. This is something where we need to work with local, State, and Federal agencies, working together to prevent trafficking, to provide support for those who are vulnerable in the community and are often targeted, whether they are runaways or people who are homeless. But also there are people who come from communities where it is not the homeless who are targeted. Children and women and also boys are targeted for trafficking.

Last week I was encouraged to see that the Senate Judiciary Committee passed two bipartisan pieces of legislation of which I was honored to be a cosponsor: Senator CORNYN's Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act and Senator KLOBUCHAR's Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. I am pleased to be a cosponsor. I cannot wait for these bills to come to the floor. I hope our leadership makes this a priority because this is such a strong bipartisan issue.

Also last week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed Senator CORKER's End Modern Slavery Initiative Act, which aims to eliminate modern slavery throughout the world. It is totally unacceptable in this day and age that people are trafficked the way they are. But to mention it again, modern slavery is being used to support terrorism. It is being used to endanger the world as well. So we have to work to end it.

I also recently helped reintroduce the bipartisan Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, which helps prevent sex trafficking. This has been a very useful program in the State of New Hampshire. I see my colleague here from North Dakota. I know she shares with me—having been an attorney general of her State—that we understand that these are horrible crimes that happen in every single community, from my home State of New Hampshire to her home State of North Dakota. We are going to work together to make sure that we can end human trafficking, that we can hold those accountable who are traffickers, and, most of all, that we can support the victims of these horrible crimes.

So with that I would like to turn the floor over for the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from New Hampshire. I think as we begin to have this broader discussion and as we begin to explore the kind of path for other projects such as this one—whether it is domestic violence, whether it is sexual assault and changing outcomes—we know the first obstacle is awareness.

The first thing we need to do is to take these horrible issues, these dark blotches in our society out of the shadows and put them into the light and develop a plan and a strategy that will not only deal appropriately with the law enforcement component of prosecuting and finding appropriate penalties for people who engage in modern day slavery, but also it is important that we look to prevention.

So I want to first take this opportunity to thank the senior Senator from Maryland, BARBARA MIKULSKI, for not only bringing together several of the Senate women today who are coming to the floor to call for action, to stop the scourge of human trafficking but also for her long-term commitment to women and children and society's most vulnerable.

I think we all know that Senator MIKULSKI has stood tall, which for a woman of her stature is always a little tough. She has stood tall for those who have no voice in society and for those who are engaged in some of the most horrible victimizations that we can imagine, which today is the victimization of sexual human trafficking. So as the Senator from New Hampshire has talked about and as a former attorney general of North Dakota, I think I know how difficult it is to shine a light on a problem that most people do not recognize or are, unfortunately, unwilling to admit is a problem.

When we began in the 1990s to talk about a different strategy to combat violence against women and domestic violence, which was an issue that had lurked in the shadows. In fact, for many States that was an issue that was considered a public health issue, not a criminal justice issue. I, along with a number of my women colleagues who were elected attorneys general, along with this body, and most noticeably now, Vice President JOE BIDEN, began to have an ongoing discussion about the Violence Against Women Act and what we needed to do not only to protect victims but to change the dynamic.

I think that as we began to take that problem out of the shadows, as we began to address the concerns of so many women who for years—literally years—had been victimized in their home, in a place that should be the safest place for human beings, we were able to build awareness and change outcomes. There is still a lot of work to do in domestic violence. But we be-

lieve that great strides were made simply because we were willing to point the finger and shine the light and say that this is not acceptable in our society.

I see a lot of similarities in this fight that we are waging today against human trafficking. With the right strategy, the right partners, the right policies and persistence, we are going to turn the tide on human trafficking.

While there continues to be much time and attention focused on intervention and recovery—I think that is rightfully so—and on criminal prosecution, I would like to take my time today to talk about preventing human trafficking in the first place. As the Senator from the State of New Hampshire discussed, the bills that are addressing this—the homeless youth bill—are absolutely critical to being a point of intervention, to prevent children from being on the streets, from being extremely vulnerable to victimization, from being extremely vulnerable to traffickers, and by helping those children off the street, by beginning to address the issues in their home that led them to flee in the first place. I think that is a very important first step to preventing human trafficking and human sex trafficking among minors.

I also think it is important that we learn from the experiences of other places.

Last year I traveled to Mexico City with Senator KLOBUCHAR, who, as we know, has been a fierce advocate and a wonderful partner on this issue, beginning not only with her work in the Senate but her work as the Hennepin County attorney.

I also traveled there with Cindy McCain. I think we would be remiss if we did not raise her voice and her name in this body today. She has been a global leader and a tireless leader, working not only in her State of Arizona but all across the globe. She has stood up to people who say this is not a problem. She has stood up to people who would just as soon sweep this under the rug and forget it is happening. She has been a leader and a champion of not only the people in her State and the women and children of this country but the women and children of the world. I am proud of our association, and I am proud of our friendship and the work we have been able to do together.

When we went to Mexico, we heard from countless government officials and NGOs about the difficulties they face stopping this unspeakable crime.

What I was particularly struck by were the stories of women and children coerced into this life—not forcefully, not being grabbed off the street against their will, but forced and coerced through promises of a better life, promises of someone to love and care for them. Unfortunately, for many of these

young girls, these promises are short-lived because these girls and women are quickly pushed into a world of physical abuse, drug use, and forced sex with hundreds, if not thousands of men. What was once a promise of a better life is a nightmare relived countless times a day as these victims are sold time and time again, their value now strictly as a commodity to be constantly traded over and over again. Imagine the horror of their lives. Imagine the horror of their existence.

How do we prevent this from happening? We must make sure to work with survivors. We must ask survivors to go to communities, to go to vulnerable populations, and tell their stories. The women and children who are most vulnerable and most susceptible need to hear firsthand the tactics used and, most importantly, the reality of following these false promises.

Shortly after returning from Mexico City, I met with Madai Morales Albino from Mexico. She is an amazing survivor of human trafficking. She was sexually exploited for 2 years, and she successfully escaped while being transported from Mexico to New York City. She is now an activist, and she talks about her experience and helps to teach and prevent this crime among the youth. She has become a role model for the younger girls at the shelter where she was cared for in Mexico. She attends national and international forums and workshops as a speaker to talk about her experience and the horror of human trafficking. She is currently studying to become a lawyer so she can continue to help girls who are now trapped in human trafficking.

The strength and courage of this young woman is awe-inspiring, and she is changing outcomes. We need more people like her in the world. We need more of her courage in the world, the courage to tell a story and then the courage to reach out and relive that horror through telling a story every day, the horror that was her existence.

We must also bring hope to the hopeless and love to those who do not feel loved. We can do this through increased educational opportunities, increased job opportunities, providing the necessary social services infrastructure, and working to build a safer, stronger community overall for women and children around the world.

Most importantly, what we should not bring to this is judgment; instead, bring a helping hand, bring an opportunity for a new life. Whether we are talking about the streets of Mexico City, Baltimore, or Indian Country in North Dakota, we can and we must do better. We can start taking action immediately in the Senate. We can directly impact efforts to prevent human trafficking in the United States by providing the resources necessary to work with some of our most vulnerable and most susceptible—our runaway and homeless youth.

I urge the majority leader to bring forward S. 262, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, a bill championed by my great friend Senator LEAHY. We all recognize that homeless youth are some of if not the most vulnerable and susceptible to trafficking. This is certainly true in North Dakota. It is certainly true in Mexico City. I am certain it is true in every community where runaway and homeless youth exist. This bill would provide much needed resources to this population and would complement other antitrafficking legislation being addressed in the Senate that addresses prevention, intervention, and recovery services to victims.

I also call on the majority leader to act by urging him to also bring S. 166, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, and S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, to the floor for a vote. I have worked tirelessly to push both of those bills since the last Congress. The Judiciary Committee reported two bills out of committee last week with unanimous support, and it is time to bring those bills to the floor for a vote. I believe all three bills should be part of a comprehensive approach to preventing trafficking and supporting victims.

We must do everything we can in our power to stamp out human sex trafficking in our backyard, across the country, and across the world.

With that, I yield the floor to my great friend from the great State of New York, Senator GILLIBRAND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I also rise to speak about human trafficking, and I associate myself with the comments of Senator HEITKAMP.

Human trafficking is a form of modern-day slavery that is alive, active, and must be stopped. Many of the stories we hear from traffic survivors sound more like plots in a horror movie than real life in the United States of America, but these stories are not fiction. Over and over we hear stories about young Americans forced into captivity, about young Americans forced into sexual exploitation, about young Americans who have no freedom to say no to a violent pimp but are still tagged with prostitution charges before they even turn 18. Human trafficking is a crime that rips families apart, breaks down the trust in our communities, and shatters young American lives.

It is long overdue for Congress to pay close attention to this issue, and I commend my fellow female Senators for bringing this issue so boldly to the floor of the Senate.

Today I will talk about what Senator HEITKAMP talked about—the vulnerabilities that led to these young boys and girls becoming trafficked and how vulnerable they remain even after they have managed to escape from their pimps and their captivity.

In small towns and big cities, thousands of Americans are trafficked each year. Every single institution these boys and girls ever relied on simply failed them, failed to protect them. Their families failed to protect them. Their schools failed to protect them. The foster system they were given to failed to protect them. Our laws are failing to protect them.

Last month alone, in Rochester, NY, the U.S. attorney announced the arrest of seven people on trafficking charges. Their victims were as young as 14 years old. The U.S. attorney said: “The victims in many cases were singled out because they were identified as being vulnerable.”

We have the responsibility in Congress to end these crimes against the most vulnerable among us. We should pass Senator LEAHY’s Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, which would provide real help to runaway youth, who are especially vulnerable to this exploitation. We should support Senator KLOBUCHAR’s Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, which would stop the prosecution of minors who have engaged in commercial sex acts. We should pass Senator CORNYN’s Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which would support programs for survivors of human trafficking and child pornography and ensure that the johns who are buying trafficking victims are actually prosecuted in Federal court.

We need a law that would vacate the criminal convictions of trafficking victims because these girls and boys are not criminals; they are not prostitutes; they are victims who deserve a chance to lead a fulfilling life. I will be introducing an amendment to Senator KLOBUCHAR’s bill that would vacate the criminal convictions of trafficked victims who were forced to break the law while they were trafficked. No victim of human trafficking should have to go through life—even after gaining their freedom from their trafficker—with prostitution charges on their record. We have an obligation to protect the most vulnerable Americans, and this vacatur amendment would help us do just that.

I know that if Congress does its job and does everything it can to help victims of human trafficking, thousands of young women and men in this country will have a chance to live a fulfilling life.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, today is a make-or-break day for millions of Americans who are better off because of the Affordable Care Act. As we speak, the Supreme Court is hearing oral arguments on a case known as *King v. Burwell* to decide whether Americans have access to health insurance subsidies through their State exchanges or whether opponents of the law—the very same people who continued to push for over 40 votes in the House of Representatives to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act, the same people who shut down this government last year because of their obsession with repealing the law—will win out with a paper-thin legal argument. It would not only be a devastating blow to millions of Americans who are currently receiving subsidies for their insurance, but it would destroy the individual health insurance markets in those States and would represent an incredible power grab by the Supreme Court that would undercut the impartiality of that Court.

At the heart of this case is the Affordable Care Act, both the text and congressional intent. The question is, Did Congress intend to allow all Americans to benefit from affordable quality coverage across this country, whether they are in a State exchange or a Federal exchange?

To answer that question, you don't have to leaf through many pages of the Affordable Care Act; you can stop at the very first title, which is on the very first page. The first section reads: "Title I. Quality, Affordable Health Care for All Americans." All Americans—not some Americans who live in a State that set up an insurance exchange like AccessHealthCT, but all Americans.

Before I go into a little bit of detail on this case, I wish to speak about this little boy. His name is Devin, and I was fortunate to meet with him just this last week. He is 8 years old. This picture is from maybe 1 or 2 years ago during one of his first trips to Washington. He lives with his parents and younger sister in western Connecticut.

Devin is one of about 20,000 people with hemophilia in this country. To stay healthy and to support his active life, which includes baseball, karate, and snowboarding, Devin has to take an injection every other day. The injections cost about \$4,000 per dose, about \$50,000 per month. Despite the challenges his disease presents, Devin was all smiles when we talked about what he liked to do, about school, and about how much you need to walk when you come to the Capitol to lobby, as Devin has the past couple of years.

The benefits of the Affordable Care Act are very clear for Devin and his family. His family will never have to

worry about annual or lifetime limits on his health care. He won't have to worry, nor will his parents have to worry about him being denied insurance over the course of his life just because of his condition.

It isn't hyperbole to say that an adverse decision by the Court would be life-threatening for Americans like Devin who rely on these new insurance protections.

Obviously, Devin and his family aren't the only ones to benefit from this law. Just last week HHS released the final report on enrollment and showed that 8.84 million people have signed up for coverage in healthcare.gov States—Federal exchange States. An additional 2.8 million signed up through State-based marketplaces, such as in Connecticut, for a total of 11.6 million people who have private health care insurance because of the Affordable Care Act and its subsidies which are being spread across the country. By the way, add another 10 million people who are on Medicare because of the Affordable Care Act and we see why the uninsurance rate in this country is spiraling downward.

The tax credits the law provided for people making less than 400 percent of poverty are critical to the success of this law because they make coverage affordable. According to an HHS report from earlier this month, nearly 8 in 10 consumers are getting coverage for \$100 or less after these tax credits.

In my home State, we had a goal to enroll 70,000 new individuals through private insurance and Medicaid, and we hit over 200,000. But the good news doesn't stop there. According to a new report since the ACA was passed, 9.4 million people with Medicare saved \$15 billion on prescription drugs, an average of about \$1,600 per beneficiary. For preventive care, there are 39 million people with Medicare and Medicare Advantage who took advantage of at least one preventive service with no cost sharing in 2014. That is why the *Times*, *USA TODAY*, the *Washington Post*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and *Politico* are saying the simple message that now, more than ever, Americans understand the Affordable Care Act is working.

Yet despite the fact it is working, opponents of the law are continuing to try to tear it down. So let us be clear about what a negative decision from the Supreme Court would mean. It would mean that anywhere from 8 to 10 million Americans would lose their health care coverage and another 5 million children could lose their coverage as well.

Subsidies are important because the law envisions three interlocking sets of provisions: insurance protections to fix the abuses within our old system, the individual coverage provision to ensure we have a viable risk pool inside insurance, and, finally, tax credits to help

people purchase insurance. Subsidies are the glue that holds all of that together.

That is why a victory for the plaintiffs would be devastating for everyone, not just those who receive subsidies in healthcare.gov. The individual markets in these States would fall into a death spiral if this law was overturned. If subsidies disappear, then people can't buy coverage. If they can't buy coverage, then the law says the individual mandate in those States has to disappear. If the individual mandate disappears, then healthy people don't buy coverage and the insurance protections, such as the ban on discrimination against people with preexisting conditions, simply cannot work. The insurance reforms either vanish or rates spike to catastrophic levels for people who decide to get coverage.

Don't take my word for it. The American Hospital Association warns that "many more people will get sick, go bankrupt or die"—or die—if the Court finds for the challengers. The health insurance industry says taking away the tax credits would "create severely dysfunctional insurance markets" in nearly three dozen States.

Frankly, we don't even need to talk about the detrimental effects in these States because this is about congressional intent, and the intent is clear. Sometimes when we try to figure out intent we have trouble because the people who wrote the law aren't here any longer or they have passed away. Well, there are hundreds of people who voted for this law who are still in Congress. All we have to do is ask them. There is not a single person who voted for this law who will tell us they wrote the law in a way that would result in the denial of subsidies to people who are getting health care through the State exchanges.

The plaintiffs say this is a carrot-and-stick approach; that the intention was to deny subsidies to people in States that didn't set up their own exchange as a way to force them to set up their own exchange. Well, there is not a single Member of Congress who voted for the law who says that is how it was designed.

Frankly, we don't even need to get to intent. We don't even need to survey all the people who voted for it. We just have to look at the law itself. The plaintiffs focus on one line that says that subsidies shall go to State exchanges, but they ignore another line in the law that says if States don't establish their own exchange, then the Federal exchange becomes the State exchange. That is just as plainly written as the one line that is the foundation of the case.

But the entire structure of the law relies on States that don't set up their own exchanges getting Federal subsidies. Why would we even set up a Federal exchange if there weren't going



to be subsidies associated with it? There would be no customers in the exchange if the intent of the law was to deny subsidies to people who bought into Federal exchanges. We wouldn't even have a Federal exchange.

Second, we would have established the insurance protections in a fundamentally different way. We would have said insurance protections apply to States that set up State exchanges and they do not apply to States that don't establish State exchanges, because again, as I said before, without those subsidies, the insurance protections simply don't work from an actuarial basis.

But that is not how the Affordable Care Act is written. The act says the insurance protections apply nationally, regardless of whether it is a State or Federal exchange. Why is that? Because subsidies were going to flow to a State no matter what kind of exchange they established.

Lastly, when Congress has historically engaged in this kind of carrot-and-stick endeavor with States, we make it totally transparent. We lay out in the statute here is what we expect you to do, and if you don't do it, here are the consequences. We don't hide the consequences to be derived at through a Supreme Court case, as is the stated belief of the petitioners in this case.

Lastly, the plaintiffs say: Well, don't worry about it. If the Supreme Court overturns this, we will just fix it. Congress can just come back and fix that line. Well, Congress isn't fixing anything these days. We can't even keep the Department of Homeland Security open and operating. Republicans have had 6 years to provide an alternative to the Affordable Care Act. We haven't seen anything more than a memo or a press release. If the subsidies disappear, they are not coming back. Congress is not fixing this problem, and 10 million Americans will lose their coverage.

I want to finish by talking about one more story, and this is the story of a woman who lives in Westport, CT. She works as a massage therapist, but since she is self-employed she was uninsured and couldn't provide insurance for herself. Last year, when the Affordable Care Act was implemented, she found out she qualified for coverage in Connecticut and that coverage finally gave her the opportunity to see a doctor. She wrote the President and said:

The cancer has been detected at a very early stage, which, with a 98 percent survival rate, has saved my life. Moreover, the cost of this screening and minor procedure will be far less than the cost of treating a more developed cancer. Thank you, Mr. President, for assuring the passage of this critical legislation. You have profoundly improved the quality of my life.

The facts are clear. The Affordable Care Act is working. The intent of Congress is clear: to provide subsidies to

all Americans, no matter their ZIP Code. The language of the bill is clear. That leaves us with one conclusion. If the Supreme Court overturns this portion of the law, it will be a plain and simple political power play. It will usher in a new era in which the Supreme Court becomes just another legislative body. They will be calling the authors of this bill liars and replacing the authors' stated intent with their own political judgment.

For the sake of Devin and Ann and millions of others who would benefit from the Affordable Care Act and for the sake of American democracy, I hope they uphold the law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I first wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that this Senator agrees with him. It should never come down to this. The whole purpose of that section of the Affordable Care Act is in fact to provide insurance to as many people as we can, especially the 40 million people who for years and years have been going without insurance, and it is doing a pretty good job.

In the second year of expanding the State exchanges or the Federal exchange, as the Senator has described, lo and behold, of the 8 to 9 million nationwide, over 1 million of those 8 to 9 million are in my State of Florida. So I thank the Senator for his courage, his insight, and his clarity and his statement.

#### IRAN'S NUCLEAR PROGRAM

Mr. President, I want to talk about S. 615. It is legislation filed last Friday, and this Senator was 1 of 11 Senators who filed it originally. There were five Republicans and six Democrats, and it was filed by the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

This is legislation giving Congress a say with regard to a potential agreement that would be enacted in the negotiations between the United States, which includes the P5 plus Iran—over preventing Iran from having a nuclear weapon.

This Senator was assured by the Republican sponsors of this bill that the bill would not come up until after the negotiations had concluded on March 24. Obviously, this Senator would not have sponsored legislation that would try to predetermine or nix the negotiations before they had a chance to succeed.

Yesterday or the day before the majority leader filed a rule XIV to bring the process directly to the floor. It is my understanding he is intending to go to that legislation next week, but that still is almost 2 weeks before the negotiations are to conclude.

I want the negotiations to be successful. It is very important to the national security of the United States

that Iran not have a nuclear weapon. That is obvious to the national security of Israel as well. Yet we are about to take up legislation that would start talking about the lifting of sanctions before an agreement has even been reached.

Well, this Senator is not going to have any part of that. Therefore, if this legislation is brought up before the negotiations conclude on March 24, this Senator will not support the efforts to proceed to the consideration of the legislation in the Senate.

It is one thing to enter into these matters of considerable national security and try to disrupt them, it is another thing looking at the consequences if these negotiations don't succeed and we can stop Iran from having a nuclear weapon, that one alternative, a very serious alternative, is war, but it is another thing to make representations to a Senator that are not fulfilled, and this Senator doesn't like it one bit.

I conclude by saying there has been a lot of commentary about the Prime Minister's speech yesterday. This Senator feels like where the Prime Minister was arguing against negotiations that are ongoing before the negotiations are concluded—I don't think that is in the interest of the United States. I don't like that one bit.

This Senator also feels that when a foreign leader comes in front of the Congress—the representatives of the American people—for what to this Senator is obvious political advantage in an election that is to take place in just 2 weeks, I don't think that is right either.

This Senator is one of the strongest supporters of Israel, and this Senator has had the privilege not only of the perspective of Armed Services but also my past service for 6 years on the Intelligence Committee.

I have visited with all of the intelligence apparatus of Israel, and it has been a seamless effort in trying to protect the interests of the United States and Israel with our intelligence apparatus. When partisan politics is injected into this, it is not good, and it is not good for the relationship.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, sadly, today the Republicans are again coming to the Senate floor—not to help the working people who work every day to make our country great—but to silence their voices.

They aren't here to reward the hard-working families that work from paycheck to paycheck just to give their children a better life and the education that they deserve. They aren't here to pass a highway bill that would support millions of jobs.

Instead, they want to hold the highway bill hostage to big polluting Canadian special interests and build the Keystone pipeline which will only create 35 permanent jobs.



They aren't here to raise the minimum wage. They aren't here to expand the child care tax credit. They aren't here to ensure equal pay for equal work. They aren't here to try to make college more affordable for middle-class families. They aren't here to help workers get health care—we know that because right now Republicans are suing to take away health care from more than 8 million Americans.

They certainly aren't here to fix our Nation's broken immigration system. If Republicans were interested in that, they would be supporting the reasonable, commonsense immigration measures proposed by President Obama that will result in indisputable economic gains for our country—raising the Nation's GDP by up to \$90 billion over the next 10 years.

No, the majority in the House and Senate don't have time for any of these measures to help working families—they are too busy pursuing their latest attack on the middle class.

I oppose this resolution because it would impede one of the basic rights of America's workers: to form a union.

If enacted, this resolution would prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from implementing rules to streamline and modernize union election procedures that will ensure union elections are conducted in a more fair and efficient manner.

These employees who work so hard deserve a union elections process that is free from unnecessary delays and wasteful stall tactics.

Let me tell you a little bit about those tactics. This comes from the testimony of someone who represents unions in California.

In 2010 a petition for representation was filed for approximately 45 automobile mechanics. Even though there were well-established NLRB rules that governed the proceedings on a petition for a unit of automobile mechanics, management asked for hearings, extensions, filed objection after objection, until finally, 427 days after the petition was filed, the union was certified.

Corporations are getting the benefits of increased profits and productivity. Why should they be allowed to stall these proceedings? Why do they oppose giving these workers a voice so that they can improve their working conditions and wages?

First, let me tell you what these rules do not do: They do not mandate timetables for elections to occur. Rather, the new rules simply eliminate existing barriers that get in the way of providing both employees and employers with access to a fair election process.

These rules do not prevent employers from discussing their views on unions with workers. What these modest changes will accomplish: The new rules, which will go into effect on April 14, will reduce unnecessary litigation

on issues that are not relevant to the outcome of the election. The new rules will modernize the current outdated process. In the past, employers had to send out mail through the post office, which cost time and money. The new rule will allow employers and unions to file forms electronically. It will also allow the use of more modern forms of communication to employees through cell phones and email.

Instead of standing up for workers across the country who are struggling with stagnant wages, Republicans have chosen to challenge these commonsense reforms.

The right to form a union is a right guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act and by the First Amendment of our Constitution.

These modest changes will merely allow workers to exercise that right in a fair and efficient process in order to protect their rights, increase wages, and grow our Nation's middle class.

What is so sad is that this is just the latest attack on the middle class and their economic security. Instead of taking up more floor time going after the rights of workers, let's fight to help working families. Instead of trying to undo measures that help the middle class, let's fight to do more for them.

At a time when wages are stagnating, instead of trying to silence the voices of hard-working men and women, let's fight to empower them through collective bargaining.

I urge my colleagues to support modernization and oppose this resolution. Let's let our workers know that we hear them, that we support them, and that we will fight to make life better for our middle class families.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the NLRB's current election process has some glaring problems, contrary to what some of my Republican colleagues have claimed.

For one, the process is inefficient. In many cases across the United States, frivolous litigation and needless delays threaten the rights of workers who want to vote on union representation. Federal appellate courts have called union election delays "inexcusable," "deplorable," and "egregious." The new reforms specifically target those systemic inefficiencies and excessive delays.

Secondly, the current system is outdated. Right now, the NLRB, employers, and unions are barred from filing forms electronically during the election process. And it does not allow for the use of modern forms of communication to employees through cell phones and emails. The updates will adapt the election procedures to few forms of technology.

Another problem is the current system is unpredictable. Right now, the election process for one region of the country could be substantially dif-

ferent in another region. That adds to inefficiencies and confusion. The new reforms will provide uniformity and certainty in elections across the country.

There is a clear problem here. The NLRB made modest, but important, changes to modernize and streamline the process.

Mr. President, today, we have heard a lot about the National Labor Relations Board. We have heard about employers delaying workers their right to decide on union representation. We have heard about current election process that is outdated and inefficient. But, really, this debate is about what kind of economy we envision for our country.

I believe that real, long-term economic growth is built from the middle out, not the top down. Our government has a role to play in investing in working families, making sure they have the opportunity to work hard and succeed and offering a hand to those who want to climb the economic ladder and provide a better life for themselves and their families.

Our government and our economy should be working for all families, not only the wealthiest few. Thankfully, we have had the opportunity to put some policies into place over the past few years that have pulled our economy back from the brink and have started moving it in the right direction.

But we have a whole lot more to do. Over the past few decades, for most workers wages have stayed flat or have fallen over the past five decades. That means that across our country today, too many families are struggling to make ends meet on rock-bottom wages and poor working conditions on the job.

While the middle class's share of America's prosperity is at an all-time low, the biggest corporations have posted record profits. In Congress, we should be working on ways to build an economy that works for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

Unfortunately, once again, instead of sticking up for workers, my Republican colleagues are rushing to the defense of the biggest corporations that have an interest in keeping wages low and denying workers a voice to improve their workplace.

Workers have the right to decide whether they want union representation. To ensure they are able to exercise that right, the National Labor Relations Board helps make sure workers have a free and fair up-or-down vote.

So the NLRB was absolutely right to carry out its mission to review and streamline its election process to bring down these barriers that prevent workers from getting a fair vote. After a rigorous review process, in December of last year the NLRB made reforms to their election process.

These updates will make modest, but important, changes to modernize and streamline the process. They will reduce unnecessary litigation on issues that won't affect the outcome of the election. The new reforms will bring the election process into the 21st century by letting employers and unions file forms electronically. They also will allow the use of more modern forms of communication to employees through cell phones and email. These reforms will simply standardize the election process across regions, which will help all sides know what to expect during the process.

But some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take great offense to these modest changes. Instead of standing for workers across the country who are struggling with stagnant wages and poor working conditions, Republicans have chosen to challenge these common sense reforms with a resolution of disapproval. Instead of talking about how to create jobs and help working families who are struggling with stagnant wages, Republicans would rather roll back workers' rights to gain a voice at the bargaining table. Let's be clear. This rule is about reducing unnecessary litigation. And using cell phones and email to transmit information in 2015 is just common sense.

By law, workers have the right to join a union so they can have a voice in the workplace. That is not an ambush. It is their right, as guaranteed by the National Labor Relations Act and by the First Amendment of our Constitution. So when workers want to vote on whether to form a union, they are not looking for special treatment. They are simply trying to exercise their basic rights. We as a nation should not turn our backs on empowering workers through collective bargaining, especially because that is the very thing that helped so many workers climb into the middle class.

In Congress, we need to continue to work to expand economic security for more families. That should be our mission to move our country forward. This resolution would simply be a step backward.

Instead of attacking workers who just want a voice in the workplace, I hope my colleagues will reject this resolution. I hope Republicans will join Democrats and work with us to protect workers' rights, increase wages, and grow our Nation's middle class.

I truly hope we can break through the gridlock and work together on policies that create jobs, expand economic security, and generate broad-based economic growth for workers and families—not just the wealthiest few.

Mr. NELSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield back all our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate having been expired, the joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

#### YEAS—53

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

#### NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Booker	King	Sanders
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Schumer
Cantwell	Manchin	Shaheen
Cardin	Markey	Stabenow
Carper	McCaskill	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Cooms	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Heinrich	Nelson	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Donnelly

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) was passed, as follows:

#### S.J. RES. 8

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to represen-*

tation case procedures (published at 79 Fed. Reg. 74308 (December 15, 2014)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the veto message on S. 1, the cloture motion be withdrawn, and at 2:30 p.m. today the Senate vote on the question of overriding the President's veto of S. 1, the Keystone bill, with the time equally divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Is there any way the time could be changed from 2:30 p.m. to 2:20 p.m., otherwise there are four people who may miss their planes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. The request is that the vote occur when?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 2:20 p.m. instead of 2:30 p.m.

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the vote on the veto override will occur at 2:20 p.m. Senators should be in the Chamber and prepared to vote from their seats. This will be the last rollcall vote of the week.

#### KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE APPROVAL ACT—VETO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the veto message on S. 1, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S. 1, a bill to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:20 p.m. will be equally divided.

Who yields time?

If no one yields time, the time will be divided equally.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on the veto message to accompany S. 1.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if we could have order in the Senate, I wish to open debate on S. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Senator CANTWELL will be co-managing this bill, and I thank her very much for her strong leadership.

The vote that is going to occur at 2:20 p.m. is a very important vote.

I rise today to oppose the attempt to override President Obama's veto message of S. 1, the very first bill the Senate majority brought to the floor.

As I look at this bill, it says to me that the only people who are helped by this bill are the big Canadian special oil interests.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, the Keystone Pipeline is presented as something that is going really to help this economy and help oil prices. I think the only thing it helps, frankly, are the special interests in Canada—the special big oil interests—which, by the way, will carry the filthiest, dirtiest, tar sands oil into our great Nation.

If we look at the history of the tar sands, we will find that misery follows the tar sands. We still have terrible problems in Michigan and Arkansas because there was a spill of this dirty, filthy oil, and they cannot clean it up because it is so, so difficult to clean.

This is a picture of a tar sands spill in 2013 in Mayflower, AR. That has not been cleaned up because this is tar sands oil. We had a spill in Michigan, and we know that since 2011 they have not been able to clean up that spill. So why would we build a pipeline to bring dirty, filthy oil into our great Nation and our great communities when we know the dangers?

Mr. President, I ask again that there be order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I know Senators have an opportunity to talk to one another, and I appreciate that, but it is hard to make our thoughts come out right when there is so much talking in the Senate.

I thank the Presiding Officer very much.

Here is the deal. Why on Earth would the Republicans make the first bill a bill to help Canadian special oil interests that will bring in tar sands oil and has caused terrible problems for our communities? It is the hardest oil to clean up. Why would they do it, and why would they go against public opinion?

A recent ABC News/Washington Post poll showed that 61 percent of Americans support the President's position on this pipeline, which is: Don't stop the process. Keep it going. Let's see what this does to our people and to our communities.

I spend a lot of time on environmental issues, and I am saying to you that as you look at the environmental laws of our great Nation, we find that

they brought such a better quality of life to people. We can turn that around if we decide at this point—there are all of the challenges we face in our communities, such as, the challenges of lung disease, the challenges of heart disease, and the challenges of stroke. That is what happens from the pollution we get from the tar sands oil.

Earlier I said that misery follows tar sands. I met with the Canadian people who live near the tar sands excavation site. They have terrible rates of cancer.

The bottom line is that because of climate change—and we see it all around us. Just the other day we learned a remote Alaskan village has to be relocated due to climate. We know the impact of this dirty tar sands oil on that, and we know what happens when the tar sands pipeline spills. We know all of these things.

I think the President is right by allowing the process to continue. He was very right to veto this bill, and I hope we will have enough votes to sustain his veto.

I yield the floor for my friend Senator CANTWELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues not to override the President's veto of this special-interest piece of legislation.

I wish to thank my colleague from California for her leadership on this issue and for her constant involvement in making sure that national environmental and safety standards are adhered to. She has been a great advocate throughout this process and I very much appreciate her voice as we close the debate about the Keystone Pipeline legislation.

This bill to approve the Keystone Pipeline undermines a well-established process for determining what is in the national interests. If we overrode the President's veto, we would be subverting safety and environmental standards that are important to the American people.

I am glad the President vetoed this legislation, and I urge my colleagues not to override the decision. I think the President's veto message said it best:

Through this bill, the United States Congress attempts to circumvent longstanding and proven processes for determining whether or not building and operating a cross-border pipeline serves the national interest.

... And because this act of Congress conflicts with established executive branch procedures and cuts short thorough consideration of issues that could bear on our national interest—including our security, safety, and environment—it has earned my veto.

So the President sums it up pretty much, I think. Why circumvent the process? The people who have been advocates for the pipeline have been circumventing the process all the way through. They circumvented the process by not going through the utility

commission in their State, the public utility commission, and instead wrote legislation around that. That legislation has been challenged in court. The rest of it has been an enormous process here in Washington, DC. While the company was negotiating with the State Department, it was also supporting efforts to circumvent that process at the State Department and just get a rubberstamp on their permit, saying "project approved." I think this project, as does every other project in the United States of America, should follow the rules.

While we spent the better part of January considering this legislation, there were other events that transpired. We heard a lot about the routing and that it was a settled matter. Since January, it is worth noting that Nebraska landowners have taken new steps to defend their rights as private property owners. On January 9, 2015, the Nebraska Supreme Court upheld a special carveout of TransCanada to site the Keystone XL Pipeline. They did this even though four judges who addressed the question said this carveout was unconstitutional.

After the setback, several landowners whose property would be seized along the proposed route filed a new suit and hopefully stopped the seizure of their land. Last month—just this past February—two Nebraska district courts have issued temporary injunctions enjoining TransCanada's effort to acquire rights of way to support the Keystone Pipeline by eminent domain. So at this moment here in the Senate, with the vote imminent, the pipeline's route through Nebraska is still in doubt because the new lawsuit challenges the Governor's ability to approve it.

It is also worth noting that South Dakota will hold a new hearing on the proposed route of the pipeline through their State in May. At this time we simply don't know whether South Dakota will make the same decision it did when it first approved the route 3 years ago. The situation in Nebraska and South Dakota makes it clear that even if this bill were to become law, the Keystone Pipeline will not get built any time soon.

I know my colleagues would like to rush the process, and they will talk about all of the various steps in the process where this project got delayed. But who said building a pipeline through the United States of America by a foreign interest should get "expedited approval" stamped on it from the very beginning? That is what they have done. They have circumvented what is the process in the State, which should have been through the utilities commission, and they have tried to circumvent the process here in the Senate.

So I hope we will not override the President's veto, but give the President of the United States the ability to still

consider these national interests of the environment and security.

We had a pretty robust debate here on the Senate floor, and many of the issues that would have been important my colleagues voted to say we shouldn't consider—environmental issues. So I get that on the other side of the aisle, there are people who want to give a pass-go, a speedy permit to this process. I urge my colleagues to not override the President, but allow him to do the homework that is needed on security, on the environment, and on making sure that due process is followed.

I ask my colleagues to not override the President's veto.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came here to speak on another topic, but let me interject in light of the comments from our colleagues from across the aisle on the Keystone XL Pipeline. Everybody says, on a bipartisan basis, We want job-creating legislation. We want to facilitate the creation of new jobs here in America. When it comes to voting, our friends across the aisle seem to be stuck on voting against job-creating legislation, because our State Department has estimated that as many as 42,000 jobs would be created by the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

The thing that mystifies me the most about this debate is at last count, we had roughly 2.5 million miles of pipelines crisscrossing America. I have come to the floor before and I have suggested that people might want to do a search on their laptop or on their tablet for oil and gas pipelines, and they will see a map of those pipelines, and it looks like a spaghetti bowl, because they are everywhere. Indeed, we also know this is the most efficient and the safest way to transport natural gas and crude as well.

So I remain mystified by the fact that the President and many in his party seem determined to try to kill what is clearly job-creating, energy-providing legislation that would be from a friendly source.

THE ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER'S SPEECH TO CONGRESS

Mr. President, turning to the Middle East, yesterday, as we all know, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu delivered what can only be characterized as a powerful and important message about the common threats to the national security of Israel and the United States. Again, only in Washington would a speech such as this be controversial. I think most people would be concerned enough about the subject matter of what he talked about that they would want to hear the insights and information he delivered in that speech. It was a powerful and important message, and really a call to arms for the United States and our allies in

Israel against the threat of radical Islam, particularly in the form of Iranian terrorism.

His words reminded me why—as I know many on both sides of the aisle agree—we have no closer Middle Eastern ally than Israel. Unfortunately, his speech also reinforced the belief I have held for many years that we have no bigger adversary in the Middle East than Iran.

The cold, hard truth is that today, more than ever, Iran is a terror-sponsoring theocracy that is actively pursuing a nuclear weapons capability and trying to establish an Iranian axis of power from Tehran to Damascus to Beirut to Gaza. Iran claims a right to enrich uranium for peaceful purposes, but its leaders have routinely lied and attempted to deceive inspectors in the past as a matter of standard practice.

Prime Minister Netanyahu also reminded all of us whose memories might have dimmed that over the last 30 years, Iran has engaged in a war by proxy against the United States and our allies. I was reminded by a member of my staff of an article that came out in 2011 in the *National Journal*. The heading of it is: "Record Number of U.S. Troops Killed by Iranian Weapons." It tells the tragic story that June of 2011 was the deadliest month in 2 years for U.S. troops, with 14 killed. These were primarily by Iranian-backed militias using very deadly weapons called explosively formed penetrators that could literally cut through the steel in our humvees and other armored vehicles like a hot knife through butter.

So given this track record that we were reminded of by the Prime Minister yesterday, and just the remainder that I have tried to provide here with this article, do we really believe that Iran would use its nuclear weapons in a way that would not make the world more unstable and less safe? Do we really believe that Iran, were they to get a nuclear weapon, won't give it to the same proxies that have been killing Americans and our allies in the Middle East and around the world, including the Shia militia, Hezbollah, Hamas, or the dictator in Syria, Bashar al-Assad, who has now killed roughly 200,000 of his own civilians in a civil war, and with almost 13 million people displaced not only internally, within Syria, but in neighboring countries and the like?

So as the P5+1 negotiations involving the United States continue, there remain serious questions about Iran's true nuclear intentions and about whether the deal the Obama administration is eagerly finalizing—whether it will cement Iran's status as a nuclear threshold nation. Based on some of the details we know so far, many of which are being held very close to the vest by the administration and not being made known to Congress, much less the American people, the Presi-

dent's deal would abandon long-standing U.S. policy of preventing a nuclear-armed Iran, period.

I remember when the former Secretary of Defense, Senator Hagel at the time—he became the Secretary of the Department of Defense—when asked about our policy toward Iran, stumbled a little bit in his answer but ultimately said that containment was not our policy. Our policy was to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. But it appears now that the deal that is being negotiated on the President's behalf by Secretary Kerry would abandon that longstanding U.S. policy of preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. Instead, it would opt for a feeble 10-year containment plan. Such an outcome would be both dangerous and unacceptable.

So while I was glad to hear Leader McConnell announce yesterday that the Senate will soon consider bipartisan legislation that would give Congress the authority to approve any agreement that is reached by the administration, that was quickly replaced by confusion when I read that some of my Democratic colleagues, who have shown great courage in urging that Congress have a role in approving any negotiated agreement between Tehran and the White House—now they are suggesting they might filibuster their own bill and the vote we are going to have at 5:30 on Monday.

Yesterday, for example, one of our colleagues who had been a key sponsor of this bipartisan legislation said that he was outraged—outraged—that the Senate would vote on the very bill that bears his name. He indicated his outrage with the Senate not for voting on the substance of the bill, but basically because of the timing. He thought the timing was wrong. In other words, he opposes voting on his own bill because of the Senate procedures and the process. I don't know how we explain that back home. I couldn't sell that to my constituents in Texas, saying, I am a sponsor of this legislation; I think it is important and the right thing to do, but I am going to vote against it because I disagree with the majority leader's timing, or the procedure by which the majority leader is bringing this to a vote and debate in the U.S. Senate. Good luck explaining that to our constituents.

I suspect who is also not concerned with the process are the Israeli Government and the millions of innocent civilians who stared down an Iranian regime bent upon their annihilation every day. I suspect they could care less about the process. What they want to do is to stop Iran from getting the bomb.

So I sincerely hope everyone here who has supported Israel and embraced a policy of blocking Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon will calm down and work together and consider this

important piece of legislation. Because as we heard yesterday, again, from Prime Minister Netanyahu, it has profound implications for both our national security as well as the security of our best ally in the Middle East.

Before the Obama administration initiated these misguided negotiations, Congress had created incredible economic pressure on the regime in Tehran through sanctions backed by the threat of military action. It also has helped, frankly, that America is now producing more oil, and the price of oil is now down around \$50 a barrel, more or less. That has put incredible financial pressure on Tehran itself, because they have basically had to finance their terrorist ambitions around the world through these various proxies by use of high oil prices. But we had imposed tremendous sanctions on Tehran, which, of course, the administration is now in the process of rolling back.

I believe an approach of tough sanctions is one we must return to as quickly as possible. The President and some of his friends have suggested it is either this deal or war. That is a false choice. That is not true. It is either this deal or tougher sanctions, sanctions designed along with the credible threat of military action if Tehran continues on its path to get a nuclear weapon that I believe will ultimately have the best chance of success and deter them from getting it.

The concept of good-faith negotiation, though, strikes me as a little implausible when you are dealing with the rogue regime and state-sponsored terrorism. We simply cannot trust the Iranian leadership with nuclear weapons. Yet, sadly, the President seems to be traveling down a path to secure what he views as a legacy foreign policy accomplishment when he should be implementing an Iran policy that would best safeguard America and our allies for years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, protecting the President's veto of the Keystone XL Pipeline Approval Act is about protecting the review process for this project. The President deserves to have all of the input from the different agencies delivered to him so he can make his decision.

Today in the vote that we will be having shortly, we are saying the President should be able to exercise his prerogative to review the pipeline and to decide whether it is in the national interest to have this pipeline constructed through the United States of America. But we are also protecting his prerogative to decide in the end, because this is a pipeline that should be rejected on its merits.

The pipeline fails the test on job creation. After it is built, it will only have

35 to 40 permanent jobs that the United States will have on its soil. Meanwhile, we should be having a debate about the wind production tax credit because if we extended that, we would keep 30,000 people working permanently here in the United States, as this wind revolution continues to explode. Last year, there were 5,000 megawatts of solar energy installed in the United States. That is like five huge powerplants. This year 7,500 megawatts, at least, of solar are going to be installed in the United States. And next year 10,000 megawatts, at least, in solar are going to be installed. But that tax break is expiring at the end of 2016. You would think there would be an urgency here on the floor of the Senate to debate the wind tax break and the solar tax break which will create upwards of 250,000 jobs in the United States.

We already have 175,000 people working in the solar industry, but there is no urgency to take up wind and solar. But a pipeline from Canada taking the dirtiest oil in the world, tar sands—tar. Think about that, tar. The tar has to be actually melted down so it can be put into a pipeline. It is tar, the dirtiest oil in the world, and then a pipeline like a straw through the United States of America, built right down to Port Arthur, TX.

What is so unique about Port Arthur, TX? I will tell you right now. It is a tax-free export zone, and so there is the plan for the Canadians—build a pipeline like a straw through the United States, right down to a tax-free export zone, and then get that oil out of the United States of America.

Why is that? I will tell you right now that the price for oil in the United States is now \$12 less than it is if you can get it out onto the global market. Per barrel, \$12 less. You don't have to go to Harvard Business School to get a degree to put that business plan on a 3-by-5 card. Get it out of the United States, and you will make \$12 a barrel more.

The advocates for the pipeline say that is not going to happen. That is why I made the amendment on the Senate floor. The oil will not be exported. If we are going to take all of the environmental risks, then we should receive the benefits of the oil being here in the United States.

Why is that important? It is important for this reason: We are—the United States is—the largest importer of oil in the world. China does not import as much oil as we do. We are the leader. You might see these ads on television where the American Petroleum Institute and other oil companies advertise that with regard to what a great job we are doing in producing more oil in the United States. And we are producing more oil in the United States. Let's take note of that. The truth is we are still 5 million barrels a day short. This pipeline will be moving

maybe 800,000 barrels of oil from Canada right through the United States, which could reduce our dependence upon imported oil, but it is going through a tax-free export zone. So we know what is going to happen.

Why is that important? It is important because we export young men and women in uniform every single day to the Middle East to protect the ships with oil coming into the United States that we import from Kuwait, from Saudi Arabia, from the other countries around the world. So why would we be exporting oil out of the United States while we are exporting young men and women in uniform out of America who then protect oil coming back in from countries in the Middle East? That makes no sense.

That is what this pipeline is all about. It is all about getting some benefit for the United States. Climate change, big loser. It is the dirtiest oil in the world. The Canadians actually escape paying the tax in the event that there is an oilspill. They don't have to pay into that fund, either, that American oil companies do. And then notwithstanding their ads on television that say they are going to keep the oil in the United States, they bitterly object to any provision being voted here that keeps it in the United States while they run ads on television saying North American energy independence, that is their greatest goal.

You can't have it both ways. Life is not like that. Either your ads are saying what your goal is, North American energy independence, or you are going to export it. But you can't have it both ways, do one thing on television and then another thing in real life and say to the Senate, please don't put any restrictions on our ability to export this oil. That is the challenge for us here.

By the way, one other thing. If we keep the oil here in the United States, that is going to keep a pressure to keep the price of gasoline lower, because the more oil we have here in the United States, the lower the price of gasoline. Every time there is a 1-penny reduction in the price of gasoline, it is \$1 billion that goes into the pocket of consumers in America. One penny equals a billion. So when the price of oil, gasoline, drops 10 cents, that is \$10 billion. When it drops \$1, that is \$100 billion. It is down by \$1. It is down by more than \$1 over where it was this time last year. That is a lot of money that goes as a stimulus into the pockets of Americans who can spend it on other things. But this oil is going out of the country, so the pressure it would keep to help our manufacturers, to help our drivers, is not going to exist. It fails on each one of these items: One, it gets exported. Two, they don't pay their full taxes, or any at all, to the Oilspill Liability Fund. We don't keep it here to keep the price lower for American drivers. I understand the Canadians want

to make the most money by getting out of the open market. That hurts you. That hurts us. That hurts our drivers. That is the challenge.

It fails each one of these tests. It fails on the climate change. It fails on the export test because it goes overseas. It fails on the tax issue. It fails on the process issue of trying to short-circuit the President's prerogative to be able to consider this in a comprehensive sense.

The President has correctly vetoed this bill. The President is standing up for the American taxpayer, for the American consumer, for the environment of the United States. He is asking the right questions. He is doing the right things.

I urge my colleagues here on the Senate floor, within the next hour, to vote to sustain the veto of President Obama on this policy which does not advance the best interests of the United States of America.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. I ask unanimous consent that all time within the quorum call be divided equally between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to speak about human sex trafficking—an issue that plagues the world and our Nation. Today I join my colleagues, Senators CORNYN, WYDEN, KLOBUCHAR, and KING, in supporting legislation to help fight this evil and to stop it from spreading. Sex trafficking is real. It is affecting millions of people around the world. We should not tolerate it, and we cannot turn a blind eye. This modern-day form of slavery has continued to grow in the shadows all around us. It is time to take action.

The scale of this problem is difficult to calculate; yet many estimates, including those from the United Nations and various human rights organizations, show that millions of human beings are being trafficked every year.

Meanwhile, the criminals who force these victims into slavery profit to the tune of \$32 billion annually.

Mr. President, 300,000 children right here in the United States are at risk of becoming victims of this vile practice. Teenagers are the primary targets. These kids are being sold into a life of physical and emotional abuse. Often they are runaways who flee violent households looking for a way out. Women and girls represent a disproportionate amount of those trafficked around the world, but this does affect all of us. The pain and suffering victims experience is hard to describe in words. Simply put, it is evil. We must do more to stop this plague, and our work begins by setting a clear example.

This Sunday we will commemorate International Women's Day. As we celebrate the progress women have made here in the United States and around the world, we must also use this moment to remind ourselves of the work that still needs to be done.

As I mentioned, Senator CORNYN and I, along with several of our colleagues, introduced a new bill to address this issue. This legislation would set up a deficit-neutral fund to support people abused by sex trafficking. Through enhanced reporting and mechanisms that would reduce demand, this bill can serve as the next step in providing care for victims of trafficking and child pornography. Furthermore, Senator CORNYN's bill protects victims in courts by treating the traffickers as violent criminals. By labeling traffickers in this way, convicts can now be detained while they await their judicial proceeding. Funding for the bill comes from increased fines placed on those convicted of trafficking.

While nothing can erase the pain inflicted on these victims, we must do what we can to make a difference. I encourage all of my colleagues to join in this effort and stand against this vile practice.

A number of my colleagues have other bills as well. We should take the time to consider solutions that are offered by all of them. Our government has a responsibility to stand up and to act for those whose voices grow weak in the shadows of this imperfect world. This is our moment to do something. These victims do not have time to wait. We must act now.

I ask unanimous consent that all time spent in quorum calls before the 2:20 vote this afternoon be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today is the 150th anniversary of the second inaugural address of President Abraham Lincoln. Later on this evening there will be an observance in the Rotunda sponsored by the Illinois State Society and the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Foundation to observe this anniversary. My colleague Senator KIRK is scheduled to be there; former Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood; Stephen Lang; and some of the most distinguished Lincoln scholars in America: Dr. Edna Greene Medford, Chief Justice Frank Williams of Rhode Island, and the most prolific Lincoln writer I know, Harold Holzer from New York.

There have been 15,000 books written about Abraham Lincoln. I think Mr. Holzer has written about half of them. He is not only prolific, but he is profound in his observations about this great man's life. He was joined by Edith Holzer, his wife, who stood by him through his Lincoln travails.

Historians disagree on whether the second inaugural address of Abraham Lincoln was his greatest speech or his second greatest. I am in the latter camp. I accord that highest honor to the Gettysburg Address for its brevity as well as its inspiration, but both speeches are immortal.

I am not a Lincoln scholar, but my life as a Springfield attorney, elected Congressman, and Senator from Illinois has taken me to some of the same streets and same buildings that were part of Abraham Lincoln's life.

Although he tried mightily to be elected to the Senate in 1858, Abraham Lincoln fell short. It was in that campaign of 1858 that he debated Stephen Douglas. At the end of the debates and when the votes were cast, Stephen Douglas was the victor in that senatorial contest in Illinois. Of course, the same two men faced off again 2 years later for the Presidency. But that Senate seat, the Douglas seat that was contested in the 1858 election, is the same seat I am honored to hold today in the State of Illinois.

We can feel Abraham Lincoln's presence in this building, particularly near the Senate Chamber. There is a magnificent room off the Senate Chamber known as the President's Room. It is one of the historic rooms in the Capitol.

It was in this room in April of 1862 that President Lincoln signed the bill outlawing slavery in the District of Columbia. It was in this room in 1965 that Dr. Martin Luther King and other leaders watched Lyndon Baines Johnson

sign the Voting Rights Act, prohibiting discrimination at the polls—100 years after Lincoln's death. It was in the same room on January 20, 2009, that a newly inaugurated President Barack Obama signed his first official documents as President of the United States. And it was in this room that Abraham Lincoln worked long into the night before his second inauguration, signing and vetoing bills passed in the final hours of one Congress, before the next Congress was sworn in. Imagine that, Congress leaving important business until the last minute.

President Lincoln was working in the President's Room on March 3, 1865, when he received an urgent message from GEN Ulysses Grant. GEN Robert E. Lee was seeking a peace conference to negotiate an end to the war. Grant asked the President, his Commander in Chief: What should I reply?

After conferring with Secretary of War Stanton and Secretary of State Seward, Lincoln sent word back to General Grant that he was not to meet with Lee "unless it be for the capitulation of General Lee's army."

The following day, in his second inaugural address, March 4, 1865, Lincoln explained more fully why he had refused Lee's request for a negotiated settlement. He said: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

Less than 5 weeks later, General Lee surrendered unconditionally at Appomattox. The cannons would fall silent. After 4 years of horrific death and destruction, the worst war and the most costly war in the history of the United States was over. But the work was not.

President Lincoln told us in his second inaugural address the urgent challenge is not only to win the war, but to win the peace by achieving true reconciliation. Another President could certainly have been vindictive toward the South—that had been the practice of the day and it is what many people wanted in the North—but Lincoln understood that if America remained divided after the hostilities ceased, then the terrible sacrifices of war would have been in vain. So he counseled in that immortal inaugural address: "With malice toward none, charity for all." Let us bind up the wounds here, and not inflict new injuries. That was how the Union would be reunited and persevere.

Six weeks later after this speech, Abraham Lincoln was cut down by an assassin's bullet. He was, in fact, the last casualty of America's war within its own boundaries.

That address, that second inaugural address, remains the second shortest in the Nation's history, only 703 words. Lincoln spoke so briefly that many people were still arriving after he finished. As at Gettysburg, some listeners were mystified by the President's brev-

ity. Few understood the genius of the speech at that moment. Frederick Douglass was an exception. He said to Mr. Lincoln afterwards, "Mr. Lincoln, that was a sacred effort."

In the century and a half since his death, we have made uneven progress in achieving the kind of America Abraham Lincoln believed we could be. A full century passed before African Americans in the South were guaranteed the most basic right of citizenship, the right to vote.

If President Lincoln were here today, I think he would be happy to see how our Union has survived. I think he would be pleased and astonished to see that America had elected and reelected another lanky lawyer from Illinois, and an African American, to be our President.

I also think he would challenge us. When our government "of the people, by the people, for the people" is under threat from a cabal of secret, special interest money that can buy elections, I think President Lincoln would tell us we have unfinished work to do.

When we neglect to bind up the wounds of war of even one soldier returning from war, and neglect to care for widows and orphans, Lincoln would have reminded us that we have unfinished work to do.

And when the right to vote is under systematic attack in so many States for obvious political reasons, there is still work to do.

When Americans who work long and hard can't earn enough to provide for their families, I think Lincoln would tell us to put our shoulder to the plough and finish the work of creating a genuine opportunity for all Americans.

We can see in the second inaugural and in the Gettysburg Address one reason that Abraham Lincoln remains our greatest President. He shows us that America is capable of constant progress toward our professed creed. We can love our country and be determined to make it better.

#### TRIBUTE TO BILL BARTHOLOMAY

Mr. President, even by Chicago standards, this has been some winter. From Boston to Birmingham, AL, tens of millions of Americans have been clobbered this winter by record snowfalls. In fact, we are heading for the exits in Washington this afternoon with the threat of another winter storm.

That may be why so many of us are so happy this week is finally here and we can literally count the days until spring training of baseball begins. In cities throughout the Sun Belt, mighty Casey is smiling again. More than Punxsutawney Phil or the sighting of the first robin, spring training for many of us marks the unofficial arrival of spring.

Few people on Earth are happier about the start of the baseball season

than Bill Bartholomay, a man who has done so much for the cities of Chicago and Atlanta, for the sport of baseball, and for our Nation.

Bill Bartholomay has achieved more in his one life than many talented people in five. He is phenomenally successful as an entrepreneur, and he has built some of the most successful insurance brokerage firms in the world. Bill has owned a restaurant, a candy company, and a chain of toy stores.

He helped a friend and business partner by the name of Ted Turner transform CNN from an upstart news station to one of the most powerful news organizations in the world.

Bill Bartholomay is more than a successful businessman, he is a principled civic leader and a true philanthropist. On top of all that, he is chairman emeritus of the Atlanta Braves. He is a man who half a century ago, with support from leaders, including the father of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., brought Major League Baseball to America's Deep South. What a life.

In 1962, Bill Bartholomay and a group of investors bought the Milwaukee Braves. The Braves roster then included a lot of great legendary ballplayers. Among them was a young catcher with a rocket for an arm whose mother had to sign his first major league contract because he hadn't reached the age of 21. His name was Joe Torre. But the Braves greatest player then and ever was a man named Henry Aaron, "Hammerin' Hank."

In 1966, Bill Bartholomay and his partners moved the Braves from Milwaukee to Atlanta. Here is something that will do your heart good. Go to YouTube and watch the video of that magic night, April 8, 1974, when Hank Aaron broke Babe Ruth's record to become baseball's all-time home-run champ, a record he would hold for 33 years. For anyone under the age of 50, it may be impossible now to fully appreciate what that moment meant.

It was 6 years almost to the day after Dr. King's assassination. For more than a year, as Hank Aaron had closed in on Babe Ruth's fabled record of 714 home runs, he had been cheered by many, but also subjected to ugly racist threats and taunts. There were people who just seethed at the idea that Babe Ruth's immortal record would be broken by a Black baseball player.

Years later, Hank Aaron would acknowledge that the anger and the jeers wore on him. They worried Bill Bartholomay too.

So watch that clip on YouTube, April 8, 1974. It was the Braves home opener against the Los Angeles Dodgers. More than 53,000 fans were standing for that great moment—a record crowd.

It is the fourth inning. Henry "Hank" Aaron is up at bat. The count is 1 and 0. And then it happens: Aaron swings and smashes the ball over the center field fence.



The fans roar. Fireworks fill the sky over the stadium. As Aaron rounds the bases, the Dodgers infielders reach out to shake his hand.

He crosses homeplate, surrounded by teammates, his beaming wife, and parents. And standing right next to him was Bill Bartholomay.

It had been a dozen years since Bill and his partners had bought the Braves and 8 years since they moved to Atlanta. Part of their reason for moving the Braves to Atlanta was because Atlanta was working hard in the 1960s to become the leading city of the new South, a city that would move beyond the old legacy of Jim Crow to a new era.

Leaders, including Dr. King, believed that Major League Baseball could help to create that new Atlanta, and Bill Bartholomay and his partners wanted to be part of that dream. Eight years after he moved the team to Atlanta, there he stood with baseball's new home-run king, a man who had started his career in the old Negro League, who had just broken the most revered record in Major League Baseball and who would become a symbol of immense pride for Atlanta and all of America. That was one of the many great moments for the Braves under Bill Bartholomay.

Since he moved the team to Atlanta in 1966, Bill has witnessed the Braves winning 16 division championships, including a record-setting 14 in a row, 5 National League pennants. And in 1995 the Braves went all the way, winning the World Series.

Bill no longer owns the Braves, but he is still closely connected to the team and has served as the chairman emeritus since 2003. He is an active member of the MLB owners group.

Bill Bartholomay grew up in Illinois in a family where his father and grandfather had made good money in the insurance brokerage business. He was the second of two boys, and he grew up in Winnetka, IL, just outside of Chicago, in a big house. The Bartholomay family were friends with both the Wrigley family, who owned the Chicago Cubs, and the Comiskey family, who owned the White Sox.

As far back as he can remember, Bill loved baseball and so did his mom. They used to go to Cubs games together.

At North Shore Country Day School, his eighth grade phys ed instructor thought Bill loved baseball a little too much. He sent home a report card that said:

Billy is very cooperative in play activities. While his ability is not great, he makes up to a large degree by his enthusiasm and interest. My greatest concern with him is that he seems to borrow much of his ideas of conduct from professional baseball.

That teacher needn't have worried. The lessons of baseball have served Bill Bartholomay very well. They have in-

spired and shaped his entire amazing life.

One of Bill's favorite sayings is: "Start strong, finish strong and play all nine innings." Translation: Give it everything you have got—no half measures.

That attitude has enabled Bill to build or even help build a number of powerful insurance brokerage firms, along with other diverse businesses.

In 2003, he became vice chairman of Willis Group Holdings, one of the largest insurance brokers in the world. He increased their presence in Chicago to the point where they became the regional headquarters of what was formerly known as Sears Tower, now known as the Willis Tower. Today that office anchors Chicago's place as a first-rate place to operate a global company.

Bill is more than a businessman, more than a man of baseball; he is a civic leader as well. In the early 1980s, then-Chicago mayor, the late James Byrne, asked Bill to serve on the park commission, overseeing Chicago's 400 parks. Bill never said no to public service. So even though he had five teen-aged kids and a number of businesses, he said he would serve for 1 year. He ended up serving for 23 years, including many as commission chairman.

All told, three of Chicago's mayors recognized Bill's talents as a bridge builder in Chicago. He made sure the commission focused not only on the wealthy parts of the city but all of the city.

Bill created a charitable foundation and he has helped to make it work and helped millions of others. He is a generous man and he is generous in praise of others.

I wish to give a short story that I read when I was reading a book one day and stumbled on this little episode in Bill's life that really tells a story. It is a story about another baseball legend, a man by the name of Satchel Paige, who may have been the best baseball pitcher ever. He was an American treasure.

He was a star in the Negro Leagues during the Jim Crow era. He later became the first African-American pitcher in the American League and the first Negro League player elected to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

He played for an astonishing 250 teams in his 40-year career. He used to pitch year around, often on back-to-back days. He hurled exhibition games on his day off. He spent the winter months playing in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico.

In 1968 Satchel Paige was 62 years old, and despite all the time he had played in baseball, he hadn't played long enough to qualify for a pension. He fell 6 months short. So Satchel Paige sent a letter to every Major League Baseball team asking them if they would consider hiring him as a

coach, and if they would for 6 months, he would qualify for a pension.

Well, you can guess who replied. It was Bill Bartholomay. Bill Bartholomay, in a real true act of kindness, said: "Baseball would have been guilty of negligence should it not assure this legendary figure a place in the pension plan."

Bill made sure Satchel Paige got his pension. He hired him to be the Braves' pitcher-coach-trainer just long enough for him to meet his pension needs. In case there was any doubt about what he was doing, he assigned Satchel Paige the number 65, the age at which his retirement salary would kick in.

But there was another reason the Braves hired Satchel Paige. That summer—the summer of 1968—riots were raging and cities were burning across America in the wake of Dr. King's assassination. Bill Bartholomay believed that having a bridge builder such as Satchel Paige might help diffuse tensions in Atlanta, and he was right.

Satchel did that partly by signing autographs and spending time with fans and serving as a good will ambassador. Even though his title was trainer, what Satchel Paige really wanted to do, even at age 62, was pitch. The club didn't care for the idea. They were afraid his eyesight wasn't good enough and a line drive might knock him off the mound, but Satchel insisted. He said he could tell by the crack of the bat where the ball was headed.

In 1969, Satchel Paige pitched a couple of innings in an exhibition game for the Braves' highest level minor league team, the Triple-A Richmond team. So picture this: Satchel Paige on the mound beaming, and who steps up to the plate? Hank Aaron. The best pitcher in baseball history against the best hitter.

Strike one, strike two, and finally Hank Aaron swings hard, gets a piece of the ball and pops out to third. Old Satchel still had it.

In his 1966 Hall of Fame induction speech, Ted Williams urged the inclusion of Negro League players to the Hall of Fame. Satchel Paige was elected as the first Negro League player to be inducted.

Satchel Paige once said: "Ain't no man can avoid being born average, but there ain't no man got to be common."

Bill Bartholomay has led an uncommonly good life as a business leader, as a pioneer in baseball, as a civic leader, as a philanthropist, and as a man who sensed in his lifetime an opportunity to build bridges in America and make us a better nation through the game of baseball and through the integration of that sport. He served the cities of Chicago and Atlanta in an extraordinary way, but he served America as well. He proved his old phys ed instructor from grade school wrong by showing that the rules of baseball are pretty good rules for life after all.

On this day, as we start spring training and a new baseball season, I wish the very best to the very best—Bill Bartholomay.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to address the motion to override the President's veto of S. 1, which would force approval of the construction of the Keystone Pipeline to transport tar sands heavy oil from Canada to the gulf coast. We will be having that vote in just a while from now.

My key consideration today is this. What would the impact of this bill be on global warming? The reason that is the core question I am raising is that already we are seeing extensive damage to our rural resources around the world from our warming planet. We are seeing this in Oregon, and we are seeing, therefore, an impact on our future economic prospects.

To put it very simply, the burning of fossil fuels is damaging our forests, our farming, and our fishing. By many estimates, to contain 2 degrees Celsius, which is almost 4 degrees Fahrenheit, we must transition aggressively and rapidly from burning conventional fossil fuels for energy toward the use of nonfossil renewable energy.

Now, this shift is well within our power. It is well within our technology. But do we have the political will to make this happen? And that test is before us in the vote we are taking today.

Building the Keystone Pipeline opens the faucet to rapid exploitation of massive, new, unconventional reserves called tar sands, and it takes us in exactly the opposite direction from where we need to go. Indeed, the pipeline locks us into utilizing the dirtiest fossil fuels on the planet for a generation, and it accelerates human civilization down the road towards catastrophic climate change. Thus, building this pipeline is a mistake, and there is a lot to be concerned about.

Now, global warming isn't some imaginary scenario 50 years from now about some computer model predicting something bad will happen. No, it is about facts on the ground right now.

The warmest 10 years on record for global average surface temperature have occurred in the last 12 years. And 2014, the calendar year we just passed, was the single warmest year on record. While some Senators may come to this floor and say that it is just an anomaly here or an anomaly there, it is not. The facts are in. When we have 10 of the warmest years on record within the

last 12 years, we know something dramatically is happening to the globe.

The average forest fire season is getting longer. Since the 1980s the season has grown 60 to 80 days longer than it was before. That means that with each year passing the fire season is growing by an average of about 2 days, and the number of acres consumed annually by wildfires has doubled to more than 7 million acres. This is an enormous impact, and those fires themselves put additional carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. So we start to see a feedback mechanism that is accelerating us down this road to catastrophic change.

The snowpack is decreasing in our Oregon mountains, the Cascade Mountains, which means smaller and warmer streams, which are certainly not good for trout. But it also means less water for irrigation. We have right now virtually no snow in the Cascades. At this point we should have a substantial snowpack. So the possibility of yet another major drought faces us this coming summer.

We had the worst-ever drought in the Klamath Basin, a large agricultural basin in southern Oregon, in 2001. We had another devastating drought in 2010—a near worst-ever drought—and another devastating drought in 2013. And here we are this year, with virtually no snowpack to provide irrigation water during the summer. That is a very big deal.

It isn't just farming and forestry. It is also fishing. The carbon dioxide that we are pumping into the air is absorbed through wave action. It becomes carbonic acid. We can envision mankind pouring vast vats of carbonic acids into the ocean, because that is essentially the effect of what we are doing. If you think putting all that acid into the ocean wouldn't be a good idea and would have bad effects, you are right. The ocean has become 30 percent more acidic than it was before the industrial revolution—before we started burning coal and other fossil fuels as a major source of energy—and we can start to see the impact.

At the Whiskey Creek Shellfish Hatchery on the Oregon coast, we have a big problem. The big problem is that the baby oysters are having trouble pulling enough carbon out of the water in order to create their shells because the water is too acidic. That is a little bit like the canary in the coal mine. If the oysters are having trouble, what other shellfish are being affected by the increasing level of acidity?

As humans on our planet, we have the moral responsibility to exercise wise stewardship of our resources—a responsibility to this generation but a profound responsibility to the generations to come.

Now, our youth tend to have a better understanding of this than do the lawmakers who come to the floor of the Senate. Our youth widely rank global

warming as a major concern, a major issue they want to see us take on. They will face the challenges that we will leave behind. But here is the problem: If we wait to tackle global warming until—we have pages on the floor—our 15- and 16-year-old pages are in office, when they are in their forties and their fifties, then it will be almost impossible to address this issue because of the feedback loops that are occurring.

I was watching yesterday a time-lapsed series of ice in the Arctic, and I can tell you that essentially, as viewed from North America, there was a swirling mass of ice—and this was over several decades—and that swirling mass became less with every passing year, to where we are halfway to starting to be ice-free in the summer. That is a massive change happening within a single human lifetime which is but a blink in time when you think about the age and course of this planet.

So big changes are occurring, and when those changes occur, we do have additional problems arise. All of that open water in the Arctic absorbs more sunlight. That is what makes the water blue and it becomes warmer; whereas, the ice reflects the sunlight and keeps the water cooler. Therefore, we have a magnification of the effect of global warming at the poles. This is not a good thing.

So whether we are looking at the impact on our farming or the impact on our forests which are burning or the impact on our oceans and our fisheries which are becoming too acidic, we have a responsibility to address those issues. That means we are going to have to not burn all the fossil fuel that we have been clever enough to find in the crust of the Earth.

It is estimated that we would have to leave four-fifths of the fossil fuels we already have identified that are in the ground. We have to leave it in the ground rather than burn it if we are not going to exceed 2 degrees centigrade in global warming. That is a huge challenge.

That means we cannot proceed to build infrastructure designed to accelerate the extraction of these fossil fuels. The pipeline is exactly that kind of infrastructure.

Now, have no doubt, I love the idea of jobs and construction. That is why I am a huge supporter of the Partnership to Build America Act. The Partnership to Build America Act would create hundreds of thousands of construction jobs over the course of a number of years in America. That is the type of investment in jobs and construction and infrastructure we should make, but we shouldn't be investing infrastructure that is going to do profound damage to our planet. That does not honor the moral responsibility we have to the stewardship of this beautiful blue-green orb that we live on known as this planet Earth.

Let's honor our responsibility and let's not override the veto the President has put on this bill.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent for up to 30 minutes to engage in a colloquy on the Keystone Pipeline approval legislation which was vetoed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I am here to discuss the Keystone Pipeline approval legislation and the President's recent veto as well as our efforts today to override that veto.

I will be joined in the colloquy with my distinguished colleague from South Dakota. Also our colleague on the other side of the aisle from West Virginia will be joining us shortly, as well as the chairman of the energy committee, our colleague from Alaska. I want to make a couple points upfront and then turn to my colleague from South Dakota.

What I have here and have shown before on the Senate floor is the route the Keystone XL Pipeline would take from the oil sands in Hardisty, Alberta, coming down through Montana where we pick up domestic crude. Often people think of it as moving Canadian crude, but it also picks up domestic crude in the Bakken region. Our country likes sweet Bakken crude oil from Montana, and then it takes it on to refineries throughout the country. So that is the project we are talking about.

This chart shows the project itself, and it shows what is going to happen if we don't approve it. You have to understand, this has been going on now for over 6 years. The President has delayed this project for more than 6 years, but if we don't build the pipeline to move our domestic crude in the United States, then Canada will build pipelines to the west coast and that oil will go to China by tanker ship and be refined in China.

Again, we go through all these different discussions, but the reality is the oil will be produced. The question is, Do we want to have that oil here in our country or would we rather see it go to China?

Of course, if it goes to China, then not only does that affect our ability to use the oil in our country because we don't have the infrastructure to move it around safely and cost-effectively, but we also then continue to import oil from the Middle East.

I will run through a couple more of these charts and bring us up-to-date. It is not like we don't have pipelines. When the President takes more than 6 years to make a decision—having such a hard time with this pipeline—it is not that we don't have a few pipelines in the country. We have millions of miles of pipeline. Of course, this is going to be the latest, greatest state of the art with all the safety features—something like 53 different safety features that are required as part of the approval process that, as we say, has been going on for more than 6 years.

The other point I want to make before we go into the latest status is this is the finding of not one, not two, not three, not four, not five reports by the administration, but in fact the Obama administration's State Department has done five environmental impact statements, three draft statements, two final statements—three draft statements and two final environmental impact statements.

Here is what President Obama's report states after studying the environmental impact: "No significant environmental impact" according to the U.S. State Department environmental impact statements as a result of the Keystone XL Pipeline.

So here we are today, after more than 6 years in the "approval process" by the administration.

We passed this legislation with 62 votes in the Senate. It passed through the House with about 270 votes in the House, a big bipartisan vote for this legislation.

Last Tuesday—last Tuesday we sent it to the President. We sent it to him in the morning and he vetoed it the same day and had it back to us that afternoon. So that was pretty efficient. We send it to him in the morning and—bang—he has it back here in the afternoon.

His rationale for vetoing the project is he said it cut short his review process. That is right out of his veto message. It cut short his review process. So for somebody who figured out how to veto it in one day who has been studying it for over 6 years—over 6 years—and he vetoed it because we cut his review process short after more than 6 years.

Subsequent to that, the President was asked by the press: Mr. President, if Congress is somehow cutting your process short, when are you going to make a decision? His response to the press—I believe it was last week or earlier this week—he said he is going to make a decision either in a couple weeks or maybe in a couple months but certainly by the end of his term.

My question is this, How can there be any process there? Where is the process? What process are you talking about?

If he delays it for more than 6 years—a situation where TransCanada, a com-

pany that has met every single requirement of the law and regulations—they have met all the requirements for more than 6 years. The six States on the route have all approved the project. All six States on the route have approved the project. It wasn't tough; they had 6 years to do it. The American people overwhelmingly support this project in poll after poll, from 65 to 70 percent.

What process is he talking about that was cut short? There is no process there. If you go on for 6 years, where a company has spent millions of dollars, taking 6 years to try to build an \$8 billion project that would help us create energy security in this country, working with our closest friend and ally, Canada, what process is he talking about? When asked: When are you going to make a decision as to your process, he said: I don't know, maybe a few weeks, maybe a few months, by the end of my term, anyway. That is 8 years.

Isn't this a country of laws? How would you or anyone else feel—any company, large or small, anybody who feels if they comply with the law and they do everything they are supposed to do and they do it over and over again and somebody who is elected to office says, yes, you know, I just don't feel like it.

When did we cease to become a country of laws? When did we cease to have a situation where we can rely on the laws and the regulations of this State, whether it is an individual, a family, a community, a company or anything else?

So when we look at a project such as this one, that is a question we have to ask ourselves, because if it can happen in this situation, can't it happen in any situation? When do we as a Congress step up and say: We pass the laws. We pass the laws and those laws have to be respected and enforced. Isn't that our job? Isn't that our obligation? Isn't that why the people of this country sent us? I believe it is.

It is one thing to say: Well, it is that TransCanada company. They do business in Canada. They do business here. What if it was you? What if it was your company? What if it was 6-plus years of your life? What if it was millions of your dollars? How would you feel about it?

Remember, America is the place people throughout history have come to do business. This is where they come to do business because they can count on our laws and they can count on our regulations and they can count on the fact that if they made the investment, they would be able to do business on a certain, dependable basis. What happened to that? When we lose that, what happens to our economy?

With that, I would like to turn to my good friend from South Dakota. This pipeline will run through his State, creating jobs and millions of tax dollars for his State.

Mr. THUNE. I appreciate the leadership of the Senator from North Dakota on this issue. He has been a fierce advocate for many months in the Senate for the jobs and economic activity, the energy independence, and the positive benefits to our national security in building this pipeline. The most recent development is the frustration with having the President veto a bill that has more than 60 cosponsors in the Senate. This is a broad bipartisan bill. The Senator from North Dakota worked very hard to make it that way. A lot of Members on both sides of the aisle support this pipeline.

What is striking to me about it is some of the misstatements and things that have been said here recently—the President in his veto message and some of the things he said. The Washington Post Fact Checker, as recently as a couple days ago, pointed out that when the President said that this is going to bypass the United States and we are not going to get any benefit from this, not only did they give him one, two, three—he got four Pinocchios from the Washington Post. What that means, folks, is that is a really big whopper to suggest that there is not going to be any benefit to the United States from this.

In fact, they went on to point out in that story that their estimate is that 70 percent of the oil to be refined would be used in this country.

Furthermore, as the Senator from North Dakota pointed out, this is a significant investment, obviously, by people who want to do business in the United States because of our rule of law or rules and certainty that come with that. The production, the oil sands up there in North Dakota is 30 percent owned by Americans. There is a lot of American ownership in this, and Canada is our friend and ally. Instead of getting the same type or quality of oil from a country where we don't have a favorable relationship—Venezuela, for instance—we can get it from Canada, and it can come through this country. The suggestion that it is not going to benefit anybody in this country is completely wrong.

I know the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out before that up to 100,000 barrels of oil a day would be put in here from his State of North Dakota and from Montana—a lot of the light, sweet crude that is so valued—and it would take pressure off the railroads.

Interestingly enough, the Senator from North Dakota pointed out that the administration found no significant environmental impact. Well, think about this. You are now putting this oil on a railcar or a truck, and the studies show that creates 28 to 42 percent more emissions than shipping it in a pipeline. It is going to go some way. It is going to go on a truck, a railcar or a pipeline. If it goes on a railcar or a truck, it will create 28 to 42 percent

more emissions than transporting it through a pipeline. From an environmental standpoint, it makes all the sense in the world.

As somebody who represents a border State to North Dakota, we have had our own issues these last couple of years with the rail service and trying to get our agriculture commodities to the marketplace. There is an awful lot of pressure to move oil on rail. If you can move some of that in the pipeline—100,000 barrels a day—it takes a lot of pressure off of the rails and frees up that infrastructure and capacity to move agricultural commodities that are so important to both of our States.

There is a lot of misinformation that has been put out on this particular subject. I hope we can at least have discussions based upon a common set of facts, and most of the facts we are talking about are things that have been put out by the administration.

My State of South Dakota—as the Senator from North Dakota mentioned—would be crossed by this. The estimate by the State Department was that it would create \$100 million in earnings in South Dakota, create 3,000 to 4,000 construction jobs, and generate about \$20 million in property tax revenue.

There is an awful lot of interest in my State in what happens with the economic activity, the jobs, the property tax revenue, and what that could do to support local governments, law enforcement, schools, and those sorts of things—not to mention getting us away from the dependence we have on foreign sources of energy.

Let's be factual in this discussion. This doesn't bypass the United States. This has tremendous economic and positive economic impacts on our country, and we should not forget that. As we debate this here and have an opportunity now to vote on this veto, we should at least have a set of facts that is consistent with reality.

The Senator from Alaska has been very involved and has been a great leader on this issue.

My colleague from West Virginia is here as well. He has been working very hard to move this project along. It is unfortunate we are where we are. Perhaps we will be a couple of votes short today, but who knows. Maybe some people will come to the right conclusion and help us advance this important project.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his leadership. The Senator from North Dakota pointed out the number of pipelines that already exist in this country. I know the Senator has also pointed out the positive impact—when we get this down and it gets refined in other parts of this country—that a lot of this energy will be used here in the United States. I appreciate the fact that the Senator has made all of those facts abundantly clear on the

floor. It is unfortunate that we have not been able to persuade the President, but I still have hope.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the good Senator from South Dakota, and turn to my colleague from West Virginia who has been a champion on this project and other energy projects. As a Governor, he has worked on energy. He understands job creation, and he understands that we can make this country much stronger if we produce energy here at home versus getting it abroad.

I turn to my colleague from the State of West Virginia and thank him for his leadership on this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. I thank the Senator. I very much appreciate this colloquy, which is basically just common sense.

I became a Senator on November 15, 2010, so I have been here a little over 4 years. That is when I was first brought to understand the Keystone project, which was underway at the time and trying to be built. I was asked the question: What do you think? I looked at it very quickly, and I looked at how much oil we buy from other countries around the world. We buy the same type of oil—750,000 barrels of oil a day—from Venezuela. I was thinking that I would rather buy from my friends rather than from my enemies—the people who take the proceeds and the profits from our buying their product and use it against us. I was very clear on that, and I think most West Virginians feel the way I do.

Let's look at the facts. Forty percent of this pipeline has already been built. This is the part we are talking about, which has not been built and which we are producing and would like to build. The capacity from the Bakken—we talked about how 12 percent of the volume from this will be Bakken oil from North America.

We are saying that we are moving and producing our oil, buying from our best, friendliest neighbor and ally, Canada, and it makes us more secure as a nation. I have heard all of the arguments against it. People have said that we can't do this because basically this oil will come straight down and go out. They make you believe it is going to come down here, get loaded on a tanker, and taken to another country, so that we get no benefit at all. That is what they are telling me.

We had a press conference 2 or 3 weeks ago. We had the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Alberta. Everybody who was there agreed that will not happen, and it can't happen because they need this to refine it. They will be subjected to the same rules and regulations that our Commerce Department puts on oil in America. No crude will be exported unless we change the law. So that prevents that from happening. That is a misnomer.

Next, they said they don't pay 8 percent into the Oilspill Liability Trust Fund in case there is a spill. They agreed to do that. They said: Wait a minute; this will not be built with American steel. Yes, it will be. They agreed to that. Everything we have asked for, they have agreed to.

We can't even get our side of the aisle to agree basically to put it in a piece of legislation to make sure that it will happen. I trust the Canadians. They will do exactly what they said. I would like to codify it by putting it in the bill, and I am working on that.

The politics of what we are dealing with is this. If we can't get four more Democrats on my side to vote with me to repeal and beat the veto the President has, this is coming back. Everybody in this understands the reality of politics. This legislation is coming back in the form of an infrastructure bill or a road bill. It will come back on a bill that we will all vote for, and we will have to spend a lot of time and energy again on this same subject. I have said to do it now. Let's do it now and move on to something that we need to move on to, which will be something of great interest.

I have a hard time reasoning with those who say that this pipeline is not going to make us more secure. We buy 7 million barrels of oil a day. We buy that oil from other countries, such as Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and even Russia.

If you want to make this country more secure, let's not depend on the foreign oil where they will use resources that will be used against us. The last time I checked, I don't believe Venezuela uses any of the money we give them for their oil to benefit America. I am not convinced that Saudi Arabia uses any of their money to benefit our country or any of these other foreign countries that we buy from.

This is a perfect, commonsense solution. I also think that our good friend from South Dakota talked about the amount of trains. My State just had a tragedy. Thank God there was no loss of life, and by the grace of God, no one was injured. I can tell you that the amount of transportation on the rail has increased 3,300 percent since 2009. So 3,300 percent more oil is being transported in America by rail. If we can relieve some of that and be safer—as well as environmentally safer—we should do it.

I ask my colleagues to consider this legislation because if we don't do it now, it is going to come back. We have a chance to put it to bed. It makes a lot of common sense as far as jobs.

I will say one more thing about jobs. They talked about jobs. When I was Governor and when the Senator from North Dakota was Governor, we built an awful lot of infrastructure, such as roads and bridges. I never remember creating one permanent job after I

built a bridge. There were a lot of good jobs that paid good money during the construction, and all of my contractors were happy. All of my affiliated trades people were happy that they had jobs, but we never expected to create permanent jobs. They were construction jobs. That is what it is.

Why are people saying that we are not creating jobs? This is construction. When it is done, it is done. I don't know why we can't come to grips with that. We do it all day long. We will talk about an infrastructure bill and be tickled to death that we are getting jobs. But when we talk about 20,000 to 40,000 jobs to build this pipeline, I don't understand why it is not something we can all embrace.

I say to all of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, as well as on the other side of the aisle, that we should all support something that makes so much sense to the American people and the working people of America and also for the security of our Nation.

I applaud and support my friend. I co-sponsored this bill. I feel very strongly about it, and I will continue to speak out about it as long as we have to. I hope today is the last time we have to speak about this legislation. I hope we get this veto repealed and move on.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank our colleague from West Virginia for his tremendous leadership. I know that will continue. He is right. If we don't win the battle today, we will win the war because we will find another bill to attach this legislation to. But the thing is that we ought to pass it on its merits, as the Senator so eloquently explained.

I will now turn to the head of the energy committee, somebody who is truly committed to an "all of the above" energy approach and demonstrates that leadership on the "all of the above" approach every day in this body and certainly in her leadership of our energy committee. That is why she speaks on this issue in a way that should have everyone listening to her. Whether she is speaking about fossil fuels, traditional energy or renewables, this is a Senator who has supported all of these and has great credibility on this issue.

I turn to my colleague from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague from North Dakota for his leadership. He has been dogged not only as we have advanced this measure through the floor and process but truly over the years.

It has been 6-plus years, or 2,350 days, since the company seeking to build the Keystone XL Pipeline first submitted its cross-border permit application. Even with all this time, the President is incapable of making a final decision.

I thank my colleague from West Virginia, who just spoke. He articulated some of the myths and misconceptions that are out there, and the Senator

from South Dakota announced them as well.

When you think about where we are today, with this veto override here in front of us—you have to think about that fact that this is bipartisan energy legislation. The first bill we sent to the President this year is bipartisan and has strong support around the country from an environmental perspective, from an energy security perspective, and from a national security perspective. The Keystone XL Pipeline is what we should endorse. It is wrong and shortsighted that this President has chosen to veto this bipartisan energy initiative.

We have heard on the floor all of the reasons why this proposal is good and sound and rational. It focuses on the energy infrastructure. I think it is also important to remind colleagues that when we had this bill on the floor in January, we had something that we have not had in a long period of time, and that was an open amendment process. We moved 41 different amendments forward to the floor, and some of those amendments actually passed. They became part of this Keystone XL Pipeline legislation.

So in addition to vetoing the infrastructure aspects of this legislation, the President has vetoed a time-sensitive provision that will provide regulatory relief to our water heater manufacturers. He also vetoed multiple provisions to increase the efficiencies of our commercial buildings. He has also vetoed a provision that would improve the energy retrofitting assistance that would be available for our schools. He also vetoed what I believe many of us viewed as a very responsible path forward on the Oilspill Liability Trust Fund and our statement asserting that climate change is real.

We made some good progress with this bill. If this vote is not successful, all of that is now off the table. We are not just talking about permitting a piece of pipe, the infrastructure that goes across the border. Keep in mind, folks, we also included some things that this body felt were important to advance, and that has all been vetoed by this President. It was wrong to veto this legislation.

I think it is also important to highlight some of the irony we see with the veto of this legislation coming from this administration. In effect, the President is making a mockery of the Executive order meant to expedite decisions, as it has been more than 2,350 days since this application was submitted for permit. But there is other irony here, and I wish to take a brief moment to point this out.

Last month the White House released the National Security Strategy for this country. I will quote from this strategy:

The challenges faced by Ukrainian and European dependence on Russian energy supplies puts a spotlight on the need for an expanded view of energy security that recognizes the collective needs of the United States, our allies, and trading partners as well as the importance of competitive energy markets. Therefore, we must promote diversification of energy sources, fuels, and routes, as well as encourage indigenous sources of energy supply. Greater energy security and independence within the Americas is central to these efforts.

Well, Canada is within the Americas.

The President's veto of the Keystone XL Pipeline contradicts his own national security policy. It contradicts his own energy policy that is outlined by the Council of Economic Advisers in their economic report when they say "the extent to which a country's economy is exposed to energy supply risks—specifically, international energy supply disruptions that lead to product unavailability, price shocks, or both.

The President is contradicting himself at every turn, whether it is his Climate Action Plan that he has introduced, vetoing his own—this veto contradicts his own climate policy.

We have an opportunity to boost our economy, to help our allies, to increase our energy security, to be an environmental leader, and to lead on energy. This President's veto denies us that. It is a failure of leadership.

I recommend that all of us on both sides of the aisle come together to override this veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, President Obama had advocated reducing our reliance on Middle Eastern oil. The President has advocated reaffirming the commitment of the United States to its close allies. The President has led us to believe he would work to create American jobs, not veto them. Of course, signing the bipartisan Keystone jobs bill would have advanced all of those priorities, but President Obama chose deep-pocketed special interests over the middle class with his partisan veto of the Keystone jobs bill. It is the kind of thing that puts union workers on edge. I suspect it makes some of our Democratic colleagues uncomfortable too.

But here is the good news: Our Democratic friends don't have to make the same choice the President made. There is a bipartisan jobs coalition right here in the Senate that would love to have their support. We are pro-Keystone jobs, we are pro-Keystone infrastructure, and we are pro-middle class.

If you are interested in jobs and infrastructure and saving your party from an extreme mistake, then join us. Vote with us to override a partisan veto and help the President pursue priorities he has advocated in the past. There is no reason to allow powerful special interests to block the billions

this infrastructure project would pour into our economy or the thousands of American jobs Keystone would support. Your vote for common sense can release this special interest stranglehold. It can return a little more sanity to Washington.

There is a lot we can accomplish by working together with serious jobs ideas and commonsense reform as our guiding principle. So I hope you will join the new majority in that effort because no matter what happens today, this new Congress is not going to stop working for good ideas, and we are not going to protect the President from them either.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader and our colleagues on both sides of the aisle for supporting this bipartisan legislation.

The Prime Minister of Israel was here yesterday and he spoke to Congress. We have an opportunity to declare energy independence. We do not need to rely on oil from the Middle East. I ask my colleagues to join with us and vote yes to override the President's veto of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill (S. 1) pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the Constitution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Bennet	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Casey	Hoeven	Scott
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Sullivan
Collins	Kirk	Tester
Corker	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McCaskill	Warner
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Cardin	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Coons	Hirono
Booker	Durbin	Kaine
Boxer	Feinstein	King
Brown	Franken	Klobuchar
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Leahy

Markey	Peters	Stabenow
Menendez	Reed	Udall
Merkley	Reid	Warren
Mikulski	Sanders	Whitehouse
Murphy	Schatz	Wyden
Murray	Schumer	
Nelson	Shaheen	

NOT VOTING—1

Donnelly

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 37.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, the bill, on reconsideration, fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, nearly 4 months ago—not 4 weeks ago but 4 months ago—President Obama announced his intention to nominate Loretta Lynch to be our country's next Attorney General. I had the privilege of attending that White House ceremony. In fact, I took this photograph at the ceremony.

But as I took it, I was mostly moved by what Ms. Lynch explained. She said she was excited about the challenge of becoming our Nation's chief law enforcement officer. She noted with obvious admiration that the Department of Justice is the only Cabinet Department named for an ideal. Think of that. The Department of Justice. It is named for the ideal of justice.

We know from Loretta Lynch's long public service career that she aspires to make that ideal a reality. She will when she becomes Attorney General of the United States. As U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, she brought countless terrorists and cyber criminals to justice. She obtained convictions against corrupt public officials from both political parties. She fought tirelessly against violent crime and financial fraud. Her record shows as Attorney General she will effectively, fairly, and independently enforce the law.

As many people have said, she is a prosecutor's prosecutor. Her record of accomplishment goes beyond just that.

It goes to who she is as a person. It is bolstered by the faith and values instilled in her by her family. The Judiciary Committee was honored to have her proud father, the Reverend Lorenzo Lynch, with us not only at both days of the historic hearings in January, but also last Thursday as the committee considered his daughter's historic nomination.

When Loretta Lynch was a young child, Reverend Lynch bravely opened his church to students and others to organize lunch counter sit-ins in North Carolina. He taught his only daughter that "ideals are wonderful things, but unless you can share them with others and make this world a better place, they are just words." Every one of us who has ever been in public service ought to listen to that. The fact that she has dedicated the majority of her career to public service reaffirms that she has lived those ideals of justice in the service of others.

Last week, the committee reported her nomination favorably with a bipartisan vote. I wish the vote had been unanimous. I suspect that if the President who nominated her had been a Republican, she would have been confirmed by now. But in the sixth year of this administration, perhaps there is no one who can be confirmed unanimously, because those Republicans who are opposing Ms. Lynch are not doing so based on her record. They are opposing her because they disagree with a decision that President Obama made and that she played no part in. That is not treating her fairly.

One need only look at her supporters to know how nonpartisan her nomination really is. Louis Freeh, the former Director of the FBI and a Federal judge, has written:

[I]n my twenty-five years of public service—23 in the Department of Justice—I cannot think of a more qualified nominee to be America's chief law enforcement officer.

I know Judge Freeh very well. He is a man of total integrity. He would not say this unless he strongly believed it.

The current New York Police Commissioner, who was appointed by a Democrat, and a former New York Police Commissioner, appointed by a Republican, both strongly support her nomination.

Even prominent Fox News hosts have praised Loretta Lynch's work as a prosecutor. Bill O'Reilly has called her a hero for her prosecution of a child rapist. Megyn Kelly, of Fox, has described Ms. Lynch as a "straight shooter" for her service as a Federal prosecutor, especially for her crackdown on gang crime and terrorism.

Ms. Lynch also has broad support from law enforcement, fellow prosecutors, civil rights groups, and numerous other prominent individuals.

I ask unanimous consent to have a list of letters in support of her nomination printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Nobody else is seeking the floor. I ask unanimous consent to go beyond the 10 minutes allotted, up to 3 extra minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. In January, Ms. Lynch testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee for nearly 8 hours. She has now responded to nearly 900 questions for the record. I have been here 40 years and I have a hard time remembering somebody who has answered so many questions. The witnesses invited by Republicans to speak on this, not a single one of them actually opposed her nomination. In fact, I asked all of the outside witnesses: If anybody here opposes her nomination, would you please raise your hand. Nobody did.

Despite this, some voted no—some Republican Senators voted no on her nomination in committee. Some of these Senators opposed her because she would not renounce the President's Executive action to keep immigrant families together. They are attacking her for this. They blame this on her. But they fail to acknowledge that if the Republican leadership in the House had just allowed a vote on the immigration reform that passed the Senate, then the President would not have been compelled to act.

Very hard-working Republicans and Democrats came together in this body to pass by a 2-to-1 margin an immigration bill. Most people felt it would pass the House of Representatives had it been allowed to come to a vote. But the Speaker determined not to let it come to a vote. You cannot then say: We are not going to vote on anything, but, oh, by the way, we are not going to let the President do what Presidents have always done in the absence of legislation, take executive action.

Now we all agree that we have problems in our immigration system. We all agree that we need legislation to fix it. The President is not going to do that. Congress has to do it. We have to stand up and vote for or against changes. But to blame the Attorney General nominee for this is simply unfair. To blame her because the House of Representatives will not vote on immigration is not fair. Ms. Lynch played no part in the President's decision to set the prosecutorial priorities of the administration.

As a Federal prosecutor in New York, no one has claimed that Ms. Lynch has failed to enforce the law. There is no legitimate reason to delay her vote any longer. In fact, there are a whole lot of people in prison today who wish that she had not enforced the law. But if they were guilty of crimes, she enforced it, whether Republicans, Democrats—no matter who they were—and with quite a few terrorists—she enforced the law. She put them in prison.

So we should examine Loretta Lynch's nomination based on her

record, her accomplishments, her extraordinary character. I call on the Republican Leader to schedule an immediate vote on Loretta Lynch's confirmation. Vote yes or vote no. But this confirmation has been pending for 116 days—116 days. We have had several breaks—some of our constituents call them vacations—during that time. Let's take a day or so and vote on her.

Let's not deprive the American people of even one more day of having Loretta Lynch as their Attorney General. Let's vote to confirm this superb woman, this superb nominee for Attorney General, this nominee who believes that justice is an ideal, that all of us, no matter what our political party, should ascribe to.

I told her father how moved I was to watch his pride as she was before our committee for confirmation, I said, the pride was well earned because of the example he set to her as a child, to face up to all obstacles and overcome them. Well, let's not have the Senate set an obstacle that she cannot overcome. Let's have a vote. Let's put her in there as Attorney General, for the good of the country, not of any political party, but for the good of the country.

This is not the Attorney General of the President. This is not the Attorney General of the Members of this body. This is the Attorney General of the United States. It is the Attorney General for 300 million Americans. Let's give 300 million Americans the Attorney General they deserve.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS RECEIVED IN SUPPORT OF LORETTA LYNCH'S ATTORNEY GENERAL NOMINATION  
CURRENT & FORMER ELECTED OFFICIALS

The Honorable John Lewis (GA-5); The Honorable Kathleen Rice (NY-4), former District Attorney for Nassau County; Durham County, NC, Board of Commissioners; Martin County, NC, Board of Commissioners; John Sexton, President of New York University, Former Chairman of the New York Federal Reserve; The Honorable Marcia Fudge (OH-11)

Two letters from the 46 members of the Congressional Black Caucus: The Honorable Alma Adams (NC-12); The Honorable Karen Bass (CA-37); The Honorable Joyce Beatty (OH-03); The Honorable Sanford D. Bishop, Jr. (GA-02); The Honorable Cory Booker (D-NJ); The Honorable Corrine Brown (FL-05); The Honorable G.K. Butterfield (NC-01); The Honorable André Carson (IN-07); The Honorable Yvette D. Clarke (NY-09); The Honorable Wm. Lacy Clay (MO-01); The Honorable Emanuel Cleaver, II (MO-05); The Honorable James E. Clyburn (SC-06); The Honorable Bonnie Watson Coleman (NJ-12); The Honorable John Conyers, Jr. (MI-13); The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings (MD-07); The Honorable Danny K. Davis (IL-07); The Honorable Donna F. Edwards (MD-04); The Honorable Keith Ellison (MN-05); The Honorable Chaka Fattah (PA-02); The Honorable Marcia L. Fudge (OH-11); The Honorable Al Green (TX-09); The Honorable Alcee L. Hastings (FL-20); The Honorable Sheila Jackson



Lee (TX-18); The Honorable Hakeem Jeffries (NY-08); The Honorable Eddie Bernice Johnson (TX-30); The Honorable Hank Johnson (GA-04); The Honorable Robin Kelly (IL-02); The Honorable Brenda Lawrence (MI-14); The Honorable Barbara Lee (CA-13); The Honorable John Lewis (GA-05); The Honorable Mia Love (UT-04); The Honorable Gregory W. Meeks (NY-06); The Honorable Gwen Moore (WI-04); The Honorable Eleanor Holmes Norton (DC); The Honorable Donald M. Payne, Jr. (NJ-10); The Honorable Stacey Plaskett (VI); The Honorable Charles B. Rangel (NY-13); The Honorable Cedric Richmond (LA-02); The Honorable Bobby L. Rush (IL-01); The Honorable David Scott (GA-13); The Honorable Robert C. "Bobby" Scott (VA-03); The Honorable Terri A. Sewell (AL-07); The Honorable Bennie Thompson (MS-02); The Honorable Marc Veasey (TX-33); The Honorable Maxine Waters (CA-43); The Honorable FredERICA Wilson (FL-24)

#### CURRENT & FORMER LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

Louis Freeh, former FBI Director, Chairman Emeritus of Pepper Hamilton; William Bratton, Police Commissioner of New York City; Kevin O'Connor, former Associate Attorney General at the U.S. DOJ in the Bush administration, current VP of Global Ethics and Compliance for United Technologies; Joseph Guccione, former U.S. Marshal for SDNY and current Managing Director for FGIS; John Gilbride, former Special Agent for DEA's NY Office and current Global Head of Financial Intelligence for Morgan Stanley; Larry Thompson, former VP of Government Affairs and General Counsel of PepsiCo, Deputy U.S. Attorney General, and U.S. Attorney for Georgia; Jamie Gorelick, former Deputy U.S. Attorney General; Bart Schwartz, Chairman of Guidepoint Solutions and former Chief of the Criminal Division for the SDNY United States Attorney's office; Brian Parr, Chief Security Officer of Citigroup and former Special Agent in Charge of the United States Secret Service, New York Field Office.

4 Former EDNY U.S. Attorneys: Andrew J. Maloney; Zachary W. Carter; Alan Vinegrad; Benton Campbell; 13 Former EDNY Assistant U.S. Attorneys: Stanley N. Alpert; Jodi L. Avergun; Robert L. Begleiter; Jason Brown; Eric O. Corngold; Matthew E. Fishbein; J. Christopher Jensen; Katya Jestin; Gregory J. O'Connell; Patricia A. Pileggi; David A. Pitofsky; Lauren J. Resnick; George A. Stamboulidis.

25 Former U.S. Attorneys from both Republican and Democratic administrations: David B. Barlow, United States Attorney, D. UT (2011-2014); Wayne A. Budd, United States Attorney, D. MA (1989-1992); Mark T. Calloway, United States Attorney, W.D. NC (1994-2001); Paul K. Charlton, United States Attorney, D. AZ (2001-2007); Paul E. Coggins, United States Attorney, N.D. TX (1993-2001); Robert C. Corrente, United States Attorney, D. RI (2004-2009); E. Bart Daniel, United States Attorney, D. SC (1989-1992); Richard H. Deane, Jr., United States Attorney, N.D. GA (1998-2001); Patrick J. Fitzgerald, United States Attorney, N.D. IL (2001-2012); Thomas B. Heffelfinger, United States Attorney, D. MN (2001-2006); Walter C. Holton, United States Attorney, M.D. NC (1994-2001); G. Douglas Jones, United States Attorney, N.D. AL (1997-2001); Scott R. Lassar, United States Attorney, N.D. IL (1997-2001); Matthew D. Orwig, United States Attorney, E.D. TX (2001-2007); Deborah Rhodes, United States Attorney, S.D. AL (2005-2009); Jose de Jesus Rivera, United States Attorney, D. AZ (1998-2001); Richard B. Roper, United States

Attorney, N.D. TX (2004-2009); Richard A. Rossman, United States Attorney, E.D. MI (1980-1981); Jack W. Selden, United States Attorney, N.D. AL (1992-1993); Donald K. Stern, United States Attorney, D. MA (1993-2001); Charles J. Stevens, United States Attorney, E.D. CA (1993-1997); Jeffrey A. Taylor, United States Attorney, D. DC (2006-2009); Gregory A. Vega, United States Attorney, S.D. CA (1999-2001); Kenneth L. Weinstein, United States Attorney, D. DC (2004-2006); Joseph D. Whitley, United States Attorney, N.D. GA (1990-1993), M.D. GA (1981-1986).

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT & CRIMINAL JUSTICE ORGANIZATIONS

National District Attorneys Association (NDAA); National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE); Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA); Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association; National Black Prosecutors Association; Women in Law Empowerment Forum; Association of Prosecuting Attorneys; FBI Agents Association; Women in Federal Law Enforcement (WIFLE); International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP).

#### CIVIL RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS

Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; National Urban League; National Women's Law Center; YWCA; Alliance for Justice; People for the American Way; NAACP Legal Defense & Education Fund, Inc.; National Immigration Law Center (NILC); Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Human Rights Campaign; American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO); Legal Momentum; Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund.

#### OTHERS

14 Former Presidents of the New York City Bar Association: Michael A. Cardozo; Michael A. Cooper; Louis A. Craco, Sr.; Evan A. Davis; Carey R. Dunne; John D. Feerick; Conrad K. Harper; Patricia M. Hynes; The Honorable Barry Kamins; Robert M. Kaufman; Bettina B. Plevan; The Honorable E. Leo Milonas; Barbara Paul Robinson; Samuel W. Seymour.

13 Current and Former Presidents of the Federal Bar Council: Robert J. Anello (2012-2014); Robert J. Giuffra, Jr. (2008-2010); Bernard W. Nussbaum (1990-1992); Joan G. Wexler (2004-2006); Mark C. Zauderer (2006-2008); Steven M. Edwards (1998-2000); Vilia B. Hayes (2014-Present); Bettina B. Plevan (1996-1998); Frank H. Wohl (2010-2012); Robert B. Fiske, Jr. (1982-1984); John J. Kenney (1994-1996); The Honorable Gerald Walpin (2002-2004); George B. Yankwitz (1992-1994).

44 Partners at Hogan Lovells: Stephen J. Immelt, CEO; J. Warren Gorrell, Jr., CEO Emeritus; Dennis H. Tracey, Head of U.S. Litigation; Stuart M. Altman; Robert B. Buehler; Ty Cobb; Steven M. Edwards; Scott Friedman; David J. Hensler; Robert F. Leibenluft; Sanford Litvack; Janet L. McDavid; Joseph R. Rackman; George A. Salter; Michael J. Shepard; Peter S. Spivack; Mark J. Weinstein; Peter R. Bisio; Claudette M. Christian; Robert B. Duncan; Ira M. Feinberg; Mark D. Gately; Craig A. Hoover; Adam K. Levin; Eric J. Lobenfeld; Martin Michaelson; Barbara M. Roth; Lee Samuelson; Ira S. Sheinfeld; Catherine E. Stetson; David F. Wertheimer; Stanley J. Brown; Arlene L. Chow; David Dunn; Amy Bowerman Freed; Maureen A. Hanlon; Mitch Lazris; Carol A. Licko; Mitchell R. Lubart; Peter J. Pettibone; Corey W. Roush; Allison J. Schoenthal; Frank T. Spano; Michael C. Theis.

11 Former Presidents of the New York County Lawyers' Association (NYCLA): Arthur Norman Field (1990-1992); Klaus Eppler (1995-1996); John J. Kenney (1996-1997); Rosalind S. Fink (1997-1998); Stephen D. Hoffman (1998-2000); Craig A. Landy (2000-2002); Catherine A. Christian (2007-2008); Ann B. Lesk (2008-2010); James B. Kobak Jr. (2010-2011); Stewart D. Aaron (2011-2013); Barbara Moses (2013-2014).

28 African American AmLaw partners and Fortune 500 general counsels: Benjamin F. Wilson, Managing Principal, Beveridge & Diamond, P.C.; John E. Page, Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary, Golden State Foods Corporation; Frederick R. Nance, Partner, Squire Patton Boggs LLP; Kevin J. Armstrong, General Counsel, DST Brokerage Solutions LLC; Anthony T. Pierce, D.C. Managing Partner, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP; April Miller Boise, Vice President, General Counsel & Corp. Secretary, Veyance Technologies, Inc.; Kwamina Thomas Williford, Partner, Holland & Knight; Michael Parham, Sr. Vice President and General Counsel, RealNetworks, Inc.; Grace E. Speights, D.C. Co-Managing Partner, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP; Gail D. Hasbrouck, SVP, General Counsel & Corporate Secretary, Advocate Health Care; John W. Daniels, Jr., Chairman Emeritus, Quarles & Brady LLP; Christopher P. Reynolds, General Counsel and Chief Legal Officer, Toyota North America; Ava E. Lias-Booker, Baltimore Managing Partner, McGuire Woods; Kevin J. Armstrong, General Counsel, DST Brokerage Solutions LLC; Dave Carothers, Managing Partner, Carothers DiSante & Freudenberger LLP; Philip G. Hampton II, D.C. Administrative Partner, Haynes and Boone, LLP; Maurice A. Watson, Chairman, Husch Blackwell LLP; Dennis Archer, Chairman Emeritus, Dickinson Wright, PLLC; Erik L. Barron, Counsel, Whiteford Taylor & Preston; W. Anthony Jenkins, Member, Dickinson Wright, PLLC; Frank P. Scruggs, Partner, Berger Silverman LLP; Paul W. Sweeney, L.A. Administrative Partner, K&L Gates; Paul Lancaster Adams, Partner, Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak & Stewart; Sherrie L. Farrell, Member, Dykema; Richard H. Deane, Jr., Atlanta Partner-in-Charge, Jones Day; Bernard Gugar, SVP & General Counsel, Harpo, Inc.; Damario Solomon-Simmons, Managing Partner, SolomonSimmonsSharrock & Associates; Steven Wright, Boston Executive Partner, Holland & Knight.

Audrey Strauss, EVP and Chief Legal Officer for ALCOA; Sara Moss, EVP and General Counsel for Estee Lauder Companies; National Conference of Women's Bar Associations; Women's Bar Association of DC; National Bar Association; Peter Walsh, Senior Deputy General Counsel for UnitedHealth Group; National Association of Women Lawyers; Constance Patillo; Frank Brown, Dean Emeritus at UNC-Chapel Hill; Tyrone Dash, Deacon at White Rock Baptist Church; National Association of Social Workers.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

KING V. BURWELL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a tremendously important case that was heard this morning in the Supreme Court. The case is *King v. Burwell*, and it involves the administration of *ObamaCare*. I was privileged to attend the argument.

The *King* case is important for a number of reasons. It is important because it involves a fundamental component of *ObamaCare*, and it is important because of its significant implications for the rule of law.

From the early days of the Republic, a core component of our constitutional character has been the idea that the government is a government of laws and not of men. That means our leaders are constrained by the words of the laws in our statutes and in our Constitution. Government officials must follow the law even when their personal preferences would lead them in a different direction.

The current administration, however, is engaged in a sustained assault on the rule of law. I have spoken many times on the Senate floor about the President's disturbing disregard for the separation of powers and other limits on his authority. His offenses run the gamut of releasing Guantanamo detainees without first notifying Congress, to claiming that congressional inaction somehow clothes him with legislative-like authority to suspend immigration laws, to arrogating to himself the power to determine when Congress is in session. President Obama's actions in the *King* case are of a piece with the other Executive overreaches.

First some background. *ObamaCare* requires every person in America to buy health insurance. This is the so-called individual mandate the Supreme Court controversially upheld 3 years ago.

Most Americans receive health insurance through their employer, which pays a large part of the premium, but not all do. Many must purchase insurance on their own. And to ensure that such individuals are able to comply with the individual mandate, *ObamaCare* directs States to create health care exchanges—government-operated Web sites where consumers can go to compare and choose insurance plans. *ObamaCare* also provides subsidies for individuals who purchase insurance through these State-run exchanges.

Remember that most people receive health insurance through their employer and that their employer pays part of the premium. Individuals who purchase insurance on their own through exchanges, however, don't receive this employer subsidy, so they themselves must contribute more toward the premium. *ObamaCare* provides subsidies to these individuals to help offset the cost of insurance.

With that background, let me turn now to the legal issue in *King*. As I have described, *ObamaCare* directs States to establish health care exchanges. To be precise, the law says that "each State shall, not later than January 1, 2014, establish an [exchange]" that meets certain conditions set forth in the law. But there is a wrinkle: The Constitution does not permit the Federal Government to order States to do things. This is called the anticommandeering principle and is well established in Supreme Court case law. What the Federal Government can do, however, is incentivize States to act, and that is precisely what Congress attempted to do with *ObamaCare*.

Here is how the incentive works. Another provision of *ObamaCare*—the one at the heart of *King*—conditions the aforementioned subsidies on an individual's enrollment in a State-run exchange. According to this provision, a subscriber is eligible for a subsidy for each month she is covered by a plan that she "enrolled in through an Exchange established by the State." The text of this provision could not be more clear. If an individual enrolls in a plan through an exchange established by the State, she gets a subsidy; if she enrolls in any other plan, no subsidy.

The incentive for States to act also could not be more clear. If a State fails to establish an exchange, its citizens lose out on millions of dollars. *ObamaCare*'s proponents quite reasonably thought this would lead States to set up exchanges and would thus accomplish the same result—the creation of State-run exchanges—that Congress could not achieve through a direct command. In fact, I actually heard arguments by administration people that if they put enough pressure on the States, the States would do this.

Congress also recognized, however, that some States might not take the deal; thus, it provided a backstop. In yet another provision of *ObamaCare*, Congress instructed that if a State does not set up an exchange by the January 2014 deadline, the Department of Health and Human Services shall "establish and operate such Exchange within the State."

Crucially, however, Congress did not similarly provide that subsidies would be available to subscribers enrolling through a federally established exchange, and the reason is obvious: If subsidies were available under both State and Federal exchanges, States would not have any incentive to create their own exchanges because the subsidies would come either way. Fewer States would create exchanges, meaning the Federal Government would have to step in and create more exchanges of its own.

The restriction of subsidies to State-established exchanges was thus a key element of *ObamaCare*'s entire cooperative federalism scheme. Without this

restriction, the end result would have been a federally run health care market—a result unacceptable to several key *ObamaCare* supporters whose votes were essential to passage of the bill.

Now we come to President Obama's act of overreach. Notwithstanding the unmistakably clear text of the statute, which limits subsidies to plans purchased through State-established exchanges, and notwithstanding that this limitation was absolutely fundamental to accomplishing Congress's purpose of incentivizing States to establish exchanges, the President decided he would also offer subsidies for plans purchased through federally established exchanges.

President Obama's open defiance of clear statutory text and utter disregard for the balance Congress struck is an affront to the separation of powers and to the rule of law. The President and his enablers argue that subsidies for federally enrolled plans are necessary to accomplish *ObamaCare*'s overall purpose of reducing costs and improving health care access. Without subsidies to individuals in the 34 States without State-run exchanges, the President argues that residents of those States will be hit with higher costs and unaffordable health care. The law must be rewritten, he says, to avoid the consequences the law itself imposes.

Laying aside the fact that the Constitution gives Congress, not the President, the power to amend laws, the President's argument is completely circuitous. The reason 34 States could afford not to establish exchanges is because the President said he was going to pay subsidies regardless of whether a State establishes an exchange. Why would a State go to the trouble and expense of creating an exchange if the end result is the same?

The President also grasps at exceedingly thin straws. Because the backstop provision instructs that if a State does not establish an exchange, HHS shall step in and establish such exchange itself, the President says this means Federal exchanges are State exchanges. Right is left and up is down.

But let's return to the real provision in dispute in *King*, the one that defines eligibility for subsidies. This provision says, again, that an individual is eligible for each month that she is covered by a plan that she "enrolled in through an Exchange established by the State." An exchange established by the Federal Government is by definition not an exchange established by the State, regardless of whether the Federal exchange is a backstop or not.

It gets even worse for the President because the provision additionally specifies that the State exchange must have been established "under section 1311 of the [statute]." That section sets forth the requirements for creating State-run exchanges. Nowhere does it

mention Federal exchanges. Rather, the conditions for creation of Federal exchanges appear in a different section—section 1321. Under no plausible reading of the text does a State exchange established under section 1311 mean a Federal exchange established under section 1321.

Advocates of the President's position would have us believe that statutes are infinitely malleable—up can mean down, right can mean left, established by a State can mean not established by a State. What matters to them is advancing some vague notion of statutory purpose that coheres with the President's leftwing agenda, regardless of what the statute actually says.

Those of us on the other side, however, insist that text matters, words matter. What the statute says is what matters, because at the end of the day the words in our statutes and in our Constitution are what bind our leaders and what prevent them from doing whatever they want.

The administration's actions in King have undermined the rule of law and contravened important constitutional checks on the President's authority. As has increasingly become the case under President Obama, it is now up to the Supreme Court to rein in the President's overreach and to reaffirm the fundamental obligation of all government officials to follow the law. I surely hope the Court will do so.

#### KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to address today's vote to override President Obama's veto of the bipartisan Hoeven-Manchin bill to authorize the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Our economy and North America's energy security would greatly benefit from building this pipeline. It would increase our GDP by approximately \$3.4 billion annually. The State Department, which has provided clear-headed analysis of the benefits of this project, has found that Keystone would support roughly 42,000 jobs during the construction phase alone. It would provide refineries with up to 830,000 barrels a day of North American oil.

Moreover, the Keystone XL Pipeline would be an environmentally sound way to transport this oil. The State Department's extensive environmental impact statement concluded that building the pipeline would actually be better for the environment than not building it.

We have to be clear here. This oil is going to go to market no matter what. Building Keystone would take oil off the tracks and off the roads, transporting it in a way that is safer, more efficient, more environmentally sound, and better for creating good-paying American jobs.

In his veto message, President Obama suggested that an issue such as

this is somehow too important to be left to the legislative process and that we should trust in the integrity of the regulatory process.

This is exactly the sort of debate we should be having in the Senate. This is the body that is supposed to debate the important issues of the day. When a project as important as this is stalled without meaningful justification for so long, our involvement is even more important.

In our consideration of this bill, we legislated according to the best traditions of this body, including robust debate, an open amendment process, and regular order. After years of mismanagement, our consideration of this bill showed how the Senate is back at work on behalf of the American people under our new leadership.

While I certainly hope we will find another means of approving the Keystone XL Pipeline, I am naturally disappointed that we came just a few votes short of overriding the President's veto and enacting this bill into law. Furthermore, I can certainly understand why many Americans will view this occasion as yet another example of how Washington is broken.

In many respects, I share this same frustration. Nevertheless, we cannot allow ourselves to slouch toward pessimism and disillusionment about every institution. Indeed, I think my fellow colleagues on both sides of the aisle merit praise for their responsible handling of this bill. Instead, we should shine a light on where exactly the problem is and offer real solutions to make Washington work on behalf of the American people.

At the end of the day, the Keystone XL Pipeline and so many other bureaucratic failures just demonstrate that our regulatory bureaucracy is broken. After all, this project is now in its sixth year of limbo, waiting for a single permit to be issued. This debate has gone on longer than an entire term of a U.S. Senator.

It should not take years and years of navigating the Federal bureaucracy only to have the government decide not to make a decision. This new Congress is focused on helping to create jobs and getting our economy back on the right track, which is why regulatory reform must be a key part of our agenda over the next 2 years. We must strive not only to approve this particularly important project but also to prevent similar abuses from occurring in the future.

Perhaps the two most troublesome features of the modern administrative state are, first, the size of the regulatory burden on the economy and, second, the lack of accountability in the regulatory bureaucracy. Both problems have been illustrated by the Keystone XL project, but they manifest themselves across the board throughout the regulatory process.

The growing Federal regulatory burden has been a concern for decades, but the problem is now worse than ever. Both the number of regulations and their combined cost have exploded in recent years. The American people are now bound by more than 1 million individual restrictions in the Federal Register, with a total cost of around \$1.86 trillion each year. To put that in perspective, that is about 11 percent of our total GDP, it amounts to about \$15,000 per household, and it totals over \$300 billion more than annual individual and corporate taxes combined. In short, our regulatory burden is enormous.

Even as we resist President Obama's mad dash to add new rules, our Nation simply cannot afford to ignore the crushing burden of existing regulations. They weigh down our efforts to boost economic growth and make it impossible to get our country back on track.

Every President, from Jimmy Carter to Barack Obama, has embraced the notion that outdated, unsuccessful or otherwise ineffective regulations should be repealed. Nevertheless, the cumulative regulatory burden continues to expand year after year.

To address this growing problem, I will be partnering with Congressman JASON SMITH to sponsor the Senate version of the SCRUB Act—Searching for and Cutting Regulations that are Unnecessarily Burdensome. This legislation creates a bipartisan commission to examine the entire administrative corpus in search of regulations that are obsolete, outdated, ineffective, overlapping, duplicative or unjustified. Its goal is to achieve a 15-percent cost reduction in our Nation's total regulatory burden. The Commission can recommend either immediate repeal or incremental reform through a flexible procedure that puts the agencies and stakeholders in the driver's seat.

The SCRUB Act transforms a long-standing bipartisan commitment to retrospective regulatory review from mere rhetoric into meaningful reality. It would result in lower prices, higher wages, and more job opportunities for hard-working Americans. All the while, such commonsense regulatory review poses no risk to our health, our safety or our environment. It is the kind of legislation that can earn support from both sides of the aisle and for which there is a realistic path to having it enacted into law.

A second critical flaw in the current administrative state is a fundamental lack of accountability in how the Federal Government makes and enforces regulations. Far too often the agencies and interest groups manipulate the rules and stack the decks against innovators, entrepreneurs, and ordinary citizens.

Thankfully, there are a number of potential avenues for meaningful reform, but the one area that has thus

far escaped much legislative attention is the role the Federal judiciary plays in the regulatory process. Given the broad authorities Congress has ceded to administrative agencies, the courts often stand as the only truth independent check on increasingly out-of-control regulators. But recent abuses by the political branches have created serious challenges for effective and appropriate judicial review on the regulatory process.

By writing vague laws, Congress has created extraordinary flexible grants of authority that are both unwise and constitutionally troublesome. Judicial deference to agency interpretations of the law has magnified this power to an extreme degree. Although originally intended as a means of curtailing judicial activism, Chevron deference and its associated doctrines have resulted in a gross misallocation of lawmaking authority. Such doctrines have consigned courts to be rubberstamps, rather than effective checks on administrative overreach.

The threat of toothless judicial oversight of increasingly problematic regulatory action was only heightened when President Obama and his allies packed the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals with compliant judges even less inclined to engage in meaningful administrative review, and Congress's creation of broadly available private rights of action to challenge administrative decisions and regulatory activities has opened another avenue for abuse of the courts.

While these provisions provide important opportunities for regulated parties to defend their liberties, too often they have allowed groups with no concrete stake in the process to use the courts as a means to drive their own ideological agendas.

Worse yet, inconsistent efforts by the judiciary to define the constitutional limits on standing have inadvertently created a perverse environment where businesses with real skin in the game are often shut out of court, while special interest groups with no meaningful injury in fact are allowed to litigate.

Restoring the constitutionally proper judicial role is vital to returning accountability to the regulatory process. In reviewing agency actions, courts should hear only real cases and controversies, where litigants have concrete interests at stake. But when they do, they should state firmly what the law is and not simply ratify what the regulatory agencies argue that the law should be.

Legislation to ensure meaningful reform on each front and thereby bringing the administrative state more in line with the Constitution will be one of my top priorities in this Congress.

It is disappointing that we could not override the President's veto of this important legislation. The failure to authorize Keystone demonstrates how

broken our regulatory process is. I hope we can use this occasion of bipartisan consensus to move forward in ways that can fix our out-of-control bureaucracy and get Washington back to work for the American people.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 660 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE ARCTIC

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is quiet around here today, this afternoon. We have been notified that we are not going to be having any further votes this week because Washington, DC, is anticipating a winter storm. It is March 4. I think most people here in Washington had hoped that winter had already come and gone, but that is not the case.

In my home State of Alaska, this is the time of year that we welcome winter. We embrace winter. In fact, I am going to be going up to the State this Friday to attend the kickoff of our biggest sporting event, which is the Iditarod sled dog race, 1,100 miles, where about 70 teams of dogs and intrepid mushers make the trek typically between the Anchorage area and 1,100 miles up to Nome.

This winter has been a little bit different. It is warmer back home than most of us Alaskans would like, and we have actually had to reroute the Iditarod for the second time in the race's history. It is going to be starting out of my hometown in Fairbanks, and rerouting the race so that it is still a thousand-mile race. But it does speak to the fact that we are seeing some changes up there, at least for this winter, in terms of our temperatures and our climate.

We have a lot of folks around here anticipating what we are going to see tomorrow who are wondering what is

going on with climate? What are we seeing? Is this temporary in nature, or are we going to start seeing more arctic conditions here on the eastern seaboard?

I want to talk about the Arctic today. I want to talk about the value of an amazing part of the globe and the opportunities we have in the Arctic, the opportunities we have as an Arctic nation.

We have a map here. This is the bathymetric chart of the Arctic Ocean. It is a view that perhaps most Americans are not intimately familiar with. You look at it and say, where on planet Earth is this?

To locate everybody a little bit, here you have Russia, Greenland, Canada over here, and the United States. This is the State of Alaska with all of the interior arctic areas there, but an amazing mass located at the top of the globe, an area where, quite honestly, most Americans put it out of sight, out of mind. The only time they really think about the Arctic is when there are temperatures that make it feel like the Arctic.

There are probably going to be a lot of folks here in Washington, DC, tomorrow who are thinking, yes, maybe we do live in an Arctic nation because I am feeling it here. It doesn't make any difference whether we have a storm coming at us or whether it is the heat of the summer in Washington, DC, or the fall in New England, or the warm winter temperatures in a place such as Arizona. Wherever you reside in this country, you are part of an Arctic nation. I am willing to bet that when the Presiding Officer was elected to represent the State of Colorado, he didn't think at that time that he was also elected to be a Senator for the Arctic. But, in fact, he is because we are an arctic nation. In Colorado—I suppose the Presiding Officer is probably thinking, tell me why the Arctic is relevant to Colorado, other than the fact that we also share some good winters and have an appreciation for the snow and colder climates. But in the State of Colorado, 30 percent—30.5 percent of the total exports that go out of Colorado are exported to arctic nations.

Now think about that. Thirty percent of what goes out of Colorado is exported to an Arctic nation, one of the eight Arctic nations—Canada, Finland, Greenland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden. These are your trading partners.

Our colleague from Wyoming was just on the floor. Let's see what Wyoming exports. They are about in the same category as Colorado, about 28.3 percent of the total exports from Wyoming are exported to the Arctic nations. When we think about the dollars that are coming to Colorado or Wyoming or Maryland as a result of exports from your States, it causes us to

maybe perhaps look at the Arctic a little bit differently.

We have an opportunity to build upon a dynamic relationship, an evolving part of the globe, as we prepare as a nation to assume the chair of the Arctic Council. This event will take place on April 25, just a couple of months from now. But the Arctic Council is the intergovernmental forum for the eight nations that have territory inside the Arctic Circle. Again, this is pretty much this map here: Canada, Russia, Denmark through Greenland, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, and then, of course, by virtue of the State of Alaska, the United States.

The Arctic Council also includes six nonvoting permanent participant groups that represent the indigenous people of the Arctic. There are also 32 observer entities. The interesting thing with these observer participants, 12 of the 32 are non-Arctic nations, so areas that are not countries that we would think of that would have a keen interest in what is going on with Arctic policy. This is France, Germany, the United Kingdom, China, Japan.

What is really impressive to me is that we are seeing the growth in the number of non-Arctic nations that are seeking observer status. Back in the 2013 Arctic Council ministerial meeting we had in Sweden, six nations were admitted as observers. Many others have indicated their interest as well.

It is also interesting to note that with the admission of China, all five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council are now members or observers of the Arctic Council. Also represented are 8 of the world's 10 largest economies based on GDP, which is an indicator of the level of importance the world ascribes to the Arctic.

What has happened with the Arctic is, again, a keen interest from all over the globe in what is happening. Why is that? What is going on that is capturing the interests, the imagination, the opportunity for nations all over the globe? So much of it is because this area, an area that for most has always been locked up in a world of ice and permanently frozen in time. So to even imagine the possibilities of what could unfold in the Arctic was so foreign that only the most adventurous of the explorers ever pushed out.

It is changing up North, whether it is the northern sea route coming across on the Russian side, whether it is the Northwest Passage, whether it is nations that are looking to explore for resources, whether it is those involved in maritime traffic and engaging in a level of commerce that are looking for that shorter route that will cut days, weeks, off of a journey and, therefore, costs off of the expense of shipping. Whether it is the tourists—cruise ships are coming across the top. Up in Point Barrow, right up here at the top of the

world, you have cruise ships that are moving through those waters—the ultimate ecotourists and those who are seeking something different.

The Arctic is notable within the international community from an economic perspective. As its shipping lanes open up, we have additional areas that become accessible for resource development. Again, the rise of tourism is an example of the increased accessibility of the Arctic.

It is also notable from a political perspective as the region that is not bogged down by the inertia of longstanding disputes. Think about so many parts of the world where there have been decades, if not centuries of conflict. This is a part of the world that does not have that overlay, if you will. It does not have the entrenched views that make international cooperation in other areas difficult.

Instead, it is an area that seeks to promote collaboration and remain a zone of peace. Think about the conversations I am able to have with Secretary Kerry, as I did just a few weeks back, talking about the Arctic and being able to speak to the Secretary of State about how we can work more collaboratively, how we can keep an area as a zone of peace as he deals with hot spots all over the globe—to know that there is a cool place, not only from a physical perspective but perhaps from an emotional and a political perspective, where perhaps we can be working together to advance goals and initiatives rather than constantly being at issue with one another.

It also is a region that is writing its history as we speak. This has been around for a long time. But what is happening at the top of the globe is like a clean sheet. It is an opportunity for us to write history. It is even more important for the United States to take a lead in guiding international policy decisions within this area. This is why I am calling on colleagues in the Senate to join me, to step up, to help us not only to build out policy initiatives but really to take that leadership role, as we should be doing as an Arctic nation.

So I have joined together with the Senator from Maine, Mr. KING, to form a new caucus. I know we have plenty of caucuses around here, but I am asking colleagues to consider joining this caucus, the Senate Arctic Caucus. This caucus has a mission to convene conversations among Members on issues relating to defense, science, energy, environment, commerce, trade, maritime affairs, the well-being of the indigenous peoples of the Arctic, to raise awareness about the importance of the Arctic, and to advance a coordinated effort toward investment in infrastructure that will benefit all Americans, including those who live in the Arctic.

I should let colleagues know that when I am offering this opportunity to

join a caucus, it is not just to say that I am paying attention to Arctic issues in name only. We really want to try to educate because, again, I think the awareness of what is happening in the Arctic has captivated the imagination and the attention of people around the world, of nations around the world. It should captivate the imagination and the attention of every Member in this body. So each Member will be receiving an invitation to join this caucus, along with a breakdown of each State's exports to the Arctic region, to help demonstrate why the Arctic matters to all 50 of the States.

So as I have outlined to the Presiding Officer, about the benefits that Colorado receives and the benefits that Wyoming receives, all Members will be getting similar figures. It was 10 years ago when I started an Arctic awareness campaign. That was a long time ago. It was an effort to get folks—not only within the legislative body but within the administration—to pay attention to what was going on within the region.

It started out pretty simply. I can remember that I was on the Foreign Relations Committee, and we had the nomination hearing for Condoleezza Rice to be Secretary of State. I asked her a question: So what are we doing in the Arctic to ensure that the Arctic remains a zone of peace? Or I asked something to that effect.

I think I caught her flatfooted. The next time I saw her before the Foreign Relations Committee, she was up to speed and engaged. But I can state with some certainty here that in 2005 the State Department was just not prepared to have a discussion on these issues.

Now, I am not going to claim full credit here. But move forward a little bit with the clock. It was good to see the movement within the administration. When Hillary Clinton was Secretary of State, she was the first Secretary of State to participate in an Arctic Council ministerial meeting. I think that was probably prompted by some visits she had made to view the Arctic, including the U.S. Arctic in Barrow, when she was a Member of this body. But as Secretary of State she traveled to Nuuk, Greenland in 2011. I accompanied her. Then in 2013 Secretary Kerry went to the ministerial meeting in Kiruna, Sweden. In 2015 Secretary Kerry will again participate in this year's meeting in Canada, where the Arctic Council chairmanship will be handed over to the United States.

I started off my comments by talking about what is going on with the weather and people feeling like we are under an Arctic siege here right now in Washington. But I think it is safe to say that Arctic awareness is at an alltime high. But unfortunately, the investment has not matched the interest. One barometer of your interest when

you are talking about the Arctic is: How do you move in the Arctic if there is ice up there? You have to be able to plow through some ice. This is where an icebreaker comes into play.

But icebreakers are expensive. The Coast Guard estimates that it is going to be about \$1 billion. It takes about 10 years to build. If I were to ask anybody in this body how many icebreakers the United States has, I think you would say: Well, of course we have an icebreaker up there.

We have one medium-strength icebreaker, the Healy, which does a good job for us. But our only Polar Class vessel, the Polar Star is on assignment to Antarctica for the next 5 years. We will not see her in the Arctic for 5 full years. The life expectancy, the useful life of the Polar Star is only 6 to 8 years. It takes 10 years to build a new one.

We are sitting here as a nation woefully behind when it comes to Arctic infrastructure, if you define it by icebreaking capacity. Russia is cleaning our clock in terms of the number of icebreakers they have. They have 27. Our own Coast Guard's High Latitude Study says it is going to require six major icebreakers—three heavy and three medium-sized icebreakers—to fulfill its statutory requirements.

Even China has one icebreaker. They are building six more. India—do you think of India as an Arctic Nation? They are considering building an icebreaker. Why? Because they see the Arctic opportunity. They want to be part of an area on the globe that is piquing their interest for a host of different reasons.

So as others in the Arctic region, whether it is Russia or whether it is Canada, as they continue some pretty aggressive national plans, combined with state investment to develop their Arctic resources and advance commerce in the north, the United States needs to be a participant. But we need to be more than a participant. We need to be a leader. We lead everywhere else. We led to the moon. We know more about the mapping of Mars than we know about mapping in the Arctic.

We need to step it up. It is exciting to think that we can step it up. I am hoping that we will be able to focus our attention on these issues. It is not just the resources and infrastructure that will make the Arctic a national priority. It is not just preparing for a 2-year chairmanship. It is about what the vision is—the long-term vision for the United States' role in an emerging part of the globe. It is as dynamic as anyplace out there.

But we have to be ready. We lack certain basic infrastructure needs. I mentioned the need for an icebreaker. I am going to be introducing legislation, hopefully very soon, to develop a solid foundation and put some building blocks in place for that investment, in-

cluding a focus on obtaining more accurate data for charting the Arctic. We simply are so far behind in our hydrographic charting. We need to do better with our ice forecasting, with our weather observation stations, with our weather buoys, with our monitoring out in our oceans, with just having a level of communications and understanding of what we have. So, as we look to the area, we have at least to be able to assess the accuracy of Arctic weather and water forecasting. We have to be able to understand whether we have gaps in Arctic weather and sea-ice observing networks and the status of our sea-ice analysis and forecasting services.

So we are going to be having a hearing tomorrow in the energy committee. We may be the only committee that is open for business. We may be the only Senators that are here in the building. But we are going to be having the first-ever hearing on the Arctic. I think it is fair to say that it is not only the first hearing in the energy committee but the first-ever hearing on the Arctic as a whole, instead of just bits and pieces of it.

So I am encouraging all of my colleagues who may be locked out because they could not jump on a flight quickly enough or they could not get on the road soon enough. But we will be having, I think, a very informative hearing tomorrow in the energy committee to focus on what, again, I am calling Arctic opportunities. I do not know if the timing of the hearing was just prescient on my part and that we knew that this was going to happen. If so, I should also do part-time work as a weather forecaster. But I do think it is certainly timely. In fact, it is long past time that we focus again on an area that hosts amazing promise and opportunity for leadership as a nation. I would encourage all of my colleagues to join us in this new Senate Arctic Caucus. Embrace your inner Arctic self. It really is a good place to be.

With that, I see that my colleague from Wyoming is here. He has been very patient. As I mentioned to the Senator from Colorado, our Presiding Officer right now, Colorado enjoys good benefits from the State of Alaska. For the fine folks in Wyoming, 28 percent of their total exports from the State of Wyoming do go to Arctic nations. So there is a connection. I look forward to working with both of my colleagues as members of the energy committee on these issues of great importance to our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, first, let me congratulate our colleague from Alaska, who is the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. That committee is in capable hands under her direction, whether the

Arctic—all energy. She is committed to affordable energy, available energy, reliable energy, secure energy, and American energy.

So we are in good stead with the new chairman who has taken over in January. As members of that committee, it is a great opportunity for us to work with her for affordable energy for all in America. We have opportunities for exports, and it is good to see her continued leadership on this and other topics.

I appreciate her hard work.

#### KING V. BURWELL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, earlier today the United States Supreme Court heard arguments in an important case, a consequential case. It is called *King v. Burwell*. This case was brought on behalf of millions of Americans who have been harmed by the President's unlawful expansion of his unworkable and unaffordable health care law.

Sometime before the end of June, the Court will decide if the law passed by Congress means what it says or if it means what the President wishes it said.

It looks at one very specific and very important part of the President's health care law. The law says that Washington could help subsidize the premiums of people buying health insurance coverage through exchanges established by the States. President Obama decided that wasn't enough. He wanted to use taxpayer dollars on behalf of people buying insurance in the Federal exchange as well. That is it. That is the legal question.

The law, written by Democrats in Congress—written behind closed doors—only authorized subsidies for one group, but the President paid them out for another group. The case is not about the Constitution, it is about the rule of law.

I was at the Court this morning listening to the arguments, and I expect that the Justices will strike down the way the President expanded the law.

Time after time this administration has claimed power it did not have and taken actions it cannot defend. The way the administration expanded the health care law is one of the most blatant of these power grabs, because when Democrats passed the law, they got exactly what they wanted. They rejected Republican idea after Republican idea that could have made this law better. They forced it through Congress with absolutely no Republican support.

It still wasn't good enough for the Obama administration, so it expanded the law some more. ObamaCare is a minefield, and the administration refused to give people the information they need to help them navigate it.

The Obama administration knew this court case was coming well before the



enrollment period to buy insurance for this year even started. So did the American President tell the American people these subsidies might not be legal? Did he warn people? What did the President actually say? Did he warn anyone signing up in the exchanges that they might not be seeing the real price of any insurance they picked? No, the President refused to do so.

He knew he might lose the case. He knew it. He knew the risk he was making people take, but the President didn't say a word—people who were just trying to make the best choices for their families. The White House did not tell people the truth about their options.

Several Republican Senators wrote to the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of the Treasury asking them to warn people. We said people need this information. There are thousands of dollars at stake for families, and the Obama administration should at least tell them what might happen.

The Secretary has refused to level with the American people.

Just the other day, the Secretary of Health and Human Services admitted she had no plan B. Her letter is clear and it is consequential. She admits that if the Supreme Court rules against the Obama administration, the President does not have the authority—does not have the authority—to use administrative actions to undo the Supreme Court decision. The administration purposefully waited to admit that until after the open enrollment period ended. It didn't want to take the chance that warning people might hurt its enrollment numbers.

Today at the Supreme Court, several Justices were skeptical of the administration's legal defense. I expect the Supreme Court to say the President must enforce the law Congress has passed, rather than the law the President wishes Congress had passed. If it does, it will help rein in this out-of-control White House. It will tell the Obama administration it must obey the law and that the President cannot keep making up the rules as he goes along.

The health care law is clear. The President was wrong to expand his health insurance exchanges beyond what the law allowed. The President was wrong to use the IRS to make up rules and penalties. The Obama administration was irresponsible for not warning people.

Republicans will have a plan to protect the people harmed by the President's action and to create a path away from ObamaCare. First, our plan will help the millions of people who have been hurt by the White House's decision to illegally implement its health care law. It would be unfair for families to lose their coverage in the middle of the year just because they believed the

false promises made by Barack Obama. So Republicans will help Americans keep their coverage for a transitional period.

Second, it will give States the freedom and flexibility to create better, more competitive health insurance markets, offering more options and different choices at home where people live, not decisions made in Washington.

We want to allow States to come up with health care systems that work for them, not the bureaucrats in the Nation's Capital. We would give every State the ability to create a better market, better opportunities suited to the needs of that State's citizens. It is time for President Obama to stop putting people through all of the pain this law has created.

The President's health care law continues to be unpopular, unworkable, and unaffordable. He needs to finally negotiate with Republicans to give people the reform they wanted all along, which is what people asked for—the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am pleased to follow my distinguished colleague and friend from the State of Wyoming, and I rise to talk about exactly the same issue and to differ with him, respectfully, that the current law is unworkable, unpopular, and unaffordable. In fact, history demonstrates that it is certainly working.

In the State of Connecticut we know well that it is working as it was intended because we have a State-run exchange, and we have cut the number of uninsured by one-half, while improving health care quality, lowering Medicaid spending, and making remarkable achievements across a whole range of metrics. That same story is true of our Nation as a whole, whether there are State-run exchanges or Federal supervised exchanges.

Today's point, whether it is in the Supreme Court or here, should be extraordinarily encouraging about the Congress's approval of the Affordable Care Act and the fact that it is working across the country. It is succeeding in delivering exactly what was intended, what the Congress promised, what its advocates saw, access for all Americans to affordable health insurance.

The ACA is working today to protect Americans from abuses, and I saw them literally day in and day out as attorney general: people who lost health insurance when they got sick, people who were denied coverage because of a pre-existing condition, people who were charged more because of their gender, people who were denied the basic care they needed and deserved for themselves, their children, and their families, giving them access not only to

health care but also to work and to family stability.

I saw every day as attorney general how imperiled and critical health care is in this country and how much we need to do more and do better in this area.

The uninsured rate in this country is the lowest it has been in 7 years, and we have lowered it a remarkable 25 percent in just 1 year. Eight million people have gained health insurance through the exchanges who didn't have it before, and I know that States with federally run exchanges have made improvements, just as Connecticut has done, which is fully in accordance with the absolutely crystal-clear intent of this Congress and this law to provide affordable health insurance for all Americans, regardless of where they live, what State, what ZIP Code, whatever their occupation and background.

Let's be clear. As with any big law there are kinks that need to be ironed out, there are glitches that need to be resolved, but the Affordable Care Act is working now and working better every month, every year.

The legal issue before the Court has been debated today in depth, and I believe with the great persuasiveness—similar to the Presiding Officer, I had the honor to serve as a law clerk to the Supreme Court and watch many arguments. To say that today is historic I think is true, but in my view almost every argument before the Supreme Court is historic in its consequences—some more than others, but every one is consequential because cases don't reach the U.S. Supreme Court unless they are difficult and consequential, and issues of statutory interpretation that are said to be simple often are more complicated than they may seem.

But I know, without a doubt, having read this statute, that the text and structure of the Affordable Care Act clearly demonstrate—in fact, they unmistakably demand—that Federal tax credits be available to every eligible taxpayer in every State in this country.

I have done arguments in the U.S. Supreme Court, and I had the honor to be attorney general of the State of Connecticut as well as a U.S. attorney.

Having looked at this statute as a whole, having read the words that need to be interpreted by the Supreme Court, I have reached this conclusion: Contrary to the argument of partisan opponents, both the act itself and the plainly overwhelming evidence from its consideration and passage demonstrate its nationwide scope.

I wasn't here at the time it was passed, but from the legislative history and, most important, from the structure and language of the act itself, there seems to be irrefutably and incontrovertibly an understanding that tax credits would be available regardless of which governmental agency set



up an exchange. The act simply would not have worked any other way and courts have an obligation to read statutes in a way that makes the most sense in terms of the overriding intent and purpose of the Congress.

The financial support simply, for universal coverage, would not be there without this interpretation, a common-sense interpretation that makes sense of congressional intent, purpose, and the law as a whole.

The law has given so many families across the country access to care for the first time. There has been an effort to repeal this act legislatively. There has been an effort to overturn it in the courts. Both have failed because it is working and because it is constitutional.

A ruling for the plaintiffs in this case that is now before the Court would not only be contrary to law, it would be catastrophic to millions of families who owe their health insurance to the structure the ACA has established. It would be, in fact, a human tragedy as well as a legal travesty.

There is simply no alternative that has been offered by opponents to this law. It is difficult therefore to see how this misguided lawsuit is anything other than one more cynical attempt to repeal or overturn this law—or torpedo it by any means necessary, regardless of the collateral damage to millions of innocent people who would suffer loss of health care insurance and health care. And the tragedy would be not only for them but for our entire Nation because the cost would ripple throughout our society—the cost in lost work; the cost in families suffering from the consequences of bankruptcy, which is caused most frequently by health care-related financial issues; the cost in the ability of our workforce to function at the height of efficiency that we all need; and the cost ultimately in diseases that have to be treated and ailments that have to be addressed and preventable health care consequences for our children. Prevention is one of the most cost-effective goals of the Affordable Care Act.

So I will work with my colleagues to support this act and to determine what other efforts can make progress toward the ultimate goal that we all should share—an America that is free from disease or injury that will bankrupt our families, an America that is healthier and better able to afford health care, and quality and timely health treatment.

The lack of standing on the part of these plaintiffs seems clear, but putting aside all of the technical issues and the legal debate, the Affordable Care Act has allowed America to make huge, exciting strides in the direction of better health care. So we should be proud of the act passed by this body. Even many of us perhaps who were not here at the time can look forward to

how much further we can go, and America has that fundamental obligation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am back now for the 91st consecutive week the Senate has been in session to urge my colleagues to wake up and pay attention to the threat of climate change. I am delighted and proud to be joined today by my colleague and friend Senator BALDWIN from Wisconsin to consider the effects of carbon pollution in her State.

According to scientists at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, weather stations around the State show that average temperatures in Wisconsin increased by about 1.1 degrees Fahrenheit between 1950 and 2006. During the same period Wisconsin got wetter. Annual average precipitation increased by almost 3 inches. These changes are likely to continue and intensify as carbon pollution continues to pile up in the atmosphere. Researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison estimate that by midcentury the State could warm by 4 to 9 degrees Fahrenheit. By the end of the century the climate in Wisconsin may look more like that of present-day Missouri or Oklahoma, raising the possibility of a dramatic shift in the Wisconsin economy and way of life.

This winter has been pretty cold in the Eastern United States and in Wisconsin. So was last year. Cold arctic air dipping down over North America drops the mercury. As we continue into a time of what has been called global weirding, scientists say that climate change may make these cold blasts more common as it alters patterns in the atmosphere. In a nutshell, on top of the long-term warming trend lies weather disorder. But the long-term warming trend is apparent. New research from UW-Madison's Professor Jonathan Martin shows that last year the so-called cold pool of frigid air that accumulates in the Northern Hemisphere each winter was the smallest since records began in the winter of 1948 to 1949. This year it is on track to be even smaller.

Sadly, some of our colleagues just can't face up to the role that human activity—such as our carbon pollution from burning fossil fuel—plays in the changes we are seeing around us. One colleague—indeed, the senior Senator

from Wisconsin—is among this group. In January he voted against amendments to the Keystone XL bill stating that climate change is real and that humans contribute to it. Well, in 2013 the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel—his State's largest paper—noted that this type of denial was at odds with both Wisconsin opinion and Wisconsin scientific evidence. The senior Senator from Wisconsin, wrote the paper's editorial board, "is just flat-out wrong." The paper went on to say, "We elect politicians to make tough decisions and find solutions, not to shut their eyes and cover their ears, as Johnson repeatedly has done on this issue." The article continued: "[S]tubbornly denying the facts on climate change may be akin to denying the facts on evolution or whether the Earth is flat."

Professor John Kutzbach of the University of Wisconsin—an elected member of the National Academy of Sciences—was among a group of climate scientists who in 2011 wrote to us in Congress imploring us to take action on climate change. Here is what the letter said:

Congress needs to understand that scientists have concluded, based on a systematic review of all of the evidence, that climate change caused by human activities raises serious risks to our national and economic security and our health both here and around the world. It is time for Congress to move on to the policy debate.

Well, I welcome that debate. Indeed, the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator MURKOWSKI, recently said on the floor of the Senate that she hopes we can "get beyond the discussion as to whether or not climate change is real and talk about . . . what do we do." So where is that debate? Where are the other Republicans? Let's finally talk about the cost of action and the cost of inaction.

The Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts was formed in 2007 by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and the University of Wisconsin Nelson Institute for Environmental Studies. The scientists and public officials in this program are doing important work to help the State of Wisconsin understand and prepare for climate change. They are studying how it will affect wildlife, water resources, public health, and important Wisconsin industries such as forestry, agriculture, and shipping and tourism on the Great Lakes.

Climate change threatens iconic aspects of the Wisconsin environment and economy. The Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts Agriculture Working Group reports that higher summer temperatures and increasing drought will create significant stress on livestock, even touching—dare I say it—Wisconsin's famed cheese industry. Victor Cabrera, an assistant professor in the University of Wisconsin-Madison Dairy Science Department—they have one—says heat stress

interferes with fertility and milk production. Dairy cows could give as much as 10 percent less milk. The U.S. Department of Agriculture predicts that by 2030 climate change will cost the U.S. dairy sector between \$79 and \$199 million a year in lost production. When opponents say reducing carbon pollution will cost too much, they conveniently leave out the cost of doing nothing, such as these costs.

Well, the dairy State is not waiting for Congress to take action. The University of Wisconsin is leading a USDA-funded effort to identify dairy practices that minimize the emission of greenhouse gases and make dairies more resilient to the effects of a changing climate. Some Wisconsin dairy farmers are burning excess methane in enormous manure digesters—that is a frightening concept—to generate their own renewable electricity.

Wisconsin sportsmen know that Wisconsin has more than 10,000 miles of trout streams—some of the best trout fishing in the country. Cold-water fish, such as the brook trout, are there, but they are highly sensitive to temperature increases in streams. Under the worst cases analyzed by the researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, “brook trout are projected to be completely lost from Wisconsin’s streams.” Even the best-case scenarios see losses of as much as 44 percent of the brookies’ current range by midcentury. Other cold-water species, such as the brown trout, are not much better off.

Trout Unlimited—sportsmen and conservationists working to protect trout streams in the Driftless Area in southwest Wisconsin and parts of Minnesota, Illinois, and Iowa—did a 2009 study showing fishing in the Driftless Area adds over \$1 billion per year to the surrounding economies.

We have heard of loggers having trouble getting to the timber because the ground is thawed and too soggy to hold up logging equipment. For Wisconsin’s loggers, the hard, frozen winter ground is what lets them move logging equipment. According to a study out of the University of Wisconsin, that period of frozen ground has decreased by 2 to 3 weeks since 1948, shortening the working window for loggers before their gear bogs down.

And then there is the badger. The Upper Midwest and Great Lakes Landscape Conservation Cooperative even lists the great Wisconsin badger as one of the species at risk from regional climate change.

Senator BALDWIN knows that, done right, action on climate change saves Americans money, spurs American innovation, and creates new American industry and jobs. Focus on Energy, Wisconsin’s statewide energy efficiency program, has been helping Wisconsin families and businesses save money and

reduce energy use since 2001. The Wisconsin Public Service Commission expects this program to inject over \$900 million into the State’s economy, and net over 6,000 new Wisconsin jobs over the next decade.

I am very grateful to my friend Senator BALDWIN for her strong leadership on behalf of the people of Wisconsin to stave off the worst effects of climate change in her home State.

I yield to her now.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his commitment to addressing the threats that climate change poses globally, to our country, and to our States. I thank him for highlighting some of those threats to my home State of Wisconsin.

Let there be no doubt that global climate change is real. It is a fact. The question is not whether it is happening, but rather how we are going to address it. Are we going to do all we can to leave the next generation a safer and healthier world?

As my friend from Rhode Island just noted, climate change will be costly to our economy and to our very way of life, and the longer we wait to act, the more costly these impacts will be.

Throughout our history, the State of Wisconsin has been a proud home to environmental leaders who have worked to pass on a stronger environment to future generations—Aldo Leopold, John Muir, and Senator Gaylord Nelson, founder of Earth Day and the namesake for the Nelson Institute at the University of Wisconsin, which my colleague from Rhode Island just mentioned in his remarks. As a representative of our great State, it is one of my top priorities to follow in this legacy and to preserve our natural resources and quality of life for future generations.

It is not hard to see why Wisconsinites have always deeply valued environmental protection. Looking out at the crystal clear waters of Lake Superior from its south shore, or standing atop Rib Mountain gazing at the forests and farmlands of central Wisconsin, to casting your fishing rod in the world-class trout streams of the Driftless region in southwestern Wisconsin, there is no question that we are blessed by the natural beauty of our State.

But even now, the impact of climate change can be seen on each of these landscapes and in the economies they support. We see it in our agriculture—growing seasons are shifting, and extreme weather harms our crops, and we have increasing concerns about drought and our groundwater.

In fact, NASA recently warned that within a few decades—within our lifetimes—the United States may enter a megadrought that could last 30 years.

In my home State, the resulting decreased soil moisture will put additional stress on farmers, on private

wells, and on municipal drinking water systems. These prolonged droughts, combined with increased intensity of storm events and changing temperature patterns, will force farmers to make changes to how and what they grow. This is extremely troubling, as agriculture is an \$88 billion industry in my home State of Wisconsin.

We also see the negative effects of climate change on our Great Lakes. In Lake Michigan, for example, lake levels are largely driven by precipitation. Changes in precipitation patterns due to climate change may cause more dramatic fluctuations or prolonged changes in lake levels.

In addition, data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shows that summertime surface water temperatures have increased 8 degrees Fahrenheit since 1980. Warmer surface water temperatures disrupt the food chain, which threatens our fish population. As these adverse effects are expected to worsen in the coming decades, they will inevitably lead to more wildlife disease, and warmer waters that will drive out native fish.

Changing water levels also create new challenges for property owners and communities along the Great Lakes. Infrastructure may need to be redesigned, insurance demands may change, and new health risks may emerge or be exacerbated as additional stress is imposed on our sewer systems. Each of these will hurt our local economies.

Tourism is also a major part of Wisconsin’s economy, and the Northwoods is a favorite destination to fish, camp, hunt, and snowmobile. But projections show that by midcentury, the climate of areas such as Bayfield and Vilas County in the Northwoods will be more similar to what we have known in the southeastern part of the State of Wisconsin in counties such as Waukesha County.

Meanwhile, Waukesha County’s climate could be more similar to what we used to expect hundreds of miles south in the neighboring State of Illinois. The impacts on tourism, recreation, and the landscapes we hold near and dear may be dramatic, and the threats may be daunting. But we cannot continue to let the challenges overwhelm us and cause inaction on our part.

Wisconsin’s State motto is “Forward.” The people of Wisconsin have never been afraid of the challenges we face or what the future holds. We have a strong progressive tradition of confronting our challenges and working together to shape our future for the next generation.

In fact, analysis by the World Resources Institute in 2013 found that Wisconsin is well positioned to meet national goals for carbon pollution reduction. By extending existing clean energy policies, Wisconsin could reduce its emissions substantially in coming years.

In addition, many of Wisconsin's most successful companies are leaders in energy efficiency, renewable energy, and clean technology. They are vital sources of innovation and will provide opportunities for the workers of today and tomorrow.

I believe smart investments by government, by companies and institutions, and by citizens will help us confront the challenge of climate change, while positioning Wisconsin for 21st century economic and ecological resiliency.

This opportunity is great. We must meet the challenge head on—going forward the Wisconsin way.

I once again thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his laser focus on this issue that is so critical to all of our home States, as well as, frankly, the entire global community.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank Senator BALDWIN for sharing this time with me this evening, and for all the wonderful work she does on behalf of her home State.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to proceed to S. 625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 625.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 27, S. 625, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 625, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Daniel Coats, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, David Vitter, Jerry Moran, Deb Fischer, Johnny Isakson, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Orrin G. Hatch, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, John Thune.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 625 occur 1 hour after the Senate convenes on Tuesday, March 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the Prime Minister of Israel shared with the Congress and the American people his perspective regarding Israel's national security interests and the threat the radical regime in Tehran poses to stability in the greater Middle East. The Prime Minister explained later in the day in a meeting here in the Senate why any agreement that leaves Iran with a threshold nuclear weapons capability is harmful not only to the strategic interests of Israel but to the United States and to our allies.

Unfortunately, President Obama appears to be pursuing an agreement that is designed to leave the Iranians with a threshold nuclear capability under which they can retain thousands of centrifuges, continue to master the nuclear fuel cycle, advance ballistic missile research and testing, and keep secret any possible military dimensions of nuclear development that has already occurred. Iran has a record of covertly pursuing aspects of a nuclear weapons program.

The administration has pursued the P5+1 negotiation, not as part of an overall strategy to end Iran's nuclear program and to defeat its efforts to dominate the region but as a stand-alone matter of litigation where a settlement must be reached. This negotiation shouldn't be about getting the best deal the Iranians will agree to; it should be about the strategic objective of ending Iran's nuclear weapons program.

Many in Congress have been wary of what kind of concessions the Obama administration might agree to with the Iranians and what were the responsible steps to be taken if Iran refused to give up the pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability.

Yesterday I began the process to move to legislation that would meet the demands from both sides of the aisle—to give Congress the ability to review and vote on any deal the President agrees to with Iran. From a legislative perspective, given that this bipartisan bill was introduced last week and that the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee has ample time to mark up this bill and send a substitute to the floor, I was surprised that some Senators made statements objecting to their own legislation. It was surprising to see some Members on the other side of the aisle threaten to filibuster their own bill—a bill they rushed to introduce before the President's negotiations were complete.

This isn't complicated. A bill was introduced, and, as I discussed with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, it can be marked up, and the committee-passed bill would be the substitute the Senate then considers.

From a policy perspective, it makes clear to the administration not to strike a deal that leaves Iran as a threshold nuclear state. And it makes obvious sense to consider the Nuclear Review Act before the deadline for a political agreement because the Iranians need to know that congressional sanctions will not be lifted if a bad deal is reached, and some will oppose lifting sanctions if they refuse to disclose the potential military dimensions of their nuclear program.

But, look, time is running out. Iran's Foreign Minister said today that he believes they are very close to a deal.

There is nothing partisan about the Senate acting to serve its constitutional role in oversight and in pursuing policies that uphold the national security interest. It was the Obama administration that decided to negotiate an agreement with Iran that would not be submitted to the Senate as a treaty. The White House went out of its way to bypass the elected representatives of the people in this negotiation with Iran. It is the Obama administration that is negotiating a deal with the Iranians that will leave them with a nuclear infrastructure. And it is the Corker-Graham-Menendez-Kaine bill that will ensure that Congress will review any deal the President strikes with Iran.

So let's be clear. The actions we have taken would allow the sponsors of this sensible, bipartisan legislation to begin the debate next week. And it will allow for the Foreign Relations Committee to follow the regular order and debate and vote on the bill. If the committee reports a bill, the committee bill will become the text that the full Senate debates. That is called the regular order.

It is my sincere hope that the sponsors of this bill will have the opportunity to review and defend their bill in committee and will not filibuster and prevent the full Senate from also acting on their important legislation. The Senators who introduced the bill—who introduced it—should certainly vote to debate the measure.

# REMEMBERING DEEDEE CORRADINI

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a truly iconic Utah leader, a remarkable woman, and Salt Lake City's first and only female mayor, Ms. Deedee Corradini.

Sadly, Mayor Corradini lost her short but valiant battle with lung cancer this week. She was a fighter until the end—just as she was in her career and in all aspects of her life.

Deedee was a true trailblazer in every sense. She served as Salt Lake City's mayor for 10 years during a time of significant growth and change. During her tenure, she was instrumental in finalizing the city's bid to host the 2002 Winter Olympics. She aggressively courted economic development and managed transportation infrastructure to ensure that Salt Lake City was prepared to take the world stage.

Always energetic, Mayor Corradini was full of ideas and determination, and she always knew how to get things done.

After her mayoral service, she worked for a time in academia and real estate, but perhaps her greatest personal achievement was her vigorous advocacy of women's ski jumping. She served for 10 years as the president of Women's Ski Jumping USA, where she lobbied tirelessly for the inclusion of women's ski jumping in the Winter Olympic Games. She was able to see her vision realized at the 2014 Sochi Winter Olympics as women ski jumpers dazzled the world in this arena for the first time.

Prior to the Sochi games, she demonstrated her enthusiasm and determination to make this dream come true for women athletes stating:

We've already won. Every single one of the women's ski jumpers, they've already won . . . Our battle to get the women into ski jumping became much more than ski jumping. It really became a women's rights issue and a human rights issue, because we were really fighting for all women in all sports and hopefully all aspects of life.

Deedee helped mentor many women and was an example of hard work, determination, and a will to succeed. Not only did she succeed in her professional pursuits; she was also a loving wife, daughter, sister, and mother.

Mr. President, Elaine and I send our deepest condolences to Deedee's family and friends, and we pray for their peace and comfort at this difficult time. Her influence and legacy will be felt for generations to come. Utah was privileged to develop and grow under her leadership.

# KILLING OF RUSSIAN OPPOSITION LEADER BORIS NEMTSOV

Mr. DURBIN. Today I recognize, on the Senate floor, the life and work of a true Russian patriot: Mr. Boris Nemtsov.

Tragically, Mr. Nemtsov was gunned down Friday night as he walked across the Bolshoi Moskvoretsky Bridge with his girlfriend, just yards from the Kremlin and Red Square in central Moscow. Hours before his death, he had given a radio interview where he criticized Russian President Putin for his aggression in Ukraine and Russia's own economic woes—brave acts in a nation where criticism of Putin is not tolerated.

Mr. Nemtsov has been one of the most vocal and highest profile opposition leaders in recent years, tirelessly speaking up for democratic reforms and rights on behalf of the Russian people. In fact, Mr. Nemtsov has been working on behalf of the Russian people for nearly 30 years.

He moved from physics into politics shortly after the Chernobyl disaster in 1986, first winning a seat in the Russian Parliament in 1990. After a series of successful economic reforms as a Parliamentarian and later Governor, Nemtsov was then appointed Deputy Prime Minister under the first President of the Russian Federation, Boris Yeltsin, and even had a chance at the Presidency himself. However, he returned to Parliament after the 1998 crash of the Russian stock market until 2004. Since then, he was active in everything from politics to banking, and over the years he raised repeated concerns that Putin's policies were rolling back democracy and civic freedoms in Russia. Mr. Nemtsov had been arrested several times—and complained of official harassment—for his participation in demonstrations in support of reforms to end corruption, uphold the rule of law, and support basic freedoms.

It is no surprise that tens of thousands of people showed up this Sunday to a rally in Moscow. Originally scheduled to lead the event himself to oppose Russian aggression in Ukraine, the rally turned into an opportunity for members of the opposition movement to mourn Mr. Nemtsov's death. People held images of Mr. Nemtsov, flew flags, and even held up posters and signs with phrases such as: "I am not afraid."

Several thousand also showed up to his funeral Tuesday. Mr. Nemtsov's mother Dina Eidman received all the well-wishers. In recent months, she had reportedly shared her fears that her son may be killed for his criticism of President Putin.

Under President Putin there has been a troubling pattern of silencing peaceful dissent—a problem no doubt made worse by the deliberate whipping up of nationalistic fervor in recent months around Putin's invasion of eastern Ukraine.

We recall the tragic death in prison of Russian human rights lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, jailed for uncovering hundreds of millions of dollars in tax fraud

perpetuated by Russian officials in 2009. Mr. Nemtsov had even visited Washington, DC, in 2010 to support the Magnitsky Act.

Some of you may know of Natalya Estemirova or Anna Politkovskaya, two Russian human rights activists and journalists who were outspoken about human rights abuses in Chechnya, and murdered in 2009 and 2006, respectively. There was also the 2006 poisoning in London of Alexander Litvinenko, an FSB officer who defected and made several claims of corruption against Russian law enforcement officials. Incredulously, one of those suspected for his murder by British authorities was later elected to the Russian Parliament. Sadly, the list goes on.

More recently, the nationalistic passions unleashed by the annexation of Crimea and Sevastopol last year has led to more narrowing of free speech and the marginalization of activists. Many have faced harassment, prison sentences, even violence. And in many of these types of cases, perpetrators are not brought to justice. In a country where authorities may sometimes be involved in crimes of their own and where law enforcement, judicial, and investigative bodies lack credibility, there is very little accountability.

What has been happening in eastern Ukraine and Russia is deeply troubling. President Putin has used the invasion of Ukraine to justify a further crack-down on his own people's talents and aspirations. He has used state-controlled media to unleash anti-Western propaganda that is an insult to the Russia people. He has bet his people's economic and international standing on the pursuit and protection of his own kleptocracy. The Russian people deserve better.

In the case of Mr. Nemtsov, I echo the words of President Obama and countless others: an independent investigation must take place to find out who was responsible for Mr. Nemtsov's death, and the perpetrators must be swiftly brought to justice. The same goes for the many others who had the courage to peacefully report the truth or voice dissent in Russia and then found themselves in jail or murdered.

I joined Senator JOHNSON this week in leading a resolution recognizing Boris Nemtsov and calling for an investigation. I urge my colleagues to support this hero who has been taken from us too soon, and I hope we can continue to work in his honor to support the Russian people as they stand for democratic reforms.

# 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, next week the Nation will celebrate the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, when we commemorate the series of marches

of nonviolent civil rights protestors from Selma to the Alabama State capital of Montgomery. They were marching for the right to vote, which had been guaranteed by the adoption of the 15th Amendment to the Constitution in 1870. The first section of the amendment reads: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

These marches gripped the attention of the Nation because of the violence reaction from the Alabama State troopers, who attacked the marchers on the Edmund Pettus Bridge after leaving Selma. The State troopers attacked the marchers using billy clubs, tear gas, fire hoses, and dogs, and numerous marchers were wounded and were beaten unconscious.

The images shown on television galvanized the American public in support of voting rights. President Lyndon Johnson called on Congress to enact voting rights legislation and make good on both the promise of the 15th Amendment as well as the responsibility of Congress to enforce the amendment "by appropriate legislation."

One of those protestors beaten on the bridge was a Freedom Rider, speaker at the March on Washington, and a leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordination Committee. That protestor was JOHN LEWIS.

I was honored and privileged to enter Congress in 1987 at the same time as Congressman JOHN LEWIS. JOHN LEWIS has been a friend and mentor of mine for many years and is known as the "conscience of the Congress." And while I did leave the House in 2006 to enter the Senate in 2007, I have continued to be inspired by Congressman LEWIS and his continuing struggle to make sure all Americans enjoy the benefits of equal justice under the law.

Just last week during Black History Month, I had the honor, along with Congressman JOHN LEWIS, to address a group of students from Baltimore who took their own pilgrimage to Selma as we approach the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday.

High School students and teachers from Park School, Baltimore City College, City Neighbors High School, and Cristo Rey Jesuit High School participated in a trip to southern cities such as Greensboro, Atlanta, Selma, Little Rock, the Mississippi Delta, and Memphis, focusing on the civil rights movement.

I wish to share some of the stories that the students told to Congressman LEWIS and me last week, because their idealism, determination, and knowledge of both the past and present is very inspirational.

Let me begin with a brief history of how this trip came into being. In 2004,

the first group of students and faculty from the Park School of Baltimore and Baltimore City College High School traveled throughout the American South, visiting with participants in the Civil Rights Movement and touring the museums, sites, and memorials that stand in witness to the foot soldiers, heroes, and martyrs of the movement. The trip was the dream of three Park School faculty members: Carol Kinne, Traci Wright, and Stradine Harris. They envisioned young people from different schools and different backgrounds learning together and becoming inspired to be agents of change upon their return.

Money to cover the expenses of the trip is raised each year by the students. They sell pizza and candy, rake leaves, write grant proposals, and solicit funds from various benefactors.

While learning about the Civil Rights Movement is a primary goal of the trip, equally important is inspiring students to raise awareness of civil rights issues facing people today and to become activists for justice in their own communities.

In 2015, four Baltimore schools—City Neighbors and Cristo Rey having joined the original two—sent 38 students on the trip.

The January 2015 trip was a special one, as the group had the chance to meet with former Ambassador Andrew Young in Atlanta and to attend an event for the movie, *Selma*, that took place on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, in honor of the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday.

The group also visited the International Civil Rights Center in Greensboro, NC, attended church service at Ebenezer Baptist Church, toured the Rosa Parks Museum, met with activists at the Equal Justice Initiative and the Southern Poverty Law Center, and learned about the movement in other museums in Birmingham, Memphis, and Little Rock. More importantly, the group was able to meet and learn from people who fought for change: Cleopatra Goree, Catherine Burks-Brooks, Kurt Carrington, Roscoe Jones, Dr. Sybil Hampton, and others.

I wish to share just a few of the many stories from students who went on this trip, as related in their blog:

Amber Smiley is a 12th grader at Cristo Rey. Amber wrote:

Across from the museum was this statue of people being attacked by dogs and hit with high amounts of pressured water. In these statues you could see the emotion in every one of them. You could see the fit and the drive to make changes. After leaving we had lunch with 3 women that marched, taught, and fought for rights. The women's names are Ms. Cleopatra Goree, Ms. Catherine Burks-Brooks, and Ms. Mimes. Each one of their stories varied but all built up to the bigger theme that we have to strive to make the world better. These words stuck with me like glue on two pieces of paper. Also, they said it's our turn to make a change its make thing about how can each school community

to come and make a change in Baltimore. These women impacted my life and the whole group to change the injustices in our world. I was really honored to have them come and give us these points of views and life stories. It was really a blessing.

Latonyah Williams is a 12th grader at City Neighbors. She wrote:

At the Little Rock Central visitor center, I found a quote that immediately grabbed my attention as I walked through the doors. It goes "If not us, then who? If not now, then when?"—John Lewis. It grabbed at me because it shows the mindset behind how the leaders were thinking back when they were fighting for our rights. They weren't thinking of themselves or their lives, but of the future and the many generations to come. So now I want to have the mindset of if not me, then who will take a stand? If not now, then most likely it will not ever happen.

I am confident that this trip continues to impact students long after they return to Baltimore.

So today, while we recognize the achievements and accomplishments of heroes like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Rosa Parks, Thurgood Marshall, and JOHN LEWIS, we cannot shy away from the painful history of race relations in our country. To do so would be a disservice to all those who struggled and sacrificed in the name of equality.

Slavery and segregation were dark and painful chapters in American history, and those abhorrent practices occurred in Maryland and throughout the rest of our Nation.

Today, we must confront the issue of racial profiling. Racial profiling is the practice of discriminatory profiling based on race, ethnicity, religion or any other stereotype, and it is a matter that needs to be addressed from its root causes.

I ask: how many more cases like Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, and Eric Garner must we have? How many more families will have to suffer until we get this right?

It has been heartbreaking to see several other American towns—from Ferguson, MO, to New York City, gripped by such a tragedies that resulted from racial profiling. Eighteen-year old Michael Brown was just days away from starting his first college classes, but he no longer has the chance to pursue his dreams.

In the Senate I have introduced the End Racial Profiling Act. This legislation is a step in the direction of ensuring equal treatment of all people under the law, conserving resources, and restoring trust in the men and women who risk their lives by signing up to protect our communities.

Racial profiling is un-American. It has no place within the values of our country. It turns communities against the partnerships needed to keep our neighborhoods safe.

Racial profiling is defined in a standard, consistent definition as the practice of a law enforcement agent relying on race, ethnicity, religion or national origin as a factor in their investigations and activities.

The legislation I have introduced creates an exception for the use of these factors where there is trustworthy information, relevant to the locality and time frame, which links persons of a particular race, ethnicity or national origin to an identified incident or scheme.

Law enforcement agencies would be prohibited from using racial profiling in criminal or routine law enforcement investigations, immigration enforcement, and national security cases.

The legislation I have introduced is supported by a broad coalition of civil rights groups such as the NAACP, Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, ACLU, Rights Working Group, ACLU, and numerous other national, State, and local organizations.

While some may predict further gridlock and political polarization with a Congress led by one party and the President of another, I firmly believe that we will find ways to work together on the issues most important to the American public—and racial profiling is clearly one of those issues.

Congress overwhelmingly reauthorized the Voting Rights Act in 2006 after building an extensive record that made a compelling case for the continued need to protect minority voters from discrimination.

As much as we wish it wasn't so, racism has not disappeared from America and there continue to be individuals and groups who would use our voting system to deliberately minimize the rights of minority voters. Congress should act to revitalize the Voting Rights Act.

Protecting the right to vote also extends to restoring the rights of nearly 4 million Americans across the country who have been released from prison but barred from the voting booth, often for life. I have been leading the fight for the Democracy Restoration Act, which would restore voting rights to individuals after they have served their time and have been released from incarceration.

If we truly want to break the cycle of recidivism, we need to reintegrate former prisoners back into society. When prisoners are released, they are expected to obey the law, get a job, and pay taxes as they are rehabilitated and reintegrated into their community. With these responsibilities and obligations of citizenship should also come the rights of citizenship, including the right to vote.

The current patchwork of State laws results in the lack of a uniform standard for eligibility to vote in Federal elections.

I believe that Congress should take strong action now to remedy this problem and enact a nationwide standard for restoration of voting rights. That is why I have introduced the Democracy Restoration Act.

As we commemorate the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, let us con-

tinue the march for justice for all Americans. I urge Congress to address the issues of voting rights and racial profiling during this session.

#### CENTENNIAL OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, yesterday marked the centennial of the U.S. Navy Reserve, an indispensable and valuable part of our Armed Forces. The Navy Reserve was established as the Naval Reserve on March 3, 1915, and since then sailors have served in every conflict from World War I to the present. In addition, five U.S. Presidents: John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, and George H.W. Bush have all served honorably in the Navy Reserve.

Today, we have more than 2,000 Navy Reserve sailors deployed around the world and our country is extremely grateful for the contributions and sacrifices that these sailors have made and continue to make to the history of the United States.

#### LIEUTENANT MICHAEL GRABOWSKI

One of those sailors I would like to talk about today is LT Michael Grabowski from Norwalk, CT. Lieutenant Grabowski is a perfect example of the student-citizen-soldier who wears two uniforms, one protecting the people of my State and the other honorably protecting our soldiers overseas. As a civilian, Lieutenant Grabowski serves in the Connecticut State Police and is one of six servicemembers of the Connecticut State Police currently mobilized by our Armed Forces. In addition, he is a first-year law student at Quinnipiac University. Michael is currently mobilized to Qatar supporting Operation Enduring Freedom as a master of arms in the Navy. Michael is a fine example of the courage and sacrifice that citizens of Connecticut and all across the country have made to protect our freedoms.

Today we celebrate Michael and every sailor and their families' commitment and service; and encourage all Americans to seize the opportunity to honor and support these brave men and women.

#### ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks to the Association of Private Sector Colleges and Universities.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ASSOCIATION OF PRIVATE SECTOR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Our nation is home to the world's greatest system of colleges and universities. From the beginning, federal policy has been to give grants and loans to students and let them

choose from among all types of institutions—public four-year universities, community colleges, for-profit colleges, and private non-profits.

For example, students can study automobile technology at Nashville's auto diesel school or forensic psychology at Argosy University or computer information systems at DeVry University.

Student choice and competition are the drivers of American higher education's success. And an important participant in American higher education has always been our for-profit colleges and universities.

The students served by for-profit colleges underscore their importance. Nearly 2,100 institutions educate 3.3 million students representing, approximately 12 percent of all college enrollments, 1.8 million Pell students and 1.9 million federal loan borrowers. More than half of enrollments are students of color. Fifty percent of students are juggling school with children. More than a third of these students are working full-time while going to school. For-profits accounted for 44 percent of certificates, 20 percent of two-year associate's degrees and 7 percent of bachelor's degrees granted in the United States in 2012.

The President along with many governors and state legislatures are setting goals to increase the number of citizens with college degrees or certificates. Governor Haslam in Tennessee has an ambitious goal called Drive to 55, to see 55 percent of Tennesseans with degrees or certificates by 2025. The president has called for America to have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world by 2020.

The only way to achieve these goals is to include all sectors of higher education, including for-profit colleges and universities. Yet this administration has taken aim at the for-profit sector, and has created regulations specifically targeting your colleges and universities.

My view is that our policies should equally apply to all institutions of higher education, no matter the sector. There are bad apples in the for-profit sector—but there are bad apples in every sector of higher education.

So let me begin to describe my priorities for all sectors of higher education, which includes your colleges and universities:

- 1) Make it easier for students to go to college (FAST Act)
- 2) Make it simpler for colleges and universities to educate (Task Force on Regulation)
- 3) Make sure that accreditation ensures quality (Accreditation)
- 4) Make it harder to overborrow (FAST Act, Skin in the Game)
- 5) Make sure colleges are collecting useful data for students, families and policymakers (Consumer Data)

These are my priorities as we work over the next few months to reauthorize this law and ensure that 20 years from now, our colleges and universities still remain the best in the world in the quality of education they provide.

Number one, make it simpler for colleges and universities to educate. Today we have a government form so complicated and confusing that it discourages as many as 2 million Americans from attending college each year. This is the dreaded FAFSA—the Free Application for Federal Student Aid—which consists of 108 questions on topics ranging from your spouse's federal tax exemptions to the net worth of your parents' investment farms.

I have joined with a bipartisan group of senators to introduce legislation that would



simplify the FAFSA form to just two questions—1) What was your household income two years ago? 2) What is your family size?

Four experts before our committee testified that these two questions would provide about 95 percent of all the information the federal government needs to determine award amounts.

It would also make the process, as much as the questions, less intimidating for parents. Because our bill would ask for household income from two years ago—as opposed to last year's income—it would restore sanity to the parents of applicants who are often being asked to provide the government with their income totals before they've even received their W-2s for the year.

One mentor with Governor Haslam's Tennessee Promise program, a woman named Cathy Hammon, says the form has a "chilling effect"—intimidating parents who may themselves never have attended college, and have no experience navigating the process. She says this: "It's the very youth we worry about the most that struggle with it."

The FAST Act would also restore year-round Pell availability. This gives students common-sense flexibility. According to a study by New America, under today's Pell schedule: "If a student attends a college that treats the summer as the start of the year, receives Pell Grants as a full-time student in that summer, and then attends full-time in the fall, she will not have enough aid to attend full-time in the spring." That doesn't make sense and it doesn't help students. So our proposal would let them use Pell all year.

Number two, make it simpler for colleges and universities to educate.

Over a year ago, Vanderbilt University hired the Boston Consulting Group to determine how much it costs the university to comply with federal rules and regulations. The answer: \$150 million, or 11 percent of the university's total non-hospital expenditures last year. Vanderbilt Chancellor Nick Zeppos says that this adds about \$11,000 in additional tuition per year for each of the university's 12,757 students.

The Higher Education Act totals nearly 1,000 pages; there are over 1,000 pages in the official Code of Federal Regulations devoted to higher education; and on average every workday the Department of Education issues one new sub-regulatory guidance directive or clarification. No one has taken the time to "weed the garden."

The result of this piling up of regulations is that one of the greatest obstacles to innovation and cost consciousness in higher education has become—us, the federal government.

A conspicuous example of this is the Gainful Employment regulation. It's a perfect symbol of what's wrong with our regulatory process that the Administration needed nearly 945 pages to define a two-word phrase that has been in the higher education law in one form or another since 1965.

What's especially concerning about the regulation is—

First, the rule is designed to almost exclusively impact and penalize for-profit colleges and universities. It selectively ignores concerns about student loan debt levels across all sectors of higher education.

The Department of Education's own National Center for Education Statistics reports that 26% of graduates from public, four-year colleges and 39% of graduates from private, four-year colleges would not be considered "gainfully employed" using the Department's metrics. It seems ridiculous that

this regulation could shut down a nursing program at a for-profit institution but not one in exactly the same circumstances at a non-profit or public institution.

Second, the rule's complex debt-to-income ratios over-emphasize a graduate's income right after college. This is especially short-sighted for educational programs that hold an important public benefit such as education or social work, but don't result in early-career, high-paying salaries.

Third, this regulation has nothing to do with the quality of the education being provided. It simply relies on arbitrary government definitions of affordable student loan debt. What would be the result? More than 800,000 students will be kicked out of their programs at a time when many public colleges are unable to accommodate more students.

This simply isn't a good regulation and I think the Administration knows I'll do what it takes to oppose it. I've cosponsored legislation by Richard Burr and Virginia Foxx to overturn the gainful employment regulation, and other regulations that are equally ill advised. I led a letter signed by several of my colleagues opposing the proposed regulations, and I am prepared to offer an amendment to restrict funds from being used to implement the rule. As we approach the rewrite of the Higher Education Act, I intend to do what I can to prohibit the Department from implementing this regulation and treat all institutions equally.

This is just one example of regulatory excess.

And when it comes to bad regulations, let me make clear: we cannot just blame President Obama and Education Secretary Arne Duncan. They have contributed to the problem, but so has every president and every education secretary—and that includes me—since 1965 when the first Higher Education Act was enacted.

More than a year ago, four members of the Senate education committee—two Democrats and two Republicans—asked a group of distinguished educators to examine the current state of federal rules and regulations for colleges and universities. We asked them not just to tell us the problem, but to give us specific solutions.

They last month sent to us, "Recalibrating Regulation of Colleges and Universities," a remarkable report in which they outline 59 specific regulations, requirements and areas for Congress and the Department of Education to consider—listing 10 especially problematic regulations. In their own words, America's 6,000 colleges and universities live in a "jungle of red tape" that is expensive and confusing and unnecessary.

So with this reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Ranking Member Murray and I will work on a process that takes full advantage of the recommendations in this report so we can include many of them in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

But the bottom line is that regulations are taking good money away from educating students and performing research and all sorts of other things colleges and universities ought to be doing.

We won't let that happen again with this reauthorization.

Number three, make sure that accreditation ensures quality.

Our higher education system today is governed by what's known as the "triad":

The federal government, which ensures that colleges and universities have the fiscal and administrative capability to participate in federal aid programs.

The state governments—governor, legislature, state boards of education—that authorize institutions of higher education, oversee public institutions, and provide substantial public funding.

Finally, and perhaps most important, is the accreditation system.

The system also has one other major check, the student consumer—who is able to choose from over 6,000 colleges and universities, and ideally is unlikely to waste their time and money on a worthless degree. When it comes to ensuring academic quality—the choice is this: Either we have Washington regulate our over 6,000 colleges and universities, or we let them self-regulate through accreditation. I much prefer accreditation.

That does not mean our system of accreditation is problem-free. Today, accreditors meddle in areas that are none of their business. And sometimes they're too stuffy to allow some of the innovation that needs to come in education. We need to take a hard look at the system and the role it serves for the American taxpayer.

We need to answer questions, such as:

Are accreditors focused on the right things such as student learning and quality?

Does the current structure of regional accreditation make sense in today's world when higher education is increasingly national in scope?

Are federal rules and regulations on accreditors getting in the way of their ability to assess and ensure academic quality?

But we need to keep in mind that this system is far preferable to any regulatory body created by the federal government.

Number four, make it harder for students to over-borrow.

There's a lot of discussion about student debt in the United States, but when you drill down on who's really got so much debt: It's a very small contingent of mostly graduate students. For most Americans, college is a good investment that will pay off.

Three out of four of our college students attend a public 2- or 4-year college and university. Of those, about two out of five of all students attend community colleges where the average tuition and fees are under \$3,300. Those students receive an average of \$4,850 in grants and scholarships. So the average community college student in America is receiving about \$1,500 more in grants and scholarships than what it costs in tuition and fees to attend college.

Thirty-seven percent of all of our college students attend public 4-year universities. The average in-state tuition and fees is about \$8,900. Those students receive in average \$5,800 in grants and scholarships. We're not talking loans, so they have to pay \$3,100 on average, in tuition and fees.

And then we have students who attend 4-year colleges that are private. That's about 15 percent. Their average tuition and fees are \$30,000 but the scholarships and grants take that down to \$12,500. At for-profit colleges and universities, the average cost is about \$15,000.

About 2 percent of federal borrowers have more than \$100,000 in debt. Graduate students are typically the problem.

The FAST Act would discourage over-borrowing by limiting the amount a graduate student is able to borrow. It would also help undergraduates from borrowing too much, by limiting borrowing based on enrollment. For example, a part-time student would be able to take out a part time loan only.

In addition, my proposal would allow institutions to limit borrowing based on evidence that students completing the program have difficulty repaying their loans.



I would also like to give schools more ability to counsel students on borrowing. Many in Congress are concerned with students borrowing more than is necessary while attending college and anecdotal examples of increased institutional counseling has led to reduced borrowing by students.

I believe that the institution, especially if we give you the ability to counsel students and limit borrowing, should bear some responsibility for this borrowing—after all you are the ones charging these students. However, I am seeking your input on this topic. Some of your members, as well as the association itself, have talked with me and my staff about this topic. I hope those discussions continue.

Number five, make sure the data colleges are collecting are useful for students, families and policymakers.

Before we rewrite this law, we need to know what information consumers actually find useful as they shop for schools, how much information is too much and what is the role of the federal government.

The federal government collects thousands of data points annually on schools, yet still cannot answer some of policymakers and students basic questions. In the future, Department of Education should only collect data that is useful to consumers or to policymakers regarding how well our federal programs are working. Consumers nor policymakers are able to absorb all of the data currently collected.

This is a prime area to reduce institutional burden. So we need to determine what information is truly needed. That may mean collecting new and different data that better fulfills federal responsibilities to taxpayers and drives the free market which makes our country and higher education system number one.

It is also important to ensure that the Department is not allowed to manipulate this data to create opaque, inappropriate or contrived metrics such as recently happened with cohort default rates and gainful employment, and will more than likely occur in the forthcoming ratings system.

I look forward to the upcoming reauthorization. Senator MURRAY and I are working very well in moving a fix to No Child Left Behind and I see no reason why the Higher Education Act will be any different. I intend to move to this bill this spring after we complete Senate action on No Child Left Behind. We will hold several hearings before holding a mark-up of a reauthorization early this summer. I look forward to continuing to work with you as the process unfolds. Thank you for everything you have done to be helpful so far and for providing opportunity to those seeking a higher education.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO JEFFREY SHAW

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Jeffrey Shaw on his retirement after serving Southwest Gas Corporation, Southwest Gas, for 27 years. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of hard work and dedication to a company that services thousands across Nevada.

Mr. Shaw stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted his life to serving his State and community. After earning his bachelor of science in

accounting from the University of Utah, Mr. Shaw worked for Arthur Andersen & Co. in its Dallas and Las Vegas offices in the audit division. In 1988, he began his career at Southwest Gas as director of internal audit. From there, Mr. Shaw worked to move higher in the company, climbing from controller and chief accounting officer all the way to president and chief executive officer of Southwest Gas. Today, the company services over 1 million homes across the country.

Mr. Shaw is not only driven in his endeavors with Southwest Gas, but within the local Las Vegas community as well. He is a member of the Nevada Society of Certified Public Accountants and the Leadership Las Vegas Alumni Association. He also serves on the boards of the Council for a Better Nevada and the UNLV Foundation, and he is a past president and a current board member of both the Western Energy Institute and the Las Vegas Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America. His work throughout these many organizations demonstrates his dedication to honorably representing Nevada on multiple fronts. Although he is retiring, his legacy within these organizations will continue for years to come.

It is not only Mr. Shaw's commitment and drive to excel that places him among the most notable in his community, but also his genuine good nature in helping others. He has served Las Vegas by contributing to higher education and the local Boy Scout community, and by working to improve the quality of life across the State. His commitment to helping those around him is unwavering.

I am very grateful for his dedication to the people of Las Vegas and to the State of Nevada. He exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Shaw on his retirement, and I give my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Nevada a better place. I offer him my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

##### TRIBUTE TO DONALDO MCINTOSH

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Donaldo McIntosh on his retirement after 58 years of service to Nevada and to the country. His hard work and dedication throughout the years is honorable.

Mr. McIntosh started his career in 1957 as a military police officer in the U.S. Army. His service extended for 3 years, protecting those in his local community, as well as his country. After serving in the Army, Mr. McIntosh then spent the rest of his career working in the transportation industry for the city of Las Vegas. In 1970, he worked as safety director for

the Las Vegas Transit System and Greyline Tours and then for Transportation Unlimited. His final years of service were spent as a transportation escort for the Pahrump Senior Center.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. McIntosh for his courageous contributions to the United States of America. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation, but also to ensure they are cared for after their service. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

The Las Vegas community has greatly benefitted from the hard work of Mr. McIntosh. Today, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. McIntosh on his retirement. I offer my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make the Silver State a better place and for his service to this country, and I give my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and a withdrawal, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### REPORT RELATIVE TO THE DESIGNATION OF FUNDING FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM—PM 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with language under the heading "Coast Guard, Operating Expenses" of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (the "Act"), I hereby designate for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding so designated by the Congress in the Act pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit

Control Act of 1985, as amended, as outlined in the enclosed list of accounts.

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed memorandum from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

BARACK OBAMA,  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 2015.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 240) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes, and that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the aforementioned bill.

The message also announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee: Mr. DELANEY of Maryland, Ms. ADAMS of North Carolina, and Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:14 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 240. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

H.R. 431. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 625. A bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-814. A communication from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cattle Fever Tick; Importation Requirements for

Ruminants From Mexico" ((RIN0579-AD91) (Docket No. APHIS-2012-0073)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-815. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "9-Octadecenoic Acid (9Z)-, Sulfonated, Oxidized and its Potassium and Sodium Salts; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9922-29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-816. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Metaldehyde; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9921-85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-817. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2015 Report to Congress from the Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Advisory Committee"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-818. A communication from the Vice President of Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, Amtrak's fiscal year 2016 General and Legislative Annual Report; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-819. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Establishing Transit Areas Through Walrus Protection Areas at Round Island and Cape Peirce, Northern Bristol Bay, Alaska; Amendment 107" (RIN0648-BE24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-820. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection System Maintenance Reliability Standard" (RIN1902-AE88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-821. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-822. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rule for Pentane, 1,1,1,2,3,3-hexafluoro-4-(1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoropropoxy)-" ((RIN2070) (FRL No. 9922-30)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-823. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Emissions Statement Requirement for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9923-94-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-824. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9924-16-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-825. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi; New Source Review—Prevention of Significance Deterioration" (FRL No. 9923-92-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-826. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Revisions for the Regulation and Permitting of Fine Particulate Matter" (FRL No. 9923-77-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-827. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Approval of Substitution for Transportation Control Measures" (FRL No. 9923-80-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-828. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Georgia; Redesignation of the Rome, Georgia, 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment; Correction" (FRL No. 9923-89-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-829. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; State Boards Requirements; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide, and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9924-02-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-830. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air

Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9923-79-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-831. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan for the Reading, Pennsylvania Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard, and 2007 Base Year Inventory" (FRL No. 9923-11-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-832. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri" (FRL No. 9923-68-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-833. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approval and Promulgation: Missouri; St. Louis Inspection and Maintenance Program" (FRL No. 9923-66-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-834. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Round 2 of Section 48A Phase III Program under the Qualifying Advanced Coal Project Program" (Notice 2015-14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-835. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2015 Trade Policy Agenda and 2014 Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-836. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office's audit of the United States government's fiscal years 2014 and 2013 consolidated financial statements; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-837. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Financial Report of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-838. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans; Supplemental Final Rule" (RIN3133-AE21) received

in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-839. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans" (RIN3133-AE04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-840. A communication from the Director, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Executive Order 13672 Prohibiting Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity by Contractors and Subcontractors" (RIN1250-AA07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-841. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Device Reporting: Electronic Submission Requirements; Correcting Amendments" ((RIN0910-AF86) (Docket No. FDA-2008-N-0393)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-842. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-068); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-843. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-131); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-844. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-150); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-845. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015-0018-2015-0025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-846. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking (OSS-2015-0220); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-847. A communication from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration and Designated Reporting Official, Office on National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of National Drug Control Policy, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was re-

ferred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-7. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan supporting scientifically-based state management of gray wolves and calling for legislative action by the U.S. Congress in an effort to remove the Western Great Lakes gray wolf population from the endangered and threatened species list; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, On December 19, 2014, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia returned the Western Great Lakes population of gray wolves to the federal endangered and threatened species list. This is the third time in the last decade that federal courts have disregarded the judgment of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service scientists and overturned a delisting of the gray wolf in the Great Lakes regions; and

Whereas, Based on objective scientific criteria, gray wolves have made a remarkable recovery from near extinction and are no longer endangered in Michigan. Michigan's gray wolf population exceeds by more than three times the number or wolves biologists consider necessary to maintain a healthy population and has grown steadily for more than a decade. Michigan's wolf population has met all federal recovery goals for delisting, both in terms of the number of wolves and the stability of those numbers; and

Whereas, The extreme protection afforded gray wolves under the federal Endangered Species Act prevents sound management of this species in Michigan. Gray wolves increasingly endanger people and domestic animals as they encroach more and more on developed areas, and they also impact other wildlife. In 2014, deadly wolf attacks on livestock and dogs increased 75 percent in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. As a result of the court's decision, Michigan's laws allowing citizens to protect their valuable livestock and dogs from wolves have been invalidated. The federal law was designed to bring back species from the brink of extinction, not manage the complicated interactions between people and an increasingly large and expanding predator population; and

Whereas, Michigan is well-prepared to manage gray wolves. The state of Michigan has developed a scientifically-based management plan that will continue to maintain a healthy gray wolf population while allowing for more flexibility when conflicts between people and wolves arise. This plan will allow the state to meet its obligations under sections 51 and 52 of the Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963 to protect the public health and natural resources in the interest of the general welfare of the people; and

Whereas, Michigan cannot properly manage the gray wolf population until gray wolves are removed from the federal endangered and threatened species list in the Great Lakes region. The federal courts' continued interference infringes on this state's rights under the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and the U.S. District Court's ruling must be overturned or the fundamental flaws in the federal Endangered Species Act corrected so that science and reason can prevail; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate,* That we support scientifically-based state management of gray wolves by the Michigan Natural Resources Commission and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources; and be it further

*Resolved,* That to achieve that end, we support federal legislation to lift federal protections on the Western Great Lakes gray wolf

population so they are no longer considered endangered, and we call on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to appeal the recent federal court ruling that returned gray wolves in the Great Lakes region to the federal endangered and threatened species list; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, the director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Michigan Natural Resources Commission, and the director of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources.

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 648. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve formulary requirements for prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans with respect to certain categories or classes of drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. VITTER):

S. 649. A bill to amend the eligibility requirements for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 650. A bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 651. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 652. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for the more accurate and complete enumeration of members of the Armed Forces in any tabulation of total population by the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 653. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 654. A bill to exempt certain class A CDL drivers from the requirement to obtain a hazardous material endorsement while operating a service vehicle with a fuel tank containing 3,785 liters (1,000 gallons) or less of diesel fuel; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 655. A bill to prohibit the use of funds by the Secretary of the Interior to make a final determination on the listing of the northern long-eared bat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 656. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 658. A bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 659. A bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a credit for married couples who are both employed and have young children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the dependent care tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. CORKER):

S. 662. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 663. A bill to repeal the violation of sovereign nations' laws and privacy matters; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 664. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a tax credit for foster families; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 665. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the

United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 666. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of medical evidence provided by non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals in support of claims for disability compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LEE, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 667. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 668. A bill to require data brokers to establish procedures to ensure the accuracy of collected personal information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 669. A bill to provide for consideration of legislation to respond to a violation by Iran of an arrangement relating to its nuclear program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 670. A bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 671. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to strengthen elementary and secondary computer science education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 672. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to support a reduction in school suspension and expulsions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SASSE:

S. 673. A bill to provide a transition plan for those individuals who may be affected by ObamaCare's unlawful implementation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 674. A bill to expand programs with respect to women's health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. Res. 96. A resolution condemning the murder of Boris Nemtsov, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 97. A resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 98. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Con. Res. 8. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of the three civil rights marches from Selma, Alabama to Montgomery, Alabama that took place over the course of several weeks in March 1965; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. REID (for Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. COATS)):

S. Con. Res. 9. A concurrent resolution honoring the life and memory of Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president emeritus of the University of Notre Dame; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 166

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 166, a bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 256

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 322

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 441, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 511

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 511, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients to be labeled accordingly.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 552

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 552, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to provide for increased limitations on leverage for multiple licenses under common control.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to marshal resources to undertake a concerted, transformative effort that seeks to bring an

end to modern slavery, and for other purposes.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 568, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 588

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 588, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to establish a consumer product safety standard for liquid detergent packets to protect children under the age of five from injury or illness, and for other purposes.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to prohibit baiting exemptions on certain land.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 638, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to exceptional event demonstrations, and for other purposes.

S. 639

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 639, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to include in any proposed rule that limits greenhouse gas emissions and imposes increased costs on other Federal agencies an offset from funds available to the Administrator for all projected increased costs that the proposed rule would impose on other Federal agencies.

S. 640

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 640, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders.

S. RES. 93

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 93, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the courageous work and life of Russian opposition leader Boris Nemtsov, and calling for a swift and transparent investigation into his tragic murder in Moscow on February 27, 2015.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 653. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Water Resources Research Amendments Act. First authorized in 1964, the Water Resources Research Act established 54 Water Resources Research Institutes at top land grant universities in each of the 50 States and the U.S. territories. These institutes created a grant program and provided opportunities for applied water supply research. The bill I introduce today would reauthorize the grant program for the next 5 years and would add a program focused on research and development of green infrastructure.

Water and the availability thereof is a defining characteristic of U.S. landscape, culture, wealth, and security. Clean water is a relatively rare and invaluable resource. Last year's funded projects included research into the impacts of climate change on water supply lakes, the development of better detection methods for pathogens in drinking water, and the impacts of drought on farm supply chains. In my own State, some of the tools we use for restoration of the Chesapeake Bay were products of these same grants in previous years. WRRRA Researchers across the Mid-Atlantic States have developed ways to keep the Chesapeake waters cleaner through urban stormwater treatment, improved road-

way design, and eco-friendly poultry farming practices. WRRRA-funded projects develop innovative and cost-effective solutions for similar water resources issues across the country. Undoubtedly, funding WRRRA is an intelligent and necessary investment in the future of our water resources.

WRRRA authorizes two types of annual grants. First, it supplies grants to each Water Resources Research Institute for research that fosters improvements in water supply reliability, explores new ways to address water problems, encourages dissemination of research to water managers and the public, and encourages the entry of new scientists, engineers and technicians into the water resources field. Second, WRRRA authorizes a national competitive grant program to address regional water issues. All WRRRA grants leverage non-federal dollars at a minimum ratio of 2 to 1, but often far beyond that level, as high as 5 to 1.

The Water Resources Research Act was most recently reauthorized in 2006, in PL 109-471. In that period, the program was authorized at \$12,000,000 per year, providing \$6,000,000 each to state and competitive project grants. Authorization for these grants expired in fiscal year 2011. Today's bill would reauthorize both grant programs for an additional 5 years by providing \$7,500,000 for institutional grants and \$1,500,000 for national competitive grants. This lower authorization level reflects our efforts to adjust for present fiscal limitations. The proposed authorization maximizes the economic efficiency of the program without compromising its efficacy. An independent review panel has judged that the Water Resources Research Institutes command significant funding leverage for the modest amount of appropriations required to support it. Thus, we can be sure that we are supporting top-notch science while maximizing cost-effectiveness. Moreover, by funding this network of institutes we are investing in our future. The Water Resources Research Institutes are the country's single largest training program for water scientists, technicians, and engineers.

Today, floods, droughts, and water degradation issues pervade the nation. Simultaneously, water resources are increasingly critical for production of resources, economic stability, and the health and well-being of the citizenry. WRRRA grants provide us with improved understanding of water-related issues and better technology to address them. Nearly half a century after the Water Resources Research grant program was first put in place, this program is relevant, critical, and deserving of our support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.



There being no objection the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 653

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Research Amendments Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.—Section 102 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10301) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (9) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (8) (as so redesignated), by striking "and" at the end; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

"(7) additional research is required into increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of new and existing treatment works through alternative approaches, including—

"(A) nonstructural alternatives;

"(B) decentralized approaches;

"(C) energy use efficiency;

"(D) water use efficiency; and

"(E) actions to extract energy from wastewater;"

(b) CLARIFICATION OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Section 104(b)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking "water-related phenomena" and inserting "water resources"; and

(2) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and".

(c) COMPLIANCE REPORT.—Section 104(c) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(c) From the" and inserting the following:

"(c) GRANTS.

"(1) IN GENERAL.—From the"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) REPORT.—Not later than December 31 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a report regarding the compliance of each funding recipient with this subsection for the immediately preceding fiscal year."

(d) EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM.—Section 104 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303) is amended by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

"(e) EVALUATION OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH PROGRAM.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a careful and detailed evaluation of each institute at least once every 3 years to determine—

"(A) the quality and relevance of the water resources research of the institute;

"(B) the effectiveness of the institute at producing measured results and applied water supply research; and

"(C) whether the effectiveness of the institute as an institution for planning, conducting, and arranging for research warrants continued support under this section.

"(2) PROHIBITION ON FURTHER SUPPORT.—If, as a result of an evaluation under paragraph

(1), the Secretary determines that an institute does not qualify for further support under this section, no further grants to the institute may be provided until the qualifications of the institute are reestablished to the satisfaction of the Secretary."

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 104(f)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(f)(1)) is amended by striking "\$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011" and inserting "\$7,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020".

(f) ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS WHERE RESEARCH FOCUSED ON WATER PROBLEMS OF INTERSTATE NATURE.—Section 104(g)(1) of the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10303(g)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "\$6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2011" and inserting "\$1,500,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2020".

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 657. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend to all veterans with a serious service-connected injury eligibility to participate in the family caregiver services program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce a bill today along with Senator BALDWIN that will help veterans and the men and women who care for them. Called the Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act, it would open the VA Family Caregivers Program to all eligible veterans who were severely injured while serving our country.

I introduced legislation creating the Family Caregiver Program in 2009 so caregivers of severely injured veterans could take care of our heroes at home. The program provides home health training, peer support, and a small financial stipend to caregivers of severely injured veterans. The caregivers also have access to mental health support and enrollment in the VA's Civilian Health and Mental Program, if they are not already eligible.

When the Caregivers Program was created, we had to limit eligibility for the program to post-9/11 veterans. It has been wildly successful. Twenty thousand veterans who served in Iraq and Afghanistan participate in the program today. This is more than five times the number the VA originally estimated would sign up. The program helps caregivers, who shoulder the cost of home care, know they are not alone.

Since introducing the Caregivers Program 6 years ago, I have gotten to know many caregivers in my State. One family who lives in Chicago, Dan and Trish Sylvester, made a lasting impression on me. Trish, a veteran of the Iraq war, is 100 percent disabled due to severe PTSD. It can be triggered by anything from a backfiring car to simply a bad thought running through her head. Dan, who is a veteran himself, graduated from DePaul Law School last year and now practices law part time.

Today, as he did all through law school, Dan takes care of Trish, making sure she stays on top of all her medications and going with her to counseling appointments. Trish's symptoms first took hold in February 2011, and she was hospitalized multiple times.

The Sylvesters' found out about the Family Caregiver Program shortly after it was launched and applied with the help of a Jesse Brown VA employee named Erica. They use the Caregivers stipend to pay for counseling services that are not provided by the VA. The money also helped them avoid having to take out more in student loans than they had to and kept Dan from having to add a part-time job to his already full plate when he was a student. Dan says the resources available to him through the program are lifesavers.

Both Trish and Dan showed courage in serving our country. Their sacrifice didn't end after their deployments. They continue to show great courage every day that they work together on Trish's recovery.

The bill Senator BALDWIN and I are introducing today would allow eligible veterans from all wars to apply for the VA Family Caregivers Program. The VA has estimated that as many as 88,000 additional veteran caregivers could qualify for the program under this bill.

Not only does the program allow veterans to stay in their homes with their families, it is a money-saver for taxpayers. The VA spends an average of \$332,000 per veteran per year in VA nursing homes. It spends an average of \$88,000 per veteran per year in community nursing homes. It also spends about \$45,000 a year in per diem payments to veterans in State Veterans Homes. Through the Caregivers Program, the VA cost per veteran per year is about \$36,000. This includes the stipend, which averages between \$600 and \$2,250 a month, based on the level of care and the geographic location, and services provided to the caregiver. It is an enormous savings to the VA, when you consider the cost of the alternative, full-time, institutional care. And it's a tremendous comfort to the veterans and the caregivers who look after them.

I commend each of the caregivers who have made the decision to care for our heroes. These veterans sacrificed their health and well-being for their country, and their caregivers have sacrificed much of their own lives, careers, school, retirement, to care for them upon their return home. We owe each and every one of them a great debt of gratitude. We want to make sure all qualified family caregivers are enrolled in this program.

With this bill, we are on the way to helping many families in need. We can finally provide assistance to the caregivers of Veterans of all eras on an equal basis.



Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 657

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Caregivers Expansion and Improvement Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 2. EXTENSION TO ALL VETERANS WITH A SERIOUS SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OF ELIGIBILITY FOR PARTICIPATION IN FAMILY CAREGIVER PROGRAM.**

Section 1720G(a)(2)(B) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking “on or after September 11, 2001”.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 660. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a credit for married couples who are both employed and have young children; to the Committee on Finance.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to join my colleagues in taking a step back from the partisan bills on the floor this week to talk about the ways we should be able to work together to grow the economy and help our working families.

Democrats have an economic theory that we are pretty confident about. We believe that real, long-term economic growth is built from the middle out, not from the top down. We believe that government does have a role to play in investing in our working families and making sure they have the opportunity to work hard and succeed, offering a hand up to those who want to climb the economic ladder and provide a better life for themselves and their families. We believe our government and our economy should be working for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

Thankfully we have had the opportunity to put some policies in place over the past few years that have pulled our economy back from the brink and have started moving it in the right direction. We are not there yet, but across the country businesses have added almost 12 million new jobs. We have had over 59 straight months of job growth, including almost 1 million manufacturing jobs. The unemployment rate is now under 6 percent. Health care costs are growing at their lowest rate in almost 50 years, while millions more families now have access to affordable coverage. The Federal budget deficit has been reduced by over two-thirds since President Obama took office.

Although many Republicans seem to keep threatening to bring us back, we

have been able to move away from the constant tea party-driven crises and uncertainty that were really destroying jobs and holding back our economy.

We are headed in a good direction. I am proud of the policies that we fought for that helped us to get here, but we do have a whole lot more to do.

The economy has changed over the past few decades, and our Tax Code has not kept up. Working families have seen their incomes stagnate while the cost of living, health care, and education has continued to go up. More and more families have two workers in the workforce, which is a good thing for so many women but brings additional expenses, such as childcare and transportation and the increased marginal tax rate paid by the second worker in the family. That is why I am very proud to introduce two middle-class tax cut bills today that will put money in the pockets of working families and update our Tax Code for the 21st-century economy.

My 21st Century Worker Tax Cut Act would create a new 10-percent credit on up to \$10,000 of the income of the second earner in a family. In other words, qualifying working families can reduce their income taxes by up to \$1,000, which can go a long way toward offsetting some of the additional costs these families bear as they go back to work. That tax cut rewards families for more work, and it would especially help women who want to rejoin the workforce today.

The second bill I am introducing today is the Helping Working Families Afford Child Care Act. This bill will update and reform the outdated child independent tax credit to help more working families. It would increase the tax credit to keep up with the rising costs of quality childcare and would make sure that the credit actually keeps up with the times by indexing it to inflation.

I am very proud to introduce these two bills today, but I am even more proud that my bills are just two of the bills Democrats are introducing today that will help working families by putting more money in their pockets and helping them access more opportunity. My colleagues are going to be talking about the bills they wrote, but our package of bills also includes, besides what I just talked about, an earned-income and childcare tax credit expansion and expansion of the American opportunity tax credit to help middle-class families afford childcare so they can get back on the job and help them pay for college so they can work hard and invest in themselves and their careers.

We know Republicans like to talk about cutting taxes. Well, with these bills we are giving everyone a chance to do exactly that—and not with more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. Republicans

have given that trickle-down theory a try, and it failed. Our approach is tax cuts for the middle class, for the workers who need it the most, to help them afford the costs they are faced with, such as childcare, putting food on the table, getting back on the job, and to give them the opportunity to work hard and succeed.

We want to grow the economy from the middle out, not the top down, and we think these middle-class tax cut bills are a very strong step in the right direction. We hope Republicans will join us to get these done.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COONS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 665. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu National Blue Alert Act of 2015.

Every day, more than 900,000 Federal, State and local law enforcement officers put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. Unfortunately these officers can become targets for criminals and those seeking to evade our justice system, and we must make sure our officers have all the tools they need to protect themselves and each other.

Each year thousands of law enforcement officers are assaulted while performing their duties and many suffer serious injuries or even lose their lives. In December 2014, New York City Police Department officers Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Liu were assassinated while sitting in their marked police patrol car in Brooklyn. This legislation is named after those officers in honor of the ultimate sacrifice that they made to serve and protect their fellow citizens.

According to preliminary data compiled by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, law enforcement fatalities in the U.S. rose 24 percent in 2014, reversing what had been two years of dramatic declines in line of duty deaths. The report indicates that 126 federal, state, local, tribal and territorial officers were killed in the line of duty this year, compared to 102

in 2013. Ambush-style attacks such as those that took the lives of officers Ramos and Liu were the number one cause of felonious officer deaths for the fifth year in a row. Fifteen officers nationwide were killed in ambush assaults in 2014, matching 2012 for the highest total since 1995.

I thank my original cosponsors who have joined me in introducing this legislation, including my lead co-sponsor Senator GRAHAM.

The rapid dissemination of critical, time-sensitive information about suspected criminals is essential to keeping our communities safe. This legislation would encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert programs through the United States. The Attorney General would establish a national Blue Alert communications network within the Department of Justice. The Blue Alert system could be used when a law enforcement officer is: seriously injured or killed in the line of duty; missing in connection with the officer's official duties; or an imminent or credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received.

The Blue Alert system could be used when the suspect has not been apprehended, and where there is sufficient descriptive information of the suspect and any vehicles involved, if applicable. This information can be used by local law enforcement, the public and the media to help facilitate capture of such offenders and ultimately reduce the risk they pose to our communities and law enforcement officers.

Currently there is no national alert system that provides immediate information to other law enforcement agencies, the media or the public at large. Many states have created a state Blue Alert system in an effort to better inform their local communities. The State of Maryland, under the leadership of former Governor Martin O'Malley, created their Blue Alert system in 2008 after the murder of Maryland State Trooper Wesley Brown. Blue Alert programs have been created in 20 states to date, with a growing number of states considering establishing Blue Alert programs.

The purpose of our National Blue Alert legislation is to keep our law enforcement officers and our communities safe. And based on the success of the AMBER Alert and the SILVER Alert, I believe this BLUE Alert will be equally successful in helping to apprehend criminal suspects who have seriously injured or killed our law enforcement officers.

I am also pleased to say this legislation has the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the Sergeants Benevolent Association of the New York City Police Department, and many other law enforcement associations. Passing this legislation can

help us live up to our commitment to help better protect those who serve us. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 96—CON-DEMNING THE MURDER OF BORIS NEMTSOV, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 96

Whereas, on February 27, 2015, Russian opposition leader and former deputy prime minister Boris Nemtsov was brutally murdered in the shadow of the Kremlin in Russia's capitol city Moscow;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov was a man of conviction and principle who dedicated his life to the fight against corruption in Russia and sought to advance democracy, human rights, free speech, free market reforms, and the rule of law throughout his life;

Whereas, in December 2011, Mr. Nemtsov helped mobilize the largest anti-Kremlin demonstrations since the early 1990's, leading tens of thousands of Russians to march in protest of widespread fraud and corruption in the parliamentary elections;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation responded by passing a series of harsh laws that vastly expanded the definition of treason, increased government control over the media, and limited the scope and activities of opposition parties and civil society organizations;

Whereas Russian authorities exploit these laws for their own political ends and use them to intimidate members of the opposition, human rights activists, and others with whom they disagree;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov strongly opposed these and other repressive measures, and expressed concerns that President Vladimir Putin's policies were threatening democracy and rule of law in Russia;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov strongly criticized Russia's annexation of Crimea and military activities in eastern Ukraine, blaming President Putin for a "mad, aggressive and deadly policy of war against Ukraine" and lying to the Russian people about this policy;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov had been investigating Russia's role in Ukraine and was preparing to release an investigative report conclusively proving the participation of the Russian Armed Forces in the invasion of Ukraine and revealing the extent to which the Government of the Russian Federation was involved;

Whereas, prior to his death, Mr. Nemtsov planned to lead a Spring March on March 1, 2015, to protest the Russian military's presence in Ukraine;

Whereas, on February 28, 2015, Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko stated that he believed Mr. Nemtsov had been murdered because he planned to disclose this evidence of Russia's involvement in Ukraine;

Whereas President Putin called critics of his government "a fifth column" and "national traitors", inviting violent attacks upon them and sponsoring a campaign of hatred, intimidation, and aggression;

Whereas, on February 20, 2015, a new movement called Anti-Maidan marched freely

through Moscow calling for violence against this "fifth column", with signs naming Mr. Nemtsov as an enemy of Russia;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov's colleagues stated that he was under state surveillance shortly before his murder and he was murdered in one of the most heavily-secured areas of Moscow, suggesting the Government of Russia's culpability;

Whereas other prominent figures in Russia who have criticized President Putin and his government have also been assassinated, including Vladimir Goloviyov, Yuri Shchekochikhin, Anna Politkovskaya, Alexander Litvinenko, Magomed Yevloyev, Stanislav Markelov, and Natalia Estemirova;

Whereas none of the individuals responsible for these assassinations have been brought to justice, raising serious questions about the ability of Russian authorities to conduct a credible investigation into Mr. Nemtsov's murder;

Whereas a culture of impunity and lack of accountability prevail in Putin's Russia, with law enforcement, judicial, and investigative bodies often used to target political opponents and civil society, and thus lacking credibility to conduct an investigation themselves;

Whereas the Russia Investigative Committee released a list of motives for Mr. Nemtsov's murder which do not take into account his role as a prominent government critic, surveillance cameras were allegedly turned off for maintenance during the time of his murder, and Kremlin-sponsored channels are inciting fear and hatred by propagating conspiracy theories that blame the United States for his assassination;

Whereas these continuing assassinations are intended to intimidate the people of Russia and undermine political and social reform in the Russian Federation; and

Whereas support for rule of law and human rights in the Russian Federation will help ensure its future as a free, strong, and vibrant society and enduring stability in the Russian Federation will come from an active civil society in which democracy flourishes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the courageous work of Boris Nemtsov, a tireless advocate for reform and human rights who sacrificed his life in the fight for freedom and democracy in the Russian Federation;

(2) expresses its deepest condolences to the family, friends, and colleagues of Mr. Nemtsov, as well as to all the people of Russia;

(3) condemns, in the strongest possible terms, the murder of Boris Nemtsov on February 27, 2015, as well as the assassinations of numerous other human rights and democracy activists in the Russian Federation since President Vladimir Putin came to office;

(4) urges the President to seek a United Nations Security Council resolution that establishes an independent investigation into the assassination;

(5) calls upon the Government of Russia to support and facilitate an independent inquiry into the murder of Mr. Nemtsov;

(6) urges the Government of the Russian Federation to release all political prisoners and to end the ongoing harassment of political opponents, human rights activists, and journalists;

(7) calls for the restoration of an independent judiciary and the rule of law in the Russian Federation, and an end to all restrictions on the media and freedom of speech;

(8) urges the President to add the names of persons that Mr. Nemtsov requested be added to the visa ban list as provided for under the Sergei Manitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112-208) and continue to sanction human rights violators in the Russian Federation;

(9) urges the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to obtain, examine, and publish the investigative report Mr. Nemtsov planned to release as part of the OSCE observer role in eastern Ukraine to demonstrate the inability of the Government of the Russian Federation to suppress the truth Mr. Nemtsov represented; and

(10) urges the President to significantly increase United States Government support to like-minded partners and human rights activists in the Russian Federation to create a more vibrant civil society and open media environment in which democracy can flourish.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 97—SUPPORTING THE GOALS OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

##### S. RES. 97

Whereas there are more than 3,500,000,000 women in the world today;

Whereas women around the world have fundamental human rights, participate in the political, social, and economic life of their communities, play a critical role in providing and caring for their families, contribute substantially to the growth of economies and the prevention of conflict, and, as farmers and caregivers, play an important role in advancing food security for their communities;

Whereas the advancement of women around the world is a foreign policy priority for the United States;

Whereas on September 24, 2014, President Barack Obama highlighted the United States support for the advancement of women, noting: "Where women are full participants in a country's politics or economy, societies are more likely to succeed. And that's why we support the participation of women in parliaments and peace processes, schools, and the economy.";

Whereas women remain underrepresented in conflict prevention and conflict resolution efforts, despite proven success by women in conflict-affected regions in moderating violent extremism, countering terrorism, resolving disputes through nonviolent mediation and negotiation, and stabilizing societies by improving access to peace and security services, institutions, and decision-making venues;

Whereas on December 19, 2011, the Obama Administration launched the first United States National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security (referred to in this preamble as the "National Action Plan") that includes a comprehensive set of national commitments to advance the active participation of women in decisionmaking relating to matters of war and peace;

Whereas the National Action Plan states the following: "Deadly conflicts can be more effectively avoided, and peace can be best forged and sustained, when women become

equal partners in all aspects of peace-building and conflict prevention, when their lives are protected, their experiences considered, and their voices heard.";

Whereas the National Action Plan requires the National Security Council staff to coordinate a comprehensive review of, and update to, the National Action Plan in 2015 with consultation from international partners and civil society organizations;

Whereas according to the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the Department of State, women's full and meaningful participation in security forces vastly enhances their effectiveness;

Whereas the ability of women and girls to realize their full potential is critical to the ability of a country to achieve strong and lasting economic growth and political and social stability;

Whereas according to the International Monetary Fund, "focusing on the needs and empowerment of women is one of the keys to human development";

Whereas according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, two-thirds of the 781,000,000 illiterate people in the world are female;

Whereas according to the United States Agency for International Development, compared to uneducated women, "educated women are less likely to marry early and more likely to have smaller and healthier families. They are also more likely to get a job and earn a higher wage.";

Whereas according to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the majority of women living in rural areas of the developing world are heavily engaged in agricultural labor, yet they receive less credit, land, agricultural inputs, and training than their male counterparts;

Whereas according to the United Nations Population Fund, women have access to fewer income-earning opportunities and are more likely to manage the household and engage in agricultural work, making women more vulnerable to economic insecurity caused by natural disasters and long-term changes in weather patterns;

Whereas according to the World Bank, women own or partly own more than one-third of small and medium-sized enterprises in developing countries, and 40 percent of the global workforce is female, yet, women entrepreneurs and employers have disproportionately less access to capital and other financial services compared to men;

Whereas despite strides in recent decades, women around the world continue to face significant obstacles in all aspects of their lives, including underrepresentation in all aspects of public life, denial of basic human rights, and discrimination;

Whereas despite achievements by individual female leaders, women around the world are still vastly underrepresented in high-level positions and in national and local legislatures and governments and, according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union, women account for only 21.9 percent of national parliamentarians;

Whereas 1 in 3 women around the world has experienced some form of gender-based violence, and 1 in 4 women has suffered abuse during pregnancy;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, approximately 800 women die from preventable causes related to pregnancy and childbirth every day, with 99 percent of all maternal deaths occurring in developing countries;

Whereas according to the United Nations Population Fund, more than 200,000,000

women and girls around the world would like to access family planning services but are unable to do so;

Whereas according to data from the World Bank, women between the ages of 15 and 44 are at a greater risk of rape and domestic violence than cancer, war, traffic accidents, and malaria combined;

Whereas on August 10, 2012, President Barack Obama announced the United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, the first inter-agency strategy to address gender-based violence around the world;

Whereas violence against women and girls impedes progress in meeting many international global development goals, including efforts to stem maternal mortality and the spread of HIV/AIDS;

Whereas on October 11, 2013, President Barack Obama stated that the practice of child marriage was a "threat to fundamental human rights";

Whereas according to the International Center for Research on Women, one-third of girls worldwide are married before the age of 18 and 1 in 9 girls are married before the age of 15;

Whereas according to the World Health Organization, suicide is the leading cause of death for girls ages 15 to 19, followed by complications from pregnancy and childbirth;

Whereas it is imperative to alleviate violence and discrimination against women and afford women every opportunity to be full and productive members of their communities;

Whereas 2015 marks the 20th anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women, where 189 countries committed to the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action to integrate gender equality into all dimensions of society;

Whereas 2015 marks the deadline for meeting the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, and progress towards meeting the targets for gender equality and women's empowerment remains uneven; and

Whereas March 8 is recognized each year as International Women's Day, a global day to celebrate the economic, political, and social achievements of women past, present, and future, and to recognize the obstacles that women still face in the struggle for equal rights and opportunities: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals of International Women's Day;

(2) recognizes that the empowerment of women is inextricably linked to the potential of countries to generate economic growth, sustainable democracy, and inclusive security;

(3) recognizes and honors individuals in the United States and around the world, including women who are human rights defenders, who have worked throughout history to ensure that women are guaranteed equality and basic human rights;

(4) reaffirms the commitment to ending discrimination and violence against women and girls, to ensuring the safety and welfare of women and girls, to pursuing policies that guarantee the basic human rights of women and girls worldwide, and to promoting meaningful and significant participation of women in all aspects of their societies and communities;

(5) supports international calls for a "Post-2015 Development Agenda" to include a stand-alone goal to achieve gender equality and women's empowerment; and

(6) encourages the people of the United States to observe International Women's

Day with appropriate programs and activities.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 98—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 98

Whereas multiple sclerosis (referred to in this preamble as “MS”) can impact people of all ages, races, and ethnicities, but is at least 2 to 3 times more common in women than in men;

Whereas there are approximately 2,300,000 people worldwide who have been diagnosed with MS;

Whereas MS is typically diagnosed in individuals between the ages of 20 and 50, however it is estimated that between 8,000 and 10,000 children and adolescents are living with MS in the United States;

Whereas MS is an unpredictable neurological disease that interrupts the flow of information both within the brain and between the brain and the rest of the body;

Whereas symptoms of MS range from numbness and tingling in the extremities to blindness and paralysis, and the progress, severity, and specific symptoms of MS in any one person cannot yet be predicted;

Whereas there is no laboratory test available that can definitively diagnose MS;

Whereas while MS is not directly inherited, studies show that there are genetic and, probably, environmental factors that make certain individuals, such as Caucasians of Northern European ancestry, more susceptible to the disease than others;

Whereas the exact cause of MS is still unknown and there is no cure;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition, a national network of independent MS organizations dedicated to the enhancement of the quality of life for all those affected by MS, recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

Whereas the mission of the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition is to increase opportunities for cooperation among MS organizations and provide greater opportunity for the effective use and development of resources for the benefit of individuals and families affected by MS;

Whereas the United States plays a critical role in coordinating MS research globally and amplifies the impact of research in the United States through which results are delivered to MS patients;

Whereas in 2012, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society of the United States was a founding member of the Progressive MS Alliance, which coordinates research to accelerate the development of treatments for progressive MS by removing international scientific and technological barriers, and which now includes MS societies from 11 countries;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week during March of every calendar year;

Whereas the goals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week are to invite people to join the movement to end MS, encourage everyone to do something to demonstrate their commitment to moving toward a world free of MS, and to acknowledge those who have

dedicated their time and talent to help promote MS research and programs; and

Whereas this year, Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week is recognized during the week of March 2, 2015, through March 8, 2015: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(2) encourages States, localities, and the territories and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week by issuing proclamations designating Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(3) encourages media organizations to participate in Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week and help provide education to the public about multiple sclerosis;

(4) commends the efforts of States, localities, and the territories and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(5) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to ending multiple sclerosis by—

(A) promoting awareness about individuals that are affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) supporting multiple sclerosis research and education programs;

(6) recognizes all individuals in the United States living with multiple sclerosis;

(7) expresses gratitude to the family members and friends of individuals living with multiple sclerosis, who are a source of love and encouragement to those individuals; and

(8) salutes the health care professionals and medical researchers who—

(A) provide assistance to individuals affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) continue to work to find ways to stop the progression of the disease, restore nerve function, and end multiple sclerosis forever.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 8—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD ISSUE A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE THREE CIVIL RIGHTS MARCHES FROM SELMA, ALABAMA TO MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA THAT TOOK PLACE OVER THE COURSE OF SEVERAL WEEKS IN MARCH 1965

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. COONS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 8

Whereas on March 7, 1965 “Bloody Sunday”, approximately 600 civil rights marchers, led by now-Representative John Lewis of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and Reverend Hosea Williams of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, headed east out of Selma, Alabama to the State Capitol in Montgomery, Alabama;

Whereas the civil rights activists sought to protest discriminatory voter registration practices, and the shooting of Jimmie Lee Jackson, who was shot after protecting his mother and grandfather in a civil rights

demonstration on February 18, 1965, in a restaurant in Marion, Alabama, and died eight days later on February 26, 1965;

Whereas the nonviolent marchers were met and attacked with clubs, whips, police dogs, and tear gas carried by State troopers, local lawmen, and townspeople at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they were leaving Selma;

Whereas dozens of peaceful marchers were injured in the forced retreat by State troopers, local lawmen, and townspeople;

Whereas images of innocent protestors brutally beaten and severely injured on March 7, 1965, remembered as “Bloody Sunday”, were depicted in television screens and in newspaper articles across the country;

Whereas Bloody Sunday galvanized a generation of civil rights activists, and heightened support and awareness for the civil rights movement;

Whereas on March 9, 1965, two days later, Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. led a non-violent protest reportedly as many as 2,500 people before turning around after crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge due to a barricade of State troopers;

Whereas on March 15, 1965, despite pressure from political figures, U.S. District Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr., issued an injunction allowing the voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery to proceed, overturning then-Alabama Governor George Wallace’s prohibition of the protest;

Whereas on March 21, 1965, with the protection of U.S. Army troops and the Alabama National Guard, more than 3,000 people, led by Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., set out from Selma to Montgomery, a 54-mile journey, marching an average of twelve miles a day along Route 80 and sleeping in fields;

Whereas the nonviolent protestors safely reached the steps of the Alabama State Capitol on March 25, 1965, by which point their numbers had grown to 25,000, including many religious and community leaders of all denominations, races, and backgrounds;

Whereas during these pivotal weeks, on March 17, 1965, and with the Selma protestors at the forefront, President Lyndon Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress, calling for Federal voting rights legislation to protect African Americans from barriers that prevented them from voting;

Whereas with the Nation captivated by the courage and conviction displayed by the civil rights activists, the United States Congress passed and President Lyndon B. Johnson enacted into law the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965 on August 6, 1965; and

Whereas issuing a postage stamp honoring the fiftieth anniversary of the civil rights marches is fitting and proper because the marches united our country and helped affirm the principle that all Americans shall be treated equally at the voting booths as guaranteed under the United States Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Postmaster General should issue a commemorative postage stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of the three civil rights marches from Selma, Alabama, to Montgomery, Alabama; and

(2) such stamp should—

(A) be issued in the denomination used for first-class mail up to 1 ounce in weight;

(B) bear such illustration or picture as the Postmaster General determines; and

(C) be placed in sale at such time and for such period as the Postmaster General determines.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9—HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF REVEREND THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C., PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

Mr. REID of Nevada (for Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. COATS)) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 9

Whereas Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., was born on May 25, 1917, in Syracuse, New York, ordained a priest of the Congregation of Holy Cross on June 24, 1943, in South Bend, Indiana, and served as president of the University of Notre Dame from 1952 to 1987;

Whereas during his tenure, the University of Notre Dame welcomed female students for the first time and embraced the spirit of open intellectual inquiry and moral engagement that defines the University today;

Whereas Father Hesburgh held a variety of appointed positions under 4 popes and 9 presidential administrations;

Whereas throughout decades of public service, Father Hesburgh proudly championed the civil rights of African Americans, the duty of society to the poor, and the fundamental human dignity of all persons;

Whereas in pursuit of those ideals, Father Hesburgh held a variety of influential public roles, including terms as a founding member and chairman of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, chair of the Overseas Development Council, chair of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, and permanent representative of the Holy See to the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna from 1956 to 1970;

Whereas in pursuit of global social justice, Father Hesburgh reaffirmed the commitment of the University of Notre Dame to human rights by helping to found the Kellogg Institute for International Studies and the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University as well as the Center for Civil and Human Rights at the University of Notre Dame Law School;

Whereas Father Hesburgh was a longtime advocate for the responsible stewardship of atomic energy and gracefully brought together scientists, scholars, and spiritual leaders to work toward an end to nuclear conflict;

Whereas Father Hesburgh served as ambassador to the 1979 United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development, the first Catholic priest to formally hold a diplomatic position for the United States Government;

Whereas Father Hesburgh received both the Congressional Gold Medal and the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian awards of the United States, as well as more than 150 honorary degrees, the most ever awarded to a single individual; and

Whereas Father Hesburgh passed away on Thursday, February 26, 2015, but remains very much alive in the hearts of all who knew him and in the University that he loved: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—*

(1) commemorates the life and achievements of Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., who throughout his life displayed extraordinary commitment to social justice and the improvement of higher education; and

(2) honors Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., for a lifetime of selfless dedication to God, Country, and Notre Dame.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building, a subcommittee hearing entitled “Surface Transportation Reauthorization—Oversight and Reform of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight Hearing: The President’s FY 2016 Budget Request for the Environmental Protection Agency.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 4, 2015, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Whistleblower Retaliation at the FBI: Improving Protections and Oversight.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on the Veterans’ Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE AND REGIONAL SECURITY COOPERATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Europe and Regional Security Cooperation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Russian Aggression in Eastern Europe: Where does Putin Go Next after Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova?”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 4, 2015, at 3:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Jessica Clarke of my staff for the duration of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern Jackman Wilson be allowed privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that Cale Clingenpeel, an intern on my staff, be granted privileges of the floor for the duration of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 9, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar

No. 15, Calendar No. 22, Calendar No. 49, and Calendar No. 50; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that following the disposition of the Tonsager nomination, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 98, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 98) supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 98) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 6 AND MONDAY, MARCH 9, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Friday, March 6, for a pro forma session with no business being conducted; further, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, March 6, it next convenes at 2 p.m., Monday, March 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be

in a period of morning business until 5 p.m. and that Senators be permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided in the usual form; finally, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators should expect a rollcall vote on the Marti nomination at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, with the other nominations in the stack going by voice vote.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 2015, AT 9:30 A.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:02 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 6, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN CONGER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE MICHAEL J. MCCORD, RESIGNED.

PETER LEVINE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE ELIZABETH A. MCGRATH.

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GREGORY T. DELAWIE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOSOVO.

PERRY L. HOLLOWAY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA.

##### INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

SUNIL SABHARWAL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE DOUGLAS A. REDIKER, RESIGNED.

MARK SOBEL, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE MARGRETHE LUNDSAGER, RESIGNED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ERICKA M. MILLER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE EDUARDO M. OCHOA.

MICHAEL KEITH YUDIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE ALEXA E. POSNY.

##### IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

##### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BURKE W. WHITMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

##### To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL F. FAHEY III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CRAIG C. CRENSHAW  
BRIG. GEN. JOHN K. LOVE  
BRIG. GEN. NIEL E. NELSON  
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN R. RUDDER  
BRIG. GEN. CRAIG Q. TIMBERLAKE

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be major

CHRISTOPHER M. ABBOTT  
CHRISTIAN M. ABODEELY  
ANDREW MICHAEL ACKLES  
CHRISTOPHER A. ADAMS  
JOSEPH M. ADAMS  
ISAAC E. ADCOCK  
JIMMY T. ADDISON  
JESSICA L. ADKINS  
JONATHAN A. AEVERMANN  
ANIBAL AGUIRRE, JR.  
CLINTON R. ALBAUGH  
JUSTIN S. ALBERICO  
JARED K. ALDEN  
EARL J. ALEXANDER II  
TOMAS D. ALFORD  
DANIEL C. ALIX  
BRADLEY R. ALLEN  
BRIAN G. ALLEN  
DARCY M. ALLEN  
JEREMY L. ALLEN  
JOSHUA J. ALLEN  
NATHAN J. ALLEN  
RYAN DALE ALLEN  
TERRANCE S. ALLEN  
ADAM ALM  
GABRIEL ALMODOVAR  
ACHILLE HENRY PAUL ALOISI  
DAVID ALEXANDER ALPAR  
JOHN G. ALSBROOKS  
PETER J. AMARAL  
RUI F. AMARAL  
PHILIP ALAN AMIRAULT  
JESSICA L. AMUNDSON  
BRIAN A. AN  
JAYSON D. ANDERSEN  
CHRISTIAN T. ANDERSON  
JACOB ANDERSON  
JESSE ANDERSON  
KEVIN S. ANDERSON  
PAUL F. ANDERSON  
RYAN B. ANDERSON  
SCOTT L. ANDERSON  
WESLEY S. ANDERSON  
JAMES MAYBERRY ANDREWS, JR.  
JAMIE LEE ANDREWS  
MATTHEW ANDREWS  
JEREMY ANKRUM  
JAMES R. ANTONE  
ROBERT A. ARENA  
COLBY K. ARENDS  
JOSHUA M. ARENS  
KARYN ARGUETA  
MICHAEL R. ARMBRUSTER, JR.  
MARK B. ARMSTRONG  
SEAN M. ARMSTRONG  
THOMAS F. ARMSTRONG  
CHRISTOPHER L. ARNOTT  
EMILY M. ARTHUR  
AARON L. ARTING  
RAPHAEL C. ASHE  
JEFFREY M. AUBRY  
MARC C. AURILIO  
MARC C. AUSTIN  
ISHAN B. AVILA  
NOAH F. AYERS  
MATTHEW T. BABER  
STACY M. BABER  
RANDY BACKLEY  
VERONICA E. BAEZ  
CHRISTOPHER F. BAILEY  
MICHAEL W. BAIN  
CINDY BAKER  
CRAIG P. BAKER  
DAWN A. BAKER  
JONATHAN L. BAKER  
KATHLEEN M. BAKER  
MICHAEL C. BAKER  
PAUL J. BAKER  
ALFREDO BALDERAS  
BRIAN BALES  
JUSTIN P. BALLINGER  
CHRISTIAN Y. BALMACEDA  
CHRISTOPHER BALSTERS  
REBECCA W. BAN  
ADAM B. BANDUCCI  
AARON N. BANDY  
TIMOTHY R. BANKS, JR.  
MAGINA BAONGA  
ERIC W. BARADA  
LAILA S. BARASHA  
BRANDON ARTHUR BARD  
TIFFANY L. BARES  
DANIEL BARKER  
RICHARD T. BARKER  
JESSE N. BARNES  
JOHN M. BARRETT  
JUSTIN R. BARRETT  
GREGORY CHARLES BARRY

IAN ROBERT BARTA  
 DANIEL J. BARTLEY  
 RYAN L. BARTON  
 DENNIS R. BATAÇ  
 YURI A. BATTEN  
 KATHERINE A. BATTERTON  
 NICHOLAS J. BATTLE  
 AARON C. BAUM  
 FRANK ANDREW BAUMANN IV  
 LEIGH A. BAUMBAUGH  
 JARNO BAUR MATTHEWS  
 NICHOLAS J. BEAMER  
 SEAN R. BEASLEY  
 DERRYL L. BEAUDOIN  
 MATHEW J. BECK  
 BRADLEY D. BECKWITH  
 JARROD N. BEERS  
 CHRISTOPHER A. BEHRENS  
 BRYAN M. BELL  
 NATHANIEL J. BELL  
 CARLOS M. BENITEZ  
 MICHAEL WILLIAM BENITEZ  
 DEREK R. BENKOSKI  
 BENJAMIN MONT BENNETT  
 CHRISTOPHER M. BENNETT  
 DAVID JAMES BENNETT  
 DAVID W. BENNETT  
 BRYCE J. BENSON  
 BROOK I. BENTLEY  
 DONALD J. BENZING III  
 CHRISTOPHER W. BERARDI  
 EDWARD G. BERGELAND  
 JEREMY BERGMANN  
 ANTHONY JOSEPH BERNARDI  
 BRANDON J. BERNARDONI  
 JAMES R. BERNINGHAUSEN  
 CLEMENTE A. BERRIOS  
 BRIAN T. BERRY  
 CARLOS R. BERSABE  
 BRANDON D. BERT  
 IAN S. BERTRAM  
 JEREMIAH NATHANIEL BETZ  
 JOSHUA D. BIBB  
 JON A. BILLMAN  
 ANTOINE L. BILLS  
 DANIEL B. BIRGE  
 MATTHEW WILLIAM BIRKENHIER  
 BOBBY D. BIRRRER  
 JARED L. BISHOP  
 JESSICA L. BISHOP  
 JESSE G. BJURBACK  
 BRANDON M. BLACK  
 TRAVIS A. BLACK  
 JEFFERY MICHAEL BLACKRICK  
 CHRISTOPHER A. BLAKE  
 RYAN C. BLAKE  
 JONATHAN DAVID BLANCO  
 NICOLE J. BLECHA  
 TAYLOR A. BLEVINS  
 ADAM J. BLOCK  
 BEAU A. BLOCK  
 DANIEL G. BLOOM  
 RICHARD M. BLOOM  
 SARAH E. BLOUGH  
 ARMIN A. BLUEGGEL  
 BRENDA E. BLUEGGEL  
 TODD L. BLUM  
 THOMAS D. BOCKRATH  
 ROLAND BODENHEIM  
 KATHARINE T. BOEING  
 BRIAN T. BOHAN  
 DANIEL H. BOLIN  
 SAMANTHA C. BOLIN  
 CHRISTINE L. BOLTON  
 VINCENT I. BONGIOANNI  
 SCOTT A. BOOTH  
 WILLIAM F. BOOTH II  
 NICOLLETTE BORGSTROM  
 PAUL BORLACK  
 NICHOLAS S. BOSIAK  
 JESSICA LEE BOSS  
 JOSHUA A. BOUCHER  
 ROBERT F. BOUFFARD  
 JASON R. BOURGOIN  
 JONATHAN BOWE  
 ZACHARY L. BOWEN  
 SARAH E. BOWLES  
 PAMELA A. BOYARSKI  
 ADAM B. BOYD  
 WILLIAM M. BOYLES  
 DOUGLAS A. BOYTIM  
 DIANA K. BRADFIELD  
 BLAKE S. BRADFORD  
 ROBERT T. BRADLEY  
 DAVID J. BRAITHWAITE  
 MARY E. BRAUN  
 MATTHEW G. BRAUND  
 DAVID T. BREDESEN  
 TIMOTHY W. BREITBACH  
 KYLE J. BREMHOLM  
 NICHOLAS W. BRENCE  
 ERICK D. BRENDSEL  
 EDWARD N. BRENNAN  
 JUSTINE J. BRENT  
 ADAM R. BRESHOCK  
 GARRETT R. BRIDGES  
 MATTHEW D. BRILL  
 ERIN BRILLA  
 NICHOLAS J. BRINEY  
 SERENA V. BRIONES  
 STEVE C. BRIONES  
 BRADFORD J. BRIZEK

JOSHUA C. BROCK  
 JUSTIN M. BROCKHOFF  
 KEVIN M. BROCKLER  
 ZACHARY P. BRODEUR  
 ADAM L. BROOKS  
 CHRISTOPHER S. BROOKS  
 STEVEN B. BROOKS  
 AUSTIN C. BROWN  
 GABRIEL P. BROWN  
 IVAN D. BROWN  
 JASON T. BROWN  
 JONAH R. BROWN  
 STANTON P. BROWN  
 NICHOLAS S. BROWNHEIM  
 MARK S. BROWNING  
 CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH BRUMFIELD  
 PETER J. BRUNKE  
 TRAVIS R. BRYCE  
 MARSHALL BUCK  
 RICHARD A. BUCKLEY  
 ROBERT H. BUCKLEY  
 ERIC M. BUDD  
 JEFFREY L. BUDIS  
 EMILY P. BULGER  
 CHRISTOPHER BULLA  
 KEVIN A. BULLEY  
 CONINGSBY J. BURDON  
 JOSHUA A. BURGER  
 ERIC L. BURKE  
 JEFFREY A. BURKE  
 IDA LEE BURKEY  
 DUSTIN K. BURLESON  
 MARK R. BURLEY  
 BRANDON E. BURNS  
 TRAVIS J. BURNS  
 JOSEPH L. BURNS  
 JARED M. BURRIS  
 WILLIAM B. BURROUS  
 RYAN LEWIS BUSBEY  
 BRIAN C. BUSCH  
 WILLIAM L. BUSCH  
 ERIC A. BUSCHELMAN  
 CHRISTOPHER BUSH  
 ADAM M. BUSHORE  
 BENJAMIN JOHN BUSLER  
 MICHAEL J. BUSSE  
 ANTHONY L. BUTLER  
 BRYAN E. BUTLER  
 MICHAEL J. BUTLER  
 MICHAEL J. BUTLER  
 TREVOR A. BUTLER  
 BENJAMIN B. BUXTON  
 JEREMY BUXTON  
 JONATHAN M. BYARD  
 DEREK CADA  
 BRANDY M. CAFFEE  
 ERIC THOMAS L. CAGURANGAN  
 DOMINIC S. CALDERON  
 CLIFFORD A. CALDWELL  
 AARON P. CALHOON  
 JESSE D. CALLAND  
 CHRISTOPHER D. CALLAWAY  
 PAUL E. CAMERON IV  
 VINCENT R. CAMMARANO  
 TODD A. CAMPBELL  
 DAVID P. CANCEL  
 GEORGE E. CANNON III  
 ANTHONY J. CANNONE  
 JASON T. CARANTA  
 MARIA E. CARDONA  
 JOHN F. CAREW, JR.  
 SCOTT MICHAEL CARLIN  
 BENJAMIN CARLSON  
 JEREMIAH B. CARLSON  
 MICHAEL M. CARLSON  
 SEAN CARLSON  
 JOSHUA C. CARMER  
 DENNIS JOHN CARMODY  
 RYAN W. CARR  
 JAMES M. CARRABIA  
 RAPHAEL N. CARRANZA  
 BRENT M. CARROLL  
 DANIEL R. CARROLL  
 KEITH CARSON  
 JOHN B. CARTER  
 JOSHUA CARTER  
 JOSHUA A. CARTER  
 MATHEW K. CARTER  
 JOHN W. CARTY II  
 JARED D. CASEBOLT  
 BRYAN J. CASEY  
 PATRICK CASEY  
 ELIZABETH C. CASKEY  
 CAROLINE D. CASSIDY  
 ALBERTO CASTANEDA  
 MATT C. CASTANEDA  
 YURIZA J. CASTILLOAGUIRRE  
 BRETT C. CASTLE  
 STEPHEN M. CASTLEN  
 NEAL CATRON  
 AARON B. CAVAZOS  
 AARON W. CELAYA  
 NICHOLAS A. CENCI  
 LISA M. CEPERO  
 ERIC J. CERONE  
 MICHAEL B. CESSAR  
 MATHEW R. CHAMBERLAIN  
 ALBERT J. CHANG  
 JENNIFER H. CHANG  
 NATHAN K. CHANG  
 PHILLIP A. CHAPMAN  
 JOHN E. CHAPPELLE, JR.

ERIC J. CHAREST  
 CHRISTOPHER A. CHARRON  
 JESSA A. CHARRON  
 JOHN M. CHEEK  
 WYATT C. CHEEK  
 KUAN HSUN CHEN  
 PEISHIUE CHEN  
 SAMUEL C. CHIPMAN  
 DEVIN J. CHIRINSKY  
 DANIEL J. CHISOLM  
 NICOLE T. CHMIELEWSKI  
 DAE BOK CHO  
 JAMES CHO  
 JAMES A. CHONGRIS  
 JOSHUA C. CHRISTOPHER  
 MATTHEW C. CICHOWSKI  
 CORY A. CILIA  
 TYLER L. CISNEROS  
 CODY W. CLARK  
 DANIEL ALLEN CLARK  
 NATHAN MICHAEL CLARK  
 ROSS E. CLARK  
 ZACHARY R. CLARKE  
 ERICK J. CLAYSON  
 JASON S. CLAYTON  
 MATTHEW E. CLAYTON  
 ERIC CLEMENTS  
 APRIL H. CLEMMENSEN  
 RANDAL W. CLER  
 JUSTIN L. CLEVELAND  
 ADAM CLIFT  
 JON A. CLINGERBREWSTER  
 MONICA CLODWICK  
 NICHOLAS J. CLOSSMAN  
 ELIZABETH U. CO  
 ANDREW J. COBB  
 NICHOLAS A. COBLIO  
 ZACHARY L. COBURN  
 NICHOLAS J. COCCIA  
 CHRISTOPHER F. COFFMAN  
 JEREMY R. COFFMAN  
 LEROY A. COHEN  
 ADAM C. COLE  
 DEREK A. COLE  
 PAUL A. COLELLA  
 DANIEL R. COLEMAN  
 JASON L. COLEMAN  
 MICHAEL L. COLEMAN  
 TIMOTHY C. COLES  
 NATHAN AARON COLESTOCK  
 PEDRO J. COLLAZO  
 KELLY R. COLLIER  
 CHRISTOPHER L. COLLINS  
 JESSICA R. COLMAN  
 CARLOS M. COLON, JR.  
 JARVIS W. COMBS  
 CHRISTOPHER M. CONANT  
 JACOB CONGER  
 JOHN PAUL CONNER  
 DANIEL J. CONNORS  
 ANDREW C. CONWELL  
 BRANDON C. CONYERS  
 EBONY S. COOK  
 JUSTIN D. COOK  
 SARAH L. COOK  
 ZACHARY COOK  
 DIAMOND D. COOKSON  
 DANIEL W. COOMBS  
 RONNIE AUGUST COOPER, JR.  
 DAVID AMOS CORDER  
 CARLO S. CORDERO  
 GABRIEL G. CORRALES  
 BRIAN J. COTE  
 DANIEL D. COUGHLIN  
 ALEXANDER A. COURTNEY III  
 MAXWELL COVER  
 JUSTIN E. COWLEY  
 BRENT A. COX  
 CHRISTOPHER R. COX  
 JAMES M. COX  
 STEPHANIE M. COX  
 MATT S. CRABB  
 MICLYNN E. CRAIL  
 ADAM S. CRANE  
 DANIEL S. CRANE  
 ANDREW HALDEMAN CRAWFORD  
 JAMES K. CRAWFORD  
 JOSE L. CRESPO  
 KYLE C. CROSBY  
 ROBERT M. CROSS  
 RYAN T. CROSS  
 MATTHEW P. CROSSER  
 BRADLEY G. CROSSON  
 CHRISTOPHER D. CROUCH  
 CAROLYN CRUZ  
 LAWRENCE J. CUCULIC  
 MATTHEW CULBERTSON  
 BRETT J. CULLEN  
 CASEY R. CUNNINGHAM  
 RYAN H. CUNNINGHAM  
 ERNESTO F. CURIEL  
 DANIEL TODD CURRIE  
 MICHAEL J. CURRY  
 ALFRED CURTIS III  
 DAVID H. CURTIS  
 SEAN H. CUTLER  
 CAMERON L. CZARNIECKI  
 WHITMAN T. DAILEY  
 MATTHEW P. DALE  
 RUSSELL DAVID DALHART  
 JEFFREY RICHARD DALLAS  
 CHRISTOPHER M. DANIELS



JOSHUA G. DANIELS  
 WILLIAM M. DANYLUK  
 ADAM C. DARROW  
 WHITICAR S. DARVILL  
 CHRISTOPHER L. DAUER  
 CONOR RILEY DAUGHERTY  
 GARY P. DAUGHERTY II  
 JOEL T. DAVEE  
 KYLE R. DAVIDSON  
 ROBERT A. DAVIDSON  
 BRADLEY W. DAVIES  
 ARLEN R. DAVIS  
 CHRISTOPHER WALTER DAVIS  
 JACOB M. DAVIS  
 JOHN DAVIS  
 JONATHAN M. DAVIS  
 JOSEPH D. DAVIS  
 KHARY S. DAVIS  
 TYSON G. DAW  
 CINDY D. DAWSON  
 CHARLES J. DAY  
 ANA C. DE FIGUEROA  
 EDWARD D. DE IULIO  
 JESSICA E. DE IULIO  
 BRIAN A. DEA  
 BENJAMIN P. DEAN  
 MATTHEW M. DEARDORFF  
 JACOB H. DEBEVEC  
 TIFFANY L. DEBROW  
 DUSTIN M. DEDMORE  
 SANDRA A. DEFazio  
 BRIAN JOSEPH DELA CRUZ  
 DAVID DELMAGE  
 GEORGE H. DELONG  
 GLEN A. DEMARS  
 ALEXANDER HENRY DEMMA  
 ALLISON ANNE DEMPSEY  
 CHRISTOPHER A. DEMPSEY  
 KRISTINA M. DEMPSEY  
 DANIEL J. DENNEY  
 DAVID R. DENNIS  
 RICHARD N. DEROHAN  
 MICHAEL A. DEVITA  
 GEORGES X. DEWILDE  
 MICHAEL R. DI PRISCO  
 CARLOS J. DIAZ SERRANO  
 VALENTINO A. DIAZ  
 BRIAN A. DICKINSON  
 DANIEL S. DICKINSON  
 MARK W. DICKINSON  
 MATTHEW J. DIEHL  
 SCOTT D. DIEHL  
 DANIEL P. DIEMER  
 KEVIN J. DIFALCO  
 RONALD J. DION  
 MATTHEW A. DISTEFANO  
 JARED T. DOCKENDORF  
 MICAH N. DODDS  
 JOSEPH G. DOLCE  
 PAUL F. DOLCE  
 MELISSA L. DOMBROCK  
 JOSEPH DOMBROW  
 TIMOTHY DONAHOO  
 BRIAN PATRICK DONNELL  
 RYAN EMERSON DONOHUE  
 LUKE T. DONOVAN  
 KRYSTA D. DORAN  
 ZACHARY T. DORMAN  
 RECO MAURICE DOUGHTY  
 ANDREW J. DOWD  
 JOSEPH RILEY DOWELL  
 JOSHUA DOWNING  
 JARED MICHAEL DOYLE  
 MICHAEL S. DRAGOON  
 LOGAN R. DRAVES  
 JUDSON C. DRESSLER  
 ANNIE K. DRISCOLL  
 TAYLOR B. DROKE  
 NICOLE DRONEY  
 BRIAN E. DUDLEY  
 AARON J. DUFF  
 CHRISTOPHER F. DUFF  
 MARC B. DUFRESNE  
 BRIAN A. DUMM  
 JARVORA B. DUNCAN  
 MARK C. DUNCAN  
 SAMUEL C. DUNLAP  
 MATTHEW D. DUNN  
 MICHAEL ADAM DUNN  
 ROBERT F. DUNPHY  
 CHRISTOPHER A. DUPUIS  
 JEFFREY D. DUPUIS  
 JEFFREY DURHAM  
 RICHARD D. DURSTEIN  
 STEPHEN B. DZIALO  
 BRIANNA MAE EADS  
 JAMES R. EBERLY  
 RYAN T. EDENSTROM  
 SUNNI R. EDINGER  
 NATHANIEL L. EDWARDS  
 JOSEPH EARL EHRENFELD  
 MITCHELL ARTHUR EHRESMAN  
 JONATHAN P. EIZENBERG  
 BRENTON J. EKREN  
 MIKE EL MANN  
 DARIN S. ELGERSMA  
 TAMMIE N. ELLERBE  
 DANELE SUTHERLAND ELLIOTT  
 JUSTIN J. ELLIOTT  
 BRENT A. ELLIS  
 MICHAEL EDWARD ELLIS  
 ROBERT J. ELLIS III

JENIFER N. ELLSWORTH  
 MATTHEW P. ELMORE  
 BENJAMIN OLLIS ELTON  
 ANDREW ENGEL  
 KURTIS ENGELSON  
 MELISSA A. ENGLISH  
 BRIAN J. ERICKSON  
 DAVID ERKENS  
 CHRIS D. ERLEWINE  
 DAVID M. ERNST  
 NICHOLAS J. ERVIN  
 KRISTINE N. ESPINOLA  
 DAVID J. ESTREM  
 KEVIN M. ETHERTON  
 DANIEL J. ETUE  
 JUSTIN P. EULBERG  
 BRADLEY K. EVANS  
 MATTHEW T. EVERS  
 BRYAN P. EWING  
 JOSHUA L. FAILING  
 JEFFREY T. FALCONE  
 BRIAN S. FALK  
 ANDREW P. FAMA  
 CORY J. FARRER  
 TIMOTHY D. FARWELL  
 TIMOTHY FAST  
 VANCE FEAVEL  
 MATTHEW FEEMAN  
 JON P. FELMET  
 ZACHARY D. FENNEL  
 JARED P. FERNEAU  
 THOMAS W. FERRARA  
 JOHN T. FIELD  
 ROXANNA M. FIGUEROA  
 JORDAN L. FILER  
 JENNIFER VAITA FILLMORE  
 FREDERICK J. FINKE III  
 CHRISTOPHER R. FINKENSTADT  
 RYAN D. FINLAYSON  
 KELSEY FINLEY  
 MATTHEW T. FINNEGAN  
 JUAN P. FIOL  
 TAMARA R. FISCHER CARTER  
 THEODORE FISHER  
 JOHN R. FITZGERALD  
 CHAD G. FLANN  
 BRENT D. FLEMING  
 KEVIN M. FLEMING  
 RUSSELL E. FLEMING  
 ADAM FLETCHER  
 SHAUN P. FLOERSCH  
 COREY J. FLORENDO  
 ALICIA A. FOGARTY  
 RENEE ELIZABETH FONTENOT  
 MATTHEW T. FORBES  
 DARIN E. FORD  
 THERESA MARIE FORD  
 CLINTON J. FORE  
 SEAN K. FORSMAN  
 ERIC J. FORSYTH  
 RALPH GARY FOSHEE, JR.  
 ADAM J. FOSSUM  
 JESSE C. FOSTER  
 EDWARD TAYLOR FRANCIS  
 THOMAS J. FRANKEN  
 STEVEN FREEMAN  
 JONATHAN M. FRENCH  
 DONALD E. FREY  
 WILLIAM R. FREY  
 JONATHAN D. FRIEDMAN  
 CHARLES A. FRIESZ  
 JOSEPH M. FRITSCHEN  
 MICHAEL S. FRITTS  
 BRANDON M. FRITZ  
 PATRICK L. FROST  
 TYRONE S. FROST  
 GABRIEL A. FRUSHA  
 MATTHEW T. FRY  
 MICHAEL A. FRYE  
 ALFRED D. FRYMAN III  
 JAMES JULIO FUENTES  
 THOMAS J. FUGLER  
 TRAVIS J. FUGLER  
 TIMOTHY P. FULKERSON  
 WILLIAM FULLINGTON  
 JEFFREY P. FULTON  
 CHARLES G. GAFFORD  
 OMAR GAMBOA  
 ERIC WILLIAM GARCIA  
 ORLANDO TOMAS GARCIA  
 RUSSELL C. GARDNER  
 JUSTIN R. GAREY  
 PHILIP N. GARITO, JR.  
 REY JAN D. GARMA  
 BRYAN P. GARTON  
 SILAS W. GASSETT  
 GREGORY S. GAUDET  
 CHRISTOPHER D. GAUSEPOHL  
 JERRY WAYNE GAY  
 PATRICK J. GAYNOR  
 GEFREY LYNN GEBHARDT  
 PHILIP A. GEDDES  
 SARAH E. GEE  
 JEREMY R. GEIGER  
 BARRY C. GEISE  
 PAUL M. GENSCIC  
 RYAN D. GEOFFROY  
 ANTHONY R. GEORGE  
 DUSTIN R. GEORGE  
 BRENT H. GESSEL  
 DARRELL GIBSON, JR.  
 JONATHAN P. GIBSON

ANDREW L. GIEBLER  
 JONATHAN C. GILBERT  
 LORI C. GILBERT  
 ROBERT A. GILBERT  
 EDWARD J. GILCHRIST  
 BRANDON G. GILLET  
 JAMES A. GIPE  
 FRANK P. GIRDWAIN  
 ANDREW J. GLASS  
 DAVID N. GLEASON  
 PATRICK GLEN  
 GARY J. GLOVER  
 THOMAS GOBLE  
 MARSHA RENEE GOETZ  
 DANIEL L. GOFF  
 ERIK M. GOFF  
 REED H. GOLDBERG  
 BRENT FAIRS GOLDEN  
 ALEXANDER K. GOLDFEIN  
 JOHN H. GOMEZ  
 NICHOLAS I. GOMEZ  
 BLAKE T. GONZALES  
 JACOB M. GONZALES  
 JOSEPH GONZALES  
 BRIAN A. GONZALEZ  
 JUAN ANTONIO GONZALEZ, JR.  
 SABRINA L. GONZALEZ  
 JEFFREY R. GOODE  
 ROBERT J. GOODREAU  
 TIMOTHY J. GOODWILLIE  
 AMBER L. GOODWIN  
 ANDREW S. GORDON  
 CHARLENE R. GORDON  
 MICHAEL A. GORDON  
 NEIL MICHAEL GORHAM  
 JASON ROBERT GOSSETT  
 JESSICA R. GOTT  
 CAMBER L. GOVERNSKI  
 IAN GRANIER  
 RASHIDA A. GRAVES  
 SCOTT H. GRAVES  
 BRANDON GRAY  
 JEFFERY RYAN GRAY  
 MICHAEL ADAM GRAY  
 HEATHER GREATTING DUFAUD  
 EMILY E. GREBENC  
 JACOB E. GREEN  
 KENNETH L. GREEN  
 ERIC B. GREENE  
 KIRK W. GREENE  
 DANIEL J. GREGORICH  
 KEVIN M. GREINER  
 JOHN N. GREMMINGER  
 KEVIN J. GRENIER  
 KYLE GRIEVES  
 PAUL A. GRIFFITH  
 DIMITRIOS P. GRILLOS  
 JOHN A. GRIMES  
 ROBERT W. GRIMES  
 JUSTIN G. GRIPP  
 RUSSELL GRONSKY  
 JEFFREY H. GROSSMAN  
 CLARK GROSVENOR  
 JARED L. GROVE  
 COURTNEY L. GROVES  
 STEVEN M. GROW  
 LENORA L. GRUBB  
 CAROLINE MEGAN GUERRINI  
 GREGORY M. GUERTIN  
 WILLIAM J. GUGELMAN  
 LAUREN T. GUIBERT  
 BRYAN P. GUIDRY  
 JESSICA GUITRON  
 JAMILEE M. GUNNELS  
 ANNA E. GUNNGOLKIN  
 CHRISTINA H. GUSTAFSON  
 JOSEPH M. GUSTAFSON  
 WILLIAM L. GUTHRIE IV  
 JASON ROBERT GUYETTE  
 JOSHUA G. HAACK  
 JONATHAN B. HABA  
 DAVID ALAN HABBEN  
 JACOB D. HARRUN  
 JEFFREY W. HADDIN  
 LUKE J. HAGEN  
 BLAKE B. HAJOVSKY  
 BRIAN S. HALE  
 MATTHEW J. HALE  
 ROBERT E. HALE  
 MAKISI W. HALECK  
 DANIEL HALL  
 JOSHUA N. HALL  
 MICHAEL C. HALL  
 MICHAEL L. HALL  
 NICHOLAS J. HALL  
 ELIAS HALVORSON  
 CHRISTIAN N. HAMILTON  
 CLINT S. HAMMER  
 COURTNEY TAYLOR HAMPTON  
 CARL HANAUER  
 JASON HANCOCK  
 ERICK DANIEL HANDEGARD  
 DAVID HANISCH  
 JARED HANN  
 JOSEPH A. HANNIGAN  
 ROBERT A. HANNUM  
 JAY HANSEN  
 LAURA R. HANSEN  
 DOMINIC MARTIN HANSON  
 MARK ANDREW HANUS  
 ROBERT N. HARMS  
 CAROLE A. HARPER

KEITH M. HARRIGAN  
 KYLE M. HARRINGTON  
 CHRISTINA C. HARRIS  
 EMILY E. HARRIS  
 JAMES ALBERT HARRIS  
 JEREMY P. HARRIS  
 JOSEPH HARRIS  
 LORENZO HARRIS, JR.  
 NICHOLAS J. HARRIS  
 JAY R. HART  
 KAREEN A. HART  
 MICHAEL L. HARTFIELD  
 FRANCIS T. HARTNETT  
 PHILLIP P. HARTNETT  
 MATTHEW C. HARVEY  
 MICHAEL J. HARVEY  
 GRANT B. HARWELL  
 JASON T. HASBROUCK  
 CHRISTOPHER K. HASEGAWA  
 JONATHAN D. HASSELL  
 BRIAN C. HASSLER  
 ERIC W. HASTINGS  
 PHILIP C. HASTINGS  
 ROBERT HATLA  
 NICHOLAS HARRIS HATCHER  
 CELINA F. HATLEBERG  
 BENJAMIN J. HAUGER  
 MARVIN B. HAUGHTON III  
 ADAM E. HAWKINS  
 MICHAEL HAWKINS  
 STEVEN R. HAWKINS  
 PAUL A. HAYES  
 JAMES IAN HAYNES  
 LUKE R. HAYWAS  
 OCTAVIA D. HEARD  
 CHRISTOPHER L. HEARNE  
 BRUCE L. HEBERT  
 DARRYL J. HEBERT, JR.  
 NATHAN C. HEDDEN  
 AARON B. HEDIGER  
 JUSTIN F. HEDRICK  
 STEPHANIE HEDSTROM  
 MICHAEL JOSEPH HEFFERLY  
 RYAN G. HEFRON  
 BENJAMIN T. HEIDENREICH  
 JODI L. HEIDMOUS  
 MICHAEL R. HEIMAN  
 ELIZABETH A. HEIN  
 JOHN C. HEINS  
 RYAN D. HEMPERLY  
 TERRENCE HENDERSON  
 WAYNE CHRISTOPHER HENRY  
 ANDREA M. HENSHALL  
 SCOTT H. HENSLEY  
 BRENDON D. HERBECK  
 KIM V. HERD  
 JONATHAN D. HERMAN  
 ERIK P. HERMANSON  
 GEORGE L. HERN, JR.  
 CHRISTINE C. HERNANDEZ  
 RHENSO B. HERNANDEZ  
 DAVID R. HERNDON  
 NEPTALI HERRADA  
 TYLER J. HESS  
 JAMES P. HEWETT  
 JUSTIN M. HICKEY  
 TOLAN D. HICKS  
 CASSANDRA R. HIDALGO  
 JEREMY M. HIGBEE  
 MICHAEL J. HILKERT  
 CHRISTOPHER R. HILL  
 JEFFREY P. HILL  
 RICHELLE N. J. HILL  
 GRANT L. HILLMAN  
 PETER HINCE  
 DAVID G. HIND  
 TRISTAN T. HINDERLITER  
 MICHAEL S. HINES  
 JUSTIN J. HINRICHs  
 KEN HIROSE  
 JEREMY M. HIRSCH  
 RYAN MCHENRY HISEROTE  
 TERRY WARREN HJERPE  
 MICHAEL A. HOADLEY  
 BLAKE R. HOAGLAND  
 FRANCIS X. HOAR, JR.  
 WELDON J. HOBBS  
 MICHAEL W. HOBSON  
 JUSTIN LEE HOCHSTEIN  
 HANNAH ELIZABETH HOCKING  
 CAMERON G. HODGE  
 JASON R. HODGES  
 MARK W. HODGES  
 DAVID B. HODGSON  
 JAMES HODGSON  
 KENNETH T. HODGSON  
 STEPHEN C. HODGSON  
 JAMES KIRK HOFFMAN  
 NATHANIEL D. HOFMANN  
 MICHAEL HOGAN  
 JOEL G. HOLDER  
 CLAYBURN HOLLAND  
 CEDRIC N. HOLLEY II  
 PAUL J. HOLLRITH  
 JASON M. HOLMAN  
 ALBERT W. HOLSONBACK II  
 KRISTOPHER C. HOLSTEGE  
 MICHAEL J. HOLT  
 JULIE A. HONEYCUTT  
 JEFFERY L. HOOVER  
 BART J. HOPKINS  
 MATTHEW J. HOPKINS

MATTHEW HORLACHER  
 WILLIAM D. HORN III  
 MARTIN L. HORNE III  
 DANIEL HORWITZ  
 ANDREW M. HOTT  
 GARRETT M. HOUK  
 LAJOYCE HOUSE  
 CARL NATHAN HOWARD  
 SCOTT D. HOWE  
 ADAM P. HOWLAND  
 JENNIFER P. HOWLAND  
 RYAN T. HOWLAND  
 DEAN D. HOYT  
 MATTHEW THOMAS HOYT  
 PAUL M. HRAD  
 JEREMY J. HROMSCO  
 KRISSI L. HRUPEK  
 MASON J. HUBBARD  
 TUNISHA TISHWANI HUBBARD  
 DEREK J. HUBER  
 NOEL A. HUDLESTON  
 ELIZABETH HUDSON  
 MITCHELL C. HUDSON  
 ROBERT K. HUGHES  
 SHAMAN HUGHES  
 ERIC SCOTT HUGHETT  
 HECTOR HUGUET  
 NOEL A. HUMBER  
 KEVIN T. HUMMERT  
 JAMES M. HUMPHREY  
 ANDREW O. HUNSTOCK  
 ADAM J. HUNTINGTON  
 SCOTT E. HUNTLEY  
 MICHAEL D. HURLEY  
 TRAVIS DON HUSABOE  
 MICHAEL CHRISTOPHER HUTCHINS  
 JARED KENNETH HUTTER  
 BRADLEY S. HYATT  
 RACHEL A. IANACONE  
 JEFFREY J. IANACCONE  
 JOHN D. IHRIG  
 BRIAN WILLIAM ILES  
 JHAMES ILLANEZ  
 SHAWN M. ILTIS  
 MELISSA C. INGRAM  
 ERIC T. INKENBRANDT  
 LAURA A. ISALY  
 LIDIA IYASSU  
 CHRISTOPHER ALLEN IZELL  
 CHRISTOPHER R. JACKSON  
 DANIEL B. JACKSON  
 FREDERICK H. JACKSON  
 PHILIP C. JACKSON  
 CHRISTOPHER M. JACOBSON  
 GABRIEL S. JACOBSON  
 CHRISTOPHER B. JAMES  
 CHRISTOPHER KEVIN JAMES  
 PATRICK ALLAN JAMES  
 TIMOTHY L. JAMES  
 MICHAEL A. JAMIESON  
 NICHOLAS J. JAMROZ  
 ANTHONY J. JANNAZO  
 KYLE JUSTIN JANSEN  
 MARK G. JANSEN  
 CELIA M. JARRATT  
 ERIC T. JEANNOT  
 CHARLES S. JELLIFFE  
 KRISTEN M. JENKINS  
 MATTHEW JENKINS  
 JANELLE V. JENNIGES  
 CHRISTOPHER L. JEROME  
 ANDREW D. JERZ  
 CHARLES W. JESSE, JR.  
 MICHAEL E. JOANOS  
 RYAN R. JOBMAN  
 CHRISTOPHER R. JOERS  
 MARC E. JOHANSEN  
 BUDDY C. JOHNS  
 ANDREAS H. JOHNSEN  
 ALEXIS R. JOHNSON  
 AMBER M. JOHNSON  
 BRENT ALLEN JOHNSON  
 BRIAN T. JOHNSON  
 CARL HEATH JOHNSON  
 CLIFTON H. JOHNSON  
 DARRIS L. JOHNSON  
 EMILIA JOHNSON  
 JASON L. JOHNSON  
 JOSHUA D. JOHNSON  
 OLIN JOHNSON  
 TYLER A. JOHNSON  
 ZACHARY S. JOHNSON  
 ZELLA L. JOHNSON  
 PATRICK WAYNE JOHNSTON  
 AARON M. JONES  
 ARTHUR J. JONES  
 BRANDON R. JONES  
 DAVID W. JONES  
 DUSTIN P. JONES  
 MATTHEW D. JONES  
 MATTHEW S. JONES  
 LOREN N. JONESHARRIS  
 NICHOLAS B. JORDAN  
 ANGELA SUSANN JOY RADDEN  
 MARIE S. JUAN ROQUE  
 DANIEL R. JUCHCINSKI  
 ERIC C. JUDD  
 JARROD L. JUDD  
 KRISTOPHER A. JUHL  
 PAUL JULIAN, JR.  
 SAMUEL S. JUN  
 NICHOLAS JUREWICZ

NATHAN WAYNE JURGENS  
 JENNIFER N. KAISER  
 ERIK D. KAPPE  
 LESLIE L. KASTROP  
 LISA A. KAZAKOS  
 BENJAMIN J. KEARNEY  
 MATTHEW J. KEILEN  
 ALEXANDER J. KELLER  
 SCOTT C. KELLERMAN  
 ERIC F. KELLOGG  
 JEFFREY M. KELLOGG  
 ALEXANDER M. KELLY  
 BRYAN S. KELLY  
 TRAVIS C. KENNEBECK  
 MICHAEL J. KENNEDY  
 RICHARD S. KERR  
 MICHAEL M. KERSCHBAUM  
 MEGAN L. KESSEN  
 KAMRAN M. KHALIDI  
 JAMES O. KILLIAN  
 WESTON D. KILLIAN  
 ANTHONY Y. KIM  
 NICOLAS R. KIM  
 TAE HOON KIM  
 DANIEL KIMBALL  
 ANGELA M. KIMLER  
 BENJAMIN R. KING  
 BRADLEY M. KING  
 DAVID W. KING, JR.  
 JEREMIAH DANIEL KING  
 LUKE V. KIRKLAND  
 RUSSELL J. KIRKLIN  
 AARON W. KISER  
 MICHAEL G. KISSINGER  
 SARAH A. KLAESER FERNANDEZ  
 THOMAS B. KLEIN  
 JOHN A. KLEINSCHMIDT  
 RORY E. KLEPPER  
 MARSHALL W. KLITZKE  
 DANIEL W. KNAPP MILLER  
 MICHAEL W. KNAUF  
 MATTHEW D. KNEPPER  
 TIMOTHY R. KNEFFEL  
 DANIEL K. KNOSS  
 BRADLEY MARSHALL KOCH  
 TIMOTHY KOGGE  
 KEVIN R. KOLB  
 MARCUS J. KOLLROSS  
 JAMES P. KOLZOW  
 STANISLAV V. KOMITOV  
 DAVID KOPP  
 JOSHUA W. KORZILIUS  
 JODY RAY KOSCHMANN  
 MAURICIO KOSSLER  
 TERRY L. KOSTELLIC, JR.  
 AARON D. KOTTLAWSKI  
 BRANDON R. KOVELL  
 MATTHEW KOWALSKI  
 MICHAEL B. KRAUSE  
 DANIEL BRENT KREHER  
 KYLE W. KREMER  
 CHRISTINA P. KREPS  
 RANDALL J. KREPS  
 MATTHEW BRIAN KRISAK  
 AARON KRIZEK  
 DANIEL J. KRUNGLEVICH  
 THOMAS L. KUBLER  
 JONATHAN S. KULAK  
 NICOLE G. KUMP  
 BENJAMIN D. KUSTER  
 MATTHEW J. KUTA  
 EDWARD H. KWON  
 RAQUEL ZARAGOZA LA BARR  
 ERIC J. LAAKE  
 MICHAEL J. LABARBERA  
 TIMOTHY F. LABINSKI  
 NIRAV D. LAD  
 BRIAN A. LADD  
 EMILY D. LADD  
 ANDREW LAFOUNTAIN  
 CULLEN WAYNE LAM  
 CHRISTOPHER LAMKEY  
 JONATHAN B. LAMOREUX  
 CHRISTIAN LONDON  
 TROY LEVAR LANE  
 DINEAN H. LANG  
 CHRISTOPHER M. LANGLEY  
 DAVID L. LANKFORD  
 LIONEL P. LANUZA  
 STEPHEN LANZOLA  
 JASON DANIEL LARISH  
 CHANCELLOR A. LARRACUENTE  
 CHRISTOPHER R. LARSEN  
 BRETT M. LARSON  
 BRIAN A. LASSITER  
 PAUL A. LATOUR  
 CHRISTOPHER LAWLER  
 SAMUEL JAMES LAWRENCE  
 JOSHUA SCOTT LAWSON  
 MATTHEW LAWTON  
 JOSEPH R. LAY  
 MATTHEW S. LAYMAN  
 PHUOCHUE THI LE  
 PATRICK T. LEARY  
 BRIANA E. LEE  
 DARREN F. LEE  
 MIN Y. LEE  
 NICHOLAS A. LEE  
 ROBERT W. LEE  
 STEVEN B. LEE  
 THOMAS W. LEE  
 TRENT WAYNE LEEPER

ROBERT J. LEESE  
 ETHAN C. LEFEBVRE  
 LUCAS W. LEFEVER  
 ABRAHAM J. LEHMANN  
 JEFFREY S. LEHMKUHL  
 ABRAHAM M. LEIGH  
 TROY JOSEPH LEIKER  
 BRIAN J. LEMAY  
 JESSICA L. LEMKE  
 CHRISTOPHER K. LEONG  
 DEVIN KWAI HUNG LEONG  
 MARK B. LESAR  
 JEFFREY S. LESSORD  
 JOEL R. LEVEILLE  
 DAVID LEVENE  
 JORDAN C. LEVINE  
 BRIAN G. LEWIS  
 CHARLTON D. LEWIS II  
 RYAN C. LEY  
 JOHN J. LIEBER  
 ALEXANDER R. LIGGETT  
 NATHANIEL L. LIGHTFOOT  
 JOSEPH M. LILES IV  
 CHRISTOPHER P. LILGEBERG  
 JACOB A. LILLICH  
 ANTHONY E. LIM  
 ASHLEY J. LINCOLN  
 SCOTT ALAN LINDQUIST  
 MICHAEL A. LINGER  
 JAMES A. LINNEHAN  
 MATTHEW LINTKER  
 AARON M. LINTON  
 FREDERICK C. LITTLE, JR.  
 LUCAS P. LOBO  
 JOHN R. LOCKARD  
 JONATHAN D. LOEHR  
 REBECCA M. LOGAN  
 WILLIAM A. LOHAN  
 THOMAS P. LOHMEYER  
 BRIAN R. LONG  
 DUSTIN A. LONG  
 MICHAEL K. LONG  
 NICHOLAS C. LONGO  
 NICHOLAS D. LONGO  
 DANIEL JAMES LONGSTREET  
 ANDREW C. LOOSER  
 READE MATTHEW LOPER  
 ERIN M. LOPEZ  
 JAMES MARCUS LOPEZ  
 MICHAEL LOPEZ  
 AUTUMN M. LORENZ  
 CHRISTOPHER J. LOVE  
 MORRIS LOVE  
 BENJAMIN A. LOWE  
 CHRISTOPHER D. LOWE  
 JAHAYRA LOWE  
 JACQUELINE POSTELL LUCAS  
 ERIK LUGO ESCOBAR  
 CHRISTINE M. LUKASIK  
 AARON D. LYNCH  
 JOHNNY E. LYNUM II  
 JEREMY M. MABRY  
 ROBERT B. MACDERMOTT  
 ANDREW T. MACDONALD  
 DOUGLAS MACDONALD  
 JUSTIN R. MACE  
 MELANIE E. MACE  
 JOHN MACHUCA  
 KATHERINE C. MACK  
 ANDREW J. MACKENZIE  
 BENJAMIN D. MACKAY  
 JAY D. MACLEAN  
 ASHLEY N. MAHER  
 CAMERON MAHER  
 MATTHEW JAMES MAIER  
 KATHRYN M. MAITREJEAN  
 NATHAN C. MALAFA  
 PETER RICHARD MALLOW  
 JAMES W. MALLOY  
 JUSTIN B. MALMSTROM  
 KEVIN MANIS  
 MATTHEW J. MANSELL  
 EDWARD A. MANTANONA, JR.  
 CHRISTIAN L. MAPP  
 JENNIFER A. MAPP  
 RICHARD W. MARBY  
 EVAN J. MARCHETTI  
 DAVID M. MARCUS  
 ANDREW P. MARSHALL  
 COLIN P. MARSHALL  
 TREMAYNE V. MARSHALL  
 KELLY MARTIN  
 KIEL M. MARTIN  
 KYLE E. MARTIN  
 MARGRET T. MARTIN  
 RICHARD A. MARTIN  
 CHRISTOPHER R. MARTINEZ  
 RONALDO MARTINEZ, JR.  
 SAMANTHA M. MARTINEZ  
 JOSEPH J. MARUSKA  
 JEREMY ALLEN MARY  
 ROBERT S. MASEK  
 ALISHA N. MASON  
 ERWIN E. MASON, JR.  
 CASEY M. MASTLEY  
 JESSICA M. MATES  
 MATTHEW F. MATIS  
 JAHARA W. MATISEK  
 ADAM DAVID MATTHEIS  
 KELLY MATTIE  
 KYLE R. MATTIE  
 ADAM JAMES MATUSZAK

KEVIN E. MAUERSBERG  
 BRIAN MAUNTEL  
 BRADLEY G. MAXON  
 TIMOTHY J. MAY  
 MITCHELL MAYES  
 CHRISTOPHER M. MAYO  
 VICTORIA J. MAYO  
 KIMANI A. MAYS  
 NICHOLAS MAZULA  
 KENNETH H. MAZUREK  
 PATRICK P. MCANDREW  
 AARON R. MCBRIDE  
 DONALD ROBERT MCCAFFERY  
 CHRISTOPHER B. MCCALL  
 JOHN R. MCCANN  
 LOUIS MCCANTS  
 CHRISTOPHER MCCARTHY  
 RYAN J. MCCAUGHAN  
 EVAN T. MCCAULEY  
 CHRISTOPHER D. MCCONNELL  
 SEAN R. MCCONNELL  
 SEAN C. MCCONVILLE  
 MATT D. MCCORMACK  
 JACLYN MARIE MCCORMICK  
 MATTHIAS MCCORMICK  
 DARYL L. MCCOY  
 JOSHUA D. MCCRARY  
 ISAAC MCCRAY  
 DANE C. MCCREARY  
 JUSTIN M. MCCULLOUGH  
 AARON J. MCCURDY  
 GREGORY A. MCDADE  
 JONATHAN P. MCDONALD  
 RYAN D. MCDONALD  
 BRYON J. MCGARRY  
 TRAVIS E. MCGARRY  
 DAVID A. MCGHEE  
 CHARLYNNE M. MCGINNIS  
 MICHAEL A. MCKAY  
 KEITH D. MCKEE  
 SEAN R. MCKEE  
 EVAN W. MCKINNEY  
 BRANDON S. MCKINNON  
 THOMAS B. MCKNIGHT  
 CHRISTINE TODD MCLEAN  
 JAMES S. MCLEAN  
 CHARLES B. MCCLERAN  
 PATRICK W. MCMORROW  
 MATTHEW M. MCMURTRY  
 JEREMY B. MCPHERSON  
 JONATHAN G. MCPHILAMY  
 STEVEN B. MCSWAIN  
 KAREN A. MEALEY  
 ERIC ALLEN MEDSGER  
 MAZEN A. MEHIO  
 BENJAMIN D. MEIER  
 MARC S. MEIER  
 GLENN M. MELEEN  
 JONATHAN ELISHA MENASHI  
 CANDIDO T. MENDES, JR.  
 EDDIE A. MENDEZLOVET  
 CHRISTOPHER S. MENDOZA  
 JESUS MENDOZA  
 ISSSEYAS H. MENGISTU  
 KURANDO MENSEN  
 BRADY J. MERRILL  
 FRED M. MERRILL  
 ALEC W. MESSERALL  
 DEVON M. MESSICK  
 THOMAS EDWARD METZGER  
 GUY G. MEYER  
 JUSTIN N. MEYER  
 PAUL F. MEYER  
 NOAH MICHAEL  
 DENISE M. MICHAELS  
 NEAL MIEST  
 BRENT J. MILES  
 ALLEN R. MILLER  
 CHRISTOPHER J. MILLER  
 JESSE P. MILLER  
 JOHN V. MILLER  
 JONATHAN M. MILLER  
 JOSHUA L. MILLER  
 LYNDEL MILLER  
 MATTHEW P. MILLER  
 PHILLIP R. MILLER  
 RYAN T. MILLER  
 SAMANTHA M. MILLER  
 DAVID C. MILODRAGOVICH  
 JACOB EDWARD MISENICK  
 LAMAR SCOTT MISTER  
 ANTHONY B. MITCHELL  
 JEFFREY R. MITCHELL  
 RYAN MATTHEW MOBLEY  
 KAREN A. MOCK  
 ROBBY J. MODAD  
 KYLE M. MODELL  
 MICHAEL D. MOFFITT  
 MICHAEL D. MOHR  
 JOSEPH G. MONTORO  
 KENT C. MOODY  
 STEPHEN MINHO MOON  
 KEITH G. MOORE  
 KENT N. MOORE  
 THOMAS W. MOORE  
 MARK A. MORALES  
 LUIS A. MORALESREYES  
 BENJAMIN P. MORAN  
 GREGORY MORAN  
 CHRISTIAN H. MORGAN  
 HARREL M. MORGAN  
 ROBERT P. MORGAN

NICHOLAS L. MORGANS  
 ERIC MORRIS  
 JOSHUA L. MORRIS  
 CHRISTOPHER T. MORRISON  
 DANIEL P. MORRISSEY  
 JUSTIN A. MOSER  
 DAVID A. MOTT, JR.  
 STEPHEN D. MOTT  
 MATTHEW J. MOTTET  
 DAVID L. MUELLER  
 WILLIAM MUIR  
 PATRICK J. MULLEN  
 DENNIS J. MULLER II  
 JUSTIN M. MULLER  
 ANTOINE N. MUNFAKH  
 SHELDON A. MUNNS  
 MARGELL MUNOZ  
 DAVID J. MURLEY  
 AUDIE R. MURPHY  
 JOSEPH C. MURPHY  
 MICHAEL C. MURPHY  
 PATRICK MICHAEL MURPHY  
 RYAN D. MURPHY  
 ELIZABETH A. MUSIC  
 ERIC LEE MYATT  
 JOHN WILLIAM MYERS, JR.  
 MICHAEL M. MYERS  
 BRADLEY R. NADOLNY  
 CHRISTOPHER M. NAIL  
 DANIAL S. NAIM  
 JUSTIN TYLER NAKAMURA  
 ADAM LEE NAKATA  
 WILLIAM L. NANNA  
 DENNIS M. NAPIER  
 CHRISTOPHER NARVAEZ  
 CHRISTOPHER K. NARY  
 CHRISTOPHER J. NASTAL  
 OMAR A. NAVA  
 TRAVIS D. NEAL  
 WILLIAM M. NEECE  
 LAURIE L. NEEDEE  
 DAVID A. NELSON  
 DOUGLAS J. NELSON  
 JOEL D. NELSON  
 RYAN R. NESS  
 CRAIG H. NEUMAN  
 WILLIAM J. NEWBY  
 IAN A. NEWCOMB  
 JOHN P. NEWMAN  
 MILES ALEXANDER NEWSOME  
 MICHAEL F. NEWSON  
 MARK D. NEXON  
 CHISALA C. NGANDWE  
 TAN ANH NGO  
 TUNG THANH HUYN NGO  
 TIN T. NGUYEN  
 VANESSA N. NICHOLS  
 DANIEL T. NIEDERHAUSER  
 JOEL NIEMAN  
 PAUL J. NIETO  
 PHILIP A. NIGHTINGALE  
 WILFRED E. NOEL  
 JONATHAN RYAN NOONAN  
 CRAIG M. NORDGREN  
 KEITH A. NORDQUEST  
 VERA J. NORTHCUTT  
 CHRISTINA A. NORTON  
 MATTHEW T. NOVOTNEY  
 MICHAEL PAUL NOWAKOWSKI  
 PAMELA J. NUILA  
 RACHAEL L. NUSSBAUM  
 JACQUELINE A. NYBERG  
 CHARLYNDA NYENKE  
 CHRISTINA J. OBERGPELL  
 YOLANDA A. OBEY  
 EDEMUMO K. OBOHO  
 CHRISTOPHER G. OBRANOVICH  
 GAVIN P. OBRIEN  
 KEVIN OBYRNE  
 JONATHAN C. ODELL  
 GORDON F. OLDE, JR.  
 STEVEN D. OLIN  
 AARON EDWARD OLIVER  
 DELL T. OLMSTEAD  
 THOMAS S. OLNEY  
 JESSICA MARIE OLSON  
 ANGELA M. ONEAL  
 DANIEL Y. ONEAL  
 TOMOYUKI D. ONO  
 ISAAH L. OPPELAAR  
 JAVIER ORAMA  
 RODOLFO A. OROZCO  
 ALEXANDER A. ORTIGNA  
 AMBER N. ORTIZ  
 MARK A. OSBECK  
 JEFFREY R. OSBORNE  
 JEFFREY S. OSGOOD  
 MATTHEW T. OSGOOD  
 THOMAS M. OSGOOD  
 RYAN T. OSTLER  
 SCOTT OSTROW  
 MARK M. OVERMAN  
 JUSTIN M. OVERMYER  
 TREVOR K. OWEN  
 RICHARD A. OWENS IV  
 JIMMY M. OXENDINE, JR.  
 STEPHEN C. PACE  
 BENHUR ESPLAGO PACER, JR.  
 JEFFREY T. PACINI  
 MICHAEL D. PACINI  
 NATHAN E. PADGETT  
 JACLYN PADILLA MELTON

JOHN H. PAEK  
 CHAIS A. PAIVA  
 DANIEL P. PALLISTER  
 WILLIAM J. PALM  
 ADAM S. PALMER  
 ERIC B. PALMER  
 CHRISTOPHER M. PAPPAS  
 PAUL A. PAPPAS  
 JEFFREY RAYMOND PAQUETTE  
 CANDACE N. PARK  
 JACOB R. PARKER  
 SANDRA A. PARKER  
 SHAWNA W. PARKER  
 WARREN C. PARKER  
 SCOTT G. PARKS  
 EVAN C. PARR  
 PATRICK R. PARRISH  
 JENNIFER L. PARTIDGE  
 KYLE W. PASLAY  
 BIRJU HARESHCHAN PATEL  
 HIREN JAYANTI PATEL  
 GERALD S. PATTON  
 TRAVIS PATTON  
 SETH E. PAULSEN  
 CHRISTOPHER S. PAXTON  
 JOSHUA A. PAYNE  
 STEVEN PAYNE  
 SHIRISHA W. PEAKE  
 CALEB B. PELGER  
 JENALEE N. PELLETIER  
 SETH A. PELLETIER  
 CASEY PELLIZZARI  
 JOSE HUMBERTO PERALES, JR.  
 PABLO M. PEREZ  
 RIGOBERTO P. PEREZ  
 ANTHONY A. PERONE  
 JULES JOSEPH PERRIE, JR.  
 BRENTON W. PERRY  
 MARK C. PERRY  
 MICHAEL E. PERRY  
 ELI US PERSONS  
 ADAM JOHN PERYES  
 CHARLENE S. PETERS  
 KENNETH PETERS  
 BRIANNE PETERSEN  
 NEIL A. PETERSEN  
 CHRISTOPHER D. PETERSON  
 JAMES PETERSON  
 MOLLY N. PETERSON  
 STEVEN M. PETERSON  
 NICK V. PETTIT  
 THOMAS PETYKOWSKI  
 STEVEN J. PFAU  
 MEGAN L. PFLUG  
 HENRY E. PFLUGRADT III  
 KEITH V. PHILAPHANDETH  
 CASEY D. PHIPPS  
 MICHAEL PIAZZA  
 ANDREW T. PICKERING  
 NICHOLAS PIER  
 CARLOS PINEDO  
 DANIEL M. PIPER  
 ANDREW D. PISUT  
 ABIGAIL F. PLATT  
 PEETER E. PLEAKETAMM  
 JODIE J. PLEISCH  
 OAK WARREN PLESTED  
 MICHAEL J. PLUGER  
 WILBURN R. POE, JR.  
 BRENTON K. POMEROY  
 KEVIN R. POND  
 DAVID C. PONTIUS  
 BENJAMIN ROY POOLE  
 FORREST L. POOLE  
 MICHAEL E. POOLE  
 MICAH J. PORTER  
 KATHERINE IRENE PORTILLO  
 BRIAN JEFFREY POTTER  
 CHRISTOPHER W. POTTS  
 JOSHUA MACK POULTON  
 JASON POWELL  
 MICHAEL HUNTER POWELL  
 ANDREW T. POWER  
 ANDREW P. POWERS  
 SEAN L. POWERS  
 DAYVID M. PRAHL  
 CHRISTOPHER A. PRENTISS  
 ROBERT P. PRENTON  
 JACOB WAYNE PRESLEY  
 DAVID PRESTWICH  
 DONALD T. PREY  
 JOHN A. PRIESTLY III  
 RENE O. PRIETO, JR.  
 THOMAS M. PRITCHETT  
 BRIAN D. PRIVETTE  
 ZACHARY A. PROBST  
 JENNIFER L. PROUTY  
 AUSTIN M. PRUNEDA  
 BRUCE ROBERT PUF AHL, JR.  
 STEVEN L. PUGH  
 STEVEN MICHAEL PUGH  
 SHEENA M. PULEALII  
 NICHOLAS M. PULIRE  
 JEDEDIAH R. PURCELL  
 WILLIAM M. PURCELL  
 ANTHONY PURDY  
 LANETTA R. PURNELLADAMS  
 JOHN H. QUERL IV  
 CLAY C. QUINBY  
 JOSHUA J. QUINN  
 MICHAEL J. QUINN  
 JOHN D. RABUN

CAMERON M. RADON  
 ANDREW T. RADZICKI  
 HERMAN L. RAINEY III  
 NICHOLAS J. RALLO  
 MICHAEL RAMAMURTHY  
 SAUL A. RAMOS  
 BENJAMIN W. RAMSEY  
 RICHARD M. RANACHOWSKI, JR.  
 DANIEL S. RAND  
 DEREK R. RANKIN  
 STACY WILLIAMS RANKIN  
 KABIR S. RAO  
 JASON C. RATCLIFF  
 JORGE ENRIQUE RATIVA HOWARD  
 ERIK G. RAUGLAS  
 ERIC C. RAY  
 MICHAEL P. RAYKOWSKI  
 STEVEN RAYMER  
 MATTHEW P. READ  
 RYAN A. REBUCK  
 MATTHEW O. REDAJA  
 NICHOLAS C. REDENIUS  
 ANDREW R. REED  
 DANIEL S. REED  
 DYLAN A. REED  
 HENRY F. REED  
 MAXIMILIEN H. REELE  
 PAULA K. REELE  
 JONATHAN C. REEVES  
 KYLE J. REICHERT  
 KENT R. REICHLE  
 KEVIN D. REKEDAL  
 ANTHONY A. RENDON  
 CHRISTOPHER M. RENNINGER  
 PHILIP RENTZ  
 MICHAEL V. RESS  
 CHRISTOPHER REVEIZ  
 JONATHAN C. REY  
 ADAN RAY REYES  
 RUSSELL J. REYNOLDS  
 THOMAS J. REYNOLDS III  
 THOMAS S. REYNOLDS  
 MICHAEL J. RICHARDS  
 DANIEL RICHARDSON  
 SEAN RICHARDSON  
 KEVIN C. RIDDEL  
 MELISSA K. RIESTER  
 ROBBIN W. RIESTER  
 JUSTIN C. RIGBY  
 DAVID M. RIGGS  
 MATTHIEU A. RIGOLLET  
 TAYLOR S. RIGOLLET  
 ERIC N. RINGELSTETTER  
 BRYSON M. RINTALA  
 PATRICK L. RIS  
 SCHNEIDER RISLIN  
 ANNETTE O. RIVAS  
 ERNEST D. RIVERA  
 JOHNATHAN ROBBINS  
 MATTHEW L. ROBERSON  
 BRYANT ADAM ROBERTS  
 JAMES T. ROBERTS  
 PALMER L. ROBERTS  
 PATRICK EVERETT ROBERTS  
 BRIAN A. ROBERTSON  
 JASON M. ROBINSON  
 JUSTIN ROBINSON  
 KIMBERLY J. ROBINSON  
 JENNIFER S. ROCK  
 ROBERT J. ROCK  
 ANTONIO D. RODRIGUEZ  
 DOUGLAS I. RODRIGUEZ  
 ISAAC RODRIGUEZ  
 NICHOLAS KIM RODRIGUEZ  
 DUSTIN R. ROGERS  
 THEODORE J. ROGERS  
 JOHN J. ROH  
 GREGORY E. ROHMILLER  
 STEPHEN F. ROHRBACHER  
 ASHLEY E. ROLFE  
 THADDEUS L. RONNAU  
 JOSHUA S. ROPE  
 WILLIAM R. ROSADO  
 MICHAEL B. ROSE  
 DERRICK B. ROSENBERGER  
 SCOTT M. ROSENBLOOM  
 KEITH J. ROSS  
 BRANDON ROTH  
 BRANDON L. ROTH  
 WESLEY C. ROUSAVILLE  
 MICHAEL T. ROY  
 DAVID RUIZ  
 ANDREA D. RUMPLE  
 JENNIFER J. RUPP  
 CHRISTOPHER L. RUSSELL  
 JAMES E. RUSSELL  
 KRISTIN M. RUSSELL  
 TANISHA J. RUSSELL  
 BRIAN MICHAEL RUTT  
 TRAVIS W. RYAN  
 PETER A. SABATOWSKI  
 MICHAEL J. SACKENHEIM  
 MARCUS A. SAGASTUME  
 DAVID ORDINARIO SAMPAYAN  
 MATTHEW STEPHEN SAMPSON  
 ANNA M. SAN MIGUEL  
 JASON M. SANCHEZ  
 MATTHEW TIMOTHY SANDERS  
 RENA M. SANDGREN  
 KIRBY A. SANFORD  
 MATTHEW SANFORD  
 DANIEL S. SANTIAGO

SETH M. SARDUY  
 MATTHEW RYAN SASSER  
 AMANDA M. SATER  
 BRIAN W. SAWYERS  
 JASON P. SCALZITTI  
 DAVID JAMES SCHADWINKEL  
 JASON SCHAUB  
 WILLIAM A. SCHEELE  
 SCOTT M. SCHEFFE  
 PAUL SCHEGLOV  
 JOHN C. SCHILLING  
 DAVID M. SCHIMKE II  
 STEPHEN A. SCHINDEWOLF  
 JONATHAN K. SCHISLER  
 ADAM G. SCHMIDT  
 BRIAN M. SCHMIDT  
 KALUN JEFFERY SCHMIDT  
 MARK A. SCHMIDT  
 DAVID R. SCHMITT  
 GINA M. SCHNEIDER  
 JOSEPH SCHNEIDER  
 KEVIN R. SCHOLZ  
 MATTHEW E. SCHOOMAKER  
 ANDREW J. SCHRAG  
 DANIEL O. SCHREIBER  
 CLAYTON W. SCHUETZ  
 WILLIAM MORRIS SCHUH  
 NICHOLAS T. SCHULTE  
 PATRICK JOSEPH SCHUTTE  
 CURTIS J. SCHWARZ  
 CHARLES K. SCIARINI  
 DOUGLAS C. SCIORTINO  
 JARROD B. SCOGGIN  
 AARON L. SCOGIN  
 ALISHA M. SCOTT  
 BRIAN F. SCOTT  
 CHRISTIN M. SCOTT  
 RYAN C. SCOTT  
 GARY S. SCULLIN  
 JAMES T. SCYOCURKA  
 RACHEL E. SEABLOM  
 BENJAMIN H. SEABOUGH  
 RAYMOND T. SEALEY  
 JONATHAN D. SEELEN  
 DOUGLAS R. SEELEY  
 JEFFERSON O. SEGUIN  
 MATTHEW SEIDERS  
 DIERK A. SEIFERT  
 TREVOR A. SEILING  
 RUPINDER SINGH SEKHON  
 BEN J. SELF  
 ANDREW J. SELLERS  
 MARGARET S. SERIG  
 REINA SERINEO  
 HAROLD F. SHAM  
 JOSEPH SHANNON III  
 URI C. SHANSKE  
 PHILIP A. SHAPIRO  
 JOHN J. SHARKEY, JR.  
 JEFFREY A. SHAW  
 ROBERT KEVIN SHAW  
 PETER C. SHAYHORN  
 BRIAN PATRICK SHEA  
 THOMAS P. SHEA, JR.  
 TRAVIS H. SHEETS  
 SHANE J. SHEFFIELD  
 RYAN W. SHELHORSE  
 MATTHEW A. SHELLY  
 PETER CHRISTIAN SHELTON  
 REGINALD P. SHELTON  
 WILLIAM J. SHELTON  
 JOEL T. SHEPHERD  
 AARON D. SHERMAN  
 BENJAMIN D. SHERMAN  
 JENNIFER B. SHERMAN  
 TROY H. C. SHETTLESWORTH  
 JONATHAN D. SHIFLETT  
 BRIAN A. SHIMKE  
 TRACI S. SHIRAIISHI  
 JUAN R. SIANCASTAO  
 SEAN OMAR SIDDIQUI  
 JORDAN SITTERI  
 JASON B. SIKORSKI  
 JASON G. SILVA  
 RYAN J. SILVA  
 ADRIAN SIMENTAL  
 JUSTIN SIMMONS  
 BENJAMIN D. SIMON  
 SETH BASIL SIMPSON IV  
 MALINDA SINGLETON  
 ERIC J. SIPOS  
 NATHAN E. SKAGGS  
 BRETT M. SKATES  
 AUSTIN B. SKELLEY  
 TIMOTHY J. SKYPECK  
 DARIN M. SLAGA  
 STUART M. SLATTERY  
 MICHAEL A. SLAUGHTER  
 CALEB SLAYTON  
 ANTHONY J. SLIGAR  
 BENJAMIN R. SMITH  
 BOYD SMITH  
 DAVID N. SMITH  
 EDITH E. SMITH  
 JONATHAN Z. SMITH  
 JUSTIN M. SMITH  
 KENNETH J. SMITH  
 KIMBERLY D. SMITH  
 MATTHEW C. SMITH  
 MICHAEL T. SMITH  
 NICHOLAS C. SMITH  
 PETER M. SMITH

RONNIE R. SMITH  
 SIERRA M. SMITH  
 TROY M. SMITH  
 WARREN S. SMITH III  
 CHRISTOPHER D. SMOROL  
 MATTHEW SODERLUND  
 TROY M. SOEDER  
 JOSEPH E. SOLANO  
 RICARDO S. SOLANO  
 NICHOLAS M. SOMERMAN  
 JICHUL SONG  
 GARY J. SOWA  
 JARED J. SPEER  
 MICHAEL J. SPENCER  
 LAWRENCE J. SPINA, JR.  
 MATT S. SPINELLI  
 MATTHEW J. SPITLER  
 EDMUND SPIVAK  
 CHAD ANDREW ST ARNAULD  
 DAVID N. ST LOUIS  
 PAUL J. STADELBACHER  
 MEGAN A. STANDIFER  
 ROBERT A. STANFIELD  
 COURTLAND W. STANLEY  
 THOMAS J. STAR  
 SEAN DANIEL STAVELY  
 LINDON H. STEADMAN  
 TIMOTHY A. STEARMAN  
 WILLIAM D. STEININGERHOLMES  
 DONNA MICHELLE STEINKE  
 BRIAN L. STEORTS  
 MICHAEL A. STEPAN  
 CHRISTOPHER G. STEPANEK  
 CHRISTOPHER D. STEPHEN  
 ANGELA L. STEPHENS  
 MICHAEL R. STEWARD  
 JESSICA STEWART  
 JAMA K. STILWELL  
 ANDREW J. STIMPSON  
 BRANDON STOKER  
 LISA A. STOKEY  
 CASON D. STONE  
 DEREK J. STORBECK  
 LUKE R. STOVER  
 JOSHUA A. STRAFACCIA  
 WILLIAM A. STREET  
 CHARLES C. STRETCH, JR.  
 BRANDON KIRK STRICKLAND  
 ZACARY SCOTT STRICKLAND  
 DAVID E. STRINGER  
 JOSHUA S. STRONG  
 MATTHEW STRONGIN  
 JOHN L. STRUBE, JR.  
 REHEMA L. STUCKEY  
 JONATHAN DOUGLAS STUECKLE  
 JOHN Z. STUKAVEC  
 AARON M. STUMPF  
 TREVOR VINCENT STUTTING  
 JEREMY J. STUURSMA  
 LARA JOY STYLES SMITH  
 NATHANIEL ISAAH SOKOLSKY  
 PAUL S. SULA  
 DANIEL W. SULLIVAN  
 GREGORY D. SULLIVAN  
 RYAN SULLIVAN  
 SARAH SUMMERS  
 BRIAN L. SUMP  
 AMANDA SUNDERLAND  
 JONATHAN E. SUNDMAN  
 PETER L. SURETTE, JR.  
 ANTHONY A. SURMAN  
 JOSHUA THOMAS SUTLIFF  
 TIMOTHY P. SUTPHEN  
 STEPHEN A. SWARTZ  
 ALLYN L. SWAVELY, JR.  
 STEVEN P. SWEET II  
 ERIC J. SWENSON  
 BRYAN K. SWIERENGA  
 COULETTE C. SWIGGETT  
 PETER J. SWINSON  
 WILLIAM B. SWOAPE  
 RYAN Z. SZMAJDA  
 KORINNE K. TAKEYAMA  
 MATTHEW E. TARNOWSKI  
 DEANA R. TATE  
 JASON ALLEN TAYLOR  
 KARA TAYLOR  
 MATTHEW W. TAYLOR  
 MICHAEL A. TAYLOR  
 RUSH HENRY TAYLOR  
 RYAN R. TAYLOR  
 SETH TAYLOR  
 WILLIAM STEPHAN TAYLOR  
 IAN W. TEEGARDEN  
 JEFFREY A. TEEL  
 MARIO H. TELLEZ  
 KATHLEEN M. TENPENNY  
 NATHAN C. TERRAZONE  
 SUSAN H. TERRELL  
 RYAN L. TERVO  
 ALICIA MARIE THALHOFER  
 BRIAN A. THALHOFER  
 APRIL R. THEOBALD  
 KRISTINE E. THICKSTUN  
 JEREMIAH THOM  
 CULLEN R. THOMAS  
 DANIEL R. THOMAS  
 KEVIN T. THOMAS  
 JEFFERY ALLEN THOMASON  
 JOSEPH L. THOMER  
 CHRISTOPHER M. THOMPSON  
 JESSE C. THOMPSON

MATTHEW A. THOMPSON  
 NOLAN R. THOMPSON  
 SCOTT MICHAEL THOMPSON  
 SCOTT R. THOMSON  
 ROBERT FRANCIS THORNTON  
 ANNALIEE A. THURBER  
 PATRICK R. TIBBALS  
 TERRELL K. TILLERY  
 BRENT S. TITTLE  
 GEORGE MICHAEL TOBIAS  
 JEREMY R. TOBIAS  
 JOHN C. TOMASKOVIC III  
 DAVID W. TOMLINSON  
 TRAVIS R. TOMPKINS  
 ERIK R. TORGUSON  
 JOSE MANUEL TORRECH  
 ERICA ETTER TORTELLA  
 TORI LEIGH NERNEY TOUZIN  
 CRAIG S. TOWLSON  
 SCOTT A. TRACY  
 HUY H. TRAN  
 VUONG M. TRAN  
 JOSHUA TAYLOR TRANTHAM  
 KIP ALAN TRAUSSCH  
 KONRAD L. TRAUTMAN  
 MARY R. TRAUTWEIN  
 ROBERTO ANTONIO TREJO  
 MICHAEL A. TRET  
 TIMOTHY W. TRIMAILLO  
 BENJAMIN N. TRUAX  
 MARCUS D. TRUMAN  
 TIMOTHY A. TRYON  
 JUSTIN M. TUBIOLO  
 BARRY M. TUCKER  
 JAMES T. TUCKER  
 JEFFREY TUCKER  
 PAUL ANTHONY TUCKER  
 TRAVIS J. TUCKER  
 AMANDA D. TURCOTTE  
 ALEXANDER J. TURNER  
 DUILIA M. TURNER  
 RYAN A. TURONEK  
 STEVEN E. TUTAJ  
 JOSHUA A. TWEEDY  
 MICHAEL J. TWINING  
 BRANDON M. UEKI  
 PATRICK J. UHES  
 JONATHAN D. UHLER  
 JANEL P. UITTERWYK  
 JASON S. ULIBARRI  
 GREGORY D. ULRICH  
 ROBERT MARTIN UMHOLTZ  
 SARA R. UNDEUTSCH  
 ZACHARY D. UNGER  
 KEVIN MICHAEL UNKS  
 SIDNEY J. USRY  
 MARK W. VAHLE  
 JOSHUA T. VAHOVIUS  
 ELIZABETH H. VALASEK  
 WILLEM R. VAN LOON  
 JON VAN NOSTRAND  
 ADAM C. VANCE  
 TRAVIS J. VANCE  
 JOHN F. VANDENBEMDEN  
 JEFFREY P. VANDERHYDE  
 ALEXANDER D. VANLEAR  
 MATTHEW VANTHOMPSON  
 CHRISTOPHER M. VANZOEST  
 ALLEN J. VARGHESE  
 MARSHALRIA M. VAUGHANS  
 EDSON L. VEGLIO  
 ALFRED ALVAREZ VELASQUEZ, JR.  
 ALBERTO VELEZ  
 CHRISTOPHER R. VELLA  
 LUDELL VIBAL  
 BRANDON DAMIEN VIGNERON  
 PATRICK A. VILLA  
 JOSHUA M. VILLALOBOS  
 ROMMEL O. VILLANUEVA  
 DAVID W. VINCENT  
 JEFFREY L. VIROST  
 ERIC J. VISGER  
 BENJAMIN L. VISSER  
 DAVID F. VITALE  
 QUOC V. VO  
 ROBERT S. VOGT  
 WILLIAM D. VU  
 SAMMY VUCKOVICH  
 NOLAN L. VUJEVIC  
 DUSTIN E. WADE  
 ARIC FORREST WAGNER  
 ERIC KENDRICK WAGNER  
 DAMON A. WAGONER  
 KYLE T. WAITE  
 CLINT W. WAITKUS  
 JAY C. WAKILD  
 BRIAN MATTHEW WALBURN  
 CHRISTOPHER J. WALKER  
 JOHN M. WALKER  
 JULIO CHRISTIAN WALKER  
 OWEN K. WALKER  
 WILLIAM H. WALKER V  
 MARK M. WALKUSKY  
 JARED WALL  
 REGINA K. WALL  
 NATHANIEL P. WALLACE  
 SHAUN R. WALLACE  
 JAMES C. WALLISER  
 GREGORY J. WALSH  
 GREGORY R. WALSH  
 JOSEPH M. WALTERS  
 TRAVIS H. WALTERS

LURIE L. WALTON, JR.  
 CLAYTON WARD  
 MICHAEL L. WARREN  
 STEVEN M. WARRINGTON  
 ADAM E. WASINGER  
 DAVID M. WASSMUTH  
 JEFFREY THOMAS WATERMAN  
 ROBERT T. WATKINS  
 DANIEL L. WAY  
 CHRISTOPHER H. WEAVER  
 JAY L. WEAVER  
 MATTHEW W. WEAVER  
 OESA A. WEAVER  
 KANESHA A. WEBBER  
 JAMES RICHARD WEBER  
 KELLY R. WEBER  
 ANDREW P. WEBSTER  
 DANIEL R. WEBSTER  
 PRESTON E. WEBSTER  
 CURTIS EUGENE WEDDLE IV  
 BENJAMIN ANTHONY WEDEKEMPER  
 MARK A. WEEMS  
 MATTHEW D. WEINMAN  
 JENNIFER E. WELLER  
 JONATHAN R. WELLMAN  
 MICHAEL W. WELLS  
 LARRY J. WENDT, JR.  
 BENJAMIN J. WERNER  
 WILLIAM H. WESTENDORF  
 GABRIEL C. WETLESEN  
 LISA R. WHALING  
 PAUL R. WHITE  
 JAKE D. WHITLOCK  
 ROBERT J. WIBLE  
 BLAIR T. WIGHT  
 VANESSA C. WILCOX  
 STEPHEN M. WILEY  
 MICHAEL WILKES  
 JORDAN P. WILKIE  
 ANDREW C. WILKINS  
 ANDREW B. WILLIAMS  
 BRIAN E. WILLIAMS  
 DEREK J. WILLIAMS  
 JARED M. WILLIAMS  
 JASON WILLIAMS  
 JASON PATTON WILLIAMS  
 JESSICA R. WILLIAMS  
 JONATHAN S. WILLIAMS  
 JOVON A. WILLIAMS  
 VERONICA REYES WILLIAMS  
 BRIAN L. WILLIS  
 RYAN S. WILLIS  
 ROBERT A. WILLOUGHBY  
 CARY W. WILSON  
 JAMES A. WILSON IV  
 JOHN W. WILSON  
 ROBERT L. WILSON III  
 CAROLYN L. WINN  
 JOHN SCOTT WISECUP  
 RICHARD N. WISEMAN  
 BRANDEN M. WITT  
 BRIAN J. WITTHOEFT  
 MATTHEW K. WOERTH II  
 CASSANDRA L. WOJTASZEK  
 GARTH W. WOLBER  
 TRIGG R. WOLD  
 ERIC M. WOLF  
 SCOTT ALAN WOLVERTON  
 CHRISTOPHER C. WONG  
 WESLEY E. WOOD  
 BIANCA C. WOODARD  
 JASON M. WOODLEY  
 MATTHEW G. WOODRUFF  
 SHAMIKA N. WOODRUFF  
 JOHN H. WOODS V  
 DARREN C. WOODSIDE  
 CHRISTOPHER L. WOOLARD  
 BRIAN M. WOOLLEY  
 ANDREW J. WORKMAN  
 ANTHONY J. WRIGHT  
 JASON RICHARD WRIGHT  
 JOHN C. WRIGHT  
 KEITH W. WRIGHT, JR.  
 NICHOLAS F. WRIGHT  
 STEVEN P. WRIGHT  
 JACOB D. WYGANT  
 JOSHUA M. WYGANT  
 JASON E. WYMAN  
 DANIEL C. WYNN  
 PATRICK A. YANEZ  
 JARED E. YANKECH  
 DANIEL A. YAWN  
 JEVON P. YERETZIAN  
 JOHN CHANG WON YI  
 YUE YIN  
 DAVID J. YOUD  
 MATTHEW E. YOUMANS  
 AARON R. YOUNG  
 ADAM B. YOUNG  
 PAIGE H. YOUNG  
 RYAN E. YOUNG  
 TYLER G. YOUNG  
 TYLER J. YOUNG  
 KEVIN M. YOUNGMEYER  
 EMILY A. YTURRALDE  
 HARRY JOHN P. ZABALA  
 NATHAN J. ZAHN  
 NICOLE C. ZAYAS  
 CARRIE A. ZEDERKOF  
 MATTHEW J. ZEIGLER  
 DAVID C. ZESINGER  
 STEPHEN P. ZIEGENFUSS

BRADLEY R. ZIMMERMAN  
MATTHEW P. ZIMMERMAN  
MICHAEL S. ZINKGRAF  
ADRIAN ALEXANDER ZINNERMAN  
JOHN ZIRKLE  
ELITHE E. ZOGLMAN  
ADRIAN ARTHUR ZOLLINGER  
JAROSLAW ZRODLOWSKI  
TERRI L. ZUBER  
MATHEW ZULAUF  
CHRISTOPHER G. ZUMMO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR  
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

NICOLE H. ARMITAGE  
DAWN B. BROOKS  
MARY T. CARLISLE  
KRISTIN L. CARLSON  
ZINA M. CRUMP  
BEATRICE T. DOLIHTE  
SUSAN F. DUKES  
KATHLEEN T. FOULK  
PATRICIA I. JOHN  
CHRISTINE A. KRESS  
DEEANN M. LEES  
LESTER P. LORETO  
BRADLEY D. NIELSEN  
JULIE R. OSTRAND  
REGINA R. PADEN  
JERRY D. RUMBACH  
RICKY JAY SEXTON  
MICHELE Y. SHELTON  
MARCIA R. SMITH  
PENNY E. SPAID  
KATHERINE S. SPENCE  
SHANNON G. WOMBLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR  
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

JAMES D. BRANTINGHAM  
JOSEPH DEICHERT  
KENNETH A. REYES  
G. LLOYD WOODBURY, JR.  
GEORGE T. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT  
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR  
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

RANDALL E. ACKERMAN  
JEFFREY D. ALEXANDER  
ANDREW L. ALLEN  
JACK E. ALLEN  
JAYSON L. ALLEN  
HEATHER J. ANDERSON  
TODD W. ANDRE  
WILLIAM S. ANGERMAN  
STANLEY B. ARANT  
DAVID M. ASHLEY  
ISREAL L. ASKEW, JR.  
ANTHONY D. BABCOCK  
JASON E. BAILEY  
DANIELLE L. BARNES  
CATHERINE V. BARRINGTON  
JASON E. BARTOLOMEI  
JOHN T. BEATTIE  
VICTOR W. BEELER  
JASON H. BEERS  
TREVOR B. BENITONE  
DAVID W. BERG  
TODD D. BERGMAN  
WILLIAM D. BETTS  
ROBERT L. BILLINGS  
PAUL R. BIRCH  
BENJAMIN W. BISHOP  
JOHN C. BLACKWELL  
RYAN D. BLAKE  
DANIEL D. BLEVINS  
THOMAS A. BONGIOVI  
MATTHEW A. BOSCHERT  
JOHN W. BOSONE  
ERIK T. BOVASSO  
JACQUELINE D. BREEDEN  
AUGUSTIN P. BRIGUET  
BERNARD C. BRINING  
SCOTT W. BROKAW  
THOMAS H. BROWN, JR.  
COREY A. BRUNSON  
DAVID W. BRYNTESON  
GREG D. BUCKNER  
TRAVIS A. BURDINE  
DERREN P. BURRELL  
WILLIAM C. BUSCHUR  
CHRISTOPHER J. CALLIS  
JOSEPH L. CAMPO  
THOMAS L. CANTRELL  
RITA C. CAREY  
PATRICK J. CARLEY  
RICHARD A. CARRELL  
DAVID S. CHACE  
JAMES W. CHAPPELEAR III  
JOHN W. CHASTAIN III  
TIMOTHY W. CHILDRESS  
BRYAN J. CHOI  
JOHN C. CHONG  
SARAH J. CHRIST

JORDON T. COCHRAN  
CHRISTOPHER L. COLCORD  
TIMOTHY C. COLE  
BRADFORD D. COLEY  
RICHARD I. COLLINS  
MICHAEL E. CONLEY  
JASON W. COSTELLO  
PEDRO A. COTTOPOREZ  
YANCEY S. COWEN  
ADRIAN M. CROWLEY  
PATRICIA A. CSANK  
CARY N. CULBERTSON  
TIMOTHY M. CULLEN  
MELISSA S. CUNNINGHAM  
PATRICK C. DALEY  
DANNY E. DAVIS  
JAMES E. DAVIS  
OSCAR DELGADO  
MARK E. DELORY  
DAVID W. DENGLE  
BRIAN R. DENMAN  
JOHN J. DERESKY  
RICHARD R. DICKENS  
MATTHEW E. DILLOW  
JOSEPH M. DINGMAN  
ANDREW S. DIPOLITO  
JEFFREY W. DONNITHORNE  
TOBY G. DORAN  
GARY J. DORMAN  
SHANE A. DOUGHERTY  
AARON D. DRAKE  
DAVID R. DUNKLEE  
JON A. EBERLAN  
DOUGLAS C. EDWARDS  
CHRISTOPHER L. ELLIS  
JOSEPH A. ENGELBRECHT III  
JEFFREY P. ENGELKER  
ROBERT H. EPSTEIN  
MICHAEL W. ERHARDT  
MICHAEL S. ERICKSON  
CHAD J. ERSAMER  
JUPE A. ETHERIDGE  
ROCKY A. FAVORITO  
ANITA A. FEUGATE OPPERMAN  
PAUL G. FILCEK  
KARL C. FISCHBACH  
ERICKA R. FLANIGAN  
RICHARD L. FLETCHER  
ARTHUR P. FORD IV  
DAVID M. FRANKLIN  
MARK S. FUHRMANN  
DANE F. FULLER  
JACK D. FULMER II  
DANIEL C. FURLEIGH  
FRANCISCO M. GALLEI  
ANTHONY S. GAMBOA  
ALEJANDRO R. GANSTER  
SOLOMON M. GARRETT IV  
CHRISTOFF T. GAUB  
LEE G. GENTILE, JR.  
JEFFREY T. GERAGHTY  
ANGELA P. GIDDINGS  
BRIDGET V. GIGLIOTTI  
JASON N. GINGRICH  
NICOLA P. GISMONDI  
DAWN M. GITHENS  
KENNETH D. GJONE  
GREGORY J. GOAR  
EDWARD G. GOEBEL, JR.  
ROBERT J. GOMEZ  
JOHN F. GONZALES  
AENEAS R. GOODING  
TIMOTHY A. GOODROE  
ERIC C. GRACE  
ROBERT S. GRAINGER  
BRYAN C. GREEN  
MICHAEL S. GREMILLION  
STEPHEN C. GROTHJOHN  
SCOTT A. GROVER  
JOHN M. GROVES  
MATTHEW S. GUENTHER  
AARON GULL  
DANIEL A. GUINAN  
GARRY A. HAASE  
TYLER N. HAGUE  
DEDE S. HALPHILL  
JAMES C. HALL  
MICHELLE L. HALL  
LOUIS W. HANSEN  
DAVID G. HANSON  
CRAIG M. HARMON  
MICHAEL J. HARNER  
SHAUN D. HARRADEN  
GLENN T. HARRIS  
LARRY R. HARRIS  
BRIAN S. HARTLESS  
SHANE C. HAUGHIAN  
GARY T. HAYWARD  
TREVOR D. HAZEN  
KEVIN D. HECKLE  
TIMOTHY J. HEINTZELMAN  
ROBERT L. HENDERSON  
SHANE M. HENDERSON  
TAMARA J. HENDERSON  
TROY C. HENDERSON  
BRIAN A. HENSON  
DALE E. HETKE  
SCOTT G. HEYLER  
TRAVIS J. HILL  
DAVID L. HILLMAN  
BRIAN A. HINSVARK  
LANCE A. HOBSON

GEORGE A. HOLLAND III  
SLOAN L. HOLLIS  
RYAN D. HOLLMAN  
ERIC W. HOOK  
TODD M. HOOVER  
ROBERT A. HOSKINS  
JAMES C. HOWARD  
FREDERICK A. HUNT, JR.  
SCOTT W. HURRELBRINK  
DALE E. HYBL  
MICHAEL D. INGERSOLL  
ZIGMUND W. JACKIM  
BRIAN A. JACKSON  
ROBERT D. JACKSON  
MATTHEW P. JEFFSON  
GARY S. JOHNSON  
MATTHEW C. JOHNSON  
STEPHAN K. JOHNSON  
KENNETH M. JONES  
MICHAEL C. JONES  
SEAN S. JONES  
KEVIN G. JUDD  
CRAIG E. JUNEAU  
HAROLD M. KAHLER  
EDWARD A. KAPLAN  
MITCHELL A. KATOSIC  
DEE J. KATZER  
RYAN P. KEENEY  
BRIAN T. KEHL  
JOSEPH P. KENDALL  
PAUL D. KIRMIS  
JOHN T. KNACK  
ERIC W. KNAPP  
DANIEL J. KNIGHT  
JASON L. KNIGHT  
MONTI L. KNODE  
RICHARD T. KOCH  
TROY D. KOEPNICK  
JEREMY D. KOKENES  
PAUL KOPECKI  
NICHOLAS T. KOZDRAS  
TIMOTHY A. KRAUSS  
JEFFREY T. KRONWITTER  
JASON B. LAMB  
RICHARD L. LAND III  
SHAWN D. LARCHER  
STAN D. LAWRIE  
JOHN W. LECLAIR, JR.  
CHRISTOPHER D. LEMANSKI  
DANIEL W. LEMON  
BRIAN D. LEWIS  
GARRY M. LITTLE  
JAMES E. LONG  
CRAIG R. LUCEY  
DAVID C. LYONS  
CHRISTOPHER A. MACAULAY  
BRETT J. MACHOVINA  
DEBORAH L. MACKAY  
CURTIS J. MADELEY  
NICOLE M. E. MALACHOWSKI  
MICHAEL E. MALLEY  
MICHAEL T. MANOR  
DANIEL J. MARKHAM  
WILLIAM L. MARSHALL  
JEFFREY S. MARTIN  
JOHN R. MARTIN  
FERNANDO MARTINEZ  
WILLIAM G. MAXWELL  
PAUL J. MAYKISH  
BRADLEY M. MCALPINE  
SHAWN B. MCCAMISH  
CRAIG A. MCCARTY  
MATTHEW S. MCCONNELL  
CHARLES A. MCELVAINE  
SEAN A. MCKAY  
RICHARD A. MCKEE  
SEAN C. MCLAY  
JEFFREY S. MCLEMORE  
ROBERT J. MCMURRY  
JOHN S. MEITER  
JEFFREY T. MENASCO  
KURT A. MENCKE  
DAMON L. MENENDEZ  
JEFFREY A. MERCHANT  
CARLOS R. MESSER, JR.  
AARON J. MEYERS  
MICHAEL T. MILES  
GREGORY J. MILLER  
MICHAEL S. MILLER  
PATRICK G. MILLER  
THOMAS G. MINER, JR.  
ALEXANDER MIRAVITE, JR.  
LAWRENCE W. MITCHELL  
MARK L. MITCHEM  
JAMES C. MOCK  
ROBERT G. MOOSE  
GREGORY M. MOSELEY  
TIMOTHY J. MOSER  
JAMES V. MOTT  
MICHAEL W. MOYLES  
ANDREW J. MUSER  
HENRY MYERS, JR.  
JOSEPH E. NANCE  
JEFFREY W. NELSON  
JESSICA D. NICHOL  
RODNEY H. NICHOLS  
DAWN A. NICKELL  
KRISTOPHER T. NORWOOD  
GREGORY E. NOWAK  
CHRISTOPHER P. NUTTING  
THOMAS J. O'CONNELL, JR.  
DONALD R. OHLEMACHER

DAVID W. OLANDER  
DEREK J. OMALLEY  
TRACY L. ONUFER  
MARK D. OREILLY  
CHRISTOPHER J. OUELLETTE  
JOHN P. PANTLEO  
ROBERT L. PATA  
JASON PATLA  
WILLIAM T. PATRICK  
JEFFERY S. PATTON  
MAX E. PEARSON  
PAUL E. PENDLETON  
JOHN C. PETERSON  
IAN D. PHILLIPS  
WILLIAM M. C. PHILLIPS  
SHANE T. PRATER  
KERRY J. PROULX  
JEFFREY A. PRUSS  
MICHELS D. PRYOR  
RILEY F. PYLES  
HUGH M. RAGLAND III  
BRIAN E. RALSTON  
ROBERT G. RAMIREZ  
COREY M. RAMSBY  
DANIEL E. RAUCH  
CLIFTON D. REED  
BOB A. REEVES  
JAY B. REEVES  
LAURA A. REGAN  
MARK D. REIMANN  
ROBERT S. RENFRO II  
ANTHONY G. RETKA  
DOUGLAS P. RICE  
LAURIE K. RICHTER  
MICHAEL G. RIDER  
SUSAN M. RIORDANSMITH  
FRANCISCO RIVERA  
TODD A. ROBBINS  
CHARLES P. ROBERTS  
ANGENENE L. ROBERTSON  
SEAN W. ROBERTSON  
QUENTON L. RODGERS  
STEVEN M. ROSS  
SCOTT A. ROTH  
SCOTT A. ROTHERMEL  
PAUL C. ROUNSAVALL  
SEAN C. ROUTIER  
ROBERT D. ROY  
JASON M. RUESCHHOFF  
TIMOTHY R. RYAN  
DEREK M. SALMI  
MARC J. SANDS  
ANTHONY J. SANSANO  
LANCE E. SCHMIDT  
KARL R. SCHRADER  
CHAD W. SCHRECKENGOST  
TODD S. SCHUG  
THOMAS W. SEKER  
HARRY L. SEIBERT, JR.  
BRETT S. SEILING  
JOHN D. SEUELL  
GLEN R. SHILLAND  
THOMAS C. SHRUM  
MICHAEL J. SIERCO  
SANJIT SINGH  
TIMOTHY A. SITES  
PATRICK M. SKENDZIEL  
JOHN P. SMALL  
BRADLEY K. SMITH  
DOUGLAS D. SMITH  
GARY T. SMITH  
JAMES E. SMITH  
MICHAEL S. SMITH  
PAUL P. SMITH, JR.  
STEPHEN P. SNELSON  
MARK K. SNOW  
MARK SOTALLARO  
ERIC J. SOTO  
BRADLEY L. SPEARS  
YVONNE S. SPENCER  
KIRK N. STAHLBAUM  
DAVID L. STANFIELD  
DEVIN STATHAM  
RICHARD V. STEELE  
DAVID E. STONE  
TODD R. STRATTON  
ANTHONY C. STROUP  
JOSE E. SUMANGIL  
DUSTIN G. SUTTON  
ROBERT A. SYLVESTER  
DREW R. TAYLOR  
MARY R. TEETER  
MERRYL TENGESDAL  
ALLEN L. THIBEAUX  
JEREMY L. THIEL  
ROBERT S. THOMPSON  
SHAWN C. THOMPSON  
ROBERT T. TIBBETTS  
DAYMEN L. TIFFANY  
VASAGA TILO, JR.  
KIMBERLY A. TOOMAN  
WILLIAM D. TRAUTMANN  
JACOB TRIGLER  
JOHN E. TRYON  
KELLY C. TUCKER  
TEERA TONY TUNYAVONGS  
WALLACE R. TURNBULL III  
UDUAK I. UDOAKA  
KENNETH R. UHLER  
DAVID M. VACLAVIK

DENNIS R. VEENEMAN  
JOSEPH L. VEIT  
MATTHEW C. VILLELLA  
JOHN C. VINCENT  
KEVIN P. WADE  
KEVIN P. WALKER  
KARILYNNE WALLACE  
DEMETRIUS WALTERS  
JENIFER B. E. WARREN  
TRACY R. WATKINS  
MICHAEL T. WEAVER  
SAMANTHA WEEKS  
HEWETT S. WELLS  
JOSEPH H. WENCKUS  
KURT A. WENDT  
TREVOR A. WENTLANDT  
SCOTT A. WESTON  
PATRICK J. WHITE  
LANCE D. WHITFILL  
DOUGLAS P. WICKERT  
LANCE A. WILKINS  
DONALD S. WILSON  
JAMES S. WILSON  
REGINA S. WINCHESTER  
JOHN W. WINKLER  
THOMAS Q. WOFFORD  
GREGORY R. WOOD  
JONATHAN L. WRIGHT  
MICHAEL A. WULFESTIEG  
DONN C. YATES  
SANG H. YOO  
JOHN P. ZAPATA  
ZACHARY B. ZEINER  
DEAN E. ZEZEUS  
JAMES J. ZIRKEL  
STEVEN M. ZUBOWICZ  
MICHAEL J. ZUHLSDORF  
CLINTON R. ZUMBRUNNEN

#### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be major*

THOMAS M. CHEREPKO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be colonel*

RODNEY E. GARFIELD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be lieutenant colonel*

MARK A. ENDSLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

#### *To be colonel*

JACOB A. JOHNSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

#### *To be major*

PATRICK MASCARENHAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

#### *To be major*

DEBRA MAYERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ENLISTED MEMBER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

#### *To be major*

DWAIPAYAN CHAKRABORTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

#### *To be major*

ERIC B. HINTZ  
DANIEL R. KLINGER  
RORY J. PETTEYS  
BART D. WILKISON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

#### *To be colonel*

KATHRYN A. SPLETSTOSER

#### FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DE-

PARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER-MINISTER:

JUDY R. REINKE, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED:

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION INTO AND WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

BRIAN C. BRISSON, OF FLORIDA

MICHAEL L. MCGEE, OF FLORIDA

ANDREW P. WYLEGALA, OF WASHINGTON

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

SANDILLO N. BANERJEE, OF VIRGINIA

MITCHELL GREGORY LARSEN, OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID MCNEILL, OF VIRGINIA

CHRISTOPHER R. QUINLIVAN, OF WASHINGTON

CAMERON S. WERKER, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BARBARA FARRAR, OF VIRGINIA

EVERETT G. WAKAI, OF CALIFORNIA

JANELLE WEYER, OF WISCONSIN

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

TIMOTHY C. CANNON, OF COLORADO

BRIDGETTE CLARK, OF ALABAMA

JOSHUA HALPERN, OF NEW YORK

DOUGLAS JACOBSON, OF MINNESOTA

YOUQING MA, OF OREGON

DEAN R. MATLACK, OF MINNESOTA

JOEL REYNOSO, OF NEW YORK

REBECCA TORRES, OF FLORIDA

TERRI TYMINSKI, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KAREN ALLEN, OF ARIZONA

KAREN BALLARD, OF IDAHO

BRITTANY BANTA, OF NEW YORK

SAMUEL L. BATEMAN, OF COLORADO

MICHAEL A. CALVERT, OF WASHINGTON

JULIE ANN CARDUCCI, OF ILLINOIS

WELLINGTON CHU, OF PENNSYLVANIA

CAROLINE CHUNG, OF VIRGINIA

JAMES PRESTON CURTIS, OF MINNESOTA

LANCE B. ENCE, OF VIRGINIA

SHAKIR Y. FARSAKH, OF NEW YORK

PAUL FROST, OF TEXAS

JEFFREY ALLEN GEIGER, OF VIRGINIA

TYLER GRANT HACKING, OF WISCONSIN

MINDI B. HERTZOG, OF FLORIDA

DAVID B. KINCAID, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ERICK V. KISH, OF WASHINGTON

DANIEL SUNG-DOK LEW, OF CALIFORNIA

ARLENE MASUE MAYEDA, OF VIRGINIA

MELISSA MCINNIS, OF COLORADO

THOMAS J. MEADE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ALLISON HILLARY MELLO, OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL A. MIDDLETON, OF VERMONT

RANDOLPH T. MOORE, OF VIRGINIA

TAMARIND E. MURRIETTA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MICHAEL K. MUTH, OF FLORIDA

GEOFFREY PARISH, OF TEXAS

CHARLES M. PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NEIL PAUL PICKETT, OF ILLINOIS

MATTHEW POOLE, OF ILLINOIS

GARY F. RAND II, OF MARYLAND

RHONDA M. SINKFIELD, OF GEORGIA

MICHELE RENEE SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

KENNIA J. SOMERVILLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JONATHAN T. WARD, OF WASHINGTON

CATHERINE M. WERNER, OF PENNSYLVANIA

## WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on March 4, 2015 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

GILBERTO DE JESUS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE WINSLOW LORENZO SERGEANT, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 8, 2015.



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 4, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 4, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### DHS FUNDING AND IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Speaker and the Republican majority for coming to their senses and allowing the House of Representatives to pass a bill funding the Department of Homeland Security for the rest of the fiscal year.

It seems odd that I would have to come to this well to congratulate the majority for funding one of the largest and most important departments in the U.S. Government. I cannot congratulate the majority alone because the bill funding the Department of Homeland Security was passed largely on the strength—yes—of Democratic votes.

The vote was strong, 257–167, but 182 of those votes came from Democrats. In fact, every Democrat who voted voted to keep the Department of Homeland Security open and protecting America until the end of the fiscal year, 100 percent. Only 75 Republicans supported paying our border security and airport security professionals.

Mr. Speaker, it should never have come to this. On the one hand, it

should never have come to this because Members of Congress should never play around with the paychecks of our fellow government employees and threaten them with furloughs in order to score cheap partisan political points.

The real people with real lives who work at O'Hare and Midway and at ports, airports, and border crossings, the real people with mortgages, car notes, and tuition bills who provide the security our democracy depends on do not deserve the way they are treated by this Congress. Lurching from funding crisis to shutdown showdown to last-minute votes is no way to run the greatest democracy the world has ever known.

We know there is a sensible, bipartisan majority that is willing to compromise and do what has to be done to keep the basic functions of government operating. That group voted yesterday, and the leadership should find a way to let that sensible majority govern, despite those who take every opportunity to make governing next to impossible in this body.

Secondly, it should never have come to this because the premise on which this funding and shutdown crisis rested was never logical or necessary.

Those who opposed the President exercising powers granted to him by the Congress have filed a lawsuit in Federal court. They picked a sympathetic judge and have won a temporary injunction on the implementation of the executive actions the President announced last November.

If they really believe in the strength of their case, this threat of a partial government shutdown was unnecessary. Clearly, they agree with me that their case is weak and that the courts will eventually overturn the temporary injunction.

But the logic was always sideways. The very Presidential actions that some in the Republican Party object to are not even funded by the appropriations made by Congress. The criminal background checks and the adjudication of each person's application is paid for in full by fees of \$465 for each immigrant, so this was never a logical funding matter.

With or without funding for the Department of Homeland Security, the premise that Congress could force the President to deport low-priority deportees who grew up in the United States or who are the parents of U.S. citizens never held water.

Even if people cannot come forward to apply and pass a criminal back-

ground check and get to the back of the deportation line, the basic way the President and the Secretary of Homeland Security prioritized deporting criminals, drug dealers, and drunk drivers over moms, dads, and DREAMers, that would not change.

Think about it. It is as if the Republicans were saying they are so upset about their obsession with border security and their conviction that the President is not doing enough about border security that they were willing to defund border security in order to make their point. Jon Stewart can't write stuff that good, and he doesn't have to.

Here is the biggest reason why it didn't have to come to a shutdown showdown. Republicans in the House could have taken action last year to fix our broken immigration system so that we don't have to continue this fiction about deporting 11 million undocumented workers.

They could have had a vote to reform our immigration system so that people can apply for visas and come legally in the first place rather than being forced into the black market where there are smugglers. They could have allowed a vote that put E-Verify in place, put serious sanctions and jail time for employers in place, and targeted our enforcement resources on felons, not families.

I stood here nearly every week last year and said: If the Republicans failed to act, the President would be forced to act within the limits of current law to rescue American families and target our enforcement resources on criminals. I was right, and for the record, I told you so, using a countdown right here on the House floor.

The coalition to pass reform, which is made up of almost all of the Democrats and about a third or more of the Republicans—the same coalition that enacted the bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security in yesterday's vote—existed then, and it exists today, if our leaders are willing to work together to address immigration reform.

It is not too late, and I predict that the Republican Party will continue boxing itself into a corner until it addresses this important American priority.

### HOUSE HUNGER CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, later this morning, I will be joined by my Republican colleague Congresswoman LYNN JENKINS of Kansas at D.C. Central Kitchen to officially relaunch the House Hunger Caucus.

I couldn't be happier that we are continuing this important bipartisan caucus in the 114th Congress. I am thrilled to have her partnership in this caucus, and I look forward to working with her.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago, my good friend and former Republican colleague from Missouri Jo Ann Emerson and I founded the House Hunger Caucus as a forum for Members to discuss, advance, engage, and work on issues related to domestic and international hunger and food insecurity.

Over the years, the House Hunger Caucus has hosted a number of briefings on topics ranging from introductions to the major domestic and international hunger programs, to food deserts in rural and urban America, to global agriculture and farmer-to-farmer initiatives, to international school feeding and child nutrition programs, just to name a few.

The caucus doesn't just look at existing programs. It also gets involved in emergency responses as they are unfolding. In 2011, during one of the worst droughts in recent memory, the House Hunger Caucus held timely briefings on the U.S. response to the famine in the Horn of Africa. Members and staff were able to hear directly from those on the ground providing assistance to deal with this unprecedented crisis.

One of the most important objectives of the House Hunger Caucus is to foster better communication among antihunger advocates by bringing together stakeholders from Federal agencies, State and local governments, nonprofits, faith-based organizations, academia, and business to discuss long-term strategies for ending hunger. The caucus also serves as a vehicle for antihunger organizations to communicate directly to Congress about hunger and food insecurity issues.

One of my top priorities for the House Hunger Caucus this year is to make sure we hear directly from those who have experienced hunger and poverty firsthand. We need to make sure that their voices are heard in the discussions here in Washington.

One of the greatest assets of the House Hunger Caucus is that it is bipartisan—Republicans and Democrats. It is a way for Members to come together to work to end hunger.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a congressional district in the United States of America that is hunger-free, not a single one. According to the USDA, more than 17.5 million American households were food insecure in 2013, meaning that their access to adequate food was limited by a lack of money or other resources; 5.6 percent of households were

considered to have very low food security. In other words, those households were hungry.

Hunger disproportionately affects the most vulnerable among us: children, seniors, and the disabled. Last year, 16 million children, or one in five, experienced hunger, and increasingly, veterans and military families are experiencing hunger.

On the international side, about 805 million people in the world, or one in nine, suffer from hunger, according to the most recent U.N. reports. This is a decrease of 100 million over the past decade and 209 million since the early 1990s.

The U.S. can be proud of its leadership in reducing global hunger and addressing the root causes of food insecurity. Through partnerships with other nations, international organizations, our own farmers, NGOs, and private sector communities, we are advancing agricultural development; increasing child nutrition; reducing malnutrition among infants and children; empowering small farmers around the globe, especially women; and providing nutritious meals in school settings. While the journey is long, we now have a proven and coordinated set of programs that effectively address global hunger.

Mr. Speaker, as we reestablish the House Hunger Caucus, I can't think of a better location to launch it at than D.C. Central Kitchen, a unique antihunger organization that prepares 5,000 meals a day for more than 80 local nonprofit partners, helping those going through tough times.

One of D.C. Central Kitchen's greatest strengths is its culinary jobs training program, where men and women who have faced the most difficult of situations—homelessness, addiction, or incarceration—participate in a rigorous job training program to prepare for culinary careers.

As part of our kickoff this week, the House Hunger Caucus will host a briefing for House staff entitled "Domestic Hunger 101" tomorrow at 1 p.m. The briefing will be given by CRS experts and is intended to present a broad overview of the major domestic Federal antihunger programs.

I look forward to continuing this important work of the House Hunger Caucus with the gentlewoman from Kansas, Congresswoman JENKINS. I encourage my House colleagues to join the House Hunger Caucus.

As Members, we don't have to agree on everything to agree on something, and ending hunger should be something we all can agree on.

#### DODD-FRANK AND OTHER FINANCIAL SERVICES BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to discuss the negative consequences of

the Dodd-Frank law, as well as reforms to the law that would represent much-needed solutions for middle class families in Kentucky and across the country.

When this act was signed into law nearly 5 years ago, its supporters made many promises. President Obama claimed it would "lift the economy" and that it would help protect Main Street, not Wall Street. In both of these instances, the opposite has proven true.

While the President is claiming victory on the economy, many Kentucky families and families across America are still hurting. Last year, the U.S. economy grew at an anemic 2.4 percent, the ninth year in a row of growth below the postwar average of about 3 percent.

President Reagan also inherited a very difficult economic situation; however, if this recovery had progressed at the same rate as the Reagan recovery of the 1980s, the economy would be about \$2 trillion larger, which works out to be about \$1,500 more per family per year.

This is hardly the boom that the President talks about. Growth this low for this long is simply not fast enough to lift incomes for most Americans.

A primary cause of the weakness of this recovery is the avalanche of red tape coming out of the Obama administration, including the nearly 400 new rules and regulations arising from Dodd-Frank that are crushing small communities around the country.

Dodd-Frank imposes costly and burdensome restrictions on community banks and credit unions that limit their ability to loan money to their customers, which is hindering economic growth and hurting low- and middle-income Americans the hardest.

A community banker in my district told me that before Dodd-Frank, lending decisions were often made based on a business judgment about the character and the creditworthiness of their customers.

People in small towns across America, they know each other, and local banks and credit unions are in the business of helping their neighbors. These institutions assume the consequences of their decisions at no risk to the financial system or to taxpayers who have been on the hook for bailouts.

□ 1015

So they are willing to take a risk, both in terms of how to best help their customers achieve his or her dreams and how to provide a reasonable return for the shareholders of the bank or members of the credit union.

But that same banker told me that, after Dodd-Frank, the government is making the decisions instead of the shareholders or the bank board, imposing a one-size-fits-all, top-down mandate on local financial institutions.

Rather than working with people, this community banker now deals with mountains of paperwork and Federal regulators. The result has been a disaster.

The number of community banks has declined by 9.5 percent. There have been far fewer new community bank charters, and less services and products are now offered to customers and consumers.

The law created new, unaccountable bureaucracies on top of an overly complex financial regulatory system. New, unaccountable bureaucracies like the well-sounding but mislabeled Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Financial Stability Oversight Council operate largely out of public view and are subject to almost none of the checks and balances imposed on other government agencies.

For example, the Bureau deemed Bath County, Kentucky, with a population of about 10,000 people, as nonrural, making it even more difficult for its people to secure loans from community banks and credit unions.

Think about this: the ridiculous scenario of Washington, D.C., bureaucrats labeling one of the most rural parts of America as nonrural and hurting the people as a result.

Shockingly, this unaccountable agency provided no valid justification for how they came to this conclusion, nor any means to challenge this arbitrary determination.

After I introduced legislation, along with members of both parties, to address this issue, the agency, after more than a year of delay, finally relented and expanded its definition of rural to include Bath County.

While this is a positive development for this Kentucky county, the process remains opaque, arbitrary, and not subject to appeal, and our rural communities continue to struggle with one-size-fits-all regulatory approaches for which they lack the resources to comply.

This week, I will reintroduce the Helping Expand Lending Practices in Rural Communities Act, which would give individuals an appeals process by which to contest this designation.

Dodd-Frank includes several other rules which are holding our economy back. Thanks to the Bureau's qualified mortgage rule, it is now harder for creditworthy low- and moderate-income Americans to buy a home.

The Volcker rule has made U.S. capital markets less competitive internationally, creating unnecessary obstacles for U.S. companies to raise the funds they need to grow their businesses and create jobs.

Despite the stated intentions of this law, community banks and credit unions have been left to comply with onerous new regulations intended to prevent a repeat of the financial crisis they did not cause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, let's join together, cut red tape and unnecessary regulations that are holding our communities back. We can create real opportunity and encourage private sector growth by repealing this law and starting over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to heed the gavel.

#### HONORING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF MINNIE MINOSO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great baseball player and a baseball player who befriended me and was a great human being who passed away on Sunday, Saturnino Orestes Arrieta Armas, Minnie Minoso, the Cuban Comet, Mr. White Sox.

Minnie Minoso was born in 1925 on November 29 in Cuba. He played baseball in Cuba, had the opportunity to come to America and play in the Negro Leagues for, being a Black Cuban, he wasn't allowed to play in the Major Leagues.

He played 3 years with the New York Cubans, and then, Bill Veeck, who was one of the leaders, I guess, the American League's Branch Rickey, gave him an opportunity to play baseball in the Major Leagues. After playing in the Minors in San Diego, he came up with the Cleveland Indians, but was quickly traded to the Chicago White Sox, where he started his career in 1951, and became known as Mr. White Sox.

He was a great White Sox baseball player, one of the greatest players of the 1950s, and a great emissary of Latin American baseballers. He was the first Black Latin American baseball player, he was the first Black White Sox player, and the second African American in the American League after Larry Doby.

Minnie Minoso had a great career. He did everything in baseball. He hit for average, he hit for power, he had speed, he was a great fielder, a great competitor, and he was a great human being.

In 1955, I was recovering from polio and I lived in Memphis, Tennessee. I went to an exhibition baseball game at Russwood Park, where the White Sox were playing the Cardinals. I had a White Sox cap, kind of like this one—this is a Minnie Minoso cap—and a White Sox T-shirt, and I was on crutches, getting autographs.

A player came and gave me a baseball, and I thanked him and I went to my dad and told my dad about it. We went down to thank the player. He was White, a pitcher named Tom Poholsky. He said: Don't thank me. Thank that player over there.

That was number 9 for the White Sox, Minnie Minoso. In the entire base-

ball field of 50 players or more, one cared about a young boy with polio who was a White Sox fan and wanted to do something for him.

But in segregated Memphis, a Black player didn't feel comfortable doing that, and he did it through a White player. It taught me, at a very early age, about the horrors of discrimination and prejudice and racism.

Minnie became my friend. I visited him in Chicago and went into the White Sox locker room. He gave me his bat. When he came to Memphis, I visited him at the Lorraine Motel, which is where the Black players stayed, while the White players were at the Peabody.

The Lorraine is where Dr. King was killed and now is a great civil rights museum in Memphis. This was another lesson in discrimination for me that taught me well and has taught me, to this day, to be vigilant against all forms of racism and discrimination.

I followed Minnie my whole life. He was like part of my family. When we moved to Los Angeles, we went and visited him at Chavez Ravine. He came up to my dad and he said: Doc, how is the kid's leg? How is he doing?

He always was concerned. He was a great human being and a great baseball player.

He was denied one of his life's goals of being voted into the Baseball Hall of Fame. I tried to help him with that.

Baseball made a mistake. They should have put Minnie in the Hall of Fame for being a great emissary of baseball and the first Latin American Black player, the first Latin American player, really, in the Big Leagues.

He died Sunday. Visitation is Friday at Holy Family Church in Chicago. The funeral is Saturday.

I will miss Minnie Minoso. He is a lesson in why sport are bigger than runs, hits, and errors. It is about human beings and humanity and young kids.

Thank you, Minnie.

REST IN PEACE, FATHER TED HESBURGH AND PROFESSOR CHARLES RICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Notre Dame family lost two larger-than-life figures.

One, a Holy Cross priest, Father Ted Hesburgh, served as Notre Dame's president for 35 years and oversaw remarkable growth of the university named for Our Lady. Father Hesburgh was known and recognized around the world.

The other was a layman, Charles Rice, who taught at Notre Dame Law School for 40 years and was a retired Marine, a devoted husband to his wife,

Mary, without whom he could never have accomplished his work, a devoted father, and an academic who dove deep into the philosophical underpinnings of the law. It is estimated that he taught half of the living alumni of the Notre Dame Law School.

While much has been written and said these last few days about Father Hesburgh, given the international stage on which he walked, comparatively less has been said of Professor Rice, except for the recognition that countless law students, colleagues, and pro-life and religious liberty advocates have given in the days since he passed away.

To my left is one of those iconic figures from the 1960s. In it, we see Dr. Martin Luther King and Father Hesburgh, standing together for racial equality in Chicago.

What allowed these two remarkable men to come together, in spite of different backgrounds and traditions, was a common understanding of justice that was grounded in our Western and Judeo-Christian philosophy of law.

It was this same philosophy that was at the heart of what Professor Charles Rice taught at Notre Dame.

In Martin Luther King's "Letter from Birmingham Jail," written 2 years prior to the famous Selma March that will be commemorated this weekend, Dr. King addressed his fellow clergymen, many of whom were criticizing his tactics in confronting unjust Jim Crow laws.

One may well ask, Dr. King wrote: "How can you advocate breaking some laws and obeying others?"

The answer lies in the fact that there are two types of laws, just and unjust.

I would be the first to advocate obeying just laws. One has not only a legal but a moral responsibility to obey just laws. Conversely, one has a moral responsibility to obey unjust laws. I, Dr. King said, would agree with St. Augustine that "an unjust law is no law at all."

Dr. King then asked, Now what is the difference between the two? How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust?

King answered that a just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law or the law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas, Dr. King continued, an unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law.

These words would be very familiar to any of Charlie Rice's jurisprudence students. Indeed, a significant amount of Professor Rice's work dealt with the concept of natural law.

Natural law principles were recognized in our Declaration of Independence, with Jefferson referencing the "Laws of Nature and Nature's God" and the recognition that individuals

are endowed by a Creator with certain inalienable rights, including a right to life.

Charlie Rice was a fierce defender of the right to life. He believed that every human being, whether an elderly grandmother who could no longer care for herself, a young adult who was incapacitated through an accident or a degenerative disease, an unborn child capable of feeling pain, or a 3-week-old unborn child whose heart had just begun to beat, had an inalienable right to life. And for Charlie, those lives, and all human lives, are sacred because they are a gift of God.

In the years since *Roe v. Wade*, Professor Rice never wavered from his core conviction on the right to life. He became increasingly concerned for the religious freedom and conscience rights of individuals when he saw government coercing them into practices that violated those rights.

Professor Rice told his students: "Never be afraid to speak the truth." He certainly never was.

For him, the truth was clear. The right to life and freedom of religion, both of which are specifically mentioned in our Nation's founding documents, are under attack.

But Professor Rice never gave up. He believed that one day those rights would be protected again, and he continued to defend those rights to the day he died.

His work in defending life and religious freedom will continue. It will live on in his wife, Mary, his children, and grandchildren, as well as the countless lives he touched.

May Professor Rice and Father Hesburgh rest in peace.

#### PRIME MINISTER BINYAMIN NETANYAHU'S RECENT ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 23 hours ago, in this Chamber, Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu was given a large megaphone to undercut American diplomatic attempts at restraining Iran's nuclear ambitions. One has to go back to the days of Gen. Douglas MacArthur being fired by President Truman, who was then invited to Congress by the Republican leadership to a rapturous audience.

Yet history has shown that General MacArthur and the Republican leadership were wrong, Truman was right, and is, deemed one of our best Presidents for the hard, difficult decisions he made to much political criticism. And history has not been so kind to the career and personality of General MacArthur and the message he delivered to that Congress.

I suspect that history will not be kind to yesterday's speech and the decision to stage it.

The Prime Minister delivered no alternative vision other than an impossible set of demands that would ensure negotiations by America, our allies, and the Russians fail. He seemed to doom Americans and Iranians to be permanent enemies, even though the Iranian people, distinct from the ayatollahs and their minions, by all accounts, are the only country in the region, other than Israel, that has a positive view towards America. Think about that.

But the flaws in Netanyahu's speech were more fundamental. He had no alternative vision, no outline of a plan that would do anything other than lead to war.

□ 1030

His remarks continued a series of dire predictions that I have heard from him since I first came to Congress in 1995. He had the same certitude when he testified before Congress about what a positive, transformational event it would be for the United States to go to war with Iraq.

It was good politics at the time, probably even for most American politicians, and I am sure it was good politics in Israel. But he demonstrated spectacularly bad political judgment, cheerleading the United States into the worst foreign policy disaster in our history, costing us trillions of dollars with no end in sight, costing hundreds of thousands of lives, and casting the Middle East in turmoil.

Indeed, Iran's ayatollahs were the only winners in the wake of that tragic war urged on by Netanyahu. It allowed Iran to have an outsized influence in the very countries that Netanyahu mentioned. The Middle East is in crisis, on the defensive with ISIS forces that are only slightly larger than the authorized strength of the California National Guard.

Mr. Netanyahu produced a vision that is bound to fail, and at what cost to the American-Israeli leadership? Making Israel a partisan issue harms Israel, according to a good friend of mine who worked for AIPAC for years. More troubling, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister did not offer one word about his failure to produce a peaceful, two-state solution. Now, I would have welcomed even a word about the pending humanitarian crisis in Gaza. I am not talking about war with the militants. I am talking about 1.7 million people in a land where 95 percent of the water is already unfit to drink, and by next year it will be the case with all domestic water. If no action is taken, by 2020, that damage will be irreversible.

But I was encouraged by the AIPAC conference. While I don't necessarily agree with all of their policy prescriptions dealing with Iran, I was heartened to see that they had two well-attended panel discussions featuring

Gidon Bromberg, an Israeli expert, that highlighted why it was in both the interest of Israel and Gaza to solve the pending water and sanitation crisis and that solution is easily within the power of Israel, the United States, and other donor nations.

I saw that as a bright spot in a troubling day. If we concentrate on simple, commonsense steps where we can work together to save lives and improve the future, I think there is a lot more on the horizon that we can accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with Israel. That is why I chose not to undercut our diplomats in the midst of negotiating by attending that joint session. Netanyahu offers one perspective—certainly not mine. But challenging his ideas is not anti-Israeli any more than challenging the ideas of President Obama is anti-American.

I will welcome a feasible alternative to a bad deal, but I have yet to hear one, especially from the Prime Minister. Until then, I will stand with Israel by empowering our negotiators and not undercutting them.

#### SELMA AND THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the 50th anniversary of the Selma voting rights movement and of the Selma to Montgomery marches that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act. Nothing so far has moved me more as a freshman Member of this august body than to sit down and talk with our colleague, JOHN LEWIS, who years ago was the chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

I have had many occasions since the beginning of this Congress to speak with Congressman JOHN LEWIS about the events of 50 years ago. He is the only living “Big Six” leader of the American civil rights movement still with us. It will forever be my honor to have sat next to Mr. LEWIS when President Obama gave his State of the Union Address earlier this year. It was not lost on me that I was sitting and listening to President Obama while sitting next to a man whose actions 50 years ago helped pave the way for Barack Obama, a Black kid from Hawaii, to become President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the freedom marches mark a significant turning point in America’s history. As an ethnic minority myself, I am thankful for those that paved the way for the freedoms and the liberties that all of us as Americans enjoy. They suffered insults and physical harm, yet their spirit remained unbroken.

The right of our citizens to vote is one that runs through the foundation

of our country. To prevent or inhibit the vote of a citizen is an action that I feel contradicts the very principles on which this country was established. Even in our current society, there are efforts being undertaken to limit citizens of our country from casting their vote. This is a despicable practice and highlights to me the importance of the Voting Rights Act and the need to remain vigilant against those who seek to reverse the great strides made by this country towards equal rights for all.

The brave actions taken by the civil rights marchers 50 years ago still resonate with our society today. That is why I am proud to join the 50th anniversary of the freedom march.

Looking through the photos of the original Selma protest, I was struck by photos of Dr. Martin Luther King, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, and others leading the 54-mile third march, arms linked together in solidarity, wearing what looked like white double carnation Hawaiian lei. Looking into the matter further, I learned, in fact, that they were wearing lei. Why were they wearing lei? I found an answer that drove home for me the importance of standing together for civil rights for all.

Mr. Speaker, many of you may not know this, but Dr. Martin Luther King actually came to speak at the University of Hawaii in 1964. He came for a civil rights symposium being held at the university. It was during this time in Hawaii that he began a deep friendship with the Reverend Abraham Kahikina Akaka, former pastor of Kawaiahao Church in Oahu and the first chairman of the Hawaii Advisory Committee of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. In the spirit of aloha, which means compassion, peace, and love, the reverend sent to Selma lei for the leaders of the protests to wear.

I will be marching this weekend, Mr. Speaker; and to honor the tradition and the bond established many years ago between Hawaii and the Alabama civil rights leaders, Senator MAZIE HIRONO and I will be presenting lei to Congressman JOHN LEWIS and all of our congressional colleagues. These lei are a tribute to the Selma marchers 50 years ago and the knowledge that their efforts reverberated through our Nation and to Hawaii, a State that was only 6 years old.

As we travel across the 54-mile historic trail and cross the famous Edmund Pettus Bridge on Saturday, we will remember those whose lives were lost fighting for our civil rights, remember those who paved the way, celebrate the hard fought victories, and remind ourselves that the fight is not yet over.

I look forward to participating in this historic weekend, and I thank the Faith & Politics Institute for coordinating our congressional pilgrimage to Alabama.

#### WHY PUERTO RICO STATEHOOD IS IN THE U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifth time this year that I have addressed this Chamber about Puerto Rico’s political destiny. I recently introduced a bill that would provide for Puerto Rico’s admission as a State once a majority of Puerto Rico’s electorate affirms their desire for statehood in a federally sponsored vote. The bill already has 70 cosponsors—56 Democrats and 14 Republicans.

In contrast to Puerto Rico’s current territory status, statehood would deliver to my constituents what all free people deserve: full voting rights, full self-government, and full equality under the law. And unlike separate nationhood, which is the only other non-territory option available to Puerto Rico, statehood would help rebuild the island’s shattered economy and improve its quality of life. Indeed, the fact that statehood would be in the best interest of Puerto Rico is beyond reasonable dispute. There will always be politicians in Puerto Rico who claim otherwise for ideological reasons, but their arguments are detached from reality.

Today I want to outline why statehood would also be in the national interest of the United States as a whole. There are three main reasons—one moral, one economic, and one political. First, the moral reason.

In 2012, my constituents held a free and fair vote in which they rejected territory status and expressed a preference for statehood. At a subsequent Senate committee hearing, then-chairman RON WYDEN said that the current relationship between the United States and Puerto Rico “undermines the United States’ moral standing in the world.” Senator WYDEN posed this question:

“For a nation founded on the principles of democracy and the consent of the governed, how much longer can America allow a condition to persist in which nearly 4 million U.S. citizens do not have a vote in the government that makes the national laws which affect their daily lives?”

If Puerto Rico desires statehood, I cannot identify any moral basis upon which Congress could decline that petition, especially in light of the enormous contribution that island residents have made in our Armed Forces over generations. How could the U.S. Government, a champion of democracy and self-determination around the world, disregard those principles with respect to its own citizens without losing credibility at home and abroad?

The second reason that statehood is in the national interest is economic. Last year, the GAO published a report

about the fiscal impact of statehood on the Federal Government. The report confirms that statehood will enhance quality of life in Puerto Rico, but it also alleviates any concern that statehood would have an adverse impact on the U.S. Treasury. As the GAO explains, new Federal outlays to Puerto Rico would be significantly counterbalanced by new Federal revenues generated from the island.

The truth is this: this Nation will benefit when Puerto Rico's economic economy is strong, when its residents do not need to move to the States to achieve their dreams or vote for their national leaders, when individuals in businesses on the island flourish, and when the corporate and individual tax base expands. The U.S. stands to gain from the state of Puerto Rico's success, just as it currently pays a severe price for the territory's shortcomings.

Finally, let me turn to the political dimensions of this debate. The evidence indicates that either national party could be competitive on the island. I am a proud Democrat, but the pro-statehood party I lead includes hundreds of thousands of equally proud Republicans. Voters in Puerto Rico have elected two Republican Governors and numerous Republican senators, representatives, and mayors at the local level. I can say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that they should not view the prospective State of Puerto Rico as either a blessing or a curse for their party's fortunes but, rather, as an opportunity.

Statehood is not only in Puerto Rico's interests; it is also in the national interests. Statehood will make Puerto Rico stronger, and it will make the United States a more perfect Union.

God bless Puerto Rico, the next State of the United States of America.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Lord, You have promised to be with all people wherever they are, whatever

their need. We reach out in prayer for the homeless, the poor, those anxious about the future, those who are ill, or those to whom freedom has been denied.

Bless the Members of this people's House. Inspire them, as representatives of the American people, to labor for justice and righteousness in our Nation and our world, mindful of Your concern for those most in need.

For all the riches of our human experience, O Lord, we give You thanks. Make us aware of our responsibilities, as stewards of Your divine gifts, and empower us with Your grace to faithfully and earnestly use our talents in ways that bring understanding to our communities and to our Nation, and peace to every soul.

May all we do be done for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### A GREAT IDEA: 529 PLANS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I believe in an opportunity economy, where hard work, education, innovation, and risk are rewarded, and we empower individuals, not government.

Imagine what determination and a degree can do for today's young people, provided they have a variety of choices to meet their needs and good information about the investment they are making.

Paying for college is hard work, and it is getting more difficult as tuition and fees continue to increase at rapid rates. Luckily, American families have an investment tool known as a 529 plan

to help them save for their child's college education.

Last week, the House approved bipartisan legislation to expand, strengthen, and improve 529 plans, which nearly 12 million families have utilized to help plan for their child's education.

With student loan debt surpassing credit card debt, we need to do everything we can to encourage American families to save for college and invest in their child's future.

#### MANUFACTURED POLITICAL CRISES

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Democrats in the House stood united to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security was funded for the remainder of the year.

After bringing our Nation's security and public safety to the brink of shutdown twice in the last 2 weeks, the Speaker finally relented and allowed the will of the majority of the House of Representatives to be heard on the floor. All Democrats and a good number of responsible Members on the other side joined together to make sure that Homeland Security was funded for the remainder of the year.

It is completely unacceptable that we have seen, since this Congress has convened, manufactured political crises that divert us away from the real issues that the American people want us to take up.

Americans at home are worried about making ends meet. They work harder and harder and can't seem to get ahead. They can't seem to save for retirement. They can't guarantee that their young kids are going to have the opportunity to attend college. That is what they want us to take up.

We cannot continue manufactured political crises intended to pander to the most extreme voices in this body.

#### BINYAMIN NETANYAHU'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to have Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu speak to a joint session of Congress yesterday. Israel is one of our country's closest allies, an essential partner in restraining Iran's nuclear threat and combating the growing threat of terrorist groups like ISIL Daesh.

Hearing Prime Minister Netanyahu speak out against radical Islam and warn the world about the threat of a nuclear Iran, I was reminded of another great leader who addressed Congress nearly 75 years ago. Winston Churchill

and Binyamin Netanyahu are the only two foreign leaders to address a joint session of Congress three times.

Like many, I believe Prime Minister Netanyahu is the Churchill of our time. Both men had to fight against global threats of unmatched and barbaric proportions but also stood firm to other world leaders advancing a strategy of appeasement over strength. I only hope that we heed Netanyahu's words now before it is too late to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. And may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### JUDGE EUGENE FAHEY, NEW YORK STATE COURT OF APPEALS

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, the nomination of Judge Eugene Fahey of Buffalo to a seat on the New York State Court of Appeals was confirmed.

I have known Gene for many years, starting when we were colleagues on the Buffalo Common Council. Gene went on to judicial service, first as a city court judge and later as a trial and appellate justice of the New York State Supreme Court. Gene's decisions include a landmark ruling affirming the validity of New York's marriage equality statute.

As colleagues on the council, Gene and I had many conversations about public service, though rarely about where our respective careers might take us. It is with tremendous pride that we now see Gene taking a seat as an associate justice on the most celebrated, top-level State court in the United States. His service will be a great credit to those whom he is sworn to serve.

Mr. Speaker, in Justice Eugene Fahey, the New York Court of Appeals gains a towering intellect, a booming voice, a compassionate heart, and an accomplished lead guitarist.

My best wishes go to Gene; his wife, Colleen; and their daughter, Ann.

#### DHS FUNDING AND THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House voted with bipartisan support to pass H.R. 240, legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security through September 30, 2015.

It is our constitutional duty to ensure that our country remains safe, and playing politics with Homeland Security funding, when the world is as dan-

gerous as it is today, is simply unacceptable. Make no doubt about it, it is critically important to stop the President's actions on immigration. But at a time like this, it would be gravely irresponsible to allow the Department of Homeland Security to shut down, or even to have the appearance of that.

When the executive and legislative branches of our government are in disagreement, the judicial branch must play referee, and that is exactly what took place when a Federal judge sided with a complaint filed by 26 States in opposition to the President's move toward amnesty.

Now that our Federal courts have halted President Obama's executive actions, further rulings will closely examine how the President has overreached his constitutional authorities.

Mr. Speaker, considering all of the facts, voting "yes" on Homeland Security funding yesterday was the right decision. However, this does not compromise my position of standing strong against the President's executive actions.

#### FUNDING DHS

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise with some relief to note that yesterday we did come together to fully fund the Department of Homeland Security. A number of us came together and ignored the extremist shutdown crowd and did the responsible thing and funded this Department.

I regret that the Department had to spend millions of dollars to prepare for a shutdown that it anticipated having to go through. Nevertheless, this is a Department that protects our Nation at a time when ISIL is executing journalists and aid workers and Christians and Muslims, when al Shabaab is threatening our Nation's biggest shopping mall. We need the Department of Homeland Security. And I say, Bully.

Let us continue to do the responsible thing and fund our departments, including the Department of Homeland Security.

#### IRAN

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that we cannot trust the tyrannical regime in Iran. For many years, our own State Department has determined that Iran is one of the world's leading state sponsors of terrorism.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu reminded us yesterday, the Iranian Government has consistently called for the destruction of Israel and has referred

to the United States as the "Great Satan." Does this sound like a negotiating partner that we can trust?

If anyone is unwilling to acknowledge their support for terror groups like Hezbollah or their hateful words toward America and Israel, then consider how this regime acts toward its own people. They stifle dissent by restricting the most basic political freedoms within their borders—the freedoms of speech, assembly, and press. They often jail opposition leaders and journalists and hold them without cause.

If Iran wants to be considered a legitimate power, they should stop arming and aiding terror groups and open up their political system to prove to the world that they are committed to freedom and peace. They can start by releasing all political prisoners, including Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian, who has been unjustly imprisoned for over 200 days. These steps should be taken before the U.S. continues to negotiate any nuclear deal.

#### PLAYING PARTY POLITICS

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, last week we were pushed to the brink of shutting down the Department of Homeland Security, the agency tasked with safeguarding our homeland from threats here and abroad, all because Congress couldn't do its job. Only weeks after horrific attacks in Paris and with news of ISIS every day, the House majority risked the national security of our country to play party politics.

We cannot continue to govern in crisis mode, threatening the safety of American lives, jobs, and our homeland, so my colleagues can score political points. Enough is enough.

Threatening to shut down DHS was reckless, unnecessary, and completely avoidable. The House majority's games have forced Congress away from its most critical priority, working for middle class families to create jobs, improve transportation and infrastructure, invest in education, and protect programs for our seniors. It is time to stop playing political games and get back to what the people elected us to do.

#### HONORING MAJOR TRENT COLESTOCK, UNITED STATES ARMY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Army congressional liaison to the U.S. House of Representatives Major Trent Colestock.



The Army has recognized his patriotism, abilities, and his demonstrated potential for increased responsibility, and it promoted him to the rank of major on February 1.

Born in my hometown of Miami, Florida, and raised in Mineral Wells, Texas, Trent graduated from Texas Christian University, where he earned a degree in business administration and an Army commission. During his congressional assignment, he earned a master's degree in legislative affairs from George Washington University.

Commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Army's Field Artillery Branch, Trent has served at Fort Drum, Fort Hood, and in Iraq for Operation Iraqi Freedom. Throughout his career in our proud military, Trent has earned many accolades, including the Combat Action Badge, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Iraqi Campaign Medal.

It is my distinct pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to join with Major Colestock's family, friends, and peers as they honor his promotion and the many accomplishments of his outstanding service to our Nation.

□ 1215

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF LOCAL RADIO AND REINTRODUCTION OF THE LOCAL RADIO FREEDOM ACT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the significant benefits and services that our local radio stations provide to our communities.

I cannot say enough about the benefits local radio provides constituents in our district in Houston and Harris County, Texas. Local radio provides AMBER Alerts, local news, weather, and critical emergency alerts, which we all know too well along the gulf coast we need. In addition to the public service, radio provides entertainment and music free to the public.

For nearly 90 years, Congress has recognized this fact and has not imposed performance fees on local radio stations. That is why I am pleased to reintroduce, along with my fellow Texan, Congressman MIKE CONAWAY, the Local Radio Freedom Act, H. Con. Res. 17.

Our simple resolution simply states that Congress should not impose any performance taxes or fees for playing over-the-air music and keep local radio free. Last week's introduction with 93 cosponsors, over 20 percent of the full House, shows the strong commitment Congress has to protect local radio and all the benefits it provides our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the original cosponsors of this resolution

and thank local radio for serving our communities.

#### THE BUCK STOPS HERE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, President Truman had a plaque on his desk that said, "The buck stops here." Many veterans are probably wondering why this old poker expression doesn't apply to the VA. However, on Monday the House passed H.R. 280, which gives the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the authority to make sure the bucks do stop on back bonuses given to management of the VA, which is very, very backlogged.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad the House has acted, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate and the President to join this effort. It is clear that it is time to send a message to the VA that the days of rewarding subpar work and service for hidden and lost files or long waiting periods are over.

We need to continue to fight for commonsense reforms that will provide this type of system that our veterans deserve. At many regional offices of the VA around the country, including my own of Oakland, veterans have waited far too long to have their benefit claims processed and are struggling to access the care they need and deserve. There are countless examples of dysfunction, and the VA is falling short of its mission.

Does anyone actually think the VA deserves bonuses for failing our veterans when we have these long lists of people waiting for medical care, having their claims serviced? No, I think not. Mr. Speaker, the VA bonus bucks stop here.

#### REMEMBERING REVEREND THEODORE M. HESBURGH, CSC

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is the funeral for one of the most influential figures in higher education, the Catholic Church, and domestic and international affairs: Father Theodore Hesburgh. He served as president of the University of Notre Dame for 35 years, in that time taking a small Catholic college and transforming it into a world renowned institution.

During his career he was granted 150 honorary degrees, more than any other person. This Congress awarded him the Congressional Gold Medal in the year 2000, becoming the first figure from higher education to receive the Congressional Gold Medal. He was also appointed by both Democratic and Republican Presidents to 16 Presidential

commissions, ranging from atomic weapons policy to immigration, to civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be a graduate of the Hesburgh Program in Public Service and hope to be able to live up to that awesome example he set.

#### SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATH

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of four high-tech fields that are dominating the digital age. The fields of science, technology, engineering, and math, commonly referred to as STEM, are driving our Nation's innovation and competition, generating new ideas, industries, and companies.

Just last week, I had the opportunity to tour the University of New Hampshire's InterOperability Laboratory to see just how important the STEM field is to the Granite State. The InterOperability Lab is the only full-service, nonprofit test lab in the world that provides both industry expertise and real-world training for our Nation's future STEM workers.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that Congress continues to advocate on behalf of the STEM fields because the demand for individuals with these backgrounds and education only continue to grow. In fact, the Office of Science and Technology Policy estimates that STEM jobs will grow almost two times faster than non-STEM jobs from 2008 to 2018. We must ensure R&D continues in these fields.

#### FUNDING DHS

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express relief that Congress has funded the Department of Homeland Security. We averted an unnecessary and harmful crisis. We should not have reached a point where the Department was on the brink of a shutdown.

The Department of Homeland Security was created after the devastating September 11 terrorist attacks and performs vital functions to protect Americans against ongoing terrorist threats. We are talking about FEMA, which responds to emergencies and disasters; TSA, which makes flying safer; the Secret Service; Customs and Border Protection; and other important services.

The Coast Guard, which patrols our waters and helps protect communities like mine near the Port of Los Angeles, is also a part of the Department of Homeland Security. We must do even more to improve port security, and

shutting down the Department would have been a step backwards.

We must stop the crisis-to-crisis governing around here. The American people deserve better than this sort of political brinksmanship.

#### CONGRATULATING MIDLAND MARKETING COOPERATIVE

(Mr. HUELSKAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Midland Marketing Cooperative, located in Hays, Kansas, which celebrates their 100th anniversary in business on March 5 of this year.

Midland started with 81 farmers, who put up a total of \$10,000 to begin capitalizing their new cooperative. Since that time, the co-op has grown to nearly 1,000 members and has over \$122 million in annual sales. They now operate 11 elevator locations, 2 full-service gas stations, 5 automated fueling stations, 2 feed mills, and 10 agronomy locations. In their five-county service area, Midland employs 62 full-time employees. When you add part-time and seasonal workers, that increases to 120 people. Midland Marketing Cooperative has returned over \$62 million in patronage to their members.

Thank you to Midland Marketing Cooperative and all the co-ops in my district who are keeping Kansas agriculture and our rural communities strong.

#### RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SELMA VOTING RIGHTS MARCH WITH THE ISSUANCE OF A POSTAL STAMP

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bipartisan resolution that would honor the Selma to Montgomery marches with a commemorative stamp.

I thank the 102 bipartisan House Members who cosponsored this resolution, and the original sponsors: Congressman BYRNE, Congressman HURD, and Congresswoman SEWELL.

The Selma voting rights march was a pivotal moment in our history that brought together Americans to march from Selma to Montgomery County 50 years ago. This stamp celebrates the march and reminds us to protect voting rights.

For 125 years the United States Postal Service has been issuing stamps to celebrate cultural milestones in the unique history of our Nation. Surely the protection of voting rights is a landmark development in our Nation's development. It is my hope that, as we

remember the struggles, discrimination, and inequalities, we will lift our hearts and unite to find bridges to equality and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members unite with me and ask the Oversight and Government Reform Committee for a hearing on this stamp.

#### HONORING JOHN FORKENBROCK, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FEDERALLY IMPACTED SCHOOLS

(Mr. TAKAI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the career of a man who was instrumental in education policy, Mr. John Forkenbrock. I have had the pleasure of working with John for the past 20 years, and he visited my home State of Hawaii twice during his time with the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, or NAFIS.

From 1988 to the present, John has served as executive director of NAFIS, an association representing over 1,400 public school districts. In that position, John oversaw major changes in the Impact Aid Program that were included in the 1994 ESEA Improving America's Schools Act, and again in 2000 and 2001 with the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are all indebted to John's leadership. Millions of children in school districts across this Nation have benefited from his hard work.

Though he will be sorely missed at NAFIS, I wish John and Patty Forkenbrock the best in their retirement.

#### MARIJUANA LAWS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a bit of a dustup over D.C.'s new marijuana reform law. D.C. has never defied the Congress, although it has been tempting, especially several times when the Federal Government shut down, shutting down the District with it, although the District, of course, is no part of these disputes.

The majority language in the appropriation bill said that the District couldn't enact marijuana laws. The law was enacted before that language was passed. When approved by the voters, there was nothing further to be done. Small amounts of marijuana became legal in the District, smoked in private. On Thursday, D.C. has taken no further official action, and is in compliance with the law as passed by Congress.

The most important impetus for passage by residents was two independent

studies that showed that virtually all of those who now carry marijuana arrests are young African Americans. That was the last straw for a substance that is de facto legal for most Americans.

D.C. passage is neutral on its face. It doesn't recommend the substance. We ought to have the same liberty other Americans already enjoy on this substance.

#### MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR FALLEN HERO, CAPTAIN DWIGHT BAZILE

(Mr. AL GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Houston has lost a firefighter in the line of duty, the State of Texas has lost a first responder, but America has lost a hero.

Mr. Speaker, today I pause to honor a hero. Captain Dwight Bazile, 57 years of age, firefighter for 37 years, promoted to captain in 2008, father to Dwight Bazile II, son of Charlotte Fielder, husband to Pamela Bazile, died in the line of duty February 21, 2015.

I ask that we have a moment of silence for a hero who died in the line of duty.

#### RECOGNIZING THE DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of my Delta Sigma Theta sisters.

Delta Sigma Theta sorority was founded in January 1913 at Howard University by 22 brave young women. They sought to promote academic excellence, to provide scholarships, to support the underserved, to educate and stimulate participation in the formation of positive public policy, and to highlight issues with recommended solutions for problems in our communities.

Since its founding, it has distinguished itself as a public service organization that boldly confronts the challenges of African American women and all Americans. The women of Delta Sigma Theta continue to push for many of these same issues. In fact, they were at the confirmation hearing of Loretta Lynch, also a member of Delta Sigma Theta.

They will be in Selma, along with many Members of Congress and the administration, for the annual pilgrimage. This journey allows us to visit not only the sites of the civil rights movement, but to hear firsthand the stories of hope that emerged from the civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, this month 102 years ago, the women of Delta Sigma Theta

marched in the historic suffragette march as the first public act. This weekend I will join my sorors again, my congressional colleagues, as we cross the bridge to show how we must continue to work, and we still have work to do.

□ 1230

#### ENSURE BORINQUEENERS RECEIVE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

(Mr. GRAYSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, last year, Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, an all-volunteer Puerto Rican unit known as the Borinqueneers. Today, I rise to urge the President to expedite the designing and the delivery of this medal before more of these brave Borinqueneers pass away.

More than 100,000 Borinqueneers served in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Puerto Ricans have fought for the United States as far back as the American Revolution, and they continue to do so honorably to this day. Thousands have given their lives defending our country, despite enduring decades of prejudice against them.

The Borinqueneers have been recognized with Distinguished Service Crosses, Silver Stars, Bronze Stars, and Purple Hearts. However, it was not until last year that the first member of the Borinqueneers, Master Sergeant Juan E. Negron, was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor, following a congressionally ordered review of cases involving potential prejudice.

Today, hundreds of Borinqueneers have made my home of central Florida their home. It is my goal and my honor as their Representative to ensure that they receive this long overdue recognition.

Puerto Rican veterans should not have to wait any longer to receive the equal treatment they deserve. Today, I ask the President to ensure that the Borinqueneers receive their Congressional Gold Medal as soon as possible.

#### BUILD TRUST

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee and one who was in a security briefing this morning, I cannot celebrate more to the brave men and women of the Department of Homeland Security that many of us stood up collectively together as Americans and provided for full funding. Let me thank them for their service.

Let me move on. Yesterday, another very provocative and important action was done. The Department of Justice report came out regarding the city of Ferguson, where it found that Blacks account for 85 percent of traffic stops, 90 percent of tickets issued, and 93 percent of arrests.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about Ferguson, though many are trying to heal—and we offer sympathy again to Michael Brown's family—but it is about America. I call upon my Republican friends and Democratic friends. We act on facts. These are facts that are probably implicated across America.

I have introduced the Build TRUST bill. I hope we can come together to find a way, both in terms of our law enforcement and making sure that they go home to their families, but also have a just and fair pattern, if you will, of treating the citizens of every hamlet and town and city and State in this Nation. We owe that to our beliefs in the Constitution, Mr. Speaker.

I encourage a bipartisan effort to look at how we can address these questions across America. We deserve that as Americans.

#### PASSENGER RAIL REFORM AND INVESTMENT ACT

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act, and I appreciate the bipartisan work of our committee leaders.

Florida is the third largest State in the Nation with a growing population, booming tourism, and expanding trade opportunities. That means more trains and more cars transporting more people and cargo over our 458 rail crossings in south Florida.

That is why stakeholders in south Florida are pleased that this rail bill authorizes \$150 million per year for 4 years for State and local governments in our region to upgrade the safety features at grade crossings and improve traffic coordination to prevent accidents and ease congestion.

Transportation moves our economy. The rail bill facilitates it to be done safely and efficiently. I urge its approval.

#### PASSENGER RAIL REFORM AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 2015

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 749.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 134 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 749.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1235

##### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 749) to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking Chairman DENHAM and Ranking Members DEFazio and CAPUANO, who have all worked well on this bill together. I also would like to thank Ms. BROWN who, in the last Congress, when this bill started on its path, to thank her for her great work. Ms. BROWN is from the State of Florida.

Since I became chairman of the Railroad Subcommittee in the 112th Congress and since I have become chairman of the full committee, this has been one of my top priorities: to pass a bipartisan passenger rail bill that reforms Amtrak. I am so happy to be here on the floor today with the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015.

The previous passenger rail bill passed in 2008 and resulted in some real improvements to Amtrak, which we are seeing today. Ridership is up 14 percent; revenue is up 37 percent; and, in the Northeast corridor, the profits are up an amazing 250 percent.

The last bill created the Northeast Corridor Commission, which has helped the States, Amtrak, and DOT finally work together on planning the future of the corridor; however, more work needs to be done to help Amtrak maximize its strengths and tackle some of its longstanding challenges.

That is why we introduced the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015. I know some of my colleagues are skeptical about Amtrak and passenger rail in general. Because of its current structure, Amtrak's finances have not been transparent to either Congress or to consumers.

The profits on the Northeast corridor have subsidized money-losing routes, masking the true cost of these services. This bill makes significant reforms to eliminate those issues.

In particular, we focus on the Northeast corridor in this bill, which truly is a nationally significant transportation corridor. With 18 percent of our population and 20 percent of our GDP produced in the Northeast corridor on 3 percent of our land mass, it is the most densely populated area of the United States and one of the most densely populated in the world, so passenger rail is needed.

By separating Amtrak into business lines, the Northeast corridor profits stay in the corridor, allowing for more investment there. Setting the other business lines apart allows the corporation to make better-informed business decisions about those lines' operations. This will help make Amtrak's operations much more transparent for both the States and the Congress.

By focusing our resources on the Northeast corridor and existing corridors where passenger rail makes sense, we will help to improve passenger rail without breaking the bank.

Finally, we also provide environmental review streamlining reforms for rail projects, something that is important to not only passenger rail, but it also will include freight rail in these environmental reviews, which will help them to be able to expand their rail network to help America move its freight more effectively and efficiently.

It is something we are already doing in highway and transit and water infrastructure projects. This will help make our limited Federal dollars go further because we all know time is money when dealing with infrastructure projects.

I know on both sides of the aisle—my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to do more and have more money invested, which I understand, and there needs to be more investment. My colleagues on my side of the aisle think we may be spending too much money.

These reforms are going to move Amtrak in a positive direction. It is not going to solve all of our problems today, but I think it substantially moves the ball down the field to get to a point where someday maybe Amtrak can stand on its own two feet.

This debate has been raging in this assembly for the last 40 or so years. My colleagues on the other side point out that no passenger rail operates without subsidies. They are correct.

Also, there is only one freight rail system in the world that doesn't get subsidies, and that is in the United States of America, our freight rail system. I think we can move Amtrak in that direction.

My colleagues on my side of the aisle argue, Amtrak has been a failure, let's get rid of it. I don't think that is the

answer either because, as I mentioned earlier, there are places in this country that desperately need to have an expanded passenger rail service.

When the United States is moving towards 400 million people, we are going to need that passenger rail service in various parts of this country. We need to make sure that we are building today a better Amtrak to serve the future of the American people and of a people that is growing.

This is a bipartisan bill, so neither side got everything that it wants, but it is a good strong reform bill that I firmly believe will significantly improve Amtrak.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I look forward to working with the Senate to take it to the President's desk.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the chairman, Chairman SHUSTER, from Pennsylvania; subcommittee chairman Mr. DENHAM; and the ranking member serving on our side, MIKE CAPUANO, for a bill that is an okay bill.

This is in the tradition, the greatest tradition, of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, which we have differences, as the chairman pointed out, over the future of rail and the funding levels that are needed, but there is consensus that this is important to the country, and we can continue that debate as we continue to improve the operations of Amtrak.

An awful lot of the focus is on the Northeast corridor. That is essentially the "cash cow." In the Northeast corridor now in the rail-air market, 78 percent of the D.C.-New York travelers are now using the train. That is a success story. There is a lot of focus on that, but Amtrak is bigger than that. We are a large nation.

I remember after 9/11, when I had a Federal official here from my region, head of the Bonneville Power Administration, and he needed to get back for some important meetings in the West, he took the train. There was no plane option.

Maintaining a national network, I believe, is essential. We need to keep that perspective in mind as we look at Amtrak as a whole, not just a corridor in one of the most populated parts of the country.

In the West, we have two long-distance trains: the Coast Starlight from Seattle through Portland, Eugene, down to Los Angeles; and the Empire Builder, which starts in Seattle and Portland, converges in Spokane—kind of a unique route—and continues on to Chicago.

We also have a State-supported route in Oregon, which is an international route. It goes from Eugene, Oregon, to Vancouver, British Columbia. Rider-

ship last year was almost up to 1 million on that route, as Interstate 5 becomes more and more problematic and congested, particularly over the line in Washington State. These are essential assets to give people an alternative.

I would also say that we need to be planning for a better future. Last year, Oregon did get about a \$20 million grant through the Intercity Passenger Rail grant program to finish planning and preliminary engineering work for the possibility of a higher-speed route—not high speed. Unfortunately, that is not in the cards in the near future.

We have a wonderful train set, an Acela train set, which can travel a lot faster than it can now because of the current routing and congestion. We are planning on doing that, working cooperatively with the freight railroads and also looking at some alternative routes for at least part of that train.

I would also point out that this bill, the railroads themselves, the freight railroads, which the chairman mentioned, are investing a phenomenal amount of money in upgrading their track, their systems, and their power; but there are still a lot of projects that are undone and don't have potential revenue sources, particularly for the short lines.

□ 1245

I am really pleased that this bill streamlines the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program, RRIF. It sounds like something my dog would say. In any case, this is sort of a very infinitely bureaucratic and lengthy process. The bill requires that the loans be done within 45 days of getting a complete application, and it also contains strong Buy America provisions. It will be all American steel, iron, and manufactured goods. I think that is an improvement on two levels, and that is a needed change.

Finally, as the chairman said, there are some of us on this side of the aisle who believe we should be making more investment so that Amtrak can have a program to acquire more power, so it can make improvements on some of the very aged and decrepit parts of the Neck here and in other places where they have critical infrastructure needs around the country. That was not to be in this bill, but this bill does leave us that option in the future. I strongly—and I believe most on this side of the aisle will strongly—support this legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY).

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee to support this bill.

I believe it will bring efficiency, savings, and greater transparency to Amtrak. Instead of increasing government

interference, this bill will actually create development opportunities for the private sector and encourage non-Federal participation by unlocking new revenue streams. This bill is common sense and straightforward. It reduces red tape by streamlining environmental issues.

As a former small business owner, it makes perfect sense to me that we direct Amtrak to target investments where there is the best potential for success and conduct a thorough cost-benefit analysis for long distance routes.

Finally, I am excited to further empower States to have a greater role in managing their routes. States must be equal partners with a greater say in ensuring that the residents—Amtrak passengers—get the best benefit. That is why, Mr. Chairman, I stand in support of this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015. This bill authorizes \$7 billion for passenger rail, including \$5.8 billion for Amtrak, over the next 4 years.

This bill is not perfect, but I appreciate the committee leadership's efforts to develop a bill in a bipartisan manner.

This bill significantly reforms the way Amtrak funding is authorized. Rather than authorizing separate appropriations for debt service, capital, and operating expenses, the bill creates two new accounts—a Northeast corridor account and a national network account. The bill also creates a new program to provide grants to the States, funded at \$300 million annually, of which \$150 million is dedicated to the Northeast corridor.

The Northeast corridor region contains 4 of the 10 largest metropolitan areas in the country. It is home to more than 51 million people, and our regional economy is the fifth-largest in the world between France and Germany. If the Northeast corridor were to unexpectedly shut down for just one day, the potential impact on the U.S. economy could be \$100 million in transportation-related impacts and productivity losses.

There is no question that it is absolutely in our national interest to do everything we can to maintain and develop the Northeast corridor, but New Yorkers also understand the importance of maintaining a national network, so I am pleased that the bill grants Amtrak the flexibility to transfer funds, if needed, to keep the national rail system operational. The bill also requires a more detailed plan for implementing specific improvements to the Northeast corridor that is free of

poison pill, antilabor provisions, and it applies Buy America to the RRIF loan program.

All of this is good, but we cannot lose sight of the bigger picture, which is that we are still woefully underfunding Amtrak. We spend more than \$50 billion per year on highways and transit and over \$15 billion on aviation, while Amtrak is just \$1.4 billion, or less than 2 percent, of Federal transportation spending. This is despite the fact that the rail system needs at least \$52 billion, or \$2.6 billion per year, for 20 years just to meet ridership demands and bring the system into a state of good repair.

The President's FY16 budget request, on the other hand, includes \$5 billion for rail. Half of that is intended to bring public rail assets throughout the country to a state of good repair, including \$550 million for the Northeast corridor; \$2 billion is for high-speed rail and commuter rail; and \$204 million is for the FRA rail safety measures, proven to be so necessary by the accidents on Metro North in New York and Connecticut.

Unfortunately, this bill before us today simply authorizes current funding levels, but given the budget constraints imposed by the majority, it is probably the best bill we can hope for right now if we want to move a bipartisan bill.

I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFazio for their efforts to advance an Amtrak reauthorization bill that moves the process forward. I look forward to working with them and the rest of my colleagues to make sure passenger rail receives the attention and resources it deserves. For now, this is a good bill, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO), the newest member of the T&I Committee.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan solution to enhance passenger rail networks and strengthen this country's transportation infrastructure.

Amtrak's Northeast and Keystone rail lines are a critical thread in the transportation fabric of my district in southeastern Pennsylvania. For me, Amtrak equals SEPTA, in many respects, as 90 percent of the 2,000 daily train rides along the Northeast corridor are regional commuter lines like SEPTA.

This important legislation does something very significant, Mr. Chairman. It keeps revenues generated on the Northeast corridor for reinvestment along the Northeast corridor. It compels Amtrak, the Federal Railroad Administration, and States to work together to develop and implement a 5-year Northeast corridor capital invest-

ment plan. For my district, it offers more promise for the Schuylkill Metro project, for the concept of utilizing existing rail beds known as the Green Line along route 29 in Montgomery and Chester Counties. And of course, it makes available more Federal funding for new train stations to replace aging train stations such as Paoli and Downingtown.

I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman DENHAM for their smart, reasoned approach and for their leadership in strengthening the passenger rail network. This is a great bill. It is great for southeastern Pennsylvania, and it is great for this country.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank Ranking Member CAPUANO for yielding me this time.

I want to thank the capable chairman of the committee, Mr. SHUSTER, and the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. DEFazio, for bringing this important Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act before us.

Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of the busiest Amtrak station in Ohio at Toledo and the Amtrak stations in Sandusky and Elyria-Lorain, I rise to urge the passage of this important bill to continue and advance passenger rail service across our Nation.

When I was born, the population of the United States was 146 million people. Today, it surpasses 320 million. By 2020, our Nation's population is projected to reach over half a billion people—over 500 million. As time moves forward, the necessity for passenger rail will become clearer with each passing day.

Many of our major urban centers are clogged with traffic jams daily, and the railroads across my region of our continent have severe freight rail and passenger rail conflicts because they are forced to use the same tracks. Imagine that we are living in the 21st century, and we are still tethered to 19th century rail pathways.

Passenger rail travel in Ohio is booming despite these constraints—up from 108,000 passengers in 2007 to 160,000 passengers in 2013. A trend in my district has grown as well, with Toledo passengers on the northwest Ohio corridor increasing from 53,000 to 77,000 over the same time. Imagine the traffic jams if all of these individuals traveled by car instead of rail.

It is not just the northeastern part of our Nation that needs added attention to passenger rail service, as important as that is. It should also include the Great Lakes Region. The corridor that stretches the length of my district and connects our industrial heartland corridor from Pittsburgh to Cleveland to Sandusky to Toledo to Gary to Chicago needs special attention, too.

During an extended stretch last year, between July and September, the Capitol Limited, which runs from Washington, D.C., to Chicago and includes my northern Ohio stretch, completed only 2.7 percent of its trips on time—2.7 percent out of 100 percent on time. The dramatic increase of freight rail consistently bumps passenger service. We need both, but what we have are these lengthy delays to passenger service across our vast region.

I have two articles I would like to insert into the RECORD detailing these troubles.

[From the Blade]

#### AMTRAK TRAINS OFTEN TRICKLE INTO TOLEDO AFTER RASH OF DELAYS

(By David Patch)

Christine Smith boarded Amtrak's Lake Shore Limited in Chicago on Tuesday night to visit a friend in Toledo.

The train left Chicago two hours late and made it only about 15 miles to Indiana's northwest corner, where it sat for about three hours, Ms. Smith recalled. By the time it got to Toledo, it was six hours behind schedule.

It was only the latest of a series of late Amtrak trains the Melbourne, Australia, resident said she had encountered since arriving in Los Angeles last month and riding from there to San Francisco, Portland, Ore., Spokane, and Chicago.

Late trains are nothing new for Amtrak, particularly for the overnight, long-distance trains such as those that serve Toledo—the Lake Shore Limited and Capitol Limited. Trains running more than three hours late have become the norm recently, and they have often lost that much or more just on the Chicago-Toledo portion of trips. The Capitol Limited was 12 hours behind schedule on Sunday.

While there have been exceptions, by far the biggest obstacle to Amtrak's time-keeping across northern Indiana and northern Ohio has been tracks blocked by freight trains belonging to Norfolk Southern, which owns and operates the line Amtrak uses between Chicago and Cleveland.

"It's absolutely unbelievable what they're doing to the American people. It's a fraud," Ms. Smith said. "Every train I've been on has been late leaving and late arriving, and freight trains are given as the reason."

During the 12 months that ended in August, Capitol Limited trains arrived at their end stations in Chicago or Washington within 30 minutes of schedule only 22.5 percent of the time, while the Lake Shore reached Chicago or New York on time 30.8 percent of the time, according to Amtrak.

But August itself was significantly worse, and September data, when available, is unlikely to show improvement. In August, the best performer was the eastbound Lake Shore, which reached New York within 30 minutes of schedule 6.5 percent of the time—two trips. The westbound was late into Chicago every day of the month, and the Capitol Limited arrived on time once in each direction.

Late westbound arrivals in Chicago also translate to late eastbound departures, because Amtrak lacks spare equipment in Chicago to make up replacement trains when equipment arrives late, and it also does not have enough engineers and conductors to always have an extra train crew ready to replace one that has worked the maximum 12-hour shift set by federal regulation.

Marc Magliari, an Amtrak spokesman in Chicago, laid even the late departures from Chicago at Norfolk Southern's feet.

"If the train is late getting to Chicago, it's most likely going to be late eastbound while we're servicing equipment and getting proper rest for our crews," Mr. Magliari said. "The result is to drive up our costs, dissatisfy our passengers, and create 'never again' riders."

While its ridership pales in comparison to major stations like New York and Chicago, Toledo historically has been Amtrak's busiest Ohio stop, and its ridership has declined of late.

After peaking at more than 90,000 riders in 2010 and 2011, Toledo's Amtrak ridership dropped to 87,073 in 2012 and 86,252 last year, according to statistics provided to the Toledo-Lucas County Port Authority, which owns the Toledo station.

During the first seven months of 2014, Amtrak's Toledo ridership has fallen by another 7 percent, those statistics show.

David Pidgeon, a Norfolk Southern spokesman, said the freight-train backlog is a product of "more trains and capacity challenges in the corridor between Chicago and Cleveland" because the freight traffic exceeds what the company handled before the 2008 recession.

"We generally have a cooperative relationship with Amtrak because we are each other's landlords," Mr. Pidgeon said. "We run on their network and they run on ours, so there's plenty of business and personal incentive to keep the cooperation going."

"We want to keep freight and passenger trains moving, period."

One of the busiest pieces of railroad in the entire United States, Norfolk Southern's double-track main has become, to varying degrees, an obstacle course of stopped and slow-moving freight trains.

A particular growth area has been oil shipments from the Bakken oilfields of North Dakota to terminals on the East Coast, rail traffic that simply didn't exist before 2009 but now accounts for dozens of trains through Toledo each week.

#### RAIL EXPANSION

Norfolk Southern is building a third main track between Chesterton and Gary, Ind., a 30-mile section that is the busiest stretch of the region's busiest freight railroad. It includes several major junctions and runs through the heart of one of America's most heavily industrialized areas, the steel mills and a major oil refinery along Lake Michigan's southern shore. Until that third track is ready for use, its construction is impairing train traffic.

When only one track is open for trains, traffic only goes one way while opposing trains wait. The spot where Ms. Smith's train stopped is near the west end of the Chesterton-Gary construction zone. LaPorte, Ind.—where the Chicago-bound Amtrak trains from Toledo have often sat for hours in recent weeks—is near the east end.

And not only have passenger trains to and from Toledo been affected by that problem, so too have Amtrak's five daily round-trip trains between Chicago and Detroit, Grand Rapids, and Port Huron, Mich., which use the same rails west of Chesterton.

The third track in northwest Indiana is one of several capacity-improvement projects under way on Norfolk Southern in the region.

Most prominent among the others is a \$160 million expansion of the Bellevue, Ohio, yard, which will double in size when the project is done later this year, easing congestion at other yards, Mr. Pidgeon said.

That "will ease the demand for space in Elkhart and hopefully significantly reduce transit times for our freight trains, keeping us moving and the network fluid," he said.

Norfolk Southern has 50 new locomotives soon to be delivered and also has bought several hundred used ones in the past year or two to address shortages.

It also is hiring close to 100 new train conductors in the Toledo area and has transferred 120 more from other parts of its system to the Cleveland-Chicago corridor to alleviate crew shortages, Mr. Pidgeon said.

The Ohio Association of Railroad Passengers, an advocacy group, cites another factor in the freight-train delays: An automated dispatching system Norfolk Southern has been introducing on portions of its rail network during the past two years.

The system, called the Auto-Router, is designed to mimic a job human train dispatchers have done for years—deciding which trains run on which tracks at what time. The automated system could supplement that work, allowing the human dispatchers to work larger territories, or eventually it could replace them.

Train dispatching is a job with a lot of variables because freight trains don't all travel at the same speed. Some are long, heavy, and slow; others are short and, ideally, fast.

Hills, track repairs, and certain trains' need to stop at yards along the way to pick up or drop off cars also can factor into how trains are dispatched.

Critics of the system including OARP—also known as All Aboard Ohio—and Norfolk Southern sources who spoke on condition of anonymity because they're not authorized to talk to reporters said the Auto-Router system's flaws are contributing to the railroad's congestion.

#### PASSENGER COMPLAINTS

While Amtrak riders interviewed by The Blade said they understand how the passenger trains are at the freight railroads' mercy, some said the passenger-train operator could handle the situation better, too.

Jean McGraw of Port Clinton, who boarded the Boston-bound Lake Shore in Sandusky in late September to visit a sister in New Hampshire, said she and her travel companion got two emails "in the middle of the night" about train delays but got no updates after that.

And when the bus Ms. McGraw and other Boston-bound passengers rode from Albany got to Boston at 4 a.m. the next day, the station there was locked. The passengers cajoled the bus driver into letting them take shelter in a neighboring bus garage, she said.

"That was it—it was ridiculous," Ms. McGraw said.

As compensation, Amtrak offered vouchers good toward future train travel. Ms. McGraw said she hopes to use hers once the current problems are resolved, but her companion swore off train travel because of the experience.

Untested is whether Norfolk Southern's handling of Amtrak violates a 1973 federal law directing the freight railroads to give the passenger trains preferential handling.

A more recent federal law, passed in 2008, directed the Federal Railroad Administration and Amtrak to develop performance standards for Amtrak trains.

However, a later appellate court ruling stalled this. According to the rail passengers association, Amtrak's overall on-time performance has plummeted since that 2013 ruling, which is the subject of a pending Supreme Court appeal.

Dan McMackin, a United Parcel Service spokesman, said his company has recently changed the train routes it uses to move packages in response to train delays, though he did not confirm that the company specifically removed its cargo from the Norfolk Southern route.

"We have seen some recent lower reliability in several lanes and are adjusting accordingly, with guidance from our rail service partners as to appropriate network corrections," Mr. McMackin said. "While there have been lanes affected over the last several months, we expect long-term reliability to return and most of our adjustments are seen as temporary."

But while UPS may be ready to send packages back to the Cleveland-Toledo-Chicago corridor once Norfolk Southern's problems are resolved, Amtrak could have a harder time winning back Tanya Miller, of Taylor, Mich., one of the riders who boarded the New York-bound train in Toledo on Wednesday morning.

"This is my first time and my very last time taking Amtrak," she said. "I'm not recommending Amtrak to anyone."

[From The Plain Dealer]

SOLUTIONS SOUGHT FOR CHRONIC AMTRAK,  
FREIGHT TRAIN DELAYS IN NORTHERN OHIO  
(By Alison Grant)

CLEVELAND, OH.—Passengers sitting on the tracks one recent morning near an idled Lake Shore Limited train in Cleveland had a lot of time to kill.

Their eastbound train was late getting out of Chicago Union Station and pulled into Cleveland about 3½ hours after its scheduled arrival of 5:35 a.m.

Then a switch problem or a downed power line on the CSX tracks between downtown Cleveland and Collinwood—reports varied—meant another delay of five hours before the Amtrak train pulled out of town.

Ed and Rosemary Sobala, heading home to Buffalo after a train trip to the canyon-lands of Arizona, Utah and Nevada, weren't too surprised.

Not one of the Amtraks on their two-week journey was on time, they said. In fact, not one was less than 5½ hours late. When the Lake Shore Limited was stalled in Cleveland, they were headed home to Buffalo—four hours away by car.

"A number of us riders jokingly referred to an Amtrak schedule as a wish list more than a schedule," Ed Sobala said.

Delays like this—and they're chronic nationwide, including along northern Ohio's east-west corridor, for both Amtrak passenger trains and freight trains—have prompted three of this region's metropolitan planning organizations to set up a rail alliance to work on improving what is the fastest-growing U.S. transportation mode in the 21st century.

"Passenger rail ridership has increased dramatically, but specifically on that corridor," said Grace Gallucci, executive director of the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency, which joined with the Toledo Metropolitan Area Council of Governments and the Erie County Regional Planning Commission to form the Northern Ohio Rail Alliance.

"And the freight railroads are aggressively pursuing increasing their capacity."

Gallucci attributes the increase in passenger rail traffic to economics and demographics—high gas prices, expensive air fares, Millennials more interested in public transportation than their parents.

Four daily passenger trains carry enough passengers to fill a dozen Boeing 737s each

day along the tracks in northern Ohio, according to the advocacy group All Aboard Ohio, and 70 daily freight trains carry about 20,000 truckload equivalents of cargo.

Amtrak's Lake Shore Limited service, from Chicago through Ohio to New York City and Boston, averages 1,100 passengers a day.

One of the rail alliance's first goals is to persuade the Ohio Department of Transportation to release \$938,000 that Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur secured in 2010 for rail planning.

The money was earmarked for ODOT to study high-speed rail, but that project was scrubbed by Gov. John Kasich when he took office. Kasich said high-speed rail was a "money pit" because it would cost the state about \$17 million a year to maintain and operate, with no guarantee enough tickets could be sold to cover the expenses.

The train money has been sitting in ODOT's accounts since.

"The study area has changed many times," agency spokesman Steve Faulkner explained.

"Most recently, folks in northern Ohio changed (it) to include a review of the Cleveland to Toledo route. That's new. For that reason, all interested parties ... must again meet in person to discuss and agree on details of the study plan."

ODOT last week set up a meeting for Oct. 28 to discuss the funding, Gallucci said.

The Northern Ohio Rail Alliance and All Aboard Ohio say redesigning the Amtrak stations in northern Ohio would do a lot to improve rail service. Trains stopping at Cleveland, Elyria and Sandusky can process passengers from only one track of the two-track railway.

That requires trains to "slalom" between tracks, and during the crossover, both tracks at the station are occupied. Opposing rail traffic must stop. The result: At least 80 minutes of delay to the four passenger trains that arrive nightly at each station, and as much or more delay to freight traffic.

The station in Toledo can process passengers from both tracks but only at ground-level walkways not platforms.

Gallucci said rail projects should qualify for money overseen by ODOT's Transportation Review Advisory Council—which typically deals with projects that add capacity to Ohio roads. She said rail station work also should be eligible for money the state is raising for ODOT projects by letting the Ohio Turnpike issue bonds that will be paid off with toll increases.

"We have to get away from this idea that every transportation mode competes against the others," Gallucci said.

Record high oil shipments from the Bakken Fields in the Dakotas to East Coast refineries have added to freight delays, including in Cleveland.

Of the 60 to 90 freight trains that rumble daily through Northeast Ohio on the tracks owned and operated by Norfolk Southern, nine are oil trains. And that's due to grow by another 18 trains in coming months, said Ken Prendergast, All Aboard Ohio executive director.

In September, officials representing agricultural, auto and chemical industries told a Senate committee that widespread delays in freight shipments were affecting an array of industries and forcing some out of business. The Associated Press reported that lawmakers displayed a photo of a giant mound of wheat languishing in North Dakota because farmers couldn't get a railroad company to ship it.

Jonathan Fields and Jacquie Mon, traveling on the Empire Builder from Portland, Oregon to Albany, New York, were delayed five hours in Minot, North Dakota, when their train was put on a siding track while oil trains moved past.

"We thought Amtrak trains had priority to the freight-owned rails if they were within a certain window of time," Mon wrote in an email. "I spent some time Googling the subject and learned about the oil trains, the judge who ruled that it wasn't legal to require the freight trains to give Amtrak priority and that his decision was being appealed."

Then came the hang-up in Cleveland, a stone's throw from FirstEnergy Stadium.

"If there had been a game, we would have had enough time for a leisurely tailgate party, time to settle into our seats and watch the teams warmup, enjoy—more or less—the game, and time for drinks and play-call second guessing after the game," Fields said.

Sobala said he concluded that Amtrak isn't reliable for travelers on firm schedules.

"One couple departed the sleeper car with their luggage during the delay in Cleveland," he said. "They decided to fly to New York because they had an appointment they couldn't miss. I last saw them get in a cab headed for the Cleveland airport."

Ms. KAPTUR. Customers are understandably frustrated. Our region needs customer-convenient hours and passenger-friendly arrivals and departures. Our Great Lakes Region needs a capital investment plan, too, for passenger service. We need evaluation for State-supported routes. Our region needs expedited attention, methodology development, and service planning to remedy growing congestion inefficiencies that benefit no one, not the freight lines, not the passenger service, and surely not the communities they are supposed to serve—nor connectivity to inner city passenger rail service.

I appreciate the efforts of Chairman SHUSTER and of Ranking Member DEFazio, as well as of Subcommittee Chair DENHAM and Ranking Member CAPUANO, in working together to produce this bill.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. I ask that our vast Midwest industrial heartland region not be excluded for alternative passenger rail service pilot programs, opportunities for rail investment, station improvements, and historic preservation, nor for public-private partnerships that can advance modern passenger rail in this vital corridor of our country.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, and I urge the adoption of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM). He is one of the principal authors of this piece of legislation, the gentleman who did yeoman's work on



this bill and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of talk about bipartisanship in this body. Oftentimes, a bill will come to the floor, and you may hope that one party or the other might throw some votes your way or that you might get some last-minute votes. True bipartisanship is what has happened on this committee.

I, Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, and Ranking Member CAPUANO have worked together to not only form a bipartisan bill but to actually educate every one of our Members. We want to talk to Members of both parties and now of even both Houses to make sure that we are actually reforming something that is going to create not only a more efficient system but create American jobs.

I want to thank each of those individuals for their willingness not only to work together but to work hard. It takes a lot of time to set up separate meetings with every single one of your colleagues in order to explain all of the intricacies on such a large bill. In this case, we have done that. We saw bipartisan and unanimous support first out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee last year and now, this year, again, unanimous support out of the Rules Committee on a bill for which we get real structural reform.

After 35 years, this splits off the Northeast corridor. So, if you are riding the train on the Northeast corridor, your profits—the money that each rider is spending—will actually go back to fixing your rail. We make sure that you are upgrading the infrastructure, that you are creating jobs, and that you are creating a more efficient Amtrak. That is something the riders on the Northeast corridor should be proud of, and it should be a lesson for every other corridor across the country—that you get to keep your profits and improve your infrastructure and actually have greater ridership numbers in the process.

Amtrak has made some great strides. In this bill, we are cutting our authorizations by 40 percent. I think it is a great opportunity to actually highlight some of the successes that they have had but to also demand more.

This also defunds high-speed rail. We want to make sure that what is happening in California does not happen in the rest of the country. Where you have great rail projects going with higher speed—with high-speed moving into New York and Florida—we want to make sure that we don't have the same challenges that are plaguing California's high-speed rail, which has tripled in price.

We also have other conservative issues in here that will get rid of waste. That includes the food and beverage losses that we see year after year. We

want to make sure that Amtrak is moving in the right direction to eliminate those losses.

□ 1300

This builds American infrastructure and creates jobs to fix century-old infrastructure problems. It unlocks the RRIF program, a program which has billions of dollars in it, yet every year when you are going to upgrade your infrastructure when you have a new project, this is one of the least areas that you want to work in because RRIF is so much of a challenge.

There are long timelines, long approval processes. If you are going to invest in something, you want to know: Am I going to win out this loan application, or is it something that is going to actually hinder or slow down our project?

We want to streamline that. We want to have those who need the access to capital that are going to improve our infrastructure to actually have the benefits of that program.

This introduces competition and leverages the private sector to reduce the Amtrak subsidies and actually use the stations to be more profitable. Amtrak has stations in many key cities that can be utilized to increase profits from everything from the restaurants and shopping that they have, but to also be able to advertise in those stations. And advertise on the right-of-way, the right of way that Amtrak has to be able to use billboards, set up cell sites. There is so much more profitability that we can have by having Amtrak as a partner.

I just want to touch on a couple of final issues.

One of the challenges that freight rails have is the red tape they have to go through on the environmental process and on the historical review process. In this reform bill, we are not saying that you don't have to go through that process; we are just saying that we are going to streamline it so you can go through it quickly. There ought to be timelines. You ought to be able to meet timelines so you can plan your infrastructure and you can plan those jobs so you can actually move America forward and move our rail forward at the same time.

This also empowers States. We have taken this reform bill to the next level. We reformed the State routes last PRIIA bill. We are doing it again this time to empower States to have more control over their routes. If a train is going to come through their district or their State, they ought to have some input on not only whether or not it is going to stop, but also increasing ridership in that process. They ought to have some skin in the game, and this allows them to do that.

One area that I want to mention that I think has created more bipartisan ship than anything else in this bill, and

somebody else that should receive some recognition is actually my dog, Lilly, who will now be able to ride on the train.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DENHAM. If you are on the Northeast corridor and you have never ridden the rail before because you have a pet that you either have to leave at home or a pet that you are going to drive because of, you will now have the opportunity to ride on Amtrak—not only in the Northeast corridor, but all across the country. This is something that we have had pet owners reach out to us on from every different State asking that they actually be able to do this.

I can take my dog back and forth to California on the airplane. I pay an additional fee to do that, but it is something that provides me the ability to be able to travel with my pet. Why wouldn't we do that same thing on Amtrak?

If Amtrak is looking for more riders, if they are looking for greater revenue, why wouldn't they be able to compete in this one more area with our airlines? I mean, this is a commonsense opportunity for those who want to take rail to actually be able to travel with their pet. I would like to say that it has been something that has not only helped us build a path, but brought on greater bipartisanship.

This bill has taken a lot of work. I appreciate the chairman's work and the ranking member's work on this. It has been a great bipartisan effort. I am looking forward to its passage today.

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the Amtrak reauthorization before us today speaks volumes for the chairman and ranking member of our committee. It is the first Amtrak bill on the floor since 2008. It is a bipartisan bill. But, it also speaks volumes that Amtrak has performed so well without additional revenue.

This bill leaves Amtrak at about level funding, just a tiny bit more. When we call Amtrak "America's railroad," that is not a metaphor, Mr. Chairman. All of its stock is owned by the Department of Transportation. The reason for that is that the private sector in the 1970s found running a railroad to be a money-losing proposition and asked the Federal Government to take over Amtrak.

Amtrak, of course, is a fiction. It is structured as a private company. But like every railroad in the world, it is either subsidized by the government or the public cannot afford to ride. The bill has almost no new funding, but even without new funding, Amtrak has already scored great points.

Amtrak has essentially overseen the revival of train travel in the United States of America, and it has done so in a way that the government can take almost no credit for. For example, ticket revenue was \$1.5 billion in 2005; then we go 5 years later to 2010, it is \$1.8 billion; and today, it is \$2.1 billion. Yet the average ticket has increased only \$5 every 5 years over that period of time. Amtrak knows what the market is about, and it has grown based on volume, not revenue. The railroad has seen phenomenal growth in passengers, reaching records as high as its highest record in 1988, when the equipment was much newer.

An important measure of efficiency is simply the number of seats filled. More Amtrak seats are filled today than at any time. Its on-time performance is above 80 percent, and that is amazing when you consider that Amtrak does not own most of the tracks it runs over. They are owned by the freight companies. The first cause of delay, frequent freight traffic. The second cause of delay, reduced speed needed for maintenance.

Amtrak has shown it knows how to run a railroad, and to run a railroad on time, but Amtrak needs to be able to run a 21st century railroad.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. NORTON. Until the Federal Government owns up to investing more in the railroad that we own, Amtrak will be running a 20th century railroad—or is it a 19th century railroad, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I really appreciate Chairman DENHAM coming up and talking about some of the important reforms in this bill. I want to add to that.

One of the key things we do in this bill is we are empowering the States. There are 19 States and 21 State-supported lines. I just look to Pennsylvania. I think they are a prime example of what happens when States work together with Amtrak.

Again, this bill, for my colleagues, especially on my side of the aisle who I hope are listening to this debate, we are going to empower those States to have equal say with Amtrak when you are investing dollars in these various lines around the country. An example is the Keystone line in Pennsylvania from Harrisburg to Philadelphia.

Several years ago, the State of Pennsylvania and Amtrak each invested \$100 million into that line. They decreased the travel time by about 20 minutes from Philadelphia to Harrisburg and Harrisburg to Philadelphia. They increased their reliability, and the ridership over the last several years has gone up almost 80 percent. This year, this first quarter, they are

projecting they are going to make a profit on that line. That is exactly the kind of example that we in Congress need to look to.

My friends on both sides of the aisle, we can have a better Amtrak if we do things more businesslike. The reforms that are in this bill are significant.

To name just a few of the lines that are State-supported:

The Heartland Flyer in Texas. And Texas right now is investing private dollars into rail. These lines that are State sponsored, it is going to help them develop these lines. Environmental reviews, streamlining the review process, that is going to help Texas when those dollars are invested.

If you look at to the Sacramento to San Francisco corridor, another State-sponsored line, when Amtrak and California get together, they can make improvements on that line to help the movement of people in that corridor.

Going to Virginia and Washington—Lynchburg, Newport News, Norfolk, and Richmond, Virginia, the State of Virginia and Amtrak can come together and make those investments. That is one of the fastest growing corridors in America. I know the folks who represent Norfolk and southern Virginia and Washington, D.C., a growing area, passenger rail is essential.

Another corridor is Raleigh, North Carolina, the technology corridor there in Raleigh connecting to the largest city in the Carolinas, Charlotte. Again, it is a State-sponsored line. It is going to give North Carolina the ability to work with Amtrak, to have power when they make those investments to upgrade those lines.

Again, there are 21 corridors in 19 States. This is really important. Some of our fast-growing Southern States, look at this bill. This bill empowers the States. It has the reforms. I believe that all Members should be able to support this as real reform and improving Amtrak.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, let me thank Chairman SHUSTER and the ranking member for their leadership and hard work in bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

I know that both sides had other provisions that they wanted included in the bill. I personally wanted to include much more funding for Amtrak, but in the tradition of our committee, we compromised and developed a bill that ensures that our Nation's passenger

rail system has an opportunity to thrive.

This legislation maintains long-distance routes, protects hardworking Amtrak employees, invests in the Northeast corridor, promotes minority opportunities in rail, improves access to the RRIF loan program, and takes another step forward in restoring passenger rail service to the Gulf States.

As more and more Americans turn to rail as their preferred mode of transportation, Amtrak is building the infrastructure and organization to meet this demand. Amtrak carried a record number of 31.6 million passengers in 2013. Their ridership has been growing across the system for over a decade, with last year's ridership numbers being the largest in history. Currently, they serve more than 500 destinations in 46 States and provide the only public transportation option for millions of rural Americans.

Let me repeat that. Currently, they serve more than 500 destinations in 46 States, and provide the only public transportation options for millions of rural Americans.

Amtrak has increased revenue, reduced debt, implemented new passenger service, improved their infrastructure, and purchased train sets that are being built in America with 100 percent American-made parts.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Amtrak reduces congestion, improves our energy independence, and it plays a vital role in emergency preparedness and recovery, as it did in the 9/11 bombings and Hurricane Katrina.

There is no perfect bill, but this is a perfect start, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation. Let's keep Amtrak moving forward.

As I close, I just want to be clear: I support this bill. I ask all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on Amtrak and move it forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I appreciate the hard work that went into this important legislation to ensure passenger rail service remains a viable option for travelers across the country. In particular, as a pet lover, I am very happy to see the language based on Chairman DENHAM's Pets on Trains legislation, which I am cosponsor of. But I do have concerns that the bill we are going to pass today doesn't set us on a course for building out services to parts of the country that do not now have access to passenger rail.

I represent Las Vegas, which welcomes more than 42 million people

from around the world to our world-class resorts, casinos, restaurants, shopping, shows, et cetera. More and more of these visitors are coming from Asia and Europe, where rail services are accessible and efficient.

□ 1315

Unfortunately, the last Amtrak train to service Las Vegas departed from the station on Glitter Gulch behind the Union Plaza in May of 1977.

Over the past 18 years, Las Vegas has continued its transformation into the premier international tourist destination. Since the trains stopped running, nearly a million more residents now call southern Nevada home and 10 million more people come to Las Vegas for work and play every year. This growth has put an enormous strain on our highways and airports.

While I will be supporting this legislation, I do hope, as the body advances further policies regarding passenger rail, we recognize the need to build out rail services to communities like Las Vegas, not just maintain the current system.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman doesn't have any additional speakers, so I am prepared to close if he is ready to close.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I echo everything that has been said. This bill is pretty good, and it deserves our support. I am looking forward to voting "yes" on this bill, and I am looking forward to getting it passed through the Senate.

I actually say, considering what is going on in Congress here now, this bill is my idea of a perfect situation. We didn't get everything we wanted; they didn't get everything some of their Members wanted, yet we are moving forward.

I congratulate the chairman and my ranking member, Mr. DEFAZIO, for being, in my opinion, the perfect type of Member of Congress: someone who knows what they want but also knows how to compromise to move a bill forward.

I am honored to be here today. I am honored to be working with such fine people.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SHUSTER. How much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHUSTER. I don't think I will use it all. I am sure any of my colleagues watching on TV are hoping I don't use it all also.

I want to close by just emphasizing again that this is truly a reform bill that was crafted in a bipartisan basis. There is significant reforms in here. It is going to make Amtrak more transparent. They are going to force these metrics to measure like businesses do. They haven't done that for the 40 years or so they have been in existence.

We have significant environmental streamlining, which not only benefits Amtrak projects, but it is going to benefit the freight rails, as they spend 18 percent of their revenues—almost \$30 billion—that they will invest across the class I railroads to go into their infrastructure, which is incredibly important to movement of freight in this country and having an efficient economy.

The bill also breaks out Amtrak into business lines, leaving the profits on the Northeast corridor—and the other profits on other corridors—but that is the biggest corridor, that is the one that makes money, leaving it there to invest in that corridor.

By the way, as they reinvest those dollars, we can learn from what is happening on the Northeast corridor because there are corridors around this country that need to be developed because of the growing population. That is why we empower the States on those 21 State-sponsored lines.

On those 21 lines, States are going to have more power, more say—equal say, I will say—with Amtrak. As Texas develops their corridors down there, they are going to work with Amtrak—the North Carolina lines; the Virginia lines that run to Washington, D.C., and other places in Virginia; and California. Those State-sponsored lines are going to have the ability to make those investments with Amtrak to improve those lines.

I just want to talk again about the Keystone line because I think that is really a prime example of what can happen on a corridor when the State and Amtrak work together. Ridership is up almost 80 percent over the past several years. They are going to be projecting a profit in the first quarter this year, which is the first time in history.

When you do those kind of reforms, when you have transparency, when you give States power, when you streamline the environmental review process, those are the kind of good things that can happen.

Again, this is not perfect. Amtrak is not perfect, but we are moving the ball in the right direction. We are moving the ball so that we can see a better Amtrak and improved passenger rail.

I truly believe that you need passenger rail in this country, especially in some of these corridors—10, 11 corridors around this Nation where populations are growing. The population of the United States is growing, and we see the prime example of the Northeast corridor, 18 percent of the population on 3 percent of the land mass. They have to have passenger rail.

There are about 11 million riders, almost 12 million riders on Amtrak, but there are 250 million people that connect to Amtrak through the transit systems in the Northeast corridor. It is an incredible link that needs to be maintained, needs to be improved; and this bill, I believe, does that.

I would encourage all my Members to come to the floor today and vote in favor of this truly reform bill that will make Amtrak better and drive down what the Federal Government puts into that system. I think this bill does that. Again, I encourage the support of H.R. 749.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Chair, nearly two centuries ago we began to utilize rail for moving freight and people around our great nation. This technological leap helped to greatly expand our economy and bring together our vast continental nation.

Today, passenger rail still plays a key role in connecting population centers and moving people to their places of work. It is vital that we continue to find new ways to improve and modernize our infrastructure to meet the demands of the modern world.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines and Hazardous Materials of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee I am proud to support this important legislation because it will help to accomplish this important goal.

The Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act will assist in advancing large infrastructure projects through new partnerships with the private sector and states including giving states a greater role in managing routes.

It will more quickly advance those projects through streamlining the environmental processes, and it increases transparency for Amtrak which will require it to operate in a more businesslike manner.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation to give our nation a stronger and more vital passenger rail system.

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act. This is good, bipartisan legislation that will strengthen our nation's passenger rail system and create American jobs. My district in New Jersey sits along the Northeast Corridor, the busiest corridor in the Nation. In 2014, the Northeast Corridor saw a ridership of 11.6 million; its highest ridership year on record.

As ridership continues to grow, the necessity to invest in rail infrastructure becomes more vital. I am pleased that this bill will provide 1.9 billion dollars for capital improvements along the Northeast Corridor. This money will assist states with the opportunity to grow their passenger rail services, which in turn will help provide more affordable transportation options.

I am a strong supporter of the Buy America provisions that will ensure that American rail is built with American iron and steel. In addition to providing the capital and resources needed to bring the American rail system into the 21st Century, this legislation will help meet the growing demand for more cost-efficient and environmentally friendly means of transportation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support for high-speed rail service along the Northeast Corridor with stops in Connecticut. High-speed rail service provides a fast, safe, and reliable transportation alternative for passengers. Expanding

high-speed rail in Connecticut would go a long way in alleviating highway congestion and promoting faster travel within and through the state. In addition, high-speed rail along the Northeast Corridor would create new jobs, boost manufacturing, and bolster America's competitiveness in our global economy. Not including a stop for Connecticut in a study on high-speed rail along the Northeast Corridor is a serious mistake, and I stand firmly against any proposal that excludes Connecticut.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-9. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 749

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

#### TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 101. Authorization for Amtrak.

Sec. 102. Authorization for Amtrak Office of the Inspector General.

Sec. 103. National infrastructure investments.

Sec. 104. Northeast Corridor.

#### TITLE II—AMTRAK REFORM

Sec. 201. Amtrak planning and grant process.

Sec. 202. 5-Year capital and operating plan.

Sec. 203. State-supported routes.

Sec. 204. Route and service planning decisions.

Sec. 205. Competition.

Sec. 206. Food and beverage reform.

Sec. 207. Right of way leveraging.

Sec. 208. Station development.

Sec. 209. Amtrak debt.

Sec. 210. Amtrak pilot program for passengers transporting domesticated cats and dogs.

Sec. 211. Amtrak boarding procedures.

#### TITLE III—INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL POLICY

Sec. 301. Federal-State partnership for Northeast Corridor development and improvement.

Sec. 302. RRIF improvements.

Sec. 303. NEC fast forward.

Sec. 304. Large capital project requirements.

Sec. 305. Small business participation study.

Sec. 306. Gulf Coast rail service working group.

Sec. 307. Miscellaneous.

#### TITLE IV—PROJECT DELIVERY

Sec. 401. Project delivery rulemaking.

Sec. 402. Historic preservation of railroads.

#### TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 501. Definition.

Sec. 502. Title 49 definitions.

#### TITLE I—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

##### SEC. 101. AUTHORIZATION FOR AMTRAK.

(a) **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT FUND.**—There are authorized to be appropriated

to the Secretary for the use of Amtrak for deposit into the Northeast Corridor Improvement Fund account established under section 24319(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code (as added by section 201 of this Act), the following amounts:

(1) For fiscal year 2016, \$439,000,000.

(2) For fiscal year 2017, \$464,000,000.

(3) For fiscal year 2018, \$480,000,000.

(4) For fiscal year 2019, \$498,000,000.

(b) **NATIONAL NETWORK.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the use of Amtrak for deposit into the National Network account established under section 24319(a)(2) of title 49, United States Code (as added by section 201 of this Act), the following amounts:

(1) For fiscal year 2016, \$973,000,000.

(2) For fiscal year 2017, \$974,000,000.

(3) For fiscal year 2018, \$985,000,000.

(4) For fiscal year 2019, \$997,000,000.

(c) **PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT.**—The Secretary may withhold up to \$2,000,000 of the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (a), and up to \$2,000,000 of the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (b), for the costs of management oversight of Amtrak.

##### SEC. 102. AUTHORIZATION FOR AMTRAK OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the Office of the Inspector General of Amtrak the following amounts:

(1) For fiscal year 2016, \$23,000,000.

(2) For fiscal year 2017, \$24,000,000.

(3) For fiscal year 2018, \$24,000,000.

(4) For fiscal year 2019, \$25,000,000.

##### SEC. 103. NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for capital grants under chapter 244 of title 49, United States Code, and section 20154 of title 49, United States Code, the following amounts:

(1) For fiscal year 2016, \$300,000,000.

(2) For fiscal year 2017, \$300,000,000.

(3) For fiscal year 2018, \$300,000,000.

(4) For fiscal year 2019, \$300,000,000.

(b) **FEDERAL-STATE PARTNERSHIP FOR NORTHEAST CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT.**—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a), 50 percent for each fiscal year shall be available for carrying out section 24407 of title 49, United States Code, as added by section 301 of this Act.

(c) **PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT.**—The Secretary may withhold up to ½ of 1 percent of amounts appropriated pursuant to chapter 244 of title 49, United States Code, for the costs of project management oversight of capital projects carried out pursuant to such chapter.

##### SEC. 104. NORTHEAST CORRIDOR.

For purposes of this title, the term “Northeast Corridor” means the Northeast Corridor main line between Boston, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia, and facilities and services used to operate and maintain that line.

#### TITLE II—AMTRAK REFORM

##### SEC. 201. AMTRAK PLANNING AND GRANT PROCESS.

(a) **REQUIREMENTS AND PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **AMENDMENT.**—Chapter 243 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new sections:

##### “§24317. Costs and revenues

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, Amtrak shall establish and maintain internal controls to ensure Amtrak's costs and revenues are allocated to either the Northeast Corridor or the National Network, including proportional shares of common and fixed costs.

“(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘Northeast Corridor’ means the

Northeast Corridor main line between Boston, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia, and facilities and services used to operate and maintain that line.

##### “§24318. Grant process

“(a) **PROCEDURES FOR GRANT REQUESTS.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, the Secretary of Transportation shall establish and transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate substantive and procedural requirements, including schedules, for grant requests under this section.

“(b) **GRANT REQUESTS.**—Amtrak shall transmit grant requests for Federal funds to be appropriated to the Secretary for the use of Amtrak to—

“(1) the Secretary; and

“(2) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

“(c) **CONTENTS.**—A grant request under subsection (b) shall—

“(1) provide a detailed financial analysis for the upcoming fiscal year for the Northeast Corridor, State-supported routes, and long-distance routes, including projections for the items listed in 24320(c)(1), as applicable, in comparison to prior fiscal year projections;

“(2) include a description of the work to be funded, along with cost estimates and an estimated timetable for completion of the projects covered by the request;

“(3) include an assessment of the continuing financial stability of Amtrak;

“(4) be displayed on Amtrak's website within a reasonable timeframe following its submission to the entities described in subsection (b); and

“(5) be in similar format and substance to those submitted by executive agencies of the Federal Government.

“(d) **REVIEW AND APPROVAL.**—

“(1) **30-DAY APPROVAL PROCESS.**—The Secretary shall complete the review of a grant request and approve or disapprove the request not later than 30 days after the date on which Amtrak submits the grant request. If the Secretary disapproves the request or determines that the request is incomplete or deficient, the Secretary shall include the reason for disapproval or the incomplete items or deficiencies in a notice to Amtrak.

“(2) **15-DAY MODIFICATION PERIOD.**—Not later than 15 days after receiving notification from the Secretary under paragraph (1), Amtrak shall submit a modified request for the Secretary's review.

“(3) **REVISED REQUESTS.**—Not later than 15 days after receiving a modified request from Amtrak, the Secretary shall either approve the modified request, or, if the Secretary finds that the request is still incomplete or deficient, the Secretary shall identify in writing to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate the remaining deficiencies and recommend a process for resolving the outstanding portions of the request.

“(e) **PAYMENT TO AMTRAK.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), in each fiscal year for which amounts are authorized to be appropriated, amounts appropriated shall be paid to Amtrak as follows:

“(A) 50 percent on October 1.

“(B) 25 percent on January 1.

“(C) 25 percent on April 1.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may make a payment to Amtrak of appropriated funds more frequently than once every 90 days if Amtrak, for good cause, requests more frequent payment before a 90-day period ends.

“(f) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS AND EARLY APPROPRIATIONS.—Amounts appropriated to the Secretary for the use of Amtrak shall remain available until expended. Amounts for capital acquisitions and improvements may be appropriated for a fiscal year before the fiscal year in which the amounts will be obligated.

“(g) LIMITATIONS ON USE.—Amounts appropriated to the Secretary for the use of Amtrak may not be used to subsidize operating losses of commuter rail passenger or rail freight transportation.

#### “§24319. Accounts

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF ACCOUNTS.—Amtrak shall establish—

“(1) a Northeast Corridor Improvement Fund account; and

“(2) a National Network account.

“(b) NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT FUND ACCOUNT.—

“(1) DEPOSITS.—Amtrak shall deposit in the Northeast Corridor Improvement Fund account established under subsection (a)(1)—

“(A) grant funds appropriated for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Fund pursuant to section 101(a) of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015 or any subsequent Act;

“(B) compensation received from commuter rail passenger transportation on the Northeast Corridor provided to Amtrak pursuant to section 24905(c); and

“(C) any operating surplus of the Northeast Corridor, as allocated pursuant to section 24317.

“(2) USE OF NORTHEAST CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT FUND ACCOUNT.—Except as provided in subsection (d), amounts deposited in the Northeast Corridor Improvement Fund account shall be made available for the use of Amtrak for—

“(A) capital projects described in section 24401(2) (A) or (B) to bring the Northeast Corridor to a state-of-good-repair, including projects described in section 24911(a)(2)(E)(i)(I);

“(B) capital projects intended to increase corridor capacity, improve service reliability, and reduce travel time for rail users on the Northeast Corridor, including projects described in subclauses (II) and (III) of section 24911(a)(2)(E)(i), consistent with the planning process established under section 24911; and

“(C) retirement of principal and payment of interest on loans for capital equipment, or capital leases, attributable to the Northeast Corridor.

“(c) NATIONAL NETWORK ACCOUNT.—

“(1) DEPOSITS.—Amtrak shall deposit in the account established under subsection (a)(2)—

“(A) grant funds appropriated for the National Network pursuant to section 101(b) of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, or any subsequent Act;

“(B) compensation received from States provided to Amtrak pursuant to section 209 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 24101 note); and

“(C) any operating surplus from the National Network, as allocated pursuant to section 24317.

“(2) USE OF NATIONAL NETWORK ACCOUNT.—Except as provided in subsection (d), amounts deposited in the National Network account shall be made available for the use of Amtrak for capital expenses and operating costs of the National Network and retirement of principal and payment of interest on loans for capital equipment, or capital leases, attributable to the National Network.

“(d) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—Amtrak may transfer any funds appropriated pursuant to the Passenger

Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015 or any other Act, or any surplus generated by operations, between the Northeast Corridor Improvement Fund and National Network accounts upon the expiration of 60 days after Amtrak has notified the Amtrak Board of Directors of such transfer.

“(2) REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after the Amtrak Board of Directors receives notification from Amtrak under paragraph (1), the Board shall transmit a report to the Secretary, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, that includes—

“(A) the amount of the transfer; and

“(B) a detailed explanation of the reason for the transfer, including effects on Amtrak services if no transfer were made.

“(e) LETTERS OF INTENT.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary shall issue a letter of intent to Amtrak announcing an intention to obligate, for a major capital project described in subclauses (II) and (III) of section 24911(a)(2)(E)(i), an amount from future available budget authority specified in law that is not more than the amount stipulated as the financial participation of the Secretary in the project.

“(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—At least 30 days before issuing a letter under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify in writing the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, of the proposed letter. The Secretary shall include with the notification a copy of the proposed letter, the criteria used for selecting the project for a grant award, and a description of how the project meets criteria of this section.

“(3) CONTINGENT NATURE OF OBLIGATION OR COMMITMENT.—An obligation or administrative commitment may be made only when amounts are appropriated. The letter of intent shall state that the contingent commitment is not an obligation of the Federal Government, and is subject to the availability of appropriations under Federal law and to Federal laws in force or enacted after the date of the contingent commitment.

“(f) ROLLING STOCK PURCHASES.—Prior to entering into contracts in excess of \$100,000,000 for rolling stock procurements, Amtrak shall submit a business case analysis to the Secretary, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, on the utility of such purchase. This analysis shall—

“(1) include a cost and benefit comparison that describes the total lifecycle costs and the anticipated benefits related to revenue, operational efficiency, reliability, and other factors;

“(2) set forth the total payments by fiscal year;

“(3) identify the specific source and amounts of funding for each payment, including Federal funds, State funds, Amtrak profits, Federal, State, or private loans or loan guarantees, and other funding;

“(4) include whether any payment under the contract will increase Amtrak's grant request, as required under section 24318, in that particular fiscal year; and

“(5) describe how Amtrak will adjust the procurement if future funding is not available.”

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 243 of title 49,

United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new items:

“24317. Costs and revenues.

“24318. Grant process.

“24319. Accounts.”

(b) NORTHEAST CORRIDOR PLANNING.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Chapter 249 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### “§24911. Northeast Corridor planning

“(a) NORTHEAST CORRIDOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT PLAN.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, and annually thereafter, the Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission established under section 24905 (referred to in this section as the ‘Commission’) shall develop a capital investment plan for the Northeast Corridor main line between Boston, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia, and the Northeast Corridor branch lines connecting to Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Springfield, Massachusetts, and Spuyten Duyvil, New York, and facilities and services used to operate and maintain those lines.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each such plan shall—

“(A) be developed to establish a coordinated approach to capital spending on the Northeast Corridor;

“(B) cover a period of 5 fiscal years, beginning with the first fiscal year after the date of the plan;

“(C) notwithstanding section 24902(b), prioritize projects and investments along the Northeast Corridor based on—

“(i) the anticipated benefits and costs of projects;

“(ii) the anticipated Federal and non-Federal funding available; and

“(iii) the information contained in the Northeast Corridor asset management plans required under subsection (b), once available;

“(D) ensure coordination and optimization across the entire Northeast Corridor and among the various owners and users;

“(E) include a financial plan for the investment period that—

“(i) categorizes each capital project as being primarily associated with—

“(I) normalized capital replacement;

“(II) replacement, rehabilitation, or repair of Northeast Corridor infrastructure assets, including tunnels, bridges, stations, and other assets; or

“(III) improvement of train performance on the Northeast Corridor, including reduced trip times, increased train frequencies, higher operating speeds, and other improvements;

“(ii) identifies the anticipated funding source and financing method for each capital project described in subclauses (II) and (III) of clause (i);

“(iii) describes the anticipated outcomes of each project, including—

“(I) an assessment of the potential effect on passenger accessibility, operations, safety, reliability, and resiliency, and on the ability of infrastructure owners and operators to meet regulatory requirements should the project not be funded; and

“(II) an assessment of the benefits and costs;

“(iv) identifies the extent to which the capital assets are or will be jointly used by intercity passenger rail service and other users, and the proportionate share of that joint usage; and

“(v) for projects that are expected to be fully or partially funded through Federal financial assistance, identifies the most appropriate public agency or entity to receive those funds and implement each capital project.

“(3) ADDITIONAL CONTENTS.—Any plan developed under paragraph (1) after the publication

by the Secretary of Transportation of the Northeast Corridor service development plan shall also—

“(A) be developed to identify, prioritize, and phase the implementation of projects necessary to achieve the goals and findings contained in such Northeast Corridor service development plan;

“(B) allow for flexibility to change prioritization and programs based upon the availability of Federal and non-Federal funding;

“(C) inform the Secretary in developing recommendations for Congress on Federal funding needs for the Northeast Corridor and any corresponding Federal investments in the respective capital programs for Northeast Corridor infrastructure owners and users; and

“(D) capture the network-level anticipated outcomes associated with plan implementation, including the anticipated effect on passenger accessibility, operations, safety, reliability, and resiliency.

“(b) **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR ASSET MANAGEMENT PLANS.**—

“(1) **CONTENTS.**—Amtrak, and States and public transportation entities that own infrastructure that supports or provides for intercity rail passenger transportation on the Northeast Corridor, shall develop and update as necessary Northeast Corridor asset management plans for the Northeast Corridor main line between Boston, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia, and the Northeast Corridor branch lines connecting to Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Springfield, Massachusetts, and Spuyten Duyvil, New York, and facilities and services used to operate and maintain those lines, that—

“(A) are consistent with the Federal Transit Administration process, as authorized under section 5326, when implemented; and

“(B) include, at a minimum—

“(i) an inventory of all capital assets owned by the developer of the plan;

“(ii) an assessment of the condition of each of those assets;

“(iii) a description of how the condition of each asset has changed since the previous iteration of the plan; and

“(iv) a description of the necessary resources and processes for bringing or maintaining those assets in a state-of-good repair, including decision support tools and investment prioritization methodologies.

“(2) **TRANSMITTAL TO COMMISSION.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, each entity described in paragraph (1) shall transmit to the Commission a plan developed under paragraph (1). Any updates to such plan shall also be transmitted to the Commission.

“(c) **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PLAN UPDATES.**—The Commission shall, at least once every 10 years, update the Northeast Corridor service development plan.”

(2) **TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 249 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“24911. Northeast Corridor planning.”

(c) **REPEALS.**—The following provisions are repealed:

(1) Sections 206 and 211 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008, and the items relating thereto in the table of contents of such Act.

(2) Section 24104 of title 49, United States Code, and the item relating thereto in the table of sections for chapter 241 of such title.

## SEC. 202. 5-YEAR CAPITAL AND OPERATING PLAN.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Chapter 243 of title 49, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

### “§24320. 5-Year capital and operating plan

“(a) **PLAN.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of an Act appropriating funds pursuant to section 101 of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, or any subsequent authorization of appropriations for the same purposes, the Amtrak Board of Directors shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a 5-year capital and operating plan for the Northeast Corridor and National Network.

“(b) **CONSULTATION.**—Each such plan shall be prepared in consultation with—

“(1) the Federal Railroad Administration;

“(2) the Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission, with respect to the Northeast Corridor; and

“(3) the requisite States, with respect to the National Network.

“(c) **CONTENTS.**—A plan prepared under this section shall—

“(1) for each of the Northeast Corridor and the National Network, include—

“(A) projected revenues and expenditures for the Northeast Corridor, State-supported routes, long-distance routes, and corporate development, including Federal and non-Federal funding sources;

“(B) projected ridership levels for the Northeast Corridor, State-supported routes, and long-distance routes;

“(C) projected capital and operational funding requirements necessary to maintain passenger service in order to accommodate predicted ridership levels and predicted sources of Federal and non-Federal funding;

“(D) projected capital and operating requirements, ridership, revenue, and expenditures for new passenger service operations or service expansions;

“(E) an assessment of the continuing financial stability of Amtrak, as indicated by factors including anticipated Federal funding of capital and operating costs, Amtrak's ability to efficiently recruit, retain, and manage its workforce, and Amtrak's ability to effectively provide passenger rail service;

“(F) estimates of long-term and short-term debt and associated principal and interest payments (both current and anticipated);

“(G) annual cash flow forecasts;

“(H) a statement describing methods of estimation and significant assumptions;

“(I) specific measures that demonstrate measurable improvement year over year in the financial results of Amtrak's operations;

“(J) prior fiscal year and projected—

“(i) operating ratio, cash operating loss, and cash operating loss per passenger on a route, business line, and corporate basis;

“(ii) specific costs and savings estimates resulting from reform initiatives;

“(iii) productivity statistics on a route, business line, and corporate basis; and

“(iv) equipment reliability statistics;

“(K) capital and operating expenditures for anticipated security needs; and

“(L) a prioritization of capital expenditures by business line; and

“(2) reflect the Northeast Corridor planning, as applicable, and grant processes established under sections 24911 and 24318.

“(d) **CONFORMANCE TO AUTHORIZED FUNDING LEVELS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any financial projection for a fiscal year that is included in a plan prepared under this section shall be based on the amount of dedicated funding for such fiscal year.

“(2) **ABSENCE OF APPROPRIATION.**—In the absence of an appropriation of funds for such fis-

cal year, the projection shall be based on the amount of funds authorized by law to be appropriated for that fiscal year, plus other dedicated funding.

“(3) **DEDICATED FUNDING DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘dedicated funding’ means any amounts appropriated for a fiscal year and any other funding sources, including revenues and other ancillary funding streams, for the Northeast Corridor or the National Network.

“(e) **STANDARDS TO PROMOTE FINANCIAL STABILITY.**—In preparing a plan under this section, the Board shall apply sound budgetary practices, including reducing costs and other expenditures, improving productivity, increasing revenues, or combinations of such practices.

“(f) **UPDATES.**—Amtrak shall provide monthly reports for the current fiscal year in electronic format to the Secretary and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate regarding the items described in subsection (c)(1), which shall include a description of the work completed to date, any differences from projections, and the reasons for such differences.”

(b) **TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for such chapter 243 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“24320. 5-Year capital and operating plan.”

(c) **REPEAL.**—Section 204 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 24101 note), and the item relating thereto in the table of contents of such Act, are repealed.

## SEC. 203. STATE-SUPPORTED ROUTES.

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Chapter 247 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

### “§24712. State-supported routes

“(a) **STATE-SUPPORTED ROUTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, the Secretary of Transportation shall establish a State-Supported Route Advisory Committee to promote mutual cooperation and planning pertaining to the rail operations and related activities of trains operated on State-supported routes and to further implement section 209 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 24101 note).

“(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Committee shall consist of representatives of—

“(A) Amtrak;

“(B) the Department of Transportation, including the Federal Railroad Administration; and

“(C) 7 States that sponsor State-supported routes, selected by the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration on the basis of appropriate expertise and geographic balance, and in a manner that ensures that all appropriate States are represented periodically on the Committee.

“(3) **DISTRIBUTION OF MEMBERSHIP.**—The membership belonging to any of the groups described in each individual subparagraph of paragraph (2) shall not constitute a majority of the Committee's memberships.

“(4) **MEETINGS; RULES AND PROCEDURES.**—The Committee shall establish a schedule and location for convening meetings, but shall meet no less than 2 times every fiscal year. The Committee shall develop rules and procedures to govern the Committee's proceedings.

“(b) **COST, SERVICE, AND RIDERSHIP FORECASTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than January 31, 2016, and annually thereafter, Amtrak shall



transmit to each State that sponsors a State-supported route, and to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate—

“(A) a final statement of costs, revenues, ridership, and other information determined appropriate by the Committee established under subsection (a), pertaining to each such route for the prior fiscal year; and

“(B) a cost, service, and ridership forecast for each such route for the upcoming fiscal year, developed pursuant to the methodology established under section 209 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 24101 note).

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The Committee may establish a different deadline than is required under paragraph (1) for submission of final financial statements and cost, service, and ridership forecasts.

“(3) QUARTERLY UPDATES.—Beginning in 2016, and each year thereafter, Amtrak shall transmit to each State that sponsors a State-supported route quarterly updates of the cost, service, and ridership forecast described in paragraph (1)(B) to enable States to pace costs against State budgets, plan effectively, and address unexpected changes in costs in a timely manner, on the following dates:

“(A) April 30, for the period encompassing January through March of such year.

“(B) July 31, for the period encompassing April through June of such year.

“(C) October 31, for the period encompassing July through September of such year.

“(c) INVOICES.—Not later than February 15, 2016, and monthly thereafter, Amtrak shall provide to each State that sponsors a State-supported route a monthly invoice of the cost of operating such route, including fixed costs and third-party costs.

“(d) DISPUTE RESOLUTION.—

“(1) REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED RESOLUTION.—If a dispute arises with respect to a forecast developed under subsection (b), an invoice developed under subsection (c), or the terms of a contract for operation of a State-supported route negotiated between Amtrak and a State that sponsors the route, either Amtrak or the State may request that the Surface Transportation Board conduct expedited dispute resolution under this subsection.

“(2) PROCEDURES.—The Surface Transportation Board shall establish procedures for expedited resolution of disputes brought before it under this subsection.

“(3) BINDING EFFECT.—The decision of the Surface Transportation Board under this subsection shall be binding on the parties to the dispute.

“(e) FRA ASSISTANCE.—The Federal Railroad Administration may provide assistance to the parties in the course of negotiations for a contract for operation of a State-supported route.

“(f) PERFORMANCE METRICS.—In negotiating a contract for operation of a State-supported route, Amtrak and the State or States that sponsor the route shall consider including provisions that provide penalties and incentives for performance based on metrics that take into account only those factors within the control of Amtrak or the State or States.

“(g) DEFINITION OF STATE.—In this section, the term ‘State’ means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.”

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such chapter 247 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“24712. State-supported routes.”

#### **SEC. 204. ROUTE AND SERVICE PLANNING DECISIONS.**

Section 208 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 24101 note) is amended to read as follows:

#### **“SEC. 208. METHODOLOGIES FOR AMTRAK ROUTE AND SERVICE PLANNING DECISIONS.**

“(a) METHODOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, as a condition of receiving a grant under section 101 of such Act, Amtrak shall obtain the services of an independent entity to develop and recommend objective methodologies for Amtrak to use in determining what intercity rail passenger transportation routes and services it should provide, including the establishment of new routes, the elimination of existing routes, and the contraction or expansion of services or frequencies over such routes.

“(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—Amtrak shall require the entity, in developing the methodologies described in subsection (a), to consider—

“(1) the current and expected performance and service quality of intercity rail passenger transportation operations, including cost recovery, on-time performance, ridership, on-board services, stations, facilities, equipment, and other services;

“(2) connectivity of a route with other routes;

“(3) the transportation needs of communities and populations that are not well served by intercity rail passenger transportation service or by other forms of intercity transportation;

“(4) the methodologies of Amtrak and major intercity rail passenger transportation service providers in other countries for determining intercity passenger rail routes and services;

“(5) the views of States, rail carriers that own infrastructure over which Amtrak operates, Amtrak employee representatives, and other interested parties; and

“(6) the funding levels that will be available under authorization levels that have been enacted into law.

“(c) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, Amtrak shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the recommendations developed by the entity pursuant to subsection (a).

“(d) CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after transmitting the recommendations pursuant to subsection (c), the Amtrak Board of Directors shall consider the adoption of the recommendations and transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing an explanation of any reasons for adopting or not adopting the recommendations.”

#### **SEC. 205. COMPETITION.**

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 24711 of title 49, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

#### **“§24711. Alternate passenger rail service pilot program**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, the Federal Railroad Administration shall complete a rule-making proceeding to develop a pilot program that—

“(1) permits a rail carrier or rail carriers that own infrastructure over which Amtrak operates a passenger rail service route described in subparagraph (B), (C), or (D) of section 24102(7) or

in section 24702(a) to petition the Federal Railroad Administration to be considered as a passenger rail service provider over that route in lieu of Amtrak for an operations period of 5 years;

“(2) requires the Federal Railroad Administration to notify Amtrak within 30 days after receiving a petition under paragraph (1) and establish a deadline by which both the petitioner and Amtrak would be required to submit a bid to provide passenger rail service over the route to which the petition relates;

“(3) requires that each bid describe how the bidder would operate the route, what Amtrak passenger equipment would be needed, if any, and what sources of non-Federal funding the bidder would use, including any State subsidy, among other things;

“(4) requires the Federal Railroad Administration to execute a contract within a specified, limited time after the deadline established under paragraph (2) and award to the winning bidder—

“(A) the right and obligation to provide passenger rail service over that route subject to such performance standards as the Federal Railroad Administration may require; and

“(B) an operating subsidy—

“(i) for the first year at a level not in excess of 90 percent of the level in effect for that specific route during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the petition was received, adjusted for inflation; and

“(ii) for any subsequent years at the level calculated under clause (i), adjusted for inflation; and

“(5) requires that each bid contain a staffing plan describing the number of employees needed to operate the service, the job assignments and requirements, and the terms of work for prospective and current employees of the bidder for the service outlined in the bid, and that such staffing plan be made available by the winning bidder to the public after the bid award.

“(b) ROUTE LIMITATIONS.—The Federal Railroad Administration may not make the program available with respect to more than 2 Amtrak intercity passenger rail routes.

“(c) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS; ACCESS TO FACILITIES; EMPLOYEES.—If the Federal Railroad Administration awards the right and obligation to provide passenger rail service over a route under this section to a rail carrier or rail carriers—

“(1) it shall execute a contract with the rail carrier or rail carriers for rail passenger operations on that route that conditions the operating and subsidy rights on—

“(A) the service provider continuing to provide passenger rail service on the route that is no less frequent, nor over a shorter distance, than Amtrak provided on that route before the award; and

“(B) the service provider's compliance with the standards established under subsection (a)(4)(A), and such additional performance standards as the Administration may establish;

“(2) it shall, if the award is made to a rail carrier other than Amtrak, require Amtrak to provide access to its reservation system, stations, and facilities directly related to operations to any rail carrier or rail carriers awarded a contract under this section, in accordance with subsection (d), necessary to carry out the purposes of this section;

“(3) an employee of any person used by such rail carrier or rail carriers in the operation of a route under this section shall be considered an employee of that carrier or carriers and subject to the applicable Federal laws and regulations governing similar crafts or classes of employees of Amtrak, including provisions under section 121 of the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997 (49 U.S.C. 4312 note) relating to employees that provide food and beverage service; and



“(4) the winning bidder shall provide hiring preference to qualified Amtrak employees displaced by the award of the bid, consistent with the staffing plan submitted by the bidder, and shall be subject to the grant conditions under section 24405 of this title.

“(d) **DISPUTES.**—If Amtrak and the rail carrier or rail carriers awarded a route under this section cannot agree upon terms to carry out subsection (c)(2), and the Surface Transportation Board finds that access to Amtrak’s facilities or equipment, or the provision of services by Amtrak, is necessary to carry out subsection (c)(2) and that the operation of Amtrak’s other services will not be impaired thereby, the Surface Transportation Board shall, within 120 days after submission of the dispute, issue an order that the facilities and equipment be made available, and that services be provided, by Amtrak, and shall determine reasonable compensation, liability, and other terms for use of the facilities and equipment and provision of the services.

“(e) **CESSATION OF SERVICE.**—If a rail carrier or rail carriers awarded a route under this section cease to operate the service or fail to fulfill their obligations under the contract required under subsection (c), the Federal Railroad Administration, in collaboration with the Surface Transportation Board, shall take any necessary action consistent with this title to enforce the contract and ensure the continued provision of service, including the installment of an interim service provider and rebidding the contract to operate the service. The entity providing service shall either be Amtrak or a rail carrier defined in subsection (a)(1).

“(f) **ADEQUATE RESOURCES.**—Before taking any action allowed under this section, the Secretary shall certify that the Federal Railroad Administration has sufficient resources appropriated under section 101(b) of Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, or any subsequent appropriation, for that purpose that are adequate to undertake the program established under this section.

“(g) **BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of Transportation may provide to a winning bidder selected under this section appropriations authorized under sections 101(b) of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, or any subsequent appropriation for the same purposes, necessary to cover the operating subsidy described in subsection (a)(4)(B).”.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the conclusion of the pilot program established under the amendment made by subsection (a), the Federal Railroad Administration shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the results on the pilot program established under section 24711 of title 49 United States Code, and any recommendations for further action.

#### **SEC. 206. FOOD AND BEVERAGE REFORM.**

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Chapter 243 of title 49, United States Code, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### **“§24321. Food and beverage reform**

“(a) **PLAN.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, Amtrak shall develop and begin implementing a plan to eliminate, within 5 years of such date of enactment, the operating loss associated with providing food and beverage service on board Amtrak trains.

“(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In developing and implementing the plan, Amtrak shall consider a combination of cost management and revenue generation initiatives, including—

- “(1) scheduling optimization;
- “(2) on-board logistics;
- “(3) product development and supply chain efficiency;

“(4) training, awards, and accountability;

“(5) technology enhancements and process improvements; and

“(6) ticket revenue allocation.

“(c) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Amtrak shall ensure that no Amtrak employee holding a position as of the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015 is involuntarily separated because of—

“(1) the development and implementation of the plan required under subsection (a); or

“(2) any other action taken by Amtrak to implement this section.

“(d) **NO FEDERAL FUNDING FOR OPERATING LOSSES.**—Beginning on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, no Federal funds may be used to cover any operating loss associated with providing food and beverage service on a route operated by Amtrak or an alternative passenger rail service provider that operates a route in lieu of Amtrak pursuant to section 24711.

“(e) **REPORT.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, and annually thereafter for 5 years, Amtrak shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing the plan developed pursuant to subsection (a) and a description of progress in the implementation of the plan.”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 243 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“24321. Food and beverage reform.”.

#### **SEC. 207. RIGHT OF WAY LEVERAGING.**

(a) **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall issue a Request for Proposals seeking private sector persons or entities to utilize Amtrak-owned right-of-way for telecommunications systems, energy distribution systems, and other activities considered appropriate by Amtrak. The Request for Proposals shall provide sufficient information on Amtrak’s right-of-way real estate assets to enable respondents to propose an arrangement that will monetize such assets through revenue sharing agreements with Amtrak.

(b) **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Amtrak Board of Directors shall review and consider each proposal submitted pursuant to subsection (a). Amtrak may enter into such agreements as are necessary to implement any such proposal or proposals.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the Request for Proposals required by this section, including summary information of any proposals submitted to Amtrak and any proposals accepted by the Amtrak Board of Directors.

#### **SEC. 208. STATION DEVELOPMENT.**

(a) **REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on options to enhance development around Amtrak stations, including—

- (1) strengthening multimodal connections, including intercity buses;
- (2) options for capturing development-related revenue streams; and

(3) other opportunities to better leverage station assets.

(b) **PROPOSALS.**—

(1) **REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall issue a Request for Proposals seeking persons or entities, where appropriate, to carry out the options identified under subsection (a).

(2) **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS.**—Not later than 24 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Amtrak Board of Directors shall review and consider each proposal submitted pursuant to paragraph (1). Amtrak may enter into such agreements as are necessary to implement any such proposal or proposals.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 30 months after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report on the Request for Proposals required by this section, including summary information of any proposals submitted to Amtrak and any proposals accepted by the Amtrak Board of Directors.

#### **SEC. 209. AMTRAK DEBT.**

Section 205 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 24101 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts” after “Amtrak’s indebtedness”;

(2) by striking “as of the date of enactment of this Act” each place it appears;

(3) in subsection (a), by striking the second sentence;

(4) in subsection (b), by striking “The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation” and inserting “To the extent amounts are provided in advance in appropriations Acts, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation”;

(5) in subsection (d), by inserting “, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts” after “as appropriate”;

(6) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “by section 102 of this division”; and

(7) in subsection (e)(2), by striking “by section 102” and inserting “for Amtrak”.

#### **SEC. 210. AMTRAK PILOT PROGRAM FOR PASSENGERS TRANSPORTING DOMESTICATED CATS AND DOGS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall develop a pilot program that allows passengers to transport domesticated cats or dogs on certain trains operated by Amtrak.

(b) **PET POLICY.**—In developing the pilot program required under subsection (a), Amtrak shall—

(1) in the case of a passenger train that is comprised of more than 1 car, designate, where feasible, at least 1 car in which a ticketed passenger may transport a domesticated cat or dog in the same manner as carry-on baggage if—

(A) the cat or dog is contained in a pet kennel;

(B) the pet kennel is stowed in accordance with Amtrak size requirements for carriage of carry-on baggage;

(C) the passenger is traveling on a train operating on a route described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (D) of section 24102(7) of title 49, United States Code; and

(D) the passenger pays a fee described in paragraph (3);

(2) allow a ticketed passenger to transport a domesticated cat or dog on a train in the same manner as cargo if—

(A) the cat or dog is contained in a pet kennel;

(B) the pet kennel is stowed in accordance with Amtrak requirements for cargo stowage;

(C) the passenger is traveling on a train operating on a route described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (D) of section 24102(7) of title 49, United States Code;

(D) the cargo area is temperature controlled in a manner protective of cat and dog safety and health; and

(E) the passenger pays a fee described in paragraph (3); and

(3) collect fees for each cat or dog transported by a ticketed passenger in an amount that, in the aggregate and at a minimum, covers the full costs of the pilot program.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the pilot program required under subsection (a) is first implemented, Amtrak shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing an evaluation of the pilot program.

(d) **LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—

(1) **SERVICE ANIMALS.**—The pilot program required under subsection (a) shall be separate from and in addition to the policy governing Amtrak passengers traveling with service animals. Nothing in this section may be interpreted to limit or waive the rights of passengers to transport service animals.

(2) **ADDITIONAL TRAIN CARS.**—Nothing in this section may be interpreted to require Amtrak to add additional train cars or modify existing train cars.

(3) **FEDERAL FUNDS.**—No Federal funds may be used to implement the pilot program required under this section.

#### **SEC. 211. AMTRAK BOARDING PROCEDURES.**

(a) **REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Amtrak Office of Inspector General shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that—

(1) evaluates Amtrak's boarding procedures at its 10 stations through which the most people pass;

(2) compares Amtrak's boarding procedures to—

(A) commuter railroad boarding procedures at stations shared with Amtrak;

(B) international intercity passenger rail boarding procedures; and

(C) fixed guideway transit boarding procedures; and

(3) makes recommendations, as appropriate, to improve Amtrak's boarding procedures, including recommendations regarding the queuing of passengers and free-flow of all station-users.

(b) **CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Not later than 6 months after the release of the report required under subsection (a), the Amtrak Board of Directors shall consider each recommendation provided under subsection (a)(3) for implementation across the Amtrak system.

#### **TITLE III—INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL POLICY**

#### **SEC. 301. FEDERAL-STATE PARTNERSHIP FOR NORTHEAST CORRIDOR DEVELOPMENT AND IMPROVEMENT.**

(a) **AMENDMENT.**—Chapter 244 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### **“§24407. Federal-State partnership for Northeast Corridor rehabilitation and improvement**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall develop and implement a program for issuing grants to applicants, on a competitive basis, for the purpose of financing the capital projects included in the Northeast Corridor Priority Project List developed under subsection (c).

“(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the following definitions apply:

“(1) **APPLICANT.**—The term ‘applicant’ means a State (including the District of Columbia), a group of States, an Interstate Compact, or a public agency established by one or more States and having responsibility for providing intercity passenger or commuter rail service.

“(2) **MAJOR STATE-OF-GOOD-REPAIR PROJECT.**—The term ‘major state-of-good-repair project’ means a capital project primarily intended to replace, rehabilitate or repair major Northeast Corridor infrastructure assets utilized for providing intercity rail passenger transportation, including tunnels, bridges, stations, and other assets as determined by the Secretary.

“(3) **IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.**—The term ‘improvement project’ means a capital project primarily intended to improve intercity passenger rail performance on the Northeast Corridor, including reduced trip times, increased train frequencies, higher operating speeds, and other improvements as determined by the Secretary.

“(c) **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR PRIORITY PROJECT LIST.**—The Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission, established under section 24905, shall develop and approve a Northeast Corridor Priority Project List that shall include—

“(1) a list of prioritized individual major state-of-good-repair projects and improvement projects along the Northeast Corridor that—

“(A) can be completed based on—

“(i) the funding authorized under section 103(b) of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015;

“(ii) any subsequent applicable authorization in effect;

“(iii) in the absence of such an authorization, a 5-year funding amount based on the most recent appropriation; or

“(iv) the requirements of subsection (d); and

“(B) are consistent with the Northeast Corridor capital investment plan required under section 24911(a);

“(2) an identification of the applicant for each individual project;

“(3) an identification of the sources of non-Federal matching funds for each project; and

“(4) a description of the benefits each project will bring to intercity rail passenger services.

“(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—The Federal grants authorized under this section shall be for no more than 50 percent of the net project cost of the project involved.

“(e) **APPLICABILITY OF CAPITAL GRANT REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as specifically provided in this section, the use of any amounts appropriated for grants under this section shall be subject to the requirements of this chapter.

“(f) **MATCH REQUIREMENTS.**—No grants may be obligated to an applicant under this section unless the applicant has transmitted to the Secretary of Transportation a binding written commitment to provide all amounts necessary for the purpose of matching Federal contributions as required by this section.

“(g) **UPDATES TO LIST.**—The Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission shall revise the NEC Priority Project List as necessary to reflect—

“(1) any differences in the availability of Federal funding from the levels assumed for purposes of subsection (c)(1)(A) (i) and (ii);

“(2) any elimination or addition of projects; and

“(3) any reduction or increase in benefits to be derived from a project.

“(h) **AVAILABILITY.**—Amounts appropriated for carrying out this section shall remain available until expended.

“(i) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this section shall supplant the requirement of applicants to compensate Amtrak for the use of Amtrak facilities or services pursuant to section 24905(c).

“(j) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Northeast Corridor’ means the Northeast Corridor main line between Boston, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia, and the Northeast Corridor branch lines connecting to Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, Springfield, Massachusetts, and Spuyten Duyvil, New York, and facilities and services used to operate and maintain those lines.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 244 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“24407. Federal-State partnership for Northeast Corridor rehabilitation and improvement.”

#### **SEC. 302. RRIF IMPROVEMENTS.**

(a) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall issue regulations implementing the amendments made by this section.

(b) **COLLATERAL.**—Section 502(h)(2) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 822(h)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “(2) The Secretary” and inserting “(2)(A) The Secretary”;

(2) by inserting “The Secretary may subordinate rights of the Secretary under any provision of title 49 or title 23 of the United States Code, to the rights of the Secretary under this section and section 503.” after “from another source.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) The Secretary shall, for purposes of making a finding under subsection (g)(4), accept the net present value on a future stream of State or local subsidy income or dedicated revenue as collateral offered to secure the loan.”

(c) **OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET REVIEW.**—Section 502(i) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 822(i)) is amended by inserting “In order to enable compliance with such time limit, the Office of Management and Budget shall take any actions required with respect to the application within such 90-day period.” after “disapprove the application.”

(d) **RRIF APPLICATION.**—Section 502(i) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 822(i)) is further amended—

(1) by striking “DISAPPROVAL.—Not later than 90 days after receiving” and inserting “DISAPPROVAL.—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after an application is determined pursuant to paragraph (2) to be”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) **COMPLETION OF APPLICATION.**—The Secretary shall establish procedures for making a determination, not later than 45 days after submission of an application under this section, whether the application is complete. Such procedures shall—

“(A) provide for a checklist of the required components of a complete application;

“(B) require the Secretary to provide to the applicant a description of the specific components of the application that remain incomplete if an application is determined to be incomplete; and

“(C) permit reapplication without prejudice for applications determined to be incomplete.

“(3) **INDEPENDENT FINANCIAL ANALYST.**—The Secretary shall assign an independent financial analyst within 45 days of submittal of a complete application.”

(e) **POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL.**—Section 502(c)(1) of such Act (45 U.S.C. 822(c)(1)) is amended by inserting “, including projects for the installation of a positive train control (as defined in section 20157(i) of title 49, United States Code) system” after “public safety”.

(f) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Section 502 of such Act (45 U.S.C. 822) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(k) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report on the program under this section that provides information on loans approved and disapproved by the Secretary during the previous year. Such report shall not disclose the identity of direct loan or loan guarantee recipients. The report shall describe—

“(1) the number of pre-application meetings with potential applicants;

“(2) the number of applications received and determined complete under subsection (i)(2), including the requested loan amounts;

“(3) the dates of receipt of applications;

“(4) the dates applications were determined complete under subsection (i)(2);

“(5) the number of applications determined incomplete under subsection (i)(2);

“(6) the final decision dates for both approvals and disapprovals of applications;

“(7) the number of applications withdrawn from consideration; and

“(8) the annual loan portfolio asset quality.”.

#### SEC. 303. NEC FAST FORWARD.

(a) **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR AUTHORITY.**—Section 502(d) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 822(d)) is amended by inserting “40 percent shall be available solely for projects described in subsection (1)(1), and” after “Of this amount,”.

(b) **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR FAST FORWARD PROGRAM.**—Section 502 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) **NORTHEAST CORRIDOR FAST FORWARD.**—

“(1) **PURPOSE.**—The Secretary, as part of the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing program, shall provide direct loans and loan guarantees to eligible entities described in subsection (a) for capital projects to improve the Northeast Corridor (as used in section 24911 of title 49, United States Code).

“(2) **COLLATERAL.**—Loans made or guaranteed under this subsection shall require collateral equal to the loan amount requested.

“(3) **INVESTMENT GRADE RATING.**—A direct loan or loan guarantee shall be made under this subsection only if a rating agency has assigned an investment grade rating of BBB minus, Baa3, bbb minus, BBB (low), (or equivalent) or higher to the project obligation. For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘rating agency’ means a credit rating agency registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission as a nationally recognized statistical rating organization (as that term is defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))).

“(4) **INCLUSION IN NEC PLANNING.**—Loans and loan guarantees made under this subsection shall be for projects that are included in the most recent 5-year budget and business plan prepared pursuant to section 24911(a) of title 49, United States Code.

“(5) **REFINANCING.**—Loans made or guaranteed under this subsection shall not be used for the refinancing of outstanding debt incurred.

“(6) **COHORT OF LOANS.**—Subsection (f)(4) shall not apply to loans made or guaranteed under this subsection.”.

(c) **REPORT ON LEVERAGING RRIF.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report identifying potential revenue sources, projects, and service improvements that could be achieved by the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b).

(d) **CONDITIONS OF FUNDING.**—

(1) **GRANTS.**—Section 24405 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking “15 days” and inserting “30 days” in subsection (a)(4)(B); and

(B) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(12) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report listing any waiver issued under this section during the preceding year.”.

(2) **RRIF.**—Section 502(h)(3) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 822(h)(3)) is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the requirements of section 24405(a) of title 49, United States Code.”.

#### SEC. 304. LARGE CAPITAL PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.

Section 24402 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following subsection:

“(m) **LARGE CAPITAL PROJECT REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For a grant awarded under this chapter for an amount in excess of \$1,000,000,000, the following conditions shall apply:

“(A) The Secretary of Transportation shall not obligate any funding unless the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that it has committed and will be able to fulfill the non-Federal share required for the grant within the applicant’s proposed project completion timetable.

“(B) The Secretary shall not obligate any funding for work activities that occur after the completion of final design unless—

“(i) the applicant transmits to the Secretary a financial plan that generally identifies the sources of the non-Federal funding required for any subsequent segments or phases of the corridor service development program covering the project for which the grant is made;

“(ii) the grant will result in a useable segment, a transportation facility, or equipment, that has operational independence; and

“(iii) the intercity passenger rail benefits anticipated to result from the grant, such as increased speed, improved on-time performance, reduced trip time, increased frequencies, new service, safety improvements, improved accessibility, or other significant enhancements are detailed by the grantee and approved by the Secretary.

“(C) The Secretary shall ensure that the project is maintained to the level of utility that is necessary to support the benefits approved under subparagraph (B)(iii) for a period of 20 years from the date the useable segment, transportation facility, or equipment described in subparagraph (B)(ii) is placed in service. If the project property is not maintained as required by this subparagraph for a period of time in excess of 12 months, then a pro-rata share of the Federal contribution, based upon the percentage remaining of the 20-year period that commenced when the project property was placed in service, shall be refunded.

“(2) **EARLY WORK.**—The Secretary may allow a grantee subject to this subsection to engage in at-risk work activities subsequent to the conclusion of final design where the Secretary determines that such work activities are reasonable and necessary.”.

#### SEC. 305. SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION STUDY.

(a) **STUDY.**—The Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a nationwide disparity and availability study on the availability and use of small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals in publically funded intercity rail passenger transportation (as defined in section 24102 of title 49, United States Code) projects administered by the Federal Railroad Administration.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report containing the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “small business concern” means a small business concern as the term is used in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “small business concern” does not include any concern or group of concerns controlled by the same socially and economically disadvantaged individual or individuals that have average annual gross receipts during the preceding 3 fiscal years in excess of \$22,410,000, as adjusted annually by the Secretary for inflation.

(2) **SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUAL.**—The term “socially and economically disadvantaged individual” has the meaning given the term in section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) and relevant subcontracting regulations issued pursuant to that Act, except that women shall be presumed to be socially and economically disadvantaged individuals for purposes of this section.

(d) **FUNDING.**—Of the total amount made available to the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Transportation and the Federal Railroad Administration, for each of fiscal years 2016 and 2017, \$3,000,000 shall be used to implement the requirements of this section.

#### SEC. 306. GULF COAST RAIL SERVICE WORKING GROUP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Railroad Administration shall convene a working group to evaluate the restoration of intercity rail passenger service in the Gulf Coast region between New Orleans, Louisiana, and Orlando, Florida.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The working group shall consist of representatives of—

(1) Amtrak;

(2) the States along the proposed route or routes;

(3) regional transportation planning organizations and metropolitan planning organizations, municipalities, and communities along the proposed route or routes, selected by the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration;

(4) the Southern Rail Commission;

(5) freight railroad carriers whose tracks may be used for such service; and

(6) other entities determined appropriate by the Administrator.

(c) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The working group shall—

(1) evaluate all options for restoring intercity rail passenger service in the Gulf Coast region, including options outlined in the report transmitted to Congress pursuant to section 226 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-432);

(2) select a preferred option for restoring such service;

(3) develop a prioritized inventory of capital projects and other actions required to restore

such service and cost estimates for such projects or actions; and

(4) identify Federal and non-Federal funding sources required to restore such service, including options for entering into public-private partnerships to restore such service.

(d) **REPORT.**—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the working group shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation in the Senate a report that includes—

(1) the preferred option selected under subsection (c)(2) and the reasons for selecting such option;

(2) the information described in subsection (c)(3);

(3) the funding sources identified under subsection (c)(4);

(4) the costs and benefits of restoring intercity rail passenger transportation in the region; and

(5) any other information the working group determines appropriate.

#### SEC. 307. MISCELLANEOUS.

(a) **TITLE 49 AMENDMENTS.**—Title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 22106(b), by striking “interest thereof” and inserting “interest thereon”;

(2) in section 24101(b), by striking “subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (c)”;

(3) in section 24706—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “a discontinuance under section 24704 or or”;

(B) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “section 24704 or or”;

(C) in subsection (b), by striking “section 24704 or or”.

(b) **TABLE OF SECTIONS AMENDMENT.**—The item relating to section 24316 in the table of sections for chapter 243 of such title is amended by striking “Plan to assist” and inserting “Plans to address needs of”.

(c) **PASSENGER RAIL INVESTMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS.**—Section 305 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 24101 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting after “equipment manufacturers,” the following: “nonprofit organizations representing employees who perform overhaul and maintenance of passenger railroad equipment.”;

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “, and may establish a corporation, which may be owned or jointly-owned by Amtrak, participating States, or other entities, to perform these functions”;

(3) in subsection (e), by striking “and establishing a jointly-owned corporation to manage that equipment”.

#### TITLE IV—PROJECT DELIVERY

##### SEC. 401. PROJECT DELIVERY RULEMAKING.

(a) **RULEMAKING.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall begin a rulemaking to govern the Federal review, permitting, and approval or disapproval of—

(1) freight railroad and intercity rail passenger transportation infrastructure projects, including those that are carried out or planned to be carried out with the use of Federal funds administered by the Department of Transportation through a grant, contract, loan, or other financing instrument; and

(2) commuter rail passenger transportation (as defined in section 24102(3) of title 49, United States Code) infrastructure projects that are funded in whole or in part through a direct loan or loan guarantee under title V of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 801 et seq.).

(b) **DEADLINE.**—The Secretary shall complete the rulemaking required under subsection (a) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS AND CONSIDERATIONS.**—The rulemaking under subsection (a) shall include procedures that—

(1) reduce the aggregate time for review and permitting of infrastructure projects described under subsection (a) while preserving existing statutory requirements for public comment or assessing the impact of a proposed project;

(2) institutionalize or expand best practices or process improvements that agencies are already implementing to improve the efficiency of reviews;

(3) identify high-performance attributes of infrastructure projects described under subsection (a) that demonstrate how projects seek to advance existing statutory and policy objectives, thereby facilitating a more efficient review and permitting process;

(4) create a process to invite Federal agencies and State, local, and tribal governments to participate in the review process, expand coordination with such agencies and governments, and require the identification as early as practicable in the process of any—

(A) Federal agency or State, local, or tribal government with jurisdiction over the project or required by law to conduct or issue a review or make a determination with regard to the project; and

(B) review, analysis, opinion, and permit, license, or approval required for the project;

(5) create process efficiencies, including—

(A) designating Federal agencies and State, local, and tribal governments as cooperating and participating agencies;

(B) conducting concurrent and integrated reviews, analyses, opinions, and permits, licenses, or approvals to the maximum extent practicable;

(C) establishing timelines, in coordination with affected Federal agencies, for completion of those reviews, analyses, opinions, and permits, licenses, or approvals;

(D) developing a coordination plan and schedule, in coordination with affected Federal agencies, for participation in the review by Federal agencies, State, local, and tribal governments, and the public; and

(E) implementing a process to effectively identify and resolve issues that may affect completion of reviews in a timely manner;

(6) effectively engage the public and interested stakeholders as early in the review process as possible;

(7) include opportunities to use existing share-in-cost authorities and other nonappropriated funding sources to support early coordination and project review;

(8) expand the use of information technology tools and identify priority areas for information technology investment to replace paperwork processes, enhance effective project siting decisions, enhance interagency collaboration, and improve the monitoring of project impacts and mitigation commitments;

(9) ensure that documents developed under the procedures are adopted and used by other Federal agencies, and State, local, and tribal governments, to the maximum extent practicable, to eliminate redundancy and duplicative reviews;

(10) include improvements to mitigation policies to provide added predictability, facilitate landscape-scale mitigation based on conservation plans and regional environmental assessments, facilitate interagency mitigation plans where appropriate, ensure accountability and long-term effectiveness of mitigation activities, and utilize innovative mechanisms where appropriate; and

(11) develop a process for periodically considering expansion of categorical exclusions for infrastructure projects described under subsection (a) that conform to those of other modal administrations.

#### SEC. 402. HISTORIC PRESERVATION OF RAILROADS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate Federal agencies, including the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, and nongovernmental stakeholders representing the railroad industry and historic preservation concerns, shall—

(1) administratively pursue program alternatives (as that term is used in 36 C.F.R. 800.14) to promote a consistent approach in the treatment of railroad and rail-related properties for historic preservation review under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f); and

(2) develop mechanisms for streamlining compliance with the requirements of section 303 of title 49, United States Code, for railroad and rail-related properties.

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) consider, among other options, the development of—

(A) programmatic agreements, program comments, exempted categories of undertakings, and guidance for historic reviews under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (as those terms are used in 36 C.F.R. 800.14); and

(B) programmatic evaluations, de minimis impact determinations, and regulatory guidance for reviews under section 303 of title 49, United States Code (as those terms are used in 23 C.F.R. 774); and

(2) take into account, at a minimum—

(A) maintenance and repair of railroad and rail-related property;

(B) repair and replacement of bridges, structures, or facilities in a like-for-like manner, or when the bridge, structure, or facility is not a contributing element of a historic district;

(C) safety-related projects, including installation, maintenance, and repair of positive train control systems;

(D) management of railroad and rail-related properties that include both historic and non-historic components;

(E) integration of reviews under section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, reviews under section 303 of title 49, United States Code, and environmental reviews; and

(F) consistency in treatment of railroads nationwide for historic preservation purposes.

#### TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

##### SEC. 501. DEFINITION.

For purposes of this Act, the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Transportation.

##### SEC. 502. TITLE 49 DEFINITIONS.

(a) **TITLE 49 AMENDMENTS.**—Section 24102 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (9) as paragraphs (7) through (11), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraphs:

“(5) ‘long-distance route’ means a route described in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (7).

“(6) ‘National Network’ includes long-distance routes and State-supported routes.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(12) ‘state-of-good-repair’ means a condition in which physical assets, both individually and as a system, are—

“(A) performing at a level at least equal to that called for in their as-built or as-modified design specification during any period when the life cycle cost of maintaining the assets is lower than the cost of replacing them; and

“(B) sustained through regular maintenance and replacement programs.

“(13) ‘State-supported route’ means a route described in subparagraph (B) or (D) of paragraph (7), or in section 24702, that is operated

by Amtrak, excluding those trains operated by Amtrak on the routes described in paragraph (7)(A).”.

(b) *CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.*—Section 217 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 24702 note) is amended by striking “24102(5)(D)” and inserting “24102(7)(D)”.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-36. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-36.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 43, line 24, strike “where appropriate” and insert “including small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals”.

Page 44, after line 16, insert the following:

(d) *DEFINITIONS.*—In this section, the terms “small business concern” and “socially and economically disadvantaged individual” have the meanings given such terms in section 305(c).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member DEFAZIO for their work on this. It has been a bipartisan effort.

It has been a long time since we have seen a rail bill, and it’s about time. We need to do something to improve our rail system. This bill authorizes \$7.2 billion for passenger rail over the next 4 fiscal years and will help improve Amtrak’s service and long-term stability. It has a wide range of support from all the stakeholders.

I have two Amtrak stations in my region, and both of them are in communities that are devastated by the economic downturn, and unfortunately, our small businesses have been slower to recover from the recession because they have less access to capital and information.

Section 208 of this bill directs Amtrak to submit a report to Congress within 1 year on the options to enhance economic development around the Am-

trak stations. This provision requires Amtrak to issue a request for proposals seeking persons or entities to carry out these proposals.

My amendment encourages the process to be inclusive of socially and economically disadvantaged businesses while keeping the intent to strengthen multimodal connections, capturing development-related streams, meaning multiple revenue sources and better leveraging station assets.

We need to encourage our socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses a chance to provide their input and feedback on station development proposals in and around Amtrak communities.

A disadvantaged business is one that is at least 51 percent owned and controlled by one or more socially and economically disadvantaged individuals or groups. According to the Minority Business Development Agency, only 2 percent of all minority-owned firms are considered high revenue, meaning businesses with annual receipts of over \$1 million. These enterprises account for 68 percent of total receipts and 61 percent of all jobs produced by all minority enterprises.

As these businesses grow and innovate, so does the rest of our economy. Our society and economy is made stronger from diversity, and socially and economically disadvantaged businesses should have information to compete and to be included in all the business development with public and private entities.

The Department of Transportation has done very well in recognizing the role that disadvantaged small businesses play in the community. We must ensure that this also remains true of Amtrak.

We need to see that these disadvantaged areas develop in sync with the money that is being spent. We just want to make sure that the information is there so they can compete on a fair basis.

My bill and this amendment is a chance to invest in our intercity passenger rail service and spur innovation, growth, and investment in the surrounding communities. I encourage the adoption of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, even though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does clarify that socially and economically disadvantaged small businesses can compete for contracts in the bills dealing with the redevelopment of stations.

A lot of these stations are in downtown areas that are very desirable for

development, and so we want to encourage that. This amendment, I believe, strengthens the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, the good thing about the amendment, it doesn’t cost anything, and I think it will really help some of our disadvantaged communities.

As the chairman said, these are in the downtown areas that need the most help, so I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR.

FITZPATRICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-36.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 63, line 6, insert after “individuals” the following: “and veteran-owned small businesses”.

Page 64, after line 13, insert the following:

(3) *VETERAN-OWNED SMALL BUSINESS.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The term “veteran-owned small business” has the meaning given the term “small business concern owned and controlled by veterans” in section 3(q)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)(3)).

(B) *EXCLUSIONS.*—The term “veteran-owned small business” does not include any concern or group of concerns controlled by the same veterans that have average annual gross receipts during the preceding 3 fiscal years in excess of \$22,410,000 as adjusted annually by the Secretary for inflation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the Chair, and I commend and congratulate Mr. SHUSTER on his very thoughtful approach to this passenger rail reform bill, which is poised to pass, and I encourage its passage here today.

Mr. Chair, our Nation’s veterans are the most highly skilled workforce in our Nation’s history. They are the product of rigorous training and iron-clad commitment to teamwork. They have a remarkable ability to succeed where others might fail.

It is no wonder, then, that nearly 2.5 million veterans own and operate their own businesses, creating and sustaining over 8 million jobs for hard-working Americans. However, the current pool of veteran-owned businesses is getting older, with recent census data showing that 75 percent of current veteran-owned businesses were age 55 and over.

As this older generation of veterans look toward retirement, America will begin to lose a key driver of economic growth. We need to be thinking now about how to encourage the next generation of veterans—the more than 250,000 servicemembers currently transitioning from military to civilian life—to take up the job-creating mantle of starting their own veteran-owned businesses.

The numbers are on our side, with one in four veterans saying they are considering starting or buying their own small business. We cannot miss this opportunity.

My amendment under consideration today works to ensure we, as a Congress, are doing everything possible to level the playing field for these veteran entrepreneurs when competing for Federal contracts. It is a simple premise that my constituents in Bucks and Montgomery Counties, Pennsylvania, know and understand as fairness to veterans.

The amendment is straightforward. It adds veteran-owned small businesses to the small business participation study required under section 305 of the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act. Section 305 directs the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a nationwide disparity and availability study on the availability and use of certain classes of small businesses.

While I am a supporter of having a completely level playing field throughout Federal contracting for every small business, the fact is, today, some get a preference when doing business with the Federal Government when veterans do not.

This amendment begins the process of addressing that discrepancy. Fairness to veterans is not about dramatically overhauling the current system, but it is about making sure that if anybody is going to get a preference, veterans should at least have an equal shot.

Adding them to the study included in the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act will give the Department of Transportation a better understanding of the availability of veteran-owned small businesses to help rebuild our crumbling rail infrastructure and hopefully help highlight the benefit of embracing veteran-owned businesses in all future Federal infrastructure projects.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of this commonsense amendment, which strengthens the underlying bill and ensures fairness to our veterans.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the author, Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is a great amendment. I wish I had thought of it, to be perfectly honest. I look forward to supporting it.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SHUSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

His amendment would ensure that veteran-owned small businesses be considered when they are looking who has historically participated in Federal funds in all projects, so I strongly support the hiring of veterans.

I appreciate Mr. FITZPATRICK for offering this bill, and, once again, it will strengthen the bill, so I support it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. CAPUANO and Chairman SHUSTER for their support of this amendment.

Like the previous amendment, there is no cost to including veteran-owned small businesses in the participation study, no cost to the Federal taxpayer, good for our Nation's veterans and their own businesses. I encourage my colleagues to support this.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-36.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 68, after line 9, insert the following new section:

**SEC. 308. NORTHEAST CORRIDOR EXPRESS SERVICE.**

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Committee, in consultation with Amtrak, shall transmit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a report that analyzes the implementation of non-stop, high-speed express passenger rail service between Washington, District of Columbia, and New York, New York, and between New York, New York, and Boston, Massachusetts. The report shall consider—

(1) estimated trip time, ridership, revenue, total cost, capacity, and other metrics for each service;

(2) impacts on existing Amtrak and commuter rail services; and

(3) impacts on Northeast Corridor infrastructure.

(b) CONSIDERATION.—Not later than 90 days after the transmittal of the report required under subsection (a), the Amtrak Board of

Directors shall consider implementing such services.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, first of all, I want to thank both sides of the aisle, particularly the leadership of Chairman SHUSTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DENHAM and others for all working together in a bipartisan effort.

The last rail reauthorization I did with Mr. Oberstar was the first one we had done in about 10 years. That was the precedent to this bill, and we need to do that. We need to act responsibly.

We need to improve passenger rail service in the United States. We need to take Amtrak and this country from a Third World passenger rail service with a Soviet-style operation into the 21st century. I think we can begin to do that with the amendment that I have offered here today and that we have a bipartisan agreement on.

It is not everything I would like. I am going to try to strengthen it as it moves through the process. This amendment would potentially open the Northeast corridor to express service from Washington, D.C., to New York City and to Boston, and it is great to have Mr. CAPUANO here. Right now, the service from Boston to New York City runs 68 miles an hour on average. That is Third World kind of operations.

I believe that we could have express service for less than 2½ hours in that corridor, closer to 2 hours with this amendment. Right now, it goes 83 miles an hour. That is our high-speed service in the United States.

Now, we are about to put a significant amount of money into the Northeast corridor, and I have no problem with that. This bill authorizes that money, some with direct appropriations, about a half billion dollars a year for each of the next 4 years. Then it also allows the revenue coming into the Northeast corridor to stay in the Northeast corridor. I have no problem with that.

Again, what do the rest of us get in the country by putting this money in? I think we have subsidized Amtrak fairly well. Right now, every ticket is underwritten—last year, \$44.98. This will also provide a subsidy. I have no problem.

But what do we get back? Seventy percent of all the air traffic delays in the country are out of the Northeast corridor, the chronically delayed flights. We will see that, too, today and tomorrow.

We can do a much better job improving service. Imagine getting from here to Penn Station in less than 2 hours



and from Boston down to Penn Station in record time.

Finally, others have done this. Virgin Trains in England, one of the leaders in innovation, has increased traffic from 14 million in the corridor from London up to the north of England, from 14 million to 28 million passengers in less than half a dozen years, an incredible record that we could replicate here.

We only had 31 million passengers on all of Amtrak last year, a little less than that; and we could double the number of people employed, the number of people working.

I have always supported labor in this. We are not trying to do this at any substandard wages. We want to make certain that all of those commitments to our brothers and sisters in labor are honored.

This is the beginning of a proposal to open this up, the Northeast corridor, and the commission actually will report back to Congress with those proposals. It won't be buried. It is going to come back to us, and then we can move it forward.

It is time to take us into the next era of passenger rail service in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, even though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Florida.

Again, he stands up tall to defend the idea of passenger rail. We totally agree on that concept. We totally agree on trying to make—especially the Northeast corridor—a more efficient rail.

I think this study, this commission might help us. I hope it does. I am pleased to stand up today and support this amendment and congratulate the gentleman for offering it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment. I believe, once again, this study can have positive impact on us.

I also commend the chairman, the former chairman of the committee, for his passion. He is absolutely right as far as getting these trains to run faster, to have less stops. We can create, I believe, in the long term, this express corridor.

He is right that while the Europeans are moving at speeds twice that rate, we can do better in the United States, and I believe this study will help us move in that direction in the future.

I thank the gentleman and support the amendment.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, in 2010, when we were in the minority, we had a little more time on our hands. I published this report in the Transportation Committee, "The Federal Government Must Stop Sitting on its Assets," and listed in here is the Northeast corridor. It is one of the greatest assets we have, from here to Boston, and we need to utilize that asset.

We can put in better service, and I think we can do this through this particular amendment. We have got to stop sitting on a valuable asset. It is the only corridor that we own. The other 22,000 miles of rail service is all on freight private rail.

We can and we must adopt this amendment to get us on our way. Thank you, and I hope everybody is on board.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. BROWNLEY OF CALIFORNIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-36.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

**SEC. 503. STATE ACTION PLANS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall require—

(1) each State, other than those States identified pursuant to section 202 of the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008 (49 U.S.C. 22501 note), to develop and implement, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, a State grade crossing action plan; and

(2) each State that was identified pursuant to section 202 of such Act to update its plan and submit to the Secretary, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, a report describing what the State did to implement the plan.

(b) CONTENTS.—Each plan required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify specific solutions for improving safety at crossings, including highway-rail grade crossing closures or grade separations; and

(2) focus on crossings that have experienced recent grade crossing accidents or multiple accidents, or are at high risk for accidents.

(c) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide assistance to the States in developing and carrying out, as appropriate, the plan required under subsection (a).

(d) CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may condition the awarding of any grants under section 103 of this Act to a State on the development of such State's grade crossing action plan.

(e) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make each plan and report publicly available on an official Internet Web site.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentlewoman

from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer a simple, commonsense amendment to the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015.

My amendment would require each State to develop a grade crossing action plan, identifying specific solutions for improving safety at rail-highway crossings; furthermore, my amendment would direct States to focus resources on crossings that have experienced recent grade crossing accidents, multiple accidents, or crossings that are at high risk for accidents.

Mr. Chairman, a week ago Tuesday, our Nation witnessed yet another tragic rail accident in my district when Metrolink Ventura County line 102 crashed into a truck along the train tracks in Oxnard.

While there are many unanswered questions about this accident, one issue is abundantly clear. As a nation, we must do more to address rail-highway crossing safety and address the increasing backlog of safety projects nationwide. Currently, California ranks second in the Nation in the number of crossing accidents.

Nationally, the Federal Railroad Administration estimates that there were over 2,000 accidents at railroad crossings in 2013, with 251 fatalities and 929 injuries.

As many residents of Ventura County know, this is not the first time an accident has occurred at the Rice Avenue intersection. This is a heavily-used corridor for both rail goods movement, passenger rail—both Amtrak and Metrolink—as well as automobiles and truck traffic.

Unfortunately, like many local communities across the Nation, Ventura County cannot, on its own, fund rail-highway crossing safety improvements.

As a member of this committee, I am pleased that this bill provides funds for passenger rail infrastructure, and I strongly support the provision that permits funds to be used for crossing safety improvements because we all know these investments benefit not only safety, but also our regional and national economies.

In 2014, we invested \$220 million in the Railway-Highway Crossings Program at the Federal level; yet, under title 49, only 10 States are required by Federal law to have action plans prioritizing rail-highway safety improvements.

It is critically important for Congress to ensure that Federal dollars for passenger rail infrastructure improvements are used wisely. We must also ensure that Federal funds are prioritized to address safety improvements at the most dangerous crossings first.



My amendment would get at the heart of this issue by requiring every State to have a specific plan in place that will ensure both the wise use of tax dollars and address rail-highway grade crossing safety in a systematic way.

I ask my colleagues to vote for my commonsense amendment.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for offering this amendment.

While grade crossing incidents have dropped 40 percent since 2000, the tragic events in Ms. BROWNLEY's district last week remind us how important it is to be aware of grade crossings.

This amendment requiring States to develop and implement plans to improve safety at grade crossings within their borders, I think, adds strength to the bill. I would also note there are similar grade crossing reporting requirements in the Federal highway program, and we should work with the Senate during conference to reauthorize the surface transportation programs, ensuring that there is consistency among the requirements at those grade crossings.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. I thank the chairman for your extraordinary work on this bill—and a bipartisan bill as well—and I thank you for accepting the amendment.

Rail-highway crossing safety problems are not unique to my district. Sadly, my colleagues have also experienced recent tragedies. On Monday, a Long Island Rail Road train struck a car stopped on the tracks in East Rockaway. In February, a Metro-North train struck a sport utility vehicle, tragically killing the driver and five train passengers in Valhalla.

I strongly believe that Congress, along with State and local governments, must address this safety issue as a matter of urgency, and I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POSEY. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I would like to speak in support of her amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman ask unanimous consent to reclaim her time?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Yes.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman is recognized.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. Does the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Yes, I yield.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I would like to support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do so.

They are putting in a high-speed rail in my State now, running over 100 miles through my district, something that will go 120-plus miles an hour through the middle of small towns and communities which are ill-prepared and ill-equipped to safely facilitate that high rate of traffic.

I wish I had thought ahead to bring some illustrations, photographs, or diagrams of some of the intersections that this train will go blazing through without much thought to the pedestrians, the vehicles, the men, women, and children in the community that will be put in danger by it.

I think this is a great amendment. If you are going to use Federal money—I see that the gentlelady said it is for projects that use Federal money, not an unfunded mandate—but if you are going to use the Federal money, you are going to use these RIF loans, some of which appear to be in the process of being granted in direct conflict of the requirements of granting the RIF loans, the very least we could do is insist that the money is used safely in our districts.

□ 1345

The very least we could do is insist that the money is used safely in our districts.

So I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I urge my colleagues to support this great amendment.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a joint resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### PASSENGER RAIL REFORM AND INVESTMENT ACT OF 2015

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. PERLMUTTER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-36.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

#### SEC. 503. QUIET ZONE REPORT.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to Congress a report evaluating the rule issued by the Federal Railroad Administration on the use of locomotive horn at rail crossings. Such report shall—

(1) evaluate the effectiveness of the rule in reducing accidents and fatalities at rail crossings;

(2) evaluate the effectiveness of the rule in establishing quiet zones;

(3) identify any barriers to the establishment of quiet zones; and

(4) estimate the costs associated with their establishment.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to H.R. 749 requires the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, to conduct a study and submit a report to Congress evaluating the effectiveness of the Federal Railroad Administration's 2005 rule on the use of locomotive horns at rail crossings. We were just talking about rail crossings.

After 10 years of being in effect, I believe it is fair we ask the FRA to update and modernize the train horn regulation, allowing flexibility for new technologies and innovations that may become available.

The basic premise behind the rule has not changed: to promote public safety by requiring train operators to sound horns at certain decibel levels while passing through railway crossings to alert motorists and pedestrians.

While the rule currently allows municipalities to apply for "quiet zone" status, I am concerned the current requirements for obtaining a quiet zone waiver are far too rigid, cost prohibitive, and time consuming. Achieving quiet zone status can take years of work and cost millions of dollars.

By requiring the GAO to study the train horn rule, I am confident the FRA can craft an updated rule striking a balance between public safety and providing communities flexibility to establish quiet zones.

I hope the GAO study will provide insight on how the FRA can update train horn requirements when communities invest in certain safety enhancements and measures installed at crossings, including barriers, warning signals, and other features to keep the public safe.

Last year, I attended an event for the unveiling of a new quiet zone in one of the cities in my district, Commerce City, Colorado, which was established after significant investment from the city. I want to thank the FRA and State officials for working with Commerce City. But we need to review how long and how costly these quiet zone applications can be.

Just last week, another city in my district, Arvada, announced four planned railway crossing improvements to establish crossing zones. According to a story published in *The Denver Post* last week, the city has been in discussions with the FRA for more than 5 years on getting the quiet zones approved. I include the text of *The Denver Post* article for the RECORD.

**RAILROAD QUIET ZONES WILL SILENCE TRAIN HORNS AT FOUR ARVADA CROSSINGS**

Arvada residents living along the Union Pacific Railroad tracks could sleep a little easier next year with the establishment of “quiet zones” at four crossings.

City Council recently approved a \$1.8 million agreement with Union Pacific that will see barriers and gates added where the tracks intersect at Lamar and Carr Streets, Olde Wadsworth Boulevard and West 66th Avenue.

Arvada communications manager Maria Vanderkolk said the city has been in discussions for more than five years with the Federal Railroad Administration, the Public Utilities Commission and Union Pacific on getting the quiet zones approved.

“It’s expensive—we got a couple approved elsewhere about 10 years ago, then we had issues with these four and they’re right in the heart of the city,” Vanderkolk said. “We told the neighborhood this would be done last year. . . various and sundry delays means this has literally taken years to get approved.”

Train horns are sounded in compliance with federal rules and regulations, which require a train to blast its horn for 15 to 20 seconds at any public crossing. Under terms of the agreement, the city will install four-quadrant gate systems—or gates with four arms, in addition to flashing lights and ringing bells, at the four crossings. These type of gates make it difficult for motorists to drive around.

Once they’re built, the trains will no longer have to blast their horns and the Union Pacific train will run quietly through the entire length of Arvada.

“Without a quiet zone, people see a train coming and think they may be able to beat it and skirt around the gate,” Vanderkolk said. “With a quiet zone, you construct a barrier so the car physically can’t get around it.”

Michael Smith has lived blocks from the railroad tracks in his home near 64th Avenue and Field Street for almost 35 years. He said over the years, the trains have become more frequent and the horns so prevalent that at times they have kept him and family members from getting a good night’s sleep.

Things got so bad they considered moving, but decided to stay once it became clear the city was working to address the problem.

“We really appreciate the work city staff has done on getting this completed,” Smith said. “It’s a lot of money, but it will be great for the community.”

The city is coordinating with the railroad on getting the crossings built by the end of 2015, said Chris Sveum, a city civil engineer.

She added: “There’s no guarantee the trains still won’t have to sound their horns from time to time, but this should cut down the rate by 95 percent.”

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, it is time for Congress to analyze the effectiveness of the train horn rule and work with FRA to improve the ability of our communities all across the country to continue investing in railway crossing safety.

A more flexible rule could enable these communities to craft solutions reducing noise, promoting long-term economic growth, and, at the same time, ensuring the safety of residents.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask for an “aye” vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, although I support the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, the past couple of weeks have seen some startling accidents at grade crossings. Having an independent entity review the train horn rule would be a good start to helping ensure such accidents don’t occur in the future.

The train horn and quiet zone rule was one that took the Federal Railroad Administration almost 10 years to complete. It was finalized 10 years ago in 2005. So this would be a good time to revisit the effectiveness.

Furthermore, with the rise in freight traffic on previously lower capacity routes, some communities are seeing more trains travel through their towns, which are used to lower traffic.

Looking at crossings, the creation of quiet zones, and their costs will be a helpful tool for small communities across the country. I recommend support for the gentleman from Colorado’s amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Transportation Committee and all of the Members for working with me on this amendment. I would ask for an “aye” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-36.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 3, through page 3, line 10, strike section 101.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment removes the taxpayer subsidies and requires Amtrak to operate as a business, as we were promised it would when it was established back in 1971.

Every year, as Amtrak’s operating losses have mounted, Congress has dutifully shoveled more money at it to keep it afloat. Every year, its congressional supporters have promised reforms to bring these losses under control. And every year, these promises have fallen flat.

This year, we are told, well, look at all the new reforms that we are building into this. In 5 years, they will have their act together. Well, how many times have we heard this promise? Let me cite just a few.

Back in 1997, facing mounting criticism, the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act required Amtrak to operate without any Federal operating assistance after 2002.

When that didn’t happen, in 2008, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) attempted to eliminate only its most expensive route from reauthorization. That year, the gentleman from Minnesota, Jim Oberstar, called any reduction in subsidies a “preemptive strike” and promised that the bill was chock-full of reforms that would soon solve Amtrak’s problems.

Well, when that didn’t happen, in 2014, the gentleman from Georgia, Paul Broun, proposed eliminating subsidies, just as my amendment does. At the time, the gentleman from Iowa, Tom Latham, said: “I concede that Amtrak could be more efficient. However, it has made significant improvements in this area recently and is moving in the right direction.”

“Moving in the right direction.”

This year, taxpayers will subsidize Amtrak in the amount of about \$1.4 billion. The bill before us authorizes \$1.4 billion for next year. Put another way, we will shell out \$45 every time a passenger steps aboard an Amtrak train. That is \$45 per passenger, per trip, and direct losses billed to taxpayers. That is up from \$32 of loss per passenger 6 years ago.

Despite endless promises, things are not getting better. Amtrak’s apologists claim this is a 40 percent reduction in authorized funding. In fact, Amtrak received \$1.4 billion in 2015, the same as this bill authorizes in 2016.

Outside experts have reported that over the next 10 years, subsidizing Amtrak will cost taxpayers \$49 billion. Let me put that in family-sized numbers. The average American family will have to cough up \$392 from its taxes over the next 10 years just to cover Amtrak's losses.

What does that \$392 out of a family's taxes pay for? Well, among other things, Amtrak's food and beverage employees, who are paid an average of \$106,000 a year to provide a service that lost over \$800 million over the past decade just selling snacks on Amtrak trains.

Are we at least seeing any improvements in service? Not hardly. Amtrak's monthly on-time performance has significantly declined.

Bigger losses, declining service—that is not moving in the right direction. That was a false promise then, just like all of the other false promises we have heard since 1971.

In last year's appropriations debate, Amtrak apologists warned that cutting off the subsidies would "eliminate an entire transportation option." It does no such thing.

Amtrak claims that it is running a profit on a heavily traveled Northeast corridor. Nothing in my amendment would change this. Anything Amtrak makes on these profitable routes, Amtrak keeps.

With this amendment, Amtrak would be perfectly free to continue to operate and expand its Northeast corridor from its own profits and to subsidize its other money-losing operations to the extent that its profits would cover them.

However, this amendment would end the practice of forcing American taxpayers to underwrite another 5 years of broken promises.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as I stand up here today, I know that if the gentleman from Minnesota, Jim Oberstar, was here, the transportation guru, he would be standing up for Amtrak. So I am going to stand up in place of Mr. Oberstar.

And let's start out with, this amendment would kill Amtrak. It would shut it down. It would strand millions of passengers, disrupt commuter operations, add to our already congested roads and airports, eliminate over 20,000 jobs nationwide, and jeopardize local economies and business that depend on Amtrak's service.

Amtrak provides the majority of all intercity passenger rail service in the United States, with more States and localities across America turning to passenger rail to meet the transportation needs of our citizens.

Amtrak reduces congestion and improves our energy independence. One full passenger train can take up to 250 to 350 cars off the road. Passenger rail also consumes less energy than both automobiles and commercial airlines.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

I certainly appreciate the gentleman's concern. He has been a true deficit hawk. One of the great challenges we face in America is reducing the deficit.

There has been a longstanding debate in this Congress about passenger rail in this country. I, for one, believe it is necessary. I think that what we have in this bill—and I have watched for the past 40 years also some of these broken promises.

I am committed to, and I think we committed in this bill to putting forth reforms, streamlining, empowering the States, which I think is a huge step in the right direction, giving States the ability to be at the table, to invest their dollars to force Amtrak to do things differently.

So, again, throughout the bill, there are these reforms. I feel confident that, in the way the country is going, with population growth and with these corridors expanding, we have to have passenger rail to move people around some of the most densely populated corridors.

So I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would simply respond to the ridership claims that it has no impact on congestion because the ridership is infinitesimal. You have to compare Amtrak's 31 million trips to the 650 million airline trips per year. According to Cato, the average American logs about 15,000 miles per year by car, 1,800 miles by plane, and just 20 miles on Amtrak.

If Amtrak is making a profit, it can use those profits any way it wants—to continue its operations, to subsidize its losing routes. But it should not be tapping further into taxpayers' pockets.

□ 1400

Voters have elected the biggest Republican majority in the House since 1928, with a resounding mandate to stop wasting money. Today this government is spending and taxing record amounts of families' earnings, and well above the 40-year average as a percentage of our economy. If we can't bring ourselves to cut this, one of the most outrageous subsidies in the entire budget, voters will have every right to ask what good are we?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. How much time do I have remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) to close.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, let's just back up for a minute. What the gentleman would do, he says, well, they could keep operating the Northeast corridor. Well, that is good, because three-quarters of the people going from Washington, D.C., to New York are choosing rail over air, and I don't know where we would fit that many more airplanes in the already congested skies. But that is actually, unfortunately, not true because of the other routes, particularly across-country and Western routes, the obligations under their contracts to their existing employees who would lose their jobs, other obligations they would have for abandoned lines and stations, and all that would total billions of dollars.

So even if they theoretically—and you would have to do further changes in the law rather than just taking away the money—could operate the Northeast corridor, they couldn't because of these other obligations. Any money would have to go there, and they would be immediately bankrupt because it would exceed their revenues.

So that is one, perhaps, unintended effect of the gentleman's amendment, because he does seem very sympathetic to the fact that three-quarters of the people going between Washington, D.C., and New York are choosing rail over air, and it is a growing percentage. He doesn't seem to be cognizant of the fact that ridership is up 14 percent—that is actually 4 million people in 1 year—that revenue is up, and the operating losses have been cut in half. They are down 48 percent.

Mr. Chairman, there is no passenger rail system that operates like Amtrak across a continent as large as ours without assistance from the government. Now, if you want to disconnect the country—as I recounted earlier, on 9/11, I had a Federal official who had to get back for meetings in the Northwest. He took the train. We have an aging society. I tell you, when I don't have to get on an airplane every week and I can take a little more time to get somewhere—and I think a lot of other people, as they are aging, would like to avoid the hassles of air travel. I believe ridership will continue to grow.

In the Northwest we are in a cooperative arrangement—and I pointed that out earlier—with Amtrak, where they operate our train, an Acela train which was purchased, and the ridership is up to about 1 million people a year. And it is growing quickly to avoid the already overly congested I-5 between Eugene and Seattle and avoid the hour and a half you are going to spend somewhere 60, 70 miles south of Seattle sitting in

your car. So he would deprive Americans of all this for ideology—not for good reasons, but for ideology.

We should be going the other way. We should be investing more and building out a robust, 21st century rail system like every other industrial country in the world. Why do we have to be Third World?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 114-36.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 48, line 14, after "procedures" insert "for passengers, including passengers using or transporting nonmotorized transportation such as wheelchairs and bicycles".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 134, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss my amendment, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Chairman DENHAM, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Ranking Member CAPUANO, and former Subcommittee Ranking Member BROWN for all their hard work and for bringing this bipartisan legislation to the floor so early this year.

Mr. Chairman, this bill shows us what Congress can do when we work together to build consensus, and yes, compromise—compromise—to get things done to improve our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

This bill makes much-needed reforms to Amtrak's business model and the RRIF loan program, which I hope will unlock a potential financing source for the CREATE rail modernization program in northeastern Illinois and help commuter rail agencies make important improvements, such as installing positive train control.

I am pleased the bill contains provisions extending Buy America require-

ments to RRIF projects. I have been mentioning this need since 2009, and I am glad to see that we are codifying these requirements to ensure that this \$35 billion loan program is investing our dollars in American materials and American jobs.

My amendment today is a small but important addition to this bill. It sharpens the directive in section 211 that requires Amtrak's inspector general to conduct a review of Amtrak's boarding procedures. Section 211 is a good step towards improving the experience of Amtrak riders and the efficiency of Amtrak's operations.

This amendment builds on this provision by clarifying that the Amtrak IG should consider the boarding needs of passengers that use mobility devices, including all forms of wheelchairs, as well as passengers with items such as bicycles. This will make sure that the IG's report considers the needs of all its riders, guarantees that Amtrak will focus on complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and harnesses a potential revenue stream from bicyclists and other users of nonmotorized transport.

Right now, Amtrak uses patchwork procedures that can make it difficult for an individual using a wheelchair or traveling with a bike to get on and off a train. The Amtrak inspector general issued a report in August of last year that found that only 10 percent of Amtrak stations are fully ADA compliant, which demonstrates the need to not only look at each station's infrastructure, but how each station gets passengers from station to platform to train. We need to make sure that Amtrak is serving all of its customers to the best of its abilities and in accordance with the law.

Mr. Chairman, similar difficulties exist for other forms of transportation, such as bicycles. Only 38 percent of Amtrak lines provide baggage service for bicycles, while only 18 percent of lines even allow for roll-on bicycle service that are complemented by ad hoc policies at many of the stations on these lines. Mobility is important to reducing congestion, and if we improve the boarding process, we improve quality of service and help encourage ridership.

This amendment is supported by Easter Seals, People for Bikes, the United Spinal Association, the League of American Bicyclists, AARP, the Rails to Trails Conservancy, the National Disabilities Rights Network, Transportation for America, and the Adventure Cycling Association.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment even though I do not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUSTER. This amendment simply clarifies that when the Amtrak inspector general looks at ways to improve Amtrak's boarding procedures at major stations that it consider passengers using wheelchairs and other nonmotorized transportation. I know this is near and dear to the hearts of Mr. LIPINSKI's constituents, so, again, I rise in support.

At this time, I would also like to take the opportunity, which I neglected to do, to thank the staff for their work over the past year. We rely on them to make a lot of this come together. Their hard work and dedication deserves recognition and appreciation.

Specifically, I would like to thank on the rail subcommittee Mike Friedberg, Fred Miller, David Connolly, and Kristin Alcalde; on the Democratic side, Jennifer Homendy and Rachel Carr for their hard work; our communications team Jim Billimoria, Justin Harclerode, Michael Marinaccio—I think I finally got it right, and he has left the committee—Keith Hall; from our front office Jennifer Hall, Beth Spivey, Collin McCune, Clare Doherty, Isabelle Beegle-Levin, Denny Wirtz, and Mary Mitchell Todd. To all of them, I thank them for their very, very hard work on helping to put this bill together.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this, and I would like to express my appreciation to the chair, ranking member, ranking members of the subcommittee and chair. This is, I think, an example of Congress doing what it should do. I appreciate it. As an alumni member of the T and I Committee, I am proud to see this move forward.

Rail corridors are absolutely critical in terms of being able to promote mobility. As the chair of the Bike Caucus, I am particularly interested in this amendment.

The committee ended last Congress on a high note with WRRDA, and being able to start this Congress on a high note with a really thoughtful approach to Amtrak, moving this forward, I think, is a signal that there is no other committee that has more potential to do more this Congress to help rebuild and renew the economy and get America moving. This is a tremendous signal about what is possible.

I lend my congratulations to the committee, Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member DEFAZIO, Ranking Member

BROWN, and look forward to working with you on more excitement as we move forward.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Illinois has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank, again, Chairman SHUSTER for his work and Ranking Member DEFAZIO. This is what we need to be doing is coming together and working these things out. There is so much that America needs done, especially when it comes to transportation infrastructure.

I want to thank the chairman for his great work in leading this committee. We have a lot of other issues to work on, other forms of transportation, but this is a good example of what we can do by working together.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment and support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on the amendment printed in House Report 114-36 on which further proceedings were postponed:

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. MCCLINTOCK of California.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 147, noes 272, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 110]

AYES—147

Abraham	Bridenstine	Culberson
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	DeSantis
Allen	Buck	DesJarlais
Amash	Burgess	Duffy
Babin	Byrne	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Carter (GA)	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Carter (TX)	Fleischmann
Benishkek	Chabot	Fleming
Bilirakis	Chaffetz	Flores
Bishop (UT)	Clawson (FL)	Forbes
Blum	Coffman	Fox
Brady (TX)	Collins (GA)	Franks (AZ)
Brat	Conaway	Garrett

Gohmert	Love	Rooney (FL)
Goodlatte	Luetkemeyer	Roskam
Gosar	Lummis	Ross
Gowdy	Marchant	Rouzer
Graves (GA)	Massie	Royce
Graves (LA)	McCaul	Russell
Graves (MO)	McClintock	Ryan (WI)
Grothman	McHenry	Salmon
Guinta	McMorris	Sanford
Guthrie	Rodgers	Scalise
Harper	McSally	Schweikert
Harris	Meadows	Scott, Austin
Hartzler	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Heck (NV)	Mica	Sessions
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (MO)
Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)	Smith (NE)
Hice, Jody B.	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)
Hill	Neugebauer	Stewart
Holding	Noem	Stutzman
Hudson	Nugent	Thornberry
Huelskamp	Nunes	Valadao
Huizenga (MI)	Olson	Walker
Hultgren	Palazzo	Walorski
Hunter	Palmer	Weber (TX)
Hurd (TX)	Pearce	Webster (FL)
Hurt (VA)	Pittenger	Wenstrup
Issa	Poe (TX)	Westerman
Johnson, Sam	Poliquin	Westmoreland
Jolly	Pompeo	Williams
Jones	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Jordan	Price, Tom	Woodall
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Yoder
Knight	Ribble	Young (IA)
Labrador	Rice (SC)	Young (IN)
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Zinke
Latta	Rohrabacher	
Loudermilk	Rokita	

#### NOES—272

Adams	Cummings	Himes
Aguilar	Curbelo (FL)	Honda
Ashford	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Barletta	Davis, Danny	Huffman
Bass	Davis, Rodney	Israel
Beatty	DeFazio	Jackson Lee
Becerra	DeGette	Jeffries
Bera	Delaney	Jenkins (KS)
Beyer	DeLauro	Jenkins (WV)
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (MI)	Denham	Johnson (OH)
Blumenauer	Dent	Johnson, E. B.
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Joyce
Bost	Deutch	Kaptur
Boustany	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Boyle, Brendan	Dingell	Keating
F.	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Brady (PA)	Dold	Kelly (PA)
Brooks (IN)	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
Brown (FL)	F.	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	Duckworth	Kilmer
Buchanan	Edwards	Kind
Bucshon	Ellison	King (NY)
Bustos	Ellmers (NC)	Kinzing (IL)
Butterfield	Emmer (MN)	Kirkpatrick
Calvert	Engel	Kline
Capps	Eshoo	Kuster
Capuano	Esty	LaMalfa
Cárdenas	Farenthold	Lance
Carney	Farr	Langevin
Carson (IN)	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Fitzpatrick	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Fortenberry	Lawrence
Castro (TX)	Foster	Lee
Chu, Judy	Frankel (FL)	Levin
Cicilline	Frelinghuysen	Lewis
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Clay	Gallego	LoBiondo
Cleaver	Garamendi	Loeb
Clyburn	Gibbs	Loftgren
Cohen	Gibson	Lowenthal
Cole	Graham	Lowey
Collins (NY)	Granger	Lucas
Comstock	Grayson	Lujan Grisham
Connolly	Green, Al	(NM)
Conyers	Green, Gene	Lujan, Ben Ray
Cook	Griffith	(NM)
Cooper	Grijalva	Lynch
Costa	Gutiérrez	MacArthur
Costello (PA)	Hahn	Maloney
Courtney	Hanna	Carolyn
Cramer	Hardy	Maloney, Sean
Crenshaw	Hastings	Marino
Crowley	Heck (WA)	Matsui
Cuellar	Higgins	McCarthy

McCollum	Rangel	Swalwell (CA)
McDermott	Reed	Takai
McGovern	Reichert	Takano
McKinley	Renacci	Thompson (CA)
McNerney	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Meehan	Richmond	Thompson (PA)
Meeks	Rigell	Tiberi
Meng	Roby	Tipton
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Titus
Moolenaar	Ros-Lehtinen	Tonko
Moore	Rothfus	Torres
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Trott
Mullin	Ruiz	Tsongas
Murphy (FL)	Ruppersberger	Turner
Murphy (PA)	Ryan (OH)	Upton
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen
Napolitano	T.	Vargas
Neal	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey
Newhouse	Sarbanes	Vela
Nolan	Schakowsky	Velázquez
Norcross	Schiff	Visclosky
O'Rourke	Schock	Wagner
Pallone	Schrader	Walberg
Pascarell	Scott (VA)	Walden
Paulsen	Scott, David	Walters, Mimi
Payne	Serrano	Walz
Pelosi	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Sherman	Schultz
Perry	Shimkus	Watson Coleman
Peters	Shuster	Welch
Peterson	Simpson	Whitfield
Pingree	Sinema	Wilson (FL)
Pitts	Sires	Wittman
Pocan	Slaughter	Womack
Polis	Smith (NJ)	Yarmuth
Price (NC)	Stefanik	Young (AK)
Quigley	Stivers	Zeldin

#### NOT VOTING—13

Amodei	Hinojosa	Speier
Black	Long	Waters, Maxine
Blackburn	Roe (TN)	Yoho
Crawford	Rush	
Fincher	Smith (WA)	

□ 1440

Messrs. MCNERNEY, WALBERG, WITTMAN, TAKANO, GALLEG0, ZELDIN, FORTENBERRY, RICHMOND, and LYNCH changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. GUTHRIE, GOHMERT, RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. NOEM, Messrs. JOLLY, YOUNG of Indiana, MESSER, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART) having assumed the chair, Mr. BYRNE, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 749) to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 134, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

□ 1445

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Yes, I am in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sean Patrick Maloney of New York moves to recommit the bill H.R. 749 to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

#### SEC. 503. AMTRAK SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for the use of the Amtrak Police Department \$150,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 for acquisition of canines, explosive detection, surveillance and communication equipment, baggage screening, counter-terrorism and critical infrastructure protection, and other security needs determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) VETERANS PROTECT PASSENGERS HIRING INITIATIVE.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall implement a veterans hiring initiative in the Amtrak Police Department, which shall include veterans with experience working with military working dogs.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the motion in the interest of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer this amendment today as the final amendment to the bill.

I am proud of the bipartisan work that the committee has done, and I want to commend the chairman, Mr. SHUSTER, also Messrs. DEFAZIO, DENHAM, and CAPUANO, and all the staff for the work that went into this legislation. This is a good bill, and it makes key investments in our rail infrastructure and in rail safety. I want to personally thank the chairman for all of his hard work on this bill and for, in particular, including the provisions that I authored on positive train con-

trol and grade crossings, the need for which has been so dramatically demonstrated by the terrible accidents in places like Valhalla and Spuyten Duyvil, New York, and recently in Oxnard, California.

However, we can make this bill better. My amendment will not kill the bill nor send it back to committee. If adopted, it would proceed immediately to final passage.

My amendment simply provides \$150 million annually to Amtrak's police department to address critical security needs. Amtrak's security force is not large, but its task is monumental, protecting nearly 32 million passengers who use Amtrak every year. My amendment gives those security officials the resources they need to prevent and defend against terrorist attacks. From additional canine units to explosive detection equipment, we need to make sure that Amtrak's police officers, nationwide, have the capability to protect passengers.

The amendment also requires Amtrak to implement a veterans hiring initiative specifically designed to hire veterans with experience working with military dogs, canine units. Amtrak has a long history of providing career opportunities to veterans, as well as Active Duty military members, but under current law is not required to do so. It is not required to seek out veterans for open positions. With more than 200,000 Active Duty servicemembers transitioning to civilian life, we can, today, guarantee that Amtrak will seek out veterans for new hires.

In the last 10 years, more than 800 attacks have occurred worldwide against passenger and commuter rail systems, killing thousands. Many of us remember the terrifying images of the terrorist attacks in Madrid and London. In Mumbai, three separate attacks in the last 15 years have killed hundreds of people.

All of us here in both parties understand the real dangers our country is facing. I have no doubt that one of the greatest threats we face is to our U.S. rail system. Subways and commuter systems, in particular, remain a top threat. Information taken from Osama bin Laden's very compound in Pakistan indicated that al Qaeda was considering attacks on a number of U.S. rail systems.

Our intelligence and law enforcement officials have foiled several threats in just recent years. In 2009, an Afghan-born jihadist plotted to bomb New York subways with devices very similar to those used in the 2005 London attacks. And in 2011, two al Qaeda-supported terrorists were arrested after plotting to bomb and derail a train between Toronto and New York's Penn Station.

At a time with heightened security and growing threats like ISIL, we are asking Amtrak's police force to do

more with less. Amtrak reports that security funding overall has decreased by more than 50 percent since 2011. We need to reverse this trend to protect the security of our national passenger rail system.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense amendment to provide the necessary funding to ensure the safety and security of Amtrak passengers and rail commuters.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this amendment will do nothing more than kill the bill. H.R. 749 is a bipartisan bill with heavy, heavy reforms that will improve and advance passenger rail in this country, including security. We have taken that into consideration. I agree that security is important, but we cover the cost of security activities in this bill.

Both sides of the aisle have worked very hard over the past 2 years to craft a bill that I believe is exactly the kind of legislation that the American people want. It is a reform bill. It is commonsense reforms. There has never been an Amtrak bill with these kinds of reforms in it empowering the States.

This bill empowers the States, those 19 States that have 21 supported Amtrak lines. They will have a seat at the table to make investments to improve passenger rail in those 19 States. It is going to give the commission on the Northeast corridor more say, more teeth to be able to force Amtrak to do things. It is going to keep the profits of the Northeast corridor in the Northeast corridor for that heavily congested area of the country that needs to have passenger rail and, along the way, learn the lessons of when we make those investments, how we can go out to the other corridors around this country that are going to need passenger rail.

This bill is not perfect; Amtrak is not perfect. But I truly believe this bill sets Amtrak on the course to reform itself and to improve itself so in the future they can move towards going away from the subsidy by the Federal Government. That is my goal: to get an Amtrak that doesn't have any Federal subsidies.

So these reforms were put in place. They are strong reforms. As I said, we have never had an Amtrak bill like this before, and it was done on a bipartisan basis. I think we can be proud of it. The Congress can be proud of this bill, and the American people can be proud that we are doing something.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this motion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 232, not voting 16, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 111]

##### AYES—184

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Fudge	Nadler
Ashford	Gabbard	Napolitano
Bass	Galleo	Neal
Beatty	Garamendi	Nolan
Becerra	Graham	Norcross
Bera	Grayson	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Payne
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan	Hahn	Perlmutter
F.	Hastings	Peters
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Pingree
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pocan
Bustos	Honda	Polis
Butterfield	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capps	Huffman	Quigley
Capuano	Israel	Rangel
Cárdenas	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carney	Jeffries	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Jones	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawrence	Sherman
Courtney	Lee	Sinema
Crowley	Levin	Sires
Cuellar	Lewis	Slaughter
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Takai
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Takano
DeFazio	Lofgren	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lowe	Titus
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham	Tonko
DelBene	(NM)	Torres
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
Deutch	(NM)	Van Hollen
Dingell	Lynch	Vargas
Doggett	Maloney,	Veasey
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn	Vela
F.	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Duckworth	Matsui	Visclosky
Edwards	McCollum	Walz
Ellison	McDermott	Wasserman
Engel	McGovern	Schultz
Eshoo	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Esty	Meeks	Welch
Farr	Meng	Wilson (FL)
Fattah	Moore	Yarmuth
Foster	Moulton	

#### NOES—232

Abraham	Hardy	Pitts
Aderholt	Harper	Poe (TX)
Allen	Harris	Poliquin
Amash	Hartzler	Pompeo
Babin	Heck (NV)	Posey
Barletta	Hensarling	Price, Tom
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Benishek	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Bilirakis	Hill	Reichert
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Ribble
Blum	Huelskamp	Rice (SC)
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Rigell
Boustany	Hultgren	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rokita
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Burgess	Jolly	Rothfus
Byrne	Jordan	Rouzer
Calvert	Joyce	Royce
Carter (GA)	Katko	Russell
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	King (IA)	Salmon
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Sanford
Clawson (FL)	Kinzing (IL)	Scalise
Coffman	Kline	Schock
Cole	Knight	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Comstock	Lamborn	Sessions
Conaway	Lance	Shimkus
Cook	Latta	Shuster
Cramer	LoBiondo	Simpson
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Culberson	Love	Smith (NE)
Curbelo (FL)	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Davis, Rodney	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Denham	Lummis	Stefanik
Dent	MacArthur	Stewart
DeSantis	Marchant	Stivers
DesJarlais	Marino	Stutzman
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Dold	McCarthy	Thornberry
Duffy	McClintock	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Trott
Ellmers (NC)	McKinley	Turner
Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Upton
Farenthold	Rodgers	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Wagner
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walberg
Fleming	Meehan	Walden
Flores	Messer	Walker
Forbes	Mica	Walorski
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Walters, Mimi
Fox	Miller (MI)	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	Mooleenaar	Webster (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Wenstrup
Garrett	Mullin	Westerman
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Westmoreland
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Williams
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Gosar	Noem	Wittman
Govdy	Nugent	Womack
Granger	Nunes	Woodall
Graves (GA)	Olson	Yoder
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Young (AK)
Graves (MO)	Palmer	Young (IA)
Griffith	Paulsen	Young (IN)
Grothman	Pearce	Zeldin
Guinta	Perry	Zinke
Hanna	Pittenger	

#### NOT VOTING—16

Amodei	Fincher	Smith (WA)
Barton	Guthrie	Speier
Black	Hinojosa	Waters, Maxine
Blackburn	Long	Yoho
Costello (PA)	Roe (TN)	
Crawford	Rush	

□ 1457

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 111, meeting with constituents in office on matters involving Ukraine. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 316, nays 101, not voting 15, as follows:

#### [Roll No. 112]

##### YEAS—316

Abraham	DeGette	Johnson (OH)
Adams	Delaney	Johnson, E. B.
Aderholt	DeLauro	Jolly
Aguilar	DelBene	Joyce
Ashford	Denham	Kaptur
Babin	Dent	Katko
Barletta	DeSaulnier	Keating
Bass	Deutch	Kelly (IL)
Beatty	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)
Becerra	Dingell	Kennedy
Bera	Doggett	Kildee
Beyer	Dold	Kilmer
Bishop (GA)	Doyle, Michael	Kind
Bishop (MI)	F.	King (NY)
Bishop (UT)	Duckworth	Kinzing (IL)
Blumenauer	Duncan (TN)	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	Edwards	Kline
Bost	Ellison	Kuster
Boustany	Ellmers (NC)	LaMalfa
Boyle, Brendan	Emmer (MN)	Lance
F.	Engel	Langevin
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Brady (TX)	Esty	Larson (CT)
Brooks (IN)	Farenthold	Lawrence
Brown (FL)	Farr	Lee
Brownley (CA)	Fattah	Levin
Buchanan	Fitzpatrick	Lewis
Buchson	Forbes	Lieu, Ted
Bustos	Fortenberry	Lipinski
Butterfield	Foster	LoBiondo
Calvert	Frankel (FL)	Loeb sack
Capps	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren
Capuano	Fudge	Lowenthal
Cárdenas	Gabbard	Lowe
Carney	Galleo	Lucas
Carson (IN)	Garamendi	Luetkemeyer
Cartwright	Garrett	Lujan Grisham
Castor (FL)	Gibbs	(NM)
Castro (TX)	Gibson	Luján, Ben Ray
Chu, Judy	Goodlatte	(NM)
Cicilline	Graham	Lummis
Clark (MA)	Graves (LA)	Lynch
Clark (NY)	Graves (MO)	MacArthur
Clay	Grayson	Maloney,
Cleaver	Green, Al	Carolyn
Clyburn	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean
Cohen	Griffith	Marino
Connolly	Grijalva	Matsui
Conyers	Guinta	McCarthy
Cooper	Gutiérrez	McClintock
Costa	Hahn	McCollum
Costello (PA)	Hanna	McDermott
Courtney	Hardy	McGovern
Cramer	Harper	McKinley
Crenshaw	Hastings	McMorris
Crowley	Heck (WA)	Rodgers
Cuellar	Higgins	McNerney
Cummings	Hill	Meadows
Curbelo (FL)	Himes	Meehan
Davis (CA)	Honda	Meeks
Davis, Danny	Hoyer	Meng
Davis, Rodney	Huffman	Mica
DeFazio	Hurt (VA)	Miller (MI)
	Israel	Mooleenaar
	Issa	Moore
	Jackson Lee	Moulton
	Jeffries	Mullin
	Jenkins (WV)	Murphy (FL)
	Johnson (GA)	Murphy (PA)



Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Rogers (KY)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross

Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Russell  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schock  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takal  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi

Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Westerman  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NAYS—101

Allen  
Amash  
Barr  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Blum  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Buck  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Clawson (FL)  
Collins (GA)  
Conaway  
Culberson  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Gohmert  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Grothman

Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Jenkins (KS)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
King (IA)  
Knight  
Labrador  
Latta  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCaul  
McHenry  
McSally  
Messer  
Miller (FL)  
Mooney (WV)  
Mulaney  
Neugebauer  
Noem

Nugent  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Poe (TX)  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Rice (SC)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Rothfus  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Stewart  
Stutzman  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westmoreland  
Wilson (SC)  
Yoder  
Young (IA)

## NOT VOTING—15

Amodei  
Barton  
Black  
Blackburn  
Crawford

Fincher  
Guthrie  
Hinojosa  
Lamborn  
Long

Roe (TN)  
Rush  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Yoho

□ 1505

Messrs. STEWART, SMITH of Nebraska, and RICE of South Carolina changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 110 for passage of McClintock Amendment No. 6, rollcall No. 111 for passage of the Democrat Motion to Recommit, and rollcall No. 112 for final passage of H.R. 749, which took place Wednesday, March 4, 2015, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 110, the McClintock Amendment No. 6, and voted "nay" on rollcall Nos. 111 and 112, against the Motion to Recommit and final passage of H.R. 749.

## OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Administration be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1213) to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1213

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Office of Compliance Administrative and Technical Corrections Act of 2015".

## SEC. 2. PROCEDURES FOR MEDIATION AND HEARINGS UNDER CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.

(a) REQUIRING MEDIATORS TO BE APPOINTED FROM MASTER LIST.—Section 403 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1403) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "after considering recommendations by organizations composed primarily of individuals experienced in adjudicating or arbitrating personnel matters" and inserting "from the master list developed and maintained under subsection (e)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) MASTER LIST OF MEDIATORS.—

"(1) DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF MASTER LIST.—The Executive Director shall develop and maintain a master list of individuals who are experienced in adjudicating, arbitrating, or mediating the kinds of personnel and other matters for which mediation may be held under this section. Such list may include, but not be limited to, members of the bar of a State or the District of Columbia and retired judges of the United States courts.

"(2) CONSIDERATION OF CANDIDATES.—In developing the master list under this subsection, the Executive Director shall consider candidates recommended by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service or the Administrative Conference of the United States."

(b) CLARIFICATION OF DEADLINE TO ELECT PROCEEDINGS AFTER END OF PERIOD OF MEDI-

ATION.—Section 404 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1404) is amended by striking "Not later than 90 days after a covered employee receives notice of the end of the period of mediation, but no sooner than 30 days after receipt of such notification, such covered employee" and inserting "Not later than 90 days, but not sooner than 30 days, after the end of the period of mediation, a covered employee".

(c) NOTIFICATION OF CONFIDENTIALITY REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) MEDIATIONS.—Section 416(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1416(b)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ", and the Executive Director shall notify each person participating in the mediation of the confidentiality requirement and of the sanctions applicable to any person who violates the confidentiality requirement."

(2) HEARINGS AND DELIBERATIONS.—Section 416(c) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1416(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Executive Director shall notify each person participating in a proceeding or deliberation to which this subsection applies of the requirements of this subsection and of the sanctions applicable to any person who violates the requirements of this subsection."

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to mediations and other proceedings which are first initiated after the date of the enactment of this Act.

## SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL TERM FOR MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE.

Notwithstanding section 301(e)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381(e)(1)), any individual serving as a member of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance as of February 28, 2015, may be appointed to serve for one additional term of 2 years.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 2015, TO FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Friday, March 6, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mrs. MILLER, Michigan, Chairman

Mr. LATTA, Ohio

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS, Illinois

# RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology:

FEBRUARY 18, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House, The Capitol,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER, This letter serves as my official resignation from the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. It has been my pleasure serving on this Committee since being elected to Congress.

Best Regards,

FREDERICA S. WILSON,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

## HONORING AGENT BRIAN TERRY

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, Border Patrol unveiled a new statue honoring slain Border Patrol Agent Brian Terry at the Naco, Arizona, border station in my district named in Agent Terry's honor.

The statue, depicted here, shows Agent Terry carrying a member of his Border Patrol tactical unit on his shoulders and is a fitting tribute to a man who loved his job and his fellow agents.

Agent Terry entered the service with the Border Patrol on July 23, 2007. Before that, he served in the U.S. Marine Corps and as a police officer in Michigan.

On December 14, 2010, Agent Terry was on patrol with three of his fellow agents in Peck Canyon near Nogales, Arizona, when they came across five individuals suspected of crossing the border illegally.

The agents approached the suspects and were fired upon, prompting them to return fire. In the gunfight that ensued, two agents were wounded, including Agent Terry. He died from his wounds in the desert later that morning while waiting for medical assistance.

Agent Terry's sacrifice is a constant reminder of the dangers those who defend our homeland face every time they put on their uniform. Their job is to protect our communities, and often, they are the last line of defense against terrorist attacks on our country.

Agent Brian Terry gave the ultimate sacrifice to carry out his duties. Every day, agents like him put everything they have on the line to keep us safe. They deserve everything we have to support them.

# THE ASSASSINATION OF BORIS NEMTSOV WAS A REPREHENSIBLE ACT

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the assassination of Russian opposition leader Boris Nemtsov last Friday in front of the Kremlin was a reprehensible act that demands a thorough and independent investigation.

Mr. Nemtsov was a political leader who had fought for democracy inside the system. His murder took place against the backdrop of Putin's continued suppression of the rule of law, political debate, and human rights in Russia. His murder follows the murder of other critics of Putin's tyranny, Anna Politkovskaya and Sergei Magnitsky.

Today, Putin is rebuilding many of the barriers to individual freedom, democracy, and self-determination that were thought relegated to what President Reagan called the ash heap of history.

As a former chairman of the Helsinki Commission in the final years of the cold war, I witnessed the yearnings of the Russian people not to be bullied through fear and control by their leaders. Vladimir Putin and his henchmen have created a culture of terror for those who oppose his rule and have increasingly isolated Russia from the world.

Congress and the American people must keep speaking out against the erosion of the basic freedoms the Russian people achieved in the 1990s.

This week, Mr. Speaker, the thoughts and prayers of the American people are with the family of Mr. Nemtsov and millions whose hopes and dreams he fought for throughout his life.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

## FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 1) "An Act to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline", returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, it was resolved that the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative.

# HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THEODORE HESBURGH

(Mr. YOUNG of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Theodore Hesburgh. As the president and public face of the University of Notre Dame for so long, his passing isn't just deeply felt in South Bend, Indiana, but all across our great State.

A lifelong educator, Father Hesburgh spent the vast majority of his 97 years giving lessons that everyone—regardless of age, profession, or station in life—can learn from. A few of those lessons, I think, are especially apt for those of us in this body, chief among them: "The very essence of leadership is that you have to have vision. You can't blow an uncertain trumpet."

Too often, those of us in elective office find it easier to blow the horn of opposition rather than committing ourselves to the hard work of developing constructive policies.

As we reflect on his legacy at this time, my hope is that we will all follow the advice that Father Hesburgh exemplified so well throughout the course of his distinguished career and rededicate ourselves to laying out a positive vision and concrete solutions that will move our great Nation forward.

□ 1515

## PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have spent the last week and a half debating funding for the Department of Homeland Security, a debate that started because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle didn't like the President's executive actions on immigration.

House Republicans finally did do what they ought to have done all along: joining with Democrats to pass the bipartisan funds for DHS through Fiscal Year 2015. That legislation has

restored certainty for thousands of employees at the Department of Homeland Security; and, even more importantly, it ensures the safety and security of our entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, while we settled the funding for DHS, we haven't addressed the issues that led us to the impasse in the first place.

Republicans in both the House and the Senate wanted to hinder the President's legal authority to better manage our broken immigration system. They have called it illegal amnesty, and many of their conservative counterparts have gone as far as calling the President a tyrant, but they have not offered any plan of their own.

Today, during this Special Order hour, I would like to take the opportunity, on behalf of our Progressive Caucus, to join with my colleague, the Congressman from Arizona, to express our concerns from the Progressive Caucus' perspective on our plans for the future as it relates to immigration.

To that extent, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for having this opportunity for us to come and talk about the root issue, as she explained, the root issue that caused almost the potential of DHS and that Department having to be shut down because of the amendments added by this House of Representatives to an appropriations bill, a bill that should have been clean.

It was a bipartisan piece of legislation, but amendments were added to it, amendments that were against the President's executive order, amendments that were aimed at undoing any progress that had been made with DREAMers, the DACA, the amendments that were punitive in its entirety, and did not seek any solution to deal with our broken immigration system.

Thankfully, the adults in the House took control. A clean bill was passed with overwhelming and unanimous support from Democrats and with significant support from our Republican colleagues.

That being done, that example should be a harbinger that on "must-pass" legislation critical to the future of this Nation, critical to its tranquility, that we stop playing games with that legislation, and that the track to deal with immigration reform should be a track that we all pursue.

To try to put mean-spirited, divisive, "got you," grandstanding amendments on a piece of "must-pass" legislation, whether it is Homeland Security the other day, Transportation in the future, that is not governing; that is merely pandering to a political ideology that has nothing to do with the underlying bill, as it did with national security.

Let me talk a little bit about how we got to that situation, as the gentlelady said. In the time that I have been here, immigration reform and the broken system has been an acknowledged fact by all sides.

There was an attempt that the Senate, a year ago, passed, a bipartisan bill, overwhelming support, that took us in a direction, a very critical first step to reforming this broken immigration system. For a year, we waited for the leadership of this House, the Republican leadership, to bring that bill up and let the people's House work its will. That never happened.

Time and time again, we admonished the leadership in saying: If nothing is done by this House to allow an up-or-down vote on that piece of legislation that the Senate passed, the President will have no option but to relieve the anxiety, to relieve the painful family divisions that were going on in this country and to prevent additional community trauma that many of our communities were facing with the high level of detentions and deportations, the splitting of families, even when there was U.S. citizen children or a spouse involved.

The President waited; he waited a considerable amount of time. I was one of those that criticized that waiting period, that should be done immediately. At the end, the President put the executive orders together, the expansion and enhancement of DACA for DREAMers, for young people, and DAPA, for those parents who have citizen children, that they, too, would get the 2-year umbrella of protection, could work and could come out of the shadows.

This was not automatic, as it has been exaggerated by the opponents of his actions. This was a process that requires documentation and that requires qualifications in order to be eligible for the programs.

As the President said, Department of Homeland Security, ICE, and Border Patrol can now concentrate on the smuggling and organized crime that occurs along our border that is the root cause of much of the violence and heartache that we see on our border.

In Arizona, there has been over close to 5,000 individuals that have lost their lives in the desert trying to cross to the United States, countless acts of violence—all generated by human traffickers, drug smugglers, and organized crime on both sides of the border.

It is time to concentrate on that very obvious threat to American security. The other is to go after the people that we don't want here. It is another exaggeration to say that this is blanket amnesty. It is not blanket amnesty, far from it.

We, like everyone else—the people that don't belong here because of felonious behavior, violence, drug smuggling, and breaking the laws of this Na-

tion, those are the people that ICE should put its emphasis on and get rid of felons, as the President said, and not families.

The President did that order, much to the outcry of some colleagues of mine on the other side of the aisle—not all. I would never paint the whole Republican Conference with one brush, but there is a significant number that see the issue of immigration in a very different and clouded way.

That clouded way has to do more with ideology. It has more to do with the sense that it is us versus them and an insecurity about the changing demography of this country and what it means to the Nation. That insecurity is just sad, an insecurity not founded in fact and not founded on the immigrant history of this Nation.

As a first-generation American, I can tell you the pride and the values that I have were grown in this country, were nurtured in this country, and serving in this body could be the highest honor I could ever have. That story is repeated, day in and day out, for the history of this Nation, that the immigrant community has come to give and to contribute, not to take.

The President has wide latitude, as President, with executive orders. The court case, an injunction to hold the implementation of his executive orders in Texas, where a selection process chose this judge for his previous legal opinions and his previous public comments regarding the issue of immigration, that sided very much with the opponents.

I am totally confident—totally confident—that as we move up the chain of the Federal court system, that the constitutional authority that the President has for these executive orders, as previous Presidents had for executive orders, will be redeemed; and that lower injunction will be overturned.

In the interim, we continue to tell people in the undocumented community, immigrant community: Come forward, bring your documentation, begin to prepare yourself for an opportunity to be one of the people and families that qualify for this program.

What the President did with those executive orders is significant in many ways. Those executive orders began mending the social fabric of this Nation. One of the most divisive issues has been immigration, and maybe it is a good election ploy to continue to beat that horse dead in order to get elected.

In the long term, in the generational term of this Nation, it does nothing but divide us along very superficial issues. It divides us along the issue of race and divides us along the issue of language and country of origin. Those are not divisions for the social well-being of this Nation that we can tolerate.

Immigration reform is also about the domestic tranquility of this Nation and

to heal that social fabric that has been ripped.

I also want to say that the Progressive Caucus, from the onset, has been a tireless advocate for comprehensive immigration reform, humane policies, family-centered reforms, and reforms that deal with the reality of what is around us and doesn't ignore it.

I am proud to be a member of that caucus and for its steadfast and unwavering support not only of comprehensive immigration reform, but of the President and his executive orders.

Five amendments were presented as part of the DHS bill, which were at the center of the controversy, and the ones that were eliminated so we could finally vote on a key piece of legislation.

One amendment, the Aderholt amendment, this amendment prohibits any funds or fees to be used to carry out the majority of the President's executive order, including DAPA and DACA.

Reality, fact, the prohibition is irrelevant and moot. All the cost of this program comes from the individual making an application. It is a fee-driven process. There is no specific allocation that this body has made to it or that the Department is making to it.

The Blackburn amendment, which I thought was of particular anguish to everyone, this amendment would end the DACA program, the DREAMer program for DREAMer children susceptible to deportation.

Let's say those almost 300,000, if not more, young people that are qualified under DACA, suddenly, with that amendment, would have that protection taken away and their status would now be back in the deportable status.

That amendment, in and of itself, does nothing for national security, does nothing to address the issue of a broken immigration system; but, indeed, adds a level of cruelty to the whole process of trying to solve this problem.

Preventing the President from being able to have new enforcement priorities, going after criminals and felons, as opposed to trying to break up families and deport families, one of the amendments was meant to stop that.

The Salmon amendment really made no sense. Undocumented people are not able and cannot receive and participate in the Affordable Care Act. Employers cannot register and have them employed, period, by Federal law. It was just to state the obvious and try to create an issue in which there wasn't one.

□ 1530

And there is no prioritization, where people under this executive order will be ahead of other people. There are two different processes: one is for a legal reprieve of protection that lasts up to the tenure of this President, and the other one, naturalization and getting legal permanent status, continues to be

a process. One process doesn't get in front of the line of the other.

I want to go back to one point. At some point, we are going to have to deal with the issue of immigration reform in a constructive, proactive way. And it is going to have to be dealt with because I think the economic security of this country is at stake; the domestic well-being and quality of life for this country is at stake; the economy is at stake; and the security is at stake; and if for no other reason, to look at the benefits of those areas in the discussion of comprehensive immigration reform.

We could continue on the path of making immigration reform and immigrants the cannon fodder in the 2016 election. We could continue to make immigration reform the collateral damage in any piece of legislation that is brought before this Congress, with the assumption that the individuals affected by these laws are not real human beings. We can continue to deny the obvious and the reality of this Nation, that when you have 11 million undocumented living, working amongst us, that the prudent, smart, and pragmatic thing to do is to deal with that issue and not exploit it or ignore it.

We have heard so much pandering to this issue. We have heard of disease being brought to this country, which was proven untrue. The young children that were in detention that came in that surge across the border 6, 7 months ago, their rate of infection was no higher than the rate of infection for children throughout this Nation. We have heard the pandering about terrorism coming over the border. Not one incident has been qualified as fact—that, indeed, that has become a pathway for terrorism.

The issue that somehow it is tearing at what America is, I think that is the most important point that we should take into consideration. "From many, there is one" is the motto that this Nation holds dear to itself, that all of us come here, and that by being here, we began to form this Union of ours, integrating the values, the aspirations, the rule of law, and the history of that Nation in making it one.

To continue to pretend that we can have a two-tiered society without consequences to the economy and the social well-being of this Nation is wrong. It is wrong for very humane and just reasons, but it is profoundly wrong on what this Nation is and what I learned and all of us have learned this Nation is and will continue to be: a nation founded on the rule of law, a nation founded by immigrants.

I also want to say—and I will say it as delicately and as carefully as I can—that the issue of immigration reform to many people who are citizens—maybe second and third generation whose original folks were immigrants who happened to be of color, who hap-

pened to come from a country of origin where the language and the culture were different from the mainstream of this Nation, whom it integrated fully and who have contributed to the defense and the well-being of this Nation—they feel that the constant drumbeat of accusation, of "it is us versus them," of division, that this issue not only is an issue of immigration reform for the people who need it and for the Nation that needs it, but it is also an issue of civil rights, that no one should be profiled into a situation where they are less than someone else because of where their parents came from, because of the language that they spoke or the country that they came from or the color of their skin.

That is not America. And we continue to pander to those emotions, fear, as a means to score political points and possibly win an election here and there. That we do it at our own peril.

So for many generations of Americans that have served this country, the issue of immigration strikes us as an issue about our rights, our presence, our history, and our ability to proudly stand with anyone else and be as American as the next person.

With that, I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for organizing this, and I thank her for the opportunity that she has granted me to be able to state some things that sometimes the confines of our debates here don't allow us to.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you very much.

I am very grateful to my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, for sharing his vast knowledge, experience, and dedication to such an important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am relatively new to this Chamber; but I must tell you that, as I have been working here and observing, I am always reminded of the fact that this is a nation of immigrants. This is a nation that was conceived of by immigrants. It was created by immigrants. It was made great by immigrants because all of our Founding Fathers who are responsible for the way this country operates and the way we operate this democracy came to this land from another land.

According to our polling that has been released by the Public Religion Research Institute in February, 77 percent of the country supports either a pathway to citizenship or permanent legal residency for undocumented immigrants. Only 19 percent want to enforce deportation. Citizenship is also favored over deportation in every single solitary State in this Nation, frequently by very wide margins.

In the last Congress, as my colleague from Arizona noted, the Democratic-led Senate passed legislation that would have provided that pathway for 11 million immigrants seeking the American Dream but currently living

in the shadows. That bill also would have strengthened border security, something I hear my Republican colleagues argue about quite frequently. That measure passed with significant Republican support, 68-32 votes; yet our Speaker, Speaker BOEHNER, declared that that bill was dead on arrival in the House.

It is not just my constituents, it is not just Democrats that know it is time for a change on immigration. The American people are quickly reaching consensus that the American Dream should not be withheld and that there is nothing to fear from those who are seeking it.

The American people are beginning to understand that the absolutely deplorable rhetoric used to keep immigrants in the shadows is just that, rhetoric. The American people are starting to agree that our legacy as a nation of immigrants means that offering the same opportunities to new generations should be the order of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I am calling on my Republican colleagues right now to open the discussion on real immigration reform.

This, as I said, is a nation of immigrants, built by people who came from different worlds, seeking opportunities to change their futures. So we should be having a conversation about how we honor that legacy and protect the promise of the American Dream for a new generation that is ready to work hard, play by the rules, and seize it.

This is not a nation that will thrive by keeping our immigrants in the shadows. This is a nation right now that is just gaining traction and economic growth, with plenty of people still looking for employment and a government too burdened by austerity measures to provide any relief.

So we should be having a conversation about the economic benefits of comprehensive immigration reform and the extraordinary impact it would have on job creation and innovation. It is not just the right thing to do; it is the fiscally right thing to do; it is a morally right thing to do; and it is a timely thing to do.

We need to let go of our excuses and end the scare tactics. Let's get together and pass comprehensive immigration reform right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### DESIGNATION OF FUNDING FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-15)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred

to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

#### *To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with language under the heading "Coast Guard, Operating Expenses" of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (the "Act"), I hereby designate for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism all funding so designated by the Congress in the Act pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, as outlined in the enclosed list of accounts.

The details of this action are set forth in the enclosed memorandum from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 2015.

#### HONORING THE REMARKABLE LIFE OF FATHER THEODORE HESBURGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the great life of Father Hesburgh.

Today I looked up on Wikipedia some information about Father Hesburgh. It says:

Born: Theodore Martin Hesburgh, May 25, 1917, Syracuse, New York, United States. Died: February 26, 2015 (age 97), Notre Dame, Indiana, United States. Alma mater: The Catholic University of America. Profession: Priest. Religion: Roman Catholic.

And then it shows his signature.

Well, today, in South Bend, Indiana, and on the University of Indiana, flags are flown at halfstaff to honor the passing of a giant among men, a warrior for peace and a champion for civil rights, Father Theodore Hesburgh.

I want you to just think for a minute and let your mind drift to what we will see in the future as a tombstone that is going to have Father Hesburgh's name, and it is going to say: Born May 25, 1917; died February 26, 2015. And I want you to forget about those two dates and, for a minute, think about the 97 years in between those dates—not just the day Father Hesburgh was born or the day Father Hesburgh died, but the 97 years that Father Hesburgh spent on Earth doing great work because, truly, a man is measured not so much by his years on Earth but what he accomplished while he was here.

For those of us at Notre Dame, I think it is important to go back and think about just who Father Ted was. Father actually passed away last Thursday at 11:30 p.m.

I want you to think about Father Hesburgh's last day. He rose in the morning. It was very important for

him to celebrate Mass, which he did that day. Throughout the course of the day, he wasn't feeling quite right; but, again, he was 97 years old. That evening, as he was accustomed to do, he smoked a cigar, and then he went to bed. And for whatever reason, he was surrounded by some very good friends, but he was also surrounded by a nun.

Father Hesburgh's last moments were the recitation of the rosary. Now, he was very fluent in five different languages. The language that he thought was the most beautiful was the French language, and the rosary was recited in French.

□ 1545

Picture, if you can, a 97-year-old man lying in a bed, friends around him, knowing that something was going to happen, and Father Hesburgh closed his eyes and passed. But think about the glorious moment right after the closing of those eyes. Because in the next instant they were opened, not on Earth, not on the University of Notre Dame, not in a bed where he was a dying old man, but in Heaven, surrounded by all those folks who knew Father Ted, who loved Father Ted, and who have been patiently waiting for his arrival, because that is what we believe. We know that he is at home.

Now, I told you Father Hesburgh was born in Syracuse, New York. He was educated at Notre Dame and at the Gregorian University in Rome, from which he received a bachelor of philosophy degree. He was ordained a priest of the Congregation of Holy Cross in Sacred Heart Church, now the Basilica, on Notre Dame campus in June of 1943.

Earlier today, Mr. Speaker, at 2 o'clock, the funeral mass for Father Hesburgh was held at this very same church, Sacred Heart Basilica on our beautiful and beloved campus. Now, as I stand here, the funeral mass for Father Ted is concluding, and the Notre Dame community will be following Father Ted on St. Mary's Road out to his final resting place at the Holy Cross Community Cemetery. It will be a sad march, but it will also be a rejoicing march because certainly we miss him, and we are going to miss him, but we rejoice in what he was able to accomplish.

For generations of students at Notre Dame, Father Hesburgh was simply known as Father Ted. That is all—Father Ted. Now, I was one of those people that was fortunate enough to be there when Father Ted was there. And some of my colleagues, I think that PETER KING was there, PETER VISCLOSKEY was there, KEITH ROTHFUS was there, and my good friend Senator JOE DONNELLY was there. Today Senators DONNELLY and COATS and I wanted to pay tribute to this national treasure by introducing a bicameral resolution to honor the life of this truly amazing man. Father Ted faithfully served

Notre Dame for decades. He served as Notre Dame's president from 1952 to 1987.

Now, I want you to think about what Father Ted has done, because mostly when people talk about Notre Dame, they say, oh, yeah, heck of a football team, and at times we have been very good. But he was able to transition us from not just a team or a little school in the Midwest that was known for the way it played football—and we were originally called the Ramblers. We were not called the Fighting Irish. We were called the Ramblers because we had no home, and so we kind of had to go around the country to play different teams, so we kind of rambled around the country. We were the Ramblers. Then we adopted the name Fighting Irish, and it was for the very immigrants that came to the university. It was one of those universities that honored the fact that people were coming from all over the world. They were coming to the United States, and there were really not a lot of institutions of higher learning that they could get entrance to. Notre Dame was one of those institutions.

So his leadership at Notre Dame just didn't stop in South Bend, and it certainly didn't stop at the university's gates. His commitment to education and social justice extended way beyond the boundaries of my alma mater and well beyond Indiana and, in fact, well beyond America's shores. His dedication is one of shared humanity that knew absolutely no bounds.

His strong belief that what unites us is far greater than that which divides us made him a champion of civil discourse and social justice. One only needs to look at a photo that I brought with me today, and in the annals of America, it is hard to look at Dr. King and Father Ted and not look at these two lions for social justice, these two lions for civil rights, to understand that they were locked arm in arm on a mission that they knew had to take place and that they could no longer turn a blind eye or a deaf ear to. That is who Father Ted was. He believed to the very soul of who he was, the very fabric of who this man was, that this is what America needed. He not only preached it, he not only taught it, he lived it.

So this week, Mr. Speaker—and, truly, I think it is almost providential—is the 50th anniversary of the march on Selma's Edmund Pettus Bridge, commemorates the 50th anniversary. Again, this was called Bloody Sunday. This was in 1965. It is hard for us to imagine that that could have taken place, but it did. In fact, we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of it this Saturday. That is what helped secure the passage of the Voting Rights Act so that every American citizen could equally participate in her democratic process. This was a milestone.

This just wasn't something to be marked on a calendar. This was a great event in terms of how we advanced democracy in our country.

Now, as we honor Selma's legacy this Saturday, I know that the spirits of these two great lions, these people that really stood up and took time to stand up when it wasn't really easy to stand up and it certainly took a lot of courage, they stood up to what they knew to be right, for what they knew to be true, and for what they knew to be truly American.

Now, as I said earlier, I just can imagine right now that when Father closed his eyes last Thursday night and then suddenly opened them, again, who was around him? Who surrounded him? Whom he was able to share that moment with is incredible. I am sure Dr. King was there with him.

Now, over the years, this man, Father Hesburgh, held 16 Presidential appointments that covered every type of major social concern and civil rights concern to Third World development that a person could possibly understand, and also campus unrest. He won the Presidential Medal of Freedom. He won the Congressional Gold Medal. He won the Sylvanus Thayer Award, and he won the Public Welfare Medal. And though he counseled Popes and Presidents, Father Hesburgh was first and foremost a priest, a priest on the campus of Notre Dame. He had said: "I never really wanted to be anything but a priest, which is in itself a great and unearned grace. I hope to live and die a priest, nothing more, but nothing less either."

Now, for decades, he has been considered the most influential priest in America, and the world he looked at as his flock. He was truly a shepherd who lived with his flock. He demonstrated this by his tireless work and his historic service to our country, to our church, and to the world.

Robert Whittington, a contemporary of Sir Thomas More, in 1520 wrote of Sir Thomas More:

"He is a man of angel's wit and singular learning. I know not his fellow. For where is the man of that gentleness, lowliness, and affability? And, as time requireth, a man of marvelous mirth and pastimes, and sometime of as sad gravity. A man for all seasons."

At the end of the day, Father Hesburgh was truly America's Renaissance man. He was truly our "man for all seasons." And much like Sir Thomas More was to his contemporaries over 500 years ago, Father Ted has left this world a better place because he took it upon himself the responsibility to inspire others here and abroad to pursue a life of justice and peace. Truly blessed are the peacemakers.

Now, as Father Hesburgh was known to say, he, too, is "resting in the loving hands of our Savior, bathed in the light

of eternal life." These words were spoken by Father Hesburgh to Secretary Condoleezza Rice upon the passing of her father. He is now at peace with God. He is with the God he served so well during his lifetime on Earth.

I will leave you with this one thought. A good friend of mine that I grew up with and graduated with, a guy named Larry Vuillemin, had gone to see Father.

KEITH ROTHFUS and I, by the way, a year ago, received his blessing when he was here. We were celebrating his birthday. We knelt down, and he gave us his blessing.

Father said to Larry Vuillemin when they were having a talk about ethics, he said: Larry, ethics is fun to intellectualize, but ethics without the heart is missing something.

So if we can just concentrate on those words, let those words soak in and seep in to who we are, then I think we can truly not only honor him, but honor him in a way that really means the most, and that is by emulating his life and trying to carry forward the same issues that Father had.

I know he is now at peace with the God he has served so well during his life. May peace be with him.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 240. An act making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

H.R. 431. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, March 6, 2015, at 2 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

643. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a 15-month transaction specific revolving

credit facility under Export-Import Bank's Working Capital Guarantee Program to Accelerant Technologies LLC; to the Committee on Financial Services.

644. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Establishment of the Multi-State Plan Program for the Affordable Insurance Exchanges (RIN: 3206-AN12) received March 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

645. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting reports submitted in accordance with Sec. 36(a) and Sec. 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 96-70), and Report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-214) for the first quarter FY 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

646. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List; and Removal of Person from the Entity List Based on a Removal Request [Docket No.: 141230999-4999-01] (RIN: 0694-AG46) received February 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

647. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties, entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

648. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-611, "Parkside Parcel E and J Mixed-Income Apartments Tax Abatement Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

649. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-610, "Prohibition of Pre-Employment Marijuana Testing Temporary Relief Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

650. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-622, "Nuisance Abatement Notice Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

651. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-623, "Not-For-Profit Hospital Corporation Certificate of Need Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

652. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-625, "Classroom Animal for Educational Purposes Clarification Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

653. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-626, "Apprenticeship Modernization Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

654. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-627, "Fiscal Year 2015 Revised Budget Request Temporary Adjustment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

655. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-628, "Lots 36, 41, and 802 in Square 3942 and Parcels 0143/107 and 0143/110 Eminent Domain Authorization Temporary Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

656. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-629, "Market-based Sourcing Inter Alia Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

657. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-630, "Ticket Sale Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

658. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-594, "St. Elizabeths East Redevelopment Support Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

659. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-595, "Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

660. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-597, "Sonia Gutierrez Campus Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

661. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-598, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 1412, S.O. 13-10159, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

662. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-599, "Urban Farming and Food Security Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

663. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-600, "Notice Requirements for Historic Properties Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

664. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-624, "UDC Fundraising Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

665. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

666. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Management and Administration, and Designated Reporting Official, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

667. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a proposed draft bill and section-by-section analysis for proposed legislation to create

the Bureau of Land Management Foundation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

668. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's FY 2014 report on the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Grants Program, managed by the Office of Justice Programs' National Institute of Justice, pursuant to Pub. L. 90-351, Sec. 2806(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

669. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report entitled, "PRO IP Act FY 2014" pursuant to Sec. 404 of Pub. L. 110-403, Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. AMASH, Mr. FARR, Mr. TONKO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. O'Rourke, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HONDA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. POCAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1232. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to make certain limitations on the transfer of personal property to Federal and State agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 1233. A bill to provide regulatory relief to community financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1234. A bill to restore to States the freedom and flexibility to regulate health insurance markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1235. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1236. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1237. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1238. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1239. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1240. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1241. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1242. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1243. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1244. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1245. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1246. A bill eliminating the debt ceiling for a period defined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1247. A bill to revive and expand the Intermediate Care Technician Pilot Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LATTA, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1248. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to exempt old vessels that only operate within inland waterways from the fire-retardant materials requirement if the owners of such vessels make annual structural alterations to at least 10 percent of the areas of the vessels that are not constructed of fire-retardant materials; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 1249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent individuals receiving work authorizations under certain deferred action programs from being eligible for the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARPER (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 1250. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that payment under the Medicare program to a long-term care hospital for inpatient services shall not be made at the applicable site neutral payment rate for certain discharges involving severe wounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. GOWDY):

H.R. 1251. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to add a Federal defender representative as a nonvoting member of the United States Sentencing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1252. A bill to apply reduced sentences for certain cocaine base offenses retroactively for certain offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1253. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the good time credit toward service of sentences of imprisonment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1254. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify the circumstances under which the enhanced penalty provisions for subsequent convictions apply; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1255. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act regarding penalties for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a mileage-based user fee for mobile mounted concrete boom pumps in lieu of the tax on taxable fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mr. MARINO, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1257. A bill to direct the Attorney General to make grants to States that have in place laws that terminate the parental rights of men who father children through rape; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. TITUS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. DeUTCH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POLIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. McNERNEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. WELCH, Ms. MOORE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1258. A bill to protect the pets of victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1259. A bill to provide for an application process for interested parties to apply for an area to be designated as a rural area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BASS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DeFAZIO, Ms. DeGETTE, Ms. DeLAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DeUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. McCOLLUM, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida,

Mr. DELANEY, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RUIZ, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER):

H.R. 1260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the American Opportunity Tax Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 1261. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1262. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to notify and obtain permission from consumers before collecting nonpublic personal information about such consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1263. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to strengthen the review authority of the Financial Stability Oversight Council of regulations issued by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1264. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to set the rate of pay for employees of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection in accordance with the General Schedule; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1265. A bill to apply the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ROSS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. BARR, Mr. HILL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. PITTENGER, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. MCHENRY):

H.R. 1266. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to make the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection an independent Financial Product Safety Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CRAMER):

H.R. 1267. A bill to exempt certain class A CDL drivers from the requirement to obtain a hazardous material endorsement while op-

erating a service vehicle with a fuel tank containing 3,785 liters (1,000 gallons) or less of diesel fuel; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to promote energy efficiency via information and computing technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1269. A bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 1270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 1271. A bill to provide for systemic research, treatment, prevention, awareness, and dissemination of information with respect to sports-related and other concussions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BERA (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 1272. A bill to provide incentives to physicians to practice in rural and medically underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 1273. A bill to promote energy savings in residential and commercial buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 1274. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to assist units of local government in developing and implementing plans, known as Vision Zero plans, to eliminate transportation-related fatalities and serious injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1275. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a national strategic action plan to assist health professionals in preparing for and responding to the public health effects of climate change, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1276. A bill to amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish a coastal climate change adaptation planning and response program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1277. A bill to provide for ocean acidification collaborative research grant opportunities; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1278. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 1279. A bill to carry out pilot programs to improve skills and job training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 1280. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to create a searchable database containing a credentials registry, a skills database, and a jobs bank; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 1281. A bill to increase the number of months of vocational educational training that may be counted as work under the temporary assistance for needy families program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1282. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 1283. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 1284. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take certain actions related to pesticides that may affect pollinators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1285. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to eliminate origination fees for Federal Direct Loans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FARR, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANDEVIN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LOEBESACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCARELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLÁN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1286. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the lower threshold for the refundable portion of the child tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DeSANTIS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. PALMER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SALMON, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. YOHO, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. GOSAR, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 1287. A bill to amend the eligibility requirements for funding under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1288. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional doc-

umentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 1289. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1290. A bill to provide for a study by the Transportation Research Board of the National Academies on the impact of diverting certain freight rail traffic to avoid urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. PASCARELL):

H.R. 1291. A bill to improve highway-rail grade crossing safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1292. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend military commissary and exchange store privileges to veterans with a compensable service-connected disability and to their dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1293. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a grant program to provide supportive services in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals and families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. VELA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H.R. 1294. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that the South Texas Veterans Affairs Health Care Center in Harlingen, Texas, includes a full-service Department of Veterans Affairs inpatient health care facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 1295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PETERS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. COLE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 1296. A bill to amend the San Luis Rey Indian Water Rights Settlement Act to clarify certain settlement terms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1297. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency As-

sistance Act to provide assistance for housing cooperatives damaged by a major disaster, to provide relief to homeowners affected by major disasters who have mortgages insured by the FHA or owned or guaranteed by Fannie Mae or Freddie Mac, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1298. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent retroactive claims of the earned income tax credit by individuals issued social security numbers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JONES, Mr. MESSER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 1299. A bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 1300. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make anthrax vaccines and antimicrobials available to emergency response providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1301. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to extend to private land use restrictions its rule relating to reasonable accommodation of amateur service communications; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. JONES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BARR, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1302. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a deadline for the certification of certain forms by regional offices of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1303. A bill to repeal Public Law 107-40; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1304. A bill to repeal the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1305. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the deductibility of excessive rates of executive compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 1306. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to conduct a study to determine the relationship between school start times and adolescent health, well-being, and performance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1307. A bill to combat trade barriers that threaten the maintenance of an open Internet, that mandate unique technology standards as a condition of market access and related measures, and to promote online free expression and the free flow of information; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOWENTHAL (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 1308. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to establish a Multimodal Freight Funding Formula Program and a National Freight Infrastructure Competitive Grant Program to improve the efficiency and reliability of freight movement in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 1309. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1310. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Mr. POE of Texas):

H.R. 1311. A bill to provide for the establishment of an office within the Internal Revenue Service to focus on violations of the internal revenue laws by persons who are under investigation for conduct relating to the promotion of commercial sex acts and trafficking in persons crimes, and to increase the criminal monetary penalty limitations for the underpayment or overpayment of tax due to fraud; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. LONG, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 1312. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 1313. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the treatment of certain small business concerns for purposes of Department of Veterans Affairs contracting goals and preferences; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself and Mr. ROSKAM):

H.R. 1314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 1315. A bill to amend section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to require that annual budget submissions of the President to Congress provide an estimate of the cost per taxpayer of the deficit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H.R. 1316. A bill to provide an amnesty period during which veterans and their family members can register certain firearms in the National Firearms Registration and Transfer Record, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1317. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to specify how clearing require-

ments apply to certain affiliate transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 1318. A bill to reauthorize the Impact Aid Program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. JONES, Ms. TITUS, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1319. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct annual surveys of veterans on experiences obtaining hospital care and medical services from medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BABIN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LONG, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 1320. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to exceptional event demonstrations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1321. A bill to prohibit the sale or distribution of cosmetics containing synthetic plastic microbeads; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. KIND, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1322. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to require the public disclosure of crop insurance premium subsidies made on behalf of Members of Congress and their immediate families, Cabinet Secretaries and their immediate families, and entities of which any such individual or combination of such individuals is a majority shareholder, and to require the public disclosure of the underwriting gains earned by private insurance providers and the business expenses covered by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SALMON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1323. A bill to amend the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 to further express United States foreign policy with respect to, and to strengthen United States advocacy on behalf of, freedom of religion or belief abroad and individuals persecuted in foreign countries on account of religion or belief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1324. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Arapaho National Forest, Colorado, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 1325. A bill to give States and localities the option to return unused Federal grant funds to the general fund of the Treasury for the purpose of deficit reduction; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. MICA, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Ms. ROSS-LEHTINEN):

H.R. 1326. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2000 Mulford Road in Mulberry, Florida, as the "Sergeant First Class Daniel M. Ferguson Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1327. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay the review and revision of the national ambient air quality standards for ozone; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUCK, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. COOK, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BABIN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, and Mrs. HARTZLER):

H.R. 1328. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny the earned income tax credit to any individual who received temporary deportation relief and work authorization in accordance with any program not specifically established by Act of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1329. A bill to abolish the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, transfer its functions relating to the Federal firearms, explosives, and arson laws, violent crime, and domestic terrorism to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and transfer its functions relating to the Federal alcohol and tobacco smuggling laws to the Drug Enforcement Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1330. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and gas leasing, to use revenues from such leasing to capitalize bonds that provide a dedicated source of revenue to fund highway, other transportation, and water infrastructure projects, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself and Mr. DENHAM):

H.R. 1331. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the treatment of medical evidence provided by non-Department of Veterans Affairs medical professionals in support of claims for disability compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas (for himself, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. JONES, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. POSEY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 1332. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to disallow the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit for individuals who are not lawfully present in the United States or who have received work authorization pursuant to certain deferred action programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama):

H.R. 1333. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify eligibility for the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOMACK (for himself, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 1334. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to make the shareholder threshold for registration of savings and loan holding companies the same as for bank holding companies; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 1335. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to provide flexibility for fishery managers and stability for fishermen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (for himself, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. REED, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. DOLD):

H.R. 1336. A bill to encourage and support partnerships between the public and private sectors to improve our nation's social programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. HURD of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KIND, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COOPER, Mr.

FATTAH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. HAHN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIREs, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. WESTERMAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. PLASKETT):

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States Postal Service should issue a commemorative stamp honoring the 50th anniversary of the three civil rights marches from Selma, Alabama to Montgomery, Alabama that took place over the course of several weeks in March 1965; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. WALBERG, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution honoring the life and memory of Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president emeritus of the University of Notre Dame; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 142. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that in order to better understand water availability, sustainability, and security at a national scale, the United States should prioritize the assessment of the quality and quantity of surface water and groundwater resources, and produce a national water census with the same sense of urgency that was

incorporated in the "Man on the Moon" project to address the inevitable challenges of "Peak Water"; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Res. 143. A resolution urging the Government of Nigeria to move forward expeditiously with national general elections; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. HAHN:

H. Res. 144. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the centennial of the United States Navy Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself and Ms. SCHKOWSKY):

H. Res. 145. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. SCHKOWSKY):

H. Res. 146. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of March 1, 2015, through March 7, 2015, as "School Social Work Week"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H. Res. 147. A resolution supporting efforts to bring an end to violence perpetrated by Boko Haram, and urging the Government of Nigeria to conduct transparent, peaceful, and credible elections; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. ROSS introduced a bill (H.R. 1337) to waive the time limitations specified by law for the award of certain medals to persons who served in the Armed Forces to permit the award of the Distinguished-Service Cross to Edward Halcomb for acts of extraordinary heroism during the Korean War; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 1232.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 1233.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Congress to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

By Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia:

H.R. 1234.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill restores freedom and flexibility in the states to allow private insurance plans, health savings accounts, and health flexible spending arrangements otherwise prohibited by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, while affecting interstate commerce which Congress has the power to regulate under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1235.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1236.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1237.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1238.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1239.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1240.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1241.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1242.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1243.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1244.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1245.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 1246.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1247.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1248.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is enacted by Congressional Authority expressed in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1249.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. HARPER:

H.R. 1250.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section XIII, Clause I

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1251.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1252.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1253.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1254.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 1255.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 1256.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 1257.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1258.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1259.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: "The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 1260.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section 8 and the 16th Amendment of the Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 1261.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 1262.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 1263.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 1264.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 1265.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1266.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER:

H.R. 1267.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 1268.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and Article IV, Section 3 of the Constitution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1269.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing power, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 1270.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 1271.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. BERA:

H.R. 1272.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 1273.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8:

"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1274.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1275.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1276.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1277.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 1278.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 1279.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 1280.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power \*\*\* To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power \*\*\* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H.R. 1281.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power \*\*\* To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

Clause 3 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power \*\*\* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1282.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 1283.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 8 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

To promote the progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1284.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8



By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1285.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1286.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and the Sixteenth Amendment

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 1287.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1288.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 1289.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1290.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

From Article I, Section 8:

“The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes . . .”

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 1291.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1292.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, 16, and 18), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia; and to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the foregoing powers

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 1293.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight, Clause Three “To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1294.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the constitution

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 1295.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which states “The Congress shall have Power To make all

Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce and relations between the United States and Native American Tribes.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defence of the United States.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 1301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1 [Rights Guaranteed]; . . . the means employed to effect its exercise may be neither arbitrary nor oppressive but must bear a real and substantial relation to an end that is public, specifically, the public health, safety, or morals, or some other aspect of the general welfare.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

And

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subse-

quent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1 and 3.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. LOWENTHAL:

H.R. 1308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Spending Authorization

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Necessary and Proper Regulations to Effectuate Powers

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power\*\*\*To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. LUETKEMEYER:

H.R. 1309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests lies in Article 1, Section 7, Clause 2 of the Constitution, which allows for every bill passed by the House of Representatives and the Senate and signed by the President to be codified into law; and therefore implicitly allows Congress to repeal any bill that has been passed by both chambers and signed into law by the President.

Additionally, the Constitution grants to Congress the explicit power to regulate commerce in and among the states, as enumerate in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, which reads: The Congress shall have Power \* \* \* To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution which provides Congress with

the power to lay and collect taxes and regulate commerce among the several states.

By Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS:

H.R. 1312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority in which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to regulate Commerce as enumerated by Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 as applied to providing for the general welfare of the United States through the administration of the National Health Service Corps.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 1313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 1314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 1315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which provides that, "The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States," and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7, which provides that, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time."

Section 1105(a) of Title 31, United States Code, requires the President to submit to Congress the Administration's annual budget request and stipulates the contents of that submission. It is within the Constitutional Authority of Congress to provide oversight and guidance on these requirements.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 & Amendment II to The Constitution of the United States

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 1317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 1319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power\*\*\* To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the

Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 1323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes:" as enumerated in Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 1325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . ."

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §8, cl. 7.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 1327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 [The Congress shall have the Power] To regulate Commerce with the foreign Nations, and among the several states and the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 1328.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1329.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8, clause 1.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 1330.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice and Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 1331.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WEBER of Texas:

H.R. 1332.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1, Clause 1,

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7,

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the Receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 1333.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. WOMACK:

H.R. 1334.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, Section Eight of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 1335.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YOUNG of Indiana:

H.R. 1336.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1337.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 131: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 169: Mr. ZINKE.
- H.R. 214: Mr. BEYER.
- H.R. 228: Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 235: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KLINE, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. SCALISE.
- H.R. 242: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 292: Mr. ROSS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. KILMER, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 335: Mr. SABLAN.
- H.R. 402: Mr. POSEY.
- H.R. 411: Mr. VEASEY.
- H.R. 412: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
- H.R. 420: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BARR, Mr. ROKITA, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
- H.R. 426: Mr. WITTMAN.
- H.R. 427: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ALLEN.
- H.R. 456: Mr. SCHIFF, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. LATTI.
- H.R. 501: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 511: Mr. UPTON.
- H.R. 532: Mr. NORCROSS.
- H.R. 542: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 546: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
- H.R. 578: Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 588: Mr. HANNA.
- H.R. 592: Mr. PALAZZO and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
- H.R. 594: Mr. BRAT and Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 605: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 606: Mr. GUINTA.
- H.R. 624: Mr. ROHRBACHER and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 631: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BERA, Mr. STIVERS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
- H.R. 647: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KILMER.
- H.R. 648: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 650: Mr. PEARCE and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
- H.R. 653: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 662: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROUZER.
- H.R. 667: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HASTINGS.
- H.R. 670: Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 685: Mr. KLINE.
- H.R. 686: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
- H.R. 699: Mr. BRAT.
- H.R. 703: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Mrs. LUMMIS.
- H.R. 704: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 721: Mr. VELA, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. CARTER of Texas, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
- H.R. 727: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 729: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 731: Mr. AMODEI.
- H.R. 742: Mr. BEYER.
- H.R. 746: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. O'ROURKE.
- H.R. 767: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
- H.R. 771: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. OLSON.
- H.R. 775: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. BARLETTA.
- H.R. 793: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 803: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.R. 815: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 816: Mr. KLINE, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. PEARCE.
- H.R. 822: Mr. BUCSHON.
- H.R. 825: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. MESSER.
- H.R. 835: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 842: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 845: Mr. BARR, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico.
- H.R. 846: Mr. JEFFRIES and Mr. GALLEGO.
- H.R. 855: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
- H.R. 868: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. BARR.
- H.R. 874: Ms. ESTY.
- H.R. 882: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
- H.R. 885: Ms. ESTY and Ms. TSONGAS.
- H.R. 888: Mr. HINOJOSA.
- H.R. 903: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. LATTI.
- H.R. 908: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 916: Mr. ISRAEL.
- H.R. 920: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 921: Mr. POMPEO.
- H.R. 923: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 928: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
- H.R. 932: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
- H.R. 967: Mr. JONES.
- H.R. 969: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. YOHO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 975: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. STUTZMAN.
- H.R. 977: Mr. GIBBS.
- H.R. 978: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. KIND, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. DELBENE.
- H.R. 985: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.
- H.R. 989: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. AGUILAR.
- H.R. 997: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
- H.R. 999: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
- H.R. 1003: Mr. OLSON.
- H.R. 1017: Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. SALMON.
- H.R. 1023: Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 1031: Mr. CLAY and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
- H.R. 1055: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 1058: Mr. HULTGREN and Mr. REICHERT.
- H.R. 1059: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. MARCHANT.
- H.R. 1062: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. FLORES.
- H.R. 1066: Mr. BUCSHON.
- H.R. 1089: Mr. NOLAN.
- H.R. 1092: Mr. DESANTIS.
- H.R. 1094: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 1102: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 1105: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. TIPTON.
- H.R. 1106: Mr. DESANTIS and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
- H.R. 1123: Mr. HONDA.
- H.R. 1126: Mr. DEFazio.
- H.R. 1142: Mr. STIVERS.
- H.R. 1143: Mr. RENACCI.
- H.R. 1147: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. PITTENGER.
- H.R. 1148: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. GUINTA.
- H.R. 1154: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. GOSAR.
- H.R. 1158: Ms. ESTY.
- H.R. 1172: Ms. DELBENE and Ms. NORTON.
- H.R. 1180: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MICA, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. MESSER.
- H.R. 1188: Mr. AGUILAR and Mr. TAKANO.
- H.R. 1193: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. CARNEY.
- H.R. 1197: Ms. ESHOO.
- H.R. 1210: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1212: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, and Mrs. BLACK.
- H.R. 1215: Mr. DUFFY.
- H.R. 1218: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. SIRES.
- H.R. 1222: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.J. Res. 9: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. AMODEI.
- H.J. Res. 25: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H. Res. 11: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. OLSON.
- H. Res. 12: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. SHERMAN.
- H. Res. 54: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CLAY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
- H. Res. 117: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
- H. Res. 120: Mr. RUSH.
- H. Res. 123: Mr. TAKANO and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
- H. Res. 133: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
- H. Res. 139: Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. MESSER.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF MICHIGAN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on House Administration in H.R. 1213, to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRATULATING BERLINDA  
TYLER-JAMISON ON HER RE-  
TIREMENT

## HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend Berlinda Tyler-Jamison on her retirement from UnityPoint Health-Trinity after 28 years. During her time at UnityPoint she created programs like "Stylin' Against Breast Cancer" and the "Trinity Golf Tournament," which annually raise tens of thousands of dollars for their important causes.

Berlinda's hard work has extended beyond her professional career. She dedicates her time to the Rock Island community as the president of the county branch of the NAACP and has served on the Rock Island Planning Commission as well as on the boards for MetroLINK and Arrowhead Ranch.

Over the years, Berlinda's commitment to creating a more diverse and welcoming community has never faltered. Even now as she prepares for this next part of her life, she plans to remain active and involved in bettering our community in Rock Island County. Her passion for serving others is truly outstanding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Berlinda for everything she has given the Rock Island community and congratulate her on her well-deserved retirement. I have faith that her future endeavors will be successful.

THE SONGS OF THE FLAG ORGANIZATION (SOTF)—A RESOURCE  
FOR BURN SURVIVORS

## HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of THE SONS OF THE FLAG organization, which was founded in Dallas, Texas by Ryan "Birdman" Parrot in 2012. Parrot, a Navy SEAL who served 8 years as a member of SEAL Team 7 completed 3 tours in Iraq before being assigned to advanced Training Command. While riding in a Humvee, he and his team were hit by an IED with most of his crew sustaining life threatening burn injuries. Upon retirement he moved to Dallas, Texas, and was inspired by Ret. CAPT Sam Brown's strength and courage despite all his debilitating scarring. Not happy with the advancements in treatment for burns compared to the advancement of prosthetics he founded this organization to help: military, first responders, and civilian burn survivors. SOTF is bringing

together community leaders, renowned burn surgeons, experienced military, dedicated first responders, and purposeful citizens to complete our mission. We partnered with Parkland Hospital in Dallas, Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, and Brigham and Women's Hospital in Boston. I submit this poem penned in their honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

SO PROUDLY WE WAVE

(By Albert Carey Caswell)

This is war  
There's another battle to be waged  
There are so many magnificent heroes who  
    need our help this day  
And just like them,  
the words no surrender we all say  
As so proudly to them we wave  
On this very day  
So high up above  
All in their love  
For all of those and what they gave  
Whether, on battlefields of honor bright  
Or First Responders and Fire Fighters who  
    into infernos go this night  
And all of those citizens so left to fight  
The scars of a Burn Survivor's plight  
For beauty is but skin deep  
As it's all in our souls where we so keep  
All of our faith and courage,  
that we all so need to find the will to dig in  
    deep  
Is that but not the beauty we all seek?  
To so fight for their cause  
The eyes of Texas are upon us,  
and we shall not pause  
Carried all in our hearts,  
for this Old Red, White, and Blue so very  
    deep  
Taking the charge  
For advancements,  
for all of those heroes who lives now loom so  
    very large  
Who upon battlefields of honor bright  
Or rushing into burning buildings with  
    hearts of courage full to bring their  
    light  
Who are in the business of saving lives  
Whether for our brothers and sisters to their  
    left,  
to their right  
Or in burning buildings oh what heroic  
    sights  
To somehow repay them for all of their sac-  
    rifice  
For we will help champion your battle for  
    your victory,  
over this fight  
And help you one and all,  
to get on with your most magnificent of all  
    lives  
Where you go  
We go  
We've got your six,  
for this is all that you need to know  
Just like the American flag,  
you too should be treated with such honor  
    so  
They Gave,  
now its time for us To Give  
Just like The American flag,  
you too so proudly wave in all you did  
And remember no matter how dark the  
    night,

The Sons of Flag have got your six,  
for all you heroes whose hearts burn bright

TRIBUTE TO VIRGINIA CARMODY

## HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the service of Virginia Carmody to the community of Onondaga County, New York. A resident of Onondaga Hill, Mrs. Carmody has served as the Executive Director of the Literacy Coalition of Onondaga County for over 6 years. In her role as Executive Director, Mrs. Carmody has established and led expansive literacy programs in Onondaga County, working towards the goal of complete literacy in the County.

In 2010, Mrs. Carmody oversaw the implementation of the Dolly Parton's Imagination Library program in the City of Syracuse, New York. The program has provided over 68,000 free books to over 4,500 children in the city. In addition, Mrs. Carmody manages adult literacy initiatives, such as an adult literacy database.

Due to the work of the Literacy Coalition of Onondaga County promoting early reading, spearheaded by Mrs. Carmody, the National Campaign for Grade-Level Reading recognized Syracuse as one of 38 municipalities across the country, as a 2013 Pacesetter.

Mrs. Carmody previously served for over 26 years in the Congressional offices of three New York Representatives. Mrs. Carmody serves on the boards of Syracuse 20/20, the Onondaga Citizens League, Visions for Change, and is a member of the Rotary Club of Syracuse. She holds a Master of Public Administration degree from American University and a Bachelor of Arts and Sciences degree in Elementary Education from the College of St. Rose. She is supported by her husband, Mitch and two children, Riley and Christina.

Virginia Carmody has worked fervently to improve literacy in Onondaga County through community engagement. I am proud to congratulate Mrs. Carmody in her deserving receipt of the Women Who Make America Award.

RECOGNIZING KIDNEY DAY AT  
THE MISSOURI STATE CAPITOL

## HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in acknowledging Kidney Day at the Missouri State

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Capitol on Thursday, March 5, 2015. This important day is supported by the Missouri Kidney Program and the National Kidney Foundation.

The mission of the Missouri Kidney Program is to help meet the educational needs, and to promote the physical and mental well-being of eligible Missouri residents with Chronic Kidney Disease. The National Kidney Foundation participates in research that is helping advance knowledge about chronic kidney disease, treatment, and patient outcomes.

The Missouri Kidney Program and the National Kidney Foundation should both be commended for highlighting three major areas of kidney disease: awareness, prevention, and treatment. The Missouri Kidney Program strives to increase public awareness of the need for organ donation and to encourage kidney donations for transplantation. The goal of the National Kidney Foundation is to reach those at risk before kidney disease occurs, and impact those in earliest stages so that progression to later-stage disease is no longer inevitable.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing the dedication of the Missouri Kidney Program and the National Kidney Foundation.

---

#### STANDING WITH ISRAEL

---

### HON. VIRGINIA FOXX

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, before a joint session of Congress, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu spoke of the threat of an Iran with nuclear weapons capability.

Prime Minister Netanyahu is absolutely right to be concerned. The world cannot tolerate a nuclear Iranian regime. The Obama administration is signaling it will support temporarily restricting, not eliminating, Iran's potential to produce nuclear weapons, but I believe it is critical that we act to ensure Iran does not obtain nuclear capabilities. Further, any deal reached by the State Department and Iran regarding their nuclear program needs to include Congressional involvement.

As a strong supporter of Israel, I am concerned about the instability and the animosity that exists toward one of our strongest allies. Though there may be widespread ignorance in the international community about the conflict between Israel and those who seek its destruction, the simple truth is that throughout history Israel has made numerous concessions in the pursuit of peace while seeking only the right to exist and defend itself from all threats.

A strong Israel is key to stability and security in the Middle East, and I will continue to stand with our friend and ally.

### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF FORMER GUAM SPEAKER FRANKLIN J.A. QUITUGUA, PH.D.

#### HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of my dear friend Franklin J.A. Quitugua, Ph.D. Dr. Quitugua was an educator and leader in our community. He served as the head of the Guam Department of Education for many years and was a Guam Senator in the 14th to the 20th Guam Legislatures. Dr. Quitugua passed away on February 26, 2015 at the age of 81.

Franklin was born on November 6, 1933 to Ignacio Perez Quitugua and Rosa Santos Arceo Quitugua. He graduated from George Washington High School in 1952, and went on to attend Northern Arizona University. He graduated in 1956 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Education.

Upon graduating from college, Franklin returned to Guam and taught at George Washington High School. He then went back to Northern Arizona University where he earned his Master of Arts degree in 1962. Franklin again returned home to serve his island community. He became the principal of George Washington Junior High School then was appointed the administrative assistant to the Director of Education in 1968. Franklin was subsequently promoted to Deputy Director of Education before being appointed the Director of Education in 1969.

As Director of Education, Franklin worked tirelessly to improve Guam's public school system. He implemented training for central office staff, administrators, and school employees while developing core curriculum department-wide. Franklin took a short break as Director of Education from 1972 to 1975 to pursue a Ph.D. at the University of Oregon. Upon receiving his Ph.D., he returned as Director of Education until running for the Guam Legislature.

In 1976, Dr. Quitugua was elected to the 14th Guam Legislature and he went on to serve seven terms as a Guam Senator. He chaired the Committee on Education and was chosen by his colleagues as the Speaker of the 19th Guam Legislature. I was privileged to serve as a Senator alongside Speaker Quitugua during the 16th, 19th, and 20th Guam Legislatures, and I remember him fondly as being a strong advocate on many issues and a leader who always worked across party lines to build bipartisan support for many legislative initiatives.

Speaker Quitugua not only continued his legacy as a staunch advocate for education during his time as Senator, but for the entire island community. He improved access to education for Guam's students and enhanced facilities and educational resources available on island. He fought for increased funding to sustain a growing student population and promoted alternative educational programs to meet the increased demands on the public school system.

After his last term in the 20th Guam Legislature, Dr. Quitugua returned as Director of Edu-

cation until he retired in 1993. He served the people of Guam faithfully and humbly for nearly 40 years, and he enjoyed spending his retirement years with his family.

I join the people of Guam in mourning the loss of Speaker Franklin J.A. Quitugua. I had the distinct honor of serving with him in the Legislature, and his passion for our island's issues will be remembered. Franklin was a true public servant who fought for our children and their right to education. I extend my sincere condolences to his children and loved ones on their loss. I commend Speaker Quitugua for his years of service to the island as a public servant and dedicated guardian of education. My thoughts and prayers are with his family during this difficult time. He will be deeply missed.

---

### HONORING DR. LOUIS CHARLES ROUDANEZ

#### HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Louis Charles Roudanez, founder and publisher of the first daily African American newspaper in the United States, on the 125th anniversary of his death.

Dr. Roudanez, a free man of color and native Louisianian from St. James Parish, founded the New Orleans Tribune to serve as an outspoken voice for the interests of African Americans during a period of turmoil and uncertainty during the final year of the Civil War and early Reconstruction. The Tribune aggressively advocated for civil rights, black suffrage, desegregated public education, and better wages and working conditions for freed slaves. It operated under the radical philosophy that "freedom without equality before the law and at the ballot box is impossible." Although primarily a lens to conditions in Louisiana, the paper worked towards reforming all of Southern society by sending a copy of each issue to every Member of Congress. It quickly received national recognition, and its editorials were often read here on the floor of Congress.

Though the Tribune ceased publishing in 1870, its spirit of advocacy, justice, fairness and uncompromising purpose was invoked in 1985 by Dr. Dwight and Beverly Stanton McKenna, when they began their newspaper and named it in honor of Dr. Roudanez's Tribune. The modern-day Tribune continues to offer an invaluable voice on issues affecting the Black community in New Orleans and around the country.

To honor Dr. Roudanez, I would like to share part of the Tribune's mission statement, published in July 1864 on the front page of its first issue: "Under the above title we publish a new paper devoted to the principles heretofore defended by the Union. Convinced that a newspaper, under the present circumstances, representing the principles and interest which we propose to defend and advocate was much needed in New Orleans, we shall spare no means at our command to render the Tribune worthy of public confidence and respect." Today we recognize the fulfillment of Dr.

Roudanez's mission. In commemoration of his life and achievements, a monument has been dedicated to Dr. Roudanez at the building that housed the Tribune.

CONGRATULATING FRED  
WHITESIDE ON HIS RETIREMENT

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Fred Whiteside on his retirement from serving as Augustana College's women's cross country and track coach. Fred is rightfully being honored by Augustana, his alma mater, for his longstanding dedication to the Augustana community.

Fred served a total of 61 seasons as a head coach of Vikings' athletic teams. He has led the Vikings to 12 CCIW track and field titles and 7 CCIW cross country titles during his tenure. Throughout his years at Augustana College, Fred has worked in various capacities including director of off-campus housing, director of custodial services, director of intramurals and associate athletic director.

Fred has enriched the lives of all those around him, students, faculty and other community members, and is a true leader. Fred has had a wonderful 33 year career at Augustana College, and I know he will be greatly missed as he enters retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Fred for his commitment to the Augustana Community, and I congratulate him again on his well-earned retirement and wish him luck with his future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING JAMES JENDRUSINA  
ON THE OCCASION OF EARNING  
THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD

**HON. DAN BENISHEK**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize James Jendrusina, of Bessemer, Michigan and his achievement in earning the Congressional Award. The Congressional Award recognizes four avenues of individual growth—community service, physical fitness, exploration, and personal development—and how the fulfillment of these goals forms balanced and promising young citizens. In their pursuit of these goals, recipients of the Congressional Awards have gained new skills and greater confidence.

In earning his Congressional Award, James volunteered over 200 hours of service through the Boy Scouts, where he focused on teaching younger scouts about service opportunities and how they are able to enrich the communities in which they live. He was also able to introduce bats to the Little Girls Campground to try to control the mosquito population.

For his personal development, James dedicated his time to learn about agriculture by planting and taking care of his own garden.

Through this experience he learned how to control pests, preserve vegetables and eventually harvest the fruits of his labor.

For his Physical Education, James chose to focus on healthy eating and working out. By running and adding a weight routine to his exercises, he was able to achieve an understanding of what is needed to ensure a healthy lifestyle.

For his Expedition, James traveled to Alaska and visited the Kenai Peninsula to learn how to fish using varying techniques.

I believe the projects undertaken by James will be the cornerstone for future achievements and a commitment to bettering one's self and their community. Please join me in congratulating James for his accomplishments and for success in the future.

200,000 MILES DRIVEN AND NO  
PLAN TO RETIRE

**HON. TIM HUELSKAMP**

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, last week I was deeply honored to welcome James Price and his wife Ellen into our D.C. office. They were in town representing the Disabled American Veterans and shared with me about how they serve our Kansas Veterans. For over twenty years Jim and Ellen have generously coordinated transportation services for our Veterans to the closest Veteran Affairs Medical Center in either Topeka or Wichita.

Four days a week for over two decades, this couple has helped transport our rural Veterans in the greater Salina area who cannot get the necessary health care services at the local Community Based Outpatient Clinic. I want to commend their dedication and selfless sacrifice; they have made a very tangible difference in the lives of so many Kansas Veterans.

Up until just a few years ago, Ellen coordinated with the Salina VA clinic and set up weekly transportation schedules for all the medical appointments for local veterans traveling to Wichita and Topeka. And Jim did much of the driving. In fact, during my conversation with Mr. Price, he reported that since he started driving vans for the VA over twenty years ago, he has logged over 200,000 miles as a volunteer. And at over eighty years old, he has no plans to retire.

Jim and Ellen Price are shining examples of the many men and women who served us in the military and go beyond the call of duty to serve long after they leave the military. Thank you, Mr. and Mrs. Price, for your selfless dedication and commitment—and to the thousands of others across the First District of Kansas—who do so much to serve our Veterans.

RECOGNIZING THE CITY OF DE  
PERE, WISCONSIN ON ITS 125TH  
ANNIVERSARY

**HON. REID J. RIBBLE**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of De Pere, Wisconsin as it celebrates its 125th anniversary.

Father Claude-Jean Allouez, a Jesuit missionary and explorer, is credited with founding this community when he established the St. Francis Xavier mission in 1671. The name was derived from rapids on the Fox River with settlers referring to this area as Rapides Des Peres.

The historic Fox River has always been part of the fabric of this community; dividing it between east and west for many years. In 1890, the communities of West De Pere and De Pere merged, and as a result the unified City of De Pere continues to thrive and grow. Today, the city boasts around 24,000 residents, and has several buildings listed on the National Register of Historic Places such as the De Pere Lock and Dam Historic District, the North Broadway Street Historic District, Main Hall on the St. Norbert College campus, and several other wonderful places.

St. Norbert College is a major institution of higher learning inside the city that is home to more than 2,000 students pursuing a wide variety of degrees, and to this day vigorously pursues their motto "To teach by word and example." It is my great honor to recognize the City of De Pere, the city leaders past and present, and the residents who have contributed so greatly toward the community as it stands today. I extend my congratulations and all the best in the next 125 years!

RECOGNIZING THE 10TH MOUNTAIN  
DIVISION ON THEIR 30TH ANNI-  
VERSARY

**HON. ELISE M. STEFANIK**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. STEFANIK. Mr. Speaker, let us honor and recognize the 10th Mountain Division on their 30th anniversary for their service to Fort Drum, the 21st District of New York, our North Country community and our nation. For the past thirty years, the brave men and women of the 10th Mountain Division have stood in harm's way to protect and defend our country. Since September 11th, 2001, the 10th Mountain Division has been the most actively deployed division to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Too many of our nation's service members have made the ultimate sacrifice and lost their lives while in service. We cannot repay the debt we owe these service men and women and their families, but we can work to honor their legacy and recognize what they have done for us. We must protect the promises that we have made to these brave individuals and strengthen our nation's commitment to

helping them as they return home from combat. As leaders in Congress we have an obligation to serve our constituents and members of our armed forces.

I am honored to serve on the House Armed Services Committee and as the Vice-Chair for the Subcommittee on Readiness and as a member of the Subcommittees on Personnel and Emerging Threats and Capabilities. As a member of these subcommittees I will fight to ensure the Defense Department, our troops and Fort Drum have the necessary tools and resources they require to defend our nation from those that wish to do us harm.

On this 30th anniversary, let us honor and reflect all that the 10th Mountain Division and Fort Drum has done for our community and our nation, and let us pledge to work together to preserve and strengthen this institution for many years to come. Thank you to the soldiers and your loved ones for keeping our nation safe.

---

HONORING THE MEMORY OF  
LARRY SCANLON

**HON. CHERI BUSTOS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Larry Scanlon, who was taken from us tragically on February 27th, 2015, after over 40 years of dedicated service to our nation's hardworking families.

Mr. Scanlon served as the longtime Political Director for the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). In this role, he fought to raise the minimum wage, protect Social Security, and add a voice for middle class families in our government and national discussion.

Larry recognized that our country's success is tied to the economic health of the middle class. In this vein, he sought to make this country greater by fighting to give families the fair shot that they deserve at the American dream.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for Larry's contributions as a fighter for the middle class, and my thoughts and prayers are with his family and friends.

---

HONORING THE JERICHO PROJECT  
FOR ITS RECEIPT OF THE 2015  
INNOVATION IN JUSTICE AWARD

**HON. STEVE COHEN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Jericho Project for its receipt of the 2015 Innovations in Justice Award for approaching criminal justice challenges in a new and effective way. The Innovations in Justice Award recipients were selected by the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys (APA) in partnership with the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and the Center for Court Innovation.

The Jericho Project was launched more than a decade ago by the Shelby County Public Defender's Office to better serve people living with serious mental illnesses and substance abuse disorders who have been cycling through the criminal justice system. The main architect, Shelby County Chief Public Defender Stephen Bush, my constituent, developed the initiative while working as an Assistant Public Defender, a position he held for almost 20 years before being appointed as Shelby County's 10th Public Defender in 2010.

Mr. Bush has overseen the development of community linkage plans that are presented to courts in support of community-based, alternative forms of sentencing. Recovery Support Specialists on the team support clients for four months after they are released from prison and help them transition to life back in the community. I am proud to say that nearly 60 percent of those participating in the Jericho Project have successfully completed their recovery plans and have avoided further cycling through the criminal justice system.

What began as a grant-funded experiment has matured into a permanent part of Shelby County's efforts to address the needs of some of its most vulnerable citizens. The Jericho Project's success has made it a national model for how criminal justice systems can better serve those struggling to survive with serious mental illnesses.

The Jericho Project has been changing lives for more than a decade, and this recognition is well deserved. I ask the House to join me in congratulating the Jericho Project for receiving the 2015 Innovations in Justice Award.

---

COMMENDING LOCAL  
BROADCASTERS

**HON. DORIS O. MATSUI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, every day, our nation's broadcasters serve communities across the country by providing the news and entertainment we rely on to get through our day. Whether it is an update on what is happening in the world, educational programming, or a review of the movies opening that weekend, most Americans turn to broadcasters for news on issues big and small.

This is especially true for local broadcasters. These broadcasters provide the public with the news that is most important, and most useful for them, because it is the news from their own communities. This is true in Sacramento and across the nation. Our broadcasters play an integral role in Sacramento's day-to-day lives, informing all of us about everything from local traffic to an in-depth look at local political issues.

Local broadcasters play a particularly important role in times of an emergency. In Sacramento, we continue to experience drought-like weather conditions, as well as heavy rains that bring with them the threat of flooding. Unfortunately, the entire state of California is susceptible to a number of natural disasters, including earthquakes, wildfires, and—of course—flooding. It is essential that residents

have access to local emergency broadcasts, so that they have the public safety information they need when a disaster strikes.

And the role of broadcasters goes beyond disseminating information to the public. They have also played an important part in growing and investing in our nation's airwaves. The spectrum sharing agreement that the broadcasters entered into with the Department of Defense helped solidify the Federal Communications Commission's recent record breaking spectrum auction of the AWS-3 band. This spectrum auction generated nearly \$45 billion in revenue, enough to fully fund FirstNet, the nationwide interoperability network for America's first responders and public safety officials.

Broadcasters play an important role in our country. I want to applaud the work of broadcasters, particularly those in Sacramento, for working diligently to cover and provide local news programming to our communities, and for being strong community partners.

---

RECOGNIZING INTERNATIONAL  
WOMEN'S DAY

**HON. ANN M. KUSTER**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize International Women's Day. This day is celebrated across the world in different ways to honor the role of women throughout history. Here in the United States, we celebrate this day during Women's History Month. Since 1913, March 8 has been marked as a day to honor the economic, political, and social achievements of women.

International Women's Day serves as a reminder of the steps we have made towards equality in the United States and internationally, and honors the women who worked to make these steps possible. As a Member of Congress from the only state in the country to have had an all-female delegation, I am proud of how far our country has come towards equality for women. But we cannot recognize these accomplishments without also mentioning the work that still needs to be done.

While we have come so far, women still face political and economic obstacles. Women are still not equally represented in small business ownership or in the technology sector. I have been working to build support and encouragement for more women small business leaders and women in technology. A few weeks ago, I had the privilege to congratulate eighteen female high school students on completing the BAE Systems Women in Technology Program, which encourages young women to consider pursuing careers in technology. As a country we need more programs like this to encourage our young women to pursue their interests and become future leaders, and to discourage them from thinking that certain careers are strictly for men.

In New Hampshire, women make up half of the state's population and about a quarter of our businesses are owned by women. It is clear that the success of women in business is vitally important to New Hampshire's future,



and the same can be said for the rest of our country. On International Women's Day, I ask my colleagues to recognize not just the progress we have made, but also how much work remains to be done. As a country we must promote the success of women.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in recognizing International Women's Day and the women who are continuing the fight to ensure there is equal opportunity for women in the present and future.

---

THE FIRST AND FINEST

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Port of Houston Authority for successfully completing its certification process for International Organization for Standardization 14001 Environmental Management Systems. This tri-annual process certifies the ports' Central Maintenance facility and the Bayport and Barbours Cut container terminals.

International Organization for Standardization 14001 certification is one of the hardest to achieve in the environmental industry. Of the 360 seaports in the United States, only 10 are certified. This also marks the fifth consecutive successful certification for the Port of Houston Authority. In 2002, it became the first port in the United States to achieve ISO 14001 status.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Port of Houston Authority for receiving this critical certification. The Port of Houston is an important asset for Houston, Texas and the nation. Best wishes on your continued success.

---

WELCOMING THE KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY SPEAKER TO WASHINGTON

**HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Mr. Chung Ui-Hwa, Speaker of the Korean National Assembly, to Washington. Speaker Chung—a neurosurgeon by training—is a distinguished member of the National Assembly, having served five consecutive terms since 1996. Last year, in his capacity as President of the Korea-U.S. Inter-Parliamentary Council, he led a delegation and paid a visit to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, where I hosted a legislative exchange. I'm honored to welcome him back to Washington and in his new capacity as Speaker.

For over 60 years, the U.S.-South Korea relationship has been a linchpin of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region. In 2013, I welcomed President Park Geun-hye, the Republic of Korea's first female president, to Southern California where she addressed the Korean-American community to discuss the

60th anniversary of the U.S.-South Korean alliance. As a former Chairman of the U.S.-Republic of Korea Inter-Parliamentary Exchange, I have been proud to help enhance the alliance, including by upgrading Korea's Foreign Military Sales status to NATO+4, passing the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement and securing an extension of the U.S.-Korea Civilian Nuclear Energy Agreement.

As North Korea continues to threaten the United States and our close allies with its nuclear, missile, and now cyber capabilities, I introduced legislation, together with Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL, to step up the targeting of those financial institutions in Asia and beyond that are supporting this brutal and dangerous regime. By shutting down North Korea's illicit activities, we deprive the Kim regime of the money it needs to pay the generals and to conduct nuclear weapons research. I appreciate that humanitarian groups around the world are strongly supporting this bipartisan legislation.

The United States and the Republic of Korea are strengthening their combined defense posture on the Korean Peninsula. Together, we are working toward a shared goal of a Korean Peninsula that is free of nuclear weapons and peacefully reunited on the basis of democratic and market principles and as articulated in President Park's Dresden address last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am again pleased to welcome my friend, Speaker Chung Ui-Hwa, to Washington and to the Congress. We are at critical juncture in the U.S.-Korea alliance, but our relationship has never been better. I look forward to working with Speaker Chung on the issues of mutual concern. I further urge my colleagues to do the same and to offer their own expressions of best wishes and support.

---

RECOGNIZING THE 23RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE KHOJALY MASSACRE

**HON. STEVE COHEN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 23rd anniversary of a terrible event in the history of Azerbaijan: the massacre of hundreds of people in the town of Khojaly in what was the largest killing of ethnic Azerbaijani civilians in the course of the Armenia-Azerbaijan conflict. Khojaly, which is located in the Nagorno-Karabakh region of Azerbaijan, was once home to 7,000 people. That was before Armenian armed forces descended on the town on February 26, 1992, killing over 600 people—including 106 women and 83 children. Hundreds more became disabled due to their injuries. More than one hundred children lost one of their parents, and 25 children lost both parents. At least 8 families were completely wiped out.

More than two decades after a ceasefire went into effect, more than 20 percent of Azerbaijan's territory, including Nagorno-Karabakh and seven surrounding districts, remains occupied and more than 1 million Azerbaijanis remain displaced from their homes. Ongoing vio-

lence along the line of contact surrounding occupied Azerbaijani territory reinforces the urgency of robust American participation in the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe's (OSCE) Minsk Group as it works towards a peaceful resolution of the Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict.

Azerbaijan is the only country that borders both Russia and Iran, and yet Azerbaijan has been a strong partner of the United States and its allies in security and energy matters. This has included: enforcing sanctions against Iran; providing troops that served shoulder-to-shoulder with U.S. forces in Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan; allowing transit for 40 percent of all non-lethal equipment used by NATO forces in Afghanistan; construction of the Southern Gas Corridor from the Caspian Sea to Italy that will provide Europe with an alternative source to Russian energy; and supplying 40 percent of Israel's oil.

I ask my colleagues to join me and our Azerbaijani friends in commemorating the devastation of Khojaly twenty-three years ago. As Azerbaijanis around the world recall this massacre and mourn the loss of loved ones, let us remember our support of peaceful efforts to resolve the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict and reforms that promote stability throughout the Southern Caucasus region.

---

HONORING BMO HARRIS BANK

**HON. BILL FOSTER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce in congratulating BMO Harris Bank as it is honored at the 39th Annual Salute to Accomplishment Dinner.

For over a century, BMO Harris Bank has invested in Joliet, where it currently has five branches employing 61 people. Partnering with community organizations and local governments, BMO Harris Bank has worked on a number of initiatives to improve the quality of life throughout the community including investing in health care research and community service projects.

Additionally, many BMO Harris Bank employees serve on boards and committees, and are members of various local non-profit organizations, including the Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Joliet, the Greater Joliet Area YMCA, the Will County Council on Economic Development, and the Joliet Park District.

Again, I would like to congratulate BMO Harris Bank and thank its employees for being a driving force of change in our community.

---

GOD, FAMILY & COUNTRY: BOB WILKINSON

**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, God, family and country. Those three words are a life

motto for one of my constituents, Robert "Bob" Lee Wilkinson. Bob is a God-fearing father, grandfather and veteran, who will be celebrating his 80th Birthday this March.

After graduating from Shawnee High School in Shawnee, Oklahoma in 1954, Bob joined the US Army. He was just 19 years old. His love of country drove him to the armed forces.

For three years Bob served in the U.S. Army Signal Corps where he was stationed at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. He became a Specialist 2nd Class with top security clearance.

Upon receiving an Honorable Discharge, utilizing the GI Bill, Bob attended Oklahoma Baptist University. He graduated with a degree in business administration. He embarked on a successful 38 year career in Human Resources as a Human Resources Executive. Bob met and married his wife, DeLora, shortly after returning to Shawnee from the Army.

Bob began his HR career while still in college, working part time at Oklahoma Gas and Electric. After graduation, he became the HR manager for Wonder Bread and Hostess Cakes in Oklahoma City. Bob was recruited to Dallas to join a startup company, Texas Instruments. At Texas Instruments, he became World Wide HR Director, which transferred him all to different cities all over the Lone Star State. One of these cities being Houston, where Bob lives today.

After 19 years with Texas Instruments, Bob went to work for Compaq Computer, serving as their HR Director for 17 years. From there he went with Drake, Beam Morin, and a Human Recourse Outsourcing Firm. Bob's contribution to HR was quite the journey and it thankfully led him to the Promised Land, Texas, and we are so glad it did. Texas and Oklahoma are grateful for Bob's passion in HR and his willingness to help others.

Bob and DeLora spend their free time traveling to the plains of Montana to visit family. They have two daughters and three grandchildren. You can find them involved in the community and political activities.

2015 will be quite the year for Bob Wilkinson. He celebrates his 80th Birthday on March 13 and this coming May, Bob and DeLora will celebrate their 57th wedding anniversary. Congrats to a life and marriage well spent. It is obvious that God, family and country really have been the driving forces in your life, Bob.

I am proud to have you as one of my many neighbors in Houston. I thank you for your service to our great country. I join not only your friends and family, but the entire community when I say, Happy Birthday Bob!

And that's just the way it is.

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT THE SENATE SHOULD RATIFY THE CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN (CEDAW)

### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). I am proud to be joined in this effort by my friend and colleague Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY.

This year we also recognize the 20th Anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women, where the United States along with over 189 governments, adopted the "Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action." Since 1995, those commitments have ushered in enormous improvements in the lives of women across the world. It is in the spirit of this inspirational anniversary that we urge the United States to ratify the most comprehensive international agreement on women's rights, CEDAW.

CEDAW is a landmark international agreement that calls on governments to take appropriate measures to end discrimination against women in all areas of life. The Convention seeks to develop women's equality in legal status, human rights, political participation, employment, education and healthcare, while committing countries to change or eradicate discriminatory laws, customs, and practices.

Despite 187 countries ratifying CEDAW, the United States is the only industrialized country in the world that has not ratified the treaty, even though its fundamental principles of equality and nondiscrimination are paramount to the ideals of our nation. Other nations that have not ratified CEDAW include Somalia and Iran.

Most importantly, CEDAW is not self-executing, meaning that any legislation the United States might adopt to comply with the treaty would have to go through the normal Congressional process.

Ratification of CEDAW would continue our nation's proud bipartisan tradition of promoting and protecting human rights. The Senate's ratification of CEDAW would strengthen our standing as a global leader for the rights of women and girls. As we recognize International Women's Day next week, I hope my colleagues will cosponsor this important resolution that will benefit women around the world.

### HAPPY BIRTHDAY TO GPO

### HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1861, the Government Printing

Office (GPO), as it was then known, opened its doors and began fulfilling an essential mission for the American people. On March 4, 2015, 154 years later, the newly renamed Government Publishing Office continues to perform that mission: producing and disseminating the official documents of this Congress and the executive and judicial branches to keep America informed. This is not merely my opinion as a proud supporter of the GPO and its talented workforce, but also the conclusion of a 2013 report of the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) requested by Congress.

As I noted in the House Administration Committee's activities report for 2014 (H. Rept. 113-721), I was pleased that Congress honored the request of Public Printer Davita Vance-Cooks, first made to the Committee in 2013, for statutory redesignation of GPO as the Government Publishing Office. This long-overdue change rightly proclaims to the American people how Congress and the President view the agency.

The proud men and women of GPO do not fulfill their mission solely by applying ink to paper. For decades GPO's employees have been in the vanguard of the Government's shift toward electronic publishing. The agency's former name, focused on the technological limits available at its birth, no longer reflected the breadth of its abilities and importance. GPO's work publishing and distributing information in multiple formats assures Americans perpetual access to the documents of our democracy. This change gives GPO and its employees the recognition they have earned.

During 2014 GPO has continued making significant strides under the stewardship of Ms. Vance-Cooks, who has now become the first Director of the Government Publishing Office. Evidence of the Director's strong management and sound judgment abounds there.

For example, the Partnership for Public Service listed GPO as one of the Best Places to Work and among the top 10 most innovative mid-sized federal agencies. The Partnership compiled its list based on the results of the OPM Federal Viewpoint Survey for 2013. Along a similar vein, a survey of over 500 customer agencies found 90% are generally satisfied with the goods and services GPO provides.

GPO's improved electronic gateway to the growing expanse of Government information, the Federal Digital System, or "FDsys", has recorded its one-billionth document retrieval. FDsys users can now browse among over one million titles as routine as daily editions of the Federal Register and as historic as President Nixon's Watergate grand-jury testimony. GPO is already taking steps to create the next generation FDsys with improved search and retrieval capabilities. GPO is also collaborating with the Clerk of the House, the Secretary of the Senate, the Library of Congress and others to make legislative data available to users in bulk form.

Although the Director and her management team have much to be proud of, challenges remain. The Director has embraced the NAPA report, especially its recommendation that

GPO increase revenues through lease of surplus space. GPO has redoubled efforts to attract office tenants, including Legislative agencies for which proximity to the Congress offers a premium. With the support of the Joint Committee on Printing, GPO solicited the private sector's input with a Request for Information on how to make better use of several acres of land now devoted to parking. The Director successfully completed a new round of wage agreements with GPO's employee unions, prudently setting future wage increases at the rate proposed by the President and Congress for all other federal civil-service employees. In addition, a successful employee buy-out conducted last year will improve the agency's financial condition. I am greatly encouraged by the Director's eagerness to work constructively with her earnest and talented Inspector General, Michael Raponi, and to incorporate his valuable recommendations into her strategic planning.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join in congratulating the Government Publishing Office on the agency's 154th birthday. I thank Director Vance-Cooks and her dedicated workforce for their extraordinary service to this country and wish them well in the years ahead.

#### 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEXAGON

### HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 60th anniversary of Hexagon, the only original musical satirical comedy revue in the nation's capital. With its multiple honors, Hexagon continues to serve the District of Columbia, both with entertainment and service by donating the proceeds of each show to a different charity in the District each year.

Hexagon was founded in 1955 by a group of young Washingtonians seeking a way to have "pure fun and nonsense." The group started out writing songs and parodies for the show "Meet the Beep," which ran for five performances at the Holton-Arms School in the spring of 1956. The comedy troupe started earning a profit and earned \$3,500, which they donated to local charities. Even though the group was not founded as a charitable organization, it has donated \$3.5 million to more than 40 organizations since its inception. Due to a lack of funds in 2008, Hexagon, unfortunately, had to move out of the District into a venue nearby in Montgomery County, Maryland, but I am proud to say that after seven years, Hexagon is back in the District, and will be performing at Wilson High School in Tenleytown.

Hexagon has been honored with a number of distinguished awards, including the Presidential Medal of "Distinguished Service" from President Ronald Reagan in 1987. In 1992, Hexagon was given the honor of becoming Washingtonian of the Year for its contributions to the community and area charities. Hexagon was one of the first organizations to be recognized with this award.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in celebrating the 60th anniversary of Hexagon, and in wishing the group success in continuing its proud legacy in the nation's capital.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF LT. COLONEL GERALD K. CARMAN

### HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take this moment to celebrate the life, and note the passing of Lt. Colonel Gerald K. Carman of the United States Air Force.

Lt. Colonel Carman passed away surrounded by his family in Duluth, Georgia on August 7, 2014 at the age of 51. Lt. Colonel Carman is survived by his wife of 25 years, Dawn Murto Carman and his two sons: Brady and Alexander.

Lt. Colonel Carman is a fellow graduate from Bates Creek High School in Lexington, Kentucky. He earned his Bachelor's from the University of Kentucky and his Master's degree from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University.

Soon after graduating, Lt. Colonel Carman joined the military and was commissioned as an officer in the United States Air Force. He later became a member of 962d Airborne Air Control Squadron (AACS) based at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska as an Instructor Pilot flying the E-3 Airborne Warning and Control Systems (AWACS) aircraft.

Lt. Colonel Carman then joined the 168th Air Refueling Wing based in Eielson AFB, Fairbanks, Alaska as an Instructor Pilot flying the KC-135 Stratotanker with the Alaska Air National Guard. He served a total of 26 years as an officer with our nation's Armed Services.

Lt. Colonel Carman's passion for flying and love for aviation continued well past his Air Force career. He was a successful commercial pilot for two of our nation's major airlines: Northwest and Delta.

We grieve the loss of this great American, but we also celebrate and honor his life and his service. Lt. Colonel Carman embodied the best of America's ideals, values, and work ethic. He also personified what it meant to be free by pursuing his dreams and teaching others the art and love of American aviation.

Because of Lt. Colonel Carman's service to our nation, American freedoms are protected for future generations. He was truly an outstanding American and an inspiration to us all.

#### CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENT OF RICHARD MILLER

### HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Richard Miller of Cheshire, Connecticut.

On February 26, 2015, Mr. Miller received the Special Lifetime Achievement Award from the Cheshire Chamber of Commerce.

He is 102 years old, and he has literally devoted a lifetime to the Cheshire community.

As a young man, Mr. Miller began his service in World War II. After four years in the Army, he was discharged with the rank of major.

When he returned to Cheshire, Mr. Miller's service did not cease. He served on various municipal boards including the Cheshire School Board, the Police Commission, the Senior Center Board of Directors, and the Beautification Commission.

Mr. Miller also volunteered with numerous civic organizations such as the Rotary Club where he was a member for almost 70 years. He established the Cheshire Food Drive, and raised funds for countless charitable organizations.

He also headed the town commission that designed, funded, and constructed a Veterans Memorial Plaza in front of Cheshire's Town Hall.

For all of these contributions and more, Mr. Miller will receive the Special Lifetime Achievement Award at the Cheshire Chamber's annual awards dinner. I wish to offer my congratulations to him for this impressive achievement and my thanks for all he has done for my hometown of Cheshire.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 109, I was absent attending Auditor Tom Schweich's funeral in the State of Missouri. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

#### KAYCE WELCH

### HON. JOHN RATCLIFFE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and honor a young student from my district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. Kayce Welch of Texarkana has just been named one of the top honorees in Texas by the 2015 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia.

Ms. Kayce Welch is being recognized for creating the "One of a Kind" project to help raise funds and awareness of juvenile diabetes, the disease she was diagnosed with at age 11, and so far raised \$3,000 through a charity walk to support a summer camp for children with diabetes. Ms. Welch is currently planning a "One of a Kind Gala for Diabetes," to be held in the spring of 2015, which she hopes will raise at least \$30,000 to help fund research into a cure.

Given the challenges we face today, it is vital that we encourage and support the kind

of selfless contributions that these young citizens have made. Youth volunteers like Ms. Welch are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. Over the past 20 years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, and has honored more than 100,000 young volunteers at the local, state and national level.

Ms. Welch should be extremely proud to have been singled out from the thousands of dedicated volunteers who participated in this year's program. I heartily applaud Ms. Welch for her initiative in seeking to make her community a better place to live, and for the positive impact she has had on the lives of others. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. Her actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future. Congratulations.

IN RECOGNITION OF GLORIA  
BLANDINA FOR A LIFETIME OF  
SERVICE TO OTHERS

**HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gloria Blandina. Ms. Blandina is to receive the 2014 Joseph Saporito, Sr. Lifetime of Service Award, presented by the Greater Pittston Sunday Dispatch for her lifelong dedication to the development of young children.

Born and raised in Pittston, Pennsylvania, she received a degree in early childhood education from West Virginia University in 1971. Ms. Blandina went on to receive her Master's degree in Early Childhood Education from Marywood University in Scranton. She spent several years working at a day care center and teaching early childhood education at Penn State University before her appointment to the Children's Trust Fund by Governor Tom Ridge in 1998. In addition to her numerous professional accomplishments, Ms. Blandina is an active member of her community. She volunteers with the Social Justice Committee to deliver food to individuals in need. She has served on the board of directors of Luzerne County Head Start, the Pittston YMCA, the Family Enhancement Center, and as the President of the St. Mary's Assumption Home School Association for the Education of Young Children.

Ms. Blandina is currently the director of the Pittston Care and Concern Free Health Clinic,

which offers a range of medical services to individuals without health insurance. The clinic has served over 3,500 patients under Ms. Blandina's leadership. She, like the doctors, nurses, social workers, and others who keep the clinic running, volunteers her time to this worthy cause that has helped so many in northeastern Pennsylvania.

I congratulate Ms. Blandina on receiving the Joseph Saporito, Sr. Lifetime of Service Award, and I commend her for all the selfless work she has done for the Greater Pittston Area.

URGING THE PRESIDENT TO ENSURE  
"THE BORINQUEÑERS"  
RECEIVE THE CONGRESSIONAL  
GOLD MEDAL AS SOON AS POSSIBLE

**HON. ALAN GRAYSON**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, 2014, Congress awarded the Congressional Gold Medal to the 65th Infantry Regiment, an all-volunteer Puerto Rican unit known as "the Borinqueneers." Today, I rise to urge the President to expedite the designing and delivery of this medal, before more of these brave Borinqueneers pass away.

More than 100,000 brave Borinqueneers served honorably in World War I, World War II and the Korean War. Puerto Ricans have fought for the United States as far back as the American Revolution, and continue to do so honorably to this day. Thousands have given their lives defending our values of freedom, justice, and equality, despite enduring decades of segregation and second-class treatment.

The Borinqueneers have been recognized with 10 Distinguished Service Crosses, more than 250 Silver Stars, over 600 Bronze Stars, and nearly 3,000 Purple Hearts. However, it was not until last year that the first member of the Borinqueneers, Master Sergeant Juan E. Negrón, was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor, following a congressionally ordered review of cases involving veterans deserving of recognition who had been overlooked due to prejudice.

Today, hundreds of Borinqueneers have made Central Florida their home. On March 7, I will host an event to honor their legacy, and thank them for their service.

It is my goal and my honor, as their representative, to ensure that they receive this long overdue recognition. Puerto Rican veterans should not have to wait any longer to receive the equal treatment they deserve. Today I ask the President to ensure that the Borinqueneers receive their Congressional Gold Medal as soon as possible.

CONGRATULATING CATHERINE  
ZINN ON RECEIVING WOMAN OF  
ACHIEVEMENT AWARD

**HON. ERIC SWALWELL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Catherine Zinn, who tomorrow will be honored by Legal Momentum as a Woman of Achievement at its 10th Annual Women of Achievement Awards Dinner.

Born in Berkeley, California, Catherine graduated from Hamilton College with a bachelor of arts degree in economics and public policy. She also was a terrific athlete there, receiving varsity letters in three sports. Since then she has established herself as a skilled business leader.

For many years she has worked in client development and relations at DLA Piper, the world's largest law firm. In her role as Senior National Relationships Executive, she has had great success in bringing in new clients and ensuring current clients remain satisfied with the firm. Before DLA Piper, Catherine worked as National Director of Business Development and National Director of Class Action Settlement at JAMS, which provides arbitration and mediation services.

Catherine has given back to her community as well, helping many organizations in the San Francisco Bay Area. For example, she serves on the boards of Bay Area Cancer Connections, helping women with ovarian and breast cancer, and Tomorrow Youth Repertory, which provides youth theater education.

Catherine also looks for ways to support women in business. She gives of herself to empower women and help them succeed.

In fact, she participated in an event I held last year, Women's Business Empowerment Day, which was organized to help women succeed in the workforce. She gave insightful and tangible advice to attendees about how to negotiate for higher wages and career advancement. I want to thank her for her contributions.

Catherine is well deserving of her recognition from Legal Momentum. I want to offer her my most heartfelt congratulations.

INTRODUCTION OF THE  
STRENGTHENING FISHING COM-  
MUNITIES AND INCREASING  
FLEXIBILITY IN FISHERIES MAN-  
AGEMENT ACT

**HON. DON YOUNG**

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act. The bill would amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson-Stevens Act)—the premier law governing commercial and recreational fishing in U.S. federal waters. The Magnuson-Stevens Act was first enacted in 1976 and was last reauthorized in 2006.

I worked on the 2006 reauthorization with my friend and Senator, Ted Stevens. Ted Stevens was a champion for Alaska and the law bears his name as recognition of his dedication to supporting and protecting Alaska fishermen and the importance of fishery resources to coastal communities. I will miss working with my friend during this next reauthorization, but will remember him fondly as the legislation moves through Congress.

Over the last two Congresses, I worked with the former Chair of the Committee on Natural Resources, Doc Hastings, to develop the text of the bill. The Committee on Natural Resources held 10 hearings, receiving comments and suggestions from over 100 witnesses representing Members of Congress, the administration, state governments, regional fishery management councils, marine fisheries commissions, commercial and recreational (including for-hire charter) fishing groups, processors, academics, and environmental groups. Due to this in-depth review of the Act and the need to keep the process going forward to reform the law, I am introducing the bill the Committee reported to the House floor in the 113th Congress.

The bill we developed in the 113th Congress would not have been possible without the knowledge and dedicated work of Mr. David Whaley, who retired from the Committee after twenty years of working on fisheries issues. I would like to acknowledge and thank Dave for his hard work and dedication over the years. I hired Dave in 1994 as my fisheries staffer for the Committee on Resources and he continued to handle Alaskan, national and international fishery issues, as well as marine mammal and ocean issues over his career on the Committee. Dave has been an invaluable resource to me and other members of the Committee during his twenty years of service on the Committee and we will miss his expertise and experience as we move this bill forward.

The Magnuson-Stevens Act allows for regional management of fisheries. The law gives guidance through its National Standards and specifies the process through which the Councils develop their fishery management plans. While the Secretary of Commerce has final approval of fishery management plans, the Magnuson-Stevens Act provides for a regional approach where the Councils, hearing from its local constituency groups, can develop fishery management plans that best suit their fisheries and fishermen. This is critical for the protection of coastal economies and for allowing the stakeholders to be a part of the management of their fisheries.

The Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act would update the Magnuson-Stevens Act to implement common sense reforms. The 2006 amendments were said to apply the 'Alaska Model' of fisheries management to other regions of the country. The premise of this reform was good. The 'Alaska Model' worked in Alaska due to stock assessments providing up-to-date fisheries data to allow the North Pacific Fishery Management Council to use adaptive management, providing optimal use of fishery resources to fishermen. The problem with trying to implement the 'Alaska Model' in other regions was that these regions

did not have adequate science—due to infrequent or out dated stock assessments—to support that type of management system. Instead of providing optimal use of the resource for fishermen, the implementation of the 'Alaska Model' resulted in fisheries being restricted in regions that were considered 'data poor' due to multiple levels of precautionary measures being applied because of inadequate scientific data.

I believe the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act will allow for increased fisheries management flexibility and transparency, provide for improved data collection, create jobs, and—what I believe is very important—create predictability and certainty for the coastal communities that depend on stable fishing activities.

The Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act would reauthorize and strengthen the Magnuson-Stevens Act to ensure a proper balance between the biological needs of fish stocks and the economic needs of fishermen and coastal communities. The bill would make a number of improvements to the Act: provide flexibility for fishery managers when rebuilding depleted fisheries; provide flexibility for fishery managers when setting annual catch levels; provide more transparency for fishermen and others in both science and management; provide a schedule for obtaining better fishery dependent and fishery independent data especially for data poor fisheries; provide greater protection for confidential information submitted to regulatory agencies; encourage and promote cooperative research projects where scientists work with fishermen to develop sound scientific information; allow fishery managers to take the economic impact of their decisions into account when setting harvest levels; allow fishery managers to take environmental conditions into account when establishing harvest levels; allow fishermen in regions where catch share programs have been controversial to have a vote to determine whether a new catch share program will be implemented and to be provided better information when considering such a program; require NOAA to provide better accountability on how fees are collected and used; clarify the role of the Magnuson-Stevens Act in relationship to other federal statutes; and authorize appropriations for an additional five fiscal years at current authorized funding levels.

As I've learned over the years as a legislator, laws are not written in stone. Congress's job is to review them, listen to constituents and modify the laws as needed. Laws that are stagnant do not help anyone. Times change and laws need to reflect new information and the needs of Americans.

Constituency groups were influential in developing the 2006 amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Act. Key aspects of the 2006 amendments were the goal to end overfishing through the requirement that annual catch limits not exceed scientific recommendations and accountability measures were instituted. Changes in the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act were also developed by listening to constituency groups at committee hearings, fishery managers at fishery council

meetings and at national conferences, and reviewing recommendations of the National Academy of Sciences. Even the National Marine Fisheries Service recognizes the need for reforms and has proposed revisions to its advisory guidelines for National Standards 1, 3 and 7 of the Magnuson-Stevens Act. These proposed revisions recommend changes that would allow for increased flexibility in rebuilding programs, clarify guidance on which stocks require conservation and management and defines depleted stocks, among other items. These changes are similar to changes included in the bill I am introducing today.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the new Chair of the Committee on Natural Resources, ROB BISHOP, as a cosponsor of this legislation. I look forward to working with him as the Strengthening Fishing Communities and Increasing Flexibility in Fisheries Management Act moves through Committee and the House. I also am pleased to have Representatives BRADLEY BYRNE and AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN as original cosponsors on the bill. I look forward to working with any Member of the House that is interested in reauthorizing the Magnuson-Stevens Act. This is an important piece of legislation and I urge Members to support its movement through the House of Representatives and 114th Congress.

#### REINTRODUCING THE SERVICES FOR ENDING LONG-TERM HOME- LESSNESS ACT

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Services for Ending Long-Term Homelessness Act. Homelessness continues to be a troubling issue facing our nation. In 2014, studies show that anywhere from 700,000 to 2 million children, families, and veterans found themselves homeless.

Nationally, on any given night, there are approximately 84,291 people who are experiencing chronic homelessness. Chronically homeless people often live in shelters or on the streets for years at a time, experience repeated episodes of homelessness without achieving housing stability, or cycle between homelessness, jails, mental health facilities, and hospitals. These individuals are all too often confronted with, or a combination of, mental illness, substance addiction, life-threatening illness or other serious health problems that make it impossible to maintain or access shelter. Fortunately, this bill presents us with the opportunity to address this national issue by ending long-term homelessness in America.

Studies have demonstrated that supportive services are a practical and a guaranteed investment of public and private resources to end long-term homelessness. These programs result in a 39% reduction in total cost of services from pre- to post-supportive housing with an overall savings of \$854,477. Furthermore, residents were significantly less likely to return to hospitals, nursing homes or prisons and there was an overall positive shift in mental and physical well-being.

The Services for Ending Long-Term Homelessness Act does three key things:

It requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), acting through the Administrator of Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, to design a national strategy for providing services in supportive housing that will assist in ending chronic homelessness and to implement programs that address chronic homelessness.

It calls for the HHS Secretary to make multi-year, renewable grants based on performance criteria, including the outcome of ending long-term homelessness matching the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Grants to eligible entities in order to provide services promoting recovery and self-sufficiency. Furthermore, it addresses barriers to housing stability for chronically homeless individuals and families in, or who are scheduled to become residents of, permanent supportive housing. This will also apply to other individuals and families who have voluntarily chosen to seek other housing opportunities after a period of tenancy in supportive housing.

It directs the HHS Secretary to require grantees to report data regarding the performance outcomes of projects carried out under this Act, which shall include measuring and reporting specific performance outcomes related to the long-term goals of: (1) increasing stability within the community for individuals and families who have been chronically homeless; and (2) decreasing recurrence of periods of homelessness.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we take a stand to put an end to long-term homelessness in America. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this critically important bill, so that we can end homelessness across this nation, because no person deserves to live without a home or to be on the streets.

#### OUTSTANDING CIVIC LEADERSHIP

#### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Sgt. Matt Levan of the Sugar Land Police Department for being named the 2014 Officer of the Year. This award reflects his exceptional contributions to our community and his outstanding civic leadership.

Sgt. Levan began his service for the Sugar Land Police Department 19 years ago and continues to display leadership and commitment to his job. As a member of the Houston Metro Internet Crimes against Children Task Force, he has taken a special interest in the welfare of children in Sugar Land. Always going a step further, he makes a practice of sharing his experience and insights to empower the public to better defend themselves from criminal threats. Thanks to officers like Sgt. Levan, residents of Sugar Land can sleep better at night knowing that our police officers are dedicated to serving our community and keeping us safe.

I commend Sgt. Levan for his outstanding leadership and service to our community at

the Sugar Land Police Department. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Sgt. Matt Levan on being named the 2014 Officer of the Year.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF CORPORAL TYLER SCOTT BREWER

#### HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life, and note the passing of Tyler Scott Brewer of Stanton, Kentucky, whom passed away on January 24, 2015 at the young age of 23.

According to his friends and family, Tyler lived a life of adventure, compassion, servitude and the natural ability to touch lives. His love for his family, friends, music, and his Kentucky home was sincere and eternal. Tyler was an absolute joy to be around, a true free spirit, and had a network of friends that stretched from coast to coast.

As a child, Tyler loved playing outside. He was especially fond of the days spent on Cave Run Lake with his family. He attended Bowen Elementary School and was praised by his teachers for being an excellent student and an extremely caring person; even at an early age he was an advocate for those who were different or less fortunate. It was in elementary school where Tyler was introduced to one of his passions, Powell County Pirate football.

Tyler started playing football in 5th grade and played all the way through his senior season of high school. He was a four-year starter on the varsity team while playing middle linebacker on defense and full back on offense. In addition to being an outstanding football player, he was also awarded the honor of Academic All State all four seasons of high school. Tyler graduated with honors from Powell County High School in 2010 and enrolled at The University of Kentucky (UK).

While at UK, Tyler decided to join the Marine Corps. He left for Paris Island, South Carolina in March 2011 to embark on the most rigorous training regimen required by any branch of the military; training that molds a recruit into a Marine. His proudest moment was his successful completion of the rite of passage known as The Crucible. Along with being a model Marine, Tyler earned the rank of Corporal in less than 3 and half years. Tyler served one tour in Afghanistan, as part of Operation Enduring Freedom, where he earned the Navy and Marine Corp Achievement Medal.

Tyler left the Marine Corps in September 2014 to return to life as a civilian. Upon returning to Kentucky, Tyler enrolled in the welding program at Maysville Community and Technical College. He was extremely excited about the school but unfortunately he would never fulfill his goal of completing the program.

Tragically, on January 24, 2015, the bright light known as Tyler Scott Brewer was taken in an automobile accident. Over 1,000 mourners visited Tyler. The outpouring of love from people all across the nation was historic for

his small Powell County community and a testament to the amount of lives he touched and affected in such a short amount of time.

Tyler was buried with full military honors and laid to rest at the Donnie G. Randall Veterans Memorial Cemetery in Stanton, Kentucky.

Tyler Scott Brewer was a son, brother, grandson, great grandson, nephew, cousin, Marine, and a true friend to all. His kind and loving spirit will be missed, but his legacy will not be forgotten.

#### McCOY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL NAMED A 2014 BLUE RIBBON SCHOOL

#### HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate McCoy Elementary School in Carrollton, Texas, for earning the distinction of being named one of the nation's most successful schools through the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program.

In 1982, the Department of Education established the National Blue Ribbon Schools Program to recognize schools for their high or significantly improved achievement. The program's goal is to identify the methods of thriving American schools to inspire others to imitate their successful practices.

In October of 2014, Secretary of Education Arne Duncan named McCoy Elementary School as a 2014 Blue Ribbon School. Schools selected for national honors reflect high standards and accountability to their students and community alike. McCoy Elementary School remains committed to enhancing the quality of learning for its students. The tireless work of the school's educators and families cannot go unnoticed, commensurate with the hard work of the students who helped earn this award.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 24th Congressional District of Texas, I ask all my distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating McCoy Elementary School on its accomplishment as a National Blue Ribbon School.

#### HONORING ALAMEDA COUNTY AS- SISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY JOHN JAY ON RETIREMENT

#### HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to honor Alameda County Assistant District Attorney John Jay on his upcoming retirement.

John has devoted his career to achieving justice for the residents of Alameda County and to keeping them safe. Following law school he served as a law clerk in the Alameda County Assistant District Attorney's Office and then, in December 1979, was appointed to be a deputy district attorney.

Over his 35 year career, John has played a positive role in nearly every part of the District Attorney's Office. Early on he tackled some of the most serious felony cases in the county, proving to be an excellent trial attorney.

John first took on a management position in 1998 when he became head of the Alameda Branch. Later he became a preliminary examination team leader in the Wiley Manuel Branch and the Assistant in Charge of the Fremont Branch, a position he holds today.

John has been a terrific mentor to the many young prosecutors in the District Attorney's Office, including myself. He also taught outside the office as well, serving as a criminal law and evidence professor at Chabot College and Las Positas College. And, he worked with police officers to help them understand what a prosecutor looks for when presenting a case. John has well earned his retirement. He looks forward to spending time with his wife Corrine and enjoying his interests in carpentry, travel and the outdoors.

I want to thank John for his years of dedicated service. I also want to wish him a very enjoyable retirement.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 108, I was absent attending Auditor Tom Schweich's funeral in the State of Missouri. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

#### CELEBRATING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MARY KIGHT

##### HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mary Kight of Waterbury, Connecticut.

Mary Kight, an extraordinary woman, exhibits remarkable strength, courage, and patriotism. Her son, Michael Aaron Kight served as a helicopter pilot in the U.S. Army and was killed in action on May 19, 1967 while trying to evacuate injured soldiers in South Vietnam.

Shortly after her son's death, Mrs. Kight joined the Gold Star Mothers and dedicated her time to helping families and communities remember her son and all those who sacrificed their lives for our country.

Mrs. Kight went on to serve as Connecticut Department Chair of the American Gold Star Mothers for many years. She was instrumental in acquiring the beautiful Gold Star Mothers Statue that is proudly displayed in Waterbury City Hall.

While Mrs. Kight is no longer the department chair of the Gold Star Mothers, she is still an active member of the organization. She is also involved in the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, and Waterbury Veterans Memorial Committee. She proudly

wears her white uniform at all of the local veterans' ceremonies to honor and remember her son.

This evening, as part of the Department of Defense's Vietnam War Commemoration program, the Daughters of the American Revolution will present Mrs. Kight with a certificate recognizing her for her service and sacrifice.

I congratulate Mrs. Kight on this honor, and thank her for all that she does for the City of Waterbury, State of Connecticut, and United States of America.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOE HOGAN

##### HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize a long-time friend and a resident of my home town of Levittown, Joe Hogan. Joe was named to be the grand marshal of the 2015 Bucks County St. Patrick's Day Parade because of his lifetime of service to the veteran's community. I have known Joe for many years and over that time he has exemplified how a committed community servant should live his life. A combat wounded Marine, Joe has served as a post-commander for his local VFW, member of the Disabled American Veterans and presently serves as the president of the Guardians of the National Cemetery, an all-volunteer support organization for the Washington Crossing National Cemetery. Joe has also served as an adult leader for Boy Scout Troop 123 and has remained active with coaching youth sports including his grandson's baseball team for the last three decades. I am fortunate to call him my friend and I look forward to seeing many more years of his involvement in our community.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF BARBARA SCHIANDRA FOR HER EFFORTS IN PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA ON BEHALF OF BREAST CANCER RE- SEARCH

##### HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Barbara Schiandra who is to be named Person of the Year by the Greater Pittsburgh Sunday Dispatch. In October 2014 Ms. Schiandra organized one of the biggest fundraisers in the history of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Over the course of four days, Ms. Schiandra raised both awareness of breast cancer's toll and the importance of its prevention and \$30,000 for breast cancer research—all during the first annual and very successful Paint Pittsburgh event.

It was Ms. Schiandra's own experience that led to this remarkable achievement. She was pregnant with her youngest son when she discovered her own cancer. At only 34 years old she was diagnosed with a highly aggressive

type of cancer with a high recurrence rate. After she began chemotherapy, she learned that she qualified for a clinical trial of a vaccine at the University of Pennsylvania sponsored by the Pennies in Action Fund, the eventual beneficiary of her community work.

Initially, the plan for Paint Pittsburgh was to utilize breast cancer awareness flags to line Pittsburgh's Main Street during the month of October. Paint Pittsburgh quickly grew into a much larger event, attracting hundreds of people and a host of local businesses. The ColorMePink 5K and Caped CURE-Sader Family Fun Walk drew over 500 participants to Downtown Pittsburgh. At the end of the four days, Barbara and her team presented a check for \$30,000 to the University of Pennsylvania Pennies in Action Fund to support its cancer research. Greater Pittsburgh, and all those affected by cancer, were highly moved by her efforts.

I congratulate Ms. Schiandra on being named Person of the Year by the Greater Pittsburgh Sunday Dispatch, and I applaud both her inspirational personal courage and her heroic efforts to fight cancer. With efforts like Barbara's, we will one day fully beat this disease.

#### HONORING THE 11TH ANNUAL SENEY VETERANS SNOWMOBILE RIDE

##### HON. DAN BENISHEK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 11th annual Seney Veterans Snowmobile Ride, which will occur on Saturday, March 14, 2015 in Seney, Michigan.

I had the privilege of participating last year with over 300 fellow riders as we honored and remembered the sacrifices and service of all that have served our nation.

Founded by Don and Diane Reed, veterans and owners of the Fox River Motel and sponsored by the Seney Snowmobile Association, the event has grown every year since it was first established building on their motto of "be a Vet, bring a Vet, thank a Vet."

Please join me in recognizing all the veterans and supporters participating in the Seney Veterans Snowmobile Ride. We must never forget our veterans and their contribution to the United States.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE HUMAN TRAFFICKING FRAUD ENFORCE- MENT ACT OF 2015

##### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce bipartisan legislation with my colleague Rep. TED POE.

In March of 1931 the infamous gangster, Al Capone, was indicted for tax fraud. Today the IRS Criminal Investigations division continues



to play a vital role in proving criminal activity and fraud, and I believe they can play an even stronger role in cracking down on human trafficking and prostitution.

This bill is meant to enhance the Internal Revenue Service's ability to crack down on sex trafficking by authorizing \$4 million to establish an office within the IRS to prosecute sex traffickers for violations of tax laws. The office would focus on the willful failure of traffickers to file returns, supply information, or pay tax where the taxpayer is an "aggravated" non-filer. In addition, the office would coordinate closely with existing task forces focused on sex trafficking offenders in the Department of Justice.

The bill also amends the Internal Revenue Code to increase criminal monetary and other penalties for attempts to: evade or defeat tax, willful failure to file a tax return, supply information, or pay tax, aggravated failure to file tax returns, fraud and false statements, and underpayment or overpayment of tax due to fraud. This offense will carry a maximum sentence of 10 years and a maximum fine of \$50,000.00.

The Human Trafficking Fraud Enforcement Act of 2015 also establishes a new felony offense for an aggravated failure to file to include failure to file with respect to income or payments derived from activity which is criminal under Federal or State law. This will target conduct committed by those involved in the promotion of commercial sex acts—pimps and traffickers—and not conduct of exploited persons in prostitution.

Last, this bill directly benefits those that are victimized by the traffickers by revising current IRS Whistleblower provisions so that women and girls who choose to participate in the investigation will be eligible to participate in the whistleblower program and may ultimately be granted up to 15% of any fines levied against the trafficker.

While important strides have been made to address trafficking, we must still use every tool possible to take down the traffickers. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation.

CONGRATULATING LOUIS GRIESEMER, SPRINGFIELD UNDERGROUND PRESIDENT, ON RECEIVING JAMES CHRISTIE SAFETY AND HEALTH PROFESSIONAL OF THE YEAR AWARD

### HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Louis Griesemer, president of Springfield Underground, on receiving the 2014 James Christie Safety and Health Professional of the Year Award presented by the National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association (NSSGA).

The James Christie Safety and Health Professional of the Year Award recognizes those that contribute generous efforts towards maintaining proficient health and safety standards at their workplace. The award was created in

1987 in recognition of James Christie, who challenged the U.S. Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) to focus on the safety practices of workers and not just the facility.

In addition to his duties as president of Springfield Underground, Louis Griesemer has been an active member of the NSSGA. He served as the association's chairman of the board in 2007.

Louis Griesemer understands that in order for American business to succeed, we need employers to act responsibly in protecting workers from safety and health hazards. The fact that Louis has been certified by the MSHA as a safety instructor stands as just one illustration of his commitment to this important goal. Further, our nation is strengthened when business leaders like Louis go "the extra mile" to bolster understanding both of and by the regulator and the regulated community. His leadership on the MSHA-NSSGA Alliance for education and training has achieved substantial results in this effort.

I am honored to recognize Louis Griesemer, and I congratulate him on receiving the 2014 James Christie Safety and Health Professional of the Year Award.

### OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

### HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,153,537,817,364.77. We've added \$7,526,660,768,451.69 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

### CONGRATULATING DR. JAMES CAPOLUPO

### HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Dr. James Capolupo of Springfield, Pennsylvania for being named the Superintendent of the Year by the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators.

Dr. Capolupo began his career as a music teacher and band director before rising to serve as an administrator in the Springfield Township School District. His talents and dedication to his students led him to be named the district's superintendent in 2005. Under his leadership, the district has become a model for innovative and effective instruction. His reputation has spread beyond the district, with representatives from more than 120 other school districts having visited Springfield to learn more about Dr. Capolupo's methods.

Dr. Capolupo earned national recognition last year when he was named a finalist for Na-

tional Superintendent of the Year by the National Association of School Superintendents. This distinction is awarded to five superintendents around the country who have created a "model of uncompromising dedication to literacy and academic achievement." So it is no surprise to learn of his recognition as Pennsylvania Superintendent of the Year.

I wish to congratulate Dr. Capolupo and the entire staff at Springfield School District for their hard work on our children's behalf.

### HORSE TRANSPORTATION SAFETY ACT

### HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Horse Transportation Safety Act with Rep. WHITFIELD, my esteemed colleague from Kentucky. I believe that the way we treat animals is a reflection of who we are as human beings so I have introduced this bill to halt the transport of horses in double-deck trailers, a practice that is dangerous for the animals and considered inhumane by many animal welfare advocates. Horses transported in these trailers often endure long journeys in cramped positions and suffer serious injuries as a result. Upon enactment, the Horse Transportation Safety Act would outlaw the transportation of horses in these two-tiered trailers. Violators of the law would be subject to civil penalties.

I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

### CONGRESSIONAL COMMENDATION FOR THE LIFE OF DR. LOIS DAVIS GIBSON

### HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 4, 2015*

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of Dr. Lois Gibson. We are all saddened by the loss of this gentle and loving spirit, Lois Gibson, wife, mother, grandmother, great grandmother, sister, aunt, sister-in-law, educator, Delta Sigma Theta Soror, Director of Nursing Program/FCCJ, Dean of Health Services/FCCJ, loved one, friend and so much more. A very proud and spiritual lady who gave so much to so many at every level of her being. Dr. Gibson was warmly considered the "Proverbial Woman" as she would touch you in her special and endearing way. She gave us a sense of pride and accomplishment, and she inspired us to go beyond our potential through learning and sharing.

As a mother, she raised generations to be proud and use the past to make a better future. As an educator, she dared us to be more than ordinary, she encouraged and pushed us to be better than we even knew; and as a citizen of the world, she made us understand and appreciate our individual differences, and all that we hold in common. As a true believer,

she simply made us believe by her example. Her standards were high, yet attainable; her truths were straightforward and without embellishment; her voice was strong with reason and reassurance; her directions were clear, simple and intended for keeping our feet on the right path; her love was great and powerful and shown brightly in her eyes and heart.

Though our hearts ache, our tears of pain are mixed with loving memories of her smile, her touch and that gleam in her eyes telling all who knew her, that she loved you and always will. And in her remembrance, we are drawn to the words of Paul, in the book of 2nd Timothy, "For I am now ready to be offered, the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept my faith". May the Lord bless and keep you now and forevermore and may the memory of my dear friend, Dr. Lois Davis Gibson remain with us for all times.

#### HONORING JOHN CORONA

#### HON. MARK TAKANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 2015

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and congratulate fellow educator John Corona, as he retires after 36 years of devoted public service.

Mr. Corona has been a valued leader in Riverside classrooms since 1979. Whether it was teaching courses, chairing the Martin Luther King High School Social Studies department, or serving as head coach of the Track and Field team, Mr. Corona has been an invaluable resource for students in our community.

For the past decade and a half, Mr. Corona's oral history project called King High School Remembers has connected hundreds of students with veterans to learn about history from those who wrote it. This program helps preserve the legacy of these heroes. Because of its impact, King High School Remembers has received widespread acclaim and numerous awards, and is recognized as an exemplary educational program.

I want to thank Mr. Corona for his devotion to his students, colleagues, and our community over the years, and wish him all the best as he begins this new chapter in his life.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE HONORABLE MARTIN KANE, THE WILKES-BARRE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK MAN OF THE YEAR FOR 2015

#### HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 2015

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Honorable Martin Kane, Magisterial District Judge in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. Judge Kane has been named the 2015 Man of the Year by the Greater Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. He

will receive this award at the Friendly Sons' annual banquet on March 13, 2015. Judge Kane has honorably served Luzerne County for 30 years.

Judge Kane is an Air Force veteran who served tours of duty in Vietnam and Thailand. He graduated from St. Mary's High School, Texas Christian University, and Wilson College, and is certified as a district judge. He has been married to his wife Kathryn for 40 years.

Elected in 1985, Judge Kane has presided over more than 300,000 cases in his career. Many of those cases were high-profile homicide and drug cases presented by the Pennsylvania Attorney General's office, Pennsylvania State Police, and the Wilkes-Barre Police Department.

Kane was appointed by Pennsylvania Chief Justices Ronald Castille and Steven Zappala to serve on the Legislative Committee, the Grievance and Bylaws Committee, and the Minor Rules Committee Intergovernmental Task Force of the Pennsylvania District Courts. Judge Kane is also special liaison to the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board and special liaison to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court for the District Judges of Pennsylvania. He previously served as the president of the District Judges Association of Pennsylvania.

Additionally, Judge Kane has served the Greater Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons of St. Patrick as treasurer. He is also an active member of many community organizations, including the N.E. Slovak Club, the Triangle Club, the Wilkes-Barre Eagles Club, the American Legion, AMVETS, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Polish American Vets, the Knights of Columbus, and the Catholic War Vets. And Judge Kane serves as an officer of the Wyoming Valley Crime Clinic. This is quite a list.

It is a distinct privilege to honor Judge Kane on receiving the Greater Wilkes-Barre Friendly Sons Man of the Year Award, and I commend him on his lifetime of public and community service.

#### CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY AND SAFETY ACT

#### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is time to further address the epidemic of sexual assaults at our nation's college and university campuses. During some of the most formative years of their lives, students across the country should not have to live in fear of being stalked or abused. That is why a bipartisan group have come together to introduce the Campus Accountability and Safety Act that will address ambiguities in the law, strengthen protections and enforcement, and improve reporting by universities.

Rape is a horrific crime that exacts a physical and psychological toll on survivors. Women trying to get an education should not have to worry that they might also be victimized by predators on their campuses. This legislation establishes new campus resources and support services for student survivors; en-

sures minimum training standards for on-campus personnel, creates new historic transparency requirements, requires a uniform discipline process and coordination with law enforcement, and establishes enforceable Title IX penalties and stiffer penalties for Clery Act violations.

I applaud the work of our colleagues in the Senate on their comprehensive and bipartisan bill, and thank my co-lead Rep. PATRICK MEEHAN for teaming up on this legislation. I am hopeful that the House will take up this effort in tandem with the Senate so that we can put a bill on the President's desk.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 5, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 10

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment

To hold hearings to examine venture exchanges and small-cap companies.

SD-538

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine tax complexity, compliance, and administration, focusing on the merits of simplification in tax reform.

SD-215

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine United States policy in Ukraine, focusing on countering Russia and driving reform.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine continuing America's leadership in medical innovation for patients.

SD-430

- Committee on the Judiciary  
Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights  
To hold hearings to examine the anti-trust decrees that govern the market for music.  
SD-226
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Veterans Health Administration.  
SD-124
- Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities  
To receive a closed briefing on Iran's military and intelligence activities and impact on regional security.  
SVC-217
- 3 p.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office.  
SD-138
- MARCH 11
- 9 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the National Nuclear Safety Administration.  
SD-138
- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on SeaPower  
To hold hearings to examine Marine Corps ground modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-222
- Committee on Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings to examine the President's request for authorization to use force against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), focusing on military and diplomatic efforts.  
SD-419
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for Indian Health Service.  
SD-124
- Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.  
SD-562
- Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold hearings to examine a nationwide public safety wireless broadband network.  
SR-253
- Committee on Environment and Public Works  
To hold hearings to examine state regulators' perspectives on the clean power plan.  
SD-406
- Committee on the Judiciary  
To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.  
SD-226
- 10:30 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of Defense  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Army.  
SD-192
- Committee on the Budget  
To hold hearings to examine benefits of a balanced budget.  
SD-608
- 2 p.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs  
To hold hearings to examine protecting religious freedom abroad.  
SD-124
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support  
To hold hearings to examine military construction, environmental, energy, and base closure programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SH-216
- MARCH 12
- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.  
SD-G50
- 9:45 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Legislative Branch  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Secretary of the Senate, the Senate Sergeant at Arms, and the Capitol Police.  
SD-124
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2016 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Marshals Service, Drug Enforcement Administration, and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; to be followed by a closed session in SVC-217 at approximately 12:00 p.m.  
SD-192
- Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine S. 556, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting.  
SD-366
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine the Visa Waiver Program, focusing on implications for United States national security.  
SD-342
- 10:30 a.m.  
Special Committee on Aging  
To hold hearings to examine how prepared Americans are for retirement.  
SD-562
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces  
To receive a closed briefing on missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SVC-217
- MARCH 17
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine the state of technological innovation related to the electric grid.  
SD-366
- MARCH 18
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Veterans' Affairs  
To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation from multiple veterans service organizations.  
SD-G50
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission.  
SR-253
- MARCH 19
- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. Strategic Command, U.S. Transportation Command, and U.S. Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SD-G50
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. crude oil export policy.  
SD-366
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Airland  
To hold hearings to examine Air Force force structure and modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-222
- MARCH 24
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine management reforms to improve forest health



**SENATE—*Friday, March 6, 2015***

The Senate met at 9:30 and 6 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
MARCH 9, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands

adjourned until 2 p.m., on Monday, March 9, 2015.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:30 and 18 seconds a.m., adjourned until Monday, March 9, 2015, at 2 p.m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, March 6, 2015

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 6, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

The House has come to the close of an eventful week, and we approach a weekend during which many Members of this assembly will gather to remember an historic event in Selma, Alabama.

Fifty years ago, brave men and women, Americans of all races, colors, and faiths, walked together to help guarantee freedoms that were still denied men and women in Alabama.

Bless the Members of this assembly, and us all, that we would be worthy of the call we have been given as Americans, to nurture and guarantee democratic freedoms to all who dwell in our great Nation. Help us all to be truly thankful and appropriately generous in our response.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 134, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 4, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to Section 4(b) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, I am writing to reappoint the following Members to the House Democracy Partnership:

The Honorable David Price of North Carolina, Ranking Member

The Honorable Lois Capps of California  
The Honorable Sam Farr of California  
The Honorable Keith Ellison of Minnesota  
The Honorable Susan Davis of California  
The Honorable Gwen Moore of Wisconsin  
The Honorable Jim McDermott of Washington

The Honorable Dina Titus of Nevada  
Thank you for your attention to these appointments.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following Members on the part of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. CUMMINGS, Maryland  
Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland

### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 134, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, March 10, 2015.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 10, 2015, at noon.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

670. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant

Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cattle Fever Tick; Importation Requirements for Ruminants From Mexico [Docket No.: APHIS-2012-0073] (RIN: 0579-AD91) received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

671. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's proposed rule — Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation General Provisions; Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Governance; Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Risk Management; Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation Disclosure and Reporting; Farmer Mac Corporate Governance and Standards of Conduct (RIN: 3052-AC89) received March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture.

672. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Raymond P. Palumbo, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

673. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Albany County, NY, et al.) [Docket ID FEMA-2014-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8371] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

674. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Summary of the Joint Final Rule: Appraisals for Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans received March 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

675. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Higher-Priced Mortgage Loans Supplemental (RIN: 3133-AE21) received March 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

676. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received March 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

677. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze State and Federal Implementation Plans; Reconsideration [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0647; FRL-9923-88-Region 9] received March 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

678. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's

direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Transportation Conformity [EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0275; A-1-FRL-9924-17-Region 1] received March 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

679. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0360; FRL-9923-26-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR47) received March 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

680. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arkansas; Revisions for the Regulation and Permitting of Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0700; FRL-9923-77-Region 6] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

681. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Approval of Substitution for Transportation Control Measures [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0871; FRL-9923-80-Region 6] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

682. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Georgia; Redesignation of the Rome, Georgia, 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment; Correction [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0893; FRL-9923-89-Region 4] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

683. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0444; FRL-9924-16-Region 4] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

684. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Metaldehyde; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0110; FRL-9921-85] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

685. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Tennessee; Emissions Statement Requirement for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0810; FRL-9923-94-Region 4] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

686. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of

Implementation Plans; Mississippi; New Source Review — Prevention of Significant Deterioration [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0798; FRL-9923-92-Region 4] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

687. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 9-Octadecenoic Acid (9Z)—, Sulfonated, Oxidized and its Potassium and Sodium Salts; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0601; FRL-9922-29] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

688. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans, State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants, and Operating Permits Program; State of Missouri [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0006; FRL-9923-68-Region 7] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

689. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Redesignation Request and Associated Maintenance Plan for the Reading, Pennsylvania, Nonattainment Area for the 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Standard, and 2007 Base Year Inventory [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0147; FRL-9923-78-Region 3] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

690. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Approval and Promulgation; Missouri; St. Louis Inspection and Maintenance Program [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0399; FRL-9923-66-Region 7] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

691. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0522; FRL-9923-79-Region 3] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

692. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; State Boards Requirements; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide, and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0903; FRL-9924-02-Region 3] received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

693. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Nineteenth Report to Congress on Progress Made in Licensing and Constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, pursuant to Sec. 1810 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

694. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting a report on data mining activity in the Department of State for calendar year 2014, pursuant to Public Law 110-53, section 804; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

695. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's Hong Kong Policy Report, pursuant to the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

696. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. RSAT-14-4215, Notice of Proposed Permanent Transfer of Major Defense Equipment, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

697. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-150, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 14-068, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

699. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

700. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-601, "U Street/14th Street, N.W., and Georgia Avenue Great Streets Neighborhood Retail Priority Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

701. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-602, "Workforce Investment Implementation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

702. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-603, "Public Space Maintenance Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

703. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-603, "Public Space Maintenance Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

704. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-604, "Federal Health Reform Implementation and Omnibus Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

705. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-605, "Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

706. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-606, "Executive Service Compensation System Changes and



Pay Schedule Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

707. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-619, "Civil Asset Forfeiture Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

708. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-621, "License to Carry a Pistol Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

709. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-593, "Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

710. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-607, "Office of Motion Picture and Television Development Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

711. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-608, "Adoption Fee Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

712. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-609, "Omnibus Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

713. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-620, "Primary Date Alteration Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

714. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-618, "Clinical Laboratory Practitioners Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

715. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-615, "New Columbia Statehood Initiative and Omnibus Boards and Commissions Reform Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

716. A letter from the Office of Presidential Appointments, Department of State, transmitting fourteen reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

717. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2014 Financial Report of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

718. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

719. A letter from the Supervisory Attorney-Advisor, Office on Violence Against Women, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Grants To Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders [OVW Docket No.: 111] (RIN: 1105-AB43) received March 4, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

720. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and

Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Fountaingrove District Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2014-0006; T.D. TTB-128; Ref: Notice No. 144] (RIN: 1513-AC09) received March 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

721. A letter from the Office of the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 2015 Trade Policy Agenda and 2014 Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program, pursuant to Sec. 163 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2213); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. HAHN, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COOK, Mr. MARINO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. NEAL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. JONES, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. NUGENT):

H.R. 1338. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on matters relating to the burial of unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 1339. A bill to prohibit the use of official funds for airline accommodations for Members of Congress which are not coach-class accommodations or for long-term vehicle leases for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. LANCE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 1340. A bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 1341. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to adjust the phaseout of the health insurance tax credit for geographic variations in the cost-of-living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALDEN (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIND, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HARPER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of

Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 1342. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H.R. 1338.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Ms. GRAHAM:

H.R. 1339.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1340.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the powers of Congress, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 1341.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 & 18

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1342.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts, and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

2) Article 1, Section 1: All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 59: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 61: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 69: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 72: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 77: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. VELA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 167: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 281: Mr. HUELSKAMP.  
H.R. 420: Mr. FARENTHOLD.  
H.R. 427: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.  
H.R. 500: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 616: Mr. DOLD and Mr. BERA.  
H.R. 625: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 642: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.R. 663: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
H.R. 664: Mrs. LUMMIS.  
H.R. 721: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA, AND Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 735: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 738: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. POLIS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 745: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 803: Mr. SALMON, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. NUGENT.  
H.R. 822: Mr. HECK of Nevada.  
H.R. 913: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.  
H.R. 960: Mr. WENSTRUP.  
H.R. 970: Mr. HILL, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. ROKITA.  
H.R. 978: Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. RUSH, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. MCCAUL.  
H.R. 1013: Mr. GALLEG0.  
H.R. 1033: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 1054: Mr. COSTA, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 1109: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H.R. 1153: Mr. ISSA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 1174: Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1188: Mr. SHERMAN.  
H.R. 1309: Mr. HILL.  
H.R. 1328: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. BLUM.  
H.R. 1332: Mr. BABIN and Mr. BARLETTA.  
H.J. Res. 22: Mr. GALLEG0.  
H. Con. Res. 23: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. NEAL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. CASTRO of Texas.  
H. Res. 122: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H. Res. 139: Mr. BABIN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.  
H. Res. 143: Ms. BASS.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING ANTHONY "TONY"  
NEAL HUNLEY

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Anthony "Tony" Neal Hunley, who passed away on January 25, 2015, after sixty remarkable years.

Tony devoted his life to public service, including an exemplary thirty-five year career in local law enforcement. His commitment and devotion for the betterment of his community touched countless people. Born in Sacramento, Tony felt a deep connection to his local region.

Tony began his service as a teenager, working in the Civil Air Patrol and the Fairfield High ROTC, as a member of the class of 1972. After graduating from the police academy, he went on to serve his community for a combined thirty-five years, first in the Fairfield Police Department as a police dispatcher, and then as a police officer. He transferred to the Concord Police Department in 1986, a job and a community he was proud to serve until his medical retirement in 2008, and where he was awarded Policeman of the Year.

Tony had a great sense of adventure and enjoyed flying single engine airplanes, riding motorcycles and auto racing. He also found great pleasure in woodworking and golf, and was an avid reader. Most important of all was his family, whom he loved beyond measure.

Tony was a compassionate officer with a great sense of humor, and his upbeat attitude was contagious. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Anthony "Tony" Neal Hunley for his life of service to a grateful community.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF  
PHILLIP LEVINE

**HON. JIM COSTA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Phillip Levine of Fresno, California who recently passed away at the age of 87. He leaves behind his loving family including his wife Frances J. Artley, three sons, Mark, John and Teddy, five grandchildren and one great grandchild.

Mr. Levine was born on January 10, 1928 in Detroit, Michigan, but has called Fresno home since 1958. The son of Russian-Jewish immigrants, Levine was born and raised in industrial Detroit where he began working in the auto factories at the age of 14. He earned his Bachelor's degree from Wayne State Univer-

sity in 1950 and later earned a Master's degree in Fine Arts from the University of Iowa in 1957. After receiving his graduate degree, he came to California where he began teaching at California State University, Fresno.

He went on to teach at Fresno State for 34 years. It was there that he built a nationally recognized program in Creative Writing that inspired many graduates to become illustrious poets. He retired in 1992 but remained deeply connected to the University. Although Levine held teaching positions at some of the most prestigious universities in the land, including New York University, Columbia University, Princeton and the University of California at Berkeley, he always returned to his home in Fresno.

As a poetry writer, Mr. Levine celebrated working people, and his words both resonated and uplifted them. He wrote more than 21 collections of poetry and in 1995 received the Pulitzer Prize for his poem "The Simple Truth." He won the National Book Award in 1991 for "What work is" and in 2013 he was honored with the Wallace Stevens Award which is given annually to recognize "outstanding and proven mastery in the art of poetry." In 2011, Mr. Levine was named as the 18th Poet Laureate of the United States, being declared one of America's greatest narrative poets by Librarian of Congress, James H. Billington. While achieving numerous successes and accolades for his work, he consistently maintained that the success of his Fresno State students was one of his biggest rewards.

Mr. Levine was truly an honorable man with a strong commitment to family, friends and his country that will live on in lives of the many people he touched. His passion for writing, education, and his community will be remembered by all who knew him. I am honored and humbled to join his family in celebrating the life of this amazing man who will never be forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in saying farewell to Mr. Phillip Levine, a man full of love for life. His genuine character, commitment to family and community will be greatly missed.

HIGH SCHOOL WRESTLING CHAMPIONSHIP CONGRESSIONAL TRIBUTE

**HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor six athletes from Pueblo County who wrestled fearlessly the weekend of February 20th to win state titles in the Class 3A and 4A finals. On the road to their championship,

these young men showed grit and determination, overcoming their adversaries on the mat while bringing pride to their respective schools and the county as a whole. To formally acknowledge their distinction and excellence, I stand to recognize:

From Pueblo County High School: Hunter Willits, Chris Sandoval, and Josiah Nava,

From Pueblo South High School: Austin Zuniga,

From Pueblo East High School: Jacob Robles,

And from Dolores Huerta Preparatory High School: Marcus Garcia.

Like many State Championship runs, Pueblo's wrestlers encountered emotional setbacks. After missing weight by one-tenth of a pound, Willits twin brother, Grant, a title favorite, was eliminated from the competition. The team was devastated by the news yet showed tremendous fortitude, rallying to win their three final matches.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly an honor to recognize each of these fine athletes. In a sport renowned for the extreme physical and mental conditions the human body is subjected to, these young men have demonstrated tenacity, tireless work ethic, and relentless commitment to success that brings honor to their schools and inspires their communities.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF SUE  
LANDSKE

**HON. LUKE MESSER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Sue Landske, a former Indiana State Senator and a truly admirable Hoosier.

Sue was a devoted wife to her husband Bill, the loving mother to five children, and grandmother to eight grandchildren. While raising her five children, Sue started her own business before being elected to the Indiana State Senate in 1984. Not only was Sue one of the longest serving state legislators from northwest Indiana, but she was also the second highest ranking member of the Indiana Senate upon her retirement in 2014. Sue was at the forefront of many legislative accomplishments, most specifically the "Lemon Law" that protected consumers against the purchase of defective vehicles, a living-will policy that gave adults medical treatment choices if they were incapacitated, and free tuition at state funded higher education institutions for recipients of the Hoosier Purple Heart award. During her spare time, Sue loved camping with her husband, visiting her children at their military posts around the globe, and spending as much time as she could with her grandchildren.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

She also served as a Member of the State Committee of the Indiana Republican Party. That is where we became friends. I always admired Sue's wisdom, candor, and civility. She was an important part of the Party's achievements during the Mitch Daniels years.

Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of former State Senator Sue Landske. My thoughts and prayers go out to Sue's family, and may God comfort those she left behind with His peace and strength.

VFW POST 6996

### HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th Anniversary of Washington County Memorial Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 6996. VFW Post 6996 was established in 1965 in Potosi, Missouri. Since then, members of Post 6996 have contributed countless volunteer hours in the Washington County community. Their selfless acts continue to set an admirable example for all.

VFW Post 6996 is comprised of members who have served honorably in foreign wars or overseas operations. These dedicated veterans seek to continue serving the American people and their fellow veterans. This non-profit service organization embodies the spirit of service and generosity by supporting troops currently overseas and ensuring returning veterans have access to health care, counseling, and housing.

For their many years of service and commitment to helping others, it is my pleasure to recognize the 50th Anniversary of Washington County Memorial VFW Post 6996 in the House of Representatives.

### RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SELMA VOTING RIGHTS MARCH WITH THE ISSUANCE OF A POSTAL STAMP

### HON. JOYCE BEATTY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bipartisan resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 23, that would honor the Selma to Montgomery, Alabama marches with a commemorative stamp.

I thank the 102 House Members who cosponsored this resolution and leading sponsors Congressman BYRNE, Congressman HURD, and Congresswoman SEWELL.

The Selma Voting Rights March was a pivotal moment in our history that brought together Americans to march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama 50 years ago.

This stamp celebrates the march and reminds us to protect voting rights.

For 125 years the Postal Service has been issuing stamps that celebrate cultural milestones and the unique history of our nation.

Surely the protection of voting rights is a landmark development in our nation's development.

It is my hope that as we remember the struggles of discrimination and inequality we lift our hearts and unite to find bridges to equality and justice.

I ask that all Members unite and join with me in commemorating this critical watershed event.

### INTRODUCTION OF THE VISION ZERO ACT OF 2015

### HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, our communities need to be safer. More than 33,000 Americans die on our roadways each year, yet this is accepted as inevitability. Even more concerning, fatalities of our most vulnerable road users—pedestrians and bicyclists—make up a growing share of those deaths, with pedestrian fatalities increasing 16% from 2009 to 2014. People who die on our streets are disproportionately children, seniors, and people from low income or minority communities.

Communities across the country are recognizing that there is only one number of acceptable deaths on our streets: zero. "Vision Zero" is the goal of eliminating all transportation-related fatalities, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, motorists and passengers. Cities from New York to San Diego are implementing interagency Vision Zero plans connecting engineering, education, and enforcement, to reach the goal of ending transportation deaths.

Congress should encourage this innovative approach to transportation safety, and today I'm pleased to introduce the Vision Zero Act of 2015 with my colleague, Representative BUCHANAN. This bill provides local communities of all sizes with funding and best practices to plan and implement a Vision Zero framework. We should no longer accept bicycle and pedestrian fatalities as harsh reality, and this bill gives us the tools to reverse this trend.

### HONORING MS. DORIS GENTRY

### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Doris Gentry and the Human Trafficking Steering Committee for the planning and implementation of the first Napa Conference on Human Trafficking. Ms. Gentry saw the need to bring awareness on this important issue, created and led a steering committee made up of the honorable law enforcement officers of Napa County, and has been working hard to bring this conference to fruition.

Human trafficking affects as many as twenty-seven million people worldwide, and as

many as eighty percent of the victims of human trafficking are former foster youth, but it is both a global and a local problem. The effort by individuals, businesses, organizations, and governing bodies to promote the observance of Human Trafficking Awareness on March 13th of 2015 represents one of the many examples of the ongoing commitment to raise awareness of and to actively oppose human trafficking.

For Ms. Gentry, philanthropy and volunteerism has been a life-long activity. She has led numerous boards and organizations dedicated to making our community a better place to live, work, and raise a family, and this conference is yet another demonstration of her devotion. Ms. Gentry is also a foster mom to one hundred teen boys, and has four children and six grand children of her own.

I am proud to represent a district with principled, community-minded and globally conscious people such as Doris Gentry. Mr. Speaker, Ms. Gentry and the Human Trafficking Steering Committee deserve to be recognized and honored here today.

### H.R. 280 AND H.R. 294, REFORMS TO IMPROVE THE CARE FOR VETERANS WHO HAVE SACRIFICED SO MUCH FOR OUR NATION

### HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 2, due to inclement weather I was unable to vote on H.R. 280 'Authorizing Secretary of Veterans Affairs to Recoup Bonuses and Awards' and H.R. 294 the 'Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act'. If I had been present I would have voted "yes" on the passage of both bills as these reforms would serve to improve the care of our Veterans who have sacrificed so much for our nation. These bills respectively improve the ability of the Veterans Administration to provide for the well being of those who have given so much for this nation, and expand the power of that Department to hold its employees accountable when they fall short of upholding that sacred duty.

Over the past year, the Department of Veterans Affairs has received scrutiny on issues that affect the care and benefits of our Veterans. Congress has taken action, along with the Department's Office of the Inspector General to investigate these wrongdoings. One finding of these investigations was the despicable act of manipulating the Department's appointment system to hide evidence of increased wait times for medical appointments, and the doctoring of medical records to the same effect.

I believe these acts are despicable and the Department of Veterans Affairs must be held accountable. Veterans Affairs employees are placed in positions of special trust and confidence and are charged with the sacred duty of caring for those who have sacrificed for the security of this nation. This bill, H.R. 280, provides the Secretary of Veterans Affairs more authority to hold accountable those employees

who break faith with this obligation. While employees would be afforded due process prior to being fined for misconduct, the Secretary's decision would be final and could not be appealed to any other agency or court. No system is perfect and no person is perfect. But the American people entrust the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with the responsibility of caring for our Veterans—which is why it is critical to empower that Department's leaders with the authority to hold their employees accountable for their actions.

My District in Jacksonville, Florida is one of the most popular retirement locations for Veterans. So this bill, H.R. 294 the 'Long-Term Care Veterans Choice Act', hits very close to home. As our Veterans enter the twilight of their lives, they often find themselves needing increased daily care, which the Department of Veterans Affairs is required by law to provide. This care is given by way of veterans nursing homes, which are currently the only institutions capable of fulfilling the Department's obligation to provide such services. However, this "one size fits all" method of caring for our Veterans is not always the most appropriate for their condition or medical situation.

H.R. 294 corrects this situation by authorizing the Department of Veterans Affairs to fund Medical Foster Home care for Veterans whose situation is conducive to receiving long term care in a non-institutional setting. Medical Foster Care provides actual homes for Veterans and families willing to accept the challenge of caring for them. Many of these families are themselves retired service members, nurses, and doctors that are able to garner a little extra money and a purpose for getting out of bed every day. There is no downside to this bill. It provides a choice for our Veterans to receive the kind of care they want and deserve in a fiscally responsible manner. I can't think of a better way to honor their service and sacrifice.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, had I been present for these votes, I would have placed my full support behind their passage.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF JERRY TARKANIAN

#### HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleague, Mr. NUNES to honor the life of Jerry Tarkanian, who passed away on February 11, 2015, at the age of 84. Jerry's family and friends as well as people throughout the nation, will miss him greatly as he dedicated much of his life to inspiring young athletes in countless communities.

Although Jerry was most recognized for his achievements as the basketball coach for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, in the Central Valley we remember Jerry as Fresno State's spirited and energetic former head basketball coach. Fresno State was Jerry's alma mater, and the community is very proud to say so.

Born in Euclid, Ohio, Jerry was the son of Armenian immigrants. He moved halfway

across the country, to California, to get an education and play basketball. In 1955, he graduated from Fresno State, and later earned his master's degree in Educational Management from the University of Redlands.

Jerry was an enthusiastic coach for 31 years who began his basketball coaching career at San Joaquin Memorial High School in Fresno. Jerry coached his first Division I team at California State University, Long Beach from 1968–1973. As a coach during the late 60s, his courage defied social norms of the time, becoming one of the first coaches to start more than three African-American players. Jerry took an intense interest in his players and wanted them to succeed both on and off the court. He was a man of encouragement who reached out to young men who lived in inner-cities and normally would not have access to a higher education. I once had the pleasure of having a conversation about Jerry Tarkanian with Magic Johnson. He told me that Coach Jerry Tarkanian was known around inner city playgrounds in America as the coach of second chances. In the Central Valley, we are truly grateful for those second chances.

In 1973, Jerry moved to Nevada to become head coach at UNLV. He is now remembered as the determined individual who turned around the basketball program at UNLV and made it into a winning program. Jerry returned to Fresno and coached at Fresno State from 1995–2002. While coaching at Fresno state, his teams had a total of six 20-win seasons for a total of 153 victories. In total, his teams had 729 victories, a National championship for UNLV in 1990, and four straight NCAA tournament appearances for Long Beach State. Additionally, Jerry coached 42 players who were drafted by the NBA, including 12 first-round selections. Due to the efforts made by Jerry and the "Stadium Builders" in the mid 1990s, Save mart Center was built. For years, there had been discussions regarding an on-campus arena at Fresno State, but it was not made a reality until Jerry began his successful coaching career at the university. When he finished his coaching career, Jerry worked as the Senior Development Consultant for Save mart Center.

In 2013, Tarkanian was elected to the Naismith Memorial Hall of Fame, an honor his fellow coaches argued for years was long overdue. Though hospitalized in the summer for heart problems and weakened by a variety of ills, he went on stage with a walker at the induction ceremony.

Jerry is appreciated by individuals throughout our nation, but he is especially treasured in Fresno, California. Central Valley residents take pride in Fresno State, and it was an honor to have Jerry lead our Fresno State Bulldogs on the basketball court. Although I come to you with a heavy heart, I am honored to have known such an admirable man.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that Mr. NUNES and I ask our colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in honoring the life of Coach Jerry Tarkanian, as he is remembered for all of the contributions that he has made to individuals throughout the country as well as the people to whom he gave a second chance.

#### JESSE REED CHAMPION TRIBUTE

#### HON. SCOTT R. TIPTON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Mr. Jesse Reed. Mr. Reed cemented his name in Colorado high-school wrestling history on February 20th, 2015, at the Colorado State High School Wrestling Championships in Denver, Colorado, by winning his fourth consecutive state title.

Jesse, a senior at Paonia Junior-Senior High School, began his dominant career as a freshman, winning the 113-pound state title. In an incredible show of dedication and pure mental toughness, Jesse overcame a MCL tear during his sophomore football season, and returned to the mat that sophomore winter and battled his way to the 120-pound state title. In a sport renowned for the extreme physical and mental conditions, in which athletes are subject to match after match, it is a testament to Jesse's resolve that he was able to prevail even without a 100 percent healthy knee.

Following another dominant season during his junior year and his third state title, Jesse, now in his senior year, knew that he had the opportunity to become the 18th wrestler in Colorado State history to win four consecutive titles. In a 4–1 decision, not only did Reed join that elite group but he also capped off an impressive final two seasons in which he didn't lose a single match.

Mr. Speaker, Jesse Reed's tenacity, unwillingness to succumb to adversity, and unparalleled success is truly to be admired and for that I congratulate him. Although he has wrestled his last match for the Eagles, his commitment to the sport of wrestling and to Paonia Junior-Senior High School will remain on the mat and inspire the Eagles who follow in his footsteps.

#### COMMEMORATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY, TURNAROUND TUESDAY, AND THE FINAL MARCH FROM SELMA TO MONTGOMERY

#### HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 6, 2015*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, fifty years ago tomorrow, in Selma, Alabama, hundreds of heroic souls risked their lives for freedom and to secure the right to vote for all Americans by their participation in marches for voting rights on "Bloody Sunday," "Turnaround Tuesday," or the final, completed march from Selma to Montgomery.

Those "foot soldiers" of Selma, brave and determined men and women, boys and girls, persons of all races and creeds, loved their country so much that they were willing to risk their lives to make it better, to bring it even closer to its founding ideals.

The foot soldiers marched because they believed that all persons have dignity and the

right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote.

On March 15, 1965, before a joint session of the Congress and the eyes of the nation, President Lyndon Johnson explained to the nation the significance of "Bloody Sunday":

I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy. . . .

At times history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom.

So it was at Lexington and Concord.

So it was a century ago at Appomattox.

So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.

The previous Sunday, March 7, 1965, more than 600 civil rights demonstrators, including our beloved colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, were brutally attacked by state and local police at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they marched from Selma to Montgomery in support of the right to vote.

"Bloody Sunday" was a defining moment in American history because it crystallized for the nation the necessity of enacting a strong and effective federal law to protect the right to vote of every American.

No one who witnessed the violence and brutally suffered by the foot soldiers for justice who gathered at the Edmund Pettus Bridge will ever forget it; the images are deeply seared in the American memory and experience.

Mr. Speaker, what is so moving, heroic, and awe-inspiring is that the foot soldiers of Selma faced their heavily armed adversaries fortified only by their love for their country and for each other and their audacious faith in a righteous cause.

The example set by the foot soldiers of Selma showed everyone, here in America and around the world, that there is no force on earth as powerful as an idea whose time has come.

These great but nameless persons won the Battle of Selma and helped redeem the greatest nation on earth.

But we should not forget that the victory came at great cost and that many good and dear persons lost their lives to win for others the right to vote.

Men like Jimmy Lee Jackson, who was shot by Alabama state trooper as he tried to protect his mother and grandmother from being beaten for participating in a peaceful voting rights march in Marion, Alabama.

Women like Viola Liuzzo, a housewife and mother of five, who had journeyed to Selma from Detroit to join the protests after witnessing on television the events at Edmund Pettus Bridge on "Bloody Sunday" and who was shot and killed by Klansmen while driving back from a trip shuttling fellow voting rights marchers to the Montgomery airport.

Persons of faith, goodwill, and non-violence like the Reverend James Reeb of Boston, a minister from Boston who heeded the call of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to come to Selma and who succumbed to the head injuries he suffered at the hands of his white supremacists attackers on March 9, two days after Bloody Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of unspeakable hostility, violence, brutality, and hatred, the foot soldiers of Selma would not be deterred—would not be moved—would not be turned around.

They kept their eyes on the prize and held on.

And help came the very next week when President Johnson announced to the nation that he would send to Congress for immediate action a law designed to eliminate illegal barriers to the right to vote by striking down "restrictions to voting in all elections—Federal, State, and local—which have been used to deny Negroes the right to vote."

On August 6, 1965, that legislation—the Voting Rights Act of 1965—was signed into law by President Johnson and for the next 48 years did more to expand our democracy and empower racial and language minorities than any act of government since the Emancipation Proclamation and adoption of the Civil War Amendments.

But our work is not done; the dreams of Dr. King and of all those who gave their lives in the struggle for justice are not behind us but still before us.

Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the Supreme Court's 2013 ruling in *Shelby County v. Holder*, which severely crippled the Voting Rights Act, we have seen many states across our nation move to enact legislation designed to limit the ability of women, the elderly, racial and language minorities to exercise their right to vote.

To honor the memory of the foot soldiers of Selma, we must rededicate ourselves to a great task remaining before us—to repair the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by working to pass H.R. 885, the Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2015, which I am proud to be one of the original co-sponsors.

As I have stated many times, the 1965 Voting Rights Act is no ordinary piece of legislation.

For millions of Americans, and for many in Congress, it is sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

As we remember and honor the foot soldiers of Selma, let us resolve also to restore the Voting Rights Act of 1965, so that it remains a lasting monument to their heroism and devotion to the country they loved.

## SENATE—Monday, March 9, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father in Heaven, clothed in dazzling splendor, we bow our hearts in Your presence. You are our helper, our defender, and our refuge. You are our hope for years to come.

Strengthen our Senators for today's challenges. Direct their thoughts, words, and actions, enabling them to follow Your leading. Lord, use them to transform dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows. Give them peace during turbulent moments and a faith that will not shrink under pressure. Make their words fountains of light.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, March 9, 2015.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. COTTON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

### MOTION TO INVOKE CLOTURE WITHDRAWN—MOTION TO PROCEED TO S. 625

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clo-

ture motion on the motion to proceed to S. 625 be withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the first vote of the week will occur at 5:30 p.m. this afternoon on confirmation of the nomination for Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator. There are three other votes in the series tonight, and those nominations will be confirmed by voice vote.

Tomorrow the Senate will begin consideration of legislation to combat human trafficking. Members on both sides of the aisle have amendments to the bill, and those Senators should be working with Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator LEAHY to get in the queue for consideration. It is my expectation that votes in relation to the trafficking bill will kick in after the policy lunches tomorrow.

### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators from both sides of the aisle and from multiple committees have worked hard to address the terrible crime of human trafficking. This is a growing area of domestic and international activity. Victims are counting on us to act. That is why tomorrow the Senate will begin consideration of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. It is authored by the senior Senator from Texas and boasts sponsors from both parties. Victims groups and advocates have called this bipartisan measure the most comprehensive and thoughtful piece of antitrafficking legislation currently pending, and similar legislation has already passed the House of Representatives.

It is no wonder the Judiciary Committee supported, without opposition, the bipartisan bill we will begin considering tomorrow. After a reasonable period of debate and amendment, we hope to see strong bipartisan support here on the Senate floor as well.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on human trafficking, I underscore, appreciate, and agree with the statement of the Republican leader. I feel very confident we will clear on our side moving to that. I think it would be a waste of the Senate's time to have a vote on a motion to proceed and a waste of time afterward, so I hope we can get on this legislation tomorrow. I doubt there will be problems on my side. If there are, I will work to clear them.

### NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as I speak here today President Obama and his administration are engaged in negotiations to prevent Iran from building a nuclear weapon. These negotiations are unprecedented and very critical to our country and the world. The stakes couldn't be higher. We as leaders should do everything we can to help these negotiations succeed. When it comes to preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear bomb, we should put partisanship way to one side.

Sadly, though, the judgment of my Republican colleagues seems to be clouded by their abhorrence of President Obama. Today Republican Senators actually sent a letter to the Iranian leadership aimed at sabotaging these negotiations.

Let's be very clear. Republicans are undermining our Commander in Chief while empowering the Ayatollahs. Just last week Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was here in the Capitol decrying the evil intent of the Iranian leadership. Republicans at that speech, which took place down the hall from where we stand today, in the House Chamber, stood, applauded, stomped their feet, and yelled in support of what the Prime Minister of Israel had to say. Today those same Republicans are trying to negotiate with the very same leaders in Iran with whom Netanyahu said we shouldn't be negotiating. This simply doesn't make sense.

The outcome of the negotiations between the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, China, Russia, and the entire world is so important. The main participants in these negotiations are the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, China, and Russia. Even though we are one of the negotiators, the negotiations affect the entire world. This letter is a hard slap in the face of not only the United States but our allies. This is not a time to undermine our Commander in Chief purely out of spite.



We should always have a robust debate about foreign policy, but it is unprecedented for one political party to directly intervene in an international negotiation with the sole goal of embarrassing the President of the United States.

Throughout the 8 years of President Bush's Presidency, Democrats—I disagreed with his foreign policy. I spoke about it on the floor lots of times. We know the disaster of the war in Iraq. But even at the height of our disagreements with President George W. Bush, Senate Democrats never considered sending a letter to Saddam Hussein or other Iraqi leaders at the time—never considered it, nor to be an embarrassment to the Commander in Chief, George W. Bush.

So I say to my Republican colleagues: Do you so dislike President Obama that you would take this extraordinary step? Obviously so.

Barack Obama is the President. This is an extraordinary step, and why it was taken, I really don't understand, other than a dislike of the President. Barack Obama is President. I have agreed with him on certain things, and I have disagreed with him on certain things, but he is my President, and he is a President to all of us. It is time for Republicans to accept that the citizens of our country twice elected President Obama by large margins as President of the United States.

Obviously Republicans don't know how to do anything other than attempt these seemingly juvenile political attacks against the President. Congressional Republicans don't know how to get things done. They don't know how to govern. If you don't believe what I just said, look at the press today; read a newspaper; look at the news. The pundits all agree that the Republicans are in a state of disarray here in the Congress of the United States. They don't know what to do or how to do it.

Today's unprecedented letter, originated by a U.S. Senator who took his oath of office 62 days ago, is a kind of pettiness that diminishes us as a country in the eyes of the world. The Republicans need to find a way to get over their animosity toward President Obama. I can only hope they do it sooner rather than later.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to the assistant leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for his remarks on this letter.

I can't think of a precedent where we have had one political party in the Senate try to intervene in international negotiations.

In this situation, if these negotiations fail, it is pretty clear to me that one of the options on the horizon will be military action against Iran. I pray to goodness that we never reach that point.

But I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada, those who are so anxious to scuttle these negotiations, to undermine these negotiations, do you think they have reflected on the fact that the alternative could be another war in the Middle East?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, with whom I have served in this Congress for 33 years, I have never seen anything like it. I have never seen anything like it.

I disagreed with President Bush so very much on what he was doing to our country, but I would never ever have considered anything even close to this.

The only thing I can figure out is what I said. The dislike of the President is so intense by the Republican leaders that this is what they are doing. They can't accept the fact that this good man, Barack Obama—this man with the unusual name—was elected twice by overwhelming margins by the people of this country, and he is doing his very best to try to alleviate a problem that exists.

It would be better for the world—I think everyone should acknowledge that—if we could work something out with Iran so they don't get nuclear weapons, and we have to try to do that. To prejudge what is going to come, if anything—the President of the United States said there is less than a 50-percent chance he can get it done, but shouldn't we let him try?

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator will yield for another question, in the history of the Senate to date, back to the 1940s when Senator Vandenberg from Michigan joined in a bipartisan effort on foreign policy as one of the hallmark events in the history of this great body, and for decades when we served in the Senate, kind of the stock phrase was that politics ends at the water's edge when the President is representing the United States overseas. We can argue and use our constitutional powers to argue back and forth, but we want to give the President the authority to try to protect and defend this country.

Can the Senator from Nevada, who is a student of history, recall any other time when a group of Senators—a partisan group of Senators—reached out to a party in negotiations with the United States directly, as this letter has done?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, I guess my thoughts have been clouded by the people I have worked with here. It was just a few years ago that two outstanding U.S. Senators who will go down in the history books—Dan Inouye and Ted Stevens. One was a good Republican, and one was a good Democrat. They worked arm in arm on issues that made our country a better country. They would never ever consider such a thing. If they were here today, they would be on this floor demanding: What is going on here? One of

these two men was a ranking member of the defense appropriations committee that funds the military. These two men worked together on that subcommittee for more than a decade, and they worked together.

My judgment is clouded by the people I have worked with here who would never consider anything like this.

Mr. DURBIN. I will ask the Senator from Nevada a further question. Didn't we also have a similar precedent when Senator McCain and Senator Kerry were leaders in an effort to finally establish diplomatic recognition of Vietnam and normalize relations? This was a bipartisan effort to try to move us beyond a painful chapter in our history which cost so many American lives. That, too, was bipartisan, as I recall.

Mr. REID. And if anyone should have some ill feelings about Vietnam, JOHN MCCAIN, who came to the House of Representatives with the Senator and me, was in a prison camp for 5 years and 4 of those years were in solitary confinement. John Kerry was shot, was wounded—highly decorated, but he had a little beef with the Vietnamese. And they worked together because they thought it would be good for our country to reestablish relations with that country.

So my mind is—I repeat—clouded with the experience I have in this body with leaders such as Mark Hatfield, a Republican, who would never ever consider anything like this.

I am dumbfounded that 47 of my colleagues would sign a letter. Last week they were over here, as I said, jumping up and down and cheering the Prime Minister of Israel because he was denigrating what was going on in Iran—you can't negotiate with these people—and now they are sending a letter to the same people whom they were cheering against just a week ago?

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form, and with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant Democratic leader.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last Saturday marked the 50th anniversary of what has come to be known as Bloody

Sunday. In March of 1965, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, then a young man fresh out of college, and Rev. Hosea Williams led 600 brave civil rights activists across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL.

These courageous men and women, and children marching with them, were marching in pursuit of the most fundamental right—the right preservative of all others—the right to vote. What they received that day, however, were brutal beatings from police batons as State troopers turned them back and chased them down.

A few days later, President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed the Nation and called on Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act. Within months, the legislation was signed into law—guaranteeing that the fundamental right to vote would not be restricted through clever State and local schemes, such as poll taxes and literacy tests.

I was proud to join Congressman LEWIS on a trip to Selma about 10 years ago for a ceremonial walk across the bridge to mark the 40th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. As we marched on a Sunday morning in the footsteps of the civil rights giants, we celebrated a bill that has often been called the most significant civil rights law ever passed by Congress. Little did we know that 8 years later, in 2013, the Supreme Court would strike down a major provision of that law.

In *Shelby County v. Holder*, by a 5-to-4 vote, a divided Supreme Court struck down the provision of the Voting Rights Act that required certain jurisdictions to preclear changes to their voting laws with the Department of Justice. The decision effectively gutted the Voting Rights Act.

In the aftermath of the *Shelby County* decision, several State legislatures pushed through discriminatory and onerous restrictions on voting that previously would have required Department of Justice clearance.

We have heard disturbing stories of a 93-year-old veteran and a nearly 70-year-old doctor who were turned away from the polls in Texas because their IDs did not meet the specifications of an onerous new State law. We heard about Florida's faulty voter verification efforts that disproportionately flag Hispanic citizens for removal from the voter rolls. And we have heard how the elimination of out-of-precinct voting and cuts to early voting impacted minority voters in North Carolina.

It is hard to believe that 50 years after Selma, we are watching State legislatures pass legislation restricting opportunities to vote in America. None of us want to subscribe or endorse voter fraud—not a person on either side of the aisle—but this goes far beyond it.

As chairman of the Judiciary subcommittee on the Constitution, I held hearings in Florida and Ohio, where

they were enacting restrictive laws to limit opportunities to vote—limiting the time you can vote, requiring IDs.

In each of those States, I called as my first witnesses elected officials of both political parties. I asked, in both States, the same question to the first panel of witnesses: What has happened in your State by way of voter fraud that has led you to restrict the opportunity to vote in your States of Ohio and Florida? The answer was: Nothing—nothing.

Then we discussed how many people have actually been prosecuted for voter fraud that led to this tightening of the laws and limiting the opportunity to vote. In Ohio, the answer was: We think in the last 10 years, a few people might have been prosecuted. This clearly was not a problem in need of a solution. This was clearly an effort made in these State legislatures to restrict the opportunity to vote for certain Americans. Why? If you believe in this country, if you believe in democracy, if you believe in the right to vote, why do so many State legislatures—under the guidance of a group called ALEC—why are they changing their laws to restrict the right to vote? Clearly it is because they want certain people to find it more difficult to vote.

When I chaired this subcommittee and I had this series of hearings, we heard over and over again that these laws have a disproportionate negative impact on lower income individuals, minorities, youth, elderly, and other vulnerable populations.

I wish that 50 years after Bloody Sunday, our society had reached a point where the protections of the Voting Rights Act were no longer necessary. But we have seen in State after State that we still need the protections of the law, or people—good American citizens—will be denied their opportunity to cast a vote in an election.

So in order to truly honor the foot soldiers of Bloody Sunday, we have to do more than vote for congressional medals. We have to work together to pass the Voting Rights Amendment Act to ensure the Federal Government is once again able to fully protect the fundamental right to vote for all American citizens.

The Voting Rights Amendment Act, which Senator LEAHY, Senator COONS, and I plan to reintroduce soon, will undo the damage of the *Shelby County* decision. Our bill will restore the Voting Rights Act by updating the formula that determines which jurisdictions must preclear changes to their voting practices with the Justice Department.

In 2006, Congress reauthorized the Voting Rights Act with an overwhelming bipartisan vote. The spirit of Bloody Sunday—the spirit of Selma, AL—was alive and well 9 years ago, when both political parties stood up and said: We are both going to endorse it. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, 390 Members in the House out of 435 voted for it, and 98 Senators—from both political parties—voted to reauthorize it, 9 years ago. Congress, after all the hearings—21 of them—with more than 90 witnesses testifying, produced a record that exceeded 15,000 pages, and the bill was solid in the law.

We recognized then that despite the progress we have made in the years since that famous march, there still was unlawful and unfair discrimination against Americans who wanted to exercise their right to vote.

The Supreme Court ignored our work, and in the *Shelby County* decision overturned a key section of this law. That is why we need to once again step up on a bipartisan basis to pass this Voting Rights Amendment Act.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I might also reflect on that victory 50 years ago and think about another civil rights milestone that we have an opportunity to act on this week—this week—in Washington.

Two weeks ago, the Judiciary Committee favorably reported the nomination of Loretta Lynch to the full Senate. If confirmed by the Senate, Ms. Lynch will become the first African-American woman to serve as Attorney General of the United States.

In January, she gave moving testimony to the committee about sitting on her father's shoulders as a young girl so she could witness civil rights activists planning sit-ins and marches in the early 1960s.

Ms. Lynch is incredible. She is so well qualified that in the course of 2 days of hearings, there was virtually no negative question asked of her. She handled it so well.

She has now waited 121 days for confirmation by the Senate. Loretta Lynch has waited longer than any nominee for Attorney General in the last 30 years. She languishes on the calendar. It is embarrassing to think that after all of the speeches and all of the reflection of this last weekend on the progress we have made in civil rights in America, this woman, whose nomination in and of itself is a civil rights victory, is being held up in the Senate for no obvious reason.

As Congressman LEWIS said in a recent letter to the Judiciary Committee, Ms. Lynch “recognizes the value of all people and has fought vigorously to ensure their equal protection under the law.” JOHN LEWIS said: “She will carry the torch of justice to help make the United States a more perfect union.”

Mr. President, we are not a perfect union. We will strive throughout our history to reach that almost impossible goal. There is a lot of work we need to do, and each generation must

accept it. First we need to confirm Loretta Lynch, and let's do it soon. Let's do it this week so she can lead the Department of Justice and continue the fight to move our Nation forward. And we must restore the Voting Rights Act so the Justice Department has the tools it needs to ensure the efforts of those who marched 50 years ago.

As I said before, no other Attorney General nominee in the last three decades has had to wait this long to receive a confirmation vote on the floor of the Senate. By way of comparison, the Democratic-controlled Senate confirmed Michael Mukasey as Attorney General 53 days after his nomination was announced.

Ms. Lynch was reported out of the Judiciary Committee on February 26 in a bipartisan vote. On that day, the Judiciary Committee also reported out the nomination of Michelle Lee to be Director of the Patent and Trademark Office as well as a bill called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

The majority leader has scheduled a vote on Ms. Lee for today, and he has said the Senate will vote this week on the trafficking legislation. Why is Ms. Lynch's nomination being kept in limbo while these other matters are being scheduled ahead of her? There is no reason to stall the process for Ms. Lynch any further. The majority leader should schedule a confirmation vote without delay.

When we have that confirmation vote, I will be proud to vote in support of Loretta Lynch. She is a nominee of outstanding qualifications, integrity, and judgment. She has been confirmed twice before by the Senate to serve as the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, and she has served in that position with distinction. She has prosecuted some of the highest profile cases in the country, and she has received widespread praise for her diligence and her no-nonsense approach.

Ms. Lynch is a prosecutor's prosecutor. But her resume stands out for other reasons as well. She received undergraduate and law degrees from Harvard. She has private sector experience at prestigious law firms, including working as a defense attorney and on civil matters. And she has international experience working for the U.N. International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

Through it all, Ms. Lynch has never forgotten her roots, growing up as the daughter of a minister and a school librarian in North Carolina. Loretta Lynch's life is a testament to the fact that in America, glass ceilings can be shattered through hard work, perseverance, and outstanding performance on the job. Now the Senate is in the position to confirm this historic nominee to serve as our next Attorney General—once her floor vote gets scheduled.

I think Ms. Lynch will do an excellent job. But don't take it from me. Let

me read some of the praise for Ms. Lynch that has come from individuals and groups that have endorsed her.

Here is what the president of the National District Attorneys Association, Michael Moore, said about her:

On behalf of the National District Attorneys Association, representing 2500 elected and appointed District Attorneys across the United States as well as 40,000 assistant district attorneys, I write in strong support of Loretta Lynch's nomination to lead the Department of Justice as the next Attorney General of the United States. As prosecutors facing challenges in the field from violent crime, to human trafficking, to gangs and drug traffickers, our membership feels that Ms. Lynch understands the operational nature of these challenges and will be a strong independent voice at the helm of the Department.

Here is a letter signed by 25 former U.S. attorneys, both Republicans and Democrats, including Patrick Fitzgerald and Scott Lassar from my home State of Illinois. They said:

We are all former United States Attorneys. Some of us served in Republican administrations, some in Democratic administrations. We all share a deep commitment to the rule of law and an abiding respect for the Department of Justice. . . . We firmly believe that Ms. Lynch will make an outstanding Attorney General. . . . we believe that Ms. Lynch has the experience, temperament, independence, integrity, and judgment to immediately assume this critically important position.

Law enforcement groups support Ms. Lynch, too. Here's a letter from the President of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, Richard Beary. He said:

The IACP believes that Ms. Lynch's years of service have clearly demonstrated that she has the qualifications and experience necessary to be an effective leader of the U.S. Department of Justice. . . . The IACP urges you to confirm Ms. Lynch's nomination rapidly.

Here is a letter from the president of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, representing 26,000 active and retired federal law enforcement officers. He expressed his full support for Ms. Lynch and said:

FLEOA stands behind her proven leadership and her support for those who investigate and enforce the federal statutes. . . . Her accomplishments and her leadership continue to resonate in the law enforcement community, and she possesses the requisite institutional knowledge that is required of the position of Attorney General.

These are just some of the endorsements that Ms. Lynch has received. She has also been endorsed by other prosecutor and law enforcement groups, bar associations, business leaders, civil rights organizations, and former top Justice Department officials from both parties.

As I mentioned earlier, this past weekend marked the 50th Anniversary of Bloody Sunday when 600 civil rights marchers were beaten on the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, AL. Our Nation's conscience was shocked by the

image of JOHN LEWIS, now a Congressman from the State of Georgia, being beaten and badly injured on Bloody Sunday by troopers with nightsticks.

JOHN LEWIS has spent his life marching for the cause of justice. He speaks with a voice of moral authority that all of us should heed. Several weeks ago Congressman LEWIS sent a letter to the Judiciary Committee in support of Ms. Lynch.

I want to read an extended excerpt from the letter I mentioned earlier. Congressman LEWIS said:

With over 30 years of legal experience, Ms. Lynch is unwavering in her efforts to create a more just society. A Harvard graduate with an extensive career in public service, private practice, and academia, she recognizes the value of all people and has fought vigorously to ensure their equal protection under the law.

She will carry the torch of justice to help make the United States a more perfect union. Ms. Lynch's commitment to civil rights stems from her family's roots in North Carolina. Her father, a Baptist minister, preached at a church where students would meet to organize anti-segregation boycotts. Her grandfather, a sharecropper and pastor in the 1930s, helped people in his community who faced challenges under the Jim Crow system.

I will never forget Loretta Lynch's description of her father raising her onto his shoulders so she could witness the civil rights protestors in his church. The fact that this young girl could be the first African-American woman to serve as our Nation's Attorney General is another milestone on our Nation's long, slow march to establish a "more perfect union."

The bottom line is this: Loretta Lynch is extraordinarily well-qualified to serve as Attorney General. She has been extensively vetted, and she has performed admirably while in the spotlight of that process. And Members of the Senate have had plenty of time to review her qualifications.

It is time to move forward and hold a vote on Ms. Lynch. There is nothing to be gained by further delay. I hope the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, will call her nomination for a vote and I hope all my colleagues will support this outstanding nominee.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we spend a lot of time, as one would expect in a legislative body, talking about the technical aspects of legislation and the procedure we use to consider it and pass it, a subject which

perhaps many of us enjoy but which probably turns the public—puts a glaze in their eyes and bores them because they don't see the relevance of it.

We talk about motions to proceed and cloture and filibusters, but what is important in the Senate is the subject matter of the legislation that we apply this procedure or these rules to. This week in the Senate we will be undertaking a very important subject; that is, how to protect our fellow citizens, many of them children, who are needing our help and waiting to be rescued. Those are children who are being trafficked in the commercial sex and forced-labor trade—not over there, not necessarily just in some other country, but right here in the United States of America.

I believe that we are all created in the image of God, that all human beings are entitled to be treated with dignity and respect. But the criminals who traffic in human flesh treat these same human beings created in the image of God as a thing. They treat these children as a commodity to be bought and sold. To me that is the very definition of evil. A few weeks ago the Judiciary Committee heard from several witnesses on what has been called modern day slavery—human trafficking.

I know many of us thought that slavery was an ugly part of our Nation's beginning but certainly only something in the past. But the truth is that there exists today something that you could legitimately call modern day slavery, and that is human trafficking. Now, even though institutionalized slavery has long been cast into the dustbin of history and is something we read about in our history books, human trafficking, particularly sex trafficking, still affects the lives of hundreds and thousands of our children.

Tragically, many of them are young girls. As the father of two daughters, it turns my stomach to realize that a majority of the human beings who are trafficked are girls who are of middle-school age. In the Judiciary Committee, we heard from Malika Saada Saar who represents a wonderful organization called Rights4Girls.

Malika spoke of a young woman named Aviva. According to Malika, Aviva was in foster care when a trafficker kidnapped her and held her hostage for almost a year. During this time, we learned in the Judiciary Committee during that hearing, Aviva was sold to as many as 10 different men a night. Of course, she did not understand. She could not comprehend why an adult man would want to buy her body when she was just a child.

When law enforcement officials found Aviva, she was arrested for prostitution at the age of 15. Let me repeat that because it is important. This young girl who was kidnapped, raped, and sold nightly—daily—was treated

like a criminal, not a victim. In 1992 Holly Austin Smith ran away from home and was forced into a sex trafficking ring the summer before her freshman year of high school.

Within hours of running away, 14-year old Holly was sold for \$200 to a man who wanted her for sex because he said she reminded him of his granddaughter. When police eventually found Holly—still only a child, scared and confused, as you can only imagine—they treated her as a criminal, not as a victim. Too often these children, who are not of the age of consent, are treated as child prostitutes.

As many of us who have worked on this issue for some time know, there is no such thing as a child prostitute. If you are not of the age of consent, you cannot consent, and you cannot agree to be used in such a horrific way. These are children who are bought and sold for sex—plain and simple—as nauseating as that truth is. Malika powerfully said during our hearing: “There should be no difference between raping a child and paying to rape a child.” Now, the individuals who commit these crimes—not just the people who traffic in them but the people who purchase these services—too often pay a fine and get on with their lives. Yet they are the child rapists who should be treated as the sex traffickers they are.

If it were not for the demand, sex trafficking would not have a business model. But unfortunately, there is too great of a demand. But often the people who purchase these children are treated with impunity. Tomorrow, I expect the Senate will move to consider legislation that I have introduced with a number of our colleagues from Minnesota, Illinois, and Oregon. Indeed, there are a number of Senators who have already contributed a lot of very good and constructive work to the product we will turn to tomorrow.

The bill is called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. The most important thing that it does is that it ends the culture of impunity for the people who purchase children and other victims of human trafficking. It holds the so-called johns and the pimps accountable, and it does not focus on the victim who should be treated like a victim and helped to heal and get on with their lives. But too often they are the ones who are prosecuted and treated as a criminal.

Instead of being treated as criminals, this bill makes sure that the future Avivas and Hollies are treated for what they are, and that is as victims. What this bill also does is it takes the money and assets forfeited from convicted human traffickers and directs it to services for the victims. So future Avivas and Hollies would have a shelter, a place to live, a roof over their head, a bed to sleep in, and somebody who loves them and cares enough to help them heal and get on with their

lives. That is the kind of treatment these victims of human trafficking deserve—not jail time.

We know that Washington can be a dysfunctional place more times than we would like to admit. So often there are political issues or ideological issues that divide us. But the fight against human trafficking reminds us that it does not have to be this way. Indeed, I was heartened a few weeks ago when this particular piece of legislation passed the Judiciary Committee with unanimous support. All Republicans and all Democrats on the committee voted to support it.

Indeed, Republicans and Democrats—not just in Congress but across the country—support this legislation, as evidenced by the more than 200 different organizations, from victims' advocates to law enforcement groups, which have joined forces to fight this modern day slave trade and to support the legislation we will turn to tomorrow. It is a fight, sadly, that must be acknowledged and it must be fought. But it is a fight we can win, finally delivering our Nation's promise of freedom to those who are enslaved.

It is not the kind of slavery we read about in our history books or the kind that resulted or helped precipitate the Civil War, but it is the kind that goes on unbeknownst to most Americans and most people but which represents that seamy underbelly of society, one that we must expose and one we must reveal as the evil that it is.

#### OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2015

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1213, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1213) to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1213) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business until 5 p.m.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this past weekend, Americans gathered in Selma, Alabama. They did that to mark the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday. Many of us are old enough to remember that day when hundreds of brave men and women marched across the Edmund Pettus Bridge. There, they were savagely beaten because they dared to stand up for their right to vote—a right that we in Vermont take as inalienable. Their blood, their sweat, and their tears helped pave the way for the Voting Rights Act. They ultimately helped move our Nation toward what is supposed to be a “more perfect Union.”

In commemorating the bravery of these foot soldiers for justice, we are reminded of what we can accomplish if we stand on principle and we come together, Republicans and Democrats, to do what is right. At a time when lawmakers seem far too polarized on the most important issues facing our Nation, I was encouraged to see leaders from both political parties join President Obama and Congressman LEWIS, and so many others this weekend in Selma. President George W. Bush shared the stage with President Obama to honor the brave men and women who inspired the Nation and helped bring about historic change.

I was proud to work with President Bush on the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, along with the Republican Chairmen of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees, Congressman SENSENBRENNER and Senator Specter. We can see them on each side of President Bush in this picture of the bill signing. We can see Congressman SENSENBRENNER standing there and the late Senator Specter standing there. I was standing over here with my camera as one of the people who helped move the bill through. President Bush had invited me to attend and I took this photograph at the signing ceremony. I am going to give this photograph to President Bush because it is the only photograph where we can actually see his hand and his signature going down. That is because I was the only person with a camera, standing behind the President. I don't say that to praise my photographic ability; I say that to praise President Bush for signing the bill.

In response to the Supreme Court's Shelby County decision—a decision

where five members of the Supreme Court decided they had a far better idea than virtually all House Members and Senators—I have been working with Congressman SENSENBRENNER on bipartisan legislation that would restore the Voting Rights Act. This is so that President Obama can sign a bill as President Bush did. Unfortunately, no Republican Senator has yet stepped forward to join me in introducing this legislation in the Senate.

The Republican Party of 2006, along with their President, reached across the aisle to advance the cause of voting rights, saying they were not there for any particular party, they were there for all Americans. I am still hopeful the Republican Senate of 2015 will continue the bipartisan tradition that President Bush and Republican leaders did in 2006.

The civil rights milestones we celebrate this month can't be just historical discussions to be talked about in a history class somewhere. The plain reality is that racial discrimination in voting still exists in this country. Chief Justice Roberts acknowledged that very fact in his opinion in *Shelby*, and he asked Congress to update the Voting Rights Act. I wish we had not had the *Shelby* decision—I think it was wrong on many counts—but the majority in the Supreme Court voted that way. I agree with the Chief Justice that it is time for us in the Congress—Republicans and Democrats alike—to act.

In his inspirational speech in Selma on Saturday, President Obama noted that 100 Members of Congress had come to Selma to honor people who died for the right to vote. He then laid out a challenge by saying, “If we want to honor this day, let that hundred go back to Washington and gather 400 more, and together, pledge to make it their mission to restore the Voting Rights Act this year. That's how we honor those people on this bridge.”

I agree with him. We should come together, as this body has done so many times before, to restore the Voting Rights Act and to reaffirm our steadfast commitment to equal protection under the law.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today, in that same spirit, I urge all Senators to come together to confirm Loretta Lynch to be our next Attorney General and the first African-American woman ever to hold this position. The delay of her confirmation is unprecedented and unwarranted. It should end.

It has been 121 days since President Obama announced his intention to nominate Ms. Lynch. Her nomination was reported by the Judiciary Committee on a bipartisan basis 11 days ago. In the last 30 years, no Attorney General nominee has waited longer

than Loretta Lynch to receive a floor vote after being reported from committee.

I think of what we did when President Bush was in the last 2 years of his Presidency. Democrats had just taken back the majority in the Senate. He nominated a person for Attorney General—actually a person I voted against—but I moved that person forward anyway because I felt the President of the United States deserved to have an Attorney General. I moved that person through in half the time we have had to wait for Loretta Lynch.

Ms. Lynch has broad support from Democrats and Republicans across the legal and law enforcement communities. So there is no excuse. She shouldn't be treated differently than previous nominees. Actually, she should receive a vote tonight, along with the other nominees who are to be confirmed. She should not be treated any differently than President Bush's nominee.

So in the wake of the bipartisan and inspirational celebration in Selma, let us come together to honor the difficult work of the Justice Department. Let's schedule a vote to confirm the first African-American woman to serve as Attorney General of the United States. Let us show the American people what we can do when we come together. Let us finally vote to confirm Loretta Lynch.

I see the majority leader on the floor. I don't want to take his time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 178

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following morning business on Tuesday, March 10, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I was talking about why I had hoped that after 121 days we could finally have a vote on the confirmation of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General. She has been supported by leading

Republicans and Democrats. She has been supported by Republicans and Democrats in law enforcement, especially in light of her very tough enforcement of terrorism laws. On the issue of abuse of public trust, she has prosecuted both Democrats and Republicans.

I mentioned a few minutes ago that when George W. Bush was in the last two years of his term, he was a lame-duck President and Democrats had just taken over control of the Senate. The President nominated Judge Mukasey to be Attorney General. Because I disagreed with Judge Mukasey on the question of torture, I told the President I would vote against him, but I also told him that any President has a right to at least have a vote on their nominees. I moved him forward in 53 days—that is from the time his nomination was announced until he was confirmed. And that includes the time it took for the paperwork to get up here and the rest of the process. I put him through the committee, got him onto the floor, and he was confirmed in 53 days.

Now we have been waiting 121 days for Loretta Lynch, who came to the Judiciary Committee with far more law enforcement background. I don't know what the difference is between this man, Judge Mukasey, who took 53 days and Loretta Lynch.

In fact, I will give you another Attorney General nominee I also disagreed with and voted against, but who I, as chairman, helped bring to a vote. President Bush nominated John Ashcroft—a former Senator who had just been defeated—to be Attorney General. I put him through in 42 days—42 days from the time his nomination was announced until he was confirmed. Forty-two days.

So Ashcroft went through in 42 days. Judge Mukasey went through in 53 days. Loretta Lynch has waited 121 days.

I was involved with the nominations of these two men even though I disagreed with them. When Republicans took back control of the Senate there was another Attorney General in between who took 86 days. But for the two men when I was Chairman: 42 days for John Ashcroft; 53 days for Judge Mukasey. But Loretta Lynch has been waiting 121 days and still hasn't had a vote. Is it any wonder that people have concern about the U.S. Senate when she has to wait all that time just to get a vote up or down? Up or down, that is all we ask. So let's hope she can be scheduled, voted on and confirmed because with her record as a tough prosecutor, that is the sort of person I would like cracking down on terrorists, cracking down on those who defraud this country, cracking down on traffickers, as she has in the past.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF DANIEL HENRY MARTI TO BE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT COORDINATOR, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NOMINATION OF MICHELLE K. LEE TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

NOMINATION OF JEFFERY S. HALL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

NOMINATION OF DALLAS P. TONSAGER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Daniel Henry Marti, of Virginia, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President; Michelle K. Lee, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; Jeffery S. Hall, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring October 13, 2018; and Dallas P. Tonsager, of South Dakota, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring May 21, 2020.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form, with

all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand, for the information of Senators, that means the vote will still be at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEE AND MARTI NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I welcome the Senate's action today to confirm two well-regarded practitioners to important leadership positions charged with protecting and promoting intellectual property.

Michelle Lee, who is nominated to serve as the Director of the Patent and Trademark Office, USPTO, will be the first woman and first Asian Pacific American to hold this position. She is also the daughter of immigrants who moved to this country and contributed to the growth of Silicon Valley through her father's career as an electrical engineer. Her historic nomination is an American success story, and it is fitting that she is confirmed today to lead the office that is home to countless stories of successful innovation and creation by Americans throughout the country.

The USPTO has been without a Senate-confirmed director for more than 2 years, which is far too long for an office that is so important to our Nation's innovators and to our economy. Close to 600,000 patent applications and 450,000 trademark class applications are filed with the office each year. By serving America's innovators, the USPTO helps Vermonters and citizens across the country build their businesses and bring their inventions to the global marketplace.

Ms. Lee is charged with leading this office at a time when too many bad actors are abusing the patent system. Something must be done to address misconduct by bad actors who are targeting everyone from small businesses in Vermont to larger companies that are crucial to our economy. Congress plays an important role in this discussion, and as I have said for the last 2 years, we must enact balanced reforms to ensure the patent system can thrive. While that discussion continues in Congress, the USPTO Director must ensure the policies we currently have in place work for the diverse patent community.



Among those policies is carrying out the landmark reforms in the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, the greatest transformation to our patent system in over 60 years. This landmark law has helped simplify the process for patent approval, reduce backlogs at the USPTO, and harmonize our patent system with the rest of the world. The AIA sought to improve patent quality by creating new and more efficient administrative proceedings at the USPTO. Three years later, the USPTO has now received over 2,000 petitions for post-grant review. These measures are important to help businesses that fall into the crosshairs of overbroad patents. But improving the quality of patents also improves their value for inventors and investors, too. The USPTO is doing tremendous work to implement these new programs under Ms. Lee's current leadership as Deputy Director of the office. Because of the AIA, there are now four satellite offices around the country to make the USPTO more accessible to inventors and small businesses. The USPTO has strengthened its pro bono program and used its fee-setting authority created by the AIA to gain better financial independence.

These are profound improvements, but strong leadership at the USPTO is needed to ensure the America Invents Act helps our patent system to thrive in the 21st century. As the USPTO's Deputy Director, Ms. Lee has proven to be thoughtful, balanced, and respectful of the diverse perspectives across the patent community. I look forward to continuing the Judiciary Committee's productive relationship with Ms. Lee and with the USPTO.

I also welcome the Senate's action today to confirm Daniel Marti as the second Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, or "IPEC." The IPEC was created by legislation I authored in 2008, the PRO-IP Act, which passed the Senate with unanimous support. In creating this position, our goal was to take a comprehensive approach to intellectual property enforcement within the U.S. government, to ensure that law enforcement has the tools it needs, and that agencies are working together efficiently. The first IPEC, Victoria Espinel, built a strong record in this position, and I am confident Mr. Marti will do well continuing this important work.

The protection of intellectual property is important to our Nation's creators, artists, inventors, and businesses alike. Whether one is a filmmaker whose work is being copied and distributed online without permission, or a family-owned business in Vermont that discovers knock-off copies of its products being sold at half the price, intellectual property theft harms innovators across the country. It also harms consumers, as we have learned from the repeated, devastating stories

of victims who inadvertently purchased counterfeit medicines or other products not knowing they were of dangerously low quality.

The IPEC plays an important role coordinating law enforcement and industry efforts to address these pressing issues. Nowhere is this work more important than in addressing counterfeiting and infringement in the online world—a complex, global problem that requires creative, thoughtful solutions. Just last month, leading advertising networks announced a new initiative to help ensure that they avoid inadvertently supporting websites that serve no legitimate purpose other than to traffic in stolen content and property. Search engines have now acknowledged that they, too, have a responsibility to help address illegal activity online. I hope Mr. Marti will renew the IPEC's work to support and encourage these voluntary initiatives, and will continue these efforts with other actors who drive so much of the online economy. Every business that operates in the Internet ecosystem has a role to play.

Mr. Marti is currently the managing partner of the Washington, DC office of Kilpatrick, Townsend & Stockton LLP. A graduate of Georgetown University and Emory University School of Law, he has spent his entire legal career specializing in intellectual property law, with a focus in trademark law and the protection of intellectual property both domestically and internationally.

I look forward to continuing the Judiciary Committee's productive relationship with Mr. Marti and the IPEC office. Last year, Senator GRASSLEY and I sent a letter to President Obama urging him to nominate a candidate to fill the IPEC position, which has been vacant for over 18 months. I chaired a confirmation hearing for Mr. Marti in December in the hope that the Senate would move swiftly with his confirmation this year. With Mr. Marti's confirmation today, the IPEC office can return fully to its important work.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on two nominees charged with important responsibilities in the enforcement of our Nation's intellectual property laws.

The first is Daniel Marti, who is nominated to become Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator in the Executive Office of the President.

The second is Michelle Lee, who is nominated to become the next Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

The United States is a world leader in the innovation of cutting-edge technologies and products that improve our daily lives. Importantly, the United States' economy, indeed every industry, relies heavily on intellectual property.

Because intellectual property rights are critical to the Nation's economic

well-being, we need strong and capable leaders at the helm of the offices that deal with patents, trademarks and copyrights. And because the top positions at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office and the Office of the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator have been vacant for quite some time, I am pleased that we are able to fill them today with two highly qualified candidates.

Mr. Marti and Ms. Lee have proven track records in the field of intellectual property law and are well respected by the intellectual property community.

Their experience and expertise are of the caliber required for their respective positions. I believe they are excellent candidates for these positions, and I will support their nominations.

#### VOTE ON MARTI NOMINATION

The question now occurs on the Marti nomination.

Mr. VITTER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Daniel Henry Marti, of Virginia, to be Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator, Executive Office of the President?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Ex.]

#### YEAS—92

Alexander	Collins	Heitkamp
Ayotte	Coons	Heller
Baldwin	Corker	Hirono
Barrasso	Cornyn	Hoeven
Bennet	Cotton	Inhofe
Blumenthal	Crapo	Isakson
Blunt	Daines	Johnson
Booker	Donnelly	Kaine
Boozman	Durbin	King
Boxer	Enzi	Kirk
Brown	Ernst	Klobuchar
Burr	Feinstein	Lankford
Cantwell	Fischer	Leahy
Capito	Flake	Lee
Cardin	Franken	Manchin
Carper	Gardner	Markey
Casey	Gillibrand	McCain
Cassidy	Grassley	McCaskill
Cochran	Hatch	McConnell



Menendez	Reid	Sullivan
Merkley	Risch	Tester
Mikulski	Roberts	Thune
Moran	Rounds	Tillis
Murphy	Sanders	Udall
Murray	Sasse	Vitter
Nelson	Schatz	Warner
Paul	Schumer	Warren
Perdue	Scott	Whitehouse
Peters	Sessions	Wicker
Portman	Shelby	Wyden
Reed	Stabenow	

## NOT VOTING—8

Coats	Heinrich	Shaheen
Cruz	Murkowski	Toomey
Graham	Rubio	

The nomination was confirmed.

## VOTE ON LEE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Michelle K. Lee, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office?

The nomination was confirmed.

## VOTE ON HALL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jeffery S. Hall, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring October 13, 2018?

The nomination was confirmed.

## VOTE ON TONSAGER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dallas P. Tonsager, of South Dakota, to be a Member of the Farm Credit Administration Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring May 21, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislation session.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

## FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SELMA MARCHES

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today on the 50th anniversary of the Selma marches and to call on Congress to come together to protect all Americans' sacred right to vote.

In March of 1965, thousands of Americans came together in Alabama to march the 54-mile highway from Selma to the State capital of Montgomery. They marched in defiance of the segregationist repression in the Jim Crow South. They marched to demand that Black American citizens be allowed to exercise their constitutional right to vote.

On March 7, 1965, 50 years ago this week, some 600 civil rights marchers headed east of Selma on U.S. Route 80. That day, March 7, would go down in history as Bloody Sunday. They got as far as the Edmund Pettus Bridge, 6 blocks away, where State and local law enforcement attacked them with billy clubs and tear gas and drove them back into Selma.

This photo reflects the scene on the bridge where JOHN LEWIS and others were being struck down with batons. Images of peaceful marchers brutally attacked by uniformed State troopers were broadcast worldwide. Seeing how peaceful activists who sought to ensure the franchise were treated by the very law enforcement officers sworn to uphold the law in Selma shocked the conscience of Americans everywhere and began an awakening that would ultimately lead to the passage of the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Two days later, on March 9, Martin Luther King, Jr., led a symbolic march to the same bridge where they were confronted by State troopers. Still awaiting requested Federal protection, and seeking to minimize the risk of additional violence, Dr. King turned the marchers around and led them back to the church where they had started.

Dr. King knew the threat of Jim Crow had to be stopped by the law, so he sought Federal court protection for a third full-scale march from Selma to the State capital in Montgomery. Ruling in favor of the demonstrators, Federal District Court Judge Frank M. Johnson, Jr., wrote:

The law is clear that the right to petition one's government for the redress of grievances may be exercised in large groups . . . and these rights may be exercised by marching, even along public highways.

On Sunday, March 21, 2 weeks after Bloody Sunday, approximately 3,200 marchers set out for Montgomery, walking 12 miles a day and sleeping in fields. By the time they reached the capital on Thursday, March 25, they were 25,000 strong.

As Dr. King said standing in front of the capital that day:

Selma, Alabama became a shining moment in the conscience of man. If the worst in American life lurked in its dark streets, the

best of American instincts arose passionately from across the nation to overcome it.

Less than 5 months after the last of the three marches, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act of 1965—landmark legislation that fundamentally transformed voting rights in the United States, particularly in the Jim Crow South.

As Americans, we all owe a debt of gratitude to those who marched, those who bled, and in some cases those who died, to transform the Voting Rights Act from a bill into a reality.

This past weekend a group of Republican and Democratic lawmakers traveled to Selma, AL, to join President Obama and former President Bush in honoring those brave Americans who worked tirelessly and at great personal cost to secure equal rights for all citizens regardless of their race. As our Nation thinks about their tremendous patriotism and sacrifice this month, it is a particularly appropriate time to talk about the role Congress can play in safeguarding the hard-won rights of minority voters by working to restore the integrity of the Voting Rights Act.

The oath of office that each of us takes when we become a Senator is to "support and defend the Constitution"—and that means supporting and defending voting rights, which are explicitly enumerated in our U.S. Constitution.

In her dissent in 2013, the Shelby County case, Justice Ginsberg highlighted the legislature's heightened responsibility where the protection of citizens' access to polls is a concern, writing that when it is confronting "the most constitutionally invidious form of discrimination, and the most fundamental right in our democratic system, Congress's power to act is at its height."

Well, over the past 50 years Congress has indeed acted. We have worked on a bipartisan basis to ensure that our citizens do not face discrimination at the polls.

In 1965, in response to a slew of violent attacks against civil rights activists, culminating in the attack on peaceful marchers crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge, we passed the Voting Rights Act, a bill that aimed to "remedy 95 years of pervasive discrimination in voting rights, which [had] resulted in the almost complete disenfranchisement of minorities in certain areas of the country." That act has been rightfully cited as a "crown jewel" of America's civil rights laws, and for the past 50 years it has expanded minority participation in elections by removing first-generation barriers to ballot access, such as literacy tests and poll taxes. Moreover, the law also helped to tackle so-called second-generation barriers to voting, such as voter ID requirements, elimination or curtailment of early voting, voter registration restrictions, and residency restrictions.

Since the act was passed in 1965, Congress has again and again reaffirmed its commitment to equality in Federal elections by reauthorizing the law in 1970, 1975, 1982, and most recently in 2006 when we voted to extend it for another 25 years. That 2006 vote was not a close one. The bill enjoyed what the press described as “overwhelming bipartisan backing,” passing the House by a vote of 390 to 33 and by a Senate vote of 98 to 0. That is pretty persuasive bipartisan backing for taking on the most invidious form of discrimination—discrimination in the right to vote. That vote represented a strong affirmation that equality is not a partisan issue. We can and we have worked together to ensure that all Americans are able to participate in our democracy by exercising their right to vote.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down key provisions of the Voting Rights Act 2 years ago in 2013. So now it is once again Congress's duty—our duty—to work together to reform the Voting Rights Act. To anyone who doubts the continued need for a robust Voting Rights Act, I submit the following:

In 2006, while sections 4 and 5 were still in effect, the House Judiciary Committee found that the Voting Rights Act was still a critical tool for countering discrimination. The committee observed that “discrimination today is more subtle than the visible methods used in 1965. However, the effect and results are the same, namely a diminishing of the minority community's ability to fully participate in the electoral process and to elect their preferred candidates of choice.”

That report further found that “despite the substantial progress that has been made” since the Voting Rights Act was first passed in 1965, “the evidence [of discrimination] before the Committee resemble[d] the evidence before Congress in 1965, and the evidence that was present again in 1970, 1975, 1982 and 1992.”

The behavior of various States in the aftermath of the 2013 Shelby County ruling highlighted the critical role that sections 4 and 5 played in protecting minority voters. For example, as the Brennan Center for Justice noted on the same day the Supreme Court issued its decision, Texas officials announced it would implement a draconian photo ID law which had been blocked by section 5 because of its racial impact. Initial estimates suggested that it would impact 600,000 to 800,000 registered voters in Texas who did not have a government-issued photo ID.

Texas was not alone. North Carolina quickly enacted a series of laws that drastically restricted voters' access to the polls by imposing a strict photo ID requirement, significantly reducing early voting and limiting the time-frame for voter registration—so three different measures.

It is particularly telling that North Carolina legislators deliberately waited for the Supreme Court to strike down the preclearance requirements of section 5 to propose the legislation, understanding that laws with such a discriminatory effect would likely not pass muster under the Voting Rights Act.

In North Carolina, more than 300,000 registered voters lacked a DMV-issued ID. Of those, one-third were African American.

In 2008, the vast majority of African Americans—70 percent—who voted in North Carolina voted during the early voting period. So North Carolina's significant reduction in early voting was cynically calculated to reduce the turnout of African Americans at the polls.

These States are not alone. The Brennan Center for Justice found that in the aftermath of the Shelby County case, “at least 10 of the 15 states that had been covered in whole or in part by section 5 introduced new restrictive legislation that would make it harder for minority voters to cast a ballot.”

Simply put, these States' behavior shows that access to our fundamental right—the right of every citizen to be heard through elections—is suffering in the wake of the Shelby County decision.

We cannot let our civil rights laws return to once again being, as Dr. King said before the passage of the Voting Rights Act, mere “dignity without strength.” We owe it to those who sacrificed before us, who sacrificed to form a more perfect Union, to work together on a bipartisan basis to restore the Voting Rights Act.

I stand ready to work with any of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this esteemed body to make that happen. I hope every Senator feels the same and understands that access to the polls—the right to vote—is the throbbing heart of a democracy, and without that the democracy is deeply damaged.

Fifty years ago this month, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., said at the foot of the Montgomery capitol: “The battle is in our hands.” Today, in Congress, in the U.S. Senate, the battle is in our hands. It is our responsibility to debate and pass such legislation to protect and defend the right to vote for every American.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REMEMBERING BILLY CASPER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a hall of fame golfer, a remarkable husband, and a loyal friend—Billy Casper. Last month, Billy passed away peacefully at the age of 83. I know I speak for all who knew him when I say he will be sorely missed.

Billy Casper was a champion both in golf and in life. Between 1956 and 1975, he won 51 tournaments on the PGA tour, including the U.S. Open in 1959 and again in 1966. In 1970, he defeated Gene Littler to capture the Masters in what was the tournament's last 18-hole playoff. During his long and illustrious career, he claimed many titles, including five Vardon Trophies for the low-scoring average that year. He was also a member of eight U.S. Ryder Cup teams and still holds the record for the most Ryder Cup points earned by a U.S. team member. He was inducted into the World Golf Hall of Fame in 1978.

Later in his career, Billy captured nine senior PGA tour wins between 1982 and 1989. I am proud that one of these victories came in Jeremy Ranch, UT—the State Billy adopted as his home.

Billy first came to Utah in 1959 to play in the Utah Open. During that week, he and his wife Shirley fell in love with Utah and eventually relocated permanently. He was an active member of the Utah golfing community and was inducted into the Utah Sports Hall of Fame in 2013.

Since his passing, several professional golfers have offered tributes in honor of Billy's memory. Jack Nicklaus, widely considered the greatest golfer of all time, said the following about Billy:

Billy Casper was one of the greatest family men—be it inside the game of golf or out—I have had the fortunate blessing to meet. He had such a wonderful balance to his life. Golf was never the most important thing in Billy's life—family was. There was always much more to Billy Casper than golf . . . It was not even a year ago, someone asked Billy how he wanted to be remembered, and he said, “I want to be remembered for how I loved my fellow man.”

Mike Reid, a fellow PGA Tour competitor and Utahn, said the following about Billy: “He taught by example, that while we strive for excellence in golf, success should never come at the cost of the relationships we hold dear.”

To Billy and his wife Shirley, family was always the first priority. They are the proud parents of 11 children, 6 of whom are adopted, and they now have over 70 grandchildren and many great-grandchildren. When his sons were old enough Billy would have them caddie for him on tour so that he could spend that special time with them. He gave freely of himself and spent countless hours in the service of others, both in golf and in church callings.

Billy Casper was one of the very best in his chosen profession, but at the

same time, he never let the trappings of the world overshadow what was most important to him—his friends, his faith, and his family. I am profoundly grateful that Elaine and I were able to call Billy and Shirley friends. I will miss Billy Casper dearly, as will all who knew him. May his memory remind us all of the importance of kindness, charity, love, and optimism.

#### RECOGNIZING THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL LABORATORY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today, with my colleague Senator CANTWELL, we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, PNNL, a true example of scientific excellence located in our home State of Washington. For the past 50 years, PNNL has served as the Department of Energy's premier chemistry, environmental sciences, and data analytics national laboratory and has tackled some of our Nation's most complex and urgent challenges.

In 1965, Battelle won a contract to operate a research and development lab at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation in Washington State. Then known as Pacific Northwest Laboratory, its scientists provided critical support to plutonium production and nuclear waste cleanup at Hanford. Through its commitment to excellence and innovation, the lab grew and evolved to serve the ever-changing needs of our Nation. In 1969, the Pacific Northwest Laboratory's scientific prowess caught the eye of NASA, which chose the lab to analyze lunar soil samples that were collected after landing a man on the Moon. The lab changed its name to the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in 1995, and in 1997 opened the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory. This state-of-the-art national scientific user facility provides researchers from around the Nation and the world with experimental instruments, a high-performance supercomputer, and specialized staff allowing them to advance energy and environmental discoveries.

Today, the lab employs 4,300 people at its main Richland campus, the marine research facility in Sequim, and in satellite offices in Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, and Washington, DC, and conducts \$1 billion in research annually for the Department of Energy, Department of Homeland Security, National Institutes of Health, and many more. While it is clear PNNL serves as a cornerstone of the Tri-Cities economy, the dedicated staff are also key leaders in the community. The lab has made it a priority to invest in STEM education, playing an important role as a founding partner in one of Washington State's first STEM high schools. Delta High School is now educating our next generation of scientists and engi-

neers. In higher education, PNNL supported efforts to create a Washington State University branch campus in the region which led to WSU Tri-Cities opening its doors in 1989. I am consistently impressed with PNNL's contributions to the local community.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I join my colleague, Senator MURRAY, in commemorating the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory's 50th anniversary. As our constituents in Washington State know, PNNL is an integral part of our economy. The lab has a total economic output of \$1.3 billion and supports more than 6,800 jobs in Washington. PNNL's commitment to commercialization and technology transfer has brought research out of the laboratory and into the real world, further bolstering PNNL's reputation as a national scientific leader and supporting Washington State's economy.

I am reminded each day how the work at PNNL impacts our daily lives. During my visits to the Port of Seattle, I know that PNNL has deployed radiation detection systems that keep our ports safe. And when I watch a movie at home, I know that the DVD I use is possible because of PNNL's advancements in digital data storage technology. Because of these and other important contributions, PNNL has earned more Federal Laboratory Consortium Awards than any other national laboratory, holds more than 2,300 U.S. and foreign patents, and fostered the creation of 108 spin-off companies that remain open today.

PNNL plays a unique role in addressing our Nation's energy demands by furthering research in climate change, advanced biofuels, and the electric grid. In the 1990s, the lab helped create the Global Change Assessment Model to help institutions across the world explore the impacts of climate change and the different policy proposals to address it. The scientists at PNNL have also developed a cutting-edge chemical process that transforms algae to crude oil in minutes, a technology that could help our Nation reduce its dependence on foreign oil. And the lab continues to lead in assessing cyber security threats by developing and testing technology to help protect the electric grid. With its stellar record of commercializing research, I have no doubt that PNNL's work will continue to meet the United States' energy challenges in the future.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, together Senator CANTWELL and I have been proud supporters and advocates for PNNL here in the other Washington, working to make sure our colleagues and the administration understand the important research it conducts, and the significant contributions it makes to the Tri-Cities community. Over the past 50 years, PNNL has benefited from a talented and committed staff of scientists, engineers,

and nontechnical staff, a dedicated and committed operator in Battelle, and a strong partner in the Department of Energy. Congratulations to PNNL. I know Senator CANTWELL and I look forward to PNNL's future contributions to Washington State, the Nation, and the world.

#### MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to express support for Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week, and to express the need for greater Federal investment in medical research.

I regret that severe weather prevented me from doing this last week, which was Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week. Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week is a time for Americans everywhere to help others learn more about multiple sclerosis, and to do what they can to make a difference for those who suffer from this disease.

Multiple sclerosis can be devastating for the individuals who suffer from it, as well as their families. Each year, I am proud to work with Senator COLLINS to recognize multiple sclerosis patients, their caregivers and their families by introducing a resolution in support of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week. Senator COLLINS and I worked together again on a resolution for 2015. I am pleased to say that this resolution, S. Res. 98, cleared the Senate on March 4. It is a testament to the support of the Senate for the 400,000 Americans who are estimated to be suffering from this terrible disease.

While it is important to recognize the toll taken by multiple sclerosis, it is just as important to note that it is but one of many debilitating or deadly diseases for which we lack a cure, or for which existing treatments are inadequate. For many of these diseases, we have made great progress due to federally funded biomedical research. Unfortunately, when medical inflation is taken into account, the National Institute of Health's, NIH, budget has been falling for nearly a decade. This is unacceptable.

We must reverse the decline in NIH funding, and work to support other Federal research programs. The research done by these programs saves lives and improves quality of life. Funding these programs also makes sound economic sense: Federally funded biomedical research is an important driver of economic growth throughout the United States. In 2013, NIH grants to my State alone supported an estimated 23,122 jobs. However, while the United States has been the world leader in medical research, other nations such as China are dramatically ramping up their investment, threatening our dominance in the field. We must work to continue investments that support patients, improve quality

of life and create jobs that benefit all Americans.

In addition to advocating for NIH funding with Senator BURR—indicative of the bipartisan support the NIH budget enjoys—I am also a cosponsor of S. 289, the American Cures Act, which would authorize increases in Federal research budgets at the NIH, but also at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Department of Defense Health Program and the Veterans Medical and Prosthetics Research Program. As we support those suffering from multiple sclerosis, we must also remember the importance of federally funded medical research. We cannot afford, from a public health or economic standpoint, not to support biomedical progress.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### RECOGNIZING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF AUTISM SPEAKS

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge Autism Speaks as they celebrate 10 years as a leading organization dedicated to serving people with autism and their families. Founded by Bob and Suzanne Wright—concerned grandparents of a child with autism—on February 25, 2005, Autism Speaks has grown to become not just a national leader in the conversation about autism, but a world leader.

Ten years ago, Congress had yet to pass the landmark law now known after two reauthorizations as the Autism CARES Act. The estimated rate of autism in the United States—according to data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—at that time was about 1 in 150. Today, the CDC estimates that the rate of autism is about 1 in 68. These same figures show that my home State of New Jersey has the highest rate of autism incidence in the Nation, at 1 in 45. It is because of the countless stories of people from my home State—from the parents seeking help for their children, to the teachers and counselors who help people on the autism spectrum to grow and develop, to the researchers seeking to understand the causes of autism—that I am so passionately committed to confronting the challenge of autism, and Autism Speaks has been a leading voice on this issue for a decade.

Over the past 10 years, Autism Speaks has committed more than \$525 million towards autism research, awareness, services, and advocacy. Most of these funds have gone to support science and medical research, including a new partnership with Google through the MSSNG program, which will sequence and store the world's largest database of genomic information on autism. Autism Speaks has raised awareness of autism worldwide, and has partnerships with organiza-

tions in 60 countries across the globe. Autism Speaks provides funds for services for people with autism through a number of grant programs and scholarships. It is also no secret that Autism Speaks has served as a leading advocate in seeking Federal legislation to address the challenges of autism.

I am proud to have championed the passage of the Autism Coordination, Accountability, Research, Education and Support Act, also known as the Autism CARES Act, which passed this body by unanimous consent on July 31, 2014. President Obama signed the Autism CARES Act into law on August 8, 2014. This law ensures that we continue the critical programs established in 2006 that provide for autism research as well as support services to individuals on the autism spectrum and their families. The Autism CARES Act also makes a number of updates and improvements on the original law, starting with better organization and coordination of Federal autism programs, including new mechanisms to ensure that goals are being met and that Federal dollars are being spent efficiently. It also requires that a report be written that focuses on the needs of young adults on the autistic spectrum or with another developmental disability and the challenges they face when they transition from school-based services to those they need during adulthood, which is a critical need that often goes unspoken. Autism Speaks' advocacy on behalf of those with autism and their families was vital to securing overwhelming bipartisan support for this law and ensuring that it passed through Congress and into law.

As they mark their 10th anniversary, I congratulate Autism Speaks for the decade of great work that they do and express my gratitude and support as they serve as a leading voice in our national discussion on autism for decades to come. •

##### TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM MEEHAN

• Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Dr. William A. Meehan, who has served with great distinction and honor at Jacksonville State University for more than 40 years. I have known him since he became president in 1999, and my admiration for his leadership and for Jacksonville State University has only grown each year. Dr. Meehan is retiring from his post as president of JSU on June 30, 2015, where his extraordinary leadership and vision will be sorely missed.

Dr. Meehan, along with his board of trustees, set a bold vision for Jacksonville State University. He inspired his team to put students first, to inspire their intellectual curiosity, and to nurture critical thinking, communication skills, and creativity in problem-solving. He led the creation of the univer-

sity's first bold strategic plan that focuses on 21st-century skills.

President Meehan set a course for JSU that would not only move the university forward but would fast-forward. Now, starting in the fall of 2015, 500 entering freshmen at JSU will have an iPad; these students will have global technology at their fingertips and be prepared for the rigors of their academic pursuits.

Under President Meehan's leadership JSU has excelled in many pursuits. Research funding continues to rise, with more than \$23 million in grants received last year, an increase of 515 percent. ACT scores of incoming freshmen have risen significantly over the past decade, housing occupancy rates have improved from 64 percent to 90 percent, and student-to-faculty ratio is a stellar 17 to 1 under Dr. Meehan's leadership. JSU now enjoys a wide alumni base of more than 60,000 in all 50 States and 95 countries around the world.

President Meehan has focused the university on innovative approaches such as the creation of 12 interdisciplinary centers that yield practical applications and solutions to real-world problems. These centers concentrate on regional education, teaching and learning, security, applied forensics, disaster and community resilience, disease ecology, ecosystems, behavioral studies, economic development, emergency preparedness, environmental policy, and veteran support.

Further, under President Meehan's leadership, JSU was just awarded a 10-year reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission of Colleges, SACSCOC. JSU also enjoys significant program accreditations, attesting to the high-quality academics provided. JSU is also fierce on the playing field and lays claim to being the only school in the Nation to hold NCAA national titles in football, men's basketball and baseball at the Division I or Division II levels.

President Meehan has a deep and abiding commitment to partnerships with K-12, community colleges, and the region in which he serves. He has extensive service with community initiatives and on education, economic development and community service strategic boards. His view of education is a seamless process flowing from kindergarten through graduate school, which results in a high quality talented professional workforce.

In addition to his strong and lasting legacy at JSU, President Meehan prides himself with a loving family. He is married to the former Elizabeth Stevens and is father to twin boys Drew and Will and daughter Carol Grace. President Meehan is a devoted member of the First Baptist Church of Jacksonville, AL.

On April 3, 2015, there will be a community-wide event to honor Dr. Meehan and his family.

On a personal note, I have found President Meehan to be one of Alabama's best university presidents. He is a driving force behind Jacksonville State University's sturdy and solid growth in all areas, from strong increases in academic scores to building on the community's fine reputation. He has been a constant source of information and good advice to me and the State's congressional delegation. He is, as all know, deeply committed to this great university, whose unique character he has further developed. I consider him a personal friend and a valuable advisor.

Please join me in thanking Dr. William Meehan for his tireless dedication to Jacksonville State University and the surrounding community. His exemplary service in higher education is an inspiration, and because of his leadership, JSU is one of the great jewels of Alabama.●

#### RECOGNIZING SKYRUNNER

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, American small businesses are cultivating the Nation's brightest minds to innovate with ingenuity. Technological advancement is a crucial element in fostering economic growth, increasing educational opportunities, and retaining high-skilled, technical jobs. Its importance cannot be understated. This week, I am honored to recognize a small business that highlights this exciting aspect of today's economy. Congratulations to this week's Small Business of the Week, Skyrunner, located in Shreveport, LA.

Stewart Hamel and Gilo Cardozo created the Skyrunner in order to reinvent recreational sports vehicles—an all-terrain buggy that also flies. Located in Northwest Louisiana, Skyrunner has combined a recreational off-road vehicle with paragliding equipment that allows the driver to use the machine in either of its two modes: car and flight. When in car mode, the vehicle boasts a rugged, dependable frame ideal for demanding terrains. The flight mode deploys the latest in reflex paragliding technology, allowing the vehicle to float back down to the ground upon entering the air. The vehicle's top speed reaches 115 miles per hour and can accelerate to 62 miles per hour in 4.3 seconds, which can launch the vehicle into the air with minimal effort.

The Skyrunner is more than just a recreational vehicle. With its minimum weight and outstanding performance, the Skyrunner has the potential to be incorporated as a valuable tool for various Federal agencies, local and State governments, and adventure enthusiasts alike. CEO Stewart Hamel of Shreveport believes his spin on the all-terrain vehicle will revolutionize the way we manage natural resources, protect Federal lands, aid in natural disas-

ters, and adventure into the wilderness.

When moving its headquarters to Louisiana from the United Kingdom, Skyrunner struggled to get a unique military application approved to import products because a bureaucrat at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency was blocking the application. Fortunately, I was able to advocate on Skyrunner's behalf to move past bureaucratic red tape, which allowed the company to begin pre-production of their product in Shreveport, LA. With a handful of prototypes under their belt, Skyrunner begins mass production of their aerodynamic dune-buggy within the next few months.

It is important that we cut through government regulations to allow our small businesses to act on innovative ideas and develop their products, market base, and workforce. By supporting these local small businesses, we can bring new technology, jobs, and state-of-the-art equipment to the areas that need it most. Congratulations again to Skyrunner for being selected as Small Business of the Week. I wish you all the best in your endeavor and thank you for bringing innovative technology to Northwest Louisiana.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 749. An act to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1213. An act to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

The message also announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: Mr. CUMMINGS of Maryland and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER of Maryland.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 749. An act to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-848. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management

Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" (44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2014-0002) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-849. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Arizona; Regional Haze State and Federal Implementation Plans; Reconsideration" (FRL No. 9923-88-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-850. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Transportation Conformity" (FRL No. 9924-17-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-851. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Off-Site Waste and Recovery Operations" (FRL No. 9923-26-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-852. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, fourteen (14) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of State, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-853. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a section of the Arms Export Control Act (RSAT 14-4215); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-854. A communication from the Report to the Nation Delegation Director, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the organization's 2014 annual report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-855. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "ATF 2014 PACT Act Report"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 675. A bill to provide for the sealing or expungement of records relating to Federal nonviolent criminal offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN,

Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 676. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent tax-related identity theft and tax fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. COONS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 677. A bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 678. A bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 679. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to Medicare data; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 680. A bill for the relief of Maha Dakar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 681. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 134

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 134, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other

statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.8 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 236

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 236, a bill to amend the Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 to create an expedited procedure to enact recommendations of the Government Accountability Office for consolidation and elimination to reduce duplication.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 259

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 259, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 269, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 307

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 307, a bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment and implementation of guidelines on best practices for diagnosis, treatment, and management of mild traumatic brain injuries (MTBIs) in school-aged children, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 396

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 396, a bill to establish the Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Committee.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 409, a bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 500, a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes.



S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 591

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 591, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 615

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, supra.

S. 674

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to expand programs with respect to women's health.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 269. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 270. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 271. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 272. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 269. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### TITLE \_\_\_\_\_ —FAMILY-BASED FOSTER CARE SERVICES

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ INCLUSION OF THERAPEUTIC FOSTER CARE AS MEDICAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1905 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (28), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (29) as paragraph (30); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (28) the following new paragraph:

“(29) therapeutic foster care services (to the extent allowed and as defined in subsection (ee)); and”;

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(ee)(1) For purposes of subsection (a)(29), subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), the term ‘therapeutic foster care services’ means services provided for children who have not attained age 21, and who, as a result of mental illness, other emotional or behavioral disorders, medically fragile conditions, or developmental disabilities, need the level of care provided in an institution (including a psychiatric residential treatment facility) or nursing facility the cost of which could be reimbursed under the State plan but who can be cared for or maintained in a community placement, through a qualified therapeutic foster care program described in paragraph (2).

“(2) A qualified therapeutic foster care program described in this paragraph is a program that—

“(A) is licensed by the State and accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities, the Council on Accreditation, or by another equivalent accreditation agency (or agencies) as the Secretary may recognize;

“(B) provides structured daily activities, including the development, improvement, monitoring, and reinforcement of age-appropriate social, communication and behavioral skills, trauma-informed and gender-responsive services, crisis intervention and crisis support services, medication monitoring, counseling, and case management, and may furnish other intensive community services; and

“(C) provides biological parents, kinship caregivers, and foster care parents with specialized training and consultation in the management of children with mental illness,

other emotional or behavioral disorders, medically fragile conditions, developmental disabilities, the impact of trauma on child and caregiver, and specific additional training on the needs of each child provided such services.

“(3) In making coverage determinations in accordance with paragraph (1), a State may employ medical necessity criteria that are similar to the medical necessity criteria applied to coverage determinations for other services and supports under this title.

“(4) For purposes of subsection (a)(29) and this subsection, therapeutic foster care services shall not include reimbursement for any training referred to in paragraph (2)(C).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; PHASE-IN OF LICENSURE AND ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to medical assistance furnished in calendar quarters beginning on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PHASE-IN OF LICENSURE AND ACCREDITATION REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall issue guidance to phase-in the application of the licensure and accreditation requirements for qualified therapeutic foster care programs specified in section 1905(ee)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (as added by subsection (a)) over a 3-year period. Such guidance shall specify that a therapeutic foster care program that is complying with the phase-in requirements for such licensure and accreditation may be considered to be a qualified therapeutic foster care program for purposes of a State receiving payment under section 1903 of the Social Security Act for furnishing medical assistance for therapeutic foster care services provided through such a program if the program also meets the conditions described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 1905(ee)(2) of such Act.

SA 270. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### TITLE IV—BETTER RESPONSE FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING

#### SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Ensuring a Better Response for Victims of Child Sex Trafficking”.

#### SEC. 402. CAPTA AMENDMENTS.

(a) STATE PLANS.—Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (xxi), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(xxiv) provisions and procedures requiring identification and assessment of all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102 (9)(B)); and

“(xxv) provisions and procedures for training child protective services workers about identifying, assessing, and providing comprehensive services for children who are sex trafficking victims, including efforts to coordinate with State law enforcement, juvenile justice, and social service agencies such as runaway and homeless youth shelters to serve this population;”;

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:



“(17) The number of children determined to be victims described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(xxiv).”.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g) is amended—

(A) by striking “For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) SPECIAL RULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4), a child shall be considered a victim of ‘child abuse and neglect’ and of ‘sexual abuse’ if the child is identified, by a State or local agency employee of the State or locality involved, as being a victim of sex trafficking (as defined in paragraph (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) or a victim of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in paragraph (9)(A) of that section.

“(2) STATE OPTION.—Notwithstanding the definition of ‘child’ in section 3(1), a State may elect to define that term for purposes of the application of paragraph (1) to section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4) as a person who has not attained the age of 24.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(2) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended by inserting (“including sexual abuse as determined under section 111”) after “sexual abuse or exploitation”.

(3) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Paragraph (5)(C) of subsection (a), as so designated, of section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g) is amended by striking “inhumane;” and inserting “inhumane.”.

**SA 271.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ AMENDMENTS TO THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.**

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(I) by striking “are sharing” and all that follows through “charitable organizations;”;

(II) by striking “14 days” each place that term appears and inserting “30 days”;

(III) in clause (i), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;

(IV) by striking clause (ii); and

(V) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and

(ii) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) unaccompanied youth and homeless families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes who—

“(A) are certified as homeless by the director or designee of a director of a program funded under any other Federal statute; or

“(B) have been certified by a director or designee of a director of a program funded under this Act or a director or designee of a director of a public housing agency as lacking a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, which shall include—

“(i) temporarily sharing the housing of another person due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or other similar reason; or

“(ii) living in a room in a motel or hotel.”;

and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘other Federal statute’ has the meaning given that term in section 401; and

“(2) the term ‘public housing agency’ means an agency described in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)).”;

(2) in section 401—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) by striking clause (iv); and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (v), (vi), and (vii) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking “Federal statute other than this subtitle” and inserting “other Federal statute”; and

(ii) by inserting “of” before “this Act”;;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (33) as paragraphs (15) through (34), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) OTHER FEDERAL STATUTE.—The term ‘other Federal statute’ includes—

“(A) the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.);

“(B) the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

“(C) subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.);

“(D) section 330(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(h));

“(E) section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

“(F) the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

“(G) subtitle B of title VII of this Act.”;

(3) by inserting after section 408 the following:

**“SEC. 409. AVAILABILITY OF HMIS REPORT.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The information provided to the Secretary under section 402(f)(3) shall be made publically available on the Internet website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in aggregate, non-personally identifying reports.

“(b) REQUIRED DATA.—Each report made publically available under subsection (a) shall be updated on at least an annual basis and shall include—

“(1) a cumulative count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness;

“(2) a cumulative assessment of the patterns of assistance provided under subtitles B and C of this title for the each geographic area involved; and

“(3) a count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness that are documented through the HMIS by each collaborative applicant.”;

(4) in section 422—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) RESTRICTION.—In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not consider or prioritize the specific homeless populations intended to be served by the applicant if the applicant demonstrates that the project—

“(A) would meet the priorities identified in the plan submitted under section 427(b)(1)(B); and

“(B) is cost-effective in meeting the overall goals and objectives identified in that plan.”;

(B) by striking subsection (j);

(5) in section 424(d), by striking paragraph (5);

(6) in section 427(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by adding “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (vii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (viii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by adding “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (iv)(VI), by striking “and” at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (v);

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by adding “and” at the end;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (F); and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(7) by amending section 433 to read as follows:

**“SEC. 433. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report, which shall—

“(1) summarize the activities carried out under this subtitle and set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Secretary as a result of the activities; and

“(2) include, for the year preceding the date on which the report is submitted—

“(A) data required to be made publically available in the report under section 409; and

“(B) data on programs funded under any other Federal statute.

“(b) TIMING.—A report under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 4 months after the end of each fiscal year.”.

**SA 272.** Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 95, after line 18, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ FEDERAL CRIMINAL PROCEDURE POST-CONVICTION RELIEF FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 237 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§ 3772. Motion to vacate; expungement; motion to dismiss**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘eligible entity’ includes—

“(A) a legal aid society or legal services organization that provides indigent legal services;

“(B) a nonprofit organization that provides legal services to victims of trafficking; and

“(C) a public defender’s office;

“(2) the terms ‘employee’ and ‘officer’ have the meanings given the terms in section 2105 of title 5; and

“(3) the term ‘victim of trafficking’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

“(b) MOTION TO VACATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person convicted of any offense against the United States may move the appropriate district court of the United States to vacate the judgment of conviction if the offense was committed as a direct result of the person having been a victim of trafficking.

“(2) CONTENTS OF MOTION.—A motion described in paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be in writing;  
 “(B) describe any supporting evidence;  
 “(C) state the offense and  
 “(D) include copies of any documents showing that the movant is entitled to relief under this section.

“(3) HEARING.—

“(A) MANDATORY HEARING.—

“(i) MOTION IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO VACATE.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a motion is filed under paragraph (1), the Government may file a motion in opposition of the motion filed under paragraph (1).

“(ii) MANDATORY HEARING.—If the Government files a motion described in clause (i), not later than 15 days after the date on which the motion is filed, the court shall hold a hearing on the motion.

“(B) DISCRETIONARY HEARING.—If the Government does not file a motion described in subparagraph (A)(i), not later than 45 days after the date on which a motion is filed under paragraph (1), the court may hold a hearing on the motion.

“(4) FACTORS.—The court shall grant a motion under this section if, after notice to and opportunity for the Government to be heard, the court finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that—

“(A) the movant was convicted of an offense against the United States; and

“(B) the participation in the offense by the movant was a result of the person having been a victim of trafficking.

“(5) SUPPORTING EVIDENCE.—

“(A) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—For purposes of this section, there shall be a rebuttable presumption that the movant is a victim of trafficking if the movant includes in the motion—

“(i) a certified copy of an official record of a Federal, State, tribal, or local proceeding, including an approval notice or an enforcement certification generated from a Federal immigration proceeding, that shows that the movant was a victim of trafficking, including a victim of a trafficker charged with a violation of chapter 77; or

“(ii) an affidavit or sworn testimony from a trained professional staff member of a victim services organization, an attorney, a member of the clergy, or a medical or other professional from whom the movant has sought assistance in addressing the trauma associated with being a victim of trafficking.

“(B) OTHER EVIDENCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, in determining whether the movant is a victim of trafficking, the court may consider any other evidence the court determines is of sufficient credibility and probative value, including an affidavit or sworn testimony of the movant.

“(ii) AFFIDAVIT OR SWORN TESTIMONY OF MOVANT SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.—The affidavit or sworn testimony of the movant described in clause (i) shall be sufficient evidence to vacate a conviction under this section if the court determines that—

“(I) the affidavit or sworn testimony is credible; and

“(II) no other evidence is readily available.

“(6) CONVICTION NOT REQUIRED.—It shall not be necessary that any person other than the movant be convicted of an offense against the United States before the movant may file a motion under paragraph (1).

“(7) DENIAL OF MOTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the court denies a motion filed under paragraph (1), the denial shall be without prejudice.

“(B) REASONS FOR DENIAL.—If the court denies a motion filed under paragraph (1), the

court shall state the reasons for the denial in writing.

“(C) REASONABLE TIME TO CURE DEFICIENCIES IN MOTION.—If the motion was denied due to a curable deficiency in the motion, the court shall allow the movant sufficient time for the movant to cure the deficiency.

“(8) APPEAL.—An order granting or denying a motion to vacate under this section may be appealed in accordance with section 1291 of title 28 and section 3731 of this title.

“(C) EXPUNGEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the court grants a motion to vacate under subsection (b), the court shall immediately vacate the conviction, set aside the verdict and enter a judgment of acquittal, and enter an expungement order that directs that there be expunged from all official records all references to the—

“(A) arrest of the person for the offense;

“(B) the institution of criminal proceedings against the person; and

“(C) the results of the proceedings.

“(2) EFFECT.—The effect of an order entered under paragraph (1) shall be to restore the person, in the contemplation of the law, to the status the person occupied before the arrest or the institution of the criminal proceedings.

“(d) PRETRIAL MOTION TO DISMISS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A person charged with an offense against the United States may move to dismiss the indictment, information, or complaint if the participation in the offense by the person was a result of the person having been a victim of trafficking.

“(2) APPLICABLE RULES GOVERNING MOTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A motion described in paragraph (1) shall—

“(i) be deemed to be a motion described in rule 12(b)(3)(B)(v) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure; and

“(ii) except as provided in subparagraph (B), be governed by the rules applicable to that motion.

“(B) RULING ON MOTION.—Notwithstanding rule 12(d) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the court—

“(i) shall decide a motion under this subsection before trial; and

“(ii) may not defer ruling on the motion until during or after trial.

“(e) ADDITIONAL ACTIONS BY COURT.—The court may, upon granting a motion under this section take such additional action as the court determines is appropriate.

“(f) CONFIDENTIALITY OF MOVANT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A motion under this section and any documents, pleadings, or orders relating to the motion shall be filed under seal.

“(2) INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION.—No officer or employee may make any report, paper, picture, photograph, court file or other document, in the custody or possession of the officer or employee, that identifies the movant available for public inspection.

“(g) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any conviction before or on or after the date of enactment of this section.

“(h) GRANT FOR BEST PRACTICES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General of the United States may make grants to eligible entities to develop, improve, or expand legal services to carry out this section.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section, including providing organizations and

agencies with funds to train legal aid services on motions practices under this section.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 237 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“3772. Motion to vacate; expungement; motion to dismiss.”.

## APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Deborah Skaggs Speth of Kentucky.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 93-642, appoints the following Senator to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation: The Honorable CLAIRE McCASKILL of Missouri.

## ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the second half; further, that at 11 a.m. the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 178 under the previous order, for debate only, until 12:30 p.m., with the time equally divided; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I say that for many of our States, climate change is a reality and even a daunting one. We look forward to working on the question posed by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee chair: What do we do? But in order to do so we need something from the majority to work with.

With that said, I do not object, and I thank the majority leader for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I might say to my friend from Rhode Island, his amendment on climate

change was a part of the Keystone bill the President vetoed. I know he and I have very different views about this. What may be challenging for his State is equally challenging in mine. We have a depression in the coalfields of Eastern Kentucky. It is a pretty grim picture. We all know Rhode Island and Kentucky may see this issue quite differently.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BROWN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD RULE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 8 which was passed by this body earlier last week but without a veto-proof majority. It would protect corporations looking to rig union elections, always at the expense of working families. Our labor movement helped build the middle class and fought for protections so many Americans take for granted: overtime pay brought about because of collective bargaining, child labor laws, collective bargaining, and talking to Members of Congress. Child labor laws, safer workplaces, unemployment insurance, workers compensation were all brought about because people came together in unions to organize and bargain collectively and came together in unions to talk to State legislators and Members of Congress in support of unemployment insurance and in support of safer work laws, child labor laws, and workers' compensation.

I am wearing my lapel with a picture of a canary in a birdcage. It was given to me 20 years ago at a workers' Memorial Day rally in Lorain, OH, a city on Lake Erie, about 25 miles west of Cleveland. This picture illustrates what the mine workers used to do 100 years ago. They took a canary down to the mines. If the canary died from lack of oxygen or toxic gas, the mine workers got out of the mines.

He was on his own. He did not have a union in those days strong enough to protect him. He did not have a government in those days that cared enough

to protect him. Since the days of the canary in the birdcage down in the mines, we have seen Congress move forward on workers' compensation, on minimum wage, on unemployment insurance, on prohibition of child labor. Much of that progress, many of those advancements were because of the labor movement.

The growing voice of workers at the table was critical to all of these advances made especially in the early part of the 20th century. Then it was Social Security, then it was Medicare and Medicaid, and then it was all of the other things that helped us together, from Head Start to Pell grants, that helped create a middle class.

The labor movement got children out of the sweatshops and into the classrooms. We expanded the rights of workers, we expanded the rights of women, we expanded the rights of people of color, and prosperity followed, shared by a growing portion of the country.

This week I led a delegation with Senator SCOTT—a Republican from South Carolina—to Selma, AL, and also to Montgomery and Birmingham to mark the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, where the young—mostly students—were nonviolently walking across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, and they were attacked by State troopers and local police and local deputized citizens of Alabama who participated in the melee and beat up a number of those students. That got the Nation's attention, and the Nation pushed Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act. Labor unions were there. Labor unions were there to ensure if we work hard and we take responsibility, we can work in a safe environment, with decent wages and benefits that allow us to take care of our family. But over the last decade that has changed. Workers in working families have paid the price. It used to be as profits went up, wages went up with those profits because the workers who helped those companies be profitable shared in the wealth they created.

That is not socialism. That is what happened in American capitalism for decades after World War II. When profits went up, wages went up, in large part because unions at the bargaining table—through the process of collective bargaining—made sure that as their workers were increasingly productive and companies did better and better and executive salaries went up, workers got a piece of the pie. But since the 1970s, profits have gone up, but wages have been pretty stagnant. American workers, our workers, continue to be the most profitable and most productive and talented in the world, but the rewards for productivity gains go to an ever-dwindling number of the richest Americans. So as companies do better and better and stockholders do better and better, as profits go up and up, workers simply have not

shared in the wealth they have created. They have not gotten their piece of the pie that they have earned. A big part of that is the decline of the labor movement. Today the middle class accounts for the smallest share of our national income since World War II. I will say that again. The middle class accounts for the smallest share of our national income since World War II.

It is not a coincidence that workers are reaping fewer of the rewards of their work while union membership has declined. That is why the National Labor Relations Board proposed the rule change which is so important and why it is critical that Republican efforts—Republicans, again, doing it on behalf of the largest corporations in America—are not successful. This change would make modest, common-sense reforms to modernize and streamline the election process by which workers form unions.

Right now companies seeking to block workers' rights to form a union can delay elections sometimes up to 2 years, and they can drag out anti-union campaigns, they can intimidate workers, and they can find reasons to fire organizers. Delay works in the corporations' favor, as workers leave the jobs, as workers who wanted the union get discouraged from the union, and delay almost always works on the side of the employer.

Workers have a right to timely elections, the right to make up their own minds free of intimidation. Choosing one's representation is a right we cherish as Americans, and the National Labor Relations Board rule preserves it for our workers. The NLRB rule would cut back on the frivolous court cases these corporations file over and over, these frivolous court cases that companies use to stall elections. It would allow NLRB hearing officers to move forward with an election despite pending litigation, the stalling tactics of frivolous lawsuits to ensure workers aren't silenced by expensive legal battles.

These reforms will not only help workers but also help businesses that act in good faith by streamlining the election process. This isn't an antibusiness move the workers and unions want to engage in, it is a cooperative move because moving quickly will bring everybody to the table more quickly.

Right now the election process varies widely from State to State. It relies on outdated forms of communication. This change will provide certainty to workers and businesses alike and will allow both to file electronically instead of only by mail, saving everyone time and money.

The lobbying effort by corporations on this is opposed to filing electronically. Imagine that. It is 2015. Why do they want to do that? Because they want to slow down the process. We

know the consequences. Stalling tactics have real consequences for workers. We have seen that over and over again.

In Massillon, OH—a city near Canton, south of Akron, in Northeast Ohio—nurses at Affinity Medical Center elected to form a union in August 2012. Ann Wyat, who was awarded Nurse of the Year, was fired for leading the activities for unionization. The company did everything it could to crush the unionizing efforts. I have been to that hospital. I have met with those nurses. I have talked to them about this. The NLRB found in favor of the workers, ruling that Affinity Medical refused to bargain and used illegal coercion and intimidation tactics, but still the company refused to comply with Federal labor law. The matter went to Federal court, which ruled in favor of the nurses and filed an injunction against Affinity Medical for failing to follow NLRB rulings, for breaking Federal law.

Last month a jury in a civil court ruled unanimously and awarded the wrongfully terminated nurse \$2 million in damages. It was serious enough what they did to this nurse that the jury ruled this nurse was due \$2 million, not just because of the inconvenience to the nurse and the denial of her rights but the punishment for a company that breaks the law.

Two and a half years later Affinity Medical is still stalling, and no contract has been agreed to. The nurses in Massillon deserve better. All workers deserve better. That is the importance of this NLRB ruling, to make it a more level playing field.

That is what the American labor movement and our commitment to our workers is about—to speak out on behalf of honest pay for an honest day's work. It is a story of a nation—and a government—respecting the dignity of work and reflecting the decency and dedication of workers.

It has been nearly 80 years since American workers' right to collective bargaining has been confirmed. We have been doing this experiment for 80 years. Rather than ending that right—and, with it, squeezing the middle class—we should be working to preserve and expand the rights of workers.

We need equal pay for women, and we need a minimum wage that supports families. The minimum wage is worth 30 percent less today in real purchasing dollars than it was 30 years ago. Rather than eroding that, we need to strengthen and grow the middle class, and we need paid family leave and paid sick leave.

We need to be able to make it a little bit easier for a union, for workers to stand up to corporate interests when workers' interests are not respected.

That should be on the Senate's agenda, but sadly it is not. Instead, we have wasted our time on a resolution that

we know will fail—all to pay back political scoring points for those corporations that fund campaigns and continue to dissolve organized labor. Without a veto-proof majority—and the resolution wasn't even close to that last Tuesday—we know it is nothing more than an empty gesture. Just as importantly, we know that if this resolution succeeded, it would do real damage to working Americans by impeding their ability to come together to organize and to build the power they have in numbers to be able to get their fair share of the American dream.

#### EXTENSION OF CHIP FUNDING

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it has been 1 month since I took to the floor of this body to urge my colleagues to work together to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP. Just this past month, I have held roundtables at almost every major city in Ohio to hear more about what CHIP means to people in Ohio. At each of these roundtables, I spoke with families who depend on CHIP to get their kids the care they need.

Please understand that there are 130,000 Ohio children who are eligible for CHIP and who have benefited from CHIP, and in almost every case they are the sons and daughters of parents who work. These are parents who don't make enough money and don't work at a place where the employer provides insurance. They may be \$9, \$10, \$11 or \$12 an hour jobs. They are working, and the income they are making simply isn't enough to buy insurance for their kids and for their families. So that is the importance of rewarding work. These 130,000 children now have insurance because of a bipartisan bill, the Children's Health Insurance Program. They have had it for 20 years.

It is in jeopardy now. Last week I was at the John R. Maloney Health Center in Columbus, where more kids rely on CHIP than anywhere else in the State. Some 13,000 children in Franklin County alone have health coverage because of CHIP.

I spoke with Meredith Mendoza, a mother living in Gahanna, OH. She works full time as a medical interpreter and makes too much to qualify for Medicaid but not quite enough to afford health insurance, and her employer doesn't provide it. Three of her four children have affordable, comprehensive coverage because of CHIP.

CHIP provides a sigh of relief for parents such as Meredith because CHIP means better access to comprehensive care for their children. Providing health insurance to low-income children isn't just the right thing to do; it is the smart thing to do.

This is why it is the smart thing to do. It allays the anxiety that so many families have about one of their children getting sick. It helps families feel

more secure that they won't be wiped out financially and in other ways by a sick child. It helps that child do better in school because the child will miss fewer days and the child will feel better. It gives that child preventive care. It means vaccines, preventive health care, getting physicals, and it means dental care. It means better performance in school. CHIP means all of that.

But the problem is that the CHIP law is until 2019. We authorized it a couple years ago. The funding runs out in September. My Governor, the Republican Governor of Ohio, wants to see us fund CHIP through 2019 so we can continue to provide this insurance to all 130,000 children in my State.

If we don't act now, States will have to assume that CHIP is expiring, as they go through their budget process. In other words, CHIP funding runs out in September, but States—through their legislative process, where fiscal years often end during the early or mid-summer—need to begin to work this through their budgets right now.

The Utah legislature adjourns this week, March 12; New Mexico, March 21; Idaho, April 3; Tennessee, April 17; Alaska, April 19; Iowa, April 21; and Montana, April 27. All but seven State legislatures adjourn before September. That makes the need to act even more dire.

That is why I was proud to introduce legislation last month called the Protecting And Retaining Our Children's Health Insurance Program Act, or PRO-CHIP. It has been endorsed by every children's hospital in Ohio, almost all of them around the country, several national groups—the March of Dimes, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Children's Hospital Association, Families USA—all kinds of people, and all kinds of groups.

CHIP just makes sense. Protecting health coverage, protecting health insurance, and providing health insurance to low-income children isn't just the smart thing to do; it is the right thing to do.

I call on my colleagues to pass the CHIP refunding bill so that it doesn't run out in September. Then States can plan so we can provide the health insurance to 10 million children—almost all of whose parents work for a living and who simply don't make enough money to provide insurance for their families.

I yield the floor.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:04 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 10, 2015, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by  
the Senate March 9, 2015:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DANIEL HENRY MARTI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INTELLEC-  
TUAL PROPERTY ENFORCEMENT COORDINATOR, EXECU-  
TIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MICHELLE K. LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNDER SEC-  
RETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
AND DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND  
TRADEMARK OFFICE.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

JEFFERY S. HALL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF  
THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION BOARD, FARM

CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTO-  
BER 13, 2018.

DALLAS P. TONSAGER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE A  
MEMBER OF THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION  
BOARD, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TERM  
EXPIRING MAY 21, 2020.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED  
MARCH 11

9 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the National Nuclear Safety Administration.

SD-138

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Marine Corps ground modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the President's request for authorization to use force against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), focusing on military and diplomatic efforts.

SD-106

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for Indian Health Service.

SD-124

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for

fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-562

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings to examine a nationwide public safety wireless broadband network.

SR-253

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine state regulators' perspectives on the clean power plan.

SD-406

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine certain nominations.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Army.

SD-192

Committee on the Budget

To hold hearings to examine benefits of a balanced budget.

SD-608

2 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs

To hold hearings to examine protecting religious freedom abroad.

SD-124

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support

To hold hearings to examine military construction, environmental, energy, and base closure programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SH-216

Committee on Indian Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission.

SD-628

## MARCH 12

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.

SD-G50

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness

To hold hearings to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SR-253

9:45 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Legislative Branch

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Secretary of the Senate, the Senate Sergeant at Arms, and the Capitol Police.

SD-124

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Food and Drug Administration.

SD-138

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2016 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Marshals Service, Drug Enforcement Administration, and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; to be followed by a closed session in SVC-217 at approximately 12:00 p.m.

SD-192

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine S. 556, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting.

SD-366

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine protecting taxpayers from schemes and scams during the 2015 tax filing season.

SD-215

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Visa Waiver Program, focusing on implications for United States national security.

SD-342

10:30 a.m.

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine how prepared Americans are for retirement.

SD-562

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To receive a closed briefing on missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SVC-217

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

<p>MARCH 16</p> <p>4 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine Federal improper payments and errors in the Death Master File.</p> <p>SD-342</p>	<p>Committee on the Judiciary</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine immigration reform, focusing on the American worker.</p> <p>SD-226</p>	<p>10 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine U.S. crude oil export policy.</p> <p>SD-366</p>
<p>MARCH 17</p> <p>10 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine opportunities and challenges for agriculture trade with Cuba.</p> <p>SR-328A</p> <p>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine the state of technological innovation related to the electric grid.</p> <p>SD-366</p> <p>Committee on Environment and Public Works</p> <p>Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine S. 659, to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting.</p> <p>SD-406</p> <p>Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine America's health information technology (IT) transformation, focusing on translating the promise of electronic health records into better care.</p> <p>SD-430</p> <p>Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine securing the Southwest border, focusing on perspectives from beyond the beltway.</p> <p>SD-342</p>	<p>MARCH 18</p> <p>9:30 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services</p> <p>Subcommittee on SeaPower</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.</p> <p>SR-222</p> <p>10 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Veterans' Affairs</p> <p>To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation from multiple veterans service organizations.</p> <p>SD-G50</p> <p>2:30 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation</p> <p>To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission.</p> <p>SR-253</p> <p>MARCH 19</p> <p>9:30 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine U.S. Strategic Command, U.S. Transportation Command, and U.S. Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.</p> <p>SD-G50</p>	<p>2:30 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services</p> <p>Subcommittee on Airland</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine Air Force force structure and modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.</p> <p>SR-222</p> <p>MARCH 24</p> <p>10 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine management reforms to improve forest health and socioeconomic opportunities on the nation's forest system.</p> <p>SD-366</p> <p>MARCH 25</p> <p>2:30 p.m.</p> <p>Committee on Armed Services</p> <p>Subcommittee on Strategic Forces</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.</p> <p>SR-222</p> <p>MARCH 26</p> <p>10 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine the Administration's Quadrennial Energy Review.</p> <p>SD-366</p>



# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 10, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS).

## DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 10, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY HARRIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

## PRAYER

Reverend Scott Sina, St. John the Beloved Catholic Church, McLean, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Loving and gracious God, we ask that You pour out Your blessings on our Nation this day.

May these men and women, who are called here today as Representatives of the people of this country, be given an inspired vision of the common good, and may they meet the challenges they face with resolve and righteousness.

May Your grace bestow upon the Members of this House a lively hope and the virtues of justice, wisdom, and compassion that they may be instruments of Your holy will in carrying out their noble vocation as public servants.

We pray that the work of this House will contribute to the flourishing of this Nation so that all peoples and families will be raised in dignity, encouraged in solidarity, and blessed with ordered liberty.

We ask this through Christ, our Lord, who reigns forever and ever.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 134, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 134, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Friday, March 13, 2015.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, March 13, 2015, at 11 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

722. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Homeland Defense and Global Security, Department of Defense, transmitting the consolidated budget justification, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 229; to the Committee on Armed Services.

723. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that an Executive Order was issued declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Venezuela, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.; (H. Doc. No. 114—16); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DOLD, Mr. AMODEI, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 1343. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H.R. 1344. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1345. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend to physician assistants eligibility for Medicaid incentive payments for the adoption and use of certified electronic health records, whether or not such physician assistants practice at a rural health center or Federally qualified health center; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. BUSTOS,

Mr. COSTA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1346. A bill to require States to carry out congressional redistricting in accordance with a process under which members of the public are informed of redistricting proposals and have the opportunity to participate in the development of such proposals prior to their adoption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 1347. A bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 1348. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to allow individuals to opt out of the minimum required health benefits by permitting health insurance issuers to offer qualified health plans that offer alternative benefits to the minimum essential health benefits otherwise required, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GRAHAM:

H.R. 1349. A bill to authorize assistance to Israel to establish an anti-tunneling defense system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SERRANO (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. KING of New York, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HANNA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 1350. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1351. A bill to establish a State-sponsored national catastrophic risk consortium to ensure the availability and affordability

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of homeowners' insurance coverage for catastrophic events; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1352. A bill to establish student loan borrowers' rights to basic consumer protections, reasonable and flexible repayment options, access to earned credentials, and effective loan cancellation in exchange for public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART):

H. Res. 148. A resolution calling on the government of Iran to fulfill their promises of assistance in this case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 1343.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "... provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1344.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. BASS:

H.R. 1345.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

Section 1.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 1346.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. COOPER:

H.R. 1347.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 1348.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The authority to enact this bill is derived from, but may not be limited to, Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. GRAHAM:

H.R. 1349.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 1350.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution, which states that "The Congress shall have Power. . . . To establish Post Offices and post roads."

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1351.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1352.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (the Commerce Clause) and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (the Necessary and Proper Clause).

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 187: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 244: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 270: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 317: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 344: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 353: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 401: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 470: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 495: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 577: Mr. BLUM, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 592: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 642: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Ms. ROSELEHTINEN.

H.R. 712: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 716: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 721: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 831: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 885: Mr. REED and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 906: Mr. GOWDY and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 917: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 920: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 932: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 969: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 985: Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 986: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 987: Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 997: Mr. TURNER and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1017: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1034: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1043: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1092: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1132: Mr. HONDA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BERA, Mr. COOK, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. LEE, Mr. VALADAO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1147: Mr. BABIN, Mr. RATCLIFFE, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1180: Mr. BABIN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. LANCE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H.R. 1202: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1222: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1270: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1283: Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1329: Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1331: Mr. HIGGINS and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.J. Res. 32: Mr. SALMON.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H. Res. 11: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H. Res. 26: Mr. JORDAN.

H. Res. 119: Mr. PERRY, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 122: Mr. COOK and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 139: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

**SENATE—Tuesday, March 10, 2015**

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, the Reverend Adam Briddell, associate pastor of the Asbury United Methodist Church, right here in Washington, DC.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Holy God, You are a stronghold for the oppressed, a fortress in times of trouble. The heavens are the work of Your fingers. You established the Moon and the stars. Who are we, that You care for us? Who are we, that You promise us grace and mercy?

May Your greatness humble us. May Your light transform us. May Your love inspire us.

Inspire us to great acts of mercy, kindness, and justice. Inspire us to love You and love our neighbor. Inspire us to labor for the sake of Your Kingdom, to sacrifice for the least and the lost.

Today may the men and women of this great Chamber be found faithful to You.

This we pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

**HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, deep in shadow, there is a specter that haunts our country. In dark corners it claims thousands of victims every year—quietly, stealthily, maliciously. It is hard for many Americans to believe that human trafficking could happen where they live, but it does, right here in the United States—in all 50 of our States. And many of these victims are children.

In Kentucky alone the Commonwealth has been able to identify more

than 100 victims since it began keeping relevant records in 2013. While this kind of abuse often begins around the age of 13 or 14, there have been reports of victims in Kentucky as young as 2 months old. It is just about the most morally offensive thing you can imagine.

These victims need a voice, they need justice, and the new Congress is determined to give them both. That is just what the bill we are considering this week, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, aims to do.

I particularly want to thank Senator CORNYN for his hard work on this legislation. He has been a tireless advocate for it. I also want to note that this legislation has always been a bipartisan exercise. I want to thank the 13 Democratic cosponsors of the bill.

It is a bill that received a hearing in the Judiciary Committee earlier this year and was reported without a single negative vote. It has been thoroughly vetted and carefully crafted, which explains its bipartisan support in the Senate. That also explains the long list of endorsements outside the Senate, with organizations such as Shared Hope International, Rights4Girls, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children among its many supporters.

Here is what one of the broad coalitions backing this bill had to say about it. "The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act provides unprecedented support to domestic victims of trafficking, who are too often invisible and underserved," they wrote. "This legislation is vital."

I hope now that it has been brought to the floor, this bill continues to enjoy its strong record of constructive bipartisan support. It is similar to a measure that was passed by the House of Representatives.

The version before us also contains some additional provisions as well. For instance, Senator PORTMAN has offered ideas to improve the way we find missing kids and to strengthen law enforcement efforts to investigate and prosecute those who commit sex trafficking crimes.

It is good to see such a strong and bipartisan piece of legislation because victims of human trafficking should be treated as victims—not as criminals—because they should have the services and resources they need to rebuild their lives and because law enforcement should have the tools it needs to protect them and to combat these crimes. This bill aims to ensure these things actually happen, and I look forward to the Senate's good work to pass it.

**REMEMBERING EDWARD W. BROOKE**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later today a former Senate colleague will be honored at the National Cathedral and laid to rest in Arlington. Senator Brooke was a trailblazer. He was a model of honesty and courage in office. Through his example, Edward W. Brooke reminded Americans that anything was possible in their country. In the years since Senator Brooke left office, we have seen the truth of that statement.

So while I am sure the Brooke family will mourn a man they loved today, just as any family would, I hope those who loved Senator Brooke can remember they have a lot to be proud of, too, as does the Senate, as does our country.

We thank this path-breaking pioneer for his many years of service to our country, and we honor him today.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

**HEALTH CARE COSTS**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, all over the country today in newspapers and electronic media there is a story. I will just pick one of them out from the front page of the Washington Post today. The headline reads: "CBO: Health law will cost less than expected." It says: "President Obama's health-care law will cost taxpayers substantially less than previously estimated, congressional budget officials said Monday, in an upbeat note for a program that has faced withering criticism since its passage five years ago."

I would just note here that the opposition has come from my Republican colleagues in the Senate and the House. They voted 67 times to repeal it in the House. Of course, each time it has failed.

Continuing on in this article, it says:

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office attributed the savings to spending on medical care in coming years that will not be as great as previously forecast. As a result, the agency said, insurers are not expected to charge Americans as much for coverage, and the government will save on subsidies for low- and moderate-income people.

What's more, the CBO has concluded that companies are not canceling health insurance policies as often as had been anticipated earlier this year. Fewer Americans consequently are planning to sign up for insurance under the Affordable Care Act, generating more taxpayer savings.

In total, the health-care law will cost taxpayers . . . 11 percent less over the next decade than estimated in January. The cost of providing subsidies for people to buy insurance on the state and federal marketplaces—the centerpiece of the law—will be 20 percent lower than projected.

The article goes on and on about the good things that are happening with health care in America.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the official mission statement for the U.S. Attorney General reads:

To enforce the law and defend the interests of the United States according to the law; to ensure public safety against threats foreign and domestic; to provide federal leadership in preventing and controlling crime; to seek just punishment for those guilty of unlawful behavior; and to ensure fair and impartial administration of justice for all Americans.

That is a tremendous responsibility.

The U.S. Attorney General is more than just a lawyer or an administrator. An Attorney General is a defender, a crime fighter, and an advocate for Americans' rights. It is not an easy job, but President Obama's nominee Loretta Lynch is up to the task.

Throughout my time in the Senate, I have seen many qualified nominees, Republicans and Democrats—people such as Janet Reno, Madeline Albright, Colin Powell, and Hillary Rodham Clinton. Loretta Lynch, a graduate of Harvard Law School, is as qualified as any candidate I have ever seen in my 33 years in Congress.

Ms. Lynch currently serves as the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. She has been confirmed unanimously for that office by the Senate twice, most recently in 2010. During her time in the U.S. attorney's office, Loretta Lynch has proven herself to be a tough crimefighter. She has vigorously prosecuted drug dealers and criminals, corrupt politicians, and greedy Wall Street bankers.

Loretta Lynch is also a guardian of the Constitution. She takes the protections afforded to Americans in the Bill of Rights seriously. Almost two decades ago she helped bring to justice a Haitian immigrant who had been physically and sexually assaulted by police officers acting outside the law.

She has also defended human rights abroad. She was part of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, where she prosecuted suspects accused of one of the most heinous crimes in world history, the genocide carried out in Rwanda.

Whatever the case, whatever the crime, Loretta Lynch has protected the innocent and fought the guilty. She has been exemplary in defending the interests of the United States and its people. She is an ideal candidate to be America's top law enforcement officer. That is why she was nominated 121 days ago by President Obama.

I look forward to the Senate finishing this confirmation as soon as possible. The American people need Loretta Lynch in their corner.

Mr. President, what is the business of the day?

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, and the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes and that the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY, be allowed to follow me for as much time as he may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, every year millions of human beings around the world are forced into slave labor and sold for sex. This includes a large number of children. While these crimes are especially prevalent in countries where prosecution of trafficking is lax or essentially nonexistent, the truth is that human trafficking occurs in every country, including right here in the United States. Every year thousands of Americans—most frequently women and children—are trafficked within the borders of the United States.

A large number of the victims are children who are bought and sold to feed the twisted desires of sexual predators. That is a key phrase, “bought and sold,” because to the criminals who prey on these children, that is what it is about—buying and selling. It is a business. That is right—the sexual exploitation and brutalization of children, some of them not yet teenagers, is a business to the traffickers who ensnare them, and many of them get rich off of the horror these children endure.

Traffickers identify vulnerable targets—often children who are already living in difficult circumstances or come from broken homes. They then engage in calculated campaigns to win the trust of these vulnerable children and lure them into their orbit. After the child has been trapped, he or she is brought into a lifestyle whose horrors are difficult to adequately describe. These children are forced into a life of prostitution, their innocence repeatedly and brutally violated hundreds or thousands of times in a year. They are controlled by a combination of sexual, physical, and psychological abuse at the hands of their traffickers. Many of them become hooked on drugs as well thanks to their captors, who see drug dependence as a useful means of control.

Some children never escape from this life. They end up dead before they have even left their childhood behind, the victim of a dangerous encounter with a sexual predator or too violent a beating at the hands of a pimp. Those children who do escape can take years or decades to recover from the trauma. Post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and lasting physical injuries are just some of the challenges victims can face as they attempt to rebuild their lives. Some never recover.

All of this is nothing more than a business to the traffickers, who enrich themselves off the violation of the innocent. I am reminded of the verse in the Gospels “For what does it profit a man to gain the whole world but forfeit his soul?”

If there is any crime against which the human person revolts, it is the sexual brutalization of children. It is well known that even hardened criminals despise those who have hurt children in this way. Going after those who traffic in children should be a priority for local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies.

This week we are considering the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, a bill put together by my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas. I cosponsored this legislation because I believe it provides a number of important tools to strengthen our efforts to eradicate trafficking in this country and to help its victims.

This legislation would give law enforcement additional resources for targeting traffickers, including increased access to wiretaps for State and local task forces conducting human trafficking and child pornography investigations, authorization for programs targeting child exploitation, and offering law enforcement training for returning veterans who want to focus on combating human trafficking.

A large portion of the bill is focused on providing assistance to victims as they seek to regain their lives. Among

the bill's many victim-related provisions are, first, a deficit-neutral domestic trafficking victims fund to increase the Federal support available to trafficking victims, financed by increased penalties for those convicted of trafficking-related crimes; second, a new block grant program to help State and local governments expand the resources they offer to trafficking victims and strengthen their law enforcement efforts; third, a provision written by my colleague from South Dakota, Representative KRISTI NOEM, that would help expand the extremely limited housing available to recovering underaged trafficking victims; fourth, a notification requirement to ensure that trafficking victims are told of any plea bargains or deferred prosecution agreements in their case; fifth, a provision to give victims of child pornography access to the same services available to trafficking victims by classifying child pornography production as a type of human trafficking; and sixth, a human trafficking advisory council made up of trafficking survivors to make recommendations to the Federal Government.

This legislation has been endorsed by some of the leading organizations in the fight against human trafficking, including the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Shared Hope International, Rights4Girls, and the National Association to Protect Children. It is also supported by a bipartisan majority here in the Senate, and I am looking forward to passing it in the very near future.

The sooner we get these tools in the hands of law enforcement, the better. If we succeed in anything as a society, it should be in protecting the innocent. I hope this legislation will help advance the fight against trafficking in this country and help promote the healing of human trafficking's many victims.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### PROTECTING STUDENTS FROM SEXUAL AND VIOLENT PREDATORS ACT

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak on S. 474, the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act. This is a bipartisan bill. It is a bill I introduced with Senator JOE MANCHIN in the last Congress, and we recently reintroduced this bill. We also intend to offer this bill as an amendment to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act that the Senator from South Dakota was just discussing.

This is a bill which provides some crucial protections to our children, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this underlying bill. I am confident it is going to pass, and I certainly hope it will pass with our amendment.

The bipartisan amendment I will be introducing, the Protecting Students

from Sexual and Violent Predators Act, amends the underlying bill to protect even more children. That is what it does. It provides specific protections against convicted child molesters infiltrating our schools.

I will say up front that I fully recognize that the vast majority of school employees would never consider sexually or violently abusing the children in their care. We all understand that, but we also understand that there are pedophiles in this country and they seek out vulnerable children. That is what they do. They know the kids are concentrated in schools with no parents around, and that is what we have to protect these kids against.

I have been fighting for this for over a year now—together with Senator MANCHIN and others—and I will not stop fighting until we get this done. I have three very personal reasons that this fight is one I have taken on and I will continue with, and the personal reasons are my own kids. They are 14, 13, and almost 5 years old. I need to know, just as every parent needs to know, that when we put our child on a schoolbus that child is going somewhere where they are going to be safe, they are going to be protected, and they are not going to be victims, they are not going to fall prey to some of the very people who are supposed to be looking after them.

Unfortunately, for too many kids that is not true today, as is the story of one particular child who inspired this legislation. For a child named Jeremy Bell, the story begins in Delaware County, PA. One of the schoolteachers there molested several boys and raped one. Prosecutors decided they didn't have enough evidence to bring a case against this monster. The school knew what was going on, so they decided to dismiss the teacher for sexually abusing his students, but then, appallingly, the school decided to make sure he went off and became someone else's problem.

The Pennsylvania school wrote a letter of recommendation for that teacher, who took that letter of recommendation and brought it to the school he applied to work at in West Virginia. He got hired, and over time he became the principal. Well, these kinds of pedophiles do not change their ways, and he didn't change his ways in West Virginia. He continued to prey on kids. Eventually, he raped and then murdered a 12-year-old boy named Jeremy Bell.

Justice eventually caught up with the killer, and he is now serving a life sentence for that murder. But for little Jeremy Bell that justice came too late. And, sadly, Jeremy Bell is not alone. Last year we had 459 school employees across America arrested for sexual misconduct with the very children they are supposed to be protecting and teaching and caring for. That is more

than one per day. And those are just the ones where there was enough evidence to actually prosecute, to make an arrest and to pursue charges. How many others were getting away with this?

Frankly, 2015 is not off to a much better start. So far we are 69 days into the new year and there have already been 82 school employees arrested across the country for sexual misconduct with the schoolchildren in their care.

These are not just statistics. These are not just numbers on a page. These are children's lives, every single one of them; such as the little girl whose sexual abuse began at age 10 and only ended when at age 17 she found herself pregnant with the teacher's child; a teacher's aide who raped a young mentally disabled boy in his care; a kindergarten teacher who kept a child during recess and forced her to perform sexual acts on him.

It is hard to even talk about these changes, but they are happening—one school employee after another caught with child pornography. Sometimes these images are of kids who are just 1 year old. This is unbelievable. It is outrageous. But it is happening.

We in Congress have to do what we can to stop this, and we can do something. The Toomey-Manchin protecting students bill takes an important step in the direction of stopping these outrageous acts, and it does so by relying on two mechanisms to accomplish this. The first mechanism is to require schools to do appropriate criminal background checks so we are not knowingly hiring pedophiles in our schools; and the second is to ban this terrible practice by which schools knowingly send a letter of recommendation for one of these creeps to go somewhere else. They are recommending them so they become someone else's problem.

Neither of these mechanisms should be controversial. The House of Representatives unanimously passed a bill in the last Congress that has both of these mechanisms. I am proud of the fact we have three former House Members who voted for this bill last year who are now cosponsors of our legislation, including the junior Senator from West Virginia, from Colorado, and from Arkansas. I appreciate their support for this commonsense legislation.

Furthermore, a few months ago, every Member of the House and Senate except one voted for even more expansive background checks when we all voted in favor of the Child Care Development Block Grant bill. The combined vote in the House and Senate was 523 to 1. This is not controversial stuff.

So what would we actually do? What does the legislation accomplish? No. 1, criminal background checks. Every State has some kind of criminal background check now, that is true, but it is pretty obvious that many of them

are not adequate. For instance, too often there are whole categories of school employees who are not covered by the criminal background check, and too often States don't check all of the criminal databases that are available to them, and so these pedophiles are slipping through the cracks.

The protecting students act requires a school district that wants to take Federal funds to pay its teachers' salaries to perform background checks on all the workers who have unsupervised contact with the children. That would include new hires and existing hires.

Another reality is that many States have only recently adopted these background checks. They have hired employees prior to the legislation requiring the criminal background checks, and some of these employees have this kind of criminal background. Take the case of William Vahey, 64 years old. He taught for decades at some of the world's most elite schools. He started in California and then started working his way across the country. Do you know what he used to do? He used to give his young students Oreo cookies laced with sleeping pills, and when the boys fell asleep he molested them and he photographed it. Scores of children were sexually abused.

This teacher had been convicted for sexual abuse of children when he was in his twenties, but these school districts weren't doing a thorough background check so they weren't discovering these things. Well, the protecting students act ensures sex offenders such as William Vahey will not fall through the cracks. They will be discovered by a more thorough and rigorous background check system that our bill requires.

I should also point out our bill—the protecting students act—requires the schools to do the criminal background checks not just for teachers but for contractors as well—some schoolbus drivers, coaches, substitute teachers, anyone who comes in unsupervised contact with the kids. There are currently 12 States that have no such requirement at all. They do not check on the backgrounds of their contractors, despite the fact these folks come in regular contact with kids.

Case in point: In Montana, parents got a very rude awakening recently. An audit of Montana's schoolbus drivers found they have 123 drivers with criminal histories, including one driver whose conviction landed him on the Sexual and Violent Offender Registry and one with an outstanding arrest warrant.

Running these background checks on school workers is only going to be helpful if it is thorough, if it is adequate. So what the Toomey-Manchin bill does is it requires the background check include all four of the major crime databases that are available. There is the FBI fingerprint database, the National

Sex Offender Registry, the State criminal registry in each State, and the State Child Abuse and Neglect Registry.

This past August parents in Alaska learned that Alaska has an inadequate background check system, and it resulted in a known child rapist teaching in Alaska schools for 4 years. This is unbelievable, but this is what is happening. On August 29, Alaska State troopers arrested a middle school teacher in Kiana, AK. The teacher had fled Missouri 4 years earlier in order to escape an arrest warrant. Multiple witnesses accused the teacher over a decade of sexual and physical abuse of his own adopted children. He had raped and starved these children—his own children. This is unbelievable. The children literally had to burrow a hole in the wall and steal frozen food and warm it up, heat it on a furnace, just to survive.

This monster was able to leave the State and obtain a teaching job in Alaska for 4 years. When asked how in the world this could happen, the Department of Education of Alaska explained: Well, the Alaska background checks looked at the State criminal registry but not the Federal registry. So they had no idea he was a wanton, despicable criminal and had such a record in other States. Had our bill been in force, Alaska would have been required to check the Federal registry. They would have discovered this before ever hiring this monster.

This is the first part of our bill—this requirement we have these background checks. And again, there is nothing controversial here. The House of Representatives passed more expansive language unanimously in the last Congress. And a few months ago, as I mentioned, we had a combined House and Senate vote of 523 votes in favor and 1 vote in opposition to the Child Care Development Block Grant Act which imposes appropriate and rigorous background checks on those caring for our kids in daycare. That makes perfect sense. We should be screening out pedophiles from working in our daycares, but we also should be providing the same level of protection to kids who are a little bit older, who are in grade school or middle school or high school.

There is a second part to our legislation, and it addresses this outrageous practice of what is known as passing the trash. This is that unbelievable act that resulted in the death of Jeremy Bell, when a letter of recommendation allowed a known pedophile to be employed in West Virginia.

Our bill simply says if a State wants to receive Federal taxpayer money, it can't knowingly help a child molester get a job somewhere else. How can this even be controversial? But the fact is this is an all too prevalent practice, and it is long past time we do something about this.

Two weeks ago, WUSA News 9 reported some shocking news on the public school system of Montgomery County, MD. Since 2011, 21 Montgomery County public school employees or contract workers have been investigated for child sex abuse or exploitation. The news station learned that the Montgomery County public school system "keeps a confidential database of personnel who demonstrate inappropriate or suspicious behavior towards children."

This school system has this watch list of suspected abusers who are working in the area's schools, and WUSA 9 learned the school system had a record, a known record, of passing the trash. For example, elementary school teacher Daniel Picca had been abusing children for 17 years. The school system knew about it. What did they do? The teacher's punishment was to move him from one elementary school to another, again and again and again. There was 17 years of passing a known child molester from 1 school to another. How many kids did he victimize?

This has to stop. It is long overdue we do something about this, and there is a way we can. We can make it illegal to knowingly recommend a pedophile for employment somewhere else. That is what our bill does.

Another example: Recently, in Las Vegas, NV, a kindergarten teacher was arrested for kidnapping a 16-year-old girl and infecting her with a sexually transmitted disease. This same teacher had molested six children—all fourth and fifth graders—several years before, but he did it in the Los Angeles school district. While the Los Angeles school district knew about the allegations in 2009, the school district recommended settling a lawsuit that alleged the teacher had molested these children. The Nevada school district specifically asked: Have there been any criminal concerns regarding this teacher? The Los Angeles school district didn't only hide the truth, they provided three letters of recommendation—three references—for this teacher.

Now for those people who say: Well, the States can fix this problem all on their own, I ask you: What could Nevada do to protect itself from what teachers or school districts are doing in Los Angeles? What could West Virginia have done about a Pennsylvania school district that sent a teacher across the State line with a letter of recommendation? There is nothing one State can do to bind another State. This requires a Federal solution.

Let me sum this up. The Toomey-Manchin bill offers a very simple proposition. If a school district wants to use Federal tax dollars to hire school employees, it has to make sure they are not hiring pedophiles in the process. I think that is pretty reasonable. Specifically, they need to perform background checks on any worker who

comes in unsupervised contact with children, and they need to stop passing the trash.

I can't believe this is even controversial. There is nobody who can stand here and say protections against child sex predators are not urgently needed, not in light of the daily revelations we are discovering.

Again, this legislation has overwhelming bipartisan support. It passed the House unanimously. How many bills pass the House unanimously these days? This did. And every Member of the House and Senate except one voted for even more extensive background checks to protect our youngest kids in childcare. Can't we provide the same protection to slightly older kids? The legislation has been endorsed by innumerable child advocate and law enforcement groups, including the National Children's Alliance, which accredits and represents the Nation's 777 child advocacy centers. Yet I am afraid we are probably going to have some opposition voiced about this legislation when we offer the amendment.

Let me be clear. First, we are not opposing a mandate on the States. We don't have the legal authority to do that. What we are simply saying is if States want to take Federal funds, they need to protect children from violent and sexual predators. If States don't want to take those measures, then they can choose not to take Federal funds. If a State has no interest in having a rigorous system for protecting kids, well, that is their decision, but we don't have to send Federal tax dollars to pay the salaries of pedophiles.

Let me conclude. This is a common-sense bill. It is long overdue. It has very broad bipartisan support. It passed the House unanimously. As I said, in this body, all but one Member voted for an even more expansive background check.

Several Senators have voiced some specific concerns, and I am working with several of them. I am willing to work with Senators who want to find ways to constructively improve this bill, but I am not going to support a bill that waters down our ability to protect our kids from pedophiles in school.

I hope this body will overwhelmingly adopt the legislation that passed the House unanimously, and we can begin to have a more thorough and effective process of protecting our kids.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Is my understanding correct that it is the time for the minority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. There is 24 minutes remaining.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Chair.

#### AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, when 47 Republican Senators signed a letter sent to the Ayatollah Khomeini, it was a letter that although supposedly instructive of the constitutional provisions of the separation of government in the United States, in effect, it was a letter to erode the negotiating position of the President of the United States and his administration in trying to reach an agreement to not have a nuclear weapon capability of building a bomb in Iran.

I think history will show the strength of American foreign policy has always been bipartisanship when it comes to the interests of America as we look out and have to defend ourselves against our enemies. Indeed, Iran with a nuclear bomb would be one of the gravest threats to our national security as well as to our allies. It saddens me that we have come to the point where we are so divided that nearly half of the Senators, on a partisan basis, in this great institution of the U.S. Senate, would in effect try to cut the legs from underneath the President and his administration in trying to reach an agreement to avert a nuclear bomb.

So much has been said about this issue, but one common theme runs throughout, and it is that people seem to know what the agreement is as it is being negotiated in secret. This Senator will reserve judgment. This Senator is also an original cosponsor of the bill we filed to have Congress weigh in on any future lifting of economic sanctions that have been imposed by the Congress, and this Senator feels that is an appropriate role, under the separation of powers, of our job as Congress. But when we see a major part, on a partisan basis, of our government try to undercut and kill the negotiations while they are going on at this very moment in Geneva, then that goes a step too far.

I am saddened. I think about what this Senator would have done when the President was not Barack Obama but George Bush. I cannot imagine that I would have tried to undercut the President of the United States representing this country and trying, on matters of war and peace, to keep peace. We can disagree about the specifics, but we still have to honor the institution of the Presidency, and when it becomes matters of war and peace, then we have to unify. That is why I am so saddened that we have come to the point at which we appear to be so divided.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Florida for his comments and I echo those this morning.

To the Presiding Officer and to the Members of the Senate, it was 70 years

ago this year, in this very Chamber, that the Republican Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, gave a speech which has been called the speech heard around the world. Here is how Senator Vandenberg opened that speech:

Mr. President, there are critical moments in the life of every nation which call for the straightest, the plainest, and the most courageous thinking of which we are capable. We confront such a moment now. It is not only desperately important to America, it is important to the world. It is important not only to the generation which lives in blood. It is important to future generations if they shall live in peace.

This was after World War I and World War II, facing the Cold War and many challenges.

Senator Vandenberg was no friend of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He was, in fact, the biggest thorn in the President's side. He opposed every New Deal program. He was bitterly opposed to U.S. engagement in Europe before World War II. He was the Nation's most famous isolationist and only moderated his stance after the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

But 70 years ago Senator Vandenberg spoke on the floor of the Senate to warn his colleagues about what would happen if the United States of America allowed partisan politics to interfere in our Nation's leadership in the world. He later became the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where he coined the phrase "politics stops at the water's edge."

Politics stops at the water's edge.

His wisdom when it came to foreign policy—his understanding that for America to be strong, we must convey strength on the world's stage—earned him a rare recognition, in fact, in this body.

My colleagues will recognize this picture because it is a painting hanging in the room right outside this Chamber. I was honored to be there when it was unveiled—Senator Levin and myself—a few years ago. We are proud of this Republican Senator from Michigan. He has been given an honor that is shared by only a handful of Senators. In our Senate history, out of 1,963 Senators—men and women who have served—only a small group have been honored with a painting, a portrait just outside this Chamber, and he is one of them.

I can only imagine what Senator Vandenberg would say if he were alive today. How would he react to a letter signed by 47 U.S. Senators, all of his own party, addressed to the leaders—those we have called enemies—of Iran? How would he react to Members of the U.S. Senate empowering Iranian hardliners—those whom we have called enemies time and time and time again—just to score political points against a President they do not like?

To be clear, Senator Vandenberg loathed President Roosevelt, and by all accounts the feelings were mutual.



Senator Vandenberg was no model of bipartisanship himself. He was not at all what we would call a moderate in his time. He may be considered a moderate today, but at the time he was extremely partisan as a Republican, and he was very prominent. He disagreed with the President's policies relating to Japan, but he didn't send a letter to the Emperor of Japan undermining the foreign policy of the President of the United States. He disagreed with the President's policies relating to Germany, but he did not send a letter to the chancellor of the Third Reich expressing his disagreements with the President of the United States.

To be clear, one of the great things about America is that we can and should and must disagree with the President when we disagree with directions and policies. But when war hangs in the balance—and specifically when nuclear war hangs in the balance—should Members of the U.S. Senate be in a position of publicly undermining the President of the United States to our enemies? I do not believe Senator Vandenberg would have become pen pals with a group of extremists whose stated goal is “death to America.”

It is shocking, dangerous, and deeply troubling to me that 47 Members of this body decided to throw away 70 years of wisdom to stand on the side of the Ayatollahs and the most extreme voices in Iran.

When President Bush decided to invade Iraq, I voted no. I voted against his policies. I spoke out publicly about my concerns about that war, but I never would have sent a letter to Saddam Hussein undermining the President before that war happened.

The chairs of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the chairs of the Senate Intelligence Committee, and the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at that time all opposed President Bush's invasion of Iraq, but none of them penned a letter to Saddam Hussein.

I do not have to wonder what Senator Vandenberg would have thought about all this because he told us. He told us 70 years ago in this very room when explaining how partisanship and division would undermine our efforts in Europe.

Senator Vandenberg said:

It must mean one for all and all for one; and it will mean this—unless somewhere in this grand alliance the stupid and sinister folly of ulterior ambitions shall invite the enemy to postpone our victory through our own rivalries and our own confusion.

So I urge my colleagues to hear the words of the Republican Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg. I urge them to stop the politics at the water's edge.

We are talking about the possibility of a nuclear Iran. We all agree that must not happen. We all agree that must not happen. We all agree that must not happen. We must stand to-

gether with the smartest, most effective strategy to make sure that does not happen. That is even more reason why this is not the time nor the place to score political points against the President of the opposite party. This is deadly serious for the United States, for Israel, and for the world.

As the Senate saw fit to give Senator Vandenberg a place of high honor, reserved for only a few Senate leaders, just a few steps from here in the U.S. Capitol, I hope my colleagues will hear and take heed of his words now.

He said:

We cannot drift to victory. We must have maximum united effort on all fronts. . . . And we must deserve, we must deserve the continued united effort of our own people. . . . politics must stop at the water's edge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The assistant minority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me commend my colleagues Senator NELSON from Florida and Senator STABENOW from Michigan for their statements. Senator NELSON spoke from his heart and spoke for many of us on both sides of the aisle who feel this letter sent by 47 Senators undermines the efforts of the President of the United States to avoid a nuclear Iran and to avoid a military response.

I particularly want to thank my colleague Senator STABENOW from Michigan for recalling that moment in history which any student of the Senate knows was something that made a difference in the foreign policy of the United States of America for 70 years. It is seldom that any of us comes to the floor and thinks that our speeches will be remembered for 70 minutes, but 70 years later Arthur Vandenberg, Republican of Michigan, set a standard for foreign policy which has guided our country since. At a time of deep political division after World War II, this self-described isolationist and extremely conservative enemy of the New Deal stood and called for unity when it comes to foreign policy. His admonition that politics should stop at the water's edge has largely guided us.

When we look at all the controversies that have ensued since then—think of the Vietnam war and what was going on in this body during that war, the deep divisions between Democrats and Republicans, those who were against the war and for the war. Yet there was never, ever anything like we have seen with this letter sent by 47 Republican Senators.

I am glad it didn't occur then, even though I had deep misgivings and trouble with the Vietnam war in its execution. I would have had to have been reckless to endorse an idea that our Nation, through its Senate, would

reach out to the Vietnamese during the course of that war, when so many lives were at stake and so many lives were lost.

So here we are today—a letter sent by 47 Republican Senators. We have talked about the impact of that. Reflect for a moment on the impact of that letter on our allies who are sitting at the table in Geneva, our allies who joined us in imposing the strictest sanctions in history on Iran to force them into negotiation, our allies, sitting with Secretary Kerry and representatives of our government, who must look at this letter from 47 Republicans and say: Why are we wasting our time? What they are saying is no matter what we do—because no agreement has been announced—no matter what we do, the Republican Senate is going to reject it. That is what the letter says.

It goes on to say—and this is a little bit of chutzpah according to the New York Times. The Senators signing the letter go on to remind the Ayatollah, who is not term-limited, that they have 6-year terms and may be around for decades—decades—and basically say to the Iranians: Don't even waste your time thinking about negotiating.

It is not a waste of time because the alternatives are absolutely horrifying. The alternative of a nuclear Iran would be a threat not only to the Nation of Israel and many other Middle Eastern States and countries beyond, in Europe and other places, but it would invite a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. The ending is totally unacceptable and unpredictable.

So is it worth negotiating? Is it worth trying to find a way to avoid a nuclear Iran? Of course it is. Should the negotiations fail—and they might. I hope not because of this letter, but they might—then what do we face; bringing Iran to its knees with more sanctions? Whom will we call on for these sanctions? Whom will we turn to and say: Will you join us in a more strict sanctions regime? The very same allies who sat at this table and saw this letter from 47 Republican Senators saying to them: Don't waste your time; we have the last word when it comes to Iran.

I don't believe the Republican leadership was thinking clearly when they signed on to this letter. I don't think they understood the gravity of their action. They certainly were premature, at the minimum. We don't have an agreement. We are days away from understanding whether there is a possibility of an agreement. Yet these 47 Senators have basically said: Don't waste your time; we are not going to accept it no matter what it is.

This is a sad outcome. Similar to the Senator from Michigan, I was 1 of 23 who voted against the invasion of Iraq. I never dreamed for one minute of sending a letter to Saddam Hussein before that vote instructing him about

the politics of America. It turns out that in the history of the Senate that has rarely, if ever, occurred.

I hope now that those 47 Republican Senators will reflect on their actions and reflect on the impact it will have. I hope the American people understand the President is embarking on a very difficult and delicate mission to try to negotiate a verifiable end to the nuclear arms race in the Middle East and specifically to end nuclear capability in Iran. He may not achieve it, but I respect him for trying. He is the Commander in Chief of the United States of America. He is the elected leader of our Nation. Though many in this Chamber cannot accept it, he is the President of the United States, and he deserves our respect.

I respected President George W. Bush, even when I disagreed with him on his policies on Iraq, and we should expect nothing less of the loyal minority when it comes to this President as well.

I conclude by saying the Senate has an important role to play. But the President's role, speaking for the United States—trying to avoid a nuclear Iran, trying to avoid a military conflict, another war in the Middle East—is something that should not be undermined for political ambition.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to completely align myself with views of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. This isn't a case of who can score political points for the evening news broadcast. We are talking about potentially the lives of millions of people. We are talking about the possibility of a cataclysmic mistake that could create havoc long after any of us has left this body. I have had the honor of representing Vermont in the Senate beginning at the time when Gerald Ford was President.

We have had Presidents I have agreed with—in fact, with every President there have been things I agreed with and with every President, Democratic or Republican, there have been things I have disagreed with. But one thing I have always done when there are such negotiations going on, I am willing to talk to the President privately, but I am not going to state my position, for or against, publicly. We can only have one person negotiating for the United States. Can you imagine if everybody who wanted to rush to the cable news shows to get on TV were to say, well, here is our negotiating position—and we are going to force the President to leave the negotiating table? What do you think those countries that joined us in imposing multilateral sanctions would do?

Many of those countries that joined us are doing so at great economic cost to themselves, but they responded—

when President Obama went to each of them and asked: Will you join us in imposing sanctions, they agreed. That made the sanctions far more effective. If they think we are not serious, they are going to be very tempted to ask: Why should we join you in supporting sanctions in the future? If the United States were alone in supporting sanctions, no matter what those sanctions are, it would not create any real pressure on Iran.

Have we not made enough mistakes in the Middle East? I remember some who said we must go to war in Iraq because it would protect Israel or because they had nuclear weapons or because they had weapons of mass destruction. None of that was true. None of it. I remember people stopping me on the street, angry that I voted against the war in Iraq. They said: We heard Vice President Cheney say they have nuclear weapons. I said: There are none.

The senior Senator from Michigan, in quoting Arthur Vandenberg—he was no fan of Franklin Roosevelt, quite the opposite, but he did say, as we were going into World War II, “politics must stop at the water's edge.” That has been the view in my own State of both Republicans and Democrats.

Let's stop rushing for the cameras and potentially hurting the Senate, potentially hurting the country. Let's think about what is best for the country.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the floor, so I will yield the floor so he can speak.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

## JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 178

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) *SHORT TITLE.*—This Act may be cited as the “Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

### TITLE I—JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

Sec. 101. Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund.

Sec. 102. Clarifying the benefits and protections offered to domestic victims of human trafficking.

Sec. 103. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.

Sec. 104. Direct services for victims of child pornography.

Sec. 105. Increasing compensation and restitution for trafficking victims.

Sec. 106. Streamlining human trafficking investigations.

Sec. 107. Enhancing human trafficking reporting.

Sec. 108. Reducing demand for sex trafficking.

Sec. 109. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 110. Using existing task forces and components to target offenders who exploit children.

Sec. 111. Targeting child predators.

Sec. 112. Monitoring all human traffickers as violent criminals.

Sec. 113. Crime victims' rights.

Sec. 114. Combat Human Trafficking Act.

Sec. 115. Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act.

Sec. 116. Bringing Missing Children Home Act.

Sec. 117. Grant accountability.

### TITLE II—COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Subtitle A—Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking

Sec. 201. Amendments to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

Subtitle B—Improving the Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking

Sec. 211. Response to victims of child sex trafficking.

Subtitle C—Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking

Sec. 221. Victim of trafficking defined.

Sec. 222. Interagency task force report on child trafficking primary prevention.

Sec. 223. GAO Report on intervention.

Sec. 224. Provision of housing permitted to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking.

### TITLE III—HERO ACT

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. HERO Act.

### TITLE I—JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

#### SEC. 101. DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “§3014. Additional special assessment

“(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 and ending on September, 30 2019, in addition to the assessment imposed under section 3013, the court shall assess an amount of \$5,000 on any non-indigent person or entity convicted of an offense under—

“(1) chapter 77 (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons);

“(2) chapter 109A (relating to sexual abuse);

“(3) chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation and other abuse of children);

“(4) chapter 117 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes); or

“(5) section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) (relating to human smuggling), unless the person induced, assisted, abetted, or aided only an individual who at the time of such action was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter (and no other individual) to enter the United States in violation of law.

“(b) *SATISFACTION OF OTHER COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS.*—An assessment under subsection

(a) shall not be payable until the person subject to the assessment has satisfied all outstanding court-ordered fines and orders of restitution arising from the criminal convictions on which the special assessment is based.

“(c) **ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS’ FUND.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ‘Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Fund’), to be administered by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(d) **DEPOSITS.**—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, or any other law regarding the crediting of money received for the Government, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended.

“(e) **USE OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—From amounts in the Fund, in addition to any other amounts available, and without further appropriation, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, use amounts available in the Fund to award grants or enhance victims’ programming under—

“(A) sections 202, 203, and 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a, 14044b, and 14044c);

“(B) subsections (b)(2) and (f) of section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105); and

“(C) section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(2) **GRANTS.**—Of the amounts in the Fund used under paragraph (1), not less than \$2,000,000, if such amounts are available in the Fund during the relevant fiscal year, shall be used for grants to provide services for child pornography victims under section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(3) **LIMITATIONS.**—Amounts in the Fund, or otherwise transferred from the Fund, shall be subject to the limitations on the use or expending of amounts described in sections 506 and 507 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76; 128 Stat. 409) to the same extent as if amounts in the Fund were funds appropriated under division H of such Act.

“(f) **TRANSFERS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the day after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, on September 30 of each fiscal year, all unobligated balances in the Fund shall be transferred to the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

“(2) **AVAILABILITY.**—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be available for any authorized purpose of the Crime Victims Fund; and

“(B) shall remain available until expended.

“(g) **COLLECTION METHOD.**—The amount assessed under subsection (a) shall, subject to subsection (b), be collected in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases.

“(h) **DURATION OF OBLIGATION.**—Subject to section 3613(b), the obligation to pay an assessment imposed on or after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 shall not cease until the assessment is paid in full.”.

(b) **TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections for chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3013 the following:

“3014. Additional special assessment.”.

**SEC. 102. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS OFFERED TO DOMESTIC VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**

Section 107(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) **NO REQUIREMENT OF OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to require United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in this subsection or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (H), as redesignated, by striking “subparagraph (F)” and inserting “subparagraph (G)”.

**SEC. 103. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended to read as follows:

**“SEC. 203. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.**

“(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Attorney General may award block grants to an eligible entity to develop, improve, or expand domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims’ services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

“(b) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

“(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

“(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

“(B) address the unique needs of child victims of human trafficking;

“(C) facilitate the rescue of child victims of human trafficking;

“(D) investigate and prosecute acts of human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking; and

“(E) utilize, implement, and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of child sex trafficking victims for prostitution offenses, and other laws aimed at the investigation and prosecution of child human trafficking;

“(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

“(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer’s time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

“(i) wire taps;

“(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

“(iii) travel; and

“(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

“(C) dedicated anti-trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenders, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims’ services through coordination with—

“(i) child advocacy centers;

“(ii) social service agencies;

“(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

“(iv) housing agencies;

“(v) legal services agencies; and

“(vi) nongovernmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking; and

“(E) the establishment or enhancement of other necessary victim assistance programs or personnel, such as victim or child advocates, child-protective services, child forensic interviews, or other necessary service providers; and

“(3) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for trafficking victims that include—

“(A) mandatory and regular training requirements for judicial officials involved in the administration or operation of the court program described under this paragraph;

“(B) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking, including case worker or child welfare supervision in collaboration with judicial officers, who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

“(C) the development of a specialized and individualized, court-ordered treatment program for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

“(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

“(ii) life skills training;

“(iii) housing placement;

“(iv) vocational training;

“(v) education;

“(vi) family support services; and

“(vii) job placement;

“(D) centralized case management involving the consolidation of all of each child human trafficking victim’s cases and offenses, and the coordination of all trafficking victim treatment programs and social services;

“(E) regular and mandatory court appearances by the victim during the duration of the treatment program for purposes of ensuring compliance and effectiveness;

“(F) the ultimate dismissal of relevant non-violent criminal charges against the victim, where such victim successfully complies with the terms of the court-ordered treatment program; and

“(G) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and nongovernmental organizations with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to

victims of child human trafficking to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

“(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

“(B) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant;

“(C) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section; and

“(D) disclose—

“(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

“(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period ending on the date of the submission of an application under this section.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

“(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b); or

“(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

“(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 3 years after the date of award of the grant.

“(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 2 times and for a period of not greater than 2 years.

“(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall—

“(1) enter into a contract with a nongovernmental organization, including an academic or nonprofit organization, that has experience with issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct periodic evaluations of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section;

“(2) instruct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to review evaluations issued under paragraph (1) to determine the methodological and statistical validity of the evaluations; and

“(3) submit the results of any evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

“(f) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity awarded funds under this section that is found to have used grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the block grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

“(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if within the 5 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section, the grantee has been found to have

violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

“(h) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount expended to carry out this section.

“(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section shall be—

“(1) 70 percent in the first year;

“(2) 60 percent in the second year; and

“(3) 50 percent in the third year, and in all subsequent years.

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING; FULLY OFFSET.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, is authorized to award not more than \$7,000,000 of the funds available in the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund, established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘child’ means a person under the age of 18;

“(2) the term ‘child advocacy center’ means a center created under subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

“(3) the term ‘child human trafficking’ means 1 or more severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving a victim who is a child; and

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State or unit of local government that—

“(A) has significant criminal activity involving child human trafficking;

“(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing child human trafficking;

“(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat child human trafficking, including—

“(i) the establishment of a shelter for victims of child human trafficking, through existing or new facilities;

“(ii) the provision of trauma-informed, gender-responsive rehabilitative care to victims of child human trafficking;

“(iii) the provision of specialized training for law enforcement officers and social service providers for all forms of human trafficking, with a focus on domestic child human trafficking;

“(iv) prevention, deterrence, and prosecution of offenses involving child human trafficking, including soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing human acts with children;

“(v) cooperation or referral agreements with organizations providing outreach or other related services to runaway and homeless youth;

“(vi) law enforcement protocols or procedures to screen all individuals arrested for prostitution, whether adult or child, for victimization by sex trafficking and by other crimes, such as sexual assault and domestic violence; and

“(vii) cooperation or referral agreements with State child welfare agencies and child advocacy centers; and

“(D) provides an assurance that, under the plan under subparagraph (C), a victim of child human trafficking shall not be required to collaborate with law enforcement officers to have access to any shelter or services provided with a grant under this section.

“(l) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY; SPECIALIZED VICTIMS' SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—No grant funds under this section may be awarded or transferred to any entity unless such entity has demonstrated substantial experience providing services to victims of human trafficking or re-

lated populations (such as runaway and homeless youth), or employs staff specialized in the treatment of human trafficking victims.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7101 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 203 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 203. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.”.

#### SEC. 104. DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(5) (42 U.S.C. 13001a(5)), by inserting “, including human trafficking and the production of child pornography” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 214 (42 U.S.C. 13002)—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director and with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, may make grants to develop and implement specialized programs to identify and provide direct services to victims of child pornography.”.

#### SEC. 105. INCREASING COMPENSATION AND RESTITUTION FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18.—Section 1594 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “that was used or” and inserting “that was involved in, used, or”; and

(ii) by inserting “, and any property traceable to such property” after “such violation”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or any property traceable to such property” after “such violation”;

(2) in subsection (e)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking “used or” and inserting “involved in, used, or”; and

(B) by inserting “, and any property traceable to such property” after “any violation of this chapter”;

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) TRANSFER OF FORFEITED ASSETS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General shall transfer assets forfeited pursuant to this section, or the proceeds derived from the sale thereof, to satisfy victim restitution orders arising from violations of this chapter.

“(2) PRIORITY.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall have priority over any other claims to the assets or their proceeds.

“(3) USE OF NONFORFEITED ASSETS.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not reduce or otherwise mitigate the obligation of a person convicted of a violation of this chapter to satisfy the full amount of a restitution order through the use of non-forfeited assets or to reimburse the Attorney General for the value of assets or proceeds transferred under this subsection through the use of nonforfeited assets.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.—Section 524(c)(1)(B) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “chapter 77 of title 18,” after “criminal drug laws of the United States or of”.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 9703 (as added by section 638(b)(1) of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-393; 106 Stat. 1779)) as section 9705; and

(B) in section 9705(a), as redesignated—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (I)—

(aa) by striking “payment” and inserting “Payment”; and

(bb) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(II) in subparagraph (J), by striking “payment” and inserting “Payment”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) in clause (iii)—

(AA) in subclause (I), by striking “or” and inserting “of”; and

(BB) in subclause (III), by striking “and” at the end;

(bb) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(cc) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement with respect to a violation of chapter 77 of title 18 (relating to human trafficking);”;

(II) in subparagraph (G), by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) in subparagraph (H), by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CROSS REFERENCES.—

(i) TITLE 28.—Section 524(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking “section 9703(g)(4)(A)(ii)” and inserting “section 9705(g)(4)(A)”;

(II) in paragraph (10), by striking “section 9703(p)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”;

(III) in paragraph (11), by striking “section 9703” and inserting “section 9705”.

(ii) TITLE 31.—Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in section 312(d), by striking “section 9703” and inserting “section 9705”; and

(II) in section 5340(1), by striking “section 9703(p)(1)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”.

(iii) TITLE 39.—Section 2003(e)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 9703(p)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”.

(B) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“9701. Fees and charges for Government services and things of value.

“9702. Investment of trust funds.

“9703. Managerial accountability and flexibility.

“9704. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility.

“9705. Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund.”.

#### SEC. 106. STREAMLINING HUMAN TRAFFICKING INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (a), by inserting a comma after “weapons”;

(B) in subparagraph (c)—

(i) by inserting “section 1581 (peonage), section 1584 (involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),” before “section 1591”;

(ii) by inserting “section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),” before “section 1751”;

(iii) by inserting a comma after “virus”;

(iv) by striking “., section” and inserting a comma;

(v) by striking “or” after “misuse of passports,”; and

(vi) by inserting “or” before “section 555”;

(C) in subparagraph (j), by striking “pipeline,” and inserting “pipeline,”; and

(D) in subparagraph (p), by striking “documents, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)” and inserting “documents”, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “human trafficking, child sexual exploitation, child pornography production,” after “kidnapping”.

#### SEC. 107. ENHANCING HUMAN TRAFFICKING REPORTING.

Section 505 of title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) PART 1 VIOLENT CRIMES TO INCLUDE HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘part 1 violent crimes’ shall include severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).”.

#### SEC. 108. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “or maintains” and inserting “maintains, patronizes, or solicits”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “or maintained” and inserting “, maintained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) by striking “knew that the person” and inserting “knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person”.

(b) DEFINITION AMENDED.—Section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) is amended by striking “or obtaining” and inserting “obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting”.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the amendments made by this section is to clarify the range of conduct punished as sex trafficking.

#### SEC. 109. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, defines a sex trafficker as a person who “knowingly... recruits, entices, harbors, transports, provides, obtains, or maintains by any means a person... knowing, or in reckless disregard of the fact, that means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion... or any combination of such means will be used to cause the person to engage in a commercial sex act, or that the person has not attained the age of 18 years and will be caused to engage in a commercial sex act”;

(2) while use of the word “obtains” in section 1591, United States Code, has been interpreted, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, to encompass those who purchase illicit sexual acts from trafficking victims, some confusion persists;

(3) in *United States vs. Jungers*, 702 F.3d 1066 (8th Cir. 2013), the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit ruled that section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, applied to persons who purchase illicit sexual acts with trafficking victims after the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota erroneously granted motions to acquit these buyers in two separate cases; and

(4) section 108 of this title amends section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, to add the words

“solicits or patronizes” to the sex trafficking statute making absolutely clear for judges, juries, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials that criminals who purchase sexual acts from human trafficking victims may be arrested, prosecuted, and convicted as sex trafficking offenders when this is merited by the facts of a particular case.

#### SEC. 110. USING EXISTING TASK FORCES AND COMPONENTS TO TARGET OFFENDERS WHO EXPLOIT CHILDREN.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall ensure that—

(1) all task forces and working groups within the Innocence Lost National Initiative engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the investigative capabilities of State and local law enforcement officers in the detection, investigation, and prosecution of persons who patronize, or solicit children for sex; and

(2) all components and task forces with jurisdiction to detect, investigate, and prosecute cases of child labor trafficking engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the capacity of such components to deter and punish child labor trafficking.

#### SEC. 111. TARGETING CHILD PREDATORS.

(a) CLARIFYING THAT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PRODUCERS ARE HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.—Section 2423(f) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “means (1) a” and inserting the following: “means—

“(1) a”;

(2) by striking “United States; or (2) any” and inserting the following: “United States;

“(2) any”; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; or

“(3) production of child pornography (as defined in section 2256(8)).”.

(b) HOLDING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACCOUNTABLE.—Section 2423(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “a preponderance of the evidence” and inserting “clear and convincing evidence”.

#### SEC. 112. MONITORING ALL HUMAN TRAFFICKERS AS VIOLENT CRIMINALS.

Section 3156(a)(4)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “77,” after “chapter”.

#### SEC. 113. CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea bargain or deferred prosecution agreement.

“(10) The right to be informed of the rights under this section and the services described in section 503(c) of the Victims' Rights and Restitution Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 10607(c)) and provided contact information for the Office of the Victims' Rights Ombudsman of the Department of Justice.”;

(2) in subsection (d)(3), in the fifth sentence, by inserting “, unless the litigants, with the approval of the court, have stipulated to a different time period for consideration” before the period; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “this chapter, the term” and inserting the following: “this chapter:

“(1) COURT OF APPEALS.—The term ‘court of appeals’ means—

“(A) the United States court of appeals for the judicial district in which a defendant is being prosecuted; or

“(B) for a prosecution in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

“(2) CRIME VICTIM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term”;  
(B) by striking “In the case” and inserting the following:

“(B) MINORS AND CERTAIN OTHER VICTIMS.—In the case”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) DISTRICT COURT; COURT.—The terms ‘district court’ and ‘court’ include the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.”.

(b) CRIME VICTIMS FUND.—Section 1402(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601(d)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting “section” before “3771”.

(c) APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: “In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.”.

(2) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 114. COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015”.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMERCIAL SEX ACT; SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS; STATE; TASK FORCE.—The terms “commercial sex act”, “severe forms of trafficking in persons”, “State”, and “Task Force” have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(2) COVERED OFFENDER.—The term “covered offender” means an individual who obtains, patronizes, or solicits a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(3) COVERED OFFENSE.—The term “covered offense” means the provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(4) FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term “Federal law enforcement officer” has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(5) LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term “local law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a unit of local government authorized by law or by a local government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(6) STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.—The term “State law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TRAINING AND POLICY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, PROSECUTORS, AND JUDGES.—

(1) TRAINING.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice, including each anti-human trafficking training program for Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers, includes technical training on—

(i) effective methods for investigating and prosecuting covered offenders; and

(ii) facilitating the provision of physical and mental health services by health care providers to persons subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(B) FEDERAL PROSECUTORS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice for United States attorneys or other Federal prosecutors includes training on seeking restitution for offenses under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that each United States attorney or other Federal prosecutor, upon obtaining a conviction for such an offense, requests a specific amount of restitution for each victim of the offense without regard to whether the victim requests restitution.

(C) JUDGES.—The Federal Judicial Center shall provide training to judges relating to the application of section 1593 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to ordering restitution for victims of offenses under chapter 77 of such title.

(2) POLICY FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—The Attorney General shall ensure that Federal law enforcement officers are engaged in activities, programs, or operations involving the detection, investigation, and prosecution of covered offenders.

(d) MINIMUM PERIOD OF SUPERVISED RELEASE FOR CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT COMMERCIAL CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.—Section 3583(k) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “1594(c),” after “1591,”.

(e) BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS REPORT ON STATE ENFORCEMENT OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING PROHIBITIONS.—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

(1) prepare an annual report on—

(A) the rates of—

(i) arrest of individuals by State law enforcement officers for a covered offense;

(ii) prosecution (including specific charges) of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(iii) conviction of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(B) sentences imposed on individuals convicted in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(2) submit the annual report prepared under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Task Force;

(D) the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)); and

(E) the Attorney General.

#### SEC. 115. SURVIVORS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING EMPOWERMENT ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act”.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking (referred to in this section as the “Council”), which shall provide advice and recommendations to the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)) (referred to in this section as the “Group”) and the President’s Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established under section 105(a) of such Act (referred to in this section as the “Task Force”).

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of not less than 8 and not more than 14 individuals who are survivors of human trafficking.

(2) REPRESENTATION OF SURVIVORS.—To the extent practicable, members of the Council shall be survivors of trafficking, who shall accurately reflect the diverse backgrounds of survivors of trafficking, including—

(A) survivors of sex trafficking and survivors of labor trafficking; and

(B) survivors who are United States citizens and survivors who are aliens lawfully present in the United States.

(3) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint the members of the Council.

(4) TERM; REAPPOINTMENT.—Each member of the Council shall serve for a term of 2 years and may be reappointed by the President to serve 1 additional 2-year term.

(d) FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall—

(1) be a nongovernmental advisory body to the Group;

(2) meet, at its own discretion or at the request of the Group, not less frequently than annually to review Federal Government policy and programs intended to combat human trafficking, including programs relating to the provision of services for victims and serve as a point of contact for Federal agencies reaching out to human trafficking survivors for input on programming and policies relating to human trafficking in the United States;

(3) formulate assessments and recommendations to ensure that policy and programming efforts of the Federal Government conform, to the extent practicable, to the best practices in the field of human trafficking prevention; and

(4) meet with the Group not less frequently than annually, and not later than 45 days before a meeting with the Task Force, to formally present the findings and recommendations of the Council.

(e) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and each year thereafter until the date described in subsection (h), the Council shall submit a report that contains the findings derived from the reviews conducted pursuant to subsection (d)(2) to—

(1) the chair of the Task Force;

(2) the members of the Group;

(3) the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Appropriations, and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Judiciary of the Senate.

(f) EMPLOYEE STATUS.—Members of the Council—

(1) shall not be considered employees of the Federal Government for any purpose; and

(2) shall not receive compensation other than reimbursement of travel expenses and per diem allowance in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The Council shall not be subject to the requirements under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(h) SUNSET.—The Council shall terminate on September 30, 2020.

#### SEC. 116. BRINGING MISSING CHILDREN HOME ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Bringing Missing Children Home Act”.

(b) CRIME CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.—Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) a recent photograph of the child, if available;”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”; and



(B) in subparagraph (A)—  
(i) by striking “60 days” and inserting “30 days”; and

(ii) by inserting “and a photograph taken during the previous 180 days” after “dental records”;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children of each report received relating to a child reported missing from a foster care family home or childcare institution.”;

(F) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated—

(i) by inserting “State and local child welfare systems and” before “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) grant permission to the National Crime Information Center Terminal Contractor for the State to update the missing person record in the National Crime Information Center computer networks with additional information learned during the investigation relating to the missing person.”.

#### SEC. 117. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “covered grant” means a grant awarded by the Attorney General under section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b), as amended by section 103.

(b) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All covered grants shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of a covered grant to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of a covered grant that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a covered grant during the following 2 fiscal years.

(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding covered grants the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for a covered grant.

(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded a covered grant during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and covered grants, the term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is de-

scribed in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General may not award a covered grant to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a covered grant and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(3) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts transferred to the Department of Justice under this title, or the amendments made by this title, may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this title, or the amendments made by this title, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

(B) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) **REPORT.**—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all approved conference expenditures referenced in this paragraph.

(D) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification that—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued;

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(iv) includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(4) **PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Amounts awarded under this title, or any amendments made by this title, may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) **PENALTY.**—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a covered grant has

violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another covered grant for not less than 5 years.

## TITLE II—COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

### Subtitle A—Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking

#### SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 343(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 5714-23(b)(5))—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))” before the semicolon at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting “, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))” after “assault”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by inserting “, including such youth who are victims of trafficking (as defined in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)))” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 351(a) (42 U.S.C. 5714-41(a)) by striking “or sexual exploitation” and inserting “sexual exploitation, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))”.

### Subtitle B—Improving the Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking

#### SEC. 211. RESPONSE TO VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children’s Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking “child prostitution” and inserting “child sex trafficking, including child prostitution”.

### Subtitle C—Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking

#### SEC. 221. VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term “victim of trafficking” has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

#### SEC. 222. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE REPORT ON CHILD TRAFFICKING PRIMARY PREVENTION.

(a) **REVIEW.**—The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, established under section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103), shall conduct a review that, with regard to trafficking in persons in the United States—

(1) in consultation with nongovernmental organizations that the Task Force determines appropriate, surveys and catalogs the activities of the Federal Government and State governments—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(2) surveys academic literature on—

(A) deterring individuals from committing trafficking offenses;

(B) preventing children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(C) the commercial sexual exploitation of children; and



(D) other similar topics that the Task Force determines to be appropriate;

(3) identifies best practices and effective strategies—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking; and

(4) identifies current gaps in research and data that would be helpful in formulating effective strategies—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available in electronic format, a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (a).

#### SEC. 223. GAO REPORT ON INTERVENTION.

On the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that includes information on—

(1) the efforts of Federal and select State law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking in the United States; and

(2) each Federal grant program, a purpose of which is to combat human trafficking or assist victims of trafficking, as specified in an authorizing statute or in a guidance document issued by the agency carrying out the grant program.

#### SEC. 224. PROVISION OF HOUSING PERMITTED TO PROTECT AND ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting “, including programs that provide housing to victims of trafficking” before the period at the end.

### TITLE III—HERO ACT

#### SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Human Exploitation Rescue Operations Act of 2015” or the “HERO Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 302. HERO ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The illegal market for the production and distribution of child abuse imagery is a growing threat to children in the United States. International demand for this material creates a powerful incentive for the rape, abuse, and torture of children within the United States.

(2) The targeting of United States children by international criminal networks is a threat to the homeland security of the United States. This threat must be fought with trained personnel and highly specialized counter-child-exploitation strategies and technologies.

(3) The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security serves a critical national security role in protecting the United States from the growing international threat of child exploitation and human trafficking.

(4) The Cyber Crimes Center of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement is a vital national resource in the effort to combat international child exploitation, providing advanced expertise and assistance in investigations, computer forensics, and victim identification.

(5) The returning military heroes of the United States possess unique and valuable skills that can assist law enforcement in combating global sexual and child exploitation, and the Department of Homeland Security should use this national resource to the maximum extent possible.

(6) Through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program, the returning military heroes of the United States are trained and hired to investigate crimes of child exploitation in order to target predators and rescue children from sexual abuse and slavery.

(b) CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, AND COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “SEC. 890A. CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT, AND CYBER CRIMES UNIT.

“(a) CYBER CRIMES CENTER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a Cyber Crimes Center (referred to in this section as the ‘Center’).

“(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Center shall be to provide investigative assistance, training, and equipment to support United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s domestic and international investigations of cyber-related crimes.

“(b) CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Child Exploitation Investigations Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CEIU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CEIU—

“(A) shall coordinate all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement child exploitation initiatives, including investigations into—

“(i) child exploitation;

“(ii) child pornography;

“(iii) child victim identification;

“(iv) traveling child sex offenders; and

“(v) forced child labor, including the sexual exploitation of minors;

“(B) shall, among other things, focus on—

“(i) child exploitation prevention;

“(ii) investigative capacity building;

“(iii) enforcement operations; and

“(iv) training for Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel, upon request;

“(C) shall provide training, technical expertise, support, or coordination of child exploitation investigations, as needed, to cooperating law enforcement agencies and personnel;

“(D) shall provide psychological support and counseling services for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel engaged in child exploitation prevention initiatives, including making available other existing services to assist employees who are exposed to child exploitation material during investigations;

“(E) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of the recruiting, training, equipping and hiring of wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program; and

“(F) shall collaborate with other governmental, nongovernmental, and nonprofit entities approved by the Secretary for the sponsorship of, and participation in, outreach and training activities.

“(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The CEIU shall collect and maintain data concerning—

“(A) the total number of suspects identified by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(B) the number of arrests by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, disaggregated by type, including—

“(i) the number of victims identified through investigations carried out by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(ii) the number of suspects arrested who were in positions of trust or authority over children;

“(C) the number of cases opened for investigation by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(D) the number of cases resulting in a Federal, State, foreign, or military prosecution.

“(4) AVAILABILITY OF DATA TO CONGRESS.—In addition to submitting the reports required under paragraph (7), the CEIU shall make the data collected and maintained under paragraph (3) available to the committees of Congress described in paragraph (7).

“(5) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CEIU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3).

“(6) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Taskforce, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CEIU.

“(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

“(7) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the HERO Act of 2015, and annually for the following 4 years, the CEIU shall—

“(A) submit a report containing a summary of the data collected pursuant to paragraph (3) during the previous year to—

“(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

“(iii) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(iv) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

“(v) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(vi) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) make a copy of each report submitted under subparagraph (A) publicly available on the website of the Department.

“(c) COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Computer Forensics Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CFU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CFU—

“(A) shall provide training and technical support in digital forensics to—

“(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

“(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

“(B) shall provide computer hardware, software, and forensic licenses for all computer forensics personnel within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(C) shall participate in research and development in the area of digital forensics, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and

“(D) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of recruiting, training, equipping, and hiring

wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program.

“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CFU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

“(4) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Task Force, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CFU.

“(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

“(d) CYBER CRIMES UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Cyber Crimes Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CCU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CCU—

“(A) shall oversee the cyber security strategy and cyber-related operations and programs for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(B) shall enhance United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s ability to combat criminal enterprises operating on or through the Internet, with specific focus in the areas of—

“(i) cyber economic crime;

“(ii) digital theft of intellectual property;

“(iii) illicit e-commerce (including hidden marketplace);

“(iv) Internet-facilitated proliferation of arms and strategic technology; and

“(v) cyber-enabled smuggling and money laundering;

“(C) shall provide training and technical support in cyber investigations to—

“(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

“(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

“(D) shall participate in research and development in the area of cyber investigations, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and

“(E) is authorized to recruit participants of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program for investigative and forensic positions in support of the functions of the CCU.

“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CCU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.”.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 890 the following:

“Sec. 890A. Cyber crimes center, child exploitation investigations unit, computer forensics unit, and cyber crimes unit.”.

(c) HERO CORPS HIRING.—It is the sense of Congress that Homeland Security Investigations of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement should hire, recruit, train, and equip wounded, ill, or injured military veterans

(as defined in section 101, title 38, United States Code) who are affiliated with the HERO Child Rescue Corps program for investigative, intelligence, analyst, and forensic positions.

(d) INVESTIGATING CHILD EXPLOITATION.—Section 307(b)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) conduct research and development for the purpose of advancing technology for the investigation of child exploitation crimes, including child victim identification, trafficking in persons, and child pornography, and for advanced forensics.”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided.

The Senator from Iowa.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 686 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on this bill before the Senate, for a few days we will continue to debate legislation to fight crime and restore dignity to its survivors. I thank the majority leader for scheduling floor action on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This important bill is authored by our assistant majority leader, Senator CORNYN of Texas.

Human trafficking is a serious crime that is too often overlooked in its various forms, which include both labor trafficking and sexual servitude. It causes drastic harm to its victims. A form of modern-day slavery, human trafficking includes both adults and children, as well as noncitizens and citizens of our country. Experts tell us it is not limited to big cities or our Nation’s coasts but stretches across the whole Nation, even to the rural parts of our country, including my Midwest. Indeed, it happens every day, everywhere in this country.

The Judiciary Committee met 2 weeks ago to hear testimony from a victim advocate, a law enforcement official, and a sex trafficking survivor about the challenges we face in fighting human trafficking. One witness, a criminal investigator from my State of Iowa who works for our Democratic attorney general Tom Miller, told us about a 20-year-old from my State who in December was abducted and forced into sexual servitude.

We have made progress in curbing human trafficking since the passage in 2000 of the Federal Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act—a measure I supported at that time—but there is still much work that remains to be done on this front. This bill before the Senate takes a creative and comprehensive approach to what is a pervasive and very troubling problem. The measure has been endorsed by over 200 groups, and it passed the Senate Judiciary Committee without a dissenting vote.

The centerpiece of this bill is its creation of a new fund called the Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund, which will be used to support a host of programs and services for human trafficking and child pornography survivors. The fund will be financed not by taxpayers’ dollars but by fines collected from individuals convicted of human trafficking and human smuggling crimes, making it deficit neutral.

If enacted, this bill will also equip law enforcement with new tools to fight trafficking. For example, it would make it easier for State law enforcement officials to wiretap human trafficking suspects without Federal approval. It also would expand the categories of persons who can be prosecuted for human trafficking. In addition, it clarifies that child pornography is a form of human trafficking.

This bill takes an extremely thoughtful and comprehensive approach, tackling not only the supply of human trafficking victims but also the demand for these victims. Tackling the problem on both fronts is something the non-partisan Congressional Research Service tells us is absolutely necessary if we are to successfully curb human trafficking. If enacted, this bill will ensure that both the trafficker and the buyer will be prosecuted for their crimes.

We had an open and productive markup of this bill. I offered an amendment, which was accepted by voice vote, clarifying that Federal grant resources can be used to meet the housing needs of trafficking victims and offer training on the effects of sex trafficking to those who serve runaway, homeless, and at-risk youth.

This amendment also updates the reauthorization language for the CyberTipline of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children to ensure that child trafficking is specifically mentioned as a form of Internet-related child exploitation.

Finally, this amendment would require the Interagency Task Force to monitor and combat trafficking to identify best practices to prevent human trafficking.

Senator BLUMENTHAL from the State of Connecticut also offered an amendment based on a bill he and Senator KIRK filed earlier this year, which was accepted in committee by a voice vote. Their bill, S. 575, known as the HERO Act, provides authorization for a program at the Department of Homeland Security that trains wounded warriors to assist in the effort to locate missing children.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill now before if Senate. I commend Senator CORNYN, the lead sponsor of this measure, for his efforts to refine the bill and build such a substantial, very bipartisan coalition supporting it. I hope we will show the same bipartisan cooperation and support on the floor as we consider amendments. I

look forward to a vote on this bill as soon as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters in support of S. 178 from various organizations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 2015.

Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY,  
*Chair, U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee,*  
*Dirksen Senate Office Building,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,  
*Ranking Member,*  
*Russell Senate Office Building,*  
*Washington, DC.*

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN,  
*Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*  
Senator JOHN CORNYN,  
*Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*  
Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR,  
*Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATORS GRASSLEY, LEAHY, FEINSTEIN, CORNYN, AND KLOBUCHAR: We write to you, the leaders of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, and to three committee Senators who have been particularly sensitive to our (often ignored) perspective. We write to you as survivors of sex trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation. We write as survivors who know, profoundly and personally, the harm caused by this crime. And we write to you as survivor leaders of organizations trying to prevent sex trafficking before it victimizes others.

We write to express our support for legislation that makes progress in three essential areas:

1. Identify new funding streams for victim services. Current public budgets are stressed. Victims of sex trafficking typically suffer multiple harms, requiring a range of services from medical and psychological assistance to treatment for the drug and alcohol addiction that so often accompanies trafficking (addictions that make people vulnerable to trafficking; addictions that develop or worsen as people try to cope with the pain of this intimate form of abuse). We've been told by law enforcement in numerous jurisdictions that when services don't exist (mainly because they are expensive) there's a disincentive to enforcing anti-trafficking laws and identifying victims.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act (JVTA), S. 178, is innovative for creating a new fund to finance victim—services an essential goal. It also achieves a second principle we stand for: Making sex buyers accountable for the harm they cause.

2. Prevent sex trafficking by targeting the buyers who create demand. Logically, trafficking will never end until we shrink the demand that creates the market. People still in the life, still being exploited, sometimes avoid this conclusion because they see no other options but the cycle of violence in which they are trapped. We are strong witnesses to the necessity of making the buyers pay, to make the crime end.

Two bills in particular strength accountability in the sex trafficking legal regime: S. 178 and Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015, S. 140. By clarifying congressional intent that sex buyers be considered parties to the trafficking crime, by compelling the Department of Justice to incorporate training and technical assistance on investigating and prosecuting buyers in its anti-trafficking programming, and by making the crime more “costly,” we can finally begin to shrink its incidence.

3. Treat victims as victims, not criminals, and let survivor voices inform anti-trafficking policy. Two bills in particular recognize these realities: the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, S. 166, which gives states incentives to approve “Safe Harbor” laws as well as job training options for victims and the Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act, which creates a survivors-led U.S. Advisory Council on Human Trafficking to review federal policy and programs.

Other proposals may also make valuable contributions, but these are the three most important principles to incorporate in new legislative initiatives.

Thank you for your consideration. Please let us know if you have specific questions or would like more information on our program activities.

Sincerely,

Winnie Lazenko, 4her—North Dakota, ND; Brooke Axtell, Allies Against Slavery, TX; Aliza Amar, Breaking the Silence Together/Sole Sisters Project, San Diego, CA; Vednita Carter, Breaking Free, St Paul, MN; Leah J. Albright-Byrd, Executive Director/Founder, Bridget's Dream, Sacramento, CA; Marian Hatcher, Human Trafficking Coordinator, Cook County Sheriff's Office, SPACE International Member, Chicago, IL; Tina Frundt, Courtney's House, Washington, DC; Cherie Jimenez, Founder, Eva Center, Boston, MA; D'Lita Miller, Founder/Executive Director, Families Against Sex Trafficking, Los Angeles, CA; Kathi Hardy, Founder/Executive Director, Freedom From Exploitation, San Diego, CA; Cheryl Briggs, Founder/President, Mission at Serenity Ranch, TX; Necole Daniels, MISSEY, Inc., Oakland, CA; Dr. Brook Bello, More Too Life, FL.

Nola Brantley, Nola Brantley Speaks! Oakland, CA; Rebecca Bender, Rebecca Bender Ministries, OR; Carissa Phelps, Runaway Girl, Inc., CA; Natasha Falle, Co-Founder, Sex Trade 101/Canada; Bridget Perrier, Co-Founder, Sex Trade 101/Canada; Stella Marr, Survivor and a Founder, Sex Trafficking Survivors United, USA; Amy Green, Survivors Consultation Network, San Bernardino, CA; Rachel Thomas, Sowers Education Group, Los Angeles, CA; Autumn Burris, Survivors for Solutions/SPACE Int'l Member, San Diego, CA; Mark (Marq) Daniel Taylor, The BUDDY House, Inc., GA; Tom Jones, Founder, The H.O.P.E. Project for Male Survivors, San Diego, CA; Kristy Childs, Veronica's Voice, Inc., Kansas City, MO; Jeanette Westbrook, MSSW, Women Graduates—USA/SPACE Int'l Member, KY; Beth Jacobs, Founder, Willow Way/Policy Chair, National Survivor Network, Tuscan, AZ.

FEBRUARY 23, 2015.

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,  
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY AND RANKING MEMBER LEAHY: We are a coalition of organizations from across the United States dedicated to improving the lives of vulnerable women and children and write to express our support for the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, S. 178 (JVTA). The JVTA would provide much needed services and support to domestic victims of trafficking and provide a tool for law enforcement, courts, and the anti-trafficking task forces throughout the country to effectively target the demand that fuels the sex trafficking market.

The JVTA provides unprecedented support to domestic victims of trafficking, who are too often invisible and underserved, by creating grants for state and local governments to develop comprehensive support programs for victims. In addition, the Act will directly assist domestic victims of trafficking by finally allowing them access to the same services and support systems that have been previously available only to foreign victims of human trafficking in the U.S. The legislation prioritizes victim assistance by training federal prosecutors and judges on the importance of requesting and ordering restitution, and training law enforcement on facilitating physical and mental health services for trafficking victims they encounter.

Every day in this country, thousands of women and children are bought and sold. The unfettered demand for sex, with underage girls in particular, has caused pimps and exploiters to resort to more extreme tactics in order to meet the growing demand. Women and children, especially girls, are advertised online where buyers purchase them with ease, anonymity, and impunity. This happens in every city, in every state.

The elimination of sex trafficking is fundamentally linked to targeting the demand for commercial sex. Any effort to prevent sex trafficking must focus on the sex buyers and facilitators. Without buyers of commercial sex, sex trafficking would not exist.

This legislation is vital. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 represents an effort to provide the necessary support services to our domestic victims of trafficking in the U.S. and to target the culture of impunity for those who seek to purchase sex, especially with children. As leaders in the anti-trafficking, anti-violence, child welfare, civil rights, runaway and homeless youth, and human rights movements, we urge Congress to pass this critical piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

Rights4Girls, ECPAT-USA, NAACP, National Domestic Violence Hotline, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ), National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA), Minnesota Indian Women Resource Center, National Women's Law Center (NWLC), American Psychological Association, National Children's Alliance, Equality Now, Shared Hope International, Association of Prosecuting Attorneys (APA), Survivors for Solutions, Breaking Free Inc., Coalition Against Trafficking in Women (CATW), PROTECT, National Crittenton Foundation.

First Focus Campaign for Children, Girls Inc. (National), National Association for Children's Behavioral Health, National Center for Youth Law, Alameda County District Attorney's Office, Advisory Council on Child Trafficking (ACCT), My Life My Choice, Girls for Gender Equity, PACE Center for Girls, Inc., The Children's Campaign, Sojourners, Men Can Stop Rape, YWCA National Capital Area, WestCoast Children's Clinic, FAIR Girls, Sanctuary for Families, Alliance for Girls, Girls Inc. of Alameda County.

DC Rape Crisis Center, Stop Modern Slavery, Women's Foundation of Minnesota, Healthy Teen Network, United Methodist Women, Foster Family-based Treatment Association, Pacific Alliance to Stop Slavery, Children's Home Society of Washington, American Association of University Women SF, Exodus Cry, Delores Barr Weaver Policy Center, Hope Academy of the Denver Street School, Directions For Youth & Families, Violence Prevention Coalition, Children

Now, Always Free, Set Free, End Slavery TN.

Child Advocacy Center a Division of Meridian Health Services, Program for the Empowerment of Girls (Albuquerque specialized court for girls), Changing Destinies, Second Life of Chattanooga, Students Ending Slavery at the University of Maryland, Hope Run Kenosha, Tex Pride Disaster & Recovery First Responders, West Florida Center for Trafficking Advocacy, Empowered You, LLC, Traffick Free, Chapelwood United Methodist Church, Hephzibah Children's Home, Side-By-Side Church International, Lives Worth Saving, Pleasant Grove United Methodist Women, Sisters of Providence, A2 Trafficking Task Force, Michigan Abolitionist Project.

Set Free Movement, Refuge of Light, Ash Creek Baptist Church, Companions of Wisdom, Zonta Club of Pinellas County, Oasis of Hope, Benton County Republican Women, Ho'ola Na Pua (Hawaii-based child sex trafficking service provider), Butterfly House, International Christian Center, New Life Refuge Ministries, The Red Web Foundation, Coastal Bend Grace House, Freedom13, The RavenHeart Center, Scott County Sheriff's Office, Flathead Abolitionist Movement, The Porch Light.

Honermann Homeschool, Heartly House, Milton Hershey School, River's Voice Music, San Antonio Against Slavery, Smoky Hill Vineyard Church, Sauk Prairie Church, MQA Charity in Action, St Mary of the Lake Human Trafficking Working Group, Eden's Glory, Project Resource Company, Shelter In The Storm, Daughters of Charity, Denver Street School—Hope Academy, Stockton Covenant Church, National Association of Social Workers, I'm Aware, Christian Inn Ministries, Inc.

Living in Liberty, Precious Ones, Thomas Spann Clinic, Children's Hospital of Wisconsin, Charlotte Law Advocates Against Trafficking of Humans, Saint Hilary Parish, RJ Huffman & Associates, Sufficient Grace Outreach, Anti-Trafficking Task Force, First Congregational Church of Boulder, The MENTOR Network, Freedom From Exploitation, Hope Hollow Exploitation Victim Assistance and Consultation Services, Virginia Beach Justice Initiative, Religious Sisters of Charity, To Love Children Educational Foundation International Inc., Children's Advocacy Center of Suffolk County, Make Way Partners, Restore NYC.

Ozone House, Inc., ENC Stop Human Trafficking Now, YouthSpark, Changing Destinies, Visitors from the Past, Perhaps Kids Meeting Kids Can Make A Difference, Living Water for Girls, The Ray E. Helfer Society, Edmund Rice International, Bay Area Girls Unite, Exodus Cry, Horizon Farms, The Tobert and Polly Dunn Foundation, Lotus Medicine, Leadership Conference of Women Religious (LCWR), Home Instead Senior Care, From Words 2 Action Outreach Ministries, Butterfly Dreams Abuse Recovery.

O L Pathy Foundation, Dignity Health, Forsythe County Child Advocacy Center, Civil Society (Minnesota based anti-trafficking organization), 300m4freedom, Bluff Country Family Resources, Sexual Assault Services, Inc., Asian Women United of MN, Tubman Family Crisis & Support Services, Rochester Franciscan, Human Trafficking Task Force, Trinity Presbyterian Church, Anoka Ramsey Community College, New York Asian Women's Center, St. Mary's Social Justice Ministry, St Mary of the Lake Human Trafficking Working Group, Franciscan Peace Center Anti-Trafficking Committee, Kids At Risk Action, Nomi Network.

Soroptimist International of Stuart, Someplace Safe, Calvary Temple, Genesee County Youth Corporation, Youth Attention Center, The Advocates for Human Rights, Livingston Family Center, Central New Mexico Counseling Service, Downey McGrath Group, Women Graduates-USA, Lutheran Services in America, Life for the Innocent, Too Young to Wed, WRAP Court (specialized "CSEC" court, Philadelphia), Real Life Giving, Christian Inn Ministries, Inc., Angels Ministry, California Alliance of Child and Family Services, Crittenton Center, Children's Court Division (2nd Judicial District Court, Albuquerque), Oak Chapel UMC, Greif Fellowship in Juvenile Human Trafficking at The Ohio State University.

FEBRUARY 24, 2015.

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,  
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on the Judiciary,*  
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

CHAIRMAN GRASSLEY AND RANKING MEMBER LEAHY: As organizations representing law enforcement leaders, officers, and state and local prosecutors from across the United States, we write to express our support for S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (JVTA). The JVTA would provide much needed services and support to domestic victims of trafficking. More importantly, this bill provides necessary tools for law enforcement, courts, and the anti-trafficking task forces throughout the country to effectively target the demand that fuels the sex trafficking market.

The JVTA provides unprecedented resources to address the issue of domestic victims of trafficking, who are too often invisible and underserved, by creating grants for state and local governments to develop comprehensive systems to address these crimes and provide services for victims. In addition, the legislation allows wire-taps obtained through state courts to be used for child sex trafficking, trains federal prosecutors and judges on the importance of requesting and ordering restitution, and trains law enforcement on facilitating physical and mental health services for trafficking victims they encounter.

According to the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children (NCMEC), at least 100,000 American children each year are the victims of commercial child prostitution and child trafficking. Women and children, especially girls, are also advertised online where buyers purchase them with ease, anonymity, and impunity. This happens in every city, in every state.

The elimination of sex trafficking is fundamentally linked to targeting the demand for commercial sex. Without buyers of commercial sex, sex trafficking would not exist. It is for this reason and others stated above that we, as representatives of law enforcement and the courts, support this bill.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 addresses a critical need by providing the necessary tools and support services for domestic victims of trafficking in the U.S. We urge Congress to pass this critical piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

National District Attorneys Association, Association of State Criminal Investigative Agencies, National Association of Police Organizations, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, National Fusion Center Association, National Black Prosecutors Association.

National Troopers Coalition, Major Cities Chiefs Association, Major County Sheriffs' Association, National Sheriffs' Association, Association of Prosecuting Attorneys.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I also take this opportunity to thank the organizations Rights4Girls, Shared Hope International, the Polaris Project, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, among many other supporters of the bill, for their effort in assisting in our refinement of this legislation so it could move forward in this manner.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. If the Senator will yield for a question, there is so much of this bill I strongly support. In fact, a lot of it reflects legislation I have written and actually passed through the committee before. I have a couple of concerns, but one that comes to mind is that we don't want to hold out false promises to victims, and I know the Senator doesn't want to either.

I certainly support having any money that the traffickers are fined go to supporting this, but my experience earlier as a prosecutor and my experience now in talking to prosecutors around the country is that most of these people, when they get prosecuted, are basically judgment-proof—they don't have any money or they have a very small amount of money. They will go to prison. Who pays for that? Of course taxpayers pay for the prison, whether it is Federal or State. They will pay for the prisons, but there is no money for the victims.

What happens if the fine money does not materialize? We have talked about up to \$30 million, I think, in fines, but let's suppose we only come up with a few thousand dollars in fines. Are we making a promise to these victims that can't be met? Is there an alternative for them in case the fines don't pay for it?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I guess, based upon the experience of the supporters of the legislation and the expert advice they got in coming to the conclusion of how to fund this fund, they feel the money is going to be available to do that.

You ask a legitimate question. I suppose I ought to have an answer for it, and I don't have from this standpoint. I think that I have great faith in the figures they have presented us and that we will have to deal with the issue you bring up at some future time because I think we will want everybody to be made whole if what you say happens.

Mr. LEAHY. The reason I ask, Mr. President, is because I know in the House of Representatives they have been concerned that the money might not be there.

I think we all want to accomplish these things for the victims. I just want to make sure we are not holding out a promise that we can't complete. Do I agree with all the fines going into this fund? Absolutely. But the experience of a lot of prosecutors I have

talked with is that the court may say: I fine you \$20,000 or \$30,000, but this is never paid. They go to prison. They have no assets. We are spending \$25,000 to \$35,000 a year as taxpayers keeping them in prison, and I want them to be in prison, but there is no money for victims.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I can say to the Senator that he raises a legitimate point because I know in other areas we have set up such funds and sometimes they come up short. But we have to remember that sometimes something is not paid out because a lot of times excess money is used for something else in the Federal budget and not paid out entirely the way it was intended originally.

But I would urge my colleague to take the word of the people who have done the research on this legislation to bring it together and the consensus it has from 200 or more organizations and feel that it will be successful. If it isn't, then I pledge to help you deal with that at that particular time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the issues raised in this are serious matters, and the Senator from Iowa, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator CORNYN, and others should be concerned about this.

I think of a victim I have talked with, Holly Austin Smith. She was 14 years old when she ran away from home and quickly became a victim of human trafficking. She met a man in a shopping mall who told her she was pretty, and promised he would give her a glamorous life in California. Remember, she was 14 years old. Then he sold her for sex. The first man she was sold to commented that she reminded him of his own granddaughter—but then he paid \$200 to rape her.

Thankfully, Holly escaped and has rebuilt her life. She is now a fierce advocate of ending all forms of human trafficking because she knows what happens to those who are trafficked. But many are not so lucky. The physical and psychological scars of being bought and sold, of being raped multiple times a night by different men, are devastating. This terrible crime destroys lives.

As we consider legislation to combat human trafficking, we must remember Holly and the thousands of other vulnerable and victimized children she represents, and we must do everything we can to keep it from happening in the first place.

Last Congress, in 2013, I led the effort to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. That historic bipartisan legislation and the funds it authorized signaled our country's commitment to ending all forms of human trafficking, both here at home and around the world. So I am glad, after the attention we gave to my bill last

Congress, to see the Senate return its attention to this issue. Stories such as Holly's make clear we have more work to do.

I support the bill we take up today, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, but I believe we must do more to prevent trafficking in the first place. We have to act to protect our young people before they become victims. It is one thing to say now that you have become a victim, we are here to help you. It does even more if we can stop them from being victims in the first place.

The legislation that Senator COLLINS of Maine and I have introduced seeks to do just that. Homeless and runaway kids are exceptionally vulnerable to human traffickers. A recent survey found that one in four homeless teens was a victim of sex trafficking or had been forced to provide sex for survival needs.

These vulnerable children, alone and on the street, are walking prey. Human traffickers lurk around bus stops and parks where homeless children congregate. They offer promises of something to eat and a night off the streets. They exploit the very sad reality that most of these children have no place to go. The weather may be cold. Far too many of our cities have no shelter for kids, and those who do face a chronic shortage of beds. Then somebody comes up and says: I will offer you food, I will offer you a warm place to sleep for the night.

As Representative POE recently said at an event on ending human trafficking: We have more animal shelters in this country than places for young people to find a safe place to sleep. What does that say about our priorities? I have nothing against having the animal shelters, but shouldn't we have more for our children than we do for the animals?

If we are serious about preventing human trafficking, we must protect these kids. We have to provide better outreach to them, more beds for them to sleep in, and more counseling to get them on the path to a stable life. This kind of prevention costs money, but it saves lives and prevents the far more costly effects of human trafficking—not just the effects of human trafficking on the victims' part, but the cost to all of us. This is smart money we ought to be proud to invest in our children. We must include the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act in our efforts here to prevent more of our kids from becoming victims. I look forward, at the appropriate place, to offering our bipartisan legislation as an amendment.

I know other Senators have amendments they wish to see considered. Senator CORKER, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has an important piece of legislation to

combat sex and labor trafficking in countries around the world. I thank him for working with me to make some improvements to its funding provisions and I hope this bipartisan legislation will be considered as an amendment by the full Senate.

I mentioned earlier Senator KLOBUCHAR has been working for years to see the safe harbor bill get passed, to make sure victims are treated as victims and not as criminals. I am proud to cosponsor her bill. After all, as I said about the Violence Against Women Act, a victim is a victim is a victim. They are not criminals. They are victims.

Senator MCCONNELL has long promised a full amendment process. I take him at his word and I expect we will have the opportunity to strengthen the underlying bill with a variety of ideas from Senators. We owe it to survivors such as Holly to pass the strongest possible bill.

We have to provide the resources desperately needed by those on the front lines protecting young people every day, such as those in my home State of Vermont at Spectrum Services and the Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs service providers. We owe it to all the survivors who bravely come forward and tell their stories, hoping to prevent just one more child from falling prey to this terrible crime.

The Senate has to pass a strong, comprehensive bill that includes prevention and prosecution, but also services for victims. We haven't accomplished as much as we should if we are only able to prosecute the perpetrator after the fact and forget about helping the victim. We have to stop trafficking from happening in the first place; but if it does happen, we have to help the victims.

An editorial in the New York Times last week noted that:

... a consensus is emerging on new initiatives to confront this human-rights problem and help its victims, often runaways or homeless youngsters who have been forced or coerced into prostitution.

I agree with that editorial, and I look forward to working with every Senator here to ensure we get this done for the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, March 5, 2015]

STEPS AGAINST JUVENILE SEX TRAFFICKING

(By the Editorial Board)

The impression that America's sex-trafficking problem mostly involves young people smuggled from overseas has given way to broad recognition of a cruel homegrown reality: the tens of thousands of juveniles who are exploited each year by traffickers in this country.

On Capitol Hill, a consensus is emerging on new initiatives to confront this human-rights problem and help its victims, often runaways or homeless youngsters who have been forced or coerced into prostitution.

The Senate Judiciary Committee last week unanimously approved a pair of anti-trafficking bills with wide backing from victim advocates and other experts, and the full Senate is expected to take up the package soon.

A bill championed by Senator John Cornyn, Republican of Texas, would create a new pool of financing—through additional fines on people convicted of sex and labor trafficking, child pornography and other crimes—for restitution, victim services and law enforcement. The idea of aiding victims without committing more tax dollars has drawn support from Republicans, and any new money for this badly underfinanced cause would help.

The Cornyn bill would also encourage prosecution of the “johns,” or buyers of juvenile sex, who typically escape criminal charges even though they are paying for what amounts to the statutory rape of children and teenagers. Their demand is what’s fueling the highly lucrative human slavery business.

The second bill, put forward by Senator Amy Klobuchar, Democrat of Minnesota, would give a preference for Department of Justice law enforcement grants to states that adopt “safe harbor” laws.

These laws help ensure that young people sold for sex are treated as victims and offered support services instead of being prosecuted. The House has approved similar bills, so it should not be hard to hammer out a strong final package.

A preventive measure that would help ensure housing and services for homeless juveniles, who are often prey to traffickers, unfortunately stalled in the Senate Judiciary Committee. One obstacle was the resistance of some Republicans to its nondiscrimination provision guaranteeing fair treatment of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youths.

No young person should “have to choose between selling their bodies and a safe place to sleep,” said Senator Susan Collins, Republican of Maine, who introduced the bill with Patrick Leahy, Democrat of Vermont. Undeterred, they plan to seek consideration from the full Senate.

Trafficking abroad remains a tremendous problem, so it is fitting that a promising approach comes from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which last week unanimously approved a measure to create an international public-private fund dedicated to the issue, similar to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. More resources could do a lot to help trafficking’s victims at home, too.

Mr. LEAHY. We talk about the Runaway and Homeless Youth Trafficking and Prevention Act. This is a partial list of the local, State, and national groups which have urged its passage. There are too many to read—this has to be in small type; otherwise, we would have a dozen posters if we put it in larger type.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the complete list.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

AccuWord, LLC; Alliance to End Slavery & Trafficking (ATEST); American Psychological Association; Campaign for Youth Justice; Center for Children’s Law and Policy; CenterLink; The Community of LGBT Center; Children’s Advocacy Institute; Child Welfare League of America; Coalition for Juvenile Justice; Covenant House International; ECPAT-USA; Entertainment Industries Council, Inc.; Family Equality Council; Family Promise; First Focus Campaign for Children; Free the Slaves; Foster Family-based Treatment Association; FosterClub; Freedom Network USA; Funders Together to End Homelessness; Futures Without Violence; Girls Inc.; Healthy Teen Network; HEAR US, Inc.; Hetrick-Martin Institute; Human Rights Campaign; Human Rights Project for Girls; Indian Oaks Academy; International Human Trafficking Institute; International Organization for Adolescents (IOFA).

Jewish Women International; Lambda Legal; MANY; Marriage Equality USA; National Association of Counsel for Children; National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth; National Center for Housing and Child Welfare; National Center for Lesbian Rights; National Children’s Alliance; National Coalition for the Homeless; National Council on Jewish Women; National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges; National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty; National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund; National Network for Youth; National PTA; National Safe Place Network; National Youth Advocate Program; Peace Alliance; Polaris; Reclaiming Lost Voices; SAFE Coalition for Human Rights; School Social Work Association of America; Sexuality Information and Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS); Shared Hope International; Southwest Key Programs; StandUp For Kids; Student Peace Alliance; The Equity Project; The Forum for Youth Investment; The General Board of Church and Society, United Methodist Church; The National Crittenton Foundation; The Peace Alliance; The Trevor Project; True Colors Fund; U.S. Fund for UNICEF; U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants; W. Haywood Burns Institute.

#### REGIONAL

Art Expression Inc., Pittsburgh, PA; Beasister2asister, Brooklyn, NY; CAP Services, Inc., Stevens Point, WI; Caring for Children, Inc., Asheville, NC; Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Albany, NY; Center for Health Justice, Inc.; Children’s Hospital Los Angeles, Los Angeles CA; Community Youth Services, Olympia, WA; Compass Family & Community Services, Youngstown, OH; Congregation of St. Joseph, OH; Covenant House New Orleans, LA; Free2Be Safe Anti-Violence Project, Huntsville, AL; Hope Hollow Exploitation Victim Assistance and Consultation, PA; Janus Youth Programs, Portland, OR; Latin American Youth Center, Washington, DC; Long Island Crisis Center/Pride for Youth, NY; Loving Arms, Inc., MD.

LUK, Inc., Fitchburg & Worcester, MA; Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan; Rainbow House, MO; Runaway and Homeless Youth Services—Boys & Girls Clubs of America; Ryan’s House for Youth, Freeland, WA; Sacramento Regional Coalition to End Homelessness, CA; Safe Harbor Children’s Center, Brunswick, GA; San Diego Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting Program; Staircase Youth Services, Inc., Ludington, MI; South Bay Community Services, Chula Vista, CA; United Way of Tucson and Southern Arizona, Tucson, AZ;

Victoria Area Homeless Coalition, Victoria, TX; Volunteers of America of America Northern New England, Brunswick, ME; Youth and Shelter Services, Inc., Ames, IA; Youth Continuum, New Haven, CT; YouthLink, Minneapolis, MN; Youth OUTright WNC, Inc., Asheville & Western NC.

#### STATE ORGANIZATIONS

AO: Advocating Opportunity, OH; AMP Iowa; Arizona Legal Women and Youth Services (ALWAYS), Phoenix, AZ; Avenues for Homeless Youth, MN; California Coalition for Youth; Chicago Coalition for the Homeless; Children and Family Services of NH; Children’s Home + Aid, IL; Coalition for Homeless Youth; Coalition to Abolish Slavery & Trafficking; Cocoon House, Everett, WA; Covenant House Pennsylvania; Covenant House Florida; Texans Care for Children, TX; The DC Center for the LGBT Community.

Empire State Pride Agenda, NY; The Bridge for Youth, Minneapolis, MN; The Florida Network of Youth and Family Services; Family Resources, Inc., FL; Families On The Move, Inc., MI; Focus on Awareness and Information Resources of New York, Syracuse, NY; Georgia Alliance to End Homelessness, GA; Healing Place Serve, LA; Human Rights Advocacy Center, Inc., FL; Illinois Collaboration on Youth; Indiana Youth Services Association, Indianapolis, IN; Lutheran Social Services of MN; Lutheran Social Services, WI; Massachusetts Coalition for the Homeless; North Little Rock School District, AR.

Outreach Resource Centers, UT; Preble Street, Portland, ME; Reed City Housing Commission, Reed City, MI; Sparrow’s Nest NW MT; Student Advocacy Center of Michigan; The Mockingbird Society, WA; The Women’s Law Center of Maryland, Inc.; Training and Resources United to Stop Trafficking, AZ; Vermont Coalition of Runaway & Homeless Youth Programs; Youth Bridge, Fayetteville, AR; Youth Pride, Inc., RI; Youthworks, Bismarck and Fargo, ND; WI Association for Homeless and Runaway Services.

#### LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Adventure Church, Kalispell, MT; Alameda Family Services, Alameda, CA; Alternative House, Fairfax, VA; Attention Homes, Boulder, CO; Avenues for Homeless Youth, Minneapolis, MN; Bradbury-Sullivan LGBT Community Center, Allentown, PA; Bill Wilson Center, San Jose, CA; Boys & Girls Clubs of the Fox Valley, Appleton, WI; Briarpatch Youth Services, Madison, WI; Bridge Over Troubled Waters, Boston, MA; Broward Human Trafficking Coalition, Ft. Lauderdale, FL; Cardinal McCloskey Community Services, Bronx, NY; Catholic Charities of Herkimer County, NY; Catholic Charities, Lubbock, TX; Center for Family Services, Camden, NJ; Center on Halsted, Chicago, IL; Central Texas Youth Services Bureau, Belton, TX; Children’s Home Society of FL—WaveCREST Shelter, Fort Pierce, FL; Community Resources in Service to People, Winterset, IA; Compator, Inc., South Gate, CA; Compass House, Buffalo, NY.

CORY Place, Inc., Bay City, MI; Covenant House NY, New York, NY; Crisis Center Inc., a Youth Service Bureau, Gary, IN; Crosswinds Youth Services, Cocoa, FL; Davis Chapel United Methodist Church, Piedmont, AL; Daybreak, Dayton, OH; Educational and Treatment Council, Inc., Lake Charles, LA; Evergreen Youth & Family Services, Bemidji, MN; Face to Face Health and Counseling Service, Inc., St. Paul, MN; Fairfield-Suisun Unified School District, Fairfield-



Suisun, CA; Family Assistance Program, Victorville, CA; Friends of Youth, Kirkland, WA; Gay & Lesbian Community Services of SE MN, Rochester, MN; Girls Educational and Mentoring Services, New York, NY; Give Them Wings, Inc., dba WINGS, Hood River, OR; Good Shepherd Services, New York, NY; Grand Rapids Public Schools, Grand Rapids, MI; HDC Project Reach Out, Superior, WA; Health Care for the Homeless, Pittsburgh, PA; Hillcrest Youth Program, Kansas City, KS; Home Start, Inc., San Diego, CA.

Hudson Pride Connections Center, Jersey City, NJ; Human Development Center/Project Reach Out, Duluth, MN; In Our Own Voice, Inc., Albany, NY; Interfaith Emergency Services, Ocala, FL; Introspect Youth Services, Inc., Chicago, IL; 1 in 10, Inc., Phoenix, AZ; Jackson Street Youth Shelter, Inc., Corvallis, OR; Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, KY; Juneau Youth Services, Juneau, AK; Kalamazoo Gay Lesbian Resource Center, Kalamazoo, MI; Karis, Inc., Grand Junction, CO; Kenosha Human Development Services, Kenosha, WI; Kids in Crisis, Greenwich, CT; Kids in Need Youth Program, Rhinelander, WI; Krista THP+, Redding, CA; Larkin Street Youth Services, San Francisco, CA; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual & Transgender Community Center, New York, NY; LGBT Center of Raleigh, Raleigh, NC; LIFE Skills Foundation, Durham, NC; Light-house Youth Services, Inc., Cincinnati, OH.

Lutheran Social Services SW RAYS, Baraboo, WI; Lutheran Social Services Youth Services, Brainerd, MN; Matrix Human Services, Detroit, MI; MCCNY Charities, Inc., New York, NY; Miami Coalition for the Homeless, Miami, FL; Montgomery County Youth Services, Conroe, TX; Morgan County System of Services, Inc., Decatur, AL; New Morning Youth & Family Services, Placerville, CA; Northwest Family Services, Inc., Alva, OK; Oasis Center, Nashville, TN; Open Arms, Inc., Albany, GA; Open Door Youth Services, Green Bay, WI; Ozone House Youth and Family Services, Ann Arbor, MI; Pathfinders Milwaukee, Inc., Milwaukee, WI; Pathways PA, Holmes, PA; Positive Alternatives, Inc., Menomonie, WI; Pride Center of Staten Island, Inc., Staten Island, NY; Pridelines Youth Services, South FL; Project Oz, McLean County, IL; Project 1649, Janesville, WI; Project Reach, New York, NY; Project YES, Ceres, CA.

Proud Haven, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA; Redwood Community Action Agency—Youth Service Bureau, Eureka, CA; Richmond Gay Community Foundation, Richmond, VA; Roanoke Diversity Center, Roanoke, VA; Safe Haven of Racine, Inc., Racine, WI; Sanctuary of Hope, Los Angeles, CA; Sasha Bruce Youthwork, Inc., Washington, DC; School District 27J, Brighton, CO; Shaw House, Bangor, ME; Social Advocates for Youth, Santa Rosa, CA; Somerville Homeless Coalition, Somerville, MA; StandUp for Kids, Chicago, IL; StandUp for Kids, Washington, DC; SunServe, Wilton Manors, FL; Tahoe Youth & Family Services, South Lake Tahoe, CA; Tamar Counseling Services, Upland, CA; Teens Alone, Hopkins, MN.

The Council of Churches of Greater Bridgeport, Bridgeport, CT; The Gay and Lesbian Center of Southern Nevada, Las Vegas, NV; The HEAT Program, Brooklyn, NY; The Night Ministry, Chicago, IL; The Youth and Family Project, Inc., West Bend, WI; Urban Peak Colorado Springs, Colorado Springs, CO; Walker's Point Youth & Family Center, Milwaukee, WI; Livingston Family Center—The Connection Youth Services, Howell, MI; School District 27J, Brighton, CO; YMCA of San Diego County, San Diego, CA; YMCA

Safe Place Services, Louisville, KY; Young Adult Guidance Center, Inc., Atlanta, GA; YouthCare, Seattle, WA; Youth Emergency Services, Omaha, NE; Youth In Need, St. Louis, MO; Youth Outreach Services, Inc., Chicago, IL; YouthLink, Minneapolis, MN; Youth Service Bureau of St. Joseph County, Inc., South Bend, IN; Youth Services Bureau of Monroe County, Bloomington, IL; Youth Services for Stephens County, Inc., Duncan, OK; Youth Services of Tulsa, Tulsa, OK.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see the distinguished senior Senator from Texas on the floor seeking recognition. I wonder if we could suggest the absence of a quorum for just 1 minute.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I know the Senator from West Virginia will be giving her first speech in the Senate here shortly and I look forward to listening to that, but I wanted to say a few words about the legislation we will be debating and hopefully passing this week, and that is the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

This is without a doubt one of the most shocking and troubling issues facing our country today. It is no exaggeration to say modern-day human slavery, at a time when we believed as a country that slavery was a part of our past and something we only read about in our history books.

Many people are under the impression that human trafficking is a problem somewhere else or at some other time in history, but the fact is human trafficking is a problem right now in all 50 States, right here in the United States of America, the most affluent country in the world. It is not just a problem in Texas, it is not just a problem in Arizona, it is not just a problem in West Virginia, it is a problem in all 50 States.

Thousands of young girls, many of them middle school age, are trapped into a life of bondage where they are abused and sold for sex every day. It is not easy to say, but it is true, and we must say it and we must acknowledge it.

This is of course unconscionable. As the father of two daughters myself, it is simply heartbreaking to hear the stories of young women who have been trapped in this system. Of course, we can imagine it is every parent's worst nightmare.

One woman I have had the privilege of meeting and who shared her very personal story about this is Melissa Woodward from the Dallas-Fort Worth area in Texas. When she was 12 years old—12 years old—she was sold into the sex trade by a family member, somebody whom she had every right to as-

sume cared for her, loved her, wanted her to grow up being a loved and productive person. But she was sold into the sex trade by a family member. Eventually she was pulled out of school and trafficked full time when she was in sixth grade. Her life became a prison.

She was chained to a bed in a warehouse. She endured regular beatings and, of course, she was sexually assaulted with regularity. She was even set on fire by one of her captors. All the while, she was forced to serve between 5 and 30 men every day.

Melissa has said that she wished she were dead. Her story of her time in captivity is gut-wrenching and heart-breaking, but just as sad is the way she was treated once she escaped from her captors. As is the case with so many victims, Melissa struggled for years to distance herself from her past. But instead of being treated as the victim she was, the criminal justice system actually treated her as the criminal. That is an all too common outcome for victims of trafficking, who are labeled as prostitutes and are left with few options but to return to the nightmare that so sadly exists in our country.

That needs to change. That is why I am glad the Senate is taking up the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, because this begins the process of making that important change. The bill helps law enforcement crack down on criminal trafficking rings and perpetrators of these crimes.

Instead of a slap on the wrist and a fine, the so-called johns—the demand side for this terrible trade—will be treated as the child rapists and the criminals they are. No longer are we just going to deal with the supply side. We are going to pay attention to the demand side too.

Critically, this bill takes fines from the perpetrators of these awful crimes and redirects them into a crime victims fund which will help people such as Melissa and others get a fresh lease on life, to begin to heal and to get the help they so badly need in order to get on with their lives.

This week we have a wonderful opportunity in the Senate, in a town that is too often divided by ideology and partisanship, to do something together on a bipartisan basis that can help people such as Melissa and the thousands of young girls like her waiting to be saved. All of us, Republicans and Democrats alike, are committed to working together to do everything we can to help these victims and to put an end to this abhorrent practice.

This particular legislation we are taking up today passed unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee a few weeks ago. That doesn't happen very often, but it did for this legislation. More than 200 groups around the country—such as the NAACP, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Rights4Girls, the Fraternal Order



of Police, and the National Conference of State Legislatures—have all endorsed our work on this issue.

I want to particularly thank some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who joined me on this effort: the senior Senator from Minnesota, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN. They have been great partners in this fight—not just this year but for many years. And there are many others. Another great partner has been the junior Senator from Illinois, Mr. KIRK, who has worked for years to get antitrafficking legislation to the floor. He introduced a bill called the HERO Act which authorizes a program to recruit wounded, injured, and returning veterans and provides them with training in high-tech computer forensics and law enforcement skills to help fight child exploitation.

I also want to acknowledge the great contribution of the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, who has a bill called the Bringing Missing Children Home Act, which improves the way cases of missing children are handled, strengthening law enforcement reporting and response procedures.

Both the HERO Act and the Bringing Missing Children Home Act have been incorporated into the underlying bill, and I want to thank both of them for their efforts and willingness to work with us to make the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act even stronger.

I know there are Members who are interested in offering amendments to this legislation. Thanks to the majority leader, we are going to have an open process where anybody with a better idea who wants to add to this base of work that is contained in this bill will have the opportunity to do so, both offering amendments and seeking votes on those.

This is a fight that sadly must be fought, but it is a fight we will win. When we do, we will finally have done our part to help deliver our Nation's promise of freedom to those who are enslaved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

MAKING WASHINGTON WORK FOR WEST VIRGINIA

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to deliver my maiden speech as a Senator from West Virginia. I am deeply humbled by the confidence placed in me by fellow West Virginians. To serve as West Virginia's first female Senator is a true honor and one that comes with great responsibility. I hope to serve as an example for that next generation of West Virginians, including my own grandchildren Celia and Charlie, and hopefully for many others. I find myself in a unique place in history, and I am grateful to and inspired by my own loving family, my husband Charlie and our three children, Charles, Moore, and Shelley, and their spouses.

For 14 years I have proudly served the people of West Virginia's Second

Congressional District in the House of Representatives. I bring that experience to the Senate combined with a strong desire to make Washington work for West Virginia.

West Virginia has a time-honored history of exceptional Senators, including my predecessors, Senators Jay Rockefeller and Robert C. Byrd. I am appreciative of their efforts to better West Virginia during their more than 80 years of combined public service in this great body.

I am proud of our State's rich history, culture, and natural beauty. But it is our people that I hold dearest in my heart. West Virginians are strong and resilient. We are the embodiment of our State's history. Born of the Civil War, West Virginians fought for freedom in the face of great turmoil. As a result, President Abraham Lincoln signed the proclamation making West Virginia the 35th State admitted to the Union.

Today, our State's forceful motto, "Mountaineers are always free," remains emblazoned in Latin on our State flag. We will never forget the principles on which our great State was founded. The Mountain State is home to unmatched scenery and natural resources that can power our Nation's economy. A State filled with small towns, Main Streets and tight knit communities, West Virginians come together to solve problems and help neighbors in need. I have often said that West Virginia is one big small town.

West Virginians expect the Senate to find pragmatic solutions to the momentous problems confronting our country. That is particularly true now during this period of divided government. There are clear differences among the American people, and these differences are certainly reflected in the Senate.

West Virginia is represented by both parties in the Senate, and I look forward to continuing to work with my friend Senator JOE MANCHIN in the months ahead, and I thank him for being here with me as a source of support today. Together, I hope we can reinstate respect for the institution, a place where deliberation and debate are valued and all voices are heard. We owe it to the American people to do better.

Throughout my time in Congress I have heard a clear and consistent message from West Virginians: Improve the economic opportunities for our State, stop the bickering, and fight for our jobs. As Leader MCCONNELL has stated, to do this the Senate must work more, have an open amendment process—which we are going to be having here in the next several days—and take the tough votes. After all, that is why we are here.

Today I will outline how I plan to produce bipartisan, commonsense solu-

tions in the Senate to make West Virginia communities stronger. This plan will create economic opportunities by bridging the gap and tackling America's infrastructure crisis, better connecting West Virginia and rural communities through increased broadband access, caring for our Nation's veterans, and ensuring a bright future for young West Virginians, and implementing a commonsense energy policy that utilizes our vast natural resources to provide affordable and reliable energy.

First, addressing our country's crumbling infrastructure is an area that can bridge the partisan divide and further economic growth. American communities need a strong Federal highway program and a full 6-year bill to meet the needs of our growing population, to ensure safety for travelers, and to offer opportunity for growth in areas that struggle economically.

West Virginians, like many across the Nation, rely heavily on roads, bridges, and highway transit to fuel our economy, to access hard to reach areas in our State, to get to and from work, and to transport necessary goods and services.

U.S. Route 35 will drastically improve safety for residents in Putnam and Mason Counties. Corridor H will unleash the economic potential of our State's eastern highlands. U.S. Route 340 will help address congestion in our eastern panhandle, and the Coalfields Expressway and the King Coal Highway can help isolated communities attract businesses and provide jobs. Point Pleasant's Charles Lanham, a well-respected gentleman, had a vision. With his friend Jack Fruth, they began a crusade for their community.

For many years Charles has worked to build the case for a 4-lane U.S. Route 35, a project that will provide a secure route to school for our children and serve as a regional transportation artery between Interstate 64 and the Great Lakes region. Charles understands the economic and safety benefits the road provides and has fought for them.

Working with Charles we have made significant progress on Route 35, but all of our States need certainty to invest in our transportation infrastructure. That certainty comes with a long-term surface transportation reauthorization bill, which brings these projects to reality across the country. Working together we can and we must achieve this goal. Now is the time to move our transportation system forward.

Second, I am committed to expanding access to broadband in communities across West Virginia, and I will be a champion for connecting our State. High-speed Internet access is a pillar of our 21st century infrastructure and a gateway to growth in rural America. High-tech businesses can

power our small communities. The world literally can be at your desktop. Unfortunately, for all the potential opportunities that broadband can offer to rural America, not having this important service can place an almost insurmountable barrier to economic development, and there are many areas in my State and the leader's State that still do not have adequate access. These areas are at risk of being left behind. In Capon Bridge, WV, a lack of broadband access is an obstacle to attracting jobs and economic development. Sadly, Capon Bridge is not unique in this regard.

Small communities across West Virginia and elsewhere in rural America lack fundamental infrastructure and lack access to vital opportunities as a result.

The answer for Capon Bridge is not a regulated Internet. Too much government control would be counterproductive, choking off private sector expansion projects and hindering new technologies. But we have to recognize that there is a role for government in helping broadband reach those hard-to-serve communities. We should leverage resources at all levels of government and encourage public-private partnerships to expand access to rural Americans. This is a necessary and achievable goal. It may sound like a small desire, but connectivity is essential to compete and thrive.

Health care access is critically important to West Virginians. We must continue to provide access to our veterans and to our children. West Virginians have a strong history of service to our Nation. These brave men and women have put themselves in harm's way to defend our freedoms. It is our solemn responsibility to care for them when they return home.

These American heroes deserve the best possible treatment and top-notch mental health services.

Access to care can be especially challenging for our veterans who live in rural communities. Many West Virginia veterans must travel significant distances to get to a VA hospital. In many cases, allowing veterans to receive treatment closer to home is more convenient for the patient and more efficient for the VA. While we have made strides to improve access for our veterans, the current program is not working as well as it should. More must be done.

Expanded access to private medical providers will help improve the quality of care we offer to our veterans. Our children in the Mountain State also deserve quality health care. If our children, the next generation of leaders, are going to realize their potential, they must have a healthy foundation. A solid education and good health are pillars for success of future generations. As a parent and grandparent, this is personal. We must work to-

gether to continue funding the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

I started my legislative career in the West Virginia House of Delegates where I served on the committee that first implemented the SCHIP program in our State. Today this program provides access to health care for tens of thousands of West Virginia's children. Maintaining this program is a priority I share with my predecessor, Senator Rockefeller, who was a tireless advocate for children's health insurance during his three decades of service in this body. I am encouraged that Senators in both parties have recognized the importance of providing continued funding for the bipartisan SCHIP program.

Finally, and of critical importance to the State of West Virginia and the country, we need to work together to implement a commonsense energy policy. We need an affordable and reliable energy policy that utilizes our State's vast natural resources. We need a policy that grows the economy and creates new job opportunities. We need a policy that supports a strong middle class. We need a policy that ensures we continue to improve safety and our environment even as we expand energy production.

The administration's overreach has contributed to thousands of coal miners losing their jobs in West Virginia and our neighboring States, devastating—I can't overstate this enough—local communities and families.

Last year I met a recently laid off coal miner from Raleigh County. After losing his job, his church came together to prepare meals for other coal miners and their families while they searched for work. Neighbors helping neighbors—the West Virginia way. This is a stark reminder of the impact misguided Federal policies can have on the lives of real people.

Anti-coal policies impact more than miners and their families. In West Virginia the attack on coal mines reduces revenues for education programs, roads, and other public services. Higher utility prices caused by overregulation means fewer jobs in energy-intensive manufacturing. And sadly, lower income families and senior citizens who live on fixed incomes are disproportionately impacted by higher energy costs. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety, I will lead the fight against excessive government regulation that has been devastating my State.

There are many areas of energy policy where we can find common ground. While the EPA's proposed greenhouse gas standards are misguided, we should continue to make the use of fossil fuel cleaner and more efficient. We must continue to support important research at Morgantown's National Energy Technology Lab and other labs that al-

lows us to make environmental progress even as we continue to use our natural resources.

Natural gas is a large and growing part of West Virginia's economy. As a child of Marshall County, which is the heart of the Marcellus Shale development in West Virginia, I am delighted to see these communities come alive with opportunity. It is proof positive that an energy economy is a jobs economy. We need improved infrastructure in order to make full use of these gas reserves. We need new natural gas and oil pipelines that safely connect producing regions with manufacturers. We need new markets that can make use of these vital resources. We need a pro-exports policy that will benefit our country in multiple ways. The Nation will see more jobs and investment, more security, and a more independent future, and at the same time we can strengthen our relationships with important allies overseas by providing them with the energy they need.

These are just a few of the ideas I hope to refine and accomplish during my first term in the Senate. Notably, there are many other very important issues—such as national security, fiscal responsibility, a balanced budget, and replacement of the Affordable Care Act—on which I will be focusing. Our plate is full, and expectations are high, as they should be. We need to roll up our sleeves and deliver. I am optimistic that we can find solutions that move our country forward. There will be differences of opinion and philosophy along the way, but Americans expect us to bridge those gaps.

Senator Byrd, the longest serving Senator, said it best:

I love this Senate. I love it dearly. I love the Senate for its rules. I love the Senate for its precedence. I love the Senate for the difference that it can make in people's lives.

Fighting for West Virginians always has been and always will be my top priority. I am honored—I can't overstate that—to represent the great people of the Mountain State as we strive to create a strong and prosperous future. Now is the time for Washington to work for West Virginia, and I stand ready to do my part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CONGRATULATING THE SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to say to our new Senator from West Virginia what an outstanding speech not only for her State but the way forward for our country, and I congratulate her for an outstanding set of comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate my colleague from West Virginia. We spoke earlier about how she and I can show the way to have a better relationship-building

effort here in the Senate by working together in order to better serve the people of West Virginia and also the country. I congratulate my colleague on her great speech and look forward to working with her. I think she has done a great job for the people of West Virginia, and I again thank the Senator.

**The PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Virginia.

#### TACKLING NATIONAL SECURITY QUESTIONS

**Mr. Kaine.** Mr. President, I rise to address a question to myself and every Member of this body, and the question is a serious one: Is the Senate capable of tackling challenging national security questions in a mature and responsible way?

We have many hard national security challenges before us now. Three of those challenges are urgent: the discussions about a potential nuclear deal with Iran, the discussions in this body about military action by the United States against ISIL, and the deliberations that will take place this month about the American budget, which will determine whether we have the resources we need to meet our security challenges. We have to show the American public—and I would argue the world—that we can give these issues the careful consideration they deserve, but I am forced to admit that recent events have caused me to have some significant doubts about our institutional capacity to tackle these issues in a responsible way.

We recently—at the end of February—ran up to the very brink of shutting down the Department of Homeland Security at a time when terrorist threats and other threats to our homeland security are so obvious on our borders and throughout the world. Thank goodness, after a week's extension of funding for Homeland Security, we pulled back from the brink. But that did not lead to an increase in confidence in this body, that Congress would contemplate not funding the Department of Homeland Security.

Last week there was a joint address to Congress by Prime Minister Netanyahu. I spent many hours conversing with Prime Minister Netanyahu in his office about Iran and other topics, but I am sad to look at that joint address and basically say it was history-making in some unfortunate ways.

Congress has heard from the Prime Minister or President of Israel seven times in the last 50 years—eight times if you count last week. Last week's address was unusual because it was designed in a partisan way. It was an invitation by the leadership of one party with an intentional decision not to let the White House know, not to let the minority party in Congress know, and to schedule the speech days before a contested foreign election, leading many to conclude that it was an effort

by Congress to affect a foreign election, which we should never do.

Following that speech, a carefully worked bipartisan bill that has been introduced in Congress to give Congress an appropriate review role over any potential Iranian nuclear deal was basically hijacked. Instead of allowing the bill to go through Congress, there was a decision to force the bill to the floor for an immediate vote, which was seen by all as a partisan move. It was described by one of the Republican sponsors of the bill as an effort to embarrass Democrats. Thank goodness that at the end of the day that effort to accelerate consideration of what was a bipartisan bill was pulled back, and we will not be doing that this week. We will be allowing a normal committee process. But the fact that the effort was made did damage to reasonable bipartisan consideration of this important issue.

Then yesterday we all awoke to the news that there had been a partisan letter signed by 47 Senators—47 of my colleagues, many of whom I work with very closely—not to the President saying “We have concerns about a deal, and we are going to weigh in” but instead to the leader of a nation that we characterize as a terrorist state. This letter presumed to instruct the nation about what Congress might or might not do. The letter was widely viewed as an effort to undercut or dilute diplomatic negotiations that are in the best tradition of our country, the notion of diplomacy.

I just came from hearings this morning in the Armed Services Committee where we heard what we have heard for 2½ years: advice from our military leadership to the Senate that sequester is hurting our national defense. Will you finally listen to us? Will you do something about it?

All of these events over the last few weeks when taken together suggest the sad possibility of a Senate that will elevate partisan political division over careful and constructive deliberation, even on the most critical security issues that affect the security of our country and the world. I deeply believe that this body—the Senate and Congress generally—has to pull back from the brink of irresponsible and partisan action with respect to these critical security questions because the stakes are simply too high.

With respect to the Iranian nuclear negotiation, I share many of the concerns of my 47 colleagues who wrote the letter. I share many of the concerns of the Prime Minister that were shared in his speech last week. But I deeply believe we should not try to tank a deal, critique a deal, or undercut a deal before there is a deal because to the extent there are efforts to stand and say this is a bad deal before there is a deal, the message that is communicated to the American public and to

the world is: We will never accept any deal. We are not interested in diplomacy. We are not interested in negotiation.

That attitude plays directly into the hands of the nation of Iran, which is currently engaging in terrorist activity. They want to be able to blame the absence of any deal on an intransigent United States that is unwilling to negotiate in good faith.

We should not tank a deal before there is a deal. Instead, why don't we do what we are supposed to do as the greatest deliberative body in the world? Why don't we allow negotiators who have been working in the best traditions of American diplomacy to see if they can find a deal and then put it on the table for the review of Congress, as has always been contemplated?

I am a proud original cosponsor and worked on the draftsmanship of a bipartisan bill that was introduced under the key sponsorship of Foreign Relations chair Senator CORKER and ranking member Senator MENENDEZ to guarantee to Congress an appropriate review of any final deal with Iran over their nuclear program if such a deal was reached. This is a bill which is rigorously bipartisan—not partisan, not political, not rushed, not accelerated, but rigorously bipartisan. It respects the ongoing process by allowing the negotiators to do their work and see if they can find an outcome. It guarantees Congress a debate and vote if a deal includes relief under the congressional sanctions Congress has enacted over the years. It is appropriately deferential to the Executive, allowing the Executive the flexibility to do sanctions relief under Executive or international sanctions that have not been part of any congressional statute.

This is a bipartisan bill which provides some assurance to allies. Our allies in the region—allies that are most affected by the Iranian nuclear ambitions are not part of the P5+1, whether you are talking about Israel or Gulf State nations or Jordan. The nations most affected by Iranian nuclear ambitions are not part of the P5+1, and the Corker-Menendez bill would give them some comfort that a deal, if announced, would receive some careful scrutiny in this body.

Finally, I believe the Corker-Menendez bipartisan approach even provides some important assurances to Iran in the negotiation. We want Iran to make not small concessions, we want them to make big and bold concessions and give up any intent to develop nuclear weapons. But what is the likelihood that Iran will make those concessions if they have no knowledge about what Congress's intent is vis-à-vis the congressional statutory provisions?

There is a right way and a wrong way to approach these matters. To rush it, to label a deal as a bad deal before there is a deal, to make it entirely partisan rather than bipartisan, reflecting

the will of the body, is an effort to undercut negotiations that weakens our President, weakens our country, and weakens our credibility; whereas if we proceed in a bipartisan way, we can make the deal stronger.

Similarly—and then I wish to cede the moment to my colleague, the Senator from Maine—we are about to start work on another critically important issue—whether Congress should finally, after 7-plus months, have a debate to authorize an ongoing war against the Islamic State in the Levant that was begun on August 8 by the President. We are now in the eighth month of a unilateral war, and aside from a Foreign Relations Committee vote in committee in December, Congress has not had a meaningful vote or debate on this fundamental responsibility. We owe it to ourselves and to this institution, we owe it to the important national security interests at stake, and especially we owe it to the people who are risking their lives in this war—and we have already had deaths of American servicemembers as part of Operation Inherent Resolve—we owe it to them to show we can have a meaningful debate that is not partisan, that is not rushed, but that is careful and deliberate. They have been waiting for 7-plus months to see whether Congress even cares.

We are at war by a Presidential act. Does Congress even care enough to have the debate on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives? Is it just partisanship now? Is it just delay now? Does the fact our service men and women are risking their lives even matter to us now?

This is the debate we will be entering into within the next few days, starting with the hearing in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tomorrow. We can't afford, on important issues of national security such as Iran or such as the war against ISIL, to send the impression to our troops, to our citizens, to our global citizens around the world, that on these important matters Congress is now just a partisan sort of sideshow rather than the deliberative body we were set up to be. We have to find a bipartisan path forward on these important security issues or we weaken confidence in this institution and in the leadership of this country.

In conclusion, the national security interests that are at stake right now before us are fundamental, whether it is about Iran, whether it is about the battle against ISIL, or whether it is about the budgetary deliberations we will be undertaking this month—a budgetary deliberation that will determine whether we can meet our commitments in these national security challenges. We have to get these debates right for the good of our country and the world, and we have to get them right to demonstrate to all that this institution does have the maturity to

tackle these issues in a reasonable way.

With that, I yield the last minute or so of my time to my colleague from Maine, Senator KING.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there is little I can add to the remarks of the Senator from Virginia on this issue.

I think this institution is being tested this week, this month, and over the next several months in a way that is really somewhat new. The test, the question, is: Can we deal with the most serious of issues facing this country and the world in a responsible, reasonable, and, yes, bipartisan, nonpartisan way?

I also worked with BOB CORKER, Senator KAINE, and the whole group that worked on putting together—Senator MENENDEZ—a bipartisan bill to provide Congress a role in the approval of whatever deal is struck with Iran. I believe Congress should have that role. But in those discussions, my concern was that some of our Members will not be able to resist the temptation to politicize and make a partisan issue—even this grave issue of war and peace, this grave issue that faces this country and the entire world—of the possibility of a regime such as that in Iran achieving nuclear weapons.

This is not an ideological debate. This is a serious debate about the future of this country. This is one of the most serious negotiations of our adult lives. I want Congress to have a role, but I want it to play that role weighing the merits, pro or con, the actual materials that are in the treaty—in the agreement. I want us to have that role, but I want to be sure we can respond to that in a responsible way. Frankly, the actions of the last few days have shaken that confidence, because we have seen what appears to be an effort to gain political and partisan advantage from this gravest of national issues.

I understand there are differences about what the deal should look like and what the terms should be. That is OK. That is what we should be discussing. But to turn this into a partisan issue I think does a grave disservice to this entire country, and to undercut the President in the last stages of the negotiation to me is unprecedented and unthinkable.

I was a young man at the time of the Cuban missile crisis. I cannot imagine the Congress of the United States writing a letter to Krushchev in the midst of those discussions and saying, Don't worry about this guy Kennedy, he doesn't speak for the country. Yet that essentially is what took place yesterday. I don't understand the need or the helpfulness of such a statement at a time when we were already moving toward a bipartisan—I believe probably veto-proof—bill to provide this institution with a check on the quality of the deal that is being struck.

It is not productive or helpful to turn issues of this kind into partisan issues. I hope we can step back from this partisan posture and meet this solemn responsibility to assess what the President and the administration and the other five countries—the agreement they come to with Iran—to determine whether, indeed, it is in the best interests of the region and the world. That is our responsibility. I hope we can muster the ability to meet that responsibility in a serious way and not, for once, turn it into a partisan issue.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

DR. FRANCIS COLLINS, DR. NANCY SULLIVAN,  
AND DR. WILLIAM GAHL

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments today to speak about Federal workers in general and some of the people at the National Institutes of Health in particular.

Government workers guard our borders, protect us from terrorists, treat our wounded veterans, dispense Social Security checks to our retirees, find cures for diseases, guide the Nation's air traffic, explore the tiniest particles and the vast expanse of outer space, ensure our air is safe to breathe, our water is safe to drink, our food is safe to eat, support our service men and women in harm's way, and promote our interests and ideals abroad. For whom does the government work? Government works for America.

The Washington Post recently reported that since reliable data first became available shortly before World War II, the percentage of all employed people working for the Federal Government hit an all-time low in December. Fewer than 2 percent of the total U.S. workforce is employed by the Federal Government. Over nearly the past half century, from 1966 to 2012—the most recent year for which comparable data is available—the number of Federal workers in the executive branch dropped by 83,000. During that time, the U.S. population increased from under 200 million to over 300 million people and the gross domestic product nearly quadrupled.

We can argue over whether we want bigger government or smaller government, but we should all agree we want better government. We can't have better government when Federal workers are constantly under assault. We need to stop treating the Federal workforce like a rented mule. We need to treat the Federal workforce like the critical asset it is.

A 2011 report by the National Academy of Public Administration and the Kettering Foundation concluded that programs operated by civil servants receive “significantly higher” scores for management and effectiveness than those run by “grant- and contract-based third parties.”

I think part of the problem is that Americans have come to accept that Federal workers are nameless, faceless bureaucrats. They aren't. They are people who are patriotic Americans and dedicated to public service. They have families and support their communities. They have been asked to do more and more with less and less while being subjected to pay freezes, sequestration-related furloughs, government shutdowns, and threats to their benefits. They have contributed \$150 billion to deficit reduction while still working hard on behalf of all Americans.

Today, as I mentioned, I wish to focus on the Federal workers at the National Institutes of Health. I wish to introduce my colleagues and all Americans to a few of the Federal workers who are making life better for all of us. But first a description of the NIH so people can understand its mission.

I can sum up its mission in two words: saving lives. The NIH is the world's premier biomedical and health-related research facility. Its job is to perform and fund the research that helps improve the Nation's health—a job it has carried out for over a century.

I am proud the NIH is headquartered in Maryland, but it is important to understand that NIH support of medical research at other research institutions has created jobs and fostered economic growth in each and every State, while establishing and maintaining the United States as the global leader in the life sciences. NIH-supported research added \$69 billion to our GDP and supported 7 million jobs in 2011 alone.

In the weeks and months ahead, Congress and the administration will have to decide whether they have to replace sequestration with a more logical, coherent, strategic, and responsible form of budgeting.

While we will have disagreements over the details, if anyone needs to be convinced about the value of replacing sequestration, look no further than the situation at NIH. Funding constraints there not only cost people their jobs, they are costing people their lives.

NIH funding has multiple drivers, but comparing the fiscal year 2013 figures with the fiscal year 2012 figures, largely because of sequestration, approximately 640 fewer competitive research project grants were issued and approximately 750 fewer new patients were admitted to the NIH Clinical Center. Each of these affects a person's life. Each of these has consequences when we do not move forward as we should.

A recent survey determined that nearly 20 percent of the biomedical scientists have considered leaving the United States due to sequestration. We are losing our best. Nearly one-half of the scientists surveyed said they have laid off staff in their laboratories or are considering laying off staff due to losing NIH grants. More than 50 per-

cent of the researchers say they have colleagues who have lost his or her job.

What is the impact? Delays in life-saving medical progress. Medical breakthroughs do not happen overnight. In almost all instances, breakthrough discoveries result from years of incremental research to understand how diseases start and progress. Cuts to research are delaying progress in medical breakthroughs, including developing better cancer drugs that zero in on a tumor with fewer side effects; research on a universal flu vaccine that could fight every strain of influenza without needing a yearly shot; preventing debilitating chronic conditions that are costly to society and delay development of more effective treatments for common and rare diseases affecting millions of Americans.

NIH Director Dr. Francis Collins recently wrote the column "Exceptional Opportunities in Medical Science" in which he describes the excitement over "personalized medicine," the BRAIN initiative, and development of the Ebola vaccine. He has also shared his concern about the budget challenges NIH faces.

Let me quote from Dr. Collins:

Although all of these ambitious scientific endeavors offer exceptional promise for advancing human health, the effect that unprecedented budget pressures are having on biomedical research cannot be ignored. Due to inflation, the NIH budget has lost almost 25 percent of its purchasing power over the last decade. The decline has had important consequences. The NIH once funded one in three research proposals, but now only has enough resources to support one in six. As a result, a great deal of excellent science is being left unfunded.

Last October Dr. Collins stated that cuts in Federal funding slowed the development of vaccines and therapies for the deadly Ebola virus, saying: "Frankly, if we had not gone through our 10-year slide in research support, we probably would have had a vaccine in time for this that would have gone through clinical trials and would have been ready."

Think about the lives that could have been saved.

To Americans who wonder what their tax dollars do—well, some go to NIH to find treatments and cures for cancer, depression, arthritis, substance abuse, addiction, diabetes, and Alzheimer's disease. To date, 145 NIH-supported researchers have received or shared 85 Nobel Prizes.

Not everyone wins a Nobel Prize, so let me talk about people who aren't in the spotlight—people some of our colleagues might refer to as "nameless, faceless bureaucrats." I will highlight the work of two of them today who are making a tremendous contribution as public servants.

Dr. Nancy Sullivan, Chief of the Vaccine Research Center, has been working on an Ebola vaccine for nearly two decades, dating back to when she was

an investigator at the University of Michigan with the then-NIH grantee and now former Director, Dr. Gary Nabel. Most vaccines spur production of a person's immune system's antibodies that block a virus from entering the cells, but that approach doesn't work for Ebola.

Gene-based vaccines can induce additional virus fighters called T-cells, so that is what Dr. Sullivan created, using pieces of Ebola genetic material. It is the most promising approach yet, and it is being tested in the parts of West Africa that have been hit the hardest with Ebola, where more than 9,000 people have died.

The concept for Dr. Sullivan's vaccine has been 16 years in the making, beginning back when few people outside the global infectious disease community had even heard of the deadly disease. Over the years, Dr. Sullivan and her team continued to tweak her ideas, constantly improving on them. Eventually she followed Dr. Nabel to NIH.

Many experts in the vaccine research community had begun to believe Ebola was insurmountable. They thought it was too aggressive for a vaccine to ever protect against it. But Dr. Sullivan never lost heart that her work would one day prove successful.

The Ebola virus infection is a highly lethal disease for which there are no effective therapeutic or preventive treatments. Consequently, work with these viruses requires highly specialized BSL-4 containment labs—the highest biosafety labs. Dr. Sullivan is a leader in the field and has personally conducted many of the most critical experiments. Her work on immunology and vaccine development is widely considered as some of the very best in the field. In spite of the difficulties associated with access to BSL-4 labs, her work has consistently been the source of novel observations.

Dr. Sullivan received her Ph.D. in cell biology from Harvard University in 1997. She received her master of science in environmental engineering in 1989, also from Harvard University.

I brought a poster to the floor where we see President Obama visited NIH to personally congratulate Dr. Sullivan for her incredible work on behalf of world health.

Some people may be familiar with the TV show "House." The main character, Dr. Gregory House, is brilliant at diagnosing conditions and illnesses that baffle everyone else. The real-life Dr. House is Dr. William Gahl, the founding Director of the Undiagnosed Diseases Program at NIH. He is America's leading medical detective, a physician dedicated to finding answers for long-suffering patients with mysterious illnesses that long eluded diagnosis. Dr. Gahl has brought together a unique combination of elite medical specialists, researchers, and Federal resources to solve baffling illnesses and

provide desperate patients and their families with information and possible solutions and treatments for their often life-threatening ailments.

Results include diagnosis and treatment of diseases so rare they don't even have names, plus new genetic discoveries, improved disease management, and the advancement of medical knowledge. NIH Director Dr. Collins said the Undiagnosed Diseases Program, which Dr. Gahl conceived and started, serves as a kind of court of last resort for patients without a diagnosis. Dr. Gahl has convinced some of the best, brightest, and busiest physicians to participate, and has devoted tremendous energy to examining patient records, selecting cases for in-depth analysis, and helping people who are seriously ill.

Under Dr. Gahl's stewardship, the program regularly involves a collective effort by more than 25 attending physicians of different specialties. The cooperation by a diverse group of experts has helped create a coherent view of each patient instead of the organ-by-organ orientation taken by most specialists. Patients are brought to the NIH campus in Bethesda for an intensive week. They meet with a parade of specialists who study their medical histories, perform thorough exams, and take numerous tests.

The doctors then meet to discuss what they have seen, discovered, or may have missed. They also debate various theories, trying to connect the dots, and come up with a possible diagnosis and treatment.

Scientists working with Dr. Gahl discovered the genetic cause of a vascular disorder not previously identified in the medical literature. The rare condition, identified in nine individuals, arises in adulthood and causes arterial calcification in the hands and feet, but does not affect arteries in the heart. The symptoms include acute pain after walking more than a short distance. The disorder previously baffled the medical field and evaded diagnosis when conventional methods were used.

In another instance, physicians working with Dr. Gahl identified the reason why a woman's muscles had grown painfully large and hard underneath her skin, making it increasingly difficult for her to perform daily activities. This turned out to be an extremely rare, generally fatal complication of multiple myeloma, and the diagnosis by the NIH Undiagnosed Diseases Program resulted in a stem cell bone marrow transplant that allows her to lead a normal life. These are people who had no hope, no hope at all. They came to NIH, and they have gotten government-supported help to give them hope and to give them life.

Dr. Gahl earned his B.S. in biology from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1972 and his M.D. from the University of Wisconsin in 1976. He

obtained a Ph.D. degree in oncology research from Wisconsin's McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research in 1981. He has published more than 350 peer-reviewed papers and trained 36 biochemical geneticists.

Dr. Gahl has made a number of seminal discoveries regarding rare diseases during his career. He said deciding who to admit into the Undiagnosed Diseases Program is always very difficult and much like triage on the battlefield. You have to make decisions about where you think you can do some good.

The Undiagnosed Diseases Program serves people who feel helpless, have suffered greatly, have waited many years for answers, and must be treated with respect and attention. According to Dr. Gahl, the NIH caregivers understand the desperation the patients and their families feel and try to balance the difficulty finding solutions with a realistic measure of hope.

Dr. John Gallin, Director of the NIH Clinical Center, said Dr. Gahl takes cases after everyone else has given up. He said that in a short time the program has developed new approaches for investigating, understanding, and diagnosing rare disorders, and has added to the body of medical knowledge. As Dr. Gallin put it, as a result of the NIH Undiagnosed Diseases Program, the language of medicine is changing. The different specialists working together now are beginning to find common ways.

Nancy Sullivan and Bill Gahl are just two of the dedicated people who work in the Federal Government. They are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats. They are dedicated, hard-working Americans trying to make life better for all of us under difficult circumstances. At a minimum, they deserve our gratitude and respect. They also deserve a predictable and reasonable budget to support their critical work.

In the weeks ahead I will be discussing the accomplishments of other outstanding Federal workers so that Americans can understand government works for America.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:37 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a serious crime and a violation of human rights that must be

stopped—human trafficking. It is a form of modern-day slavery, people profiting from the control and exploitation of others.

I rise as a doc, a fellow who has practiced in the public hospital system for 32 years, understanding the unique role nurses, physicians, and other health care providers play in this issue.

Health care providers are frontline and one of the few to interact directly with trafficked women and children. A recent survey published in the *Annals of Health Law* reports that 28 percent of trafficked women sought a health care professional while being held captive.

Now, this does not mean that the nurse, the doctor or other health care provider had the training to recognize it, but because of the unique and critical involvement with these victims, it is important these health care providers do have the tested tools and training to identify and help those being trafficked.

The Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care amendment would save lives and, as importantly, would begin the rebuilding of lives destroyed by modern-day slavery. It would provide for the development of best practices to enable health care workers to recognize and assist victims of human trafficking.

It is proven that many trafficking victims report receiving health care from federally funded clinics and emergency rooms while in captivity yet, as I mentioned earlier, they go undetected. This legislation would improve the awareness of health care workers, ultimately helping these victims.

Senator TIM KAINE recently spoke about a missive that Pope Francis gave on Ash Wednesday, calling for us to be "islands of mercy in a sea of indifference." The ethic of nurses, physicians, and other health care workers is to be that merciful creature. This would give them the training to better enable them to be that "island" in what for that woman or child caught in captivity must seem a "sea of indifference."

Having passed the House by unanimous consent, this amendment represents a bipartisan effort that will enable the medical community to bring relief to those suffering in ways that those of us who have never been there cannot imagine.

Senator PETERS is joining me in this bipartisan effort. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help transform victims of trafficking into survivors and people who blossom.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

#### AUTHORIZING THE USE OF FORCE AGAINST THE ISLAMIC STATE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss one of the most critical national security challenges facing

the Senate: specifically, how we should craft an authorization for the use of military force against the terrorist organization known as the Islamic State.

I have spoken before on the floor about what I believe the outline of an authorization should contain. Now that the President has released his proposal—and with Secretary Kerry, Secretary Carter, and General Dempsey slated to testify tomorrow on behalf of this proposal—I feel compelled to address this topic in greater detail.

Before delving into the specifics of the administration's proposed authorization, we should consider how this institution has grappled with these vital questions throughout our Nation's history. Dating back to 1798, Congress has on several occasions enacted legislation short of a formal declaration of war authorizing the use of military force by the President. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, Congress authorized U.S. naval action against both state and non-state actors who attacked U.S. commercial vessels. More recent authorizations formally passed by the Congress include those intended to protect the Middle East, Taiwan, and Southeast Asia from communist aggression in the 1950s and 1960s. And since the end of the Cold War, we have passed authorizations concerning Lebanon, the September 11 attacks, and Iraq—all in 1991 and in 2002.

I voted for those latter four authorizations here in this Chamber. Each case was unique, but in every case the White House did not send the Congress "take it or leave it" language. Rather, the Senate and the House fashioned text that represented a negotiated outcome with the White House and within Congress.

For example, Presidents Eisenhower and George H.W. Bush worked closely with Congress to obtain strong authorizations for the use of military force, despite Democrats controlling both Chambers. President George W. Bush twice did the same with a Democrat-led Senate. This approach yielded concrete benefits—a more thoughtful debate and strategy around our use of force, greater unity in supporting our military, and congressional willingness to fulfill our constitutional responsibilities.

Historically, the Senate has fulfilled its role as a place of intelligent, informed debate in moving authorizations for use of military force. We must do so again as we consider this authorization to combat the Islamic State. Thirteen years ago, as the Senate began to deliberate over an authorization to rid Iraq of its violent dictator, I said: We all must leave our political party affiliations at the door when it comes to our national security and supporting our troops in the field.

It is time for Congress to come together, to hold a public debate, and to craft the right authorization to defeat the Islamic State.

Turning to the proposed authorization before us today, I agree with the legal interpretation offered by the Obama administration that the executive branch has the power to conduct operations against the Islamic State under article II of the Constitution and the existing authorizations from 2001 and 2002. Unfortunately, the administration has undermined the credibility of its own proposal by continuously changing its position as to how the 2001 and 2002 authorizations should be employed. Therefore, in order to settle any legal questions about the power to use force against the Islamic State—and to demonstrate America's resolve in this fight against terror—I firmly believe that a new authorization should be enacted.

Accordingly, the senior Senator from Oklahoma and I discussed in this Chamber last month three principles that we believe should be included in a new authorization for the use of military force against the Islamic State.

First, the authorization must clearly articulate that the executive branch is authorized to use force—employed in accordance with the law of war—against the Islamic State.

Second, the authorization must be flexible enough to be used against the Islamic State as it appears today but also in whatever form the Islamic State transforms into in the future. This flexibility must include the authority to use force against organizations that associate with or support the Islamic State.

Finally, and most importantly, the authorization must not impose any artificial and unnecessary limitations, such as those based on time, geography, and type of force, which could interfere with our strategic objective of defeating the Islamic State.

Unfortunately, the President's draft authorization does not fully adhere to these principles.

First, the President's proposal "does not authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces in enduring offensive ground operations." Obviously, this is an unwise artificial limitation on what type of forces we can employ. But the President's proposed operative text offers little to define what this restriction entails. Therefore, my initial reaction, one that is widely shared, is: What does this restriction mean?

To be fair, the President's introductory letter that accompanied his draft does provide some insight into the administration's interpretation of this phrase. Specifically, the President argues that the authorization would provide him with the power to conduct rescue operations, to provide advice and assistance to partner forces, and to deploy the use of Special Forces in missions against the Islamic State's leadership, intelligence collection, and targeting missions.

But in laying out his vision, the President's proposal also tells our en-

emies what he is not prepared to do. Knowing these limitations would provide the Islamic State with a critical advantage: The terrorists would exploit this information in crafting their strategies. Why would we telegraph our strategy to our enemies?

The President's proposed legal limitations will also limit our ability to adjust our strategy as needed based on the military situation on the ground. For example, when our counterterrorism strategy in Iraq faltered during the mid 2000s, we changed it and we adopted a new counterinsurgency strategy commonly called the surge. As we all know, the surge was a great success.

Therefore, ensuring any authorization has the flexibility to allow our forces to change and adapt their strategies and tactics is essential. Imposing the President's proposed artificial and unnecessary, yet legally binding, restrictions on our forces would be a colossal mistake.

Indeed, General Jack Keane, who devised the principles of the surge, recently testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee about his own proposal as to how to conduct operations against the Islamic State. In his testimony, the general did advocate using Special Forces in a similar manner to what the President discussed in his letter accompanying his proposal. But the general went further. He stated that the United States and our coalition partners should position combat brigades in Kuwait if our current operation "stalls or is defeated."

Obviously, the use of combat brigades would be prohibited under the President's proposal. Therefore, if the President's limited operations are not successful and additional ground forces are required, adopting the President's proposal would create significant uncertainty.

This raises the question: Would Congress need to debate and pass yet another authorization before those units could be used in combat? On its face, this would be completely impractical and hardly in our national security interest.

Another area in which the President's proposal does not provide sufficient flexibility is its 3-year time limitation. Simply put, if we advertise when the authorization expires at an arbitrary date and time, will our enemies not hunker down and wait for that date?

Secretary of State John Kerry stated in his previous testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the administration does not believe a new authorization should include a geographic limitation. To its credit, the President's proposal does not. Specifically, the Secretary argued: "In our view, it would be a mistake to advertise to ISIL that there are safe havens for them outside of Iraq and Syria."



Undoubtedly, the Secretary was concerned about creating artificial limitations that could negatively affect our ability to conduct necessary military operations. He is right. But his concern should extend to the other artificial restrictions that appear in this proposal. How else can we read the prohibition of “enduring offensive ground combat operations” and a 3-year time limitation?

In conclusion, we can do better. Our forces must have the flexibility to use, or the ability to threaten to use, whatever tools and strategies are necessary to defeat the Islamic State. When America enters into a fight, we should enter to win. And we should not just do this in a halfhearted, stupid way.

So I hope the White House will reconsider some of the things that they have advocated and that they have set forth and get this thing done right so that if we are going to enter into warfare, we ought to know what we are doing and ought to have the tools and the legal legalities to be able to do it well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is considering S. 178.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The senior assistant legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator cannot reserve the right to object. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I know the Presiding Officer has other places to be, and I am going to be presiding in the chair in a moment.

I will not offer amendments because my understanding is that even though we are on the bill, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want me to offer noncontroversial amendments. So I will wait until they are ready for that just to keep the peace on the floor, but I will talk about the amendments because they are incredibly important to the underlying legislation.

We are talking about the human trafficking legislation. This is something that as cochair and cofounder of the Human Trafficking Caucus, as a father, and as someone who represents the citizens of Ohio, who are directly affected by this, I have a strong interest.

I am delighted the Senate is taking up this legislation. I do hope it will be not just bipartisan but nonpartisan. I do not see any reason for it not to move forward in the Senate, changing some of these laws that are in desperate need of changing to ensure that this horrific practice of human trafficking and sex trafficking can be curbed. It can be minimized by legislation that this Chamber should have taken up, in my view, some time ago.

We really haven't been at this subject for a decade. We know a lot more about the problem now. We know, unfortunately, that about 300,000 of our youth are subject to human trafficking—about 1,000 in my home State of Ohio alone.

The amendments I will offer—once someone on this side comes to the floor who will allow me to offer them—have to do with human trafficking in the broadest sense.

The first amendment has to do with those people who are, unfortunately, trapped in sex trafficking being treated not as criminals but as victims and with ensuring that those victims get the proper care they need and the help to be able to get back on their feet. These are young people—we are told many times—who are between the ages of 11 and 13 when they are first exposed to human trafficking, in this case sex trafficking. In fact, that is the average age, we are told.

Having talked to some of the victims at home, having talked to some of those who are in the trenches working, trying to help these young women, girls, young men, and boys, this legislation is badly needed to ensure we are looking at this—not again as a criminal matter but—as victims who deserve our support.

Specifically, it requires that every State put together a plan to improve child protection services—containing, among other things, provisions and procedures requiring identification and assessments of all reports involving children known or to be suspected victims of sex trafficking—with better information and better data, a description of efforts to coordinate State law enforcement, child welfare agencies, and juvenile justice agencies such as runaway and homeless youth shelters to help serve these victims.

Finally, this legislation calls for an annual State report on the number of children identified as known or suspected to be a victim of sex trafficking.

The other amendment I am going to offer will be an amendment with regard to homeless children and youth. As has been discussed on this floor before, the

HUD definition of homelessness practically excludes the most common situations for families and unaccompanied youths—and that would be staying in motels or temporarily with others because there is no place else for them to stay. Even if local communities identified these families or youth as having the most pressing unmet needs, communities can't use the HUD homeless assistance funds to serve them except in extremely limited or near-impossible conditions.

This is related to human trafficking and also to sex trafficking in that, unfortunately, many of these young people involved in these situations—where they are homeless, where they are not on the street but are going from house to house or perhaps staying in a motel—are targeted by these traffickers.

I believe these two amendments, which are not only bipartisan—and they are; I have support on both sides of the aisle—but are also nonpartisan and are ones that would be appropriate to include in the legislation.

At the appropriate time I will offer those amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. We need to confer for a couple of minutes.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 270

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 270.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 270.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking, and for other purposes)

At the end of the bill, add the following:

#### **TITLE IV—BETTER RESPONSE FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING**

##### **SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Ensuring a Better Response for Victims of Child Sex Trafficking”.

##### **SEC. 402. CAPTA AMENDMENTS.**

(a) STATE PLANS.—Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)(B)—

(A) in clause (xxii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(xxiv) provisions and procedures requiring identification and assessment of all reports involving children known or suspected to be victims of sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B)); and

“(xxv) provisions and procedures for training child protective services workers about identifying, assessing, and providing comprehensive services for children who are sex trafficking victims, including efforts to coordinate with State law enforcement, juvenile justice, and social service agencies such as runaway and homeless youth shelters to serve this population;”;

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(17) The number of children determined to be victims described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(xxiv).”.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g) is amended—

(A) by striking “For purposes” and inserting the following:

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) SPECIAL RULE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4), a child shall be considered a victim of ‘child abuse and neglect’ and of ‘sexual abuse’ if the child is identified, by a State or local agency employee of the State or locality involved, as being a victim of sex trafficking (as defined in paragraph (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) or a victim of severe forms of trafficking in persons described in paragraph (9)(A) of that section.

“(2) STATE OPTION.—Notwithstanding the definition of ‘child’ in section 3(1), a State may elect to define that term for purposes of the application of paragraph (1) to section 3(2) and subsection (a)(4) as a person who has not attained the age of 24.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3(2) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note) is amended by inserting “(including sexual abuse as determined under section 111)” after “sexual abuse or exploitation”.

(3) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Paragraph (5)(C) of subsection (a), as so designated, of section 111 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106g) is amended by striking “inhumane;” and inserting “inhumane.”.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this is the amendment I spoke about a moment ago to ensure a better response for victims of child sex trafficking.

AMENDMENT NO. 271

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for the moment on this side there is an objection to setting aside the pending amendment. I have no objection to the pending amendment being there, but—I have been told there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. To my colleague from Ohio, go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. I call up my amendment No. 271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the definition of “homeless person” under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ AMENDMENTS TO THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (5)(A)—

(I) by striking “are sharing” and all that follows through “charitable organizations;”;

(II) by striking “14 days” each place that term appears and inserting “30 days”;

(III) in clause (i), by inserting “or” after the semicolon;

(IV) by striking clause (ii); and

(V) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and

(ii) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) unaccompanied youth and homeless families with children and youth defined as homeless under other Federal statutes who—

“(A) are certified as homeless by the director or designee of a director of a program funded under any other Federal statute; or

“(B) have been certified by a director or designee of a director of a program funded under this Act or a director or designee of a director of a public housing agency as lacking a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence, which shall include—

“(i) temporarily sharing the housing of another person due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or other similar reason; or

“(ii) living in a room in a motel or hotel.”;

and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘other Federal statute’ has the meaning given that term in section 401; and

“(2) the term ‘public housing agency’ means an agency described in section 3(b)(6) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(b)(6)).”;

(2) in section 401—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) by striking clause (iv); and

(ii) by redesignating clauses (v), (vi), and (vii) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively;

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking “Federal statute other than this subtitle” and inserting “other Federal statute”; and

(ii) by inserting “of” before “this Act”;

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (14) through (33) as paragraphs (15) through (34), respectively; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (13) the following:

“(14) OTHER FEDERAL STATUTE.—The term ‘other Federal statute’ includes—

“(A) the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.);

“(B) the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9831 et seq.);

“(C) subtitle N of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043e et seq.);

“(D) section 330(h) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(h));

“(E) section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786);

“(F) the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

“(G) subtitle B of title VII of this Act.”;

(3) by inserting after section 408 the following:

“SEC. 409. AVAILABILITY OF HMIS REPORT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The information provided to the Secretary under section 402(f)(3) shall be made publically available on the Internet website of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in aggregate, non-personally identifying reports.

“(b) REQUIRED DATA.—Each report made publically available under subsection (a) shall be updated on at least an annual basis and shall include—

“(1) a cumulative count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness;

“(2) a cumulative assessment of the patterns of assistance provided under subtitles B and C of this title for the each geographic area involved; and

“(3) a count of the number of individuals and families experiencing homelessness that are documented through the HMIS by each collaborative applicant.”;

(4) in section 422—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) RESTRICTION.—In awarding grants under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not consider or prioritize the specific homeless populations intended to be served by the applicant if the applicant demonstrates that the project—

“(A) would meet the priorities identified in the plan submitted under section 427(b)(1)(B); and

“(B) is cost-effective in meeting the overall goals and objectives identified in that plan.”;

and

(B) by striking subsection (j);

(5) in section 424(d), by striking paragraph (5);

(6) in section 427(b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by adding “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (vii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (viii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (iii), by adding “and” at the end;

(II) in clause (iv)(VI), by striking “and” at the end; and

(III) by striking clause (v);

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by adding “and” at the end;

(iv) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (F); and

(B) by striking paragraph (3); and

(7) by amending section 433 to read as follows:

**"SEC. 433. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress an annual report, which shall—

"(1) summarize the activities carried out under this subtitle and set forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Secretary as a result of the activities; and

"(2) include, for the year preceding the date on which the report is submitted—

"(A) data required to be made publically available in the report under section 409; and

"(B) data on programs funded under any other Federal statute.

"(b) TIMING.—A report under subsection (a) shall be submitted not later than 4 months after the end of each fiscal year."

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this is the homeless and youth amendment I spoke about a moment ago. I thank everyone for their indulgence. I am pleased to have these amendments offered, and we will have an opportunity to speak on these amendments and another amendment I plan to offer later.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. PORTMAN assumed the Chair.)

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer my support to the underlying legislation we are considering on the floor today. This is the most significant antitrafficking legislation to come before the Senate in over a decade. As I said earlier when I offered a couple of amendments, I am very pleased to be in this body on a non-partisan basis, not just a bipartisan basis, to be able to address this issue, and I would like to thank the Senators who have worked hard in their committees to make that possible. I thank Senators CORNYN and KLOBUCHAR for their work. I see Senator WYDEN is here, Senator LEAHY is here, Senator GRASSLEY is here, and others who have been involved with this. They and their staffs are to be commended. It has been a good process.

It is an issue a lot of us care about. Why? Because it is one that affects our States and our constituents in very significant ways.

Last year I cofounded and I now co-chair the Caucus on Human Trafficking with Senator BLUMENTHAL, and we have had a number of good meetings and conferences here on the Hill bringing experts together and raising awareness of this issue.

Unfortunately, this horrible crime affects every single part of our country. In Ohio this came to my attention initially because in parts of Ohio, along the I-75 corridor, particularly in Toledo, there were higher incidences of

prosecutions of human trafficking. A school group actually brought this to my attention several years ago. The more we looked into it, the more we realized that this affects so many of our constituents, and it particularly affects the most vulnerable in our society—children, runaways, the missing. In the greatest country on the face of the Earth, almost 300,000 of our American children are at risk of trafficking and commercial sexual exploitation, more than 1,000 each year in Ohio alone.

In 2000 I did support the last major bill that directly addressed this growing problem of human trafficking. It was called the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. And I supported the reauthorization in 2011. But since that time we have learned a lot more about the problem. We now know more about how to eradicate what is really a modern form of slavery. Our new legislation, which is called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, builds on what we know works, and it strengthens protections for the victims.

I would like to take a moment, if I could, to talk about two of the bills that are contained within this underlying legislation that are the product of a lot of bipartisan work that exemplifies some of the finest traditions of this body.

The first is the Bringing Missing Children Home Act. The Bringing Missing Children Home Act is something I coauthored with Senator SCHUMER on the other side of the aisle, and we did it because we know there is unfortunately a strong correlation between victims of sex trafficking and children who have recently been in and out of the child welfare system. We also know that children who have run away or who are missing are the most vulnerable to being abused, trafficked, and exploited.

In 2014 an FBI sting recovered 168 children who were victims of sex trafficking. Nearly each one of those children—nearly all of them had been involved in some kind of foster care or the child welfare system. Many of them had been reported missing—by the way, with insufficient information to find them.

It is a strong correlation, and it is one that any effort to stop human trafficking must also address. That is what my legislation does. The Bringing Missing Children Home Act strengthens law enforcement reporting and response procedures, making it easier to communicate and work with child welfare agencies. It accomplishes this in a number of ways.

First, it amends the current Missing Children's Assistance Act so that Federal law makes clear that children who are trafficked or sexually exploited are treated as victims and not as criminals. You will hear this in this debate,

and this is one of the great underlying aspects of this legislation, we are changing the way we look at this, to understand that there is simply no such thing as a child prostitute.

Second, this legislation requires law enforcement to update their records of missing children within 30 days with all the relevant information obtained during the initial investigation. This is very important because this new information will allow us to find these children more easily and more quickly, to avoid them falling into the trap of sexual trafficking and traffickers.

Specifically, the bill requires new dental and medical records, as well as photograph, if available. For almost all of these children, there is a photograph available if you take the time to try to find it. I can't stress this last part enough. It is so hard to find these kids, and without having a photograph, it is made much more difficult. Yet in most instances we apparently don't.

We tracked this in Ohio. Let me give an interesting statistic. Since January 1 of this year there have been 87 children reported missing in the State of Ohio—87 kids. We only have photographs for 21 of them, so for 66 of these young people we have no photographs. It is tough to find them when you don't know what they look like. This bill will help change that.

Third, it requires law enforcement to work directly with State and local child welfare systems after someone is reported missing so that all the relevant information can be obtained as quickly as possible.

Finally, it removes all the roadblocks that prevent State attorneys general from modifying records in the National Crime Information Center. We want these records to be updated constantly as new information is provided.

To put it simply, we think it is a commonsense bill that streamlines how missing children cases are handled. It makes it easier to share information that could lead to recovery.

The second bill I wish to talk about that is part of this underlying legislation is called the Combat Human Trafficking Act which I coauthored with Senator FEINSTEIN. The Bringing Missing Children Home Act is about helping victims. This legislation, the Combat Human Trafficking Act, is about punishing the traffickers.

We start by giving prosecutors expanded tools to put traffickers behind bars. Our legislation enlarges the number of charges Federal prosecutors can level against traffickers and those who conspire with them. It also makes those engaged in trafficking strictly liable for their crimes. We also expand the training available for our Federal law enforcement tasked with investigating and prosecuting traffickers, and we require that the Bureau of Justice Statistics prepare an annual report detailing our success in this fight.

Just as importantly, this bill strengthens victims' rights by providing more information to victims on ongoing prosecutions, requiring them to be informed in a timely manner of any plea agreements or prosecution agreements in cases in which they are involved.

The legislation we are considering passed out of the committee unanimously for a reason. There are things that do divide us in this place. We talk about those a lot, and everybody reads and hears about them. But this is an exception. This is about bringing us together, in this case to protect our kids from human trafficking. Human traffickers and sexual trafficking are issues on which we should not have any divide. This is legislation both Republicans and Democrats can enthusiastically support.

Earlier today I joined with some of my colleagues in introducing some amendments to the legislation because although I support the underlying bill—it is a good bill—it can be made even better, and I am looking forward to the debate. In the process, I hope we will raise awareness about the issue, raise consciousness about the issue not just among our colleagues and around Capitol Hill but around the country because ultimately, if we are going to solve this problem in our communities, everyone needs to be part of it, everyone needs to be vigilant, and everyone needs to understand that this happens in your community, it happens in your State, and it happens, unfortunately, in our country.

If we can raise awareness about this wicked practice of human trafficking and sex trafficking, that would do a lot to try to curb it, to reduce it, and eventually to stop it. This is what we came to Washington to do—to pass legislation that actually helps back home. With this legislation, we can stand together to protect the most innocent among us from the most heinous of crimes.

I thank you the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am going to make now not be part of the remarks on the bill that is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY are printed in today's RECORD under "Morning Business.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday the Democratic leader, Senator REID, told us that Democrats and Republicans could finally agree on one thing; that is, we ought to focus not on the partisan politics and the ideology that so often divides us, but we ought to focus on the victims of human trafficking, largely middle school-age girls who are bought and sold like commodities.

I came to the floor yesterday and said that I believe we are all created in the image of God, and it is a sin, it is the very personification of evil for people to treat those same human beings as if they were things. That is what the scourge of human trafficking is all about.

I was very glad to see that finally we seemed to be chipping away at the dysfunction of the Senate that we have experienced over the last few years and, in the new majority, given an opportunity for an open amendment process on a subject that we all agree needs to be dealt with that we could work on together. So imagine my surprise when earlier today the same Democratic leader said the Democrats were going to filibuster this anti-human trafficking legislation. Why in the world would they take a 180-degree turn? Why would they do such an about-face or flip-flop? Well, they said because there was language contained in the bill they disagreed with. No, they didn't say they would use this open amendment process to file an amendment and have a vote to strip it out or to modify it or otherwise change it; they said: We are going to block the bill; it is dead unless this language comes out. Yet they do nothing to try to effect that outcome.

We might wonder what this language is that they are so upset about that they would literally kick the tens of thousands of children and other victims to the curb because of their outrage that this language is contained in this legislation. Well, imagine my surprise to find out that the reason why the Democratic minority is going to filibuster this antitrafficking bill is because they object to language that has been the law of the land for 39 years—39 years. So I guess they woke up this morning and thought, well, we better do something about it. What is the provision that causes them so much discomfort, that they are so upset about that they are willing to block this legislation? Well, it is something called the Hyde amendment. Basically what that does is it prohibits the use of taxpayer funds for abortions.

I realize that in America we are of different minds on the subject of abortion. I am proudly pro-life, but others in our Senate are pro-choice, and we probably have a whole spectrum of views on this very personal issue. But we have had a bipartisan consensus—unanimity almost—for the last 39 years that whatever else the law is, as handed down by the Supreme Court or by Congress, we are not going to use taxpayer funds for abortion.

So imagine my surprise when that very language and very reference was included in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act bill that now today I find out for the first time our Democratic friends object to.

Imagine my surprise when that very language was part of the bill that was filed in mid-January and a month later was marked up and voted on in the Senate Judiciary Committee and all members of the Judiciary Committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, voted for it. They voted for it unanimously. Well, I don't believe that was a mistake. Our friends across the aisle have outstanding staff. They are very talented people. I don't always agree with them, but they are good at what they do. I don't believe for a minute that they would have missed a reference in this legislation to a restriction on funding taxpayer-provided abortions, and I don't believe that those staff members, being the diligent professionals they are, didn't tell their principal, their member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. So this idea that there has been some kind of ambush is preposterous. It is just not credible.

Well, imagine my surprise when not only did we have a 15-to-0 vote, I believe it was—in other words, a unanimous vote of the Judiciary Committee—for this bill, we have Democratic cosponsors of this bill. Not only do they support the bill, they have been actively working with us on the legislation. Just looking at the face of the bill, I count 10 Democratic cosponsors. Do you think they didn't read the bill before they put their names on it? Do you think their staffs didn't tell them what is in the bill?

Well, as we all know, this sort of thing is ordinarily very hotly debated. There are no shrinking violets in the U.S. Senate, no people who sit passively on the sidelines and say: Well, I better not speak up and express my views. That doesn't happen. We have strong-willed, talented people on both sides of the aisle, and there are no shrinking violets. Let's just lay that to rest. People are willing to speak up, and they do speak up every day, every hour, virtually every minute on things they feel strongly about.

So this idea that we have created an ambush, that we have surprised our colleagues by including this language in a bill that is on the floor, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act—

voted unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee, all Republicans and all Democrats, with 10 Democratic cosponsors—that we have somehow surprised them by including this restriction on taxpayer-funded abortion that has been the law of the land for 39 years is patently ridiculous. It is just not believable.

Let me provide a little more information. The reference in the bill is on page 50 under limitations. It says: “Amounts in the Fund, or otherwise transferred from the Fund”—that is, the crime victims compensation fund created by this legislation, \$30 million that goes to help treat victims and help them heal and get on with their lives—this bill says that this fund “shall be subject to the limitations on the use or expending of amounts described in sections 506 and 507 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 . . . to the same extent as if amounts in the Fund were funds appropriated under division H of such Act.”

I went to see how many Democrats voted for that consolidated appropriations act in 2014 that contained the Hyde amendment language and the limitations on taxpayer-funded abortions. Imagine my surprise when I saw that 55 Democrats voted for that language in the 2014 consolidated appropriations bill that is referred to on pages 50 and 51 of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

This is the same bill the Democratic leader said Democrats were going to filibuster because they were so outraged, they were surprised, they were bushwhacked, they were ambushed, they were tricked. Twenty-three Democrats voted for that same appropriation language in 2014.

But it gets better—or worse, as the case may be. Democrats have supported legislation consistent with the Hyde amendment for a long time. As I have said, it has been the law of the land for 39 years. When was the last time? Well, the Department of Homeland Security funding. Remember this back-and-forth we had over the defunding of the President’s Executive action on immigration that so many on our side of the aisle are upset about because it is not within the President’s authority to do it—and that is not just my opinion; it is the Federal judge’s in Brownsville who has issued a preliminary injunction—but how many Democrats voted for the Department of Homeland Security funding bill that contains that same limitation on taxpayer funding for abortions? Forty-five Democrats voted for it.

So imagine my surprise when 45 Democrats recently voted for that appropriations bill to come to the Senate today and be told: We are outraged. We are never going to support that. And, by the way, we didn’t know it was in the bill when we voted for it in the Ju-

diciary Committee or when we cosponsored the bill.

Well, they presumably knew about it when they voted for the Department of Homeland Security funding in February of 2015, when 32 of them voted for the CR omni or CRomni in December of 2014. And, oh, by the way, remember ObamaCare? Every single Democrat voted to support ObamaCare which contained the same restriction on taxpayer funding for abortions.

They have also voted for the Children’s Health Insurance Program, the so-called SCHIP, for Defense authorization bills. In other words, our Democratic friends have voted time and time and time again for the exact same language they now say they are going to filibuster on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, language they said they weren’t aware of when they voted for it—they didn’t read it, their staff didn’t tell them about it.

Well, if that is true, I would get new staff. But I know the staff on the Democratic side, like the staff on the Republican side, are highly professional people and they wouldn’t fail to identify offensive language that their Senator could not and would not and never has voted for, or they would be out of a job.

So I plead with our Democratic friends, please don’t make this Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act another political football. For heaven’s sake, if we can’t agree to protect the most vulnerable victims of this heinous crime, what can we ever agree on? If we can’t agree on that, if we are going to try to find a way to flyspeck legislation and say, well, I won’t allow this bill to go forward if that language is included in there—even though it has been the law of the land for 39 years, even though routinely Democrats have voted for that restriction on taxpayer-funded abortion time and time and time again—why start now, when we are talking about the most vulnerable victims of this heinous crime, and say: Well, we are going to punish you. We are not going to provide you the services you need in order to heal and get better and get on with your life, because we woke up this morning, March 10, 2015, and after 39 years we decided this is where we draw the line. We are drawing the line here. Never again will we ever vote for the Hyde amendment to be applied to any funds appropriated by or in the possession of the Federal Government.

So I really would ask my colleagues: Please reconsider. Please let’s not do this. Don’t do this to these children and these victims of trafficking. Don’t do it to this institution.

We all understand that Washington can be a pretty tough place. All of us are volunteers, and we understand politics can sometimes be a tough business. But let’s not take it out on these victims of human trafficking. That

should be beneath us. They don’t deserve that. They deserve better.

If we pass this legislation and we get it to the President’s desk and he signs it—which I believe he will—hundreds, if not thousands, of victims of human trafficking have a safe place to sleep, they will have people who love them and care for them try to help them heal and get better. We will take the money from the people who perpetrate these crimes and we will use that money to help provide needed services to these children and other victims of human trafficking.

We will say “no more” to the teen-aged girl who is arrested for prostitution, because she is a victim of trafficking—we will tell her, no more are you a criminal. We will recognize her for the victim she is, and we will treat her appropriately.

We will deal not only with the supply side of this terrible crime, we will deal with the demand side—people who get off the hook too easily with impunity, people who purchase these illicit services, and somehow always seem to avoid responsibility and continue to participate in this crime with impunity.

So the domestic trafficking victims fund in our legislation supplements existing authorized grant programs that are already subject to appropriation laws such as the Hyde amendment. They are already subject to the same provisions. Our legislation clarifies that the Hyde amendment also applies to any funds that are used to supplement those existing grant programs. Our legislation does not in any way expand or change the scope of the Hyde amendment. It just says these funds operate under the same rules that cover the existing grant programs they supplement.

Everyone agrees the programs we supplement in this legislation need more funds. I know the distinguished ranking member, the Senator from Vermont, has made an impassioned plea to add more money beyond the victims compensation fund that we created. He is saying there needs to be more money. As a long-time member of the Appropriations Committee, I hope the Appropriations Committee looks at that and makes a decision whether they ought to supplement what we do. But these funds are being subjected to the same limitation on spending as every dollar the Senate Appropriations Committee has appropriated during the last 39 years.

So my hope is this, that Members of the Senate will rise above this disagreement, this posturing, this attempt to try to play “gotcha” at the expense of these victims of human trafficking. No Member should attempt to make this bill a debate about extraneous issues and policies that have been settled on a bipartisan basis for 39 years.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOtte). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have listened very carefully to my good friend from Texas. We have worked together on many pieces of legislation over the years. In fact, I hoped we could have gotten this trafficking bill up during the last Congress, as he knows. Unfortunately, there were objections raised and we couldn't. I hope we are not going to get into a question where we compare apples and oranges and forget what we are supposed to be doing.

The distinguished Senator says on the one hand during the debate on the Affordable Care Act, according to him—and I will take him at his word—that this language was in there and every Democrat voted for it—which meant, of course, that every Republican voted against it. If you are going to use and follow his argument that the language in the Affordable Care Act was voted for by Democrats, it was voted against by Republicans.

I am not suggesting they don't care about the Hyde amendment because they voted against it, according to the Senator from Texas. But let's talk about things that should be on appropriations bills.

I am one of the few Members of either party in this body who has actually prosecuted child molesters. I am one of the few Members of this body who has actually gone to crime scenes and seen the results of child molestation. I am one of the few people in this body who has prosecuted a child molester, not with evidence from the child, but because the child was dead. The young boy had been raped by the man whom I prosecuted, and molested over a long period of time.

So I don't need to have people tell me about the horrors of child molestation. I have seen it. I remember being in a room and looking at that dead child, the same age as one of my children. And I remember the man who did it who would have done anything to escape my prosecution, and I worked day and night around the clock for weeks. I was a young prosecutor in my twenties, and I prosecuted him and convicted him. He went up on appeal to the Supreme Court—our Supreme Court—and I argued that appeal myself, and his conviction was upheld.

So I know the need for this. Let's not let political "gotcha" games stop us from legislation that might protect these people.

The Senator from Texas suggests I want more money. That is not quite what I said. He said he wanted \$30 million based on fines. I said I just want to guarantee that \$30 million was there. I think again of that child molester, that child murderer. He was just one of the many cases I prosecuted. We could have fined him \$1 million or \$20 million

or \$1 billion—or \$200—and he would not have been able to pay it and wouldn't have paid it. If the victim had lived, there would be no money.

All I want to make sure of—and I would be happy to see—is that if there are fines collected, that they go to help victims as they should. But if no money is collected from fines, I want to make sure there is money. We will prosecute somebody who has been involved with child trafficking or child molestation. We will prosecute them, as we should. They will go to prison and we will spend \$25,000 to \$35,000 a year of taxpayer dollars to keep them in prison, and we should. But we will say to the victim: I am sorry; we fined him \$100,000 to go to the victims' fund, but he is basically judgment proof. I just want you to know we had good intentions. If he had paid that \$100,000 fine, we would have given it to you to help you. But, gosh, go in peace. Have a good life.

All I am saying is this: If there is money from a fine, sure. The Senator from Texas and I agree that it should be put in the Fund. But if there are no funds, don't promise a \$30 million pot of money that will never be filled if there are no fines, if there is no money in it. If there is money from fines, put the money from fines in, but where there is a difference between the amount that is in there and the \$30 million, then shouldn't we, as a country that spends trillions of dollars, give the difference between the fines and the actual \$30 million? Shouldn't we care about these victims? Shouldn't we care about the people who are victimized?

Shouldn't we also do this: If we have the money in there, we could take increased steps to prevent victims from becoming victims in the first place. I would have given anything if there had been some program, some money, to have found out that this child I talked about was being victimized, and then we could have stopped it before the State's attorney got called in to look at the dead body. How much better it would have been if we could have stopped it to begin with.

So all I am saying is this: I am happy to work with the senior Senator from Texas on this bill, just as I was last year. We had a bill without this provision, and I was hoping and trying to get consent to bring it up and pass it when we had a bill without this provision. It is important to note, though, that when it didn't have this provision last year, I wish we could have passed it. Now let's work on a bill that will pass. If you want to score political points, do it on something that doesn't involve vulnerable children. Let's work together to get a bill passed that helps them. And let's make sure that on the point I raised, that we address this at some point. If there is going to be \$30 million worth of fines that go in there,

I am all for it. My guess is that we would be lucky to get a small percentage of that.

Back when this came up in the House of Representatives, they rejected this method of funding, and they called it budgetary gimmickry. Actually, what the House did in authorizing the bill—they did what they were supposed to do. They authorized actual funding so we could stand up for the victims of human trafficking, not just stand here trying to score political points.

In other words, let's have the money. Let's make sure the money is there. This is like saying: If you commit a crime, we are going to fine you \$100 million or \$300 million or \$1 billion. But if the person never had more than a net worth of \$1,000, what difference does it make? Put real teeth in here. Stop the traffickers, and ensure there is money to help the victims. Have money to help the victims.

The distinguished Presiding Officer was one of the senators who testified at the Judiciary Committee hearing on human trafficking last month. Other senators testified as well. Their testimony had people tearing people up. The distinguished Presiding Officer was attorney general for her State. She understands the reality of this, as I do and others do.

It has been years since I was State's attorney, but, I say to my friend from Texas, I still wake up some nights from nightmares about the crime scenes I went to. I would wake up from them at night when we were debating the Violence Against Women Act, and I am glad that Republicans and Democrats joined together on that both here and in the other body so we could pass it. A victim is a victim is a victim, not a number, not a concept. Those of us who have spent time with victims and those of us who have been at crime scenes of victims understand this. Too often victims could no longer speak, could no longer testify. We would hear about them at their funeral.

We can do better. So let's not talk about who scores points or who doesn't score points. There are good people who worked on this, good people in both parties. We are not going to be voting on something tonight, I imagine. Let's spend the time between now and tomorrow sitting down and trying to work out a way forward. Save the political points for something where the most vulnerable in society do not suffer. We can talk about what we will do on stock frauds or who gets taxed or what regulations we will have for corporations. There, raise your points. Make political points there. But for anyone who has seen these victims and anyone who has talked with these victims and anyone who has been with these victims, they know this is not the time for politics.

Let's get together this evening or tomorrow. Let's work it out so we can



have something that will really protect victims, something that will have real funding to protect them—not something illusion, but real funding. And maybe if we can do that, I might have less nightmares about some of those victims I saw.

My friend from Texas was a judge; he certainly saw those cases. The Presiding Officer was attorney general; she saw those cases. We have a number of former prosecutors on both sides here. Any one of us who has handled these cases has to remember every single aspect of them.

I remember preparing for trial in these cases, having young children at home. I would work late in the office. I wouldn't bring the materials home at all because I didn't want my kids to see what I was looking at. I will admit there is another reason: I didn't want my children to see their father cry as I read these police investigations. These aren't statistics; these are real people. Let's work together.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Madam President.

I have an amendment at the desk which has been slightly modified from its original form, and I ask unanimous consent that it be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I will object until I have had a chance to see the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I have now filed my slightly modified amendment—I will explain the modification in a minute—and it is at the desk.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so my amendment can be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I object. Some Members on my side of the aisle have concerns about certain aspects of the Senator's amendment, so

on their behalf, I object to setting aside the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I will explain and speak on this amendment even though it is not pending as we speak.

I will also file an ongoing objection to anyone setting aside the pending amendment for another or for any votes being scheduled until this matter can be worked out.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, the amendment I have at the desk is about a very important issue. Before I explain what it is, I will say that I strongly support the underlying bill.

I compliment Senator CORNYN and others who have worked on a bipartisan basis on this bill. I certainly look forward to supporting this bill irrespective of how the vote goes on my amendment, but I obviously hope my amendment is adopted in the context of this bill.

Clearly, this issue of human trafficking is a very serious one. It takes many forms, all of them ugly. One form is a phenomenon I am going to talk about today, which is the issue of birth tourism and trafficking in women and families who want to get into this country in order to physically have their children in this country because present policy recognizes those children immediately as U.S. citizens simply because they were born in this country.

This phenomenon of birth tourism is a very real one, and it often puts these birth mothers and families in very dangerous situations, quite frankly, at the hands of human smugglers or the equivalent.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have two news reports which illustrate this phenomenon printed in the RECORD.

The first news report is an article entitled "No vacancy at California birth hotels," which underscores some of the abuses and horrendous conditions that go on as a result of this, and the second article is from the Washington Post, which is entitled "Inside the shadowy world of birth tourism at 'maternity hotels.'"

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From WorldMag.com, March 12, 2013]

NO VACANCY AT CALIFORNIA BIRTH HOTELS

(By Alaina Gillogly and Les Sillars)

It started last summer. Neighbors of a tan, sunbaked mansion in Chino Hills, Calif., knew something was going on in the large Spanish-style home with stucco walls and a tiled roof overlooking the community. Cars sped up and down the quiet little road: And a remarkable number of pregnant Asian women came and went throughout the day.

Then in September, disgruntled neighbors became anxious citizens when 2,000 gallons of raw sewage spilled down the hillside.

City authorities discovered in the subsequent investigation that the seven-bedroom

house had become a 17-room "birth hotel." The 7,964-square-foot residence on Woodglen Drive had been housing up to 30 pregnant Chinese women who wanted to give birth to their children on American soil. Each room had matching bedding and furniture, room keys, monogrammed towels, and a portable hot water kettle.

Last month, a local court shut down the operation, owned by Los Angeles Hermas Hotel Inc., for building code violations that included exposed wires, missing smoke alarms, improper ventilation, and carpet stretched over a 3-foot-wide hole in the floor. The owners have six months to fix the problems and get the proper business permits, or they face permanent closure.

This operation was just one of about 15 baby hotels in the heavily Asian Chino Hills area, with dozens more around the country.

"Birth tourism" has made the news recently, but the Chino Hills incident touched off a crackdown in California as local authorities apply zoning and building codes in an effort to control the operations.

It's also reopened the debate over the Fourteenth Amendment. Birth hotels are legal in the U.S. because the Fourteenth Amendment gives citizenship to children born on American soil. They have the right to vote, immigrate from their parents' home country, and apply for permanent visas for their parents once they turn 21.

Birth tourism is a rising industry in countries like China, South Korea, and Saudi Arabia. A three-month stay, plus medical fees, can easily run more than \$50,000. Although the Chino Hills operation had a variety of safety and health issues, other birth hotels offer luxurious accommodations with chefs to prepare food from the home country.

Recent studies by the National Center for Health Statistics have reported the number of babies born to non-resident women topped 7,000 per year, up 50 percent since 2000, although it's not clear how many are the result of birth tourism.

That is a tiny fraction of the number of children born with at least one parent in the country illegally—350,000 in 2009, according to the Pew Hispanic Research Center. But critics say "birth tourism" is an abuse of an American law designed to enfranchise slaves born on American soil.

"The practice is a misinterpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment," said John Fonte, Hudson Institute senior fellow and director of the Center for American Common Culture. "U.S. citizens should be very concerned."

Some Californians are concerned. Rosanna Mitchell started a group called Not in Chino Hills to protest against the facility. "Our mission is to keep a vigilant eye and use all our efforts necessary to do so," wrote Mitchell on the website.

She told WORLD that, aside from worries about sanitation, traffic, and under-the-table businesses, she doubts those patronizing birth hotels are genuinely pursuing the American dream. "Something needs to be done," she said. "It's outrageous that they would take advantage of the U.S."

Rep. Steve King, an Iowa Republican, introduced a bill in January to amend the Fourteenth Amendment to "clarify" that citizenship applies to those born in the U.S. provided at least one parent is a U.S. citizen, a lawful immigrant, or serving in the military. The bill, with 13 co-sponsors, is currently in committee.



[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5]  
INSIDE THE SHADY WORLD OF BIRTH  
TOURISM AT "MATERNITY HOTELS"  
(By Abby Phillip)

In luxury apartment complexes in Southern California and in grand, single-family homes in New York, "maternity hotels" are brimming with pregnant women and cooing newborn babies.

For wealthy foreign women, the facilities offer the promise of a comfortable, worry-free vacation complete with a major perk: a U.S. passport for their newborn.

One such maternity hotel in New York resembled a nursery: Newborn babies rested in a row of bassinets that lined the wall, according to an NBC News report that offered a look inside the facility.

Women who book rooms at these properties can expect to live in well-stocked apartment complexes or large suburban homes with laundry and catered food as part of the package. Once their babies are born in an American hospital, they are cared for by nurses while the mothers rest for at least a month. They can pass their time with shopping trips to luxury stores, trips to amusement parks or poolside at the "hotel" while attentive caretakers look after the infants, feeding, bathing and putting them to sleep on a regimented schedule, NBC News found.

The cost—\$40,000 to \$80,000 per stay—is worth it for the prospect that the visitor's child will automatically be afforded the benefits given to U.S. citizens—and perhaps will have an easier time gaining legal residency in the United States when that child turns 21.

"For my baby, it's a chance to, a step to two countries' cultures . . . Chinese culture and American culture," one woman told NBC.

There's nothing illegal about foreign nationals giving birth in the United States. But traveling to the hotels requires the illegal practice of lying about the real reason for visiting the United States. Pregnant women purporting to be tourists enter the country in the latter stages of pregnancy, some overstaying their visas to recover in the comfort of the "maternity hotels."

Birth tourism companies have flourished in recent years, according to federal officials—and many of them prefer hard-to-track cash to fuel their operations.

That money, federal officials allege, is being pocketed by a group of individuals who have skirted tax law, flouted immigration laws and helped their clients defraud U.S. hospitals of tens of thousands of dollars for each baby born.

On Tuesday, federal agencies, including Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the IRS, along with the Los Angeles Police Department, conducted a massive operation to raid more than 30 California locations operated by "birth tourism businesses." Officials collected piles of evidence that will likely be used against some of the "maternity hotel" operators in future prosecutions.

The companies advertise their services online—and no foreign language skills are necessary to guess the subtext.

What are the benefits of a U.S. passport for a foreign national's unborn child?

"Too many," the Web site of StarBabyCare explains to prospective clients. "You can enjoy the free education from junior high school to public high school. . . . You can apply loans or grants which is only for the U.S. citizen. . . . You can receive your senior supplement benefits when you are living overseas. . . . To the parent, after the baby becomes an adult, he/she can petition the parents for a green card."

According to court documents, an undercover investigator was told: "The baby will then have a birth certificate and 'freedom.' The baby will have a bright future having United States citizenship."

Federal officials say that Chao Chen and Jie Zhu, the couple that operated the You Win baby tourism company, engaged in "sham marriages" to get green cards for themselves. In documents filed in federal court this week, officials said that the two "divorced" in 2012, but married U.S. citizens in Las Vegas months later.

Both applied for permanent residency, and an immigration officer reviewing the cases noted that the marriages were "suspect" based on the timing.

Such companies have openly encouraged women willing to pay for the service to commit visa fraud as well. They were counseled not to tell customs and immigration officials that they were pregnant, to wear loose clothes and to avoid traveling to the United States while looking visibly pregnant.

"U.S. might refuse entry due to the belly is too big," StarBabyCare's Web site informed potential customers. "Therefore the size of the belly is quite important to determine when you should arrive in Los Angeles."

According to court documents, birth tourists were told to avoid traveling directly to Los Angeles International Airport from overseas, to avoid raising suspicion. They might even consider studying U.S. culture and booking recreational visits in order to make their travel seem more legitimate, the company advised. Alternate arrival ports such as Hawaii or Las Vegas were preferable.

You Win paid more than \$60,000 a year to rent Southern California apartments that housed the women, according to court documents. Federal officials believe that StarBabyCare operated a "maternity hotel" from at least 10 units at one complex.

As more attention has been trained on the practice in recent years, the outrage has—predictably—followed.

Los Angeles County officials have cited the "hotels" for illegally operating business in residential homes in 2013. Angry neighbors at a Chino Hills "hotel" picketed as the report became public. Among its findings: The 17-bedroom, 17-bathroom operation was blamed for overloading the septic tank in the community.

Usually, the women participating in the programs paid several thousand dollars up front as a deposit and thousands more upon arrival in United States, according to investigators. The balance was paid after childbirth.

But "some or all" of that money—which for You Win likely amounted to over \$1 million—went unreported to federal authorities in 2013.

"Chen failed to report hundreds of thousands of dollars in income on his 2013 federal tax return," according to federal officials.

As women went into birth, they were taken to local hospitals and declared jobless. As many as 400 babies associated with just one of these companies were born after 2013 in Orange County, Calif., hospitals. Despite the fact that many of these women paid tens of thousands of dollars to participate in the "maternity hotel" scheme, they claimed to be unable to pay the hospitals, which typically charged about \$25,000 per birth.

Some paid nothing at all, while others paid a fee closer to \$4,000.

No one was arrested during Tuesday's raids. But Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents collected evidence and po-

tential witnesses for use in future prosecutions on tax, immigration and fraud charges.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, recently the Obama administration conducted a raid on some of these shadowy operations. I compliment them for doing that. There needs to be a crack-down on these operations, but the ultimate crackdown and ultimate solution is to change the policy of the Federal Government that recognizes these children immediately as U.S. citizens simply because they are physically born in this country even though both of their parents are here illegally. No parent is here under any sort of legal status, and that is the ultimate response and ultimate solution we need, and that is what my amendment—that I will call up as soon as that is allowed and get a vote on—is about.

My amendment would change the present practice, policy, and law to say that only somebody born in this country who has at least one parent who is a U.S. citizen, a legal green card holder, or a serving member of the U.S. military, immediately gets that recognition as a U.S. citizen.

As I suggested, this issue and practice—including this shadowy world of birth tourism and human smuggling—is a very serious issue. In fact, it is an exploding issue, as these recent cases in the press have brought to light.

According to the Center for Immigration Studies, each year about 300,000 to 400,000 children are born to illegal aliens in the United States, and under our present practice, all of them are immediately recognized as U.S. citizens. This is a huge magnet for more illegal crossings into our country, often at the hands of very dangerous people.

Birthright citizenship draws women from Mexico and Central America to make that dangerous trek north, often in the hands of coyotes and drug cartels. These women put their lives into the hands of criminal gangs with a demonstrated pension for sexual assault and sex trafficking.

In addition, there is a huge business of birth tourism, including those who market to women and families in China. As I mentioned, on Tuesday, March 3, Federal agents broke up an alleged birth tourism ring in southern California, raiding several homes and apartment complexes where pregnant Chinese women, who were here on fraudulent visas, paid up to \$80,000 in some cases so their babies would be born here.

DHS and IRS investigators were seeking evidence and statements against those alleged in the scheme. Besides visa fraud, authorities are looking into possible tax and money laundering charges. As I referred to the news reports that are now part of the RECORD, in some cases this involves horrendous conditions and a very shadowy world in terms of this so-called birth tourism.

The ultimate solution to this enormous magnet for illegal crossings—often at the hands of very dangerous people—is to not recognize everyone who is simply born in the United States to be a citizen of the United States because of that fact alone. Again, that is what my amendment would do. That is far more effective than any set of raids on these operations or on any enforcement provisions.

If we move toward this, we would be in the company of a huge majority of countries in the world. Of advanced economies, only Canada and the United States grant automatic citizenship to children born to illegal aliens. No European country does that. No other advanced industrialized country does that, nor should we. As I suggested, it is a huge magnet for more and more illegal crossings, and my amendment would fix that.

Some people will argue this is not possible with a statutory change. This is embedded in the U.S. Constitution through the 14th Amendment and any change would have to be a constitutional amendment. I believe that is not the case and is a result of a fundamental misunderstanding of the Constitution in this regard, including the 14th Amendment.

The 14th Amendment does not say that all persons born in the United States are citizens, period, end of story. If we look at the precise language, it is very instructive. It states that citizenship extends to “all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof.” That latter phrase—“and subject to the jurisdiction thereof”—was included because it means something, and its original meaning clearly refers to the political allegiance of an individual and the jurisdiction that a foreign government has over that person.

That is exactly why American Indians and their children were not immediately recognized as U.S. citizens simply because of their birth in this country. There was actually litigation about that going directly to this language of the 14th Amendment. The courts decided, no, the fact that these American Indian children were born in the United States in and of itself did not make them U.S. citizens because “and subject to the jurisdiction thereof” had a meaning. It meant these children could not be subject to any other governmental or quasi-governmental authority and an American Indian tribe was such an authority.

Because of that litigation and interpretation, in order for those American Indian children to be recognized as American citizens, it actually took specific congressional action, and Congress passed the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924. I believe that goes directly to this issue that this practice is not embedded in the Constitution and in the

14th Amendment, and so that allows the statutory fix my language would offer.

Senator HARRY REID, the minority leader, actually introduced a bill in 1993 titled the “Immigration Stabilization Act,” which included nearly identical language to my amendment and stand-alone bill. This language has broad support in the country, including broad bipartisan support.

In Senator REID’s bill—now that is going back a ways—it stated “in the exercise of its powers under section 5 of the 14th article of the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the Congress has determined and hereby declares that any person born after the date of enactment of this title to a mother who is neither a citizen of the United States nor admitted to the United States as a lawful permanent resident will not be a U.S. citizen.” So there we have language from a leading Democratic Member that goes to the same issue.

There is broad bipartisan support, not just in the Congress but in the country for this fix, particularly in the context of these huge illegal alien flows into the country. I believe Americans recognize that we cannot continue to adopt and recognize this policy. It is an enormous magnet for the continuing flows of illegal aliens into the country.

It brings up industries such as this shadowy world of birth tourism which was recently raided by Federal authorities. It puts those mothers and families in the hands of very unsavory criminal elements in many cases, and we should not allow this to continue.

My amendment would stop that practice, stop those abuses, and stop encouraging those flows of illegal aliens. I strongly encourage the Senate to directly consider this amendment, vote on it, and to adopt it as part of this very important underlying bill.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent to have two letters that were written by leading groups on immigration reform, FAIR and the Eagle Forum, printed in the RECORD.

They are in strong support of this measure. I will submit additional letters of support as they develop over the next day or two.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERATION FOR AMERICAN  
IMMIGRATION REFORM,  
Washington, DC, March 10, 2015.

HON. DAVID VITTER,  
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR VITTER: I am writing to thank you for your efforts as a United States Senator to end birthright citizenship—the practice of automatically granting U.S. citizenship to anyone born in the United States, regardless of the parents’ immigration status.

Your amendment to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (S. 178) would

close this loophole that is based on a misinterpretation of the 14th Amendment. Specifically, your amendment would amend the Constitution so that children born in the U.S. only gain citizenship automatically if one parent is either a U.S. citizen, legal permanent resident, or a non-immigrant active member of the Armed Forces. Your language is consistent with the intent behind the “subject to the jurisdiction thereof” clause of excluding from automatic citizenship American-born persons whose allegiance to the United States is incomplete.

Even the Obama Administration recognizes that the current practice of birthright citizenship encourages unlawful behavior and abuse of the system. Indeed, just last week federal and local law enforcement officials raided the Southern California offices of a company that encourages foreign pregnant women to come to the U.S. to give birth, promising them benefits like citizenship and free education. Known as “birth tourism,” these companies arrange for pregnant women to come to the U.S. and advise them to provide false information on visa applications. This particular Irvine business made approximately \$2 million in 2013, with fees ranging from \$15,000 to \$50,000.

Your amendment would end this magnet of illegal immigration because the U.S.-born children of illegal aliens will not be eligible to sponsor family members for legal permanent resident status (green cards) once they reach the age of twenty-one. Again, we thank you for sponsoring this commonsense legislation.

Sincerely,

DAN STEIN,  
President.

EAGLE FORUM,  
Washington, DC, March 10, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR VITTER, On behalf of Eagle Forum and the families we represent, we express our support for your amendment to S. 178 ending the practice of birthright citizenship. Automatically granting citizenship to any child born on U.S. soil, even if the child’s parents are temporary visitors or illegal aliens, cheapens the value of American citizenship. Action by Congress to clarify the long-misinterpreted intent of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment is both necessary and appropriate.

Birthright citizenship is an invitation to exploit the benefits of American citizenship. Simply being born in our country, whatever the citizenship of the parents, entitles a child to government aid. It circumvents the lengthy process of naturalization, including the pledge of new citizens to “support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States.” This loophole encourages illegal immigration and even “birth tourism,” which brings pregnant women to this country just in time to give birth. Both illegal immigration and birth tourism fuel human trafficking, which stems from a desire to claim the protections of our laws and the support of the welfare state.

Permitting birthright citizenship is a misreading of the Fourteenth Amendment. The amendment states that U.S. citizens are “all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof” Those final five words are critical and clearly limit the application of the amendment. Visitors who are not U.S. citizens are “subject to the jurisdiction” of their country of origin, not the United States. Furthermore, the Constitution vests control over immigration law to Congress. It is past time for the legislative branch to exercise its power to end birthright citizenship.

Eagle Forum thanks you for your leadership on this critical issue and stands ready to assist you.

Faithfully,

PHYLLIS SCHLAFELY,  
*Chairman.*

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to consider my amendment No. 273.

Mr. LEAHY. Reserving the right to object, and I have to object.

The Senator has the right, of course, to file his amendment, but there is an amendment presently pending and it would have to be set aside. There is someone on this side who does not want it set aside, so I will object. Of course, the Senator can file his amendment, but the request, as I understand it, is to set aside the pending amendment. On behalf of several Senators on this side, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I ask the Senator from Vermont if he opposes the amendment that was also co-sponsored by Senator FEINSTEIN.

Mr. LEAHY. I don't know who is co-sponsoring the amendment.

Madam President, addressing the Senator through the Chair, as we are required to do by the Senate rules, I would say that my objection is to setting aside the pending amendment. I would further address the Senator from Illinois—but through the Chair—that when the amendment is up, I will be glad to look at it and take a position on it. Of course, he and I have known each other for a long time. I will be happy to tell him whether I will vote for it or not.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I would say that this amendment is directed at backpage.com, probably the largest provider of online slavery services in the United States. I would hope the Senator is not defending Lacey and Larkin, who make \$30 million a year off of slavery.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, to respond to the Senator, I may very well support his amendment. The technical question is, Should the amendment of the Senator from Ohio be set aside so that this one may be the one pending? On that issue, there is objection. When the Senator's amendment is pending before the Senate, it may very well be one I will vote for, and I will be happy to discuss it at that time.

Mr. KIRK. I thank the Senator.

Madam President, this is an amendment that is directed at attacking backpage.com, which stands on the principle that was well established in the Civil War—that we Americans have freedom and we should not be free to enslave other Americans. I think, as the largest provider of online slavery services, Lacey and Larkin should be put out of business.

I think it is incumbent on us, in the underlying legislation—I would remind the Senator from Vermont that we would live up to the full spirit of this legislation to make sure that just because the Internet was invented, slavery should not be empowered by the Internet.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KIRK. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, through the Chair, I ask my friend from Illinois, who has been a warrior on these issues, particularly with this backpage.com and this advertisement of children and other people trafficked as part of this modern day slavery, if the Senator's amendment, the HERO Act, is actually included, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. KIRK. Amendment No. 273 would include the SAVE Act, which has already substantially passed with huge bipartisan support of the party of the Senator from Vermont in the House of Representatives. If we look, we will find that backpage.com is active in every State, providing online services to the public.

Mr. CORNYN. My question and point was that the SAVE Act, I understand, is the subject of the amendment that the Senator is seeking to offer and for which I hope our friends on the other side will relent and allow us to go forward, debating and amending this important piece of legislation. As distinguished from the SAVE Act, which is the subject of the Senator's your amendment, the HERO Act, I believe is already a part of the underlying legislation. I just wanted to congratulate the Senator from Illinois and thank him for his longstanding dedication to this issue and the contribution he has made to the underlying piece of legislation.

Mr. KIRK. As a Senator from Illinois, our true gift to the people of this country has been individual freedom and dignity, epitomized by the Lincoln candidacy for the Senate, and by the victory in the Civil War. We should not allow the freedom of the Internet to allow freedom to enslave others. These two men have made tens of millions of dollars.

I yield back to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. I would just ask the Senator to yield for one final question.

Would the Senator please outline his bill, his amendment, the SAVE Act?

Mr. KIRK. The critical issue is how to restrict the ability of Americans to enslave each other. I don't think we should have that freedom. We want to make sure we thread the needle very carefully here, to make sure the freedom and commerce available on the Internet is not going to help people such as Lacey and Larkin to enslave others. We want to make sure that there is an ever-widening sphere of freedom inside the United States that is not inhibited by the Internet.

Mr. CORNYN. I would ask, is the Senator's amendment targeted in a way that respects the freedom of the Internet and the right of the people?

Mr. KIRK. Very much so. The way we thread the needle here is to make online providers of slavery services liable for the costs that local governments incur in cleaning up the mess they create.

In the case of Cook County, IL, we have had our crusading sheriff, who I would note is also a Democratic sheriff, establish a great effort to recover the young, underage girls involved and to make sure the costs incurred in helping out these young women—these citizens of the United States—to make sure they can charge it against the online provider, which makes eminent sense.

I would say that our freedoms are protected because Tom Dart was elected by the people of Cook County. As an elected official, he is trying to simply carry out his goal there. This makes eminent sense to do this.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KIRK. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING JONATHAN MYRICK DANIELS

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, this past weekend we saw a huge commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Selma to Montgomery voting rights march. I rise to honor the work and sacrifice of Jonathan Myrick Daniels. He was a young Episcopalian seminary student from Keene. The Presiding Officer certainly knows his name and Keene, as well. He was from Keene, NH, and he answered the call of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., for clergy to travel to Alabama to join him on that march.

Jonathan lost his life 5 months later, in an act that Reverend King called "one of the most heroic Christian deeds of which I have heard in my entire ministry." Although Jonathan had originally intended to spend a short time in the South and then return to his studies at the Episcopal theological school in Boston, he felt compelled by events to remain in Alabama through the spring and summer to register voters with the Episcopalian Society for Cultural and Racial Unity.

On August 14, 1965, Jonathan was arrested along with a number of other civil rights activists at a demonstration in Fort Deposit, AL, a small town outside of Montgomery. They had gone there to protest segregation in the town's stores. But their demonstration was over within minutes. Armed white men from the town descended on them and took them to jail.

Jonathan and his fellow activists spent 6 days in the Hayneville jail. Many in the group were still teenagers. Despite the conditions, Jonathan somehow maintained an unflinchingly upbeat attitude and good humor. He wrote his mother in New Hampshire a brief letter from the jail, apologetically describing it as a peculiar birthday card for her. He wrote:

The food is vile and we aren't allowed to bathe (whew!) . . . As you can imagine, I'll have a tale or two to swap over our next martini.

He declined an offer of bail money from an Episcopal organization because the amount would not have covered the release of the rest of his group. On Friday, August 20, the whole group was suddenly released. Strangely, their bail had been waived, but no one was there to meet them or take them home. The town seemed completely deserted.

Jonathan and a few others walked a block away to a store to buy something to eat and drink. As he climbed the steps of the porch to the store, he suddenly heard someone shout from inside and threaten to shoot if they didn't leave. Jonathan barely had time to react before the man opened fire, but somehow he managed to jump in front of his friend Ruby Sales, a 17-year-old African-American girl. He saved Ruby's life, but Jonathan was killed by the close-range shot that was intended for her. He was just 26 years old.

The shooter called the murder in to the sheriff's office himself. He said: I just shot two preachers. You better get on down here. An all-white jury later acquitted the man, taking just 2 hours to find him not guilty. While Jonathan was sacrificing his life for civil rights in Alabama, here in the Senate debate raged over the Federal Government's role in protecting the voting rights of disfranchised American citizens.

Since 1870 the 15th Amendment to the Constitution had prohibited State governments from denying a citizen's right to vote based on race. However, in precincts throughout the South, Black Americans were subjected to discriminatory poll taxes, literacy tests, and other forms of voter intimidation. In many places, town clerks outright refused to register Black voters.

Just 2 weeks before Jonathan was killed, Congress finally passed the Voting Rights Act, which outlawed electoral practices that discriminated against minority groups. Well, 2015 marks the 50th anniversary not just of that march in Selma but of this land-

mark law. While this anniversary presents an obvious time for reflection, it is also a time to look forward and address the challenges still facing our country.

The impact of the Supreme Court's 2013 ruling in *Shelby County v. Holder*, which struck down a critical section of the law requiring Federal approval for electoral law changes in districts with the history of discrimination, is particularly troubling. This ruling now allows States to implement restrictive voting requirements that will make it more difficult for voters to cast their ballots. In fact, since this ruling, almost all of the affected States have already begun attempts to restrict voting, targeting seniors, students, minorities, and threatening their access to the polls.

The right to make your voice heard as a citizen of this Nation is a fundamental principle of our democracy, and it should never be infringed upon. We have a responsibility to protect this right and address these injustices.

While our Nation has made a lot of progress since the 1960s and 1970s, the struggle is far from over. Inequality and racism remain in our society. As long as discrimination and racial disparities exist, the full protections of the Voting Rights Act are necessary to guarantee the rights of citizenship for every American.

Jonathan Daniels should be turning 76 years old in March. He is widely recognized as a martyr of the 20th century. In Keene, his hometown, an elementary school bears his name. As we mark the 50th anniversary of his passing, as well as the passage of the Voting Rights Act, we must strive to honor his legacy by ensuring that all current and future American citizens can exercise the rights he died to protect.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

#### MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have had to take to the Senate floor to note my opposition to the so-called Smarter Sentencing Act. Does that mean I am against all sentencing reform? No. But there are some issues that are particularly wrong with the suggestions that have been put in bill form so far.

My speeches on this issue have been necessary because there are so many misconceptions about that legislation and Federal drug sentences and prisoners. Before addressing them, I want to let my colleagues know that I do believe there are some inequities in the criminal justice system, and the Judiciary Committee will be looking at ways to address them. I will set out that part of the committee's agenda after discussing sentencing.

The Smarter Sentencing Act would arbitrarily cut in half the mandatory minimum sentences which are imposed on a host of serious—very serious—drug offenses. Those offenses include the importation, manufacture, and distribution of serious drugs, such as heroin, PCP, LSD, and meth.

As an example, the Governor of Vermont devoted an entire state of the State address to the heroin epidemic. The Governor of Maryland just launched an anti-heroin initiative following the near doubling of heroin overdose deaths in that State in the 2 years between 2011 and 2013.

The Smarter Sentencing Act would cut mandatory sentences in half for importing, distributing, and manufacturing heroin. It would cut the sentences for the same activities with respect to LSD, a drug that causes psychosis and suicide. It would reduce sentences for the drug trade that two of President Obama's appointees in the Drug Enforcement Administration and in the Justice Department have warned that the world's most dangerous terrorist organizations are engaged in this trade to fund their operations. It would harm the ability of prosecutors to obtain cooperation from lower level offenders to obtain intelligence regarding terrorist-planned attacks.

As President Obama's own U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York has warned, "[T]here is a growing nexus between drug trafficking and terrorism, a threat that increasingly poses a clear and present danger to our national security." The threat should determine the response. It would be foolhardy to meet the threat of narcoterrorism by cutting drug sentences.

Under Federal sentencing law, those who are low-level offenders avoid mandatory minimum offenses. Just under half of all drug courier offenders were subject to mandatory minimum sentences, but fewer than 10 percent received mandatory minimum sentences. One reason for the difference is that offenders who cooperate in prosecuting high-level drug conspirators avoid the mandatory minimum sentences.

As a Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association wrote:

[A]ny change in the mandatory minimum sentencing standard does a disservice to the brave men and women who are asked to put their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists and criminals.

Currently, the system in place allows Federal law enforcement agents to infiltrate and dismantle large-scale drug trafficking organizations and to take violent armed career criminals off of the street. In turn, this allows progression up the scale of criminal organizations from low-level subjects to higher ranking members through the effect of the mandatory minimum sentencing act.

A second reason mandatory minimum sentences are not imposed on many eligible drug couriers is the so-called safety valve. Defendants can qualify if they have no or a very light criminal history. That means those who are convicted but are not violent do not serve mandatory minimum sentences.

The average sentence for a Federal drug courier offender is only 39 months. The offenders who qualify for the safety valve are drug couriers and drug dealers. They are not people who are in prison for the possession of drugs. That is because drug possession does not trigger Federal mandatory minimum sentences, and it is also because, according to the sentencing commission, almost no citizen is in Federal prison for mere drug possession.

Eighty-eight percent of the drug possession prisoners were apprehended along the Southwest border, and the median amount of drugs in their possession was 48 pounds. I wish to emphasize “48 pounds.” These, then, with 48 pounds are not low-level, casual offenders. Only 270 mere Federal drug possession cases were brought anywhere else in the country in the most recent year for which the sentencing commission has statistics. And the average sentence for drug possession for citizens is 1.3 months. That is months, not years. Most citizens convicted of Federal drug possession charges receive probation.

The proponents of the bill say there are too many people in prison and that the bill would save the taxpayers money. Well, it turns out that is not true. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that the bill, even while releasing hundreds of thousands of prisoners earlier than under current law, would increase direct spending by about \$1 billion and would reduce revenues by \$42 million over 10 years.

The supporters of the so-called Smarter Sentencing Act do not even attempt to contest my points in opposition—and I have made these points more than once before the Senate. The supporters do not say there is not a heroin epidemic. They cannot say citizens are serving Federal mandatory minimum sentences for possession. But they do say this: Their major ploy is to paint a picture that poor, innocent, mere drug possessors are crowding our prisons.

They do not argue that Obama administration officials did not warn of

the link of drug crimes to terrorism and national security threats. They don't challenge the statistics from the sentencing commission or the existence of the safety valve or the effect of mandatory minimum sentences in enhancing prosecution of very serious drug offenders. They won't take on the Congressional Budget Office's cost estimates. They do cite CBO's discretionary cost savings of \$3 billion, but, in the long run, entitlement spending can be more costly because entitlement spending must be paid.

They don't do any of these because they simply can't. They are committed to a bill as a matter of ideology. The facts simply do not matter to the supporters. They try to change the subject. All they can do is resort to rhetoric. In fact, the supporters of that legislation are even Orwellian in their rhetoric. I mean that literally. George Orwell wrote a famous essay called “Politics and the English Language.” He said: “In our time, political speech and writing are largely the defense of the indefensible.”

The arguments for the Smarter Sentencing Act are merely a weak attempt to defend the indefensible.

What I have called the leniency industrial complex refers then to the people who are sentenced to drug mandatory minimum sentences as “non-violent.” They use that term even though any truly nonviolent offenders would qualify for the safety valve. They gloss over the fact that even if an offender was not violent in a particular case, he may have committed a prior violent offense that would make him, in fact, a violent person. And, of course, many drug-related crimes occur through force or the threat of force, or are conducted by people in a criminal enterprise that relies on violence.

The bill's supporters even refer to some drug offenders as “nonviolent,” and these people are serving mandatory minimum sentences for carrying a firearm in the commission of a crime. Few Americans would call someone who carries a gun while committing a drug crime nonviolent. And the leniency industrial complex wants people to think that people who are sentenced to mandatory minimum sentences are somehow low-level offenders. They neglect to mention that the true low-level offenders receive the safety valve and avoid mandatory minimum sentences and that many others avoid them by providing substantial assistance to law enforcement.

Many of the cases they cite involve repeat offenders. Repeat offenders are not low level. Lenient sentences did not stop them from dealing dangerous drugs, and another lenient sentence won't stop their next drug deal.

When it comes to terms such as “low level” and “nonviolent,” again quoting Orwell, the bill's supporters have their own private definition, but allow the

hearer to think they mean something quite different.

Their political language has to consist largely of euphemisms, question-begging, and sheer cloudy vagueness.

I regret to say that the elements in the media have uncritically accepted the Orwellian rhetoric surrounding this bill. A recent New York Times editorial swallowed the “low-level” rhetoric whole hog. It challenged my well-supported conclusion that high-level offenders would benefit from enactment of the Smarter Sentencing Act, without even mentioning the serious crimes and drugs the bill applies to. It editorialized that my opposition to the bill “defies . . . empirical data,” even though my sources are the sentencing commission and the Obama administration appointees.

When the Times attempted to back up its support for the bill, it linked not to any authoritative evidence but to the report of an ideological advocacy group. This is the so-called empirical data that the Times finds worthy.

Why should taxpayers fund the sentencing commission if the self-proclaimed paper of record shuns its statistics in favor of those offered by lobbying groups? The Times said the Federal policymakers should rely on State experience in reforming sentences, so I would like to do that.

Only 270 citizens are prosecuted for drug possession in the Federal system each year, and most receive probation. The States have many drug possession offenders in prison, so the actions they take for that class of offenders do not bear on Federal prison populations, nor do the States prosecute anyone for importation of heroin or LSD or meth or cocaine. But the Federal Government does, as my colleagues know. So State drug sentencing changes are not relevant to those prisoners as well. And it is the Federal Government, much more than the States, that uses lower level offenders to take down the most serious drug offenders.

Meanwhile, I have offered to consider legislation that would lower some mandatory minimum sentences if others could be imposed or raised. For instance, the sentencing commission has identified child pornography and financial crimes such as insider trading as areas where Federal judges are particularly lenient and where no mandatory minimum sentences exist. But it is the proponents of the Smarter Sentencing Act who refuse to take me up on that good-faith offer. Their ideology does not include compromise.

The White House says they want to work with this Senator on these issues, but then invites other Members of Congress, but not the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to a meeting to discuss the subject. Since then, I have had a discussion with the President inviting me to come down there and visit with him some time.

But in the New York Times' Orwellian world, this Senator is a roadblock to sentencing reform. That is upside down and backward. Problems do exist in the criminal justice system. I plan to have the Judiciary Committee address some important ones. But rather than marking up ill-considered and dangerous legislation such as the so-called Smarter Sentencing Act, we will take up bills that can achieve a large measure of consensus. I would like to take this opportunity to address some of the committee's criminal justice agenda, which will show my commitment to real problem solving through consensus. The first area we will address is reform of asset forfeiture.

Asset forfeiture can serve a valuable purpose for law enforcement and society by helping to deprive criminals and criminal organizations of their money—money from proceeds of their crimes and the instrumentality of that crime. It also helps to compensate victims who are injured or who suffer as a result of criminals' wrongdoing. It can also return that money to law enforcement, which can use it to continue to combat serious crime and put more bad guys behind bars.

But current law provides perverse incentive that have led to abuses. Law enforcement can sometimes directly benefit from property that they seize, sometimes contrary to State law. Those whose property is taken often do not have access to fair procedures or law enforcement to help them get that property back. These processes and procedures need real structural reform. Innocent property owners must be able to challenge seizures and protect their property from government abuses.

I am also looking into reversing a Supreme Court decision that denies property owners the opportunity to use their very own money to hire a lawyer to help defend them against the government. Even though the administration has made some administrative changes to these practices and policies in response to widespread criticism, I believe real legislative reform is needed. I look forward to working with my colleagues in a bipartisan way to make those necessary changes.

Second, as a way of looking at reform, I am very concerned that too many times in America equality under the law is not a reality; that the poor do not receive the same justice in many instances. For more than 50 years, the Supreme Court has ruled that indigent people accused of felonies must be afforded counsel. And for more than 40 years, starting with the decision of *Argersinger v. Hamlin*, the Supreme Court has found that the Sixth Amendment of the Constitution requires that Federal, State, and local governments provide counsel to indigents who are accused of misdemeanors if their convictions could potentially lead to imprisonment.

I regret to say that although I am aware of instances where the Federal Government is responsible, it is particularly at the State level where the Sixth Amendment is violated numerous times on a daily basis. I cannot think of any Supreme Court decision that has ever faced such resistance in magnitude and time as that *Hamlin* case.

Indigent misdemeanants are being pressured to waive counsel. Sometimes they are threatened with imprisonment if they seek to have counsel appointed. There are other ways the decision is violated. Then there is the question of the competence of the counsel actually appointed, given how many cases are assigned to an individual lawyer and how quickly judges resolve them.

I fear some innocent people are being sentenced to prison. There are other consequences as well. We should make sure there are collateral consequences imposed on people who are guilty of domestic violence misdemeanors, for instance. We do not want collateral consequences imposed on people who did not actually commit misdemeanors.

If people later get in trouble with the law, we don't want them to qualify for the safety valve because some of their previous convictions were for misdemeanors in which they did not receive the right to counsel. We don't want people to have criminal records when they seek employment when they did not have counsel who could have prevented a conviction.

In some situations, a misdemeanor will automatically become a felony if the accused has committed it repeatedly. We don't want a misdemeanor conviction to render a later crime a felony if questions of innocence surround the earlier crime.

Third, I want to address databases for criminal records. Those databases can serve useful purposes, such as enabling background checks, background checks on people who are being considered for a job or for volunteering to work with children. There are proposals to expand the purposes for which the databases can be used, but I am concerned about the quality and the completeness of the records in the database. If the database contains erroneous or outdated material, then the people being checked may unfairly lose out on a job or the ability to help children.

There are procedures at the Federal level to challenge the information in the database if the person knows their records are inaccurate, but that is a very steep climb. The States have their own procedures for people to challenge the accuracy of criminal records, but success there may be even harder and may cost more than people can afford. Records are also sometimes not expunged, even when the law said they must be expunged.

I do not want to see the arrest record turn up in a background check and

deny someone the ability to work, deny the economy the benefit of that productivity, and deprive the government of tax revenue from that work because a background check turned up a record of an arrest from long ago that never resulted in a conviction.

This is a widespread problem. According to press reports, when arrests are included, 32 percent of adults in this country have criminal records that are contained in databases. I am sure we can reach bipartisan agreement on legislation to address this problem in some form.

There are dangerous and poorly considered proposals to change the criminal justice system that are divisive, are not based on reality, and will never become law. There are also problems in the criminal justice system that are clear, widely recognized, have serious consequences, and can be the subject of effective bipartisan legislative efforts. I will do what I can to make sure the Committee on the Judiciary devotes its energy to the second category.

I yield the floor.

#### PASSENGER RAIL REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the House of Representatives recently passed H.R. 749, the Passenger Rail Reform and Investment Act of 2015.

I am pleased to see the House take bipartisan action on this bill. Intercity passenger rail is a critical part of our transportation infrastructure. People in many regions of the country are in desperate need of better ways to travel between fast-growing cities, and passenger rail is our best hope at relieving congestion on highways and runways that don't have additional room to expand.

The House bill is a good step forward. H.R. 749 would maintain current levels of Federal support for Amtrak to operate routes that connect the country. It would also authorize some additional funding to invest in passenger rail projects and improve a Federal loan program that can be used for rail infrastructure. This is a productive place to start.

The authorization levels in this bill are too low to get our passenger rail network where it needs to be, let alone to keep up with the rest of the world by bringing high-speed rail to the United States. H.R. 749 also fails to address critical rail safety priorities or even reauthorize funding for the Federal Railroad Administration's safety oversight activities.

We can and must do better than a flat-funded authorization bill that turns a blind eye to safety and to the growing needs of our country. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate to improve this bill and



make some real progress toward developing modern, safe, and efficient passenger rail options that America deserves.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish today to honor Bob Hufford, an icon in the Missouri food industry for the past 63 years. He announced his retirement from the Associated Wholesale Grocers, AWG, board of directors after four decades of service with the last 11 years having served as its chairman. AWG is a retailer-owned cooperative serving over 2,300 retail member stores with a complete assortment of grocery, fresh meat, fresh produce, specialty foods, health care, and general merchandise items.

During Bob's tenure as chairman, AWG sales grew from \$4.5 billion in 2004 to almost \$9 billion in 2014, while patronage paid to members grew by 155 percent. Bob helped direct the addition of the Fort Worth division in 2007, the replacement of the Oklahoma City distribution center in the same year, and the addition of the gulf coast division in 2013. During the same period, Bob grew his own company, Town and Country, in Fredericktown, MO, to be one of the largest employers in southeast Missouri with over 10,000 employees.

Bob's passion for the food business was sparked early in his life by his father's work for a meatpacking company. Bob's first job was working in a local supermarket, while going through high school and later college. He became a sales representative for the National Biscuit Company, otherwise known as Nabisco, in 1958. While working for Nabisco, Bob called on two grocers, Max Penner and Wayne Gott, who recognized his leadership skills and work ethic. In 1970 they invited him to become a third partner in a new 5,000-square-foot store in Fredericktown, which Bob accepted.

From that modest beginning Bob grew his business to 44 stores currently operating. Recently, Bob converted his company into an employee-owned company, allowing his employees to share in the store's profits. Today Bob serves as the CEO of the company, which operates stores in Missouri, Arkansas, Tennessee, and Kentucky. He and his wife Marsha have a wonderful family of five children, eight grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. Many of his family members have worked in the business next to Bob.

Bob was named Missouri grocer of the year and inducted into the Missouri Grocers Association Hall of Fame, along with his good friend and former partner Wayne Gott.

I ask that all my colleagues join me in congratulating Bob Hufford on his decades of success. I wish him the best in his well-deserved retirement.●

#### REMEMBERING AARON ANDERSON

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I honor the life of Aaron Anderson, a longtime resident of San Francisco, a passionate advocate for education, a devoted and loyal friend, and most of all a dedicated family man, who passed away on February 7, 2015. He spent 25 years in higher education as a learner, educator and contributor, most recently as an administrator and instructor at San Francisco State University's College of Business. He was 50 years old.

Aaron was originally from Old Saybrook, CT, and attended the University of Connecticut, where he was captain of the men's cross country team. He began his career in higher education in student services at California Polytechnic State University and University of California, Berkeley, and went on to receive his Ph.D. in higher education from the University of Michigan. He was an expert and author in the area of organizational behavior and change, and brought this expertise to his passion for advancing education at all levels.

At SFSU, Aaron served as director of strategic organizational initiatives, following stints as executive MBA program director and graduate business programs acting director. As an instructor in organizational change and psychology, he inspired and fostered creativity in his students and colleagues and served as a mentor to many of the graduate students in his classes. His passion for education extended outside the classroom as well, where he found time to serve as a Board member for Educate Our State and as President of the McKinley Elementary School PTA.

In addition to the passion he brought to his profession, Aaron had a love for life that could not be suppressed. He remained physically active, biking wherever he went and never missing an opportunity to run up Mt. Tam or windsurf at Chrissy Field. He played weekly at traditional Irish music sessions in Berkeley and San Francisco and was an avid photographer and a prolific user of social media. Most importantly, however, he was deeply committed to his family, and embraced his early role as a stay-at-home dad.

Aaron will be deeply missed by all those lucky enough to have known him. I send my heartfelt condolences to his loving wife, Darby Davenport, as well as his two sons, Clayton and Jeremy.●

#### RECOGNIZING DR. M. JOHN CULLINANE

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend Dr. Murdock John Cullinane, Jr., for his 46 years of service to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Dr. Cullinane, who will retire this month, is Deputy Director of the U.S.

Army Engineer Research and Development Center, ERDC, in Vicksburg, MS, a position he has held since 2010. He is culminating his public service career as the second in command of one of our Nation's most diverse research and development institutions. As Deputy Director, he has led the ERDC program management board, which is responsible for developing and implementing the organization's strategic mission. He has earned the respect of his colleagues and others for his commitment to the best interests of ERDC and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Prior to becoming Deputy Director, Dr. Cullinane served as a senior science technical manager and spent 9 years as the technical director for ERDC's Environmental Quality and Installations business area, which conducts research on installation transformation, operations, and environmental issues, as well as remediation and restoration, land planning, stewardship and management, threatened and endangered species, and cultural resources. He previously served as the technical director of military environmental engineering and science, as well as program manager of restoration research, a position that saw him direct all aspects of the Army restoration research program.

Dr. Cullinane has also led ERDC in several successful corporate initiatives to optimize the generation of unique technical solutions for a diverse customer base and to develop effective, efficient, and sustainable ERDC business operations and processes. He has also championed the ERDC Business Sophistication, Employee Success, Superior Solutions, Strategic Communication, and the Transition Stratagem, BESST, Initiative, a strategic framework designed to guide the organization into the year 2020.

Dr. Cullinane has had a distinguished career of exemplary service to the U.S. Army and the Army Corps of Engineers. His professionalism, dedication, and technical expertise have been valuable to ERDC and are a testament to his good character and high standards. His contributions are in keeping with the finest traditions of military and civilian service and reflect great credit upon the Army Corps, the Army, and our Nation.

I am pleased to commend Dr. Cullinane for his service and to wish him well in the years ahead.●

#### RECOGNIZING NORTH DAKOTA FARM SERVICE AGENCY EMPLOYEES

• Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 302 U.S. Department of Agriculture Farm Service Agency—FSA—staff in North Dakota and thank them for their hard work and dedication to serving our State's farmers and ranchers.

The farm bill is perhaps the most important piece of legislation we can pass



for North Dakota, and I am proud to have been a part of writing and passing it. But the work doesn't end when the President signs the bill. In fact, that is when the real work begins for hundreds of FSA employees.

Our farmers are faced with a big decision this month, when they will decide on both base acre reallocation and yield updates as well as elect which farm program they will participate in for the next 5 years.

This is a big decision for farmers, and one that will have effects on their bottom lines for the next 5 years. It is also a complicated decision. The 2014 farm bill gave producers the opportunity to tailor farm programs to their specific operation by choosing between revenue protection—at the county or individual farm level—or price protection coverage, or a combination of the two.

These important decisions are compounded for farmers with declining commodity prices and producers facing greater economic uncertainty than they have in recent years.

And that is why the FSA staff are so important. They held 307 informational sessions attended by 15,469 individuals across our State throughout the winter to update as many producers as possible on their options. And they have had long days with our farmers at the local level helping folks with base reallocation, yield updates, and program election. Producers recognize and appreciate their hard work and dedication, and I thank them for their service to our State. I have heard from farmers more than once that “the ladies in the office know what they're doing and have been very helpful.”

I would also like to thank the North Dakota State University Extension Service staff for the countless hours they have put into educating producers about their options and walking them through how each program and economic scenario could affect them for the next 5 years.

Farmers and ranchers are the backbone of my State and this country. It is important that we continue to provide them with the tools and certainty they need. I thank the dedicated men and women of the Farm Service Agency who work daily to make this a reality.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-856. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department of Defense (DoD) intending to assign women to previously closed positions in the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-857. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the National Security Education Program for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-858. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Federal Home Loan Bank Capital Stock and Capital Plans” (RIN2590-AA71) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-859. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-860. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order declaring a national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States posed by the situation in Venezuela; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-861. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Categories of Archaeological Material From the Pre-Hispanic Cultures of the Republic of El Salvador” (RIN1515-AE01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-862. A communication from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Rural Development Loan Servicing” (RIN0570-AA88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 6, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-863. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities of the Department of Energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-864. A communication from the Supervisory Attorney Advisor, Office of Violence Against Women, Department of Justice,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Grants To Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders” (RIN1105-AB43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-865. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Lansing, Michigan)” (MB Docket No. 15-2) (DA 15-210) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-866. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications” (RIN0648-XD437) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-867. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Cod Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XD715) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-868. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Fountaingrove District Viticultural Area” (RIN1513-AC09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-869. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementation of Sections 101, 103 and 105 of the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014” (MB Docket No. 15-37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-870. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; HHS Notice of Benefit and Payment Parameters for 2016” ((RIN0938-AS19) (CMS-9944-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 25, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-871. A communication from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; Establishment of the Multi-State Plan Program for the Affordable Insurance Exchanges” (RIN3206-AN12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 27, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-872. A communication from the General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, General Services Administration,

received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-873. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Certified Business Enterprise Expenditures of Public-Private Development Construction Projects for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-874. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-593, "Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-875. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-594, "St. Elizabeths East Redevelopment Support Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-876. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-595, "Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-877. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-597, "Sonia Gutierrez Campus Way Designation Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-878. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-598, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 1412, S.O. 13-10159, Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-879. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-599, "Urban Farming and Food Security Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-880. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-600, "Notice Requirements for Historic Properties Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-881. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-601, "U Street/14th Street, N.W., and Georgia Avenue Great Streets Neighborhood Retail Priority Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-882. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-602, "Workforce Investment Implementation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-883. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-603, "Public Space Maintenance Contracting Authorization Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-884. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-604, "Federal Health Reform Implementation and Omnibus Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-885. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-605, "Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-886. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-606, "Executive Service Compensation System Changes and Pay Schedule Approval Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-887. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-607, "Office of Motion Picture and Television Development Establishment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-888. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-608, "Adoption Fee Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-889. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-609, "Omnibus Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-890. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-610, "Prohibition of Pre-Employment Marijuana Testing Temporary Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-891. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-611, "Parkside Parcel E and J Mixed-Income Apartments Tax Abatement Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-892. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-615, "New Columbia Statehood Initiative Omnibus Boards and Commissions Reform Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-893. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-618, "Clinical Laboratory Practitioners Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-894. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-619, "Civil Asset Forfeiture Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-895. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-620, "Primary Date Alteration

Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-896. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-621, "License to Carry a Pistol Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-897. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-622, "Nuisance Abatement Notice Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-898. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-623, "Not-for-Profit Hospital Corporation Certificate of Need Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-899. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-624, "UDC Fundraising Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-900. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-625, "Classroom Animal for Education Purposes Clarification Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-901. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-626, "Apprenticeship Modernization Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-902. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-627, "Fiscal Year 2015 Revised Budget Request Temporary Adjustment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-903. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-628, "Lots 36, 41, and 802 in Square 3942 and Parcels 0143/107 and 0143/110 Eminent Domain Authorization Temporary Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-904. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 20-630, "Ticket Sale Regulation Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 682. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage; to

the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 683. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 684. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 685. A bill to prescribe safety standards for motorcycles and related equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a limitation on certain aliens from claiming the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 687. A bill to authorize the establishment of American Dream Accounts; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 688. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 689. A bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 690. A bill to support local decision-making functions of local educational agencies by limiting the authority of the Secretary of Education to issue regulations, rules, grant conditions, and guidance materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 691. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to obtain the consent of affected State and local governments before authorizing the construction of a nuclear waste repository; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 692. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 442 East 167th Street in Bronx, New York, as the "Herman Badillo Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 693. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Lena Horne in recognition of her achievements and contributions to American culture and the civil rights movement; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 694. A bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old children employed in logging or mechanized operations from child labor laws; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 695. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on matters relating to the burial of unclaimed remains of veterans in national cemeteries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 696. A bill to increase the number and percentage of students who graduate from high school college and career ready with the ability to use knowledge to solve complex problems, think critically, communicate effectively, collaborate with others, and develop academic mindsets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 697. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. REED, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. KING):

S. 698. A bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 699. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the American Opportunity Tax Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 700. A bill to amend the Asbestos Information Act of 1988 to establish a public database of asbestos-containing products, to require public disclosure of information pertaining to the manufacture, processing, distribution, and use of asbestos-containing products in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 701. A bill for the relief of Tim Lowry and Paul Nettleton of Owyhee County, Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Res. 99. A resolution calling on the Government of Iran to fulfill its promises of assistance in the case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's History; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 155

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 155, a bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity by repealing the income tax and other taxes, abolishing the Internal Revenue Service, and enacting a national sales tax to be administered primarily by the States.

S. 178

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, *supra*.

S. 197

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 197, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 207, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran, and for other purposes.

S. 262

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 262, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 271

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 271, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 373

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 373, a bill to provide for the establishment of nationally uniform and environmentally sound standards governing discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel.

S. 405

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 405, a bill to protect and enhance opportunities for recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting, and for other purposes.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-

Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 440

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 440, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an exclusion for assistance provided to participants in certain veterinary student loan repayment or forgiveness.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 546

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to establish the Railroad Emergency Services Preparedness, Operational Needs, and Safety Evaluation (RESPONSE) Subcommittee under the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Advisory Council to provide recommendations on emergency responder training and resources relating to hazardous materials incidents involving railroads, and for other purposes.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services

for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 591

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 591, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 615

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 627

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 627, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 683. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I wish to introduce the Compassionate Access, Research Expansion, and Respect

States Act CARERS Act. This commonsense legislation would make our Federal marijuana criminal laws fairer and more in line with our values and ensure that medical marijuana is more accessible to the millions of Americans who need it for treatment purposes. I thank Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND and Senator RAND PAUL for joining me on this bill, and I appreciate their hard work on this legislation.

The CARERS Act would clarify how the Federal Government handles medical marijuana in the States. Currently, 23 States and the District of Columbia have passed laws legalizing medical marijuana for qualified patients. But the Federal Government still bans medical marijuana and treats the people who use it with contempt. It is time we end this backward approach toward a substance that helps treat millions of Americans, including veterans, who suffer from debilitating diseases.

Today, the Federal Government classifies marijuana as a schedule I drug, meaning it lacks a recognized medical value and it has a high potential for abuse. Incredibly, marijuana shares the same classification with such drugs as heroin or LSD—substances that no one disputes are incredibly dangerous and harmful. Schedule II is the next controlled substances category for drugs deemed to have some medical use, such as cocaine and methamphetamine. The view that marijuana has no medical use whatsoever, but the methamphetamine has some medicinal use is troubling and contrary to science. We can do better.

In 2013, the Department of Justice issued guidance to Federal prosecutors and regulators to refrain from prosecuting individuals that use, purchase or sell marijuana in States where it is legal as long as a State regulatory framework exists that maintains certain standards, such as a ban on sales to minors. As a result of this guidance, more and more States have taken steps to legalize medical marijuana.

Sadly, despite this guidance, the inability of Federal and State law to be on the same page regarding the legality of medical marijuana has resulted in confusion and uncertainty for State regulators and the public about what the law requires. This lack of clarity is only part of the problem. Individual users of medical marijuana in States with legalized medical marijuana continue to be targeted by the Drug Enforcement Agency. That is unacceptable and must change. Individuals who use medical marijuana in States where it is legal should not fear prosecution simply based on prosecutorial discretion. We can do better.

I am encouraged that the winds of change are blowing at the Federal level on whether to prosecute medical marijuana, but confusion remains. While the 2013 guidance likely trumps the

prior two memorandum, what message do these documents send? Is medical marijuana legal or not? Is it right that the law can be changed at a moment's notice by an unelected Federal prosecutor? And what protection does State law afford medical marijuana users when State and Federal law collide, especially when marijuana is classified by the Federal Government as a schedule I drug? This legislation brings certainty and uniformity to these issues.

Another problem with current law is that medical marijuana operates largely in the shadows because financial institutions are scared to do business with legitimate marijuana businesses. Banks and other financial institutions are hesitant to do business with legitimate marijuana businesses because they are concerned about losing their Federal depository insurance or facing Federal prosecution. As a result, the medical marijuana industry operates largely as a cash business which is bad for the economy and endangers public safety. Dealing with high quantities of cash and having to transport it leaves these businesses and their operatives as easy targets for criminals.

The current medical marijuana situation in America is untenable. It is unfair for the Americans that operate legitimate marijuana businesses. It is unfair to people with disabilities, including veterans with post-traumatic stress, traumatic brain injury or missing limbs who rely on medical marijuana for treatment. It is unfair to children with intractable epilepsy who need cannabidiol—known as CBD—to control their seizures.

This issue has a real impact on the lives of ordinary Americans. Recently, my staff met with Jennie Stormes, a woman recently forced to leave my home State of New Jersey because of our restrictive medical marijuana laws. Ms. Stormes' son Jackson suffers from Dravet syndrome, a severe and debilitating form of epilepsy. Without medication, Jackson can have multiple seizures in a day. This condition has affected Jackson's development and put him through a tremendous amount of pain.

Jeannie Stormes and her family shared with my staff the hardships of living in a State where it is hard to gain access to the medication Jackson needs. Jackson has tried 23 different drugs in 60-plus different combinations, but nothing worked to control his seizures. She talked about how medical marijuana was the first drug that controlled his seizures and changed their lives. Unfortunately, Jennie announced her family was moving to Colorado because it was too difficult in New Jersey to access the medicine Jackson needed to stay alive.

We need this legislation to help the Jackson Stormes of the world. No child in America with a debilitating disease

deserves to live a life of pain without access to the medication that he or she needs. Jennie and Jackson's story pains me. It tells me that we have a long way to go. But their story also gives me hope. It gives me hope because despite all the hardships they have gone through, they remain strong and committed to their cause. It is people like Jennie and Jackson who make our country great. It is for them that we need to continue to fight to move our country forward.

The CARERS Act would take significant steps towards addressing the situation that Jackson and Jennie went through.

First, the bill would end the Federal prohibition of medical marijuana. Millions of Americans need to gain access to the medicine that works best for them. The Federal Government's current stance on medical marijuana has only created confusion and uncertainty. This bill would prohibit the Federal Government from prosecuting persons who are in compliance with State medical marijuana laws and let people, like Jackson, gain access to the care they need.

The bill would reschedule marijuana as a schedule II drug. The Drug Enforcement Agency insists that medical marijuana is a fallacy. It insists that marijuana is a dangerous substance and it is properly classified as a schedule I drug. Doctors know that is wrong, I know that is wrong, Jennie and Jackson know that is wrong. It is time we finally properly classify marijuana.

The bill would also allow States to import CBD. CBD is an oil substance made from a marijuana plant that contains virtually no THC—meaning you experience no high from the drug. CBD is the medicine Jackson needs—along with thousands of other individuals with Dravet syndrome—to control his seizures. We must make this important drug more available so people can access the medication they need.

The bill would create a safe harbor for banks and financial institutions that want to do business with legal medical marijuana businesses. It is not safe that these businesses are forced to deal only in cash. It is bad for our economy and it is bad for law enforcement. The bill would institute protections that these institutions need to feel comfortable doing business with medical marijuana establishments.

The bill would promote research. A large problem for our Nation is that not enough research exists on the impact of medical marijuana. We know there are legitimate medical uses of the drug, but we can learn much more. We need to allow experts to access the drug to conduct tests and clinical trials to fully understand the effects of the drug and how it can best be utilized. This will only benefit the doctors who prescribe it, the lawmakers who regulate it, and the people who need it.

Finally, the bill would allow VA doctors to prescribe medical marijuana to veterans in States that have legalized medical marijuana. Many men and women in uniform who have bravely served our Nation come home with invisible wounds of war and they deserve the best care available. This means allowing them access to the medicine they need to heal or control their condition. Those who have served our country deserve to be served by us, and that means receiving the best care available.

I want to thank Senators PAUL and GILLIBRAND for working on this legislation with me and I urge my colleagues to work with us to help ensure the CARERS Act is signed into law.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 686. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a limitation on certain aliens from claiming the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation with Senator ENZI and a few other Senators to close a tax loophole that could mean billions of dollars in tax benefits going to individuals based on work they performed illegally in the United States.

The tax benefit I am referring to is the earned-income tax credit. The earned-income tax credit was established as a work incentive to help move more individuals from the welfare rolls to the payrolls. The policy behind the EITC is one I and many of my colleagues support as it is intended to foster betterment and personal responsibility by giving those on the lowest rungs of the labor pool an extra incentive to jump in and stay in the workforce rather than rely on welfare programs.

It does this by providing a tax benefit to low-income individuals based on the amount of earned income they have.

The earned income tax credit is refundable, so it benefits even those who don't earn enough money to have a Federal income tax liability by providing them a cash payment.

In 1996 Congress as a matter of policy determined that the earned income tax credit should be "denied to individuals not authorized to be employed in the United States." That is the exact language used in the title of the relevant provision that was enacted in 1996. Congress carried this policy out by requiring those claiming the earned income tax credit to provide a Social Security number for themselves, their spouse, and their children.

From a policy perspective, this rule made a lot of sense to me and many of my colleagues, as it passed both the

House and the Senate with broad support. Obviously, if the object of the earned income tax credit is to encourage work, it makes no sense to provide such an incentive to those who are not legally allowed to work. Why would we want to encourage individuals to break our immigration laws?

What Congress didn't know at the time was that at an unknown future date, a President, with the stroke of a pen, would essentially grant millions of undocumented workers amnesty. Under the President's action, those previously working illegally in the United States will be eligible for work authorization and a Social Security number.

Based on an IRS interpretation of the earned income tax credit eligibility requirements, those who obtain a Social Security number will be eligible to claim the earned income tax credit not only for future years but for previous years while they were living and working in the United States undocumented. Based on the statute of limitations, those obtaining deferred action could then go back and amend or file returns for up to 3 previous tax years to take advantage of a credit that can be worth several thousands of dollars each year.

The legislation I am introducing today with Senator ENZI will fix this loophole by making it clear that those granted deferred action are not eligible to claim the earned income tax credit for the years they worked in the United States as undocumented workers. This proposal is simply an extension of current policy. Those granted deferred action will still be able to claim the earned income tax credit in years going forward for work they perform legally. This proposal reflects the commonsense proposition that American taxpayers should not subsidize work they performed illegally in the United States.

This bill should be a no-brainer for any of my colleagues who agree that we should not reward individuals for breaking our immigration laws and our employment laws. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense piece of legislation.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 691. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to obtain the consent of affected State and local governments before authorizing the construction of a nuclear waste repository; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 691

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Nuclear Waste Informed Consent Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, the terms "affected Indian tribe", "Commission", "high-level radioactive waste", "repository", and "spent nuclear fuel" have the meanings given the terms in section 2 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10101).

#### SEC. 3. CONSENT BASED APPROVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may not authorize construction of a repository unless the Secretary has entered into an agreement to host the repository with—

(1) the Governor of the State in which the repository is proposed to be located;

(2) each affected unit of local government;

(3) any unit of general local government contiguous to the affected unit of local government if spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste will be transported through that unit of general local government for disposal at the repository; and

(4) each affected Indian tribe.

(b) CONDITIONS ON AGREEMENT.—Any agreement to host a repository under this Act—

(1) shall be in writing and signed by all parties;

(2) shall be binding on the parties; and

(3) shall not be amended or revoked except by mutual agreement of the parties.

#### SEC. 4. APPLICATION.

This Act applies to any application submitted to the Commission for construction authorization for a repository that—

(1) exists as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) is submitted on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 700. A bill to amend the Asbestos Information Act of 1988 to establish a public database of asbestos-containing products, to require public disclosure of information pertaining to the manufacture, processing, distribution, and use of asbestos-containing products in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 700

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Reducing Exposure to Asbestos Database Act of 2015" or the "READ Act".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has classified asbestos as a category A human carcinogen, the highest cancer hazard classification for a substance;

(2) the International Agency for Research on Cancer has classified asbestos as a class 1 human carcinogen;

(3) despite the enactment of the Asbestos Information Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 2607 note; Public Law 100-577), which sought to improve transparency and public awareness of the



presence of asbestos in commercial materials and products, many people in the United States still incorrectly believe that—

(A) asbestos has been banned in the United States; and

(B) there is no risk of exposure to asbestos through the use of new commercial products;

(4) asbestos is still being imported and used, and is otherwise present as a contaminant, in some consumer and industrial products in the United States;

(5) according to the Environmental Protection Agency, the manufacture, importation, processing, and distribution in commerce of many asbestos-containing products are not banned in the United States, including—

(A) cement corrugated sheet;

(B) cement flat sheet;

(C) clothing;

(D) pipeline wrap;

(E) roofing felt;

(F) vinyl floor tile;

(G) cement shingle;

(H) millboard;

(I) cement pipe;

(J) automatic transmission components;

(K) clutch facings;

(L) friction materials;

(M) disc brake pads;

(N) drum brake linings;

(O) brake blocks;

(P) gaskets;

(Q) non-roofing coatings; and

(R) roof coatings;

(6) consumers and workers are at risk of asbestos exposure, and families of workers are also put at risk because of asbestos brought home by the workers on the shoes, clothes, skin, and hair of the workers;

(7) the Environmental Working Group estimates that as many as 10,000 citizens of the United States die each year from mesothelioma and other asbestos-related diseases;

(8) the National Institutes of Health reported to Congress that mesothelioma is a difficult disease to detect, diagnose, and treat;

(9) mesothelioma responds poorly to conventional chemotherapy, and although new combination treatments for mesothelioma have demonstrated some benefits—

(A) the median survival period for mesothelioma is only 1 year after diagnosis of the disease; and

(B) the majority of mesothelioma patients die within 2 years of diagnosis of the disease; and

(10) until asbestos is completely banned from being used in or imported into the United States, transparent and accessible information about the location and identity of asbestos and asbestos-containing products in the United States is necessary to better protect consumers, workers, families, and the people of the United States.

### SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF ASBESTOS-CONTAINING PRODUCT DATABASE.

The Asbestos Information Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 2607 note; Public Law 100-577) is amended—

(1) in section 4—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (7) as paragraphs (4) through (8), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) ASBESTOS-CONTAINING PRODUCT.—The term ‘asbestos-containing product’ means any product (including any part) to which asbestos is deliberately or knowingly added or in which asbestos is deliberately used or knowingly present in any concentration.”;

(2) in section 2, by inserting “(referred to in this Act as the ‘Administrator’)” after

“Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

### “SEC. 5. ASBESTOS-CONTAINING PRODUCT DATABASE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Using funds otherwise made available to the Administrator, the Administrator shall, in accordance with this section, establish and maintain a database of asbestos-containing products (referred to in this Act as the ‘database’) that is—

“(1) publicly available;

“(2) searchable; and

“(3) accessible through the website of the Administrator.

“(b) SUBMISSION OF DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining the database, including plans for the operation, content, maintenance, and functionality of the database.

“(2) INTEGRATION.—The plan described in paragraph (1) shall detail the integration of the database into the overall information technology improvement objectives and plans of the Administrator.

“(3) IMPLEMENTATION.—The plan described in paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) a detailed implementation schedule for the database; and

“(B) plans for a public awareness campaign conducted by the Administrator to increase awareness of the database.

“(c) DATE OF INITIAL AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Administrator submits the plan under subsection (b)(1), the Administrator shall establish the database.

“(d) SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION ON ASBESTOS-CONTAINING PRODUCTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date that is 270 days after the date of enactment of this section, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, any person who manufactured, processed, distributed, sold, imported, transported, or stored an asbestos-containing product in the immediately preceding calendar year shall submit to the Administrator a written report, in a form to be determined by the Administrator, containing information sufficient to identify the characteristics and location of the asbestos-containing products.

“(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) the type or class of asbestos-containing product;

“(B) the manufacturer of the asbestos-containing product;

“(C) any applicable import history of the asbestos-containing product;

“(D) the name and street address of any location accessible by the public in which the person has reasonable knowledge that the asbestos-containing product has been present within the immediately preceding calendar year; and

“(E) any additional information the Administrator determines is appropriate to enable consumers and workers to avoid exposure to asbestos-containing products.

“(e) ORGANIZATION OF DATABASE.—The Administrator shall—

“(1) categorize the information available on the database—

“(A) in a manner consistent with the public interest; and

“(B) in such manner as the Administrator determines will facilitate easy use by consumers; and

“(2) ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the database is sortable and accessible by—

“(A) the date on which information is submitted for inclusion in the database;

“(B) the name of the asbestos-containing product;

“(C) the model name;

“(D) the name of the manufacturer;

“(E) the name of the importer, if applicable;

“(F) the name of the reporting person;

“(G) the name and street address of any location in which an asbestos-containing product is reported to have been present; and

“(H) any other element the Administrator considers to be in the public interest.

### “SEC. 6. PENALTIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person who knowingly manufactured, processed, distributed, sold, imported, transported, or stored an asbestos-containing product in the immediately preceding calendar year and who did not submit a report to the Administrator under section 5 shall be liable for a civil penalty of \$10,000 for each day after the deadline under section 5(d)(1) the report has not been submitted.

“(b) FALSE OR INACCURATE INFORMATION.—Any person who knowingly provides false or inaccurate information in a report under section 5 or who knowingly fails to provide information required in a report under section 5 shall be liable for a civil penalty of \$10,000 for each violation of this paragraph.”.

### SEC. 4. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORT.

Not later than 2 years after the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency establishes the database of asbestos-containing products under section 5(a) of the Asbestos Information Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 2607 note; Public Law 100-577) (referred to in this section as the “database”), the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains—

(1) an analysis of the utility of the database, including—

(A) an assessment of the extent of use of the database by consumers, including—

(i) whether the database is accessed by a broad range of the public; and

(ii) whether consumers find the database to be useful; and

(B) efforts by the Administrator to inform the public about the database;

(2) recommendations for measures to increase use of the database by consumers; and

(3) recommendations for measures to further reduce the harm caused by exposure to asbestos, including bans on the importation and use of asbestos-containing products.

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 99—CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN TO FULFILL ITS PROMISES OF ASSISTANCE IN THE CASE OF ROBERT LEVINSON, THE LONGEST HELD UNITED STATES CIVILIAN IN OUR NATION'S HISTORY

Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 99

Whereas United States citizen Robert Levinson is a retired agent of the Federal



Bureau of Investigation (FBI), a resident of Coral Springs, Florida, the husband of Christine Levinson, and father of their seven children;

Whereas Robert Levinson traveled from Dubai, United Arab Emirates, to Kish Island, Iran, on March 8, 2007;

Whereas, after traveling to Kish Island and checking into the Hotel Maryam, Robert Levinson disappeared on March 9, 2007;

Whereas, in December 2007, Robert Levinson's wife, Christine, traveled to Kish Island to retrace Mr. Levinson's steps and met with officials of the Government of Iran who pledged to help in the investigation;

Whereas, for more than eight years, the United States Government has continually pressed the Government of Iran to provide any information on the whereabouts of Robert Levinson and to help ensure his prompt and safe return to his family;

Whereas officials of the Government of Iran promised their continued assistance to the relatives of Robert Levinson during the visit of the family to the Islamic Republic of Iran in December 2007;

Whereas, in November 2010, the Levinson family received a video of Mr. Levinson in captivity, representing the first proof of life since his disappearance and providing some initial indications that he was being held somewhere in southwest Asia;

Whereas, in April 2011, the Levinson family received a series of pictures of Mr. Levinson, which provided further indications that he was being held somewhere in southwest Asia;

Whereas Secretary of State John Kerry stated on August 28, 2013, "The United States respectfully asks the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to work cooperatively with us in our efforts to help U.S. citizen Robert Levinson.";

Whereas, on September 28, 2013, during the first direct phone conversation between the leaders of the United States and Iran since 1979, President Barack Obama raised the case of Robert Levinson to President of Iran Hassan Rouhani and urged the President of Iran to help locate Mr. Levinson and reunite him with his family;

Whereas, on August 29, 2014, Secretary of State Kerry again stated that the United States "respectfully request the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran work cooperatively with us to find Mr. Levinson and bring him home";

Whereas the United States Government is currently engaged in regular, direct negotiations with the Government of Iran over its nuclear program;

Whereas March 9, 2015, marks the 2,922nd day since Mr. Levinson's disappearance, and he is now the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history; and

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has announced a \$5,000,000 reward for information leading to Mr. Levinson's safe return: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that Robert Levinson is the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history;

(2) notes the pledges by current officials of the Government of Iran to provide their Government's assistance in the case of Robert Levinson;

(3) urges the Government of Iran, as a humanitarian gesture, to intensify its cooperation on the case of Robert Levinson and to immediately share the results of its investigation into the disappearance of Robert Levinson with the United States Government;

(4) urges the President and the allies of the United States to continue to raise with offi-

cials of the Government of Iran the case of Robert Levinson at every opportunity, notwithstanding serious disagreements the United States Government has with the Government of Iran on a broad array of issues, including human rights, the nuclear program of Iran, the Middle East peace process, regional stability, and international terrorism; and

(5) expresses sympathy to the family of Robert Levinson for their anguish and expresses hope that their ordeal can be brought to an end in the near future.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 273. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 274. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 275. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 276. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 277. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 278. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 279. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 280. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 281. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 282. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 283. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 284. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 273. Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

##### SECTION \_\_. SAVE ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Stop Advertising Victims of

Exploitation Act of 2015" or the "SAVE Act of 2015".

(b) ADVERTISING THAT OFFERS CERTAIN COMMERCIAL ACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591(a)(1) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by inserting "advertisements," after "obtains,".

(2) MENS REA REQUIREMENT.—Section 1591(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended in the undesignated matter following paragraph (2), by inserting "except where, in an offense under paragraph (2), the act constituting the violation of paragraph (1) is advertising," after "knowing, or".

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 1591(b) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting "advertised," after "obtained,"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting "advertised," after "obtained,".

SA 274. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

##### SEC. \_\_. CITIZENSHIP AT BIRTH FOR CERTAIN PERSONS BORN IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "The following";

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) through (h) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively, and indenting such paragraphs, as redesignated, an additional 2 ems to the right; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) DEFINITION.—Acknowledging the right of birthright citizenship established by section 1 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a person born in the United States shall be considered 'subject to the jurisdiction' of the United States for purposes of subsection (a)(1) only if the person is born in the United States and at least 1 of the person's parents is—

"(1) a citizen or national of the United States;

"(2) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States whose residence is in the United States; or

"(3) an alien performing active service in the armed forces (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code)."

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(3) may not be construed to affect the citizenship or nationality status of any person born before the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 275. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

##### TITLE II—SAFE COMMUNITIES

##### SEC. 21. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Keep Our Communities Safe Act of 2015".

##### SEC. 22. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Constitutional rights should be upheld and protected;

(2) Congress intends to uphold the Constitutional principle of due process; and  
(3) due process of the law is a right afforded to everyone in the United States.

**SEC. 23. DETENTION OF DANGEROUS ALIENS DURING REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.**

Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place such term appears (except in the second place it appears in subsection (a)) and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “the Secretary of Homeland Security or” before “the Attorney General—”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “conditional parole” and inserting “recognizance”;

(3) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “PAROLE” and inserting “RECOGNIZANCE”; and

(B) by striking “parole” and inserting “recognizance”;

(4) in subsection (c)(1), by striking the undesignated matter following subparagraph (D) and inserting the following:

“any time after the alien is released, without regard to whether an alien is released related to any activity, offense, or conviction described in this paragraph; to whether the alien is released on parole, supervised release, or probation; or to whether the alien may be arrested or imprisoned again for the same offense. If the activity described in this paragraph does not result in the alien being taken into custody by any person other than the Secretary, then when the alien is brought to the attention of the Secretary or when the Secretary determines it is practical to take such alien into custody, the Secretary shall take such alien into custody.”;

(5) in subsection (e), by striking “Attorney General’s” and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security’s”; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) LENGTH OF DETENTION.—

“(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an alien may be detained under this section for any period, without limitation, except as provided in subsection (i), until the alien is subject to a final order of removal.

“(2) The length of detention under this section shall not affect a detention under section 241.

“(h) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

“(1) LIMITATION.—The Attorney General’s review of the Secretary’s custody determinations under subsection (a) shall be limited to whether the alien may be detained, released on bond (of at least \$1,500 with security approved by the Secretary), or released with no bond. Any review involving an alien described in paragraph (2)(D) shall be limited to a determination of whether the alien is properly included in such category.

“(2) CLASSES OF ALIENS.—The Attorney General shall review the Secretary’s custody determinations for the following classes of aliens:

“(A) Aliens in exclusion proceedings.

“(B) Aliens described in sections 212(a)(3) and 237(a)(4).

“(C) Aliens described in subsection (c).

“(D) Aliens in deportation proceedings subject to section 242(a)(2) (as in effect between April 24, 1996 and April 1, 1997).

“(i) RELEASE ON BOND.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An alien detained under subsection (a) may seek release on bond. No bond may be granted except to an alien who

establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the alien is not a flight risk or a risk to another person or the community.

“(2) CERTAIN ALIENS INELIGIBLE.—No alien detained under subsection (c) may seek release on bond.”.

**SEC. 24. ALIENS ORDERED REMOVED.**

Section 241(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Attorney General” each place it appears, except for the first place it appears in paragraph (4)(B)(i), and inserting “Secretary of Homeland Security”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by amending subparagraphs (B) and (C) to read as follows:

“(B) BEGINNING OF PERIOD.—The removal period begins on the latest of—

“(i) the date on which the order of removal becomes administratively final;

“(ii) the date on which the alien is taken into such custody if the alien is not in the custody of the Secretary on the date on which the order of removal becomes administratively final; and

“(iii) the date on which the alien is taken into the custody of the Secretary after the alien is released from detention or confinement if the alien is detained or confined (except for an immigration process) on the date on which the order of removal becomes administratively final.

“(C) SUSPENSION OF PERIOD.—

“(i) EXTENSION.—The removal period shall be extended beyond a period of 90 days and the Secretary may, in the Secretary’s sole discretion, keep the alien in detention during such extended period, if—

“(I) the alien fails or refuses to make all reasonable efforts to comply with the removal order, or to fully cooperate with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order, including making timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien’s departure or conspires or acts to prevent the alien’s removal that is subject to an order of removal;

“(II) a court, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or an immigration judge orders a stay of removal of an alien who is subject to an administratively final order of removal;

“(III) the Secretary transfers custody of the alien pursuant to law to another Federal agency or a State or local government agency in connection with the official duties of such agency; or

“(IV) a court or the Board of Immigration Appeals orders a remand to an immigration judge or the Board of Immigration Appeals, during the time period when the case is pending a decision on remand (with the removal period beginning anew on the date that the alien is ordered removed on remand).

“(ii) RENEWAL.—If the removal period has been extended under clause (i), a new removal period shall be deemed to have begun on the date on which—

“(I) the alien makes all reasonable efforts to comply with the removal order, or to fully cooperate with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order;

“(II) the stay of removal is no longer in effect; or

“(III) the alien is returned to the custody of the Secretary.

“(iii) MANDATORY DETENTION FOR CERTAIN ALIENS.—The Secretary shall keep an alien described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 236(c)(1) in detention during the extended period described in clause (i).

“(iv) SOLE FORM OF RELIEF.—An alien may only seek relief from detention under this subparagraph by filing an application for a writ of habeas corpus in accordance with chapter 153 of title 28, United States Code. No alien whose period of detention is extended under this subparagraph shall have the right to seek release on bond.”;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “or is not detained pursuant to paragraph (6)” after “the removal period”; and

(B) by amending subparagraph (D) to read as follows:

“(D) to obey reasonable restrictions on the alien’s conduct or activities that the Secretary prescribes for the alien—

“(i) to prevent the alien from absconding;

“(ii) for the protection of the community; or

“(iii) for other purposes related to the enforcement of Federal immigration laws.”;

(4) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “subparagraph (B)”;

(5) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) ADDITIONAL RULES FOR DETENTION OR RELEASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—

“(A) DETENTION REVIEW PROCESS FOR COOPERATIVE ALIENS ESTABLISHED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish an administrative review process to determine whether an alien who is not otherwise subject to mandatory detention, who has made all reasonable efforts to comply with a removal order and to cooperate fully with the Secretary of Homeland Security’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order, including making timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien’s departure, and who has not conspired or acted to prevent removal should be detained or released on conditions.

“(ii) DETERMINATION.—The Secretary shall make a determination whether to release an alien after the removal period in accordance with subparagraph (B), which—

“(I) shall include consideration of any evidence submitted by the alien; and

“(II) may include consideration of any other evidence, including—

“(aa) any information or assistance provided by the Secretary of State or other Federal official; and

“(bb) any other information available to the Secretary of Homeland Security pertaining to the ability to remove the alien.

“(B) AUTHORITY TO DETAIN BEYOND REMOVAL PERIOD.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may continue to detain an alien for 90 days beyond the removal period (including any extension of the removal period under paragraph (1)(C)). An alien whose detention is extended under this subparagraph shall not have the right to seek release on bond.

“(ii) SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may continue to detain an alien beyond the 90 days authorized under clause (i)—

“(I) until the alien is removed, if the Secretary determines that there is a significant likelihood that the alien—

“(aa) will be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future;

“(bb) would be removed in the reasonably foreseeable future; or

“(cc) would have been removed if the alien had not—

“(AA) failed or refused to make all reasonable efforts to comply with the removal order;

“(BB) failed or refused to cooperate fully with the Secretary’s efforts to establish the alien’s identity and carry out the removal order, including making timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary to the alien’s departure; or

“(CC) conspired or acted to prevent removal;

“(II) until the alien is removed, if the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies in writing—

“(aa) in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, that the alien has a highly contagious disease that poses a threat to public safety;

“(bb) after receipt of a written recommendation from the Secretary of State, that release of the alien is likely to have serious adverse foreign policy consequences for the United States;

“(cc) based on information available to the Secretary of Homeland Security (including classified, sensitive, or national security information, and without regard to the grounds upon which the alien was ordered removed), that there is reason to believe that the release of the alien would threaten the national security of the United States; or

“(dd) that the release of the alien will threaten the safety of the community or any person, conditions of release cannot reasonably be expected to ensure the safety of the community or of any person; and

“(AA) the alien has been convicted of 1 or more aggravated felonies (as defined in section 101(a)(43)(A)) or of 1 or more crimes identified by the Secretary of Homeland Security by regulation, or of 1 or more attempts or conspiracies to commit any such aggravated felonies or such identified crimes, if the aggregate term of imprisonment for such attempts or conspiracies is at least 5 years; or

“(BB) the alien has committed 1 or more crimes of violence (as defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code, but not including a purely political offense) and, because of a mental condition or personality disorder and behavior associated with that condition or disorder, the alien is likely to engage in acts of violence in the future; or

“(III) pending a certification under subsection (II), if the Secretary of Homeland Security has initiated the administrative review process not later than 30 days after the expiration of the removal period (including any extension of the removal period under paragraph (1)(C)).

“(iii) NO RIGHT TO BOND HEARING.—An alien whose detention is extended under this subparagraph shall not have a right to seek release on bond, including by reason of a certification under clause (ii)(II).

“(C) RENEWAL AND DELEGATION OF CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) RENEWAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may renew a certification under subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) every 6 months after providing an opportunity for the alien to request reconsideration of the certification and to submit documents or other evidence in support of that request. If the Secretary does not renew a certification, the Secretary may not continue to detain the alien under subparagraph (B)(ii)(II).

“(ii) DELEGATION.—Notwithstanding section 103, the Secretary of Homeland Security may not delegate the authority to make or renew a certification described in item (bb), (cc), or (dd) of subparagraph (B)(ii)(II) below the level of the Assistant Secretary for Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

“(iii) HEARING.—The Secretary of Homeland Security may request that the Attorney General or the Attorney General’s designee provide for a hearing to make the determination described in subparagraph (B)(ii)(II)(dd)(BB).

“(D) RELEASE ON CONDITIONS.—If it is determined that an alien should be released from detention by a Federal court, the Board of Immigration Appeals, or if an immigration judge orders a stay of removal, the Secretary of Homeland Security may impose conditions on release as provided under paragraph (3).

“(E) REDETENTION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, without any limitations other than those specified in this section, may detain any alien subject to a final removal order who is released from custody if—

“(I) removal becomes likely in the reasonably foreseeable future;

“(II) the alien fails to comply with the conditions of release or to continue to satisfy the conditions described in subparagraph (A); or

“(III) upon reconsideration, the Secretary determines that the alien can be detained under subparagraph (B).

“(ii) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any alien returned to custody pursuant to this subparagraph as if the removal period terminated on the day of the redetention.

“(F) REVIEW OF DETERMINATIONS BY SECRETARY.—A determination by the Secretary under this paragraph shall not be subject to review by any other agency.”.

#### SEC. 25. SEVERABILITY.

If any of the provisions of this title, any amendment made by this title, or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid for any reason, the remainder of this title, the amendments made by this title, and the application of the provisions and amendments made by this title to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected by such holding.

#### SEC. 26. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) APPREHENSION AND DETENTION OF ALIENS.—The amendments made by section 23 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 236 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by section 23, shall apply to any alien in detention under the provisions of such section on or after such date of enactment.

(b) ALIENS ORDERED REMOVED.—The amendments made by section 24 shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 241 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by section 24, shall apply to—

(1) all aliens subject to a final administrative removal, deportation, or exclusion order that was issued before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) acts and conditions occurring or existing before, on, or after such date of enactment.

**SA 276.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ TREATMENT OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthoriza-

tion Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking the paragraph heading and inserting “SPECIAL RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting “AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.”; and

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “contiguous to the United States” and inserting “contiguous to the United States, Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, and other any foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate”; and

(2) in paragraph (5)(D), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “, except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a)(2),” and inserting “who does not meet the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)”.

**SA 277.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

#### TITLE \_\_\_\_ HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS RELIEF AND EMPOWERMENT ACT

##### SECTION \_\_\_\_ SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Human Trafficking Survivors Relief and Empowerment Act of 2015”.

##### SEC. \_\_\_\_ PROTECTIONS FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS.

Section 1701(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(c)) is amended by striking “where feasible” and all that follows, and inserting the following: “where feasible, to an application—

“(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

“(2) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law—

“(A) that—

“(i) provides a process by which an individual who is human trafficking survivor can move to vacate any arrest or conviction records for prostitution or any other non-violent offense committed as a direct result of human trafficking;

“(ii) establishes a rebuttable presumption that any arrest or conviction of an individual for an offense associated with human trafficking is a result of being trafficked, if the individual—

“(I) is a person granted nonimmigrant status pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(T)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)(i));

“(II) is the subject of a certification by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 107(b)(1)(E) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(E)); or

“(III) has other similar documentation of trafficking, which has been issued by a Federal agency; and

“(iii) protects the identity of individuals who are human trafficking survivors in public and court records; and

“(B) that does not require an individual who is a human trafficking survivor to provide official documentation as described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) of subparagraph (A)(ii) in order to receive protection under the law.”.

**SA 278.** Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**TITLE —TRAFFICKING AWARENESS TRAINING FOR HEALTH CARE**  
**SEC. —01. TRAFFICKING AWARENESS TRAINING FOR HEALTH CARE.**

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—  
 (1) GRANT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and in consultation with the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall award, on a competitive basis, a grant to an eligible school under which such school will—

(A) not later than 6 months after receipt of the award, develop best practices for health care professionals—

(i) to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(ii) to respond appropriately to such individuals;

(B) in developing best practices under subparagraph (A), survey, analyze, and evaluate, in consultation with law enforcement personnel, social service providers, and other experts in the field of human trafficking, existing best practices that foster the practice of interprofessional collaboration, including those used by industries other than the health care industry, to determine the extent to which such existing best practices may be adapted for use as part of the best practices under subparagraph (A);

(C) develop curricula, training modules, or materials to train health care professionals on the best practices developed under subparagraph (A);

(D) not later than 12 months after the receipt of the award, make a subgrant to one entity located near an established anti-human trafficking task force initiative in each of the 10 administrative regions of the Department of Health and Human Services—

(i) to design, implement, and evaluate a pilot program using the best practices developed under subparagraph (A) and the curricula, training modules, or materials developed under subparagraph (C);

(ii) to conduct the pilot program at one or more eligible sites within the respective region, which may include an eligible site that is a school-based health center; and

(iii) to complete the implementation and evaluation of such pilot program within a period of 6 months;

(E) not later than 24 months after the receipt of the award, analyze the results of the pilot programs conducted through subgrants under subparagraph (D), including analyzing—

(i) changes in the skills, knowledge, and attitude of health care professionals resulting from the implementation of the programs;

(ii) the number of victims of a severe form of trafficking who are recognized under the programs;

(iii) of those recognized, the number who received information or referrals for services offered through the programs; and

(iv) of those who received such information or referrals—

(I) the number who participated in followup services; and

(II) the type of followup services received; (F) determine, using the results of the analysis under subparagraph (E), the extent to which the best practices developed under subparagraph (A) are evidence-based; and

(G) submit a comprehensive assessment of the pilot programs conducted through subgrants under subparagraph (D) to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, including an identification of—

(i) the best practices that are determined pursuant to subparagraph (F) to be evidence-based; and

(ii) the best practices that are determined pursuant to such paragraph to require further review in order to determine whether they are evidence-based.

(2) CONTENTS.—The best practices developed through the grant awarded under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall address—

(i) risk factors and indicators to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(ii) application of Federal and State law, including reporting requirements, with respect to victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(iii) patient safety and security, including the requirements of HIPAA privacy and security law as applied to victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(iv) the management of medical records of patients who are victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(v) public and private social services available for rescue, food, clothing, and shelter referrals;

(vi) the hotlines for reporting human trafficking maintained by the National Human Trafficking Resource Center and the Department of Homeland Security;

(vii) validated assessment tools for the identification of victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(viii) referral options and procedures for sharing information on human trafficking with a patient and making referrals for legal and social service assistance related to human trafficking when indicated and appropriate; and

(B) shall not address patient medical treatment.

(3) DISSEMINATION.—Not later than 24 months after the award of a grant to a school under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, shall—

(A) post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services the best practices that are identified by the school under clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(G); and

(B) disseminate to health care profession schools the best practices identified by the school under paragraph (1)(G)(i) and evaluation results.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “eligible site” means a health center that is receiving assistance under section 330, 399Z–1, or 1001 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b, 300).

(2) The term “eligible school” means an accredited school of medicine or nursing with experience in the study or treatment of victims of a severe form of trafficking.

(3) The term “health care professional” means a person employed by a health care

provider who provides to patients information (including information not related to medical treatment), scheduling, services, or referrals.

(4) The term “HIPAA privacy and security law” has the meaning given to such term in section 3009 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300j–19).

(5) The term “victim of a severe form of trafficking” has the meaning given to such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(c) NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, and this section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

**SA 279.** Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. —. TRANSPORTATION FOR ILLEGAL SEXUAL ACTIVITY AND RELATED CRIMES.**

Chapter 117 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking section 2421 and inserting the following:

**“§ 2421. Transportation generally**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Whoever knowingly transports any individual in interstate or foreign commerce, or in any Territory or Possession of the United States, with intent that such individual engage in prostitution, or in any sexual activity for which any person can be charged with a criminal offense, or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

“(b) REQUESTS TO PROSECUTE VIOLATIONS BY STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall grant a request by a State attorney general that a State or local attorney be cross designated to prosecute a violation of this section unless the Attorney General determines that granting the request would undermine the administration of justice.

“(2) REASON FOR DENIAL.—If the Attorney General denies a request under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall submit to the State attorney general a detailed reason for the denial not later than 60 days after the date on which a request is received.”.

**SA 280.** Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IV—PREVENTING DEMAND FOR CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING**

**SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “International Megan’s Law to Prevent Demand for Child Sex Trafficking”.

**SEC. 402. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) Megan Nicole Kanka, who was 7 years old, was abducted, sexually assaulted, and murdered in 1994, in the State of New Jersey by a violent predator living across the street from her home. Unbeknownst to Megan Kanka and her family, her attacker had been

convicted previously of a sex offense against a child.

(2) In 1996, Congress adopted Megan's Law (Public Law 104-145) as a means to encourage States to protect children by identifying the whereabouts of sex offenders and providing the means to monitor their activities.

(3) In 2006, Congress passed the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-248) to protect children and the public at large by establishing a comprehensive national system for the registration and notification to the public and law enforcement officers of convicted sex offenders.

(4) Law enforcement reports indicate that known child-sex offenders are traveling internationally, and that the criminal background of such individuals may not be known to local law enforcement prior to their arrival.

(5) The commercial sexual exploitation of minors in child sex trafficking and pornography is a global phenomenon. The International Labour Organization has estimated that 1,800,000 children worldwide are victims of child sex trafficking and pornography each year.

(6) Child sex tourism, where an individual travels to a foreign country and engages in sexual activity with a child in that country, is a form of child exploitation and, where commercial, child sex trafficking.

(7) According to research conducted by The Protection Project of The Johns Hopkins University Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, sex tourists from the United States who target children form a significant percentage of child sex tourists in some of the most significant destination countries for child sex tourism.

(8) In order to protect children, it is essential that United States law enforcement be able to identify child-sex offenders in the United States who are traveling abroad and child-sex offenders from other countries entering the United States. Such identification requires cooperative efforts between the United States and foreign governments. In exchange for providing notice of child-sex offenders traveling to the United States, foreign authorities will expect United States authorities to provide reciprocal notice of child-sex offenders traveling to their countries.

#### SEC. 403. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **CENTER.**—The term “Center” means the Angel Watch Center established pursuant to section 404(a).

(2) **CHILD-SEX OFFENDER.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “child-sex offender” means an individual who is a sex offender described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16911) by reason of being convicted of a child-sex offense.

(B) **DEFINITION OF CONVICTED.**—In this paragraph, the term “convicted” has the meaning given the term in paragraph (8) of section 111 of such Act.

(3) **CHILD-SEX OFFENSE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “child-sex offense” means a specified offense against a minor, as defined in paragraph (7) of section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16911), including—

(i) an offense (unless committed by a parent or guardian) involving kidnapping;

(ii) an offense (unless committed by a parent or guardian) involving false imprisonment;

(iii) solicitation to engage in sexual conduct;

(iv) use in a sexual performance;

(v) solicitation to practice prostitution;

(vi) video voyeurism as described in section 1801 of title 18, United States Code;

(vii) possession, production, or distribution of child pornography;

(viii) criminal sexual conduct involving a minor, or the use of the Internet to facilitate or attempt such conduct; and

(ix) any conduct that by its nature is a sex offense against a minor.

(B) **OTHER OFFENSES.**—The term “child-sex offense” includes a sex offense described in paragraph (5)(A) of section 111 of such Act that is a specified offense against a minor, as defined in paragraph (7) of such section.

(C) **FOREIGN CONVICTIONS; OFFENSES INVOLVING CONSENSUAL SEXUAL CONDUCT.**—The limitations contained in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 111(5) of such Act shall apply with respect to a child-sex offense for purposes of this title to the same extent and in the same manner as such limitations apply with respect to a sex offense for purposes of such Act.

(4) **JURISDICTION.**—The term “jurisdiction” means any of the following:

(A) A State.

(B) The District of Columbia.

(C) The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(D) Guam.

(E) American Samoa.

(F) The Northern Mariana Islands.

(G) The United States Virgin Islands.

(H) To the extent provided in, and subject to the requirements of, section 127 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16927), a federally recognized Indian tribe.

(5) **MINOR.**—The term “minor” means an individual who has not attained 18 years of age.

#### SEC. 404. ANGEL WATCH CENTER.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall establish, within the Child Exploitation Investigations Unit of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (referred to in this section as “ICE”), a Center, to be known as the “Angel Watch Center”, to carry out the activities specified in subsection (d).

(b) **LEADERSHIP.**—The Center shall be headed by the Director of ICE, in collaboration with the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this section as “CBP”) and in consultation with the Attorney General.

(c) **MEMBERS.**—The Center shall consist of—

(1) the Director of ICE;

(2) the Commissioner of CBP;

(3) individuals who are designated as analysts in ICE or CBP; and

(4) individuals who are designated as program managers in ICE or CBP.

(d) **ACTIVITIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center shall—

(A) receive information on travel by child-sex offenders;

(B) establish a system to maintain and archive all relevant information, including the response of destination countries to notifications under subsection (e), to the extent available, and decisions not to transmit notification abroad; and

(C) establish an annual review process to ensure that the Center is consistent in procedures to provide notification to destination countries or not to provide notification to destination countries, as appropriate.

(2) **INFORMATION REQUIRED.**—The United States Marshals Service's National Sex Of-

fender Targeting Office shall make available to the Center information on travel by child-sex offenders in a timely manner for purposes of carrying out the activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (e).

(e) **NOTIFICATION.**—

(1) **TO COUNTRIES OF DESTINATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center may transmit notice of impending or current international travel of a child-sex offender to the country or countries of destination of the child-sex offender, including to the visa-issuing agent or agents in the United States of the country or countries.

(B) **FORM.**—The notice under this paragraph may be transmitted through such means as determined appropriate by the Center, including through an ICE attaché.

(2) **TO OFFENDERS.**—

(A) **GENERAL NOTIFICATION.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Center transmits notice under paragraph (1) of impending international travel of a child-sex offender to the country or countries of destination of the child-sex offender, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with any appropriate agency, shall make reasonable efforts to provide constructive notice through electronic or telephonic communication to the child-sex offender prior to the child-sex offender's arrival in the country or countries.

(ii) **EXCEPTION.**—The requirement to provide constructive notice under clause (i) shall not apply in the case of impending international travel of a child-sex offender to the country or countries of destination of the child-sex offender if such constructive notice would conflict with an existing investigation involving the child-sex offender.

(B) **SPECIFIC NOTIFICATION REGARDING RISK TO LIFE OR WELL-BEING OF OFFENDER.**—If the Center has reason to believe that to transmit notice under paragraph (1) poses a risk to the life or well-being of the child-sex offender, the Center shall make reasonable efforts to provide constructive notice through electronic or telephonic communication to the child-sex offender of such risk.

(C) **SPECIFIC NOTIFICATION REGARDING PROBABLE DENIAL OF ENTRY TO OFFENDER.**—If the Center has reason to believe that a country of destination of the child-sex offender is highly likely to deny entry to the child-sex offender due to transmission of notice under paragraph (1), the Center shall make reasonable efforts to provide constructive notice through electronic or telephonic communication to the child-sex offender of such probable denial.

(3) **SUNSET.**—The authority of paragraph (1) shall terminate with respect to a child-sex offender beginning as of the close of the last day of the registration period of such child-sex offender under section 115 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16915).

(f) **COMPLAINT REVIEW.**—The Center shall establish a mechanism to receive complaints from child-sex offenders affected by notifications of destination countries of such child-sex offenders under subsection (e).

(g) **CONSULTATIONS.**—The Center shall seek to engage in ongoing consultations with—

(1) nongovernmental organizations, including faith-based organizations, that have experience and expertise in identifying and preventing child sex tourism and rescuing and rehabilitating minor victims of international sexual exploitation and trafficking;

(2) the governments of countries interested in cooperating in the creation of an international sex offender travel notification system or that are primary destination or

source countries for international sex tourism; and

(3) Internet service and software providers regarding available and potential technology to facilitate the implementation of an international sex offender travel notification system, both in the United States and in other countries.

(h) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State may provide technical assistance to foreign authorities in order to enable such authorities to participate more effectively in the notification program system established under this section.

#### SEC. 405. SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS.

(a) BILATERAL AGREEMENTS.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should negotiate memoranda of understanding or other bilateral agreements with foreign governments to further the purposes of this title and the amendments made by this title, including—

(1) by establishing systems to receive and transmit notices required under title I of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.); and

(2) by establishing mechanisms for private companies and nongovernmental organizations to report on a voluntary basis suspected child pornography or exploitation to foreign governments, the nearest United States embassy in cases in which a possible United States citizen may be involved, or other appropriate entities.

(b) NOTIFICATION TO THE UNITED STATES OF CHILD-SEX OFFENSES COMMITTED ABROAD.—It is the sense of Congress that the President should formally request foreign governments to notify the United States when a United States citizen has been arrested, convicted, sentenced, or completed a prison sentence for a child-sex offense in the foreign country.

#### SEC. 406. ENHANCING THE MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 108(b)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7106(b)(4)) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: “, including severe forms of trafficking in persons related to sex tourism”.

#### SEC. 407. ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO MEET MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF TRAFFICKING.

The President is strongly encouraged to exercise the authorities of section 134 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2152d) to provide assistance to foreign countries directly, or through nongovernmental and multilateral organizations, for programs, projects, and activities, including training of law enforcement entities and officials, designed to establish systems to identify sex offenders and provide and receive notification of child sex offender international travel.

#### SEC. 408. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.—Nothing in this title may be construed to preclude or alter the jurisdiction or authority of the Department of Justice under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16901 et seq.), including section 113(d) of such Act, or any other provision of law, or to affect the work of the United States Marshals Service with INTERPOL.

(b) ANGEL WATCH CENTER.—Nothing in this title may be construed to preclude the Angel Watch Center from transmitting notice with respect to any sex offender described in paragraph (3) or (4) of section 111 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16911) or with respect to any

sex offense described in paragraph (5) of such section.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY INVESTIGATIONS.—Activities carried out under this title shall not impede, hinder, or otherwise impact negatively any investigations of the Department of Homeland Security.

**SA 281.** Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

#### Subtitle D—Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking

##### SECTION 231. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the “Strengthening Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act of 2015”.

##### SEC. 232. CAPTA AMENDMENTS.

Section 106 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of clause (xxii); and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(xxiv) provisions and procedures to identify and assess reports involving children who are sex trafficking victims or labor trafficking victims;

“(xxv) provisions and procedures for training representatives of the State child protective services systems about identifying and assessing children who are sex trafficking victims or labor trafficking victims; and

“(xxvi) provisions and procedures for identifying services (including the services provided by State law enforcement officials, the State juvenile justice system, and social service agencies, such as runaway and homeless youth shelters) and procedures for appropriate referral to address the needs of children who are sex trafficking victims or labor trafficking victims;”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(D)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of clause (v);

(ii) by inserting “and” at the end of clause (vi); and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(vii) the provisions and procedures described in clauses (xxiv) and (xxvi) of subparagraph (B);”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A);

(ii) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the term ‘sex trafficking victim’ means a victim of—

“(i) sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10))); or

“(ii) a severe form of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(A) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(A)); and

“(D) the term ‘labor trafficking victim’ means a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons described in section 103(9)(B) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)(B)).”;

(2) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(17) The number of children identified under clause (xxiv) of subsection (b)(2)(B), and of such children, the number identified as sex trafficking victims (as defined in sub-

section (b)(4)(C)) and the number identified as labor trafficking victims (as defined in subsection (b)(4)(D)).”.

#### SEC. 233. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, a report that—

(1) describes the specific type and prevalence of any severe form of trafficking in persons to which children who are identified for services or intervention under the placement, care, or supervision of State, Indian tribe, or tribal organization child welfare agencies have been subjected as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) summarizes the practices and protocols utilized by States to identify and serve—

(A) under section 106(b)(2)(B) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)), children who are victims of trafficking; and

(B) children who are at risk of becoming victims of trafficking; and

(3) specifies any barriers in Federal laws or regulations that may prevent identification and assessment of children who are victims of trafficking, including an evaluation of the extent to which States are able to address the needs of such trafficked children without altering the definition of child abuse and neglect under section 3 of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 note).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) SEVERE FORM OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term “severe form of trafficking in persons” has the meaning given the term in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9)).

(2) VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING.—The term “victim of trafficking” has the meaning given the term in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)).

**SA 282.** Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.

(a) INTER-AGENCY TASK FORCE.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), in cooperation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, shall convene a Pain Management Best Practices Inter-Agency Task Force (referred to in this section as the “task force”).

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The task force shall be comprised of—

(1) representatives of—

(A) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(B) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(C) the Department of Defense;

(D) the Drug Enforcement Administration;

(E) the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

(F) the Office of National Drug Control Policy;

(G) the Institute of Medicine;  
(H) pain management professional organizations;

(I) the mental health treatment community;

(J) the addiction treatment community; and

(K) pain advocacy groups;  
(2) the Director of the National Institutes of Health;

(3) physicians, dentists, and non-physician prescribers;

(4) pharmacists;

(5) experts in the fields of pain research and addiction research; and

(6) other stakeholders, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) DUTIES.—The task force shall—

(1) not later than 180 days after the date on which the task force is convened, develop best practices for pain management and prescription pain medication prescribing practices, taking into consideration—

(A) existing pain management research;

(B) recommendations from relevant conferences; and

(C) ongoing efforts at the State and local levels and by medical professional organizations to develop improved pain management strategies;

(2) solicit and take into consideration public comment on the practices developed under paragraph (1), amending such best practices if appropriate; and

(3) develop a strategy for disseminating information about the best practices developed under paragraphs (1) and (2) to prescribers, pharmacists, State medical boards, and other parties, as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(d) LIMITATION.—The task force shall not have rulemaking authority.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date on which the task force is convened, the task force shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) the strategy for disseminating best practices developed under subsection (c);

(2) the results of a feasibility study on linking best practices developed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c) to receiving and renewing registrations under section 303(f) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823(f)); and

(3) recommendations on how to apply such best practices to improve prescribing practices at medical facilities, including medical facilities of the Veterans Health Administration.

**SA 283.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

#### **TITLE IV—ANTI-TRAFFICKING TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY PERSONNEL**

##### **SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title:

(1) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—The term “human trafficking” means an act or practice described in paragraph (9) or (10) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

##### **SEC. 402. TRAINING FOR DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL TO IDENTIFY HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall implement a program to—

(1) train and periodically retrain relevant Transportation Security Administration, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and other Department personnel that the Secretary considers appropriate, with respect to how to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking, and, where appropriate, interdict a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking, during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities; and

(2) ensure that the personnel referred to in paragraph (1) regularly receive current information on matters related to the detection of human trafficking, including information that becomes available outside of the Department’s initial or periodic retraining schedule, to the extent relevant to their official duties and consistent with applicable information and privacy laws.

(b) TRAINING DESCRIBED.—The training referred to in subsection (a) may be conducted through in-class or virtual learning capabilities, and shall include—

(1) methods for identifying suspected victims of human trafficking and, where appropriate, perpetrators of human trafficking;

(2) for appropriate personnel, methods to approach a suspected victim of human trafficking, where appropriate, in a manner that is sensitive to the suspected victim and is not likely to alert a suspected perpetrator of human trafficking;

(3) training that is most appropriate for a particular location or environment in which the personnel receiving such training perform their official duties;

(4) other topics determined by the Secretary to be appropriate; and

(5) a post-training evaluation for personnel receiving the training.

(c) TRAINING CURRICULUM REVIEW.—The Secretary shall annually reassess the training program established under subsection (a) to ensure it is consistent with current techniques, patterns, and trends associated with human trafficking.

##### **SEC. 403. CERTIFICATION AND REPORT TO CONGRESS.**

(a) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall certify to Congress that all personnel referred to in section 402(a) have successfully completed the training required under that section.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall report to Congress with respect to the overall effectiveness of the program required by this title, the number of cases reported by Department personnel in which human trafficking was suspected, and, of those cases, the number of cases that were confirmed cases of human trafficking.

##### **SEC. 404. ASSISTANCE TO NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.**

The Secretary may provide training curricula to any State, local, or tribal government or private organization to assist the government or organization in establishing a program of training to identify human trafficking, upon request from the government or organization.

**SA 284.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice

for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

##### **SEC. —. CITIZENSHIP AT BIRTH FOR CERTAIN PERSONS BORN IN THE UNITED STATES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “The following”;

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) through (h) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively, and indenting such paragraphs, as redesignated, an additional 2 ems to the right; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) DEFINITION.—Acknowledging the right of birthright citizenship established by section 1 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a person born in the United States shall be considered ‘subject to the jurisdiction’ of the United States for purposes of subsection (a)(1) only if the person is born in the United States and at least 1 of the person’s parents is—

“(1) a citizen or national of the United States;

“(2) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States whose residence is in the United States; or

“(3) an alien performing active service in the armed forces (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code).”

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a)(3) may not be construed to affect the citizenship or nationality status of any person born before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section or any amendment made by this section, or any application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

#### **AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

##### **COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Tax Complexity, Compliance, and Administration: The Merits of Simplification in Tax Reform.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### **COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the



Senate on March 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "U.S. Policy in Ukraine: Countering Russia and Driving Reform."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Continuing America's Leadership in Medical Innovation for Patients."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY, AND CONSUMER RIGHTS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "How Much For A Song?: The Antitrust Decrees that Govern the Market for Music."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND INVESTMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 10, 2015, at 10

a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Venture Exchange and Small Cap Companies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members of the Judiciary Committee be granted floor privileges throughout the consideration of S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act: Tristan Dunford, Matt Piant, Arielle Giordano, Christopher Boden, and Mary Fletcher.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted to Steve Curtis, military fellow, with Senator BURR's office during the consideration of S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, a clarification of the initial appointment rather than reappointment, made on March 9, 2015, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Deborah Skaggs Speth of Kentucky.

#### EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE COURAGEOUS WORK AND LIFE OF BORIS NEMTSOV

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 93.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 93) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the courageous work and life of Russian opposition leader Boris Nemtsov, and calling for a swift and transparent investigation into his tragic murder in Moscow on February 27, 2015.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 2, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 11; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the time be equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half; finally, that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my hope the logjam on this bill, which seems to have developed today, will be broken tomorrow and that we can begin to consider amendments under a fair and open process, which is what we would like to do on this measure that came out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously.

Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator CORNYN have been here all day trying to work through amendments, and there are a number on our side in the queue and ready to go.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:03 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

##### To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT J. BECKLUND

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

##### To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL J. FEELEY

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 3036:

*To be major general*

COL. PAUL K. HURLEY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. DAVID S. BALDWIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD, AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 10506 AND 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. TIMOTHY J. KADAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN J. TOWNSEND

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. TAMMY L. MIRACLE

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RE-

SERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. MARIA C. POWERS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5149:

*To be rear admiral*

CAPT. JOHN G. HANNINK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) RON J. MACLAREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN D. ALEXANDER  
REAR ADM. (LH) RONALD A. BOXALL  
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT P. BURKE  
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW J. CARTER  
REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTOPHER W. GRADY  
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL E. JABALEY, JR.  
REAR ADM. (LH) COLIN J. KILRAIN  
REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW L. LEWIS  
REAR ADM. (LH) DEWOLFE H. MILLER  
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN P. NEAGLEY  
REAR ADM. (LH) PATRICK A. PIERCEY

REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES A. RICHARD  
REAR ADM. (LH) HUGH D. WETHERALD  
REAR ADM. (LH) RICKY L. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN K. ANTONIO  
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK R. WHITNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL A. SOHL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) NANCY A. NORTON  
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT D. SHARP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) TERRY J. MOULTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be rear admiral*

REAR ADM. (LH) BRET J. MUILENBURG

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE POOLESVILLE  
SWIM AND DIVE TEAMS

## HON. JOHN K. DELANEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 2015*

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Poolesville High School's Girls and Boys Swim and Dive Teams, which last month became 2015 Class 3A/2A/1A State Champions in Maryland. This year's win is the fourth consecutive state championship for the Poolesville Boys Team and the second championship in three years for the Poolesville Girls Team.

Both team members and Poolesville Coach Jon Leong deserve recognition for their outstanding performance, their ability to work as a team, and their athletic talent. This year's championship will make the Poolesville Boys Swim and Dive Team the first high school team in Maryland to win more than three state swimming titles. Throughout their work, members of the Boys and Girls Swim and Dive Teams have acted as role models for their peers, and they should be proud of their accomplishments.

I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues help me in honoring the significant occasion of this year's Swim and Dive State Championship victories for Poolesville High School. The boys and girls teams are model organizations and are an inspiration in our community.

IN HONOR OF DR. SIMON W.  
CHANG

## HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 2015*

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable public service career of Dr. Simon W. Chang, who is retiring as the Superintendent of the Naval Research Laboratory (NRL) Marine Meteorology Division in Monterey, CA following a 32-year career with the Federal Government. During that time, Dr. Chang built an unparalleled reputation for scientific excellence and insightful leadership through overseeing the development of state of the art weather prediction systems to support U.S. military operations. Dr. Chang's insightful leadership was recognized in 2007 with the Presidential Rank Award of Meritorious Executive, and in 2009 with his election as a Fellow of the American Meteorology Society.

A native of Nanjing, China, Dr. Chang earned his Bachelor of Science Degree in Meteorology from the National Taiwan University. After immigrating to the United States he

earned his Master of Science Degree in Atmospheric Sciences from the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology and his Ph.D. in Meteorology from Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Chang joined NRL in 1983, and has led the Monterey Meteorology Division since 2003. His work has advanced the science of meteorology and, in particular, the study of tropical cyclones, air-sea interactions, numerical weather prediction, satellite data assimilation, and mesoscale meteorology. He authored the definitive mesoscale meteorological analysis for the 1991 Gulf War Illness study that determined the extent to which our deployed military forces could have been exposed to dangerous contaminants in the aftermath of Operation Desert Storm.

As the NRL Monterey Division Superintendent, Dr. Chang was in charge of developing several key Navy global and regional scale weather models, tropical cyclone prediction models, highly accurate data assimilation systems to bring millions of observations per day into those models, and user-friendly tactical-scale tools to translate raw weather data into actionable military information. He established close collaborations with other regional scientific organizations; such as the Fleet Numerical Meteorology and Oceanography Center, the Naval Postgraduate School, the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, and the Central and Northern California Ocean Observing System, to put the Monterey Bay Area at the forefront of atmospheric and oceanographic research. For my part, I had the great pleasure of working with Dr. Chang to secure funding for a new state of the art lab building for the Monterey Division.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in sharing our gratitude to Dr. Chang for a job well done and extend our best wishes to Simon and his family in this next chapter of life. I know that even in retirement, he will still find himself involved in the community and helping people in need and will continue to stand as an example for others.

RECOGNIZING BASKETBALL  
LEGEND SAM JONES

## HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 2015*

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today it is with great pleasure that I rise to commemorate the contributions of Sam Jones. Mr. Jones was a star Guard in college and went on to play professionally for the Boston Celtics. On March 5, 2015, Mr. Jones' alma mater of North Carolina Central University will retire his jersey inside McDougald-McLendon Gymnasium.

Sam Jones was born June 24, 1933 in Wilmington, North Carolina and attended

Laurinburg Institute located in Scotland County, North Carolina. After, Mr. Jones went to Durham where he attended what was then known as North Carolina College and quickly became a breakout star on the basketball court. Mr. Jones played at North Carolina College from 1951 until 1954 and again from 1956 until 1957. While there, he amassed 1,745 career points under head coaches John McLendon and Floyd Brown. Nearly 60 years after leaving North Carolina College, Mr. Jones is still the school's second-leading scorer.

In 1957, Mr. Jones entered the NBA draft and was selected by the Boston Celtics in the first round as the eighth overall pick. During his remarkable 12 year career with the Celtics, Mr. Jones scored 15,411 points and averaged 17.7 points per game and also had 4,305 career rebounds and 2,209 career assists. Impressively, Mr. Jones led the Boston Celtics to 10 NBA championship wins—the second most of any NBA player—behind his then teammate—Bill Russell. He also played in five All Star games and is widely regarded as one of the greatest NBA players of all time.

Mr. Jones was inducted into the North Carolina Sports Hall of Fame in 1969 and both the North Carolina Central University Hall of Fame and the prestigious Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame in 1984. In 1970, Mr. Jones was selected as part of the NBA 25th Anniversary All-Time Team and was later honored by being named among the top 50 players in the history of the NBA as a member of the 50th Anniversary All-Time Team in 1996.

Throughout his career, Sam Jones never lost sight of what was most important—his family. He is married to Gladys Jones and together they have five adult children—Aubrey, Phyllis, Michael, Terri, and Ashley and many grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, Sam Jones has served as inspiration to generations of young men and women both here and around the world who are drawn to the game of basketball. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Sam Jones on the high honor bestowed upon him by our shared alma mater of North Carolina Central University.

ABINGTON HIGH SCHOOL DIVISION  
V 2014 SUPERBOWL CHAMPIONS;  
ETIENNE BOURGOIN 2014 DIVI-  
SION 3 2014 MASSACHUSETTS  
STATE GOLFING CHAMPION

## HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 2015*

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and congratulate the administration, coaches, and players of the Abington, MA high school football team. On December 6,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

2014, the Green Wave won the Massachusetts Interscholastic Athletic Association Division V Superbowl, defeating the Northbridge High School Rams, 36–6, earning them the title, State Champions.

Abington High School has a long tradition of excellence in high school football. The Green Wave has earned the state-best overall three year record of 35–3 from 2012–2014. Since the year 2000, they have won nine South Shore League Championships (2001, 02, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 12, 13), three Superbowl Championships (2002, 2005, 2012), one South Sectional Championship (2013), and one State Championship (2014).

Mr. Speaker, the young men on this football team conducted themselves in such a way as to bring honor, pride, and recognition to the Town of Abington. They represent what is truly best about high school student-athletes.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to join with the families, friends, and residents of Abington, MA, to congratulate the high school football team on their remarkable achievement.

Administration: Superintendent Peter Schafer, Principal Teresa Sullivan, Athletic Director Peter Serino, Head Coach Jim Kelliher, Assistant Coaches Ed Reilly, Jim Daly, Scott Pifer, Mike Bruning, Brian McSharry, Tim Wells. Freshmen Coaches: Jay Brown, Tim O'Brien, Keith Faxon, Kalonji Kabongo, Mbela Kabongo. Water Boys: Eddie Reilly, Michael Reilly, Jack Reilly, Chris Lussier, Drew Donovan.

Players: Owen Leary, Bryan Dwyer, Javin Vincelle, Aidan Cawley, Evan Fanara, Nate Riordan, James Landers, Jake Tosone, Josh Riordan, John Kearns, Dave Lyons, Brendan Glavin, Christian Bermudez, Owen Kearney, Ryan Landers, Shawn Donovan, Donnell Leon, Josh McCabe, Will Curtin, Josh Martin, Ray Emery, Dexter Chevallier, Sam Malafronte, Cole McMahon, Ryan Paris, Cole Jansen, Luca Cerasani, Josh Rix, Shane Sullivan, Joe Hankins, Matt Dalton, Danny Malone, George Cellini, Brian O'Donovan, Alex Freeman, Colbey MacLeod, Jared Aprile, Rob Toomey, Chris Chevalier, Dennis Cummins.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note the accomplishments of Abington High School senior, golfer Etienne Bourgoin. He fired a 74 under difficult conditions to win the Division Three State Golfing Championship in October 2014. He was also honored by the Boston Globe as the Division Three Golfer of the Year

for 2014. In addition, he was the co-medalist at the sectional tournament and at the South Shore League Championship. He was the number one golfer for four straight years at Abington High School. Etienne is the first individual state champion in Abington High School history.

Please join me in congratulating Etienne Bourgoin on his historic victory.

#### RECOGNIZING THE NEWTOWN FIRE ASSOCIATION

#### HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 2015*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Newtown Fire Association celebrates 125 years of continuous service to the Newtown community this year and I congratulate the volunteers for the dedication and commitment that transcends the generations. The association was formed in the aftermath of a local mill fire in October 1889 when a group of citizen-responders saw the need for local fire protection and met the following month to create the all-volunteer Newtown Fire Association. This company continuously provided high level protective services to the community and continues the tradition today with a 21st century staff of certified firefighters and state-of-the-art fire and rescue equipment. This special anniversary acknowledges a century of selfless volunteer, first-responders who are honored for their courage and service. Congratulations to the Newtown Fire Association on this milestone with the gratitude of the community for demonstrating the dedication of your founders and an ongoing commitment to the protection of your neighbors, their lives, their homes and their properties.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF ROSE TOREN

#### HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 10, 2015*

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Rose Toren—moth-

er, wife, grandmother, successful business woman, author, and Holocaust survivor—who passed away on February 2, 2015, at the age of 91.

Rose's favorite saying, "Never give up," which she passed along to her family, dictated the way she lived her life. Born into a traditional Jewish family in Poland as Rosalia Orenstein, she was the sole member of her family to survive the Holocaust.

On an otherwise ordinary evening in 1939, Nazi soldiers pounded on her door and ordered the family of seven to gather in a field. Her younger sister, Eda, decided to escape and was never seen again. At her father's urging, Rose also ran, never to see her family again.

With the help of classmate Urszula Grande, Rose obtained forged paperwork and assumed the identity of a displaced Christian Pole, Kazimiera Lukashuk. She clung to her new identity but was plagued by feelings of anger and isolation in denying her Jewish heritage. In a moment of despair, she admitted her true identity to someone whom she believed was a friend.

Rose quickly found herself in the walls of Auschwitz, where she was spared the gas chamber and worked knitting sweaters. She escaped Auschwitz shortly before the end of the war.

Like many Jewish survivors of the Holocaust, Rose fled Europe to Israel, where she met her husband, Jack Toren. The young couple later moved to New York, where their daughter Lili was born. When Lili was 9, the Toren family moved to Beverly Hills to provide the best life possible for their daughter.

Rose was quick to laugh and lived a life of defiance, thriving and bringing joy to countless others, against all odds. She is survived by her daughter, Mayor Lili Bosse, her son-in-law, John Bosse, and her grandchildren, whom I hope take comfort in the way Rose lived her life as a resilient and astounding woman. May her memory be a blessing to us all.

**SENATE—Wednesday, March 11, 2015**

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of life and love and laughter, You are the alpha and omega, the beginning and the end. Thank You for the gift of this day, for life and health, for forgiveness and freedom, for family and friends. Lord, we are grateful for the hope we have in You and for the joy we find in Your presence. You have given us this great gift of prayer, enabling us to reach out to You whenever we desire.

Today, use our Senators to make our Nation stronger and our world better. Open their ears to the cries of despair and give them wisdom to solve difficult problems. Sanctify their thoughts, words, and deeds so that they will live worthy of Your great love.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

**HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, every year in America countless innocent victims, including children, are bought and sold into modern-day slavery. This heinous crime of human trafficking is shameful and disgraceful, and the Senate can do something about it by passing the bipartisan human rights legislation before us today.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, introduced by Senator CORNYN and his Democratic colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR, would give voices to the voiceless and justice to the children suffering in the shadows. Their bipartisan human rights bill may not be that long, but it sure is effective, and it is transparent. This bill has been available for any Senator and any

member of the public to read since January. This bipartisan legislation was considered and strengthened in an open and transparent committee process. This human rights bill conforms with longstanding bipartisan law that so many of our Democratic friends have supported repeatedly. It is no wonder that once Senators have read the bill, they can't seem to help but support it.

We welcome the 13 Democratic cosponsors of this human rights bill. We welcome the messages of support our Democratic friends have delivered as well.

Here is what one Democratic Senator from New York had to say just a few days ago. "We should pass Senator Cornyn's Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act," she said. She explained that this bipartisan bill would "support programs for survivors of human trafficking and child pornography and ensure that the Johns who are buying trafficking victims are actually prosecuted in Federal court." She is right. All of those measures are contained in the text of this bipartisan bill.

We also heard the Democratic Senator from North Dakota who called on me to bring "S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, to the floor for a vote." I was happy to do it. I am appreciative of her support.

I am appreciative of the support from so many from across the aisle who have read and support this bill. The children who suffer from such terrible oppression and injustice must appreciate their support too. They must appreciate our Democratic friends closely examining this bipartisan human rights bill of modest length and then voting unanimously to support it in the Judiciary Committee.

On Monday they must have appreciated seeing our Democratic friends join with us to unanimously advance the same bipartisan human rights bill. Here is what the Democratic leader had to say that day—right after I called for strong bipartisan backing for our human rights legislation. "On human trafficking, I underscore, appreciate, and agree with the statement of the Republican leader. I feel very confident we will clear on our side moving to that. I think it would be a waste of the Senate's time to have a vote on a motion to proceed and a waste of time afterward. . . . I doubt there will be problems on my side," the Democratic leader said. "If there are, I will work to clear them." I was very appreciative of my good friend making that statement after examining this bipartisan legislation.

This bipartisan human rights bill may not be that long, but it is critical

to helping lift innocent victims out of the shadows.

A broad coalition—everyone from the NAACP to the National Domestic Violence Hotline—has called it "vital."

They wrote:

The [Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act] provides unprecedented support to domestic victims of trafficking who are too often invisible and underserved.

They continued:

As leaders in the anti-trafficking, anti-violence, child welfare, civil rights, runaway and homeless youth, and human rights movements, we urge Congress to pass this critical piece of legislation.

So I would urge Members on both sides of the aisle to help pass this transparent and bipartisan human rights legislation overwhelmingly.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

**HEALTH CARE SUBSIDIES**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, around the country we see a number of stories appearing. I will take one of the stories from the New York Times and read just a little bit of it. It is a long article, but everyone gets the drift of it. There are a few paragraphs I am going to read.

The Obama administration said Tuesday that 11.7 million Americans now have private health insurance through federal and state marketplaces, with 86 percent of them receiving financial assistance from the federal government to help pay premiums.

About three-fourths of people with marketplace coverage—8.8 million consumers—live in the 37 states served by HealthCare.gov, the website for the federal insurance exchange. The other 2.9 million people are in states that created and operate their own exchanges.

Sylvia Mathews Burwell, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, underlined the importance of subsidies for people in states using the federal exchange—subsidies that could be withdrawn if the Supreme Court rules against the Obama administration in a pending case.

Administration officials suggested that more than 7 million people could lose subsidies, making insurance unaffordable, if the court ruled that such assistance was unavailable in the federal exchange. The plaintiffs contend that the Affordable Care Act does not allow subsidies in the federal exchange.

In Florida, nearly 1.6 million people have selected or been automatically re-enrolled in health plans—the largest enrollment of any state in the federal exchange—and 1.5 million of them qualified for subsidies in the form of tax credits, which averaged \$294 a month.

In Texas, 1.2 million people selected or were re-enrolled in health plans, and one

million of them qualified for financial assistance averaging \$239 a month.

In North Carolina, 560,400 people selected health plans in the federal marketplace, and 515,500 of them qualified for subsidies averaging \$315 a month.

A lot rides on what the Supreme Court does, affecting millions and millions of people. If the Supreme Court can't see the absolute clear language of that bill, millions of people will lose their health insurance, and that would be a tragedy. It would be so very bad if suddenly people find themselves with no health insurance after they waited for so long to get it.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, an ancient Greek philosopher once said, "To be doing good deeds is man's most glorious task."

Today the Senate has an opportunity to do a good deed. We have a chance to do something to address human trafficking. It is hard to fathom that in the 21st century, slavery continues to rear its ugly head in the form of human trafficking. But in the shadows of American society, there are children, women, and men who are literally being enslaved and subjected to the most shockingly inhumane treatment imaginable. The victims of human trafficking suffer physical and sexual abuse and violence. Forced to live in squalor, they have no hope. This legislation before this body aims to change that. It seeks to not only prevent trafficking but also gives survivors hope for a new life.

This legislation creates a domestic trafficking victims fund that will help support victims of trafficking and child pornography get back on their feet by providing housing, job training, and other support services. This legislation provides funding to train law enforcement in rescuing and supporting survivors of human trafficking and effectively prosecuting traffickers. It officially designates child pornography as a form of human trafficking and ensures that victims have direct access to child advocacy centers. It protects victims and witnesses by treating suspected human traffickers as violent criminals. It keeps victims of trafficking and child pornography informed regarding any plea bargain or deferred prosecution related to their cases.

This legislation is good for our country. It will go a long way in curbing human trafficking and child pornography. That is why it is supported by 200 law enforcement and victims' rights groups nationwide.

Unfortunately, Republicans are committed to turning a bipartisan bill into an unrelated and unconscionable political fight. We can give all the speeches out here we want saying somebody

should have read the bill more closely. The question is—and we can have all kinds of debates out here as to how it got in the bill. A number of people feel it was by a little bit of sleight of hand and that it shouldn't be in there. In this legislation that is meant as an outline to stop child trafficking and human trafficking generally, there is a provision dealing with abortion. It has nothing—nothing—to do with this.

I served in the House of Representatives with a very fine man. He has had his name affixed to an anti-abortion bill—anti-abortion legislation for almost three decades, and it has been continued year after year in appropriations bills. What I am talking about, what is happening in this legislation, it would make it permanent. It is wrong.

If my friend the Republican leader is so in tune with getting this passed, take that provision out of the bill; otherwise, it will not pass. Take it out.

It is unfortunate that Republicans are committed to turning a bipartisan bill into an unrelated, unconscionable political fight. Is it worth it? Is it really worth endangering a piece of legislation that would do good for our country?

Democrats will not allow a bill to prevent human trafficking and child pornography to be hijacked by a Republican ploy. We can do a lot of good with this legislation, and I hope my Republican friends will choose to do the right thing and take this out of this legislation and pass this bill without any gimmicks.

#### LETTER SENT TO IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, talking about gimmicks, there have been a number of reports in the press in the last couple of days about how this unprecedented letter to the leaders of the Iranian regime originated. We know 47 Republican Senators signed it. There are news accounts reporting that this was intended as a big joke. A big joke? Others say Republicans say it was a political organizing exercise after being hammered so hard with their non-funding of Homeland Security. Others say it was simply designed to sabotage negotiations. Pick whatever one of the three you want. Whatever the reason, one thing is clear: This is not a joke; this is not an organizing exercise; this is about Iran getting a nuclear weapon.

I am disappointed that so many of my Republican colleagues are destroying the long tradition of bipartisanship in defending Israel and stopping Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. I am heartened that a few Republicans—seven to be exact—didn't sign the letter. That is nice. Seven out of 54 didn't sign the letter. Seven is certainly better than nothing.

As some of the seven Republican Senators have said, they agree with Democrats that this letter was not appro-

priate. We are witnessing a fundamental test of Republicans' ability to govern. They are treating nuclear negotiations as a chance to play games—political games. They are treating a human trafficking bill as a chance to play some of these games. This is not the time for games. Republicans' behavior on these issues is irresponsible and beneath the dignity of this institution. We can and should do better.

Mr. President, what is the business of the day?

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided. The Democrats will control the first half and the majority will control the final half.

The assistant minority leader.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week I had an opportunity to cross the street into the Supreme Court, and I witnessed the first oral argument I have ever seen. It was a historic moment for me and for our Nation because it was a moment for the Court to argue about the Affordable Care Act and the intention of Congress when it was creating this Affordable Care Act.

Having been here at the time it was debated and having voted for it, it was interesting to hear arguments made on the floor of the Supreme Court that suggested something we had never intended. The exchanges that were created under the Affordable Care Act are exchanges created by each State or Federal exchanges. There was never a distinction made in the debate nor any intention that the subsidy given to those who bought insurance in these exchanges would be different if the exchanges were State-created or federally created, and that is basically the argument before the Supreme Court.

One can only imagine what the final decision of the Supreme Court will be, but we know it is critically important to millions of Americans. In the past year alone, 10 million uninsured Americans finally have insurance because of the Affordable Care Act. In the private market, millions more now have access to expanded coverage for preventive health services, such as a mammogram or a flu shot, without any cost sharing. Because of the Affordable Care Act, a person no longer needs to stay in a job simply to carry health insurance or be

denied coverage because of a pre-existing condition—a situation which virtually every family faces. And because of this law, prescription drugs for seniors cost less.

Last week, when the Supreme Court heard arguments in *King v. Burwell*, the plaintiffs made an argument that those who were governed by Federal exchanges were supposed to be treated differently under this act. That was never the intention of those of us who were part of the creation and voting for this legislation.

A ruling in favor of *King* would change this provision as we intended it. It would mean 8 million Americans would no longer be able to afford health insurance.

According to the Urban Institute, premiums for people able to purchase insurance would increase by 35 percent. I can't imagine that even Senators who voted against this bill are cheering at the prospect that 8 million Americans would lose insurance and many others would face higher premiums.

Well, the Republicans have argued they have an alternative to the Affordable Care Act in the Senate. They put out a draft proposal last month. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in the House said he was going to release his own plan.

The Affordable Care Act puts families in charge of their care instead of insurance companies. It expands health care coverage and lowers health care costs, makes Medicare stronger, and lowers the deficit.

What part of that do my Republican colleagues disagree with?

Before the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, 50 million Americans lacked health insurance while health care costs for working families and small businesses were increasing by double digits. The Affordable Care Act changed all of that. Ten million people now have private health insurance, millions more are covered by Medicaid, and for the first time ever insurance companies have to live up to their promise of being there when you actually need them.

The Senate Republican proposal falls short. It would allow insurance companies once again to charge higher premiums to women, to decide that people with preexisting conditions will not get any coverage at all, and to decide that certain individuals will only get so much help for paying their bills. If Republicans have their way, insurance companies will get to decide again whether you can renew your health insurance policy as you become older. Worse yet, under the Republican proposal, 12 million people would lose their health insurance and taxes on working families would go up. That is not right.

The Supreme Court would put in jeopardy health insurance coverage for Ariana Jimenez. She lives in Chicago

and works part time as a nursing assistant at a community health center. Ariana pays \$52 a month for her health insurance premium. When asked what would happen to her coverage if the Supreme Court took away the tax credit, she simply said: "I wouldn't be able to afford it."

In Illinois over 800,000 people now have health insurance. Over 290,000 people purchased their plan through the Illinois marketplace, which is a Federal marketplace. An additional 530,000 people have enrolled in Medicaid, and 125,000 young adults in Illinois can still stay on their parents' health insurance plan.

Since September 2010, children under the age of 18 enrolled in the employer-based or marketplace plan have been eligible to receive vaccinations for diseases such as measles without any cost sharing.

A few years ago Domingo Carino found out he had a health condition that required medication he couldn't afford. Thanks to the Affordable Care Act and to some help from staff at the Asian Human Services Family Health Center in Chicago, Domingo found good health insurance that only costs him \$11 a month. Domingo's plan not only allows him to afford the medication he desperately needs, but he is also able to keep his current primary care physician. According to Domingo, he can now live without worrying about how to afford his medication.

For Domingo and millions like him the tax credits provided by the Affordable Care Act are a lifesaver. If those who oppose the Affordable Care Act prevail in the Supreme Court, that tax subsidy, or tax credit, will not be available to Domingo.

Over 54 million people also benefit from Medicaid. Before the Affordable Care Act, two out of three people on Medicaid were pregnant women and children. That is 36 million vulnerable Americans. Medicaid also provides for people with disabilities.

Before the Affordable Care Act, almost 3 million people were covered by Medicaid in Illinois. More than half a million births were covered by Medicaid in Illinois, too. Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, another 290,000 people in Illinois are covered by Medicaid. That means these people finally get better from a condition they could not afford to treat. That is a success story.

The new Republican plan uses something else out of an old playbook. Republicans want to cap Medicaid spending for each beneficiary. This budget gimmick would hurt the most vulnerable people in America—low-income seniors, people with disabilities, children, and pregnant mothers. States would be forced to make harsh choices on what they would cover and what they would not cover.

Is that what America wants?

According to a recent Gallup poll, the uninsured rate dropped 3.5 points from 2013 to 2014. In Illinois the uninsured rate dropped 4.5 percent in the same period of time.

The Affordable Care Act includes changes meant to help slow the growth in health care costs, and they are working. We need to stick with the Affordable Care Act.

#### HEALTH CARE RESEARCH FUNDING

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, another critical part of this conversation is health care research.

One of the most outstanding men serving the Federal Government in America is named Francis Collins. He is an amazing man who heads up the National Institutes of Health. He is a great physician and a great researcher.

When the United States wanted someone to head up the Human Genome Project, they picked Francis Collins. He managed to bring that project to success by providing more information than anyone ever dreamed of, and now we are better in treating problems and diseases across America.

I went to see him last year at the National Institutes of Health. We talked about medical research in America, and what he had to say was terrifying. There has been a 23-percent decline in medical research in the United States over the last 10 years. We have not even kept up with inflation in providing money for medical research, and that is not lost on people in the research field.

We are now finding that our medical researchers are older and older. Younger researchers have given up. They don't think they are getting approvals for their research applications. As they leave the field, the new generation of researchers has diminished and our ability to find cures has also diminished.

At the same time that the United States is backpedaling and falling away from its leadership in biomedical research, the rest of the world is charging forward. The European Union is making massive investments in medical research and in just a few years the Chinese will pass the United States for the first time in their investment in biomedical research. They understand that in addition to finding cures, biomedical research is really the opening for entrepreneurship, profitability, pharmaceutical companies, medical devices, and they want to make sure China is in the lead. Why isn't the United States in the lead?

I will speak about two particular diseases that need to be researched.

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have to leave the floor in a moment, and I



would like to direct my question to my friend, the senior Senator from Illinois.

I too met with Francis Collins. He is a genius. We are so fortunate that he is there. He told me something I can't get out of my mind—sequestration. It took \$1.5 billion away from the things that the Senator from Illinois has been talking about. The second year of sequestration will take away \$2 billion.

I read in the press that Republicans in the House—with their budget and the budget over here—are going to continue the sequestration.

I ask my friend, what will that do to Francis Collins and the people he has working at that institution?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will respond to the Democratic leader and say that I have heard the same thing. There are some Republicans in the House who believe that sequestration—this across-the-board cut—is what we should do, and I could not disagree more.

I chair the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. If we go forward with the sequestration, this will be devastating to America's national defense. If we get into this practice of cutting back in biomedical research, it will not only deny us the basic money we need to fund research grants—and we are now funding a lower percentage than we have in decades—it will also mean a discouraging message to researchers. They are going to think: What is the point in becoming an NIH researcher if the government and Congress will not provide the basic resources we need? The third element, which we cannot overlook, are all of the millions of people in the United States and around the world who are praying that we will be able to come up with breakthroughs when it comes to medical research.

In the United States of America, a person is diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease once every 68 seconds. Last year we spent over \$200 billion on Medicare and Medicaid for the care of Alzheimer's patients.

What Francis Collins has said to me is that if we can dedicate growth in research funds, we can—with the grace of God and maybe miraculously—find a cure or find a way to delay the onset of Alzheimer's, even for a few months. The savings to the Federal Government would be so much more than the actual cost of the medical research.

This notion of cutting back on NIH research, which some in the House are pushing, is really an effort that will cost us more in the long run—not to mention the human suffering.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could, through the Chair, ask my friend one final question. During my last trip to the National Institutes of Health, when I met with Dr. Collins and others, one of the issues they were so in tune with was that they were so close to having a universal vaccine for flu. In the past they would come up with the best solu-

tion they could for a flu vaccine every year. If we are fortunate, it is 50-percent effective. They are very, very close to having a universal vaccine for flu.

Tens of thousands of people in the United States die from the flu every year. Why didn't they proceed? Sequestration. They didn't have the money to continue the research.

I thank my friend very much for bringing this subject up. It is something that is devastating not only to the scientific community, but it is devastating to the people out there who would benefit from the research who really don't know what could be in store for them.

It is such a shame for our country that China—Japan has done a good job for many, many decades. They have the lowest death rate in the world. The European Union is trudging way ahead of the United States in something on which we have lead forever.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada.

It was not that long ago that America was consumed with Ebola and what it meant in terms of threats to life in Africa, the United States, and around the world, and it was right that we focused on stopping the scourge of the Ebola epidemic in Africa.

But there was a concern, as well, expressed over and over again this last fall, about how many Americans would be a victim to this Ebola epidemic. It turns out at the end of the day that fewer than a handful were actually affected by it, but every year in the United States and around the world, hundreds, if not thousands, die from flu—influenza.

Again, just to get to the point the Senator from Nevada makes, we are penny wise and pound foolish by denying the money for research for a universal flu vaccine that will save lives around the world. A minimal investment in the United States can make a dramatic improvement in the morbidity and mortality of those who are affected by flu.

So I thank the Senator from Nebraska for joining in this conversation this morning and talking about the biomedical research deficit which we are facing in the United States.

I wish to mention one or two other specific examples in this field. The kind of research we are talking about at NIH holds great promise when it comes to treating disorders such as multiple sclerosis. MS is an unpredictable and disabling disease that affects the central nervous system. Symptoms range from numbness and tingling to blindness and paralysis, and there is no known cure.

Today more than 2.3 million people have been diagnosed with MS worldwide, including 20,000 in my home State of Illinois.

Typically, MS is diagnosed between the ages of 20 and 50, but between 8,000

and 10,000 children and adolescents live with it in America, people such as Meghan Malone. In 2004, at the age of 14, Meghan was diagnosed with MS. Her first symptoms began when she was in the eighth grade. She lost vision in her right eye for a few days. One year later her feet went numb while she was out trick or treating with friends. By the next morning she couldn't feel her thighs, and a few days later she was completely numb from the waist down.

Her parents quickly brought her to the hospital where she was diagnosed with MS. She panicked, thinking she was too young for this disease and afraid of what it meant for her future, but she is doing what she can to stay healthy. She spends a lot of time exercising every day. She tries to think positively.

Since her diagnosis, Meghan has gathered her friends and family to participate in Walk MS every May. There is one in my hometown of Springfield, IL. They have raised over \$50,000—Meghan has—to help fight the disease. Meghan said:

I walk to give hope to others who are newly diagnosed with MS. It wasn't easy to hear those words and I think by walking I can help others find ways to be positive about their diagnosis.

The National Multiple Sclerosis Society has been sponsoring Walk MS since 1988 and they have raised \$870 million to support research. The National Multiple Sclerosis Society and people such as Meghan are doing their part, but if the Federal Government is going to do something it has to do its part. We have to make an investment at the National Institutes of Health to complement the efforts by private citizens and generous people across America to fund research in these diseases.

Let me give an example. Jonah Chan and his team at the University of California in San Francisco can teach us a lesson. Dr. Chan's team invented a new technology that led to the discovery of a drug normally used for allergies that has the potential to repair the nervous system in people with MS, but this important discovery needs further Federal investment in biomedical research to move these early findings to promising treatments. Here is what I have done. I have introduced the American Cures Act. It will increase funding at the Nation's top four biomedical research agencies, a 5-percent annual budget increase over and above inflation—the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, the Department of Defense, and the Veterans' Administration medical research programs. The American Cures Act will make funding for critical biomedical research projects less political and more predictable.

Dr. Collins at NIH told me: If you gave us regular funding increases of 5 percent real growth a year for 10 years, I will prove to you that investment

will come back tenfold in helping the improvement of health in the United States and reducing the cost of health care. I believe him. I have confidence in him. So why would we not do it? We should be making this commitment.

Cystic fibrosis is another example of federally funded basic research that improves people's lives. The other day Patrick Magner, a sophomore at Loyola Academy in Wilmette, IL, wrote to me about his two young brothers. John is 12 years old, a fully functioning sixth grader, and Matthew is 9 years old and plays sports in school. On the outside, one would never know they are dealing with cystic fibrosis.

John and Matt both take about 30 pills a day to help with their basic digestive functions. This doesn't include several other prescriptions, over-the-counter drugs, and daily therapy. They consider themselves lucky because 50 years ago people with cystic fibrosis didn't live long enough to even attend school. Today, with more advanced treatment, life expectancy for people with cystic fibrosis has increased over 800 percent. Research generated by NIH funding continues to give John and Matt hope for their future.

Their older brother Patrick wrote:

Without this funding, my two younger brothers might not be alive today. This funding is crucial to not only curing cystic fibrosis, but other diseases as well.

That is the promise of the American Cures Act. It allows America's smartest medical researchers to continue to find treatments to stop progression and one day, God willing, find a cure for diseases such as MS, cystic fibrosis, and many more.

Last week I joined Senator BOB CASEY of Pennsylvania on his resolution to support Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week. I would also like to acknowledge the work of Senators WYDEN, HATCH, BROWN, MARKEY, and others on behalf of fighting this terrible disease. Together, along with the American Cures Act, these efforts are improving people's lives.

In order to lead to breakthrough cures for these diseases, we need as a nation—as a government—to take the lead. This research shouldn't be a low-budget priority; I think it should be one of the highest.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make Federal funding for biomedical research the true national priority which it is.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Washington.

#### KING V. BURWELL

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the oral arguments in *King v. Burwell* that took place last week. Similar to many of us on the floor today, I was here when we

fought to get the Affordable Care Act passed. I know firsthand our top priority was to help all Americans get more affordable health care coverage. That goal is clear in the history and in the text of this law. I am confident the Supreme Court will reach the same conclusion; that no matter how the health care exchange is set up in any State, if people qualify for tax credits, people should get them just as Congress intended. Unfortunately, many of our Republican colleagues appear to be hoping for the opposite outcome.

I wish to take a step back to note how appalling this particular situation is. Right now Republicans seem to be rooting for a ruling that would take away millions of Americans' health care coverage. They seem to want a ruling that would put their own constituents' health at risk, and that amounts to a tax increase on 6.5 million people of about \$3,200 a year.

Working families should not have to pay the price for Republican political games, including this Supreme Court case that they pushed for. If I were a mother who no longer has to worry about what happens if my child breaks an ankle or a struggling worker who now has a little bit more to spend on groceries because their health care insurance no longer costs so much, I would have a lot of tough questions for Republicans right now. I would wonder why on Earth Republicans are so focused on taking apart a law that is helping families get quality, affordable health insurance.

The Affordable Care Act was a critical step forward in terms of making sure our health care system puts patients and families first. Over 10 million Americans have gained coverage in the last 2 years. In fact, today the uninsured rate is at a near-historic low. Health care coverage is more affordable for families across the country, and we are seeing important improvements in the quality of care patients are getting.

We have a lot more work to do to strengthen our health care system, but there is no question that this law is doing what we set out to do: expand access to affordable health care for all—Americans. Democrats want to build on this progress.

So while we see Republicans putting politics first ahead of families' needs, Democrats are going to be focused on building on the Affordable Care Act with more coverage, not less; more affordability, not less; and better quality, not less.

We know the work to put patients first didn't end when the Affordable Care Act passed. That is why we are going to keep working to move our health care system forward, not backward, for our families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, last month I came to the floor to launch what I call the "Waste of the Week." We look at how we spend the taxpayers' dollars. We all know the biggest issue over the past several years is now sort of fading into the ether is the fact that the government continues to spend the taxpayers' money in reckless ways, including not balance our budget and go deeply into deficit spending every year, then borrow to cover the cost, and increase our debt limit from the staggering \$18 trillion-plus and growing. My purpose in coming to the floor was to highlight some examples of this waste.

I wish to step back for a moment to say this follows numerous bipartisan efforts to deal with a larger issue, and that is our debt and deficit, in a way that we can put a budget proposal together to get us out of this mess and stop loading up our children and grandchildren with the responsibilities and costs they probably will not be able to repay without significant sacrifice in terms of their standard of living.

Having failed every one of those over the past 5 years—Simpson-Bowles, the Gang of 6, the Committee of 12, the supercommittee, the dinner committee on which I served 7 arduous months trying to come to some minimal agreement in terms of how to deal with our debt and deficit because the President blocked every single attempt. I thought the least we could do was look at the simple things, the easy things. We started with—not such a small thing—duplication of efforts in terms of benefits that went to people that were actually illegal totaling \$5.7 billion, the difference between Social Security disability and unemployment insurance.

Last week I talked about duplication. There are 52 programs—through the Federal Government, through a number of agencies, to provide assistance on economic development. Do we need 52? Can't we consolidate some of these down to three or four? Why does every agency in the government have to duplicate what is being done in every other agency? We talked about the savings that would come from that.

It is my understanding that the minority leader and the minority whip—No. 1 and 2 on the Democratic side—came down here and talked about the fact that in the budget we may be cutting funding for the National Institutes of Health and how tragic it would be if we took one penny away from them. I can give them a very simple example on the third week of Waste of the Week in terms of how they can save some money or better utilize some money through the National Institutes of Health.

This is a study for which I have to give credit to my former Senate colleague, Dr. Tom Coburn. For years Dr.

Coburn highlighted examples of government waste, fraud, and abuse. He was a champion of transparency and made great strides in giving the American people a more accountable government.

So I come here today to share one of Dr. Coburn's taxpayer issues he brought before the Senate, and I think it needs to be brought here now. How timely it is when I was just preceded unknowingly by those who came to the floor saying we can't take a penny out of NIH because it goes to critical research.

I support NIH. I think it is an important agency. We need to do some of that research. But does NIH need to do this: Does NIH need to fund a study to determine the benefits of massage by using 18 white rabbits from New Zealand that receive 30-minute massages four times a day?

According to co-medical director of the Ohio State University Sports Medical Center, "We tried to mimic Swedish massage because anecdotally, it's the most popular technique used by athletes."

That study amounted to a cost of \$387,000 of taxpayer money given in a grant. Why didn't they just ask the football team? Why didn't they just walk in the locker room and say: Hey guys, you have just been beat up for 60 minutes and you probably have a lot of aches and pains. A good hot shower and a massage—does that help?

I think every one of us—we have all had aches and pains—understands that a massage helps relieve the soreness. Do we need to spend \$387,000 on a study and take 18 white rabbits and give them massages four times a day on taxpayer dollars to prove the point that massages actually work?

So once again, while this is a small thing, we have to add to our chart showing that we continue to expend taxpayer money and waste taxpayer money on frivolous things that are not needed. You can point out every egregious agency spending.

Until we are willing to have the political will to stand up and deal with the runaway entitlements, these discretionary programs will continue to be squeezed. Unfortunately, we have come to a roadblock under this Presidency in terms of any effort left to deal with the larger issue of runaway spending and runaway debt. This burden is being placed on the future of America and the children and grandchildren of Americans and that is generational theft, and it is irresponsible for this body to not take action.

At the very least, can we not at least do the most simple of things in terms of eliminating waste of taxpayer dollars through duplication, and unnecessary studies?

Eliminating waste like this will not change Washington's long-term fiscal picture, but it does point out that it is

important to ensure that taxpayer funding of projects like this keep, like the Energizer bunny, going and going.

I hate to say this, but sadly, after the project was over, the 18 New Zealand white rabbits were euthanized. It is my hope that in going forward, instead of killing rabbits, we can kill taxpayer-funded government waste like this project.

I see my colleague from Arizona has come to the floor. I have just finished the latest "Waste of the Week." We will be back next week with "Waste of the Week" No. 4.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from Indiana for his "Waste of the Week" speech, although I wish it were the "Waste of the Day" event that we celebrate. But I wish to thank him for his steadfast and longstanding efforts at eliminating government waste and mismanagement. If we are going to convince the American people that we need to make significant sacrifices, we have to start with an efficient government that does not waste the taxpayers' dollars. So I thank my friend from Indiana.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REMEMBERING BORIS NEMTSOV

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, last week Senator GRAHAM and I introduced a Senate resolution condemning the murder of my friend and a true Russian Patriot, Boris Nemtsov. The resolution calls upon the Russian Federation to support an independent investigation into Boris Nemtsov's murder and take immediate steps to end its suppression of free speech and justice. It also urges President Obama to continue to sanction human rights violators in the Russian Federation and to increase U.S. support to like-minded human rights activists in Russia.

My friends, I was devastated to learn of Boris's murder in Moscow last month. My thoughts and prayers remain with his family and many friends in Russia and around the world. With his death, the struggle for free speech and human rights in Russia has suffered another shattering blow.

When the Soviet Union collapsed, Boris Nemtsov was one of Russia's earliest and most vigorous economic and political reformers, a champion of liberalization and democracy. His leadership of Russia's laboratory of reform eventually brought him to Moscow, where he served as Deputy Prime Minister and was once a favorite for the Russian Presidency.

But then Russia took a dark turn when Vladimir Putin entered the

Kremlin. Boris was one of the first to warn of the coming Putin dictatorship, even when many of his fellow liberals could not see it. As Putin's grip on power tightened, Boris's hopes for a free, just, and economically vibrant Russia, at home and at peace in Europe, were dashed. Yet, even after multiple arrests and countless threats on his life, Boris never stopped fighting the corruption and lawlessness of the Putin regime, never stopped seeking to advance democracy, human rights, free speech, free market reforms, and the rule of law.

In December 2011 Boris Nemtsov helped mobilize the largest anti-Kremlin demonstrations since the early 1990s, leading tens of thousands of Russians to march in protest of widespread fraud and corruption in the parliamentary elections. He stood up to harsh laws that vastly expanded the definition of "treason," increased government control over the media, and limited the scope and activities of opposition parties and civil society organizations—laws that Vladimir Putin and his cronies have exploited to intimidate the Russian people into obedience.

Shortly before his death, Boris Nemtsov was reportedly planning to release a report on Russia's military involvement in Ukraine. At the protest march scheduled 2 days after his murder, he was set to demand "the immediate end to the war and any aggressive actions towards Ukraine." He investigated and saw through the fabricated rationalizations of Putin's war. Putin didn't invade Ukraine to protect Russian-speaking peoples or to establish a federal state. Putin didn't invade Ukraine because he is crazy or merely to reassert Russia's sphere of influence in the near abroad. Rather, Boris Nemtsov wrote that the goal of Putin's "fratricidal war" is the "preservation of personal power and money at any cost," a "cold strategy for lifelong despotism." Putin was willing to doom Russia to isolation and sanctions and to sink his country "into lies, violence, obscurantism, and imperial hysteria" for his own personal power and enrichment. As Boris Nemtsov knew, this is not Russia's war; this is not Ukraine's war; this is Vladimir Putin's war.

That is why Boris Nemtsov's murder is not just a tragedy for the people of Russia but for the people of Ukraine. He was one of the few brave Russians who sought to pierce the veneer of Putin's cynical and false narrative that Russia was not at war in Ukraine. There are many who now believe that Boris is yet another casualty of that war. At the memorial march honoring his life in Moscow on Sunday, one woman held a sign that read "The war killed Nemtsov."

I had long been concerned about Boris's safety and said so publicly. I will never forget the last meeting we had in my office. I begged him to be

careful, and Boris told me he would never give up the fight for freedom, human rights, and rule of law for his fellow Russians, even if it cost him his life. I am heartbroken that it has come to that.

That Boris Nemtsov's murder occurred on a bridge in a shadow of the Kremlin in one of the most secure parts of the Russian capital raises serious questions about the circumstances of his killing and who was responsible. In KGB fashion, Vladimir Putin will round up all the usual suspects, but I fear we will never know who really pulled the trigger that night. Putin's farcical oversight of the investigation ensures that it will be a sham.

We don't need any investigation to know who was responsible for Boris's murder. Vladimir Putin may not have ordered Boris's assassination, but perhaps what is most frightening about Putin's Russia is that he didn't need to. Boris is dead because of the culture of impunity that Vladimir Putin has created in Russia, where individuals are routinely persecuted and attacked for their beliefs, including by the Russian Government, and no one is ever held responsible.

Sadly, Boris Nemtsov was not the first and certainly will not be the last victim of Putin's repression. The culture of impunity has steadily worsened, deepened by the increased surveillance and harassment of members of opposition and civil society groups, the ongoing detention of numerous political prisoners, and by the continued violent attacks on brave journalists who dare to publish the truth about official corruption and other state crimes in Russia.

According to one news report, at least 23 journalists have been murdered in Russia for reporting on government criminality and abuse since Vladimir Putin came to power in 2000, along with several anti-Kremlin political activists. In only two of these cases have there been convictions.

Igor Domnikov, a reporter who was writing about government corruption, was severely beaten in Moscow. He died 2 months later.

Sergei Yushenkov, a leader of a Russian opposition party, was shot and killed at the entrance of his apartment building. At the time, he was serving on a commission investigating the Kremlin's potential role in the 1999 apartment bombings in Russia.

Another member of that commission, a reporter who was investigating corruption in Russian law enforcement, was poisoned to death.

American journalist Paul Klebnikov was investigating Russian Government connections to organized crime when he was shot to death in Moscow.

Anna Politkovskaya, a journalist and human rights activist, was a fierce critic of Vladimir Putin's brutal war in Chechnya. She was murdered in the

stairwell of her apartment building on Vladimir Putin's birthday in 2006. The lawyer who represented her family later survived a poisoning attempt.

Former FSB officer Alexander Litvinenko exposed the Putin regime's massive corruption, ties to organized crime, and involvement in assassination and murder. He was poisoned in 2006 with a radioactive isotope in a brazen act of nuclear terrorism.

Ivan Safronov was investigating a secret sale of Russian missiles and fighter jets to Syria and Iran. He was pushed to his death from the window of his Moscow apartment.

Sergei Magnitsky blew the whistle on tax fraud and large-scale theft by Russian Government officials. He was thrown into one of Russia's harshest prisons without trial, beaten and tortured, denied medical care, and died in excruciating pain. Even after his death, the Russian courts convicted him of tax evasion in a show trial.

As Orwell once wrote, "In a time of universal deceit—telling the truth is a revolutionary act."

Russia has fewer and fewer revolutionaries, but Boris Nemtsov was certainly one of them. Boris told the truth and was willing to lay down his life for it. He told the truth about Putin's reign of terror and hatred. He told the truth about Putin's kleptocracy, rampant corruption, and systematic theft perpetrated against the Russian people. He told the truth about Putin's illegal invasion of the sovereign Nation of Ukraine and Russia's continued support for violence, instability, and terror.

Boris told the truth, and we must honor his memory by speaking these same truths fearlessly. Our Nation and free people everywhere must draw strength from Boris's example and continue to resist Vladimir Putin's dark and dangerous view of the world.

Last Sunday, over 50,000 Russians marched in tribute to Boris Nemtsov, still seeking, despite the odds, what a Russian poet once called the footprints of the forgotten truth. At a funeral on Tuesday, thousands more waited in line in the cold for more than 1 hour to pay Boris their respects.

Finally, as the hearse carrying Boris Nemtsov pulled away, mourners tossed flowers and chanted: "Russia will be free!"

As I remember my friend Boris Nemtsov, that is my most sincere hope and fervent prayer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

## JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

Portman amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking.

Portman amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Senate is presently considering a series of human trafficking bills that will help law enforcement and nongovernmental organizations to take swift aggressive action to protect our most vulnerable populations and work to ensure justice, restitution, and healing for victims of these most horrific crimes.

Human trafficking—modern-day slavery—is not a vestige of the past. It is an evil presence here and now. Children and young adults are being bought and sold in our back yard. This problem knows no borders. It is happening in communities across Ohio. It is a particular problem in Toledo—northwest Ohio—where several north-south and east-west highways come together.

It is difficult even to obtain accurate information on this depraved crime that happens in the shadows. But we know that as many as 17,000 individuals may be trafficked into our Nation each year, and some estimate that as many as 100,000 American children may be victims of trafficking within the United States each year.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will give the Department of Justice additional tools to help victims and to crack down on this crime. It would enhance services for victims of human trafficking, and it would expand victim restitution, as well as provide additional resources to law enforcement to help improve human trafficking reporting and investigation.

There is bipartisan and bicameral support for the tracking provisions of this bill. This is a bill about human trafficking. We should not let it become a fight about abortion. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will agree with this and strip out the Hyde language that has become such a point of controversy. I know reasonable people can disagree about the

Hyde amendment, but now is not the time or place to debate it.

There is agreement—broad, wide, deep agreement—on the need to address trafficking. Americans from all walks of life have come to us asking that we do something. We can and we should. These new tools would be essential in assisting the Department of Justice, which has made combating trafficking a priority.

I would like to commend Attorney General Holder for his leadership on this issue. Under his management, DOJ's commitment to preventing human trafficking and bringing these criminals to justice has never been stronger. The Attorney General has really stepped up on this. This bill will give our next Attorney General, Loretta Lynch, the tools she needs to build upon Holder's efforts.

Another area where we can do more to prevent human trafficking is giving law enforcement in our communities the resources to find kids before they fall prey to traffickers. That is why I plan to introduce an amendment that would provide grants to local law enforcement for tracking down homeless and runaway youth, and that will include assistance for retired Federal agents to assist local law enforcement in these investigations. We must find these at-risk children and teens and bring them home before their youthful rebellion becomes something so much worse.

A group of retired FBI agents in northwest Ohio came to my office and asked for our help in the creation of a pilot program that would allow retired agents to assist local law enforcement in finding runaway kids and teens. Generally, northwest Ohio children who become involved in trafficking do so within about 2 weeks of running away from home. So finding them quickly is essential. About one-third of runaways become victims of trafficking. Think of that. One-third of runaways become victims of trafficking.

Toledo has just one detective working on cases of missing children, both adult and children. These retired FBI agents want to help local law enforcement investigate the 18,000 runaways in Ohio every year, but they need help. Police don't have the manpower to track these children, but every city has retired agents who could assist the overworked departments.

I will also be introducing a series of amendments, which I hope will be bipartisan, including the Rape Survivor Child Custody Act, a bill I introduced in the last Congress with Senator AYOTTE. We know that human trafficking victims are especially vulnerable to sexual assault. Women who give birth to a child conceived through rape can often face intimidation from attackers who pursue, amazingly enough, parental rights.

My amendment would help protect these survivors by encouraging States to pass laws allowing women to petition for the termination of their attacker's parental rights, if there is clear and convincing evidence the child was conceived through rape. These women have already been subjected to horrific crimes. They should not have to suffer a life of intrusion by the man who raped them.

I was first moved to introduce this bill because of the case of Ariel Castro in Cleveland. He was on trial in Ohio for kidnapping, raping, and holding prisoner three women for nearly a decade. He asked the judge for parental rights to visit his 6-year-old daughter he conceived through rape.

While the judge denied his request, Ohio has no law that prevents rapists such as Castro from claiming parental rights and forcing their victims to let these criminals into their children's lives. I hope this law encourages Ohio and other States to pass laws making it clear that anyone who commits such a terrible act forfeits any right to parent a child he forced on his victim. This amendment will help protect rape survivors, ensuring their right to care for their children free from fear.

Senators KLOBUCHAR, CORKER, and LEAHY also have their own bill, which they plan to offer as amendments, and which will help us to work to stamp out this terrible crime.

Finally, I want to commend those in my State who have helped lead the way on this issue. There is a history of strong bipartisanship on this issue that cuts across all ideological lines. State Representative Teresa Fedor helped to lead a successful fight for passage of the safe harbor bill in the Ohio legislature 3 years ago.

Dr. Celia Williamson, a professor of social work at the University of Toledo, is recognized nationally, and even internationally, as a leader in human trafficking research and activism. She has been a tremendous force on this issue. With her help and leadership, the University of Toledo just established the Human Trafficking and Social Justice Institute. The university has hosted annual human trafficking conferences, and the formation of this institute is a terrific next step in its commitment to addressing a problem that plagues Toledo and too often goes unacknowledged and unaddressed.

Finally, I want to commend the members of the Lucas County Human Trafficking Coalition, which has had some very diverse membership and has worked for several years to better coordinate and provide services to victims.

Human trafficking is a problem that knows no borders and, of course, knows no political party. I hope we can continue to work together to combat this awful epidemic. I hope we will be able to work through our issues to resolve

the issue with the Hyde amendment language.

We must take swift and aggressive language to prevent these crimes and work to ensure justice and restitution and healing for its victims.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we are debating a bill today that should be about an issue we can all agree on—eliminating human trafficking. This bill should be about protecting women's health and rights and about fighting back against the unacceptable presence of human slavery in our country. In other words, if anything should be bipartisan, this bill is it.

I know many of us were hoping this bill—the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act—would be an example of Republicans and Democrats working together because surely we can agree these problems need to be addressed—and urgently—and that the gridlock and dysfunction we see far too often in Congress should have absolutely no place in this discussion. So I am appalled that on a bill intended to help women, Republicans actually have chosen to double down on their political fight against women's health. Republicans have tried to sneak in a provision that would hurt women and drag this bill into yet another partisan fight. They just can't seem to help themselves.

The provision the Republicans are hoping to sneak in—again, on a human trafficking bill—would be a permanent extension of the so-called Hyde amendment. It would move beyond the status quo, which only applies to appropriated taxpayer money, and expand it into the new nontax-funding streams this bill would authorize. That means if this law passes—a law intended to help women who have experienced truly horrific violence and hardship—Congress would at the same time allow politicians to interfere even more with the most deeply personal health decisions a woman can make.

Trying to slip a women's health restriction into a women's safety bill is akin to slipping a tractor ban into the farm bill. It doesn't make sense.

This isn't the first time Republicans have tried this political stunt. Again and again Republicans in Congress have picked completely unnecessary political fights over women's health. They threatened a government shutdown over Planned Parenthood funding in 2011. They have tried to jam through reproductive health riders on appropriations legislation. House Republicans even attached women's health restrictions to the education bill they tried to pass this month. It is shocking to see it happening again.

The good news is that the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act can still be the bipartisan legislation it should be. Democrats are here and ready to work with Republicans to fix this bill and move past this partisan debate over

women's health. We are very hopeful that once that happens, we can get this bill passed and take a step toward solving a horrible problem we all know needs a solution.

I hope my Republican colleagues agree with me that women deserve better than one step backward for every step forward when it comes to their health and their rights. I hope they agree that a bill to end modern-day slavery in the United States is not the right time to try to sneak in a political victory for their base. If they agree, they will prove that by working with us rather than focusing on political fights we have seen more than enough of in this Congress.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 285.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWN. I object on behalf of a number of Members on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, it is hard to adequately express my frustration that we can't get moving on this bill.

First of all, the underlying bill that our friends on the other side are blocking progress on is a very sensible, important, constructive bill. I commend Senator CORNYN for having introduced this. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

This is the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

Let's be clear what this is about. We have a huge problem in this country. In all 50 States there are people who actually engage in the buying and selling of human beings, mostly women and young children, in a sex trade. That is what is happening. And this is a bill that would enhance the penalties and thereby discourage this activity. It would take some of the proceeds from the penalties paid by these monsters who would engage in this kind of activity and it would use those proceeds to help victims. I don't understand where the objection comes from for a bill such as this, and now we can't move ahead on my amendment.

My amendment is a little bit different but it is in a similar vein. It is designed to help protect children from sexual predators in schools, and we just heard the objection. The folks on the other side of the aisle somehow object

to legislation that would enhance a protection for the kids in our schools. Let me explain why this is so important.

The inspiration for this bipartisan bill that I have introduced with Senator MANCHIN and which I just tried to call up as an amendment and I was prevented from doing so—the inspiration for this is an absolutely horrendous story that begins in Delaware County, PA.

There was a schoolteacher who for years was molesting boys in his care. He raped one of the boys. The prosecutors discovered what was going on, but they never had enough evidence to actually press charges. The school knew what was going on, so they decided: Why don't we make this monster someone else's problem? And that is exactly what they did.

They wrote a letter of recommendation so this animal could go across the State line—which he did—get hired by a school in West Virginia—which he did—and become a teacher, eventually rise to be principal, and along the way continue molesting we don't know how many kids, but we do know in the end he raped and killed a 12-year-old boy. Because that is what these people do. And there is a practice that happens—as hard as this is to talk about, as unbelievable as this is in practice, it is a reality that some schools would like these people to become someone else's problem, and they actually give them a letter of recommendation so they can go somewhere. And they do indeed become someone else's problem. That is what I am trying to stop here. That is what we are trying to stop.

This happened with a teacher who left Pennsylvania and went to West Virginia, and the little boy's name was Jeremy Bell.

Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia and I have teamed up on a bill that would make this practice of knowingly and willfully aiding a known pedophile from getting a job somewhere else—we would make that illegal.

We wouldn't think we should have to do that because we wouldn't think anybody with a conscience could do it, but it happens. We know it happens. We have heard these stories time and again.

By the way, this is not such an isolated event as we would like to think it is. Last year alone, 459 teachers and other school employees across America were arrested for sexual misconduct with the kids they were supposed to be taking care of and looking after.

We all know that for the vast majority of schoolteachers it would never occur to them. It would never cross their mind, they would never do such a thing. But there are a number of pedophiles—monsters who prey on kids. And they know where the kids are. So they try to find their way into these schools so they can prey on the victims.

The 459 who were arrested last year were the ones we knew enough about that prosecutors felt they could prosecute, so they made an arrest. How many more are happening but we don't know enough of the specifics, we don't have a strong enough case to actually make an arrest?

So far this year, we are not off to a much better start. We are 69 days into the new school year, and already 82 people have been arrested across America.

This isn't some isolated one-time problem. This is a genuine problem we need to do something to solve, so Senator MANCHIN and I have come together with a bill that addresses this.

The whole idea, the whole goal, is very simple: Let's make sure schools are not hiring these predators and we are protecting our kids from them. It does that with two mechanisms, two simple provisions that achieve this.

One is it requires background checks that will get the job done and screen out those who have a previous conviction; and it will also make it illegal to have this terrible practice of passing the trash—this terrible practice of recommending a teacher who is a known pedophile. Neither of these mechanisms should be controversial.

This is almost identical legislation which passed the House unanimously. The House is not exactly known for not having any partisan divides, and yet it passed unanimously. We have Members of this body who were Members of the House in the last Congress and voted for it then, are now cosponsors of this legislation, and amazingly to me we are having this discussion.

I am being blocked from offering this amendment. The language in my amendment is almost identical to the language we had in the child care development block grant, which this body voted for and all but one Member voted in favor of that bill, which would provide exactly this kind of criminal background check on employees for daycare.

This body has voted to ensure the protection of really young kids, as it should have. I fully supported that. Why would we block providing comparable protection to kids who are just a little bit older? How can it be that we want to make sure pedophiles don't get into our daycare centers but it is OK for them to be in elementary schools, in middle schools, and in high schools? This makes no sense at all. And it is necessary, because while every State has some kind of background check system, there are huge loopholes, there are huge gaps, there are huge inconsistencies that are allowing people to get through.

Our legislation would require background checks on any adult hired by a school who would come in unsupervised contact with kids—teachers, contractors, schoolbus drivers, a sports

coach—anybody so that we would be protecting our kids from pedophiles who actively seek the opportunity to prey on these kids.

One of the things we do to make sure the background check would be thorough is we require that the school districts would check both the State and Federal databases. Let me give a story about why this is so important.

In Alaska, parents got a very rude awakening when they discovered this story. It was on August 29 of last year. Alaska State troopers arrested a middle school teacher in Kiana, AK.

The teacher had fled Missouri 4 years earlier to escape an arrest warrant. Multiple witnesses accused the teacher of over a decade of sexual and physical abuse of his own adopted kids. He had raped and starved his own children. These kids literally burrowed a hole through the wall so they could take frozen food out of the freezer. They heated it up on a furnace just to survive. It is just one of those unbelievable horror stories—while this monster was able to obtain a teaching certificate in Alaska and teach there—teaching kids for 4 years.

When asked how this could possibly happen, the Alaska Department of Education explained that Alaska's background checks only check the State's criminal registry. Now, had our legislation been in force, they would have been required to check the Federal registry, and they would have learned that he was a fugitive with an arrest warrant and a criminal record in another State. That is the kind of ability we have to have to prevent these people from going across States and committing these kinds of crimes.

The other provision that I mentioned earlier is a provision that would preclude—make it illegal—for someone knowingly to recommend a pedophile to be hired at another school. Again, you would like to think that something like that wouldn't even be necessary. But it is, and another story reveals this recently.

A Las Vegas, NV, kindergarten teacher was arrested for kidnapping a 16-year-old girl and infecting her with a sexually transmitted disease. That same teacher had molested six children, all fourth and fifth graders, several years before when that teacher was working in the Los Angeles school district.

The Los Angeles school district knew all about these allegations. In 2009, in fact, the school district recommended settling a lawsuit they were facing because the teacher had molested the children. The Nevada school district to which the pedophile went had specifically asked if there were any criminal concerns regarding the teacher, and the Los Angeles school district not only hid the truth that they knew about this guy's predations, but they actually provided three references so that he could get hired in Las Vegas.

So for people who say the States can solve these problems themselves, I would ask: What was that 16-year-old girl supposed to do? What could Nevada have done about the Los Angeles school district's behavior?

So I am not going away on this. This is something that we need to do. I have three young kids. When any one of us parents anywhere in America puts our children on the school bus in the morning, we have every right to expect they are going to a place where they will be safe—as safe as they could possibly be. We know that there is more that we could be doing here to make them safer. It is unconscionable that we don't act on it.

So I will be back, because we are going to have a vote on this one way or another, and I am very disappointed we couldn't have it this morning.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MR. GRASSLEY. I would like to follow up on something that the Senator from Pennsylvania just said on the process—not on the substance of these amendments.

We are in a situation where we have a bill before the Senate that has broad bipartisan support, and it came out of the committee I chaired, the Senate Judiciary Committee, on a unanimous vote. Now we are stalled on proceedings, and I would like to emphasize what is different and why this bill should be moving forward in the year 2015 as opposed to the last few years when the other political party controlled the Senate.

In the U.S. political system, elections are supposed to have consequences, and as a consequence of the last election, there is a new majority in the Senate. That new majority results from campaign positions taken in the last election that if we had a new majority, the Senate was going to be run in the way that James Madison implied that it ought to run—as a deliberative body, as a body where every Member could participate, where you would reach consensus, and where you give very serious thought to legislation that comes before this body—and do it in a way differently than the House of Representatives was meant to do business and has done business for the 230 years under our Constitution.

So we ran on a platform that we would have the Senate debate and be open for amendments, and the leader announced that when this bill was going to come up, it would be an open amendment process. Everybody could participate. Now we are in a situation where the minority is not allowing us to move forward on amendments because they have objections to a provision that was in this bill since its introduction. Every Member had not only days but weeks to consider it before it came out of committee on a

unanimous vote. And those provisions that were in this bill from the introduction—and every Senator knew they were in there, and every Senator's staff knew they were in there. If they didn't know that this language was in there, then they didn't read the legislation. There are plenty of people to read legislation around here, even beyond the Members of the committee.

So this language deals with what is called the Hyde amendment, which for either 39 or 40 years has basically said that taxpayers' money should never be used to finance abortions. So all of a sudden there is objection to that language in this bill, which was in the bill when the very same Members who are objecting to it now on the floor of the Senate knew it was in there, and we can't move forward because they object to the amendment.

So I proposed to them that they offer an amendment to strike what they don't like and find out where the votes are. If they win, they win. If they don't win, we move forward. But you can't hardly hold up a piece of legislation over language that is in the bill that has been part of the law of this country for 39 or 40 years and then say that you didn't know it was in there, when it was in there when you voted to get it out of committee.

Senator TOOMEY just gave a speech about his amendment. He asked unanimous consent to bring it up. The minority in the Senate, which has the same right to offer amendments that any other Senator can offer, refused to let him get a vote on his amendment or even disputed the fact of laying an amendment aside to move forward on it. So we are at a standstill.

Statistically, I would like to show how the new majority is intending to operate the Senate on a different basis than had been operated on in previous years and use statistics of last year. If the statistics are off by 1 or 2 numbers, I hope somebody will forgive me. But roughly, we had 18 rollcalls on amendments last year, because there was every effort to be made to stall the Senate so amendments couldn't come up for a vote. Already this year we have had approximately 40-some rollcall votes on amendments, and more than a majority of those have been amendments offered by the minority party in the Senate.

So the elections showed that people want the Senate to work as a deliberative body, where every Senator can participate, and we ought to move forward on that.

I would ask the people who object to moving forward on this amendment to offer an amendment to strike the provisions they don't like and move on so that the other several Members of the Senate who are stalled now on offering their amendments can offer their amendments and eventually we can get through those amendments and vote on



a bill that got out of the Senate Judiciary Committee without a single dissenting vote from either Republicans or Democrats.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, of course I also would like to see the trafficking bill go forward.

I am looking around the floor of the Senate, and I think I am the only person standing on the floor who has actually prosecuted people for molestation and endangerment of children.

I am not going to repeat what I said yesterday. I talked about some of those horrible cases, and I did mention having young children of my own at the time and how hard working on those cases hit me. When normally preparing for trials—in the evenings, in most cases—I could just work at home preparing for the trial. When preparing for these types of cases however, I didn't come home. I would work in my office for two reasons. I didn't want to take any chance, inadvertently, that one of my children would see any of the pictures or the exhibits that we were going to have in the trial, as graphic as they were. But also, I didn't want them to see their father crying, which I did as I would read these files, and have them ask me why I was crying, because I couldn't lie to them. It was better just to stay in the office.

I say that because we have to approach this not just in the after-the-fact manner expressed. I like the idea of having the \$30 million to help those who have been hurt—the victims. I worry, as the House of Representatives worried, that if it is simply money that comes from fines, we are never going to see that money. All the people I prosecuted on crimes against young people went to prison. If you could have given them a \$50 million fine or a \$50 fine, they weren't going to pay it. They had no money. After their defense was over, they had no funds.

At some point we are going to have to correct that. Say \$30 million is a good target, and any fines will go into that fund, but we should take taxpayers' funds to make up any difference.

When we lock these people up, we spend \$25,000 or \$35,000 a year to lock them up. But half of the time we tell the victim: It is terrible what happened to you. Sorry, we can't do anything for you.

We also have to approach the things necessary to prevent what happened. I am filing a Leahy-Collins amendment, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Trafficking Prevention Act. I will file that. The amendment will help runaways such as Holly Austin Smith. She was 14 years old when she was lured away from home by a man who promised her a glamorous life in California. Instead, he sold this 14-year-old for sex.

She told her devastating story to the Senate Judiciary Committee last month. Both Senator GRASSLEY and I were there and heard it. I was certainly moved by her words and call for action.

She told us to protect girls such as her, saying that "policies on prevention should be one of our highest priorities." I agree. That is why Senator COLLINS and I are offering this amendment.

Of course we should have the ability to go after somebody who has committed these crimes. But wouldn't it be better for the victims if we could stop the crime from happening in the first place? If we can do something to help people such as this 14-year-old and we can stop it from happening in the first place, we would be much better off.

Too many of the runaway and homeless youth in this country have no place to go. They have no place to sleep at night. They are alone on the street without resources or adults to protect them, and human traffickers know that. One shelter survey found that 50 percent of the homeless youth have been solicited for sex by an adult within 48 hours of leaving home.

I ask any parent or grandparent in this Senate: What would you think if your children or grandchildren were put in that situation?

This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue, this is a human issue—this is an American issue.

It is our hope that we can work around what I hope is a momentary glitch in this bill so we can get to these things.

I will say again, based on my own experience as a prosecutor and based on everything I have heard over the years—part of the time as the ranking member and part of the time as chairman of the Judiciary Committee during the past 40 years—that when it comes to the fight against human trafficking, we cannot simply focus on ending demand and arrest our way out of this problem. We have to eliminate the conditions that make these children so vulnerable.

The good news is the program supported by this amendment has helped thousands of young people get back on their feet by providing shelter, job training, and caring adults to counsel and guide them. These programs work. They keep kids safe, and they save lives.

A growing number of homeless and runaway youth are LGBT, and many of them have been thrown out of their homes for who they are. Again, as a parent and grandparent, that is heart-breaking to me. We have to ensure that these particularly vulnerable children, who have already been rejected once, do not face rejection again, and that is why Senator COLLINS and I included a nondiscrimination provision in our amendment that will make clear that any program accepting Federal dollars

must help care for all of these children. They can't turn these young people away because they do not like the way they look or dress or who they love. No program that takes Federal money should be allowed to discriminate, period.

The nondiscrimination language in this bill is nearly identical to the language that 78 Senators—Republicans and Democrats alike—supported in this body when we passed the Violence Against Women Act in the last Congress, the Leahy-Crapo bill. It is the same language the Republican-controlled House passed and the President signed into law 2 years ago.

Last year, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I moved this legislation through committee and Senator GRASSLEY and Senator CORNYN, to their credit, and almost every Republican on the Judiciary Committee voted for it. If these protections are acceptable for adult victims of domestic and sexual violence, why shouldn't they be for children? No one should be discriminated against, but especially not these vulnerable children who have already faced more adversity than many of us will ever know.

We, as Senators, lead a privileged and sheltered life. We work hard, but it is still a privileged and sheltered life. We are not facing what these children are facing—a scared, vulnerable, lonely child at a bus stop or trying to get somebody to buy them a pizza because they are hungry or looking for a place where they can sleep out of the cold. We are never going to face that, but too many Americans do.

Some may argue and say that the antidiscrimination language somehow threatens religious freedom. That is not true. No one's religious freedom is threatened by this language. This is not about religion, it about supporting all of the children who most desperately need our help.

I understand their concerns. We have narrowed the scope of this provision so it applies only to these programs being reauthorized in this amendment. We have also clarified that nothing in this bill stops organizations from providing necessary sex-specific programming, such as shelters for homeless, runaway, or trafficked girls.

I have heard from dozens of service providers in my State of Vermont, and also across the country, that these programs work.

As Cyndi Lauper, a long-time advocate for homeless and runaway youth, wrote in an op-ed for *The Hill* yesterday, "The time to act is now, because homeless youth don't have the time for us to wait until tomorrow."

Who will help these young people if we do not? These children are too often left behind, and for too many being left behind means being trafficked. We cannot and should not leave them behind today.

I urge all Senators that when the amendment is called up to support it. I ask unanimous consent that the op-ed that was in The Hill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Hill, March 10, 2015]

DON'T LET THE SENATE THROW AWAY 40 PERCENT OF AMERICA'S HOMELESS YOUTH  
(By Cyndi Lauper)

"Enough is enough." It's a phrase that is said all too often about so many issues in our society, but unfortunately not enough when it comes to our nation's most vulnerable young people.

Congress must reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA), our nation's only federal law that specifically funds vital services for homeless youth. Republicans and Democrats have come together to ensure that our Federal Government offers much needed support to all homeless youth.

Sens. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) and Susan Collins (R-Maine) have introduced bipartisan legislation to reauthorize RHYA, which will likely be brought up for a floor vote in the Senate this week—possibly as soon as today.

The act includes a non-discrimination clause that will help ensure lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) homeless youth not only have access to critical services, but that those services are safe, welcoming, and tailored to meet the needs of all youth.

We need that clause and some groups are trying to push to have it taken out. I was taught to listen to Proverbs 31: Speak up for those who cannot speak up for themselves. Our kids need us to protect them, not to discriminate against them.

Research shows that while LGBT youth make up to seven percent of the general youth population, they comprise, on average, 40 percent of the 1.6 million youth that are homeless in this country each year. Think about that. It's impossible to ignore.

There is no getting around the fact that these kids are too often being thrown out of their homes and left to fend for themselves on the streets. The fact that this occurs each and every day in our country is simply a tragedy—a tragedy that does not have to continue.

At the True Colors Fund, we continue to hear stories of young people being discriminated against, offered improper services, and even turned away by service providers just because they happen to be lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender. By continuing to leave 40 percent of our homeless youth unprotected, we are cutting our society off at the knees.

Kids actually ARE our future. What kind of future do we have in store if we do not care for all of our youth? ALL deserve to have their needs met so that these incredible and courageous young people can achieve their dreams and become healthy, happy, and contributing members of our society. These are our future teachers, parents, and leaders and we cannot afford to leave even one of them behind.

Programs and services receiving federal funding must be inclusive of all youth. Congress can start by passing the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act to ensure that all youth are protected in the vital programs that it would reauthorize. The time to act is now, because homeless youth don't have the time for us to wait until tomorrow.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment to Senator CORNYN's bill, S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

Under current law, there are many trafficking victims who, even after gaining freedom from their captors, have to live their lives stuck with a criminal record because of things they were forced to do in captivity.

Imagine being freed from the hell of sexual slavery only to find yourself unable to get a job or stable housing because the law considers you a criminal.

My amendment, the Federal Criminal Procedure Post-Conviction Relief For Victims of Trafficking Act, would vacate the criminal convictions of trafficking victims who were forced to break the law while they were trafficked. It would expunge the criminal records of trafficking victims and it would give trafficking victims a chance to restart their lives without stigma and without a criminal record.

These boys and girls were snatched into captivity. They were forced into sexual slavery, and they were denied the freedom to make their own decisions, including the chance to say no to committing a crime.

These victims are not criminals. Their bodies are scarred. Their memories are shaken by trauma. The least Congress can do is give them the dignity of a clean record and a new chance to lead a fulfilling life. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I also wish to urge my colleagues to support a bill Senator RUBIO and I introduced called the Strengthening the Child Welfare Response to Trafficking Act. This bill would require each State to develop a plan to protect young victims of labor and sex trafficking from falling back into captivity after they have escaped.

As it stands now, many of the various services and programs that are meant to keep children from these dangerous, oppressive cycles are failing to do their jobs. Instead of being protected and comforted as victims of violent crime, young trafficking survivors are sent into the juvenile justice system and treated as criminals—as if it were their own fault and their own choice that they were held in captivity and forced into exploitation. This is just not the case.

This bill would give American children better trained protective service workers, better lines of communication

between victims and protective services, and better data on where trafficking crimes are actually occurring, how often, and whom traffickers are targeting.

I commend my colleagues for bringing this issue of human trafficking so boldly to the Senate floor, and I encourage everyone in this Chamber to support these legislative efforts to solve our country's trafficking problem.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 284 TO AMENDMENT NO. 271

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk, Vitter amendment No. 284, to Portman amendment No. 271, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 284 to amendment No. 271.

Mr. VITTER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. CITIZENSHIP AT BIRTH FOR CERTAIN PERSONS BORN IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "The following";

(2) by redesignating subsections (a) through (h) as paragraphs (1) through (8), respectively, and indenting such paragraphs, as redesignated, an additional 2 ems to the right; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) DEFINITION.—Acknowledging the right of birthright citizenship established by section 1 of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a person born in the United States shall be considered 'subject to the jurisdiction' of the United States for purposes of subsection (a)(1) only if the person is born in the United States and at least 1 of the person's parents is—

"(1) a citizen or national of the United States;

"(2) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States whose residence is in the United States; or

"(3) an alien performing active service in the armed forces (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code)."

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The amendment made by subsection (a)(3) may not be construed to affect the citizenship or nationality status of any person born before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **SEVERABILITY.**—If any provision of this section or any amendment made by this section, or any application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the provisions of this Act and the amendments made by this Act and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this is the same amendment I presented—tried to present—and discussed on the floor of the Senate yesterday. It addresses a very serious problem with our broken immigration system as well as a problem that leads to serious abuse and trafficking, which is why it is certainly relevant and pertinent in this ongoing discussion of the bill on the floor.

First of all, let me again compliment Senator CORNYN and everyone who has joined him on a bipartisan basis in support of his antihuman trafficking amendment. I think that underlying bill is very positive and very significant. I certainly fully support it, apart from how my amendment fares. Obviously I hope my now second-degree amendment to the Portman amendment is adopted, but I certainly support this underlying effort, which is very important.

As I said, my amendment pertains to birthright citizenship and the fact that that now acts as an enormous magnet to increase and encourage illegal crossings into our country. It also has spawned an entire subculture and industry, quite frankly, that has given rise to significant abuse—often very dangerous and horrific conditions for the women and families who are caught in it.

Yesterday, as part of my floor statement, I submitted for the RECORD several news reports that underscored these cases of abuse. This came to light in part because of the raid by Federal agencies just within the last few weeks of these so-called birth tourism businesses, and those Federal raids uncovered some truly grizzly situations in California and elsewhere that underscore my point.

This ad, which is an ad on behalf of one of these birth tourism companies in China, also underscores my point. The Presiding Officer and I couldn't come up with a cartoon such as this and call it fiction if we were challenged to, but this is real. This is an actual cartoon ad enticing birth mothers in China to go to the United States, to come back with their baby having been born in the United States, and the baby wrapped in the American flag means automatic U.S. citizen. That of course triggers all sorts of significant benefits and opportunities for the immediate family of that baby to in the future

come to the United States and become citizens.

This birthright citizenship has clearly mushroomed into a significant problem and a significant form of abuse of our immigration system.

According to the Center for Immigration Studies, every year about 300,000 to 400,000 children are born to illegal aliens in the United States, and under this practice—and I underscore “practice”—of birthright citizenship—and I will come back to that word because it is not mandated by the Constitution—they automatically are recognized as U.S. citizens simply and purely because of the physical location of their physical birth.

I said “practice” for a reason. It is not mandated by the Constitution as opposed to what we hear on a regular basis. It isn't even mandated by statutory law. It is the practice of several administrations, including this one. It is a very uncommon practice if we look worldwide. Only Canada, among advanced or industrialized countries, follows this practice along with the United States. No other advanced or industrialized country—for instance, no European country—follows this practice of counting folks, giving them citizenship based purely on the fact, on the accident of the location of their physical birth.

My amendment would change this. It would simply say a person can only be a citizen if they were born in this country and at least one parent is a U.S. citizen or a legal, valid green card holder or a serving member of the U.S. military. That is a commonsense rule that I think the vast—in fact, I know from public polling and other means—the vast majority of Americans of all stripes, of all walks of life, and of both parties support.

Again, let me be clear. My amendment would say a child born in this country is a U.S. citizen if they are born in this country and at least one of the parents is a U.S. citizen or a valid green card holder or a member of the U.S. military.

If there is any policy reason why that rule is unreasonable, I would love to hear it. I have been promoting this debate, I have been pushing this change of policy for several years now, and I have never heard a real debate on the policy, on the merits. There are lots of excuses that people don't want to bring this up, don't want to have a vote, but I have never heard a real debate and objection on the merits.

That being said, let me move to one of the excuses, and the most popular excuse given is that somehow this is embedded in the Constitution—specifically, the 14th Amendment—and we can't change this absent a constitutional amendment. I am absolutely convinced that is not true, and I will explain why.

The first reason I think we can glean that it is not true is the language of

the 14th Amendment. That is a good place to start, right? We are talking about the 14th Amendment. We are talking about a specific constitutional provision, so let's start by going there and see what it says. Does it say everyone physically born in this country is a U.S. citizen, period? No, it does not. So what does it say? It extends citizenship to “all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof.” The key phrase is “and subject to the jurisdiction thereof.”

As the Presiding Officer knows, our Founding Fathers, including our later Founding Fathers who came up with the language of the 14th Amendment, chose their words carefully, and it is a fundamental rule of either constitutional or statutory construction that any word there, any phrase there must be there for a reason. It is not there just to add extra words without adding meaning.

So that phrase absolutely has to mean something. It has to be there for a reason. When we look at the history of the 14th Amendment, the debate, the discussion in Congress, it is very clear it was there for a reason. It was there to exclude persons born in the United States who had allegiance, who had some calling to another country. Specifically, the folks participating in that debate talking about this language said, We are not including American Indians; they have an allegiance to the tribe. We are not including aliens. Aliens—that word was broadly used. We are not including aliens. That certainly includes in today's language illegal aliens who have an allegiance to another country. They are citizens of another country. We are not including the children of diplomats who happen to be born here during their diplomat parents' stay. They clearly are citizens of another country. They have an allegiance to another country.

This line of thought was further elucidated by court decisions. In fact, there is a specific court decision with regard to American Indians. The Court directly said in that case, no, the 14th Amendment does not make American Indian children automatically U.S. citizens—based on the specific language I am citing. Because of that, it wasn't until the Indian Citizenship Act of 1924 was passed, explicitly making those children American citizens, that they became American citizens. Much more recently, respected jurists such as Judge Richard Posner of the Seventh Circuit wrote in a 2003 case:

Congress would not be flouting the Constitution if it amended the Immigration and Nationality Act to put an end to the nonsense.

Talking specifically about birthright citizenship. So I hope we get through these excuses, these flawed constitutional arguments, these flawed arguments. Really, they are excuses to

avoid the debate, to avoid the issue, to avoid giving any reason why we should not go to the rule I am proposing. Why we should, in fact, recognize any child physically born in this country as automatically a U.S. citizen, even if neither parent is a citizen, neither parent is here in the country legally, neither parent is a green card holder, neither parent is a serving member of the U.S. Armed Services.

As I explained at the beginning, this is a very real, in fact, exploding phenomenon. There is a whole industry, an underworld, that is selling so-called birth tourism. This ridiculous but true cartoon is an example. This acts as a magnet—a potent, powerful magnet growing in power by the year to lure more and more folks to come across the border in specific cases to have their babies here, 300,000 to 400,000 per year.

In the last few weeks, as I mentioned earlier, there was a raid by the relevant Federal agencies on some of these underworld and trafficking operations related to birth tourism. It hit the news. It made significant news, as it should have. It was a significant law enforcement action. I applaud that action. It is a dangerous element. It is an underworld, usually criminal elements in the midst of that, oftentimes abusing the women and children who have been placed into their hands.

Clearly, the most effective way to put an immediate end to all of this is not simply conducting a law enforcement raid once every 5 years or once every 3 years or even once a week. Clearly, the most effective way to end this is to end the practice of birthright citizenship. That is what my amendment—now a second-degree amendment pending to the Portman amendment—would do.

I urge all of my colleagues to put an end to this nonsense, as Judge Posner said in his dicta, to set our policy straight, to adopt the commonsense position of the vast majority of the American people, to adopt the same policy of every advanced industrialized country now save us and Canada, and to adopt this language on the present bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I want to talk about the bill we are looking at now, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Certainly there is nothing more hideous, nothing more morally offensive than the sexual exploitation of a human being. Take that exploitation today at a level that happens over and over again with children and with adults. This is modern-day slavery. It exists right here in our country and all over the world. Slavery officially ended in the United States 150 years ago. Worldwide there may be more people involved in enslaved activ-

ity and labor or in sex trafficking than at any other time.

According to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, at least 100,000 American children each year are victims of commercial child prostitution, child trafficking, other children brought to this country. Certainly this is not a tragedy that is isolated in the United States. In fact, it is worse than other places, but it is unacceptable in all places.

Women and children, especially young girls, are advertised online where buyers purchase them with ease, generally with anonymity, and usually with impunity. We are told this happens in most cities in our country and in every State in our country. But this fight against sex trafficking and labor trafficking isn't just a law enforcement issue, it is a human rights issue, and we should take it as seriously as we possibly can take anything.

That is why I was pleased to join Senator CORNYN and Senator AYOTTE and others in cosponsoring and supporting the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This act would provide law enforcement, the courts, and antitrafficking task forces with the necessary tools to help them track down traffickers; and it would also help victims restore their lives.

Last year we were able to pass the continuation of the Victims of Child Abuse Act, of which in our State we have 22 centers. We have hundreds of centers in the country where the beginning of restoration comes with that first interview, that first determination. We are putting this behind us and moving forward. That same thing needs to happen with victims of exploitation. This bill helps victims of trafficking who are often invisible, often underserved, often unknown by anybody in the community where they have been taken except a person who somehow has seized control of them and the people with whom that person deals.

This bill would create grants for State and local governments to develop comprehensive systems to address these crimes and to provide services for the victims of these crimes. This legislation would allow wiretaps obtained through State courts to be used to stop child sex trafficking. This would train Federal prosecutors and judges on the importance of requesting and ordering restitution.

In the last few days we passed a law that hopefully will wind up on the President's desk so there could be some compensation for victims of child pornography. We need to have that same kind of restitution and seizing of assets of these criminals who use people in this way, and this bill allows some of those things to happen. It trains law enforcement on the physical and mental services that are immediately necessary, and necessary in a longer term, for victims of trafficking.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act has been endorsed by 200 advocacy groups. Those would include the NAACP, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Rights4Girls, the National Association to Protect Children, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Conference of State Legislators. We need to get this done.

The elimination of sex trafficking has to be also focused on the demand side. Without the buyers and facilitators, sex trafficking wouldn't happen. Labor trafficking wouldn't happen unless there were buyers of that unwilling labor. Neither of these things should be allowed to continue. This bill deals with this topic in our country. I know the Foreign Relations Committee is looking at what we can do to encourage the elimination of this travesty and tragedy all over the world.

We have to take a stand against this modern-day slavery. This is a problem that I hope we see Senators on both sides of the aisle step up to in the next few days and hopefully this week and figure out how to serve.

REMEMBERING TOM SCHWEICH

Madam President, this is the first chance I have had to be on the floor since I attended a memorial service a week ago yesterday in our State memorializing the life of our State auditor, Tom Schweich. Tom Schweich was very smart. He was very capable. He was very good at his job. He had a wonderful family. He had established such a record as State auditor that at the end of his first term, Tom Schweich, a Republican, wasn't even opposed by a Democrat. I think it was the first time in our State since the 1880s that the Democrats had not offered a candidate for any State office.

Sometimes people with great capacity and great opportunity can face challenges that others do not see. Tom's family is missing him. His friends are missing him. Missouri will miss him but certainly benefited from his good work. I am thinking today, as I have every day since I heard the news of his death, about the service he provided, the lost opportunity of not having him with us any longer, and I am thinking about his family.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I first want to thank my colleagues who are continuing to work on this very important issue of sex trafficking, Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and Senator LEAHY, the ranking member, who

has long been working on this issue and has a very important bill of his own related to this, as well as Senator CORNYN. Senator CORNYN and I have worked together on the sex trafficking issue for the past year. We are cosponsors of each other's bills. We have worked in the past on other judiciary issues, including a successful bill on prescription drug take-backs, where we just recently were able to get the rules out and got to work on that very important issue. I thank him for his good work. We continue to work on the bill, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. We know there are some major issues that have come up, and we continue to look for a path forward on that issue.

I do want to point out that sometimes in all of the disagreements, what gets lost is the good that needs to be done and why this bill is so important. It would support victims by taking fines and criminal assets from convicted human traffickers and directing them toward services and treatment to help these victims restore their lives.

I know as a prosecutor in my former job that if people get the help they need—if they can go to a shelter and they have an alternative to a pimp—they will have a fighting chance of getting their life together again and not going back into that cycle of violence.

They also, by doing this—and we have done a lot of this in Minnesota—if we give them the support they need, then they will testify against the person who is running that sex trafficking ring, against the perpetrator. We had a 40-year sentence last year in St. Paul, MN, against someone who was running a sex trafficking ring. That was because we were able to provide the support the victims need, and that is what Senator CORNYN's bill is about. It doesn't only help victims, as I said, it also helps law enforcement and ensures that the criminals, including johns, are brought to justice under our law because a financial transaction should not mask a sexual assault or rape on a child.

I think people often think of sex trafficking as something that is just happening in another country, in another part of the world. It is, in fact, the third largest enterprise in the world. First is illegal drugs, then illegal guns, and then the illegal trafficking of people, primarily kids. That is going on in our world right now. But what people don't always expect is that in the United States, when we have sex trafficking cases, 83 percent of the victims are from our own country. Eighty-three percent of the victims are from the oil patches in North Dakota, from the streets of Minneapolis, and from the hills of West Virginia. This is happening in our country right now.

That is why this pair of bills, Senator CORNYN's bill and the bill I have—the safe harbor bill that passed through

the Judiciary Committee unanimously last week—is designed to focus on domestic trafficking. It does have international implications because if we do our job and we show as a country that we take this seriously, it will help us partner with other countries.

Senator HEITKAMP, Cindy McCain, and I went down to Mexico last spring to focus on partnering with Mexico. They have been enormous help in some of the Federal prosecutions for sex trafficking rings we have had in our country—girls who have been brought across the border from Mexico. They have helped with that. We have met with the Attorney General as well as the head of their Federal Police on more work that can be done.

But just think about what is happening right now in our country. Just in the last few weeks, five St. Paul, MN, residents were charged with running a multistate sex trafficking ring. One of the alleged victims was 16 years old. Last month a man was indicted in Federal court under the leadership of our U.S. attorney in Minnesota. What was he indicted for? He was indicted for trafficking a 12-year-old girl, a young girl in Rochester, MN, who got a text that said: Come to a party. The girl shows up where she is supposed to go; it is the parking lot of a McDonald's. She gets shoved in the car, along with her friend. They are brought up to the Twin Cities. The man rapes her and takes sexually explicit pictures of her and puts them on Craigslist. The next day she is sold to two guys, and she is raped by those two men. That happened in Minnesota. The charges were just filed.

The average age of a victim of sex trafficking is 12 years old—not old enough to go to a high school prom, not old enough to drive. That is what is happening in our country right now.

What can we do? Well, I discussed Senator CORNYN's bill and the importance of that bill. I hope we can work through these issues. There is also the other bill, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. That would make sure victims of sex trafficking, like the 12-year-old Rochester girl, are treated as victims. This is a bill that passed through the Judiciary Committee. I thank 26 of my colleagues across the Senate for cosponsoring this bill. It has been an honor to work with them, with Senator CORNYN as the Republican lead.

I appreciate the help of the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the Fraternal Order of Police, Shared Hope International, and the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence.

This bill is different from the bill we have in front of us on the floor, but it has the same focus. What this bill does is it says: Let's look at some of these models that have worked across the

country. One of them is my State, and it is called the safe harbor law. What it does is that when States do this, they basically aren't prosecuting these 12-year-old or 15-year-old girls or 16-year-old boys; they are seeing them as victims, and then they give them the kinds of services they need. A version of this bill, led by ERIK PAULSEN, one of my Republican Congressmen, passed through the House last year. I know the Presiding Officer was there at that time. So I feel good about this bill's chances in the House as well as in the Senate.

Fifteen States across the country already have these safe harbor laws, and another 12 States are making good progress in the direction that we need, so we are not starting from scratch. What the bill does is simply give incentives for States to adopt these kinds of laws.

The bill also creates a national strategy to combat human trafficking which would encourage cooperation and coordination among all the agencies that work on the problem—Federal, State, tribal, and local. Our law enforcement officers and prosecutors, as I mentioned, have to work together on this issue at all levels, but law enforcement can't do it alone. We need to make sure we are giving them the right support, and that is what this national strategy is about.

Other parts of the bill include allowing victims of sex trafficking to be eligible for the Job Corps program to help them get back on their feet.

I am also pleased to have included in this safe harbor bill, in the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, a provision that Senators WHITEHOUSE and SESSIONS worked on that got included in our bill to clarify the authority of the U.S. Marshals Service to assist local law enforcement agencies in locating missing children.

I also know Senator LEAHY and Senator COLLINS have a very important bill that I am a cosponsor of, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, which we would like to be considered either as a part of this bill, if we can work out these other issues, or on its own. It is a very important bill.

I have been very impressed by the bipartisan work we have done today. I was also very excited when all the women Senators, including the Presiding Officer, came together and asked for a hearing under Senator GRASSLEY's and Senator LEAHY's leadership. We had a very good hearing, and I think we can move from there.

This is one of those issues which people haven't talked about a lot in our country for a long time. I think one of the reasons it has come to the forefront is because of the Internet—something we love. More and more of these kinds of purchases can be made behind closed doors and out of the jurisdiction

of any law enforcement officers if they don't see it happening. Well, that is what happened with that 12-year-old girl in Rochester; she just received a text.

This is not only going to take Congress getting the bills done, it will also take the work of the private sector. I have been impressed by the work by our hotels and transportation companies, places such as the Radisson hotels and our various transportation companies that have really stepped up and trained their employees because they are on the frontlines, they can look for problems, and they can report them to law enforcement. That is something which we can not legislate; that is something which is just happening.

I know there are a number of amendments—some I like and some I do not. I hope we can work through those as well.

I thank the Presiding Officer and thank all of those—especially Senator LEAHY, whose chair I am temporarily filling here on the floor, as he has spent a lot of time watching over this bill the last 2 days. I again thank Senator CORNYN for his good work.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO BRIAN PHILLIPS

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a gentleman from Rosebud, TX, who has helped this Senator from Utah on occasions too numerous to count and in ways impossible to measure. For over 4 years Brian Phillips has dutifully served as my communications director. As he prepares to pursue new opportunities, I want to pause and acknowledge his service to me, to my office, to the people of Utah, and to our Nation.

The role of communications director in a Senate office is not for the faint of heart nor is it for the arrogant or overconfident. Many believe the job of a communications director is to rack up style points, political positioning, and positive spin. I have learned from Brian that a true communications director is laser-focused on substance, rock solid in his principles, and devoted to creating a space for people to hear and understand a message. He has expanded my view of what communication truly is and what it can be—what it should be.

Brian brought to my office the grittiness of his Texas roots, his passion from years on the campaign trail, the wisdom of one who has been tested in tough times, and the vision of a conservative reformer who has seen the

view from higher up. I am certain there were times when Brian wondered what in the world he had gotten himself into with a freshman Senator and a ragtag team from Utah. I am also certain we are all better in what we do because he was willing to stand with us.

Brian is more than a communications director. He is a trusted counselor. I trust Brian's assessment of complex situations and count on his counsel to navigate challenging circumstances and to maximize seemingly hidden opportunities. No one has prepared me better to answer hard questions or deliver vital messages at critical moments. I would put Brian's uncanny sixth sense—his "Spidey" sense, as he calls it—about what lurks around corners up against anyone's communications professional anywhere. Brian is a master at leading people into strategic thinking, sometimes through heated discussions, but always to the higher ground of meaningful dialog.

Brian is comfortable with and capable of engaging people from across the professional and personal spectrum. I have watched him work with Senators and staff, with interns and individual Utahns, jaded journalists and passionate groups of grass-roots activists. He sets everyone at ease, provides an honest assessment, pushes when needed, pulls when necessary, and through pushes, pulls, nudges, and shoves, gets everyone to the best possible place. To watch him work is extraordinary.

There are many in this town who simply look out for themselves. There are many who judge their success by their own headlines, bylines, and story lines. I am most thankful that Brian Phillips put me and my staff, along with the people of Utah and the people of this Nation, ahead of his own interests. Because he put others first, he has created a legacy that will last.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, we are here today and apparently this week to discuss legislation pending before the Senate, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

We have a serious problem in this country and around the globe in regard to human trafficking. This legislation is an issue that needs to be addressed and ought not be delayed. In fact, many from across the country are asking us to do just that, including hundreds of Kansans who are concerned about the rights of individuals, the rights of women and men across the country. Congress has legislation now

pending that seems to me to be very straightforward and common sense in trying to eliminate this scourge from our country.

I want to highlight what I think is unfortunately developing in the Senate. I would refer back to the elections of November 2014, in which, I thought, at least one of the messages the American people delivered to us through their votes was a desire to see that legislation—particularly legislation such as this—be addressed, that the Senate consider it, amendments be offered, votes be taken, and ultimately legislation be approved or disapproved by the Senate. Unfortunately, we still find ourselves in a position in which we are unable to move forward on this legislation to consider amendments.

I would guess that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would indicate that when the Republicans were in the minority they from time to time blocked consideration of legislation pending. I would tell you, that in my view, when I was a participant in that process, it was because of the belief that we would have no opportunity to offer amendments to legislation then pending. What I want to see is how the Senate can process legislation, and what I want is for every Member of the Senate to have the opportunity to offer amendments, to have them considered, to be voted on, and that right should exist for every Republican Senator and every Democratic Senator. We should be in a position in which we can resolve our differences not by blocking the consideration of an important piece of legislation but by taking a vote on an amendment offered by a Senator from a State here in the United States and that the Senators have an opportunity to present their case, votes be taken, and issues be resolved. Unfortunately, we are in a position where we are even unable to consider this legislation, and I would ask that this circumstance come to an end.

Again, in my view, a message from November 2014—the last time voters spoke in the United States—was, could we at least have a Congress that can function, that can consider issues, and where votes can be cast and decisions made. We find ourselves one more time in a situation in which we are unable even to get to the bill to enable that consideration to occur.

At least as stated in the press, there is an argument about a provision in the legislation. I would again say that if there is a provision in the legislation, despite the fact that it was unanimously approved by the committee—every Republican and Democrat voted for it. And now there is this claim that they are opposed to that. If you are opposed to something, the way to solve it is not to block consideration of the bill. The way to solve it is to allow the bill to be considered, and if you oppose something in the bill, offer an amendment, have a debate, and let the votes



decide here on the Senate floor whether that provision should remain in or be removed.

That provision that people are indicating is causing problems is one that is related to the public funding of abortions. It is a provision that has been law since the 1970s. It was voted on many times in the Senate, and 23 Senators voted for that provision in a spending bill in 2014—just last year.

It appears we are manufacturing problems that don't really exist. This provision was in the bill when the committee considered it, when the committee approved it. Now as we bring this bipartisan bill to the Senate floor, there are those who are saying we can't consider it because this provision is included. I would indicate that the idea of public funding—the use of taxpayer dollars to support abortion—is disapproved by 7 out of 10 Americans. This is not a radical kind of issue or proposal. But my point is that we should have the opportunity to debate this and every other item within the bill, reach a conclusion, and move forward on a piece of legislation that is important in trying to protect the lives and safety of people across our country, particularly women and children.

So my plea to my colleagues is this. Could we again get to the point where the Senate functions, where we debate bills, votes are taken, and issues of importance are considered. I hope I learn later today that is the case—that we can move forward in resolution of this legislation.

I am here to indicate I oppose public funding of abortion. I support the trafficking legislation now pending. But I will never have the opportunity to demonstrate that because we are at a point in which no legislation is able to be considered.

Madam President, I thank you for the opportunity to address the Senate.

I notice the Senator from Wyoming is on the floor, and I would be happy to yield the floor for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I agree entirely with my friend, the Senator from Kansas, and I thank him for his leadership and thoughtful deliberation on this matter.

I would like for a moment to talk about this bill that is on the floor, S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I have an amendment that I am offering today on human trafficking in Indian Country. I will tell you that human trafficking is widespread in Indian Country, and we have to do everything we can to stop it. Violent crime rates against women and girls in Native American communities are far higher than the national averages. This amendment delivers help to trafficking survivors and gives tribes the resources they need to battle human trafficking in their own back-

yards. This amendment has broad support and is a vital addition to the bill on the floor today.

My amendment would provide tribes the opportunity to access funding for recovery programs for survivors and special training for local law enforcement in order to combat human trafficking specifically in Indian Country. This amendment would allow Indian tribes to be able to compete for resources for programs to prevent human trafficking. It would provide for training for local tribal law enforcement so they would be better able to track trafficking activities. These trainings and additional resources will better equip the tribal resources to better spot human trafficking in local communities and to act quickly to respond.

This funding would also help the survivors of sex and labor trafficking in their recovery. Programs such as this assist survivors in human trafficking and enable them to begin to heal and restore their lives. The bill, S. 178, allows for more protections for victims of human trafficking in our country, and my amendment would extend those protections to the tribes in Indian Country as well.

OBAMACARE

Madam President, I noticed earlier today the minority leader as well as the minority whip on the Senate floor talking about the President's health care law.

I would like to point out that the Congressional Budget Office released a report Monday about the Obama health care law—ObamaCare. I see the White House is actually championing the report. They call it great news for America.

Let's be clear. This report contains significant amounts of bad news for people—bad news for people who signed up on the ObamaCare exchanges for getting their health insurance coverage.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office predicts that health care premiums will increase more than 8 percent a year this coming year for ObamaCare enrollees. They also predict it will increase 8 percent next year for ObamaCare enrollees through the exchange for the benchmark plan, and they predict it will increase another 8 percent a year after that. Most Americans can't afford to pay 8 percent more a year in premiums each and every year, which is what the Congressional Budget Office is proposing, but you don't hear the Democrats on the floor talking about that.

Wasn't it the President of the United States who said that premium rates would go down for families by \$2,500 a year?

Isn't it so that many Senators on the other side of the aisle came to the floor and said rates would go down. NANCY PELOSI said they would go down for everyone. Why are the Democrats not

mentioning what the CBO is saying, that year after year after year the rates are going to go up 8 percent, another 8 percent, another 8 percent?

So we know the reality of what is happening to people all across the country, which is why this health care law continues to be unpopular, unaffordable, and unworkable. So I think it is time for the White House to stop celebrating and start thinking about the people who have been impacted specifically by this expensive and unworkable piece of legislation.

I found it interesting that on Monday, the Secretary of Health and Human Services held an event to celebrate the number of people who had signed up for coverage this year. Secretary Burwell said she was "pleased with the results to date." She repeated the administration's sound bite about the health care law working.

Well, that is not what I am hearing from people at home in Wyoming. It is not what I am hearing from my friends, neighbors, and patients. As a doctor who has been taking care of patients in Wyoming for 25 years, I talk to lots of patients every weekend at home. It is also not what I read in the papers. Papers all across the country, from the east coast to the west coast, talk about hard working Americans who have been devastated by the impacts of this terrible health care law. It seems that every day there is more bad news about more ways that ObamaCare is hurting American families and failing to live up to the many promises made by the President and the Democrats in this body who voted for it—the promises they made.

When you take a look at the Congressional Budget Office's new estimates of how many people are going to sign up for ObamaCare this year, they had originally said there would be 14 million people who would sign up for ObamaCare plans by the end of the year. Now they have dropped that number down to 11 million people. So it is not a surprise when fewer people—3 million fewer people—sign up, that it is going to cost the taxpayers less than the very high number they were expecting to have to pay. So that number has dropped, but it is because fewer people are choosing to sign up for the Obama health care plan. Is the Obama administration pleased that the President's health care law is so much less popular with the public than the President and Democrats expected it to be?

As I talk about some of the stories that are coming out from the east to the west coast, I would like to start with a story from the Portland Press Herald newspaper in Portland, ME. On February 27, the headline was: "Many insured under Affordable Care Act taking a hit at tax time."

The article tells the story of Diana Newman, who lives in Southwest Harbor. She had ObamaCare insurance last



year. She went to file her taxes a few weeks ago. The article says that “she got a \$400 surprise.” That is how much she owed on her taxes specifically because of the new health care law. She told the newspaper that her tax troubles are just another stumbling block in what she said was a long, difficult year trying to figure out how to use and how to pay for her new insurance.

She said: “At the end of all this confusion, I was hit with hundreds of dollars at tax time.” She said: “It’s frightening.”

Frightening—that is how somebody whom the President is claiming has been helped by the law is describing the impact on her life. It is frightening. It turns out she was one of almost a million people who got bad information from the government about their tax forms.

Well, that just made things more confusing for her. She said: “At this point, I don’t know what to think. I may owe more, or less, or about the same.”

Is the Obama administration—and all the Democrats who voted for this health care law—pleased about the way it is frightening this woman in Maine? I don’t hear the Senate minority leader or the whip talking about that.

Does the administration think that ObamaCare is working for Diana Newman?

The tax preparation company H&R Block says that more than half of their clients—more than half of their clients—have had their refunds reduced because of the health care law. On average H&R Block says their customers owe the IRS an extra \$530. That is a lot of money for hard-working taxpayers. A lot of people count on getting that tax refund to help them pay their bills this time of year.

Is the Obama administration pleased to see the IRS take another \$530 from hard-working American families? Some of these people who owe money to the IRS didn’t sign up for ObamaCare insurance at all last year.

Many are now finding out for the first time that they owe a tax penalty because the health care law’s mandate says they have to buy health insurance and not just necessarily insurance that works for them and their family and their family’s needs. Oh, no, the mandate states they have to buy insurance. President Obama says works for them, even though they know it doesn’t work for them. It may be too much insurance or insurance they don’t need, don’t want, can’t afford, and they don’t have the freedom or flexibility to even make that choice. President Obama says he knows what is best for them because they don’t.

The problem is that by the time many of these people figured that out, it was already too late to sign up for ObamaCare insurance for this year so now they are getting taxed—penalized.

People who didn’t understand the tax penalties feel as though the Obama administration has pulled a fast one on them.

Again, as we approach the 5-year anniversary, ObamaCare continues to be unpopular with the American people. There is so much anger about the timing of the tax issues that the administration had to backtrack and allow extra time for people to sign up this year.

The President made a YouTube video saying the deadline was February 15. February 15 came and went, and then the President said: Well, we better open it up again. This President is making it up as he goes along. We have seen it time and time again with this President and this law. He is making it up as he goes along.

Is the Obama administration pleased with this confusion and anger that a lot of Americans are feeling because of the IRS penalties?

It is not just Washington that is causing trouble for people who have to sign up for the President’s health care. We are seeing bad news all across America.

I talked about Maine earlier. Let’s go over to the other coast. Let’s go to Oregon. Oregon tried to set up its own health insurance exchange. They did such an awful job that not one single person was ever able to sign up on the State Web site—not one, no one. People had to fill out paper applications if they wanted to try to buy insurance last year.

How much did it cost the State to set up this exchange where not one person was able to buy insurance from the Web site? It cost taxpayers \$248 million.

Last Friday the Governor of Oregon officially gave up. He signed a law dissolving the State exchange. Oregon will just use the Federal Government’s exchange and the Federal Web site.

Does the Obama administration think that the failed Web site and the wasting of \$248 million in taxpayer money is a sign that the health care law is working? Is this administration pleased with the way Oregon’s ObamaCare exchange wasted nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars? That is one State alone.

Just next door in Washington State, they are having troubles of their own. There was an article in *The Hill* newspaper here in Washington, DC, on February 25 titled “State’s ObamaCare overcharges 13K.” There were 13,000 people overcharged in the State’s ObamaCare exchange in Washington State.

According to the article, the Washington State ObamaCare exchange said it withdrew the incorrect amount of money from the bank accounts of 13,000 people. Think about that in reference to your own checking account, where there may be an automatic withdrawal

based on a cable bill, cell phone bill or whatever. Many people—13,000 in this case in Washington State—had an incorrect withdrawal from the Washington State ObamaCare exchange. It says that some of the people say that more than three times the correct amount was withdrawn for their monthly premium for health insurance.

Can you imagine if the electric company or one of the utilities—your cell phone provider or your cable company—withdrew three times the amount expected from your checking account for that monthly bill. For some people that glitch in the State system probably meant their accounts were going to end up overdrawn.

Even if the States get the problem fixed right away, that is an alarming failure by that ObamaCare exchange.

Is the Obama administration pleased with the anxiety the exchange is causing 13,000 people in Washington State? These are just a few of the ways ObamaCare is not living up to the promises that Democrats and the administration made to the American people.

Later this month, on March 23, we will hit the fifth anniversary of President Obama signing this health care bill into law. If Monday’s event with Secretary Burwell was any indication, the White House is going to throw a celebration. Once again they will say they are pleased and they will say ObamaCare is working. The Obama administration should not be pleased with its health care law. The Obama administration, and every Democrat who voted for it, should be embarrassed by it.

It is not what Democrats promised, and it is not what people wanted. People wanted something very simple when it came to their health care and health care reform. People want the care they need, from a doctor they choose, at a lower cost, and that is what Republicans in the Senate are planning to give them.

We can do it without a 2,000-page law, and we can do it without all of the negative side effects of ObamaCare. That will be health care reform worth celebrating.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senator LEAHY, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, in explaining an amendment we have filed, amendment No. 290, to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking

Act. I wish to take this opportunity to thank Senators AYOTTE, MURKOWSKI, HEITKAMP, and BALDWIN for also cosponsoring our amendment and for their strong support.

Our amendment would reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs which expired in 2013. These three programs—the Street Outreach Program, the Basic Center Program, and the Transitional Living Program—have helped thousands of our homeless youth meet their immediate needs and provide long-term residential services for those who, sadly, cannot be safely reunited with their families.

The Street Outreach Program helps homeless and runaway youth find stable housing and connects them with the treatment, counseling, and crisis prevention they need. A central goal of this program is to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse.

The Basic Center Program helps community-based providers meet the basic needs of shelter, food, and clothing for homeless youth.

The Transitional Living Program supports long-term housing services that help our homeless youth enter stable living environments and develop critical life skills.

The amendment Senator LEAHY and I and our cosponsors are offering complements the underlying bill by addressing prevention, intervention, and recovery services for the victims of sex trafficking—particularly among one of the most vulnerable populations, and that is our homeless youth. According to the Institute of Medicine and the National Resource Council, homelessness is one of the most common risk factors for sex trafficking. Without access to food, shelter, and social supports, homeless youth too often turn to what is termed survival sex—a way to trade sex for a place to sleep and other basic necessities. Another recent report found that one in four homeless youth are victims of sex trafficking or engaged in survival sex. Approximately 48 percent of homeless youth have done so because they did not have a safe place to stay. Our amendment strengthens the existing programs by ensuring that service providers know how to identify trafficking victims and give these youth the support they need.

In Maine, our homeless shelters are critical partners in the fight to end human trafficking. In Portland, the Preble Street Resource Center has used Runaway and Homeless Youth Act resources to connect young people who need food, safe shelter, health services, and educational support with those who can provide those services. The Preble Street Anti-Trafficking Coalition is currently helping approximately 50 trafficking victims—whose ages range from 15 to 42—start new lives. There are more than 1.6 million homeless teens in the United States, an astonishing number. A growing number

of homeless youth identify as LGBT, and it is estimated that up to 40 percent of runaway and homeless youth are LGBT. Our amendment would also ensure that those seeking services through these Federal programs are not denied assistance based on their race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability. All homeless young people need access to safe beds at night and services during the day so they will never have to choose between selling their bodies and a safe place to sleep.

The stand-alone bill on which our amendment is based was reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary during the last Congress with an overwhelmingly strong bipartisan vote of 15 to 3. It has the support of nearly 270 organizations, including service providers, anti-trafficking advocates, and many faith-based organizations that serve homeless youth each and every day. Covenant House, the largest service provider for runaway and homeless youth, strongly supports our reauthorization of these programs.

Let me thank Senator LEAHY for working so hard and for working to incorporate important feedback into our amendment, such as applying the non-discrimination clause only to the runaway and homeless youth programs and clarifying the continued ability to provide sex-specific shelters and programming, such as all-girls shelters or all-male shelters.

Let me take this opportunity to also commend Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR for their work on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, a bill I have proudly cosponsored. The policies and tools included in this bill are important pieces of the Federal response to the horrific crime of human trafficking. Congress must do more to provide law enforcement with the tools it needs to pursue to end sex trafficking and to also support preventive programs such as the runaway and homeless youth programs that help those who fall victim to traffickers. In many ways our bill is the bookend for the bill that is pending on the Senate floor because it focuses on the service end in helping those who are most vulnerable, our young people.

By providing homeless young people with the support and services they need, we can help prevent them from ever being trafficked in the first place. The runaway and homeless youth programs have provided a lifeline and housing for America's homeless and for its human trafficked youth for 40 years. They are a vital tool in addressing these serious problems. I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I want to thank the distinguished senior

Senator from Maine, my New England neighbor, for her comments, speaking on Leahy-Collins amendment No. 290. She and I and others have worked on this for a very long time. In her comments, she talked about shelters for homeless teens, and I think about how much better this whole country would be if this homeless teen could turn to a shelter and not to a trafficker.

As I said earlier on the floor, traffickers often find their victims soon after they runaway or become homeless.

In a couple of States, such as mine and the Senator from Maine's, especially at this time of year, people need shelter or they die. They literally die in a relatively short period of time from the cold.

We see what happens. Listen to the stories of these trafficking survivors. Many of them began as a homeless or runaway teen. They are scared, desperate for affection, for food, for safety, and for a safe place to sleep.

Our children and our grandchildren don't have to be scared. They have a safe place to sleep. They have food. But for a lot of these runaways, that is not the case.

That is a problem we can fix. We can reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. We can ensure that no child is turned away, regardless of their religion or their race or whom they love. A child is a child is a child. They all deserve our protection.

We don't say: OK, you four homeless children, we will take care of you but not you because you are the wrong race or you are the wrong religion or you love the wrong person. So you have to just stay out and be prey to the traffickers.

We will recount some of the stories I told before, the traffickers I prosecuted years ago and the horrible stories. I know the distinguished Senator from Maine has heard these stories, and she has visited these shelters. She has seen and heard the stories. When you do, it tears your heart. So I hope the amendment that she, Senator MURKOWSKI, I, and others have written will be in the final bill when it is passed. I thank my friend from Maine for her hard work.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I am just going to say that I know the distinguished Senators from Vermont and Maine have been on the floor talking about an amendment they hope to offer to this anti-trafficking bill. But

the sad fact is that no one is going to get to offer any amendments to this bill unless the Democratic leader, Senator REID, decides that we are going to have an open amendment process because right now there are objections to anyone setting any of the amendments for votes, much less asking to set aside the pending amendment and making your amendment the pending amendment so it could be considered and scheduled for a vote.

I wish to make sure our colleagues understand the rationale because I have had conversations with a number of members of the Judiciary Committee, which voted unanimously to support this bill. That doesn't happen very often, that we have that kind of unanimous support. Ten of our Democratic colleagues are cosponsors on the original bill.

So it might sound strange that after 10 Democrats have cosponsored the bill, after all of the Republicans and all of the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have voted to support this bill—and the minority leader, Senator REID, has agreed to dispense with the normal procedural process to get the bill on the floor—that we would now have this unusual situation where this bill is being hijacked and being used to debate something that it really doesn't have very much to do about, and that is the subject of abortion.

Some of our colleagues raised this issue yesterday for the first time, and they said they were surprised to find some language in the bill that limited the use of the funds in this bill consistent with the Hyde amendment. The Hyde amendment is a prohibition against using taxpayer funds for abortion, and it has been the law of the land for 39 years—39 years. All our bill does is preserve the status quo when it comes to the Hyde amendment.

Then, all of a sudden, some of our colleagues woke up I guess yesterday morning and discovered this and said that they were outraged and that it was totally unacceptable. Well, when we offered them an opportunity to offer an amendment to change that, they said: No, we don't want an amendment. We don't want to change it by a vote of the Senate. We just want to block the bill. We want to kill the bill.

Unless something changes between now and the time we vote on cloture on the bill, that is what is going to happen because they don't want to amend the bill; they don't want to allow others the opportunity—such as the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Vermont—to amend the bill; they just want to kill the bill.

It really is baffling to me, on a topic we all ought to agree is an important one, where some of the most vulnerable individuals in our society—children who have been sex-trafficked—would be the beneficiaries of the bill, that we are for some reason debating a provision in

the bill that was in the bill when 10 Democrats agreed to cosponsor it, when all members of the Judiciary Committee, including those same Democrats, agreed to vote for the bill, and when the Democratic leader agreed to bring it to the floor unanimously by a vote of the Senate. All of a sudden we want to try to revisit a provision that has been the law of the land for 39 years.

I hope something happens between now and the end of the week that causes some of our friends to reconsider this idea that they are going to filibuster this bill which many of them cosponsored and for which many of them voted. It would be a real shame and a tragedy if something that was designed to help these vulnerable kids was killed in the Senate because this became a political football. That would be a shame.

I know the distinguished Senator from Utah is on the floor and ready to speak.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I will speak for a few seconds on what the distinguished Senator from Texas said.

It would be absolutely pathetic if this bill were stopped—a bill this important that means so much to our families and to our children—because of the long-term language that has been, as I say, for 39 years—I can't believe this Senate has become so political that we would raise that issue at this time on this bill that almost everybody with any brains at all would be for. I would be ashamed of myself. And then not be willing to bring up an amendment if they don't like the language, go through the regular order, and act like the Senate and act like Senators—it is pathetic. What have we come to around here that we are so doggone partisan that we can't even pass a bill to protect children? I think it is pathetic, is all I can say.

UKRAINE

Madam President, in my nearly 40 years of public service, I have become very concerned with the state of our national security.

From the firestorm of terrorism that has swept Syria and Iraq, to the looming specter of a nuclear Iran, our Nation faces yet another potential catastrophe in Ukraine, where Russian separatists and soldiers continue their drive to consume as much of that nation as President Putin desires. It is particularly vexing that each of these catastrophes could have been prevented or at least greatly mitigated had the instigators of these events believed that the United States intended to use its national power to deter and, if necessary, repulse those seeking to use aggression against our national interests.

As I mentioned before, Ukraine is the latest example. Almost 1 year ago Rus-

sian forces seized and then annexed the Crimean peninsula. Ever since then, Russian separatists and Russian forces have snapped up large parts of eastern Ukraine.

Until last year, the areas controlled by Russian separatists and Russian forces could be loosely grouped into two areas along the Russian border—specifically, a northern area around the city of Luhansk and a southern area around the city of Donetsk. In between these two Russian-controlled areas lies the town called Debaltseve, which is a vital transportation hub. By seizing this strategic town, Russia can transport troops and supplies more easily between the Russian-controlled areas in the north and the South.

However, after weeks of fighting in and around Debaltseve, a ceasefire called Minsk II was brokered. Unfortunately, as many realists warned, Minsk II was not worth the paper it was written on. Predictably, 72 hours after the ceasefire was signed, Russian forces violated the protocol and Ukrainian soldiers retreated from the town under heavy fire.

Adding insult to injury, President Putin was quoted by the New York Times, after the fall of Debaltseve, saying:

Life is life. It just goes on. No need to dwell on it.

What is the response of the United States to this aggression? Well, until today the only concrete action, as reported by ABC News, is that the administration has decided to send fewer than 10 soldiers to western Ukraine to provide combat medical training to Ukrainian forces. This would not be so laughable if I did not believe the Ukrainians will require far greater medical assistance if Russian aggression continues unabated. But now that Russian-backed forces have solidified their control over whole swathes of eastern Ukraine, what comes next? Will Mr. Putin be appeased and go home? I very much doubt it. Recent reports indicate that both sides have moved some heavy weapons away from the battlefield; nevertheless, I believe this could just be a lull in the storm.

As I mentioned earlier, Russian forces have annexed Crimea, which is a peninsula between the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov. To supply their forces in Crimea, Russians must fly over or cross a narrow strip of water between the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov called the Kerch Strait. But if Russians controlled the land between Crimea and the Russian border, they could ship those supplies more efficiently and at lower cost. This stretch of land, of course, is Ukrainian sovereign territory. Therefore, it is very possible that the Russians will move to conquer this region to establish a land corridor between Russia and Crimea.

Many military experts believe this is Russia's objective since Russian-

backed separatists have intensified their military activities around the port city of Mariupol.

The New York Times reports that the city “is a bustling port in a strategic location on the Sea of Azov, near the Russian border.”

Mariupol is the only major obstacle to the Russians realizing a long-held goal of opening a land route between Russia and Crimea and taking complete control of the Sea of Azov and its rich industrial infrastructure.

In addition, the highly regarded Institute for the Study of War has noted that a village approximately 8 miles from Mariupol has “become the most actively contested area” in the region.

So what has been our response to this aggression? How is this administration preserving what is arguably one of the greatest American national security accomplishments in the past 100 years—ensuring a safe, secure and democratic Europe? Well, to be honest, not much.

Before the events of the past 12 months, this administration’s Pollyanna policy toward Russia was defined by the so-called reset. It was my impression this policy was designed to convince the Russians we were not a threat and therefore we should work together for the common good. Unfortunately, the Russians exploited the former and did not give a darn about the latter.

Then, as the situation in Crimea and eastern Ukraine continued to grow more dire, we instituted a series of economic sanctions—first against Russian officials, then later against banks and businesses associated with Putin’s cronies. These economic sanctions have grown against a number of key Russian energy, banking, and defense firms. To be fair, today the administration announced a modest increase in the number of individuals to which economic sanctions will be directed against.

However, one would be hard-pressed to call these sanctions robust. Individuals’ assets were frozen and companies find it harder to raise capital, but they are hardly enough to make Mr. Putin think twice before proceeding to use force against his next objective.

What about our diplomatic efforts? As the Congressional Research Service has stated, “The administration has appeared to leave the leading role in negotiating such a [peace] settlement [regarding Ukraine] to France and Germany.”

What about U.S. military aid? According to the Congressional Research Service, the United States has allocated \$120 million in security assistance so far. Today our government announced a modest increase in aid. Of the aid previously announced, funds were used for body armor, helmets, vehicles, night and thermal vision devices, heavy engineering equipment, advanced radios, patrol boats, rations,

tents, countermortar radars, uniforms, and first aid equipment and supplies. Glaringly absent from this list are the pieces of equipment that could tilt the balance of power and change Mr. Putin’s calculations. Specifically, where are the intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, heavy weapons and logistics assets?

What is the administration’s response? Just this week Brian McKeon, the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy stated—more than 1 year after the Russian invasion of Crimea—that the Obama administration is “still working in the inter-agency group on reviewing a number of options including lethal defensive weapons, but I can’t give you a timetable on when we might have a decision on additional assistance.”

That is pathetic. By any measure that is pathetic. I am flabbergasted not only by Mr. McKeon’s comment but the thought that the administration believes anyone would see that as a legitimate answer.

In other areas, what about the deployment of more U.S. military units to Europe to reassure our allies? While the United States has deployed some troops to the region, that is not enough to convince Moscow this administration is determined to give a resolute response to further Russian aggression.

Specifically, the initial deployment of U.S. land forces were in company-size units. A company-size unit has less than 150 soldiers, an insufficient force to amount to an effective deterrent. Then the administration announced that a single armored brigade—which consists of less than 100 tanks—would be deployed on a rotational basis. Once again, this is a relatively small force to deter what historically has been one of the great land armies.

Deterrence comes through strength. The world has changed since the fall of the Berlin Wall, but it appears this has been lost on President Putin. Indeed, it appears President Obama believes the world has changed more than it has. Regardless, the United States must take more forceful and dynamic actions. Otherwise, our policy of appeasement could result in more than just the loss of eastern Ukraine.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I thought I might take just a few minutes during this lull in our schedule. If other Senators come down to talk, I will yield to them, but I would like to talk a little about what is in this piece of legislation—the Justice for Victims

of Trafficking Act. While I am on the Judiciary Committee and the Senator from Vermont is on the Judiciary Committee—he has worked together with me and others on this piece of legislation—I am aware of the fact there are many Senators for whom this is a relatively new topic and who have not been as immersed in it.

First, I would just say by way of major support that there are 200 victims’ rights groups and law enforcement organizations that have endorsed this legislation—200 of them. I am looking forward to having a conference call with them this afternoon, where I can explain to them how we are currently stuck and to solicit their help in getting us unstuck so we can hopefully move this legislation along, have an open amendment process, and working with our colleagues in the House, send this important piece of legislation to the President.

As I said, more than 200 victims’ rights and law enforcement organizations have endorsed this legislation, including Shared Hope International, Rights4Girls, the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Children’s Alliance, the National Criminal Justice Association, the End Child Prostitution and Trafficking organization, PROTECT, Alliance to End Slavery and Trafficking, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National District Attorneys Association.

I read that rather long list of supporting organizations to point out there is nothing political about this particular bill. This is neither a Republican bill nor a Democratic bill. This is, I think, in the best traditions of the Senate, the Congress, when Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle work together to come up with a policy solution that makes sense and that will help.

One of the key features of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act is the creation of a special Crime Victims Compensation Fund. It is called the Domestic Trafficking Victims Fund.

When I had the honor of serving as attorney general of Texas, we had a Crime Victims Compensation Fund—much like I suspect most States have—where people who commit crimes and who pay fines and penalties pay into that fund, and those moneys are then distributed on a grant basis by the State to help organizations such as the Court Appointed Special Advocates Groups—CASA—which I worked closely with as attorney general, and a number of crime victims’ groups and other survivors of crime.

What we do is use that same model here. We take the money that is paid

by people convicted of human trafficking, sexual abuse, child pornography, child sexual exploitation, interstate transportation for illegal sexual activity, commercial human smuggling, and we require a special additional assessment of \$5,000 upon conviction for any one of this class of crimes.

In other words, one of the things we are trying to do is move from this model of just dealing with the supply side of a problem and deal with the demand side. We are trying to focus on the people who purchase these illicit services from trafficking victims and then use that fund to do some good, to provide grants to various faith-based organizations, nongovernmental organizations, and the like that help treat the victims of child trafficking and hopefully help them begin to heal once they are rescued from their abusers and their assailants.

The other thing we do, sort of from a structural point of view, is we don't treat a young girl who has been trafficked as the criminal. In other words, in the past there has been a tendency to say we are going to arrest the 15-year-old girl and charge her for being a prostitute, when in fact she has no choice in the matter. She is being compelled by either violence or some other coercive means to do what she is doing. So it is not a voluntary act on her part.

So what we do is we don't treat them as a criminal. We treat the purchaser of these services as the criminal. We fine them. We use that money then to supply services to help that victim get rescued and get better, to heal, and to get on with their lives.

That is what is a little different here because we are not actually using tax dollars. We are using the fines and the penalties assessed against these perpetrators to help these victims heal once they are rescued. That is one of the most important parts of this bill.

We expect there would be roughly \$30 million a year available for that out of this bill alone. That would be in addition to other things we are doing and other things that are being done at the local and State level.

We also make sure that we clarify the benefits and protections offered to victims of domestic human trafficking. Under current law, U.S. citizens are sometimes placed at a disadvantage when seeking services to restore them to their well-being and to offer them protection. But now we would make sure that those services are available without regard to citizenship and would make sure that people who would otherwise not get benefits will get benefits. This disparity in certification has led to some confusion, as we might imagine.

For example, under current law, a young person who has been trafficked from Central America through Mexico and into the United States would be eligible for a temporary visa while they

cooperate with law enforcement because that testimony would be essential to convict the person who trafficked them. This clarifies that U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents should never be denied services due to the fact that they have not received that kind of special certification. It is a little technical, but it is an important area.

We also provide child human trafficking deterrence block grants paid entirely through the Crime Victims Compensation Fund I mentioned a moment ago. These funds would be granted to qualifying organizations based on their focus on victim rescue and restoration.

Collaboration among law enforcement, social services, emergency responders, children's advocacy centers, victims service providers, and nonprofits would be encouraged to help communities and government work together to develop a holistic approach to figure out what works best to protect these victims of trafficking and to serve victims.

It also would create a new purpose area under the Victims of Child Abuse Act for the 900 children's advocacy centers across the country that provide restorative services for victims of child pornography, and it requires that not less than \$2 million a year be dedicated to this purpose.

In my experience, in Texas, the children's advocacy centers are some of the most outstanding organizations that exist for the treatment of victims of abuse and trafficking. One of the key features in the children's advocacy centers that I have visited is—imagine that a child who has been assaulted or a victim of human trafficking is not only going to be terrified by the experience, but they are also terrified by the law enforcement authorities who try to question them and to get evidence so they can make a case and conviction against the person who did harm to the child. The children's advocacy centers do an amazing job of creating a more relaxed atmosphere, where law enforcement and social service providers can work together in an environment where a child does not feel threatened and where the child can actually not only begin to get better but also cooperate with law enforcement authorities and provide more reliable testimony and evidence that can be used to convict the perpetrators.

Also in the bill, we would amend the human trafficking asset forfeiture statute to track the asset forfeiture statute for money laundering and eliminate the need for prosecutors to show direct traceability to the underlying crime and the targeted proceeds when they can show that the assets involved in the crime are used to conceal the source of criminal assets. This is basically taking another provision of current law. I realize that the whole issue

of asset forfeiture, when taken to the extreme—I know Chairman GRASSLEY is interested in holding hearings on the subject. But I think the part of this which is not controversial is taking the assets used in the commission of a crime and forfeiting that by the perpetrator, again, using those funds in part to help their victims get better.

We also have a provision in the bill that would allow for the streamlining of criminal investigations of human trafficking.

Under current law, State and local law enforcement may obtain a wiretap warrant in State court upon showing that the investigation may provide evidence of murder, kidnapping, gambling, robbery, bribery, extortion or dealing with narcotic drugs, including marijuana or other dangerous drugs, or other crimes dangerous to life, limb or property and punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year.

What we would do here is provide additional tools for law enforcement to conduct lawful wiretaps in order to get evidence important to convicting the perpetrators of these terrible crimes.

We also would require better reporting of this terrible crime of human trafficking. I remember a few years ago, when the Super Bowl was in Dallas, actually working with local law enforcement there where I learned for the first time that, unfortunately, at the same time that the Super Bowl is held in different cities around the country, there is a spike in the amount of trafficking that occurs in conjunction with these huge public events. That was quite an eye-opening experience for me.

Part of what we need to do is to get the facts, and to make sure that human trafficking is treated as the serious crime that it is for purposes of the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting Program. This legislation would encourage law enforcement to investigate and report human trafficking activity by classifying this as a part I violent crime and requiring it to be included in the calculation of index crime rates—again, making sure we understand what the facts are, because I think the fact is that so much of this crime and this sort of activity is hidden from public view. So most Americans probably don't know that this sort of activity goes on in their cities, in their States, and across the country. This would help us deal with that.

Under another provision of the bill, we would also make sure we use existing task forces to target offenders who exploit children, and we would, in particular, target child predators.

One of the things we learn, as we get deeper into this topic, is the sad fact that somebody who sexually abuses a child is likely to do it more than once. In other words, these twisted individuals unfortunately are going to commit crime after crime after crime until

they are caught and taken out of commission.

This is one reason why I feel so strongly that we had to eliminate the rape kit backlogs around the country, and we worked closely with a courageous woman named Debbie Smith to reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act to make sure the money that Congress appropriated for the rape kit backlog was adequately funded. Due to the power of DNA testing, we can identify people who commit these serial offenses, and law enforcement can connect the dots better and at the same time exonerate people who have perhaps been falsely accused because they are excluded through a DNA test through this rape kit backlog elimination effort.

So trying to make sure we take these serial offenders off the streets is a priority under our bill.

As I said, we worked very closely with a number of colleagues, including the Senator from Vermont, the Senator FEINSTEIN of California, Senator COONS, Senator WYDEN, and Senator KLOBUCHAR on the other side. On our side, we have had a lot of great effort by Senator PORTMAN and Senator KIRK, among others. Senator COLLINS has certainly made important contributions. But I wish to particularly recognize the contributions of the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN.

We added a second title, title II in the legislation, entitled "Combating Human Trafficking." Senator FEINSTEIN was the person who made that major contribution to this effort.

My point is that this has really been a bipartisan collaborative effort—something we don't see enough of here in Washington, DC—untainted by politics and ideology, where we are actually trying to do some good for people who need our help the most.

Senator FEINSTEIN contributed much of the meat of title II, including amendments to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, response to victims of child trafficking provision, creating an interagency task force report on child trafficking primary prevention and also requiring a General Accountability Office report to Congress that includes information on Federal and State law enforcement agencies to combat trafficking in the United States and requiring that it include information on each available grant program intended to combat human trafficking or assist victims of trafficking.

On our side of the aisle, I mentioned that one of the people who has been a relentless warrior on this has been our friend the junior Senator from Illinois, Mr. KIRK, who contributed the HERO Act to this legislation. That is title III under the HERO Act.

Under that important part of the legislation that makes up this overall bill, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, the HERO Act would provide express statutory authorization for the

existing ICE Cyber Crimes Center—Immigration and Customs Enforcement—recognizing that so much of what happens in terms of the marketing and the solicitation for people to engage in these crimes occurs now on the Internet.

I had the privilege of being here with the Senator from Illinois on the floor yesterday afternoon, and he talked about this one particular site that has been responsible for the trafficking of so much human flesh, mainly in the form of minor children, and his efforts to combat that. But part of what the HERO Act would do is to make sure that we have this powerful tool in the fight against sexual exploitation of children and the production, advertisement, and distribution of child pornography and child sex tourism—if you can imagine such a thing.

The HERO Act would also authorize the Cyber Crimes Center to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of recruiting, training, and hiring wounded and transitioning military veterans to serve as law enforcement officials in the investigation and prosecution of these crimes. This child exploitation section uses sophisticated investigative tools to target violators who operate on the Internet, which has been one of the primary focuses of the Senator from Illinois in his efforts, targeting the use of Web sites, email chat rooms, and file-sharing applications.

Major initiatives, including Operation Predator, an Immigration and Customs Enforcement office within the Department of Homeland Security's flagship investigative initiative for targeting sexual predators, child pornographers, and child sex.

It includes the National Child Victim Identification System, which was developed to assist law enforcement agencies in identifying victims of child sexual exploitation, and the virtual global task force and international alliance of law enforcement agencies working together to fight online child exploitation and abuse.

I realize this has been rather lengthy, but I thought it was worth making sure that all of our colleagues and anybody within the sound of my voice who cared to listen understood what was in this important piece of legislation, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

To summarize, 200 organizations across the country who are focused like a laser on the bane and evil that child sex trafficking is have endorsed this legislation. The original piece of legislation had 10 Democratic cosponsors, about an equal number—perhaps; I can't remember the exact number—of Republican cosponsors, and it passed by unanimous vote of the Senate Judiciary Committee in February.

Coming to the floor, we had something that hadn't happened often

enough, in my view, which was that Democrats and Republicans together agreed to bypass the usual cumbersome procedure to get a bill to the floor, known as cloture, and we all agreed we should take up this bill together. That is when things went off the rails, sadly. But I am an optimistic person and I am hopeful cooler heads will prevail.

I have had some private conversations with a number of Senators who are really very disturbed by the possibility that legislation as important as this is to the victims of human trafficking might be kicked to the curb because of some phony diversion and argument about restrictions on funding.

Again, the provisions of this bill that limit the use of the funds under the Hyde amendment has been the law of the land for 39 years. It was originally started in 1976. Basically, the Hyde amendment says that no taxpayer funds may be used for abortion services. This has been one of the rare areas in an area of great controversy—the subject of abortion—where Congress has come together on a bipartisan basis to say we are going to draw a bright line there to say no matter what your views are on abortion, we are not going to allow taxpayer funds to be used for abortion. Again, that started in 1976 and it has been the law of the land since that time.

Every appropriations bill that has passed, including the CROmnibus, the continuing resolution omnibus bill that was passed last fall in the lame-duck session of Congress, included a restriction known as the Hyde amendment restriction in it. As a matter of fact, we specifically referenced that provision in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

So you could imagine my surprise when I think it was yesterday that I got calls, letters, and heard speeches that people were surprised—shocked—that this provision was in the legislation when it was filed in January—I think January 13—and made public to the world. If anybody thought it was hidden, it was hidden in plain sight to anybody who cared to read it. And to me, what was so surprising about some of the reaction is that this maintains the status quo. This doesn't change anything, and has been the law of the land for 39 years since the original Hyde amendment was adopted.

So my hope is we can break out of this terrible cycle of dysfunction which I think, frankly, reflects Congress in a very negative light. I certainly hear it back home in Texas. People say: Well, can't you all get along? Can't you do anything? They don't want us to compromise our principles, and we won't. I don't think we should. But there are so many areas like this where we are united together in trying to do everything we can to help law enforcement investigate and prosecute human trafficking and to help the victims of

human trafficking to heal after they are rescued—to heal, get better, and to get on with their lives. That is all this legislation does.

I say that is all. That is a pretty big deal. It provides \$30 million a year—not tax dollars. These are fines and penalties paid by the people who commit these terrible crimes. It provides \$30 million a year as funds that can go toward grants to faith-based organizations, child advocacy centers—you name it—organizations that will spend their lives trying to help these children try to get better and get on with their lives. That money is available to them.

But if we don't pass this bill this week, that is not going to happen. How tragic it would be if somehow we let the politics of the day and this feigned outrage over a provision that has been a law of the land for 39 years derail us from doing our job.

I have every confidence that the heart of every Member of this body is in the right place when it comes to trying to help these victims of human trafficking. I just ask us to get our heads screwed on right. I know our hearts are in the right place, but frankly I am a little worried about people's heads not being screwed on right when it comes to focusing on a solution that is within our reach and one that has I think enjoyed so much support all across the country—as I mentioned, more than 200 victims rights and law enforcement organizations across the country. I am looking forward in probably the next 10 minutes or so joining a conference call with various members of these organizations, where I can update them on where they are and basically ask them for their help.

Call your Senator. Call your Congressman. Tell them we need to get this done, because in all likelihood tomorrow we are going to have a very important vote in the Senate.

I said I wasn't going to get mired down in procedure, but we do have an important vote tomorrow which is called a cloture vote. In other words, in order to get to a final passage of this bill, we need to have at least 60 Senators out of 100 vote for ending debate on the bill. That is called a cloture vote. But if we don't have 60 Senators vote to end debate on this bill, then basically we are dead in the water.

We have 54 Senators on our side of the aisle. There are 46 on the other side of the aisle. You would think on a bill that does as much as this bill does for the victims of human trafficking and that is so devoid of politics that we could get 60 votes or more. I wish we could get 100 votes to close off debate and finally pass this bill. If we did that in short order, I know we could work with our colleagues in the House of Representatives, who have already passed a similar although a little bit different bill, to try to reconcile those two pieces of legislation and get them

to President Obama's desk for his signature. The sooner we do that, the sooner these victims of human trafficking will get the help they need that this bill would provide.

So I hope that Senators will think long and hard about their vote on closing off debate tomorrow and getting us to the finish line on this legislation. Again, we don't need everybody. We don't need 100 Senators to vote to close off debate tomorrow, but we do need 60. If we don't get 60, this bill is going to be dead in the water.

I would ask all of our colleagues to examine their conscience and to think about what we are doing here and how much good we could do if we come together. I know from talking to some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they have had some sleepless nights. Several of our colleagues have said they basically have had a hard time sleeping thinking about the human tragedy reflected in human trafficking, and they worried whether we will actually be able to get this bill over the finish line. I hope and pray we will. We will find out tomorrow.

This is something that is in our hands. We can't control a lot of things in the world, but we can control whether we produce 60 votes here in the Senate tomorrow to close off debate, to get to final passage by a majority vote in the Senate. And if we can, then we are going to be able to expedite the help these victims of human trafficking need. We are going to be able to make sure the predators who prey on innocent children and other victims of human trafficking pay the price, but that out of that bad comes some good when children are rescued and these victims begin the process of healing.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I was stunned a few minutes ago to hear the assistant Republican leader on the floor speaking about trafficking legislation that is now before the Senate. I am glad he is speaking about the legislation. He has done that quite a bit. But as he spoke about the bill, it is very stunning what he said.

He said:

This bill is being hijacked and being used to debate something that it really doesn't have very much to do about, and that is the subject of abortion.

I totally agree with my friend from Texas. This bill has been hijacked by an issue completely unrelated to human trafficking.

I suggest that the majority take it out. We can debate on how it is in the

bill. Some said that it was by sleight of hand, and some said that the Democratic staff should have seen that it was in there. It is in there, and it has to come out.

Unless that language is taken out of the bill, there will be no bill. We cannot have this legislation hijacked by an abortion issue.

My friend the President pro tempore of the Senate and the chairman of the Finance Committee said:

I can't believe that this Senate has become so political that we would raise that issue at this time on this bill.

"Raise the issue"—he took the words right out of my mouth. I can't believe it either.

I say to my friends the majority, take the abortion language out of the bill. It has nothing to do with abortion.

I hope my Republican friends will choose to do the right thing and eliminate this unrelated issue on an otherwise good piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to talk about a couple of amendments on the legislation that we are considering this week, which is the human trafficking legislation.

Up to this point, this has been a bipartisan exercise. In fact, Senator BLUMENTHAL, the Senator from Connecticut, and I started a caucus here in the Senate on human trafficking about 3½ years ago, understanding that there was an increasing concern and awareness about this issue around the country, and we wanted to bring colleagues together to talk about the issue. We now have many other Members of the Senate who are a part of that.

We had monthly meetings—holding up people who were doing great things around the country—describing the problem so that all of us, Members of the Senate and their staff, understand the seriousness of this issue and why we need to address it. That has always been nonpartisan—not just bipartisan but nonpartisan.

I think it is time for us to move forward with this debate and to have these amendments offered and to actually vote on this legislation that would help to deal with this problem all around the country, and unfortunately it is everywhere.

Often people think that this is an international issue, that the only human trafficking concern we should have would be in Africa or Asia or other countries. But it actually happens right here, and it happens in my home State of Ohio.

I first became involved in this issue when a school outside the city of Toledo came to me and told me their concern about it and how these young people were getting involved and engaged in it. The more we learned, the more I looked into it, and the more I realized this is something which is very real in



the communities I represent in Ohio, and unfortunately I believe the same is true in every State represented in this Chamber.

We have had an interesting debate so far. Sometimes we have gotten a little sidetracked, such as the issue we saw a moment ago, but for the most part I have been pleased that over the last few days we have talked about the scope of the problem, talked about some of the solutions to it, and we talked about some of the good legislation that is in the underlying bill.

There are two pieces of legislation that I offered that are part of the underlying bill, and I am happy about that. They are both bipartisan amendments. There are also a couple of amendments that I think would be helpful for us to include in the legislation. I offered those amendments earlier this week with the hopes that they would have already been considered. They have not been considered yet, but I hope to move forward with this legislation. The longer we wait, the more difficult it becomes for us to move forward. I hope we can resolve whatever differences there are and go ahead and start voting on amendments and moving this legislation forward so we can actually help those victims of trafficking who are looking for our support. Again, if we are not going to act here in the Senate and are not going to move this forward in the House and get it to the President for signature—every day more and more people are in danger, particularly children, of falling into the hands of human traffickers.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 270

I have a couple of amendments I wish to talk about briefly today. The first amendment is called Ensuring a Better Response for Victims of Sex Trafficking. This amendment contains a piece of the legislation I actually offered a couple of years ago with Senator WYDEN of Oregon. Senator WYDEN's legislation and my legislation called the Child Sex Trafficking Data and Response Act was partly enacted into law last year, and that was the data part of the bill—in other words, the part of the bill that relates to how we needed to improve the information we are getting on sex trafficking so we can better address the problem. Law enforcement officials have been looking for better information around the country. They want to know what the best practices are and how to deal with it. It is important to understand the problem in order to come up with solutions.

Now we need to get to the second part of the legislation that was not enacted last year, and that is on the response portion. The amendment does just that. The response portion of the bill changes the way we treat victims of sex trafficking. Right now many of these victims are falling between the cracks. Currently children are only eli-

gible for help through the child welfare system if they are abused by their parents. Currently, because children are only allowed to be eligible for help in that category, some kids just cannot get the help they need. This legislation ensures that all children who are trafficked are considered victims of sexual abuse and can be eligible for services as they go through what is sometimes a long and arduous process of recovery.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 271

The second amendment I wish to include gets at some of the underlying problems that make it more likely that a child will be trafficked. We heard a lot about this on the floor the last couple of days. I have talked about it in terms of our missing children. One of the elements of the underlying bill is a bill we put forward in the last couple of years on how to identify missing children. Why? Because those children who are runaways or go missing tend to be some of the most vulnerable to sex traffickers. So the idea is to get the best information we can on those kids as soon as possible so we can find them.

As an example, there have been about 67 kids who have gone missing in Ohio in the last month and a half. Yet we only have records for, I believe, 26 kids in terms of photographs. This legislation would require photographs for all of these kids so that the kids who are not currently able to be found because we can't find a photograph of them can be more easily found—not just by law enforcement but by citizens who are being vigilant and diligent.

There is another issue, too, and it is something that is addressed in this amendment, which is cosponsored by Senator FEINSTEIN. The first one is one from a Wyden-Portman amendment, and this is from a Feinstein-Portman amendment. These are bipartisan bills.

It currently is true that there is an over-narrow definition of "homelessness" by the Department of Housing and Urban Development that does not enable homeless kids to get the help they need. That is current law. We are trying to change that to ensure that we can expand that definition to include the kinds of children who unfortunately many times are vulnerable to trafficking.

I will give an example of the scope of this problem. During this last school year—2 years ago, 2012 to 2013—there were 24,236 kids in Ohio who were homeless at one point during the school year; however, the Federal Department responsible for preventing child homelessness counted only 4,700 cases. So we have over 24,000 kids who are homeless; yet this Department says only 4,700. In other words, the very program meant to help these kids undercounted by a factor of five. So the amendment simply updates the definition of "homelessness" to ensure that these kids are not forgotten and do not fall between the cracks.

We know this action alone will not end child homelessness, but it will help deal with this problem and will help to put a roof over their heads, for thousands of these kids and their families, and prevent some of the long-term emotional, developmental effects that are caused by homelessness, as well as keep these kids off the streets and hopefully away from these traffickers so they are not vulnerable, as I said, to being sex-trafficked.

We hope for a day when every single child in America is protected, when every child is able to follow their dreams and can live in a home with a family who is protecting and watching over them. We know that if we are going to see that hope realized, we have to fight for it. In the meantime, we have important work to do here on the floor of the Senate to ensure that we are doing everything we possibly can to protect these kids.

These two amendments will help make this underlying legislation even stronger. I hope my colleagues will support both of them. Again, I hope we can now get over whatever is holding up movement on these amendments, get the amendments enacted into law, and get the bill over to the House of Representatives. And I believe they will pass it and get it to the President for his signature so we can indeed begin to address this horrific practice of human trafficking.

I yield back my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MR. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator CORNYN for his important leadership on this issue. I thank Senator KLOBUCHAR, whom I have enjoyed working with on a related bill, the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act, which I hope will also be considered during the course of this debate.

We must commit to eliminating all forms of modern-day slavery and human trafficking. These are horrendous crimes that undermine the most basic human right of freedom and sadly target the most vulnerable and at-risk individuals in our society.

For too long we in the United States have assumed this is a problem for others but not for ourselves. We heard heartbreaking stories of the underground trafficking of humans but believed this was a tragedy unique to places in the world where a poor economy and weak rule of law allow vulnerable women and children to fall into these unspeakable circumstances. This is no longer the case. Reports and research have brought this crime out of the dark here at home, revealing that trafficking in humans is a reality in our own States and communities. Ignorance and denial are no longer options.

I am proud to support the legislation we are considering today which would improve services and restitution available to victims of human trafficking. It

would make changes to our criminal law to allow law enforcement to hold accountable those offenders who perpetrate these heinous crimes and also better protect those at risk of becoming victims.

I am proud to say that my home State of Arizona has been a leader on this issue. In April 2013 then-Governor Jan Brewer launched a task force on human trafficking which brought together local policymakers, law enforcement, nonprofits, think tanks, and universities in Arizona to examine the issue and explore ways to reduce trafficking and protect victims. The work of this task force led to these results: In 2014 the Arizona Human Trafficking Council was established to build on the efforts of the task force in the longer term by improving the State's awareness of human trafficking, promoting cooperation among law enforcement, State agencies, and the community, and improving victims' services.

The task force yielded legislative accomplishments. Based on recommendations of the task force, Arizona passed a law in April 2014 that increased penalties for traffickers, makes it easier for prosecutors to hold accountable those engaged in prostitution with a minor, and protects victims' identities in criminal proceedings.

In an effort to equip those who are in a position to intervene, the members of the task force have worked to improve training for social workers, health care providers, and probation officers, among others. These efforts provide them with the knowledge and tools needed to stop this exploitation and connect victims with resources to help.

I would be remiss if I failed to mention the hard work of my wife Cindy to bring attention to the suffering of those who are victims of human trafficking. She has dedicated herself to their cause, and through her service on both the Arizona Human Trafficking Task Force and Council as well as international efforts to combat trafficking, she has become a well-respected and persuasive voice on this vital issue, driving change both in Arizona and abroad.

America's leadership furthering human rights around the world means that we must hold ourselves to the highest standards when basic human rights are being undermined right here. I am grateful for the Senate's action. We must commit to continued efforts to restoring the freedom of those caught in the horrors of modern slavery and eliminating this crime wherever it occurs.

Finally, here in the Senate we have gridlock on numerous issues. There are differences of opinion and philosophies. How in the world have we got differences on an issue such as this? Is the issue of right to life or abortion such an overwhelming issue that we can't address an issue which is the most

egregious crime against innocent women and children?

This is really not an honorable time or a laudable time for the U.S. Senate. We should be taking up amendments and passing this legislation today. We are letting partisanship over an issue that has been discussed and debated—and will be many times in the future—prevent us from moving forward with this legislation. It is not honorable. It is not honorable for us to hold up this legislation because we have a difference on the issue of abortion.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle, let's not let this issue prevent us from doing the right thing.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as the ranking member of the Budget Committee, I wish to take a few minutes to discuss the budget situation.

My understanding is that Senator ENZI, the chairman of the committee, intends to have a Budget Committee markup on Wednesday, March 18, and Thursday, March 19. My understanding is the resolution will come to the floor the following week of March 23. Unless I am mistaken, we will engage in what is called within the Beltway a vote-arama, where there will be a very significant number of amendments that will be allowed to be offered.

Before we discuss a budget, whether it is at the Federal level, the State level, or one's family, I think it is imperative to understand the conditions that exist as one prepares a budget. A budget reflects what our country is about. It reflects our national priorities. It reflects how we attempt to address the problems we face. It attempts to address how we go forward as a people into the future.

So the first issue at hand when we discuss a budget is to, in fact, determine what is going on in America today. What are our problems? What should we be doing and what should we not be doing?

I start off with the premise that I think is shared by the vast majority of the American people, which is that the middle class of this country over the last 40 years has been disappearing; that people today, by the millions, in Vermont and throughout this Nation, are working longer hours for low wages, despite a huge increase in productivity. That is the reality that faces most people in this country. But there is another reality, and that is that the people on top and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well.

Today, real median family income is almost \$5,000 less than it was in 1999 in inflation accounted-for dollars. Why is that? How does that happen? The typical male worker—that man right in the middle of the American economy—made \$783 less last year than he did 42

years ago, after adjusting for inflation. How does that happen? We have an explosion of technology, a huge increase in productivity; we have the so-called great global economy, \$3 trillion all over the world; and the typical male worker—the guy in the middle of the economy—makes \$783 less last year than he did 42 years ago.

The typical female worker is making \$1,337 less than she did in 2007. Today, despite the modest gains of the Affordable Care Act—legislation I supported—40 million Americans continue to have no health insurance and we remain the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right.

Then we have today, because many people were driven from the middle class into poverty, more people today living in poverty than almost any time in the modern history of America. How does that happen?

Despite a very significant improvement in the economy since President Bush left office, real unemployment is not 5.5 percent, it is 11 percent. Youth unemployment, which we never talk about, is 17 percent, and African-American youth unemployment is much higher than that.

Throughout this country, a significant number of young people have given up on the dream of college. Here we are in a competitive global economy and we have bright young people from working-class families and they are looking at the cost of college and they are saying, Sorry, ain't for me. I am not going to come out of school \$50,000, \$60,000 in debt. What sense does that make when we are engaged in enormous economic competition with countries all over the world?

Then we have another group of young people graduating college or graduate school in debt to the tune of \$50,000, \$100,000. I talked to a young doctor in Burlington, VT, some months ago. She graduated medical school \$300,000 in debt for the crime of wanting to be a primary care physician. Does that make any sense?

While the middle class continues to disappear, the people on top and the largest corporations have never had it so good. That is the other reality of America today. The middle class shrinks—a whole lot of people living in poverty, people have no health insurance, kids can't afford to go to college—but people on top are doing phenomenally well.

Today, the top 1 percent earns more income than the bottom 50 percent. And since the Wall Street crash of 2008, over 99 percent of all new income goes to the top 1 percent. Over 99 percent of all new income goes to the top 1 percent.

Corporate profits are soaring. The stock market is up. CEOs now earn 270 times what their average employee makes. Today, the top one-tenth of 1

percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. The top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. And the wealthiest family in this country alone—one family—owns more wealth than the bottom 42 percent of the American family. Does that sound like the America we want to see, that we believe in, where so few have so much and so many have so little?

It is an extraordinary fact that between 1985 and 2013, the bottom 90 percent of our people lost \$10.7 trillion in wealth that it otherwise would have had if the distribution of wealth had remained at the same level as it was in 1985. If we had the same distribution of wealth, the bottom 90 percent would have had close to \$11 trillion more wealth. Meanwhile, the top one-tenth of 1 percent experienced an \$8 trillion increase in wealth as the distribution of wealth became increasingly unequal.

What a phenomenon, this huge transfer of wealth from working people to the millionaires and billionaires.

Now let me get to the budget, because when we deal with a budget, we can't ignore that reality. If the rich get much richer and the middle class declines, it makes no sense at all to say we are going to give more tax breaks to the rich and we are going to cut programs for the middle class and working families. This is the Robin Hood principle in reverse. It is taking from the middle class and working families and giving to the very rich.

I worry very much that this is exactly what will be in the Republican budget that we debate next week in committee. I expect—and I may be mistaken and I hope I am but I don't think I am—I expect the Republican budget in the Senate this year will be very close to what the so-called Ryan budget did last year which was passed by the Republican House. There may be nuances of differences, I don't know, but I think it will be very close.

Let me tell my colleagues what the Republican budget will be about. The Republican budget will oppose ending tax loopholes for the wealthy and large corporations—loopholes that allow billionaire hedge fund managers to pay a lower tax rate than electricians and schoolteachers. I expect that the Republican budget will continue to allow major profitable corporations such as General Electric, Verizon, and many others to go through a given year paying absolutely nothing in Federal income tax. I expect that the Republican budget will attempt to voucherize Medicare—and it as we know it to be—and I expect there will be massive cuts in Medicaid, education, nutrition programs, Pell grants, and the kinds of programs that working families absolutely depend upon.

We need a very different budget than what I believe the Republicans are going to propose. We need a budget

that stands for the working families of this country and not just the millionaires and billionaires.

Let me tell my colleagues what that budget should include, although I don't think the Republican budget will include these ideas. When real unemployment is 11 percent, we need a budget that creates millions of decent-paying jobs. In my view, and in the view of many economists, the fastest way to create those jobs and address a real national crisis is to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure—our roads, our bridges, water systems, wastewater plants, airports, dams, levees, and expand broadband to rural America. According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, we need to invest over \$3 trillion to rebuild our infrastructure. We are not going to do that, but we need to make a major investment. When we do that, we make America more productive and safer, and we also create millions of jobs.

A serious budget needs to make our Tax Code fairer and to bring substantial new revenue into Federal coffers. We need a budget that ends unfair tax loopholes and asks the wealthiest people and largest corporations to pay their fair share of taxes.

Today at the hearing we had in the Committee on the Budget, a Republican witness testified that he thought that corporate taxes should be zero—zero. Well, that does not make a lot of sense to me.

We need a budget that understands when the Federal minimum wage is a starvation wage of \$7.25 an hour, we need to substantially raise the minimum wage. We need to deal with the overtime scandal we currently see. We need to raise wages for low- and moderate-income families.

At a time when large numbers of our young people have given up on the dream of higher education and college is increasingly unaffordable, we need a budget that says to every kid in America that if you have the ability and you have the desire, you are going to get a higher education regardless of the income of your family. At a time when corporations have shipped millions of decent-paying jobs to China and other low-wage countries, we need a budget that rewards companies for investing in America and for creating jobs here, not abroad.

At a time when millions of people still lack health insurance, we need a budget that ensures quality, affordable health care for all Americans by supporting the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, strengthening Medicare and Medicaid, and extending funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, community health centers, and the National Health Service Corporation.

Let me conclude by making this simple and obvious point: A budget is about priorities. A budget is about

choices. And what we have to determine is whether our budget coming out of the Senate is a budget that represents the needs of the rich and large corporations and their wealthy campaign donors, or whether we produce a budget which represents the needs of working families and the middle class and the millions and millions of families who are struggling economically to keep their heads above water.

I hope we make the right choice. I hope we stand with the working families of this country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of a unanimous consent request. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am on the floor to discuss the Human Trafficking Survivors Relief and Empowerment Act, which is legislation I introduced last week to aid the recovery of survivors of human trafficking.

This bill, which I have also filed as an amendment to Senator CORNYN's Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, will make important strides toward helping survivors of human trafficking free themselves from the social stigma that is associated with their victimization and help them rebuild their lives as productive members of society.

I wish to start by sharing the story of a young woman who was featured on NPR several weeks ago. She is a human trafficking survivor. Her story is far too common.

She was raped for the first time at age 11. At 13, she was lured away from her family and eventually forced into engaging in commercial sex. She talked about the physical trauma she endured at the hands of her captor—her skull was cracked, all of her ribs broken, and she endured regular beatings and black eyes.

For roughly 7 years, her entire teenage life—a life she should have been spending in school and among friends—

she endured the worst kinds of physical and emotional torture. Finally, at age 20, she was rescued by a thoughtful police officer nearly 1,400 miles from her home.

Fortunately, this young woman is now in the process of rebuilding her life. She has moved home near her family, she has a young son, and she is hoping to go to school for nursing and to make a better life for herself and her family. However, she is constantly confronted by the reality of the criminal record she accumulated as the result of being a trafficking victim. Every application she fills out, every job interview she attends, she is forced to relive and explain the most painful moments of her life.

As this victim told NPR, "I'm not ever going to forget what I've done, but at the same time, I don't want it thrown in my face every time I'm trying to seek employment."

Human traffickers use force, fraud, and coercion to compel their victims to engage in criminal activity, particularly prostitution, yet it is often the trafficking victims who are arrested, detained, prosecuted, and convicted.

My legislation is simple. It provides an incentive for States to enact laws that allow human trafficking survivors to clear their State criminal records of prostitution and other low-level, non-violent crimes that result from being trafficked.

Specifically, these vacatur statutes allow trafficking survivors to file a motion in court to expunge their criminal record for crimes they can reasonably demonstrate were the result of being trafficked.

My colleague Senator GILLIBRAND has filed a similar amendment that would address this issue at the Federal level or in Federal court. Her amendment would ensure that victims charged with Federal crimes have the opportunity to clear their record of the most serious types of charges associated with trafficking.

My amendment would encourage States to provide a remedy for the most common types of charges that trafficking victims face.

I urge my colleagues to support my legislation and my amendment. I hope we can get trafficking legislation done in a way that will help the victims in the future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 5 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:01 p.m., recessed until 5 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LEE).

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks Senator ISAKSON be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, there are a lot of people—scientists, doctors and health professionals, our military and security leaders, the insurance and reinsurance industry, most of our major utilities, even faith leaders—who agree that climate change is a serious problem and an important priority.

In the private sector, many corporate leaders see climate change as both a moral challenge and a financial opportunity. Indeed, as I rise today for now the 92nd time to urge my colleagues in Congress to wake up to the urgent threat of climate change, major American companies have already begun to take action. They are not waiting around for Congress.

Ceres, for instance, is a nonprofit organization that helps to mobilize investors and business leaders to build a sustainable global economy. Ceres reports that nearly half of Fortune 500 companies now have their own clean energy targets.

Institutional investors are also committed to fighting climate change. In 2003, there were just 10 of them. Ten years later, by 2013, there were 110, holding \$13 trillion in assets. Walmart uses about 25 percent renewable energy, Google is at 35 percent, and Apple nearly 75 percent. More and more companies are seeing the benefit of cleaning up their energy sources and investing in the future, and it is not just out of the goodness of their hearts. These are our most profitable corporations. They have made a successful business model of saving money by reducing their carbon footprint.

Coca-Cola, for instance, knows how disruptive climate change can be to the water supply that is the most basic need of its bottling facilities. Apparel giant VF Corporation understands the threat of changing conditions to agricultural commodities such as cotton. And, yes, these companies also know that four out of five Americans support action on climate change. In other words, climate-friendly corporate practices are a hit with consumers, particularly younger consumers.

Since consumers want climate friendliness, there are also companies that try to have it both ways. They try to look like good actors on climate change without really being good actors. It is called green washing, and the major oil and gas companies are classic green washers. Look at their public statements and their ad campaigns,

and we might think they were helping to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels. But what they say and what they do, do not match up. Look at the green ad campaigns that have been run by the big oil companies. Some of these multimillion dollar campaigns still run today.

Here is Chevron saying, "We agree," it is time for oil companies to get behind renewable energy. This campaign started in 2010 and is still around. For years Chevron said renewable energy was part of its business plan. It actually once built utility-scale solar and geothermal projects, and it even made money doing it. But in the end, Chevron's core business of drilling up oil and gas prevailed, and last year Chevron sold off almost all of its renewable energy business, but they still pretend they are green. They still say "We agree," but in real life they don't.

Not too long ago, BP styled itself "Beyond Petroleum" and told us to think outside the barrel. The company made industry-leading investments in wind farms and solar power in the billions of dollars. But BP, too, has exited the solar business and has attempted to sell its U.S. wind farms in what a company spokesperson called "part of a continuing effort to become a more focused oil and gas company." They were just pretending to be green. Here is their logo. Look at this ridiculous little green and flower/sunshine thing from oil extractors. It is a total phony.

The pick of the fossil fuel industry litter is actually Shell. Public pronouncements from Shell Oil have been sensational. Shell ads told us of the effort to "broaden the world's energy mix." Well, in 2012, Shell reported investing about \$400 million into low-carbon alternatives, which seems like a lot until we realize that was out of nearly \$23 billion that year spent by Shell—less than 2 percent. Comparing that \$400 million in 2012, Shell has spent at least \$5 billion in recent years to expand oil and gas drilling operations in the Arctic. Shell is one of the largest holders of filthy tar sands rights in Canada.

But here is the champ when it comes to climate doublespeak. ExxonMobil excels. Since at least 2008, the oil giant has run ads such as these, with scientific formulas and Lucite molecules and all these technological-looking things. I remember one with folks in lab coats. Exxon executives and engineers tell us about the need to protect the environment and to move toward cleaner, more diverse energy sources such as wind and solar, as images behind them of wind turbines twirl in the distance.

Exxon does not report transparently enough for a solid case to be proven, but there is at least a reasonable inference that could be drawn that they spend more on advertising their green research than they spent on their green

research. The Wall Street Journal wrote: "Exxon's ads are part of a growing effort by the industry to counter a political backlash against rising oil prices and global warming worries."

Faking it is not a solution, and this campaign is still running. The latest ads are right there on Exxon's Web site, where the public is watching. The Exxon Web site also tells us "rising greenhouse gas emissions pose significant risks to society and ecosystems"—again, for public consumption.

But when they filed comments with the regulators, in 2009, Exxon wrote: "Support for the effects of climate change on public health and welfare is almost nonexistent and engulfed in an extremely high degree of uncertainty."

For years Exxon has been devoted to propping up climate denial and climate deniers. The Union of Concerned Scientists found that between 2002 and 2010 ExxonMobil contributed to and lobbied anti-climate Members of Congress over pro-climate Members at a ratio of 10 to 1. Recent disclosures show that even after vowing that it would no longer bankroll groups that deny climate change, Exxon continued for years to fund the work of climate skeptic Willie Soon, an astrophysicist whose research is under investigation for failure to divulge his oil industry backing.

Which Exxon are we supposed to believe? Remember the words of the Exxon vice president who testified before Congress in 2008 that "the pursuit of alternative fuels must not detract from the development of oil and gas."

ExxonMobil's ads boast that the company is "taking on the world's toughest energy challenge." The toughest challenge we face is finding a way to fuel the global economy without driving the climate to the breaking point with our limitless, endless carbon pollution. ExxonMobil is committed to an oil economy that has no future. If only Exxon and the other oil giants would devote more of their advertising budget to research and to the development of renewable fuels, we might be better off.

If you don't think that the big oil companies are bad enough on their own, once they get together they are downright dirty. These companies—Chevron, BP, Shell, and ExxonMobil—are all members of the American Petroleum Institute, the oil and gas industry trade association. As we all know around here, the American Petroleum Institute is dedicated to obstructing action on climate change and even to spreading false doubt about its existence, and API in turn funds some of the worst and most irresponsible climate denial front organizations.

Chevron, BP, Shell, and ExxonMobil also support something called the American Legislative Exchange Council or ALEC. ALEC is an organization which works to undercut climate

science and undermine climate progress at the State level, interfering in our State legislatures. ALEC has tried to roll back State renewable fuel standards and has handed out model State legislation to obstruct and tie up the President's Clean Power Plan.

So which way are they going to have it, the way they sell themselves in the ads with funny little sunbursts and Lucite molecules or their real presence in State legislatures and in Congress spending money to shut down the climate debate and keep pumping the oil?

Major companies such as Google, eBay, Facebook, Yahoo, and even Occidental Petroleum have disassociated themselves from ALEC because of its destructive position on climate. Google's CEO Eric Schmidt has said "they are literally lying about climate change." But they keep getting funding from Chevron, BP, Shell, and ExxonMobil.

The reality is these major fossil fuel companies are dedicated to a fossil fuel future that puts basic operating systems of our planet at risk. All these ad campaigns and all these public statements to make the companies look good are just a way to paper over that basic, dirty, continuing fact. It is a sham. It is a false front. It is phony PR, and all the green washing in the world shouldn't be able to cover it up.

But I will conclude by saying it does seem to be having its effect. We have seen recently in the news in Florida that Florida Department of Environmental Protection officials have been ordered not to use the terms "climate change" or "global warming" in any official communications, emails or reports. That is according to DEP employees, DEP consultants, DEP volunteers, and State records, all dug out by the Florida Center for Investigative Reporting.

Governor Scott of Florida has repeatedly said he is "not convinced that climate change is caused by human activity," despite the scientific evidence to the contrary. It is apparently a gag order about climate change that was well known and distributed verbally statewide.

I guess Governor Scott has told reporters that he had not been convinced about climate change and that he would need something more convincing than what I have read. I would be interested to know what his reading list was. So here we are in a world of fantasy in which the big oil polluters put on this pretense that they are clean, that they care about clean energy, that they are interested in a nonfossil fuel future, while they are supporting the very organizations that undercut that work here in Congress and they are able to get behind people such as the Governor, apparently, in Florida—certainly his administration—who are so paralyzed about climate change that they not only won't say the words, but

they won't allow State employees to even say the words. That is a pathetic state of democracy.

I yield the floor, and I now turn to my friend from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I have nine grandchildren. Seven of them are 11 or under; two of them are in college. Those 7 who are 11 or under represent the joy of my life and the life of my children. But tonight when you and I go to bed and each Member of this Senate goes to bed, somewhere back in our State, young women and young children the same age as my grandchildren will be bought and sold into slavery. They will be trafficked as human beings for sex workers, for pornography workers, and for workers themselves. It is wrong for the greatest Nation on the face of this Earth and the richest Nation on the face of this Earth to have the crime of human trafficking take place day in and day out.

I am so proud of Senator CORNYN and others from this Senate who brought forward the bill that is before us today. I want to appeal to those who are holding it up to go to cloture to ask themselves this question when they go to bed tonight: When you put your head on that pillow, some child somewhere in your State is going to be trafficked for sex purposes or pornography. Some young life, some life of innocence is going to be ruined. I think it is time for us to put aside any differences we may have on this legislation and move it forward so that we have for the first time the focus on human trafficking and the abuse of kids.

This is a serious problem in my State of Georgia. Atlanta has one of the highest rates of trafficking of any city in the United States, I am told. Our attorney general, Sam Olens, has said the following:

Human trafficking is a modern day slavery, plain and simple. It robs children of their innocence and dignity.

We must combat this evil, and it is appropriate that the most deliberative body in the world, the U.S. Senate, begin to put together a framework where we confront child slavery, sex trafficking, and the targeting of our children in multiple ways. We need to provide them with benefits to be able to be protected. A lot of that is in terms of housing and safe havens, but it also concerns other things. We need to increase the resources for victims of trafficking, No. 1. A lot of kids who are trafficked and can get out of trafficking and get out of possession end up having serious problems with PTSD and TBI. The problem of being abused as a child is as rough as the battleground in Afghanistan or Iraq. We must provide the safe havens and the therapy and the mental health care that is necessary to help them bring back their life.

I gave a graduation speech 5 years ago to a young lady who was 22 years old and just graduating from high school. She had dropped out of high school pregnant at the age of 15. She had come under the spell of a trafficker who took her in, made her a sex worker, and she ended up having three additional children. She was almost lost for life. But finally some good person found her. They brought her into the county school system. They found her a way to go to the alternative school. She ended up graduating No. 1 in her class and going to the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. A life was saved, but it was only saved because people reached out to her. We need to encourage that and produce that.

Back in my home State of Georgia in my hometown of Roswell, GA, there is a guy by the name of Dave McCleary. Dave McCleary is a Rotarian who 2 years ago took this project on as his passion—to be a spokesman for those who are abused, those who are trafficked, and those who are thrown into prostitution and pornography. He has made a major difference in Rotary clubs in Georgia, and now they are activating themselves to pay attention to this terrible disease and this terrible affliction.

We need to recognize child pornography as a form of human trafficking so victims have access to support, and we need to require that traffickers be treated as violent criminals to protect the victims and witnesses. Most important of all, we need to help State and local governments fight human trafficking through increased shelters, law enforcement, task forces, and problem-solving cures for people with these problems.

We also need to get to the floor for another reason. Senator CORKER in the Foreign Relations Committee has a bill which would be an amendment to this bill which expands our human trafficking response. We can't get to that until we get to cloture, and we can't get to cloture until we get 60 votes.

So I appeal to Members of the Senate to find common ground to let this debate come to the floor, so that when you lay your head on the pillow tonight, instead of thinking about a child that is being abused, you think about the abuse that you are avoiding because the Senate took action on human trafficking.

#### COMMENDING JOHN LEWIS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, 2 years ago, on the 48th anniversary of the crossing of the Edmund Pettus Bridge by a bunch of brave citizens who challenged the United States to do what was right and make voting rights equal for everybody, I walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge with Congressman JOHN LEWIS from my State.

JOHN LEWIS is 75 years old this year, and he continues to be a leader for civil

rights and for passion. This past weekend in Selma, AL, he led the President of the United States, Barack Obama, the past President of the United States, George W. Bush, and over 100 Members of Congress across the Edmund Pettus Bridge for us to reflect and remember over the last 50 years what has happened in this country, where voting rights have gone from being a dream to a reality, where equality for men and women and people of all races now exists. It would not have happened were it not for a few good men and a few good women who at their time in history responded to history's call.

JOHN LEWIS was one of those people. I am proud to serve with him in the Georgia delegation to the Congress, and I am proud of all he has done to make America a better place to live.

So on this year when he celebrates his 75th birthday anniversary and on the 50th anniversary of the crossing of the Edmund Pettus Bridge, I pay tribute to a great citizen of Georgia, a great American, and a great humanitarian—JOHN LEWIS, the Congressman from the city of Atlanta and the State of Georgia.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, while the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia is on the floor, I wish to associate myself with what he had to say about Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

Congressman LEWIS has been a friend, a colleague, and a mentor to all of us on both sides of the aisle on the issues of civil rights. He is one of the true heroes. We sometimes overuse the word "hero." But I think the Senator and I would both agree that this is a man who deserves the word "hero."

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. President, we are talking about human trafficking. We have heard horrific stories. Certainly those of us who are parents or grandparents have to think how horrible it would be if these things had happened to our children or our grandchildren.

I am usually the only person on the floor who has prosecuted child molesters—and I still have nightmares over some of the cases I have prosecuted—I wish we would never have another one of these awful cases.

So as we consider legislation about human trafficking and exploitation, we could take immediate action to show support for protecting our Nation's most vulnerable from human trafficking by confirming Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General. I say this because Ms. Lynch has a proven track record in prosecuting human trafficking and child rape cases.

Ms. Lynch's record in pursuing these cases is so well established that even prominent FOX News hosts have

praised her. One host at FOX News called her a "hero" for the prosecution of a child rapist. Another has described Ms. Lynch as a "straight shooter" for her overall service as a Federal prosecutor. And a third host on FOX News has called for a vote on her nomination "this week", saying there should be "no more slow walking" by the Senate. I couldn't agree more.

As we go into this debate, I think about the fact that Ms. Lynch was recently named one of "New York's New Abolitionists" by the New York State Anti-Trafficking Coalition. Why? Because of her leadership in combatting human trafficking. She has emphasized anti-trafficking programs at the U.S. Attorney's office that she leads. Over the course of the last decade, her office has not just talked about why they oppose human trafficking, they have indicted over 55 defendants in sex trafficking cases. They have rescued over 110 victims of sex trafficking.

I will give you a couple of examples. In one case, her office obtained convictions against three brothers for sex trafficking. What did they do? These brothers were sentenced to double-digit prison terms for running a trafficking ring that enticed victims as young as 14 and 15 years old. They had them transported illegally into the United States. Then they forced them to work as prostitutes in New York City and elsewhere. The defendants beat and sexually assaulted the victims to compel them to work and then punished them for not earning enough money.

In another case her office obtained a conviction against an owner of several New York bars for his role in sex trafficking and forced labor ring. The evidence at the trial established that the defendants recruited and harbored scores of undocumented Latin American immigrants and forced them to work as waitresses at the owner's bars.

How did they compel them to work? His accomplices used violence, beatings, and rape, as well as fraud and threats of deportation, to compel the victims to work and to prevent them from reporting the illegal activity to the police. Because of Loretta Lynch, this monster was arrested and sentenced to 60 years in prison. That is one way you stop this.

She has similarly prosecuted those who exploit children for sexual abuse to the fullest extent of the law. During her tenure, she has directed prosecutors in her office to bring 173 prosecutions for child exploitation and child pornography in coordination with the Department's Project Safe Childhood. In one case, the office prosecuted and obtained a guilty plea from a pediatrician who sexually exploited three of his patients under the guise of providing medical treatment. That predator now faces 30 years in prison.

I am saying this because no Member of this body—Republican or Democrat—no Member is in favor of sex trafficking. No Member is in favor of the exploitation of children in this fashion. Why don't we show we believe that, by confirming this highly qualified woman to be attorney general? She goes out and gets the people, she prosecutes them, she convicts them, and she sends them to prison.

I sometimes think of those exploited children I represented in the past. In the better cases, we could tell the child that he or she was safe and that we locked up the person who did this to them. But I also think of one of the very first cases I had—within weeks of becoming a 26-year-old State's attorney. I will never forget that case for as long as I live. We prosecuted the man. I convicted him. It was appealed to the Vermont Supreme Court, and I argued and won that appeal. He was convicted and went to prison for the rest of his life. But that does not help his victim. I can only go to the grave of his 2-year-old victim and say: We convicted the man who did this to you, but we can't bring you back to life.

Let's take the steps we need to stop this. We can do it. We stalled at one point on this bill. Let's find our way around that, and let's get this done. Let's give prosecutors the tools not just to prosecute criminals when we find them—let's take the steps necessary to stop this from happening in the first place.

When I think of that 2-year-old boy, if better steps had been in place to stop the abuse from happening, he would have lived. The abuser was prosecuted after the fact. There was no case in which I wanted to get a conviction more than I did in that case, but it didn't bring the 2-year-old victim back to life. Some victims in the cases I worked on were alive, and I saw how scarred the abuse left them.

We can prosecute those who commit these heinous crimes. Let's stop the crimes from happening. Let's ensure that these homeless kids, instead of going with anybody who will offer them a warm place and food—where the warm place and food turn into a hell on Earth for them—let's make sure there are shelters, people, and counselors who can help.

Mr. President, I see our distinguished chairman is here, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss what I discussed earlier in the day. In fact, I think it was this morning when I spoke to the reason why this legislation is not moving along. I am not going to repeat what I said then, but since then the minority leader came to the floor and gave reasons for this bill not moving along, and so I will once again bring up some important issues about this legislation

and rebut the other side on why we are not moving forward with this bill.

As we all know, this bill was unveiled in January after weeks of negotiation among our respective staff. It has been in the public domain since it was introduced in January. Since that time, we have followed regular order with respect to this legislation. We had a hearing on this bill. We scheduled a markup in February, and amendments were offered to the bill at that markup. The ranking member offered an amendment to the very same section of the bill that included this language.

Numerous committee members took the opportunity to speak about the bill during the hearing and markup. The markup offered a prime opportunity for any member—including the minority members of the Senate—to ask questions and make changes and strip out language to which they might have objected. We promised regular order during floor consideration as well, just as we have on practically every other piece of legislation that has been before the Senate since the new majority has taken over.

The language which they now object to on the floor, weeks after a committee markup took place—I remind everyone that this bill passed without a single dissenting vote in committee—is referred to as the Hyde amendment. We are talking about language that has been standard for the last 39 or 40 years. It is included virtually every time Congress appropriates taxpayer dollars for health services. The Hyde amendment has been and currently is the law of the land.

Hyde amendment language has been added to appropriations bills every year for decades. We have heard: Well, it has been added to appropriations bills, but it has not been on authorization bills. That is not true because it has been included in more than one authorization statute. I will give some examples, including laws authorizing the SCHIP program and programs in the Department of Defense. We negotiated this bill and this language in good faith.

I urge the Members of this body not to impede passage of a measure that over 200 groups have reviewed and endorsed. Yesterday I put letters from some of those groups or maybe even all of those groups in the RECORD so everyone can see the wide support this bill has not only in the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee by being voted out unanimously, but also outside groups support it as well. The 200 outside groups who participated in the hours of helping us reach a consensus on this bill have made it clear that ending human trafficking is an important priority for all of them. We need to put aside partisan politics. We need to pass this bill for their sake and the sake of trafficking survivors who are being subjected to degradation every day while we wait to act.

My asking that politics be put aside in order to get this legislation passed is not something new. Those politics were put aside in the Judiciary Committee.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I hate to see this held up over just the Hyde amendment. In somewhat similar legislation, the Republican House of Representatives was wise enough not to create this illusory "special assessment fund." The House-passed bill is an authorizing bill and does not contain the Hyde amendment.

I will yield the floor in a moment, but first I wish to quote from a statement by ATEST, Alliance To End Slavery and Trafficking. They urged the Senate, as I have, to reach a bipartisan compromise on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act.

For well over a decade, the work to combat modern slavery and human trafficking has been an example of Congress's ability to put partisanship aside in the interest of tackling a difficult and seemingly intractable problem. That willingness to be thoughtful, practical, and balanced in approach has proven successful in this work, and made tremendous contributions to the fight against this heinous crime. The debate that is emerging over the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, S. 178, and the application of the Hyde amendment to funds collected from perpetrators of human trafficking jeopardize this pragmatic balance in favor of a partisan confrontation that undermines the achievement of our joint goal of ending modern slavery in the United States and around the world.

For these reasons, we urge all members of the Senate to turn away from this divisive debate and find a bipartisan approach to this new initiative to protect and serve the needs of survivors.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALLIANCE TO  
END SLAVERY AND TRAFFICKING,  
Washington, DC.

ATEST URGES SENATE TO REACH BIPARTISAN COMPROMISE ON JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

For well over a decade, the work to combat modern slavery and human trafficking has been an example of Congress's ability to put partisanship aside in the interest of tackling a difficult and seemingly intractable problem. That willingness to be thoughtful, practical, and balanced in approach has proven successful in this work, and made tremendous contributions to the fight against this heinous crime. The debate that is emerging over the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, S. 178, and the application of the Hyde Amendment to funds collected from perpetrators of human trafficking jeopardize this pragmatic balance in favor of a partisan confrontation that undermines the achievement of our joint goal of ending modern slavery in the United States and around the world.

For these reasons, we urge all members of the Senate to turn away from this divisive debate and find a bipartisan approach to this



new initiative to protect and serve the needs of survivors.

Mr. LEAHY. I agree that we should get away from the divisiveness the Hyde amendment has created and find a way to go to the basic legislation.

Mr. President, I see my friend from Tennessee in the Chamber, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, I come to the floor to offer an amendment to the legislation, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am sorry, I didn't hear what the request was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I sent an amendment to the desk.

Mr. LEAHY. Did the Senator ask to set aside the pending amendment?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I did not.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. President, I withhold that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. Then I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me for a question?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Yes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, am I correct that the Senator from Tennessee is not asking the Senate to set aside the pending amendment but wishes to file an amendment? Is that correct?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Vermont through the Chair that the answer is yes.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, under those circumstances, I will not object.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment entitled the Stop Sexual Abuse by School Personnel Act of 2015. It is sponsored by me and Mr. KIRK, the Senator from Illinois.

In summary, what the amendment does is the following:

It requires States to have a criminal background check for all school employees.

It allows States and local school districts to use Federal funding authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures on background checks for school employees. Our amendment accomplishes this through the following: providing States with the flexibility and

resources to conduct searches of State and Federal criminal registries as determined by the State; empowering States to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures concerning the timely disclosure, notice, and appeal of background check results; supporting the development, implementation, or improvement of mechanisms for assisting in the identification of and response to incidents of child abuse, including by providing training and development for school personnel; and any other activities determined by the State to protect student safety.

In addition, the Alexander-Kirk amendment adopts the 2014 General Accountability Office report which recommended establishing the U.S. Department of Education as the lead agency to inform States of best practices. It also authorizes the U.S. Education Secretary to make reporting of student sexual abuse by school personnel a part of the annual Secretary's report card. Finally, it protects schools and school districts from being sued if they are in compliance with State regulations and requirements.

This is an enormously important subject and one of interest to every single Member of the United States Senate. There is at least one other amendment on the subject by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia. I expect there may be more amendments on the same subject. They all have the same goal—preventing sexual abuse of the 50 million children in our 100,000 public schools by school personnel.

These amendments are all under the jurisdiction of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, of which I am the chair. As chair of that committee, I believe there is a right way and a wrong way to reach this laudable goal. The right way is for the Federal Government to enable States and local governments to do a better job. The wrong way is for the Federal Government to set itself up as a national school board or as a human resources department to override State laws and dictate how to hire and fire six million teachers or other school personnel.

We have 6 million school personnel that could be affected by background check proposals. The question is, Can the local school board or can Washington, DC, do a better job of helping make children safe in Utah, in Iowa, in Tennessee, or in Vermont?

Senators TOOMEY and MANCHIN deserve our thanks and great credit for putting the spotlight on this issue that every single Senator cares about. But, I am afraid their solution for background checks will try to accomplish this purpose the wrong way. It would override State laws in at least 46 States to dictate policies and procedures for 100,000 public schools. Their

approach and their amendment, if enacted, would be the most extensive Federal takeover of local school personnel decisions in our country's history.

Let me say that once more. Their amendment, if enacted, would be the most extensive Federal takeover of local school personnel decisions in our country's history.

Now, I see on the floor the Senator from Iowa. I have spent some time in Iowa over the years and I know what a good education system they have in Iowa. In fact, Iowans are very particular about their education system. I don't know of a State that was more upset with No Child Left Behind than Iowa when it passed because it dictated education policies from Washington. Iowans asked, "Does Washington cherish the children of Iowa more than we do in Des Moines or in any other community in Iowa? Why do the people in Washington think they can tell us what to do about how to educate our children better than we do?" That is the issue here: whether it is Washington imposing academic standards such as Common Core or deciding whether schools and teachers are succeeding or failing, or mandating a one-size-fits-all approach to employee background checks on 6 million school personnel in 100,000 schools. I believe the American people are tired of this Washington-knows-best attitude toward local schools.

Senator KIRK and I have the Stop Sexual Abuse By School Personnel Act of 2015—which offers an approach toward this laudable goal in the correct way. Let me explain why I say it is the correct way.

First, it requires every state to have background checks for its 6 million employees who have access to children, but it doesn't dictate to them how to do the checks. Repeatedly we have found that when Congress tells the U.S. Department of Education to do something, it then proceeds to write a lot of regulations about exactly how to do it. I will give you an example.

In No Child Left Behind, there are requirements about improving low-performing schools. The law says there are six ways you must fix them. I put in the law last year a seventh way to fix schools: allowing the Governor of the State to come up with his or her own way to do this. Then, the U.S. Department of Education Secretary can approve or disapprove that approach. The Department, in its well-intentioned activities, defined what a Governor of Tennessee or Utah or Iowa could say about his or her own idea about fixing low-performing schools. That happens all the time. It happens all the time. Over the last several years we have created, in effect, a national school board in Washington, DC, by substituting the judgment of Washington for local schools. Achieving the laudable goal of

stopping sexual abuse by school personnel in the way suggested by the Senators from Pennsylvania and West Virginia would only make that national school board bigger. In the words of one teacher I spoke with, their proposal would only make the U.S. Department of Education more of a human resources department for 6 million local school personnel.

Last year, the Government Accountability Office found that 46 States require background checks for all public school employees. My amendment require all states to do them. It would also ensure background checks for contractors who have unsupervised contact or interaction with children.

It would also let schools and school districts use Federal funding to expand access to more registries since the cost of conducting the checks sometimes keep them from doing so.

My amendment takes this broader approach because the Government Accountability Office report in 2014 that background checks alone are not enough to prevent child abuse by school personnel. Background checks are only as good as the databases used to conduct them. I understand sometimes those databases can have inaccurate or incomplete information. One report estimated that 1.8 million workers a year are subject to FBI background checks that include faulty or incomplete information such as the final result of the case.

GAO's report also highlights that those charged with child abuse are only a fraction of those who abuse children. For example, a risk management company told GAO that few child abusers are caught the first time they abuse, and many abuse children multiple times before they are caught. Therefore, background checks alone are not enough to help protect children from abuse.

Experts say, according to the GAO report, that training to prevent child abuse is a key tool to help school employees recognize early warning signs of abuse and they recommend that schools integrate training into their child abuse prevention efforts. Yet, because of cost constraints, GAO found that only 18 States required training. The amendment Senator KIRK and I are offering would help more States with schools that offer training by allowing States and school districts to use Federal funding to do it.

Third, the Alexander-Kirk amendment would establish the Department of Education as a resource for States. The Department of Education is not supposed to be the school board for Utah or Tennessee or Iowa; it is supposed to be, if anything, an enabling resource. So another important way to prevent child abuse is to ensure schools are aware of information and resources that are already available to them by the Federal Government.

According to GAO, again: "The Federal Government, through its existing resources and expertise, is well positioned to assist States and localities and to help strengthen their prevention and response efforts."

Yet, last year, more than 30 States surveyed by GAO were not aware of Federal resources available to schools to help address sexual abuse because no single agency was leading this effort, and coordination among the Federal agencies is limited. In one baffling example, a lead official who coordinates interagency meetings to talk about child maltreatment said none of the meetings had focused on sexual abuse by school personnel.

States are looking for help. Twenty-nine States said additional guidance and technical assistance could be useful, such as guidance on developing professional standards and codes of conduct, examples of training models, and materials, and opportunities for grants. That is why the Alexander-Kirk amendment adopts GAO's recommendation to instruct the Secretary of Education to lead an effort, in coordination with other agencies, to develop and disseminate best practices that States, districts, and schools can take to prevent and respond to sexual abuse by school personnel.

Fourth, the amendment would recommend that the Secretary of Education pull together a dependable set of data on abuse by school personnel for the Secretary's report card. GAO reported that several Federal agencies collect data related to violence against children and students, but none systematically identify the extent of sexual abuse by school personnel. Therefore, my amendment also adopts the GAO recommendation that the Secretary of Education work to identify ways to better track and analyze the prevalence of child abuse by school personnel and report on it in the Secretary's report card.

This is an approach to solving the problem that respects the idea that in my hometown, and in each Senator's hometown in 100,000 schools, there are school boards, parents, and communities that cherish their children and they don't believe that Washington cherishes them more. This proposal would give those parents, communities, teachers, and principals the tools they need to prevent child abuse. It would enable them to do a better job of stopping sexual abuse of children by school personnel.

In a meeting I attended earlier today, it was said that the Senate has already passed the Toomey-Manchin amendment because we passed the child care and development block grant. Let me talk about that a minute. The child care and development block grant went through the committee I now chair. There are three things wrong with the argument that the Toomey-Manchin

amendment has already passed. First, the child care development block grant is funded 100 percent by the Federal Government. It affects 1.5 million children. It affects a little more than 1 million children. The Federal Government funds about 10 percent of elementary and secondary education. So if we fund 100 percent of a program, the argument is strong that we can also write the rules for it. If we fund 10 of a program, the people who fund 90 percent might say, "What gave you the right to tell us what to do?"

Second, the argument was made that the child care and development block grant contains basically the same set of background checks as the Toomey-Manchin. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Toomey-Manchin amendment is significantly different from the background check provisions in the child care and development block grant. It is different in terms of its scope, privacy provisions, mitigating factors in an appeals process, potential lawsuits against a school district, and materiality. Let me focus on these differences for a minute.

First, in terms of scope, the child care and development block grant applies to about 1.5 million children who receive vouchers to for childcare. The Toomey-Manchin bill applies to all elementary and secondary schools in States that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That is 100,000 public elementary and secondary schools, 14,000 local school districts, and 50 State education agencies.

Second, in terms of privacy, the child care and development block grant ensures that the only information employers receive is whether the prospective employee passed or failed the background check. The Toomey-Manchin amendment has no similar protections and allows employers to share the results of background checks with other prospective employers. That is a privacy concern.

Third, it differs in terms of what we call mitigating factors: The child care and development block grant permits States to create a review process through which disqualified employees can become eligible for employment due to mitigating factors such as the length of time since they committed a crime. The Toomey-Manchin bill doesn't permit States to conduct such reviews. My bill allows states to do a review.

Fourth, private right of action provisions: The child care and development block grant expressly does not create a private right of action if the childcare provider is in compliance with all State regulations. The Toomey-Manchin bill does not contain similar language, potentially exposing schools to litigation. The Alexander amendment does include that.

Finally, materiality. The child care and development block grant precludes

hiring an employee if they make a material false statement on a background check. The Toomey-Manchin bill has no such materiality requirement.

I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, these differences between the background check requirements in the child care and development block grant bill and the Toomey-Manchin amendment.

Finally, I am glad we are discussing the topic of protecting students from sexual abuse. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia for putting the spotlight on this issue. I have worked with them to suggest changes to their bill.

We have fundamental differences in our approaches. I think, when it comes to local schools, the limit of Washington's responsibility is to enable communities and schools to do a better job of educating our children.

Most of the discussion we are having in the Senate education committee today is reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The discussion is about who determines whether schools and teachers are succeeding or failing, local communities or Washington? The theory is that local control of these decisions allows for more innovation. This respects the fact that parents, communities, teachers, and principals cherish their own children. It certainly would be wrong for us to say Washington cherishes their children more than they do.

I spend a lot of my time arguing with people—they are often Democrats—who want to say: I have got a good idea. Now, let's impose it on all schools. For example, Common Core—we have 42 States operating under waivers from the U.S. Department of Education. In order to get that waiver, which they need to keep their schools from being deemed as failing, states have to, in effect, adopt Common Core. This requirement has created a general uprising in Tennessee; I imagine it has in North Carolina; I suspect it has in Iowa, not so much because of what the standards are but because the very idea that Washington would be telling local school districts it knows better than their state capital and local school boards what their academic standards ought to be. The same thing with teacher evaluation.

When I was the Governor of Tennessee in the 1980s, we became the first State to pay teachers more for teaching well. I had a year-and-a-half brawl with the National Education Association. When we defeated them, and 10,000 teachers were gradually able to move up the career ladder.

When I came to Washington, people thought I would require every State do that. I said, absolutely not. That is not the way our constitutional federalism works. States have a right to be right, and have a right to be wrong on teach-

er evaluation and Common Core. Those are tremendously important issues, but it is hard enough to fairly evaluate a teacher without Washington trying to tell you how to do it.

Take the business of whether a school is succeeding or failing, whether a school has made adequate yearly progress, or whether a teacher is highly qualified. We have had a 12-year experiment with trying to make all these decisions at the U.S. Department of Education. One teacher said it had become a human resources department for 100,000 local schools. It hasn't worked. It does help to know how the children are doing on their tests. It does help to aggregate the results so we know whether children are falling behind. It does help for States to have the results from the national assessment of educational progress so we can compare North Carolina to Tennessee. But it does not help to have well-meaning people in Washington say: I know exactly how to make your children safe, how to tell them what to learn, how to evaluate teachers, how to tell them whether schools are succeeding or failing, and how to fix them.

One other example. What about guns? Sexual abuse of children is a terrible tragedy. That is why we have at least two amendments on it, and maybe we will have a third. So are guns in schools. We have had some terrible tragedies there.

What did the U.S. Congress do about that 20 years ago? They passed something called the Gun-Free School Zones Act. They whipped it right through Congress as if that was going to fix the problem of guns in every school in America. There were two things wrong with it. The Supreme Court of the United States struck the bill down as unconstitutional, as a Federal overreach into local affairs. But the main thing wrong with it was that is not how you make schools safe. You don't make schools safe by passing a law in Washington and pretending you have made 50 million children safe in 100,000 schools. This would suggest that if there is a problem with school safety in my hometown in Maryville, TN, it is up to the U.S. Senate to fix that problem, to make the schools safe. It is not. That is not how you do it. In my hometown, they make that school safe because the community is involved. They win the football games, they have good academic scores, and they have safe schools. Someone asked the principal when they won the football game why they did so well? The principal said, it is because we are a community school. When something happens here, the community shows up.

If we want to fix the problem of abuse of children in schools, there is a right way to do it and there is a wrong way to do it. The right way is to recognize the problem, require States to have background checks, and enable

them to do a better job at using Federal funds to access data registries and provide training for employees. In addition, the U.S. Department of Education can be designated as the lead agency to provide best practices to local schools and to include data on the prevalence of child abuse by school personnel on Secretary's report card. The wrong way to do it is to take over the personnel decisions for 6 million employees in 100,000 schools and pretend that schools will be safer. There is a fundamental difference of opinion by Senators who agree on a laudable goal.

I believe it is more appropriate under our constitutional system of federalism for Congress to limit itself to enabling schools to do a better job of their essential responsibilities rather than creating, in effect, a national school board that tries to run our schools and hire and fire those personnel.

I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks a summary of the Alexander-Kirk amendment.

I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BACKGROUND CHECK REQUIREMENTS IN CCDBG AND TOOMEY BILL

The Child Care and Development and Block Grant (CCDBG), as amended in 2014, and Senator Toomey's amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act both create a new requirement that states, as a condition of receiving federal funds under relevant programs, conduct comprehensive criminal background checks for all prospective and current child care or school employees. Key differences between the two approaches include:

##### Scope:

CCDBG applies to all child care providers that receive federal funding

Toomey's bill applies to all elementary and secondary schools in states that receive federal funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This includes:

100,000 public elementary and secondary schools

14,000 local school districts

50 state educational agencies

##### Privacy:

CCDBG ensures that the only information employers receive is whether the prospective employee passed or failed the background check.

Toomey's bill has no similar protections and allows employers to share the results of background checks with other prospective employers.

##### Mitigating factors:

CCDBG permits states to create a review process through which disqualified employees can become eligible for employment due to mitigating factors, such as the length of time since they committed a crime.

Toomey's bill does not permit states to conduct such reviews.

##### Private right of action:

CCDBG does not create a private right of action if the child care provider is in compliance with all state requirements.

Toomey's bill does not contain similar language, potentially opening schools to litigation.

##### Materiality:

CCDBG precludes hiring an employee if they make a material false statement on a

background check; Toomey's bill has no such materiality requirement.

THE STOP SEXUAL ABUSE BY SCHOOL  
PERSONNEL ACT OF 2015

WHAT THE ALEXANDER AMENDMENT DOES

Requires states to have a criminal background check for all school employees.

Allows States or local school districts to use federal funding authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education act to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures on background checks for school employees, including:

Providing states with the flexibility and resources to conduct searches of State and Federal criminal registries, as determined by the State;

Empowering states to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures concerning the timely disclosure, notice, and appeal of background check results;

Supporting the development, implementation, or improvement of mechanisms for assisting in the identification of and response to incidents of child abuse, including by providing training and development for school personnel; and

Any other activities determined by the State to protect student safety.

Adopts the 2014 GAO report recommendation to establish the U.S. Department of Education as the lead agency to inform schools of best practices.

Authorizes the U.S. Education Secretary to make reporting of student sexual abuse by school personnel a part of an annual "Secretary's Report Card."

Protects schools and school districts from being sued if in compliance with State regulations and requirements.

REASONS TO SUPPORT THIS AMENDMENT

It requires states to have a criminal background check for all school employees, help states and local school districts do them, but does not dictate how they do it.

It will support what most states are already doing—According to GAO, 46 States already require background checks of some kind for all public school employees and 42 States have established professional standards or codes of conduct for school personnel.

Rather than mandating a one-size-fits-all approach for 14,000 local school districts and 100,000 public schools, it will provide states with flexibility to establish, implement, or improve background check policies and procedures that best meet State and local needs.

It will support State and local efforts to increase reporting of child abuse, limit the transfer of school personnel implicated in abuse, as well as provide training on how to recognize, respond to, and prevent child abuse in schools.

It will protect schools and local school districts from civil litigation resulting from background check decisions that are otherwise in compliance with State regulations and requirements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS).

The Senator from Iowa.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the nomination that will be before the entire Senate next week, the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be the Attorney General of the United States of America, and to urge all of my Senate colleagues to quickly confirm United States Attorney Lynch to this position.

Loretta Lynch has dedicated much of her life—many years of her life—to public service, serving twice as the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York. In this role she earned a reputation as a tough but fair prosecutor.

I would like to take a few minutes to outline some of Loretta Lynch's record. As United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, she has kept communities safer by bringing serious, violent criminals to justice, prosecuting high-level gang members and drug traffickers. U.S. Attorney Lynch has also tirelessly fought public corruption. While she was at the U.S. Attorney's Office, she was the lead prosecutor in municipal corruption cases on Long Island and supervised the prosecution of the New York State Senate majority leader recently.

During her time in private practice, Loretta Lynch did pro bono work as special counsel to the prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, further evidencing her commitment to public service and to the enforcement of the law. Hers is a truly impressive record, and one that without question prepared United States Attorney Lynch to serve as Attorney General Lynch upon confirmation by the Senate.

I had the opportunity to meet with Loretta Lynch this past January. She and I discussed how the Department of Justice can do more to give law enforcement the tools it needs, also to eliminate witness intimidation—a major issue in cities such as Philadelphia and others around the country. Also, we talked about reforming the juvenile justice system, and finally reducing tensions between police, law enforcement and the communities they serve.

I was very impressed by United States Attorney Lynch. I believe she is well suited to address these and many other issues she will confront as the Attorney General of the United States. These issues, of course, are not only critical to Pennsylvania but also our whole country.

I am also confident that Loretta Lynch, when she is confirmed—and I believe she will be—will continue the important work of Attorney General Holder to fairly enforce Federal voting

and civil rights laws, to support equality for LGBT Americans, to work to reduce the over-incarceration of non-violent offenders, and also to address disparities in our criminal justice system.

Despite Loretta Lynch's record as a prosecutor, serving twice as the United States attorney in the State of New York, and despite her record and countless expressions of support from law enforcement, from civil rights advocates, and past Attorneys General, Loretta Lynch's nomination has been pending for 122 days before the Senate. This is the longest it has taken the U.S. Senate to vote on the nominee for Attorney General in 30 years.

This is especially surprising given that the Senate has already confirmed Loretta Lynch twice. In both 2000 and 2010, the Senate confirmed Loretta Lynch to be the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, as I mentioned earlier. In each case her confirmation before the Senate was unanimous.

Loretta Lynch's nomination we know is historic for many reasons, but the principal reason is she would be the first African-American woman to serve as the Nation's Attorney General. However, apart from the historic nature of her nomination, and I hope confirmation, Loretta Lynch is supremely qualified for this position for all the reasons I stated earlier. They could be summarized in a few words: integrity, intellect, and experience. I could add more words to that, but they are the qualities we want in any prosecutor and, of course, they are the qualities we want in an Attorney General. I believe we have those qualities with Attorney General Holder, and we want to have the confirmation completed for the new Attorney General nominee, Loretta Lynch.

I strongly support Loretta Lynch's nomination, and I am pleased the majority leader has committed to considering her nomination on the Senate floor. I call on all of my colleagues to confirm Loretta Lynch without delay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we live in a country of unparalleled opportunity. The blessings of liberty are the birthright of every American, and the Framers ordained our Constitution to protect these rights. To deny any person these basic freedoms would seem almost unthinkable today. So the fact that even as I speak there are thousands of individuals living as slaves in our very own country is even more unthinkable. But it is undeniably true.

In this country, right now, there are thousands of human beings living as slaves, men, women, and children, stolen from their homes, stripped of their

God-given rights, and robbed of their human dignity. These individuals live among us. They live in our neighborhoods and our suburbs, our biggest cities and our smallest towns. They live in a world of silence, fear, hopelessness, and unspeakable suffering.

These individuals of whom I speak are the victims of human trafficking, a heinous and abominable crime that we should call by its real name: modern-day slavery. The State Department estimates that up to 17,500 individuals are trafficked to the United States every year. The majority of these are women and children. Some of them are forced into a life of unpaid servitude, many others into sex work. Worldwide, the International Labor Organization estimates that 4.5 million people are currently enslaved through sex trafficking. These numbers are staggering, but they illustrate the scope of the problem. The suffering of each individual victim should not be lost in a sea of statistics.

For victims of human trafficking, the surreal horror of their lives bears testimony to the gravity of the crime.

Consider the case of Holly Smith. When Holly was just 14 years old, she met a man at a local shopping mall in New Jersey. With all the innocence of youth, Holly confided in this man all the fears and anxieties of her adolescence, telling him how nervous she was to begin high school.

Holly could never have guessed that the man she had just met—the man she had just trusted with her deepest feelings—was a human trafficker trained to emotionally manipulate young girls to lure them into prostitution. This man promised Holly a life of glamor and excitement if she agreed to run away with him.

Holly took the bait. She ran away with the man who would later abuse her and intimidate her into prostitution. She was one of the many victims of child sex trafficking.

Holly eventually escaped this nightmare and even had the courage to tell her story at a Judiciary Committee hearing on human trafficking last month, but many are not so lucky. We must do more to help victims such as Holly. We must do more to combat the evils of human trafficking.

As a legislative body, we made significant progress in the year 2000 when we passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. This legislation took critical steps in providing greater protection to victims and levying heavier penalties against traffickers. We have since reauthorized that legislation on four occasions.

In each instance, I have been passionately committed in the fight against human trafficking. My staff has also been equally devoted to this issue, and I was especially proud when President Bush asked my former Judiciary counsel, Grace Chung Becker, to head the

very first human trafficking unit within the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division. It is only fitting that the Justice Department established this unit as a subset of its Civil Rights Division and not its Criminal Division. Human trafficking is more than a mere crime; it is a fundamental violation of human rights.

It is not my intention to minimize the significance of the legislation we have passed thus far, but we still have so much work to do. We have recognized that human trafficking is a serious problem; now we need a serious solution.

I am grateful for Senator KLOBUCHAR's initiative in addressing that problem. Her Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act properly identifies children lured into prostitution as victims, not criminals. By encouraging States to adopt safe harbor laws, we are better equipped to help victims receive the care and treatment they deserve.

Senator CORNYN's Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act also aids these victims by establishing a special fund that will provide them more of the resources they need to repair their shattered lives. Senator CORNYN's bill also imposes severe penalties on traffickers, including heavier fines that the Justice Department will direct toward victim compensation.

I strongly support both of these bills, and I am grateful for my colleagues' enormous efforts in building a coalition to combat this scourge.

Human trafficking is a complex problem, and solving it requires a multi-front approach. It is a problem of both supply and demand. In addition to passing this legislation to address the problem of supply, we must also address the problem of demand.

The prevalence of human trafficking is a moral stain on our country, and we can never eradicate this evil if we are only addressing part of the problem.

Through stricter enforcement of obscenity laws, we can decrease demand for sex trafficking. There is an undeniable link between illegal adult obscenity and sex trafficking, and I have long been an outspoken voice on this issue.

Laura Lederer, former Senior Advisor on Trafficking in Persons at the State Department, observed that there are "numerous links between sex trafficking and pornography" and that pornography is even "used in sex trafficking and the sex industry to train women and children what to do."

In 2011, I led 41 other Senators in sending a letter to Attorney General Eric Holder calling for greater enforcement of Federal obscenity laws. In his response, even he agreed that hard-core pornography is associated with sex trafficking. This type of obscenity not only harms individuals, families, and entire communities, but also normalizes sexual harm to children.

How long will we let this culture of perversion persist? How long will we ignore the pressing problem of adult obscenity at the expense of the innocent women and children who are too often the victims of this vice?

Enough is enough. Ignoring the problem of adult obscenity is ignoring the problem of human trafficking, and ignorance will not free the innocent women and children trapped in the clutches of modern-day slavery. The First Amendment does not protect adult obscenity, so the Federal Government is acting well within its power to impose greater enforcement. I firmly believe a consistent commitment to enforcing these laws will have a significant impact in reducing the prevalence of sex trafficking.

I want to conclude by discussing this body's handling of this important bill. In my 39 years as a Member of this body, I have seen the Senate at some of its best moments and at some of its worst moments. Last year I came to the floor repeatedly to warn of how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—who were then in the majority—had abused the legislative process for partisan political gain.

Since the beginning of the 114th Congress this January, we have made remarkable progress in restoring the Senate as an institution. By restoring this body's traditions of fulsome debate, an open amendment process, and regular order through the committee system, our new majority is putting the Senate back to work for the American people. While the sailing has not always been totally smooth—it rarely is in my experience—the progress we have seen in restoring this institution to its proper role as a productive legislative body is real and meaningful.

Given this headway, I have been extremely disappointed to see a logjam develop and impede our progress on this vital piece of bipartisan legislation, something that should pass this body 100 to 0. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have threatened a filibuster, claiming that we somehow ambushed them with a controversial abortion rider. That claim is absolutely ridiculous. The language they are suddenly so upset about has been in the bill the entire time, as those of us on the Judiciary Committee can attest. My colleagues had no complaints about this language when the bill passed out of the committee; in fact, it passed unanimously. Moreover, not only was this language in the bill from the beginning, but it has also been the law of the land for nearly four decades.

Democrats in this body have supported countless other bills—including even ObamaCare—with similar language, knowing that such provisions are important to many people on both sides of the aisle.

This policy represents a sensible and appropriate compromise in an issue

area characterized by conflicting and deeply held views. As such, the notion that this provision should provoke my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to grind the legislative process to a halt boggles the mind. It makes us wonder what in the world is going on here.

Even the most charitable interpretation of this move suggests that the minority is once again resorting to outrageous my-way-or-the-highway tactics to impose an extreme pro-abortion policy.

More disturbingly, this ploy plainly demonstrates the minority leadership's desire to pick a political fight over abortion and to muck up the majority's efforts to exercise reliable leadership. By resorting to this sort of obstruction, they have demonstrated just how desperately they want to derail our efforts to legislate responsibly and instead resort to their tired and discredited war-on-women rhetoric to win cheap political points. I am unabashedly pro-life, and I have no qualms whatsoever about debating that issue.

If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so desperate to debate that issue and push an extreme plan to overturn the longstanding compromise—that is the law of the land—let us debate such a measure at an appropriate time, but not on this bill. To hold this important human trafficking bill hostage is a deplorable approach.

The minority leader earlier came to the floor and tried to manipulate my words to support his shameful gambit. For all of my colleagues who are tempted by this irresponsible strategy, let me repeat my previous point.

It would be pathetic to hold up this bill. This bill is absolutely critical to families and our children. I cannot believe the Senate has become so political that my colleagues would raise this issue—this tangential, long-settled issue—at this time—after the same transparently clear language passed unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee.

For my colleagues to hold up this bill in an effort to seek to impose their extreme policy, to overturn the law of the land that has long enjoyed bipartisan support, to pick a false fight over abortion, or to try to embarrass the majority is itself embarrassing. They ought to be ashamed.

I urge my colleagues in the minority, in the strongest possible terms, to reconsider their position and allow the Senate once again to do the people's business.

Look, all of us are fed up with the delays and the problems of not legislating the way we should in the Senate. All of us are fed up with some of the tactics that have been used, but to use them on a bill such as this? Come on. This is a bill that will make a real difference, and there should not be one Senator in this body voting against it,

and they certainly shouldn't vote against it because there is language in there that is the law of the land today.

Yes, many Democrats don't like it. But I don't like them holding up one of the most important bills for children and families and women just so they can make a cheap political point on abortion.

I care a great deal for my colleagues on the other side. They have special concerns just as we have special concerns. They have special challenges just as we have special challenges. But this is one we ought all to agree on. Get it out of the Senate, get it going, and start doing more to stop human trafficking in our society today.

This is something we ought to all quit playing games with. Just pass it, and get it through the Senate and the House.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on Monday I gave a statement on the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and the Voting Rights Act. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD President Obama's remarks from the commemoration.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SELMA TO MONTGOMERY MARCHES

EDMUND PETTUS BRIDGE  
SELMA, ALABAMA

THE PRESIDENT: Well, you know I love you back.

It is a rare honor in this life to follow one of your heroes. And John Lewis is one of my heroes.

Now, I have to imagine that when a younger John Lewis woke up that morning 50 years ago and made his way to Brown Chapel, heroics were not on his mind. A day like this was not on his mind. Young folks with bedrolls and backpacks were milling about. Veterans of the movement trained newcomers in the tactics of non-violence; the right way to protect yourself when attacked. A doctor described what tear gas does to the body, while marchers scribbled down instructions for contacting their loved ones. The air was thick with doubt, anticipation and fear. And they comforted themselves with the final verse of the final hymn they sung:

"No matter what may be the test, God will take care of you; Lean, weary one, upon His breast, God will take care of you."

And then, his knapsack stocked with an apple, a toothbrush, and a book on govern-

ment—all you need for a night behind bars—John Lewis led them out of the church on a mission to change America.

President and Mrs. Bush, Governor Bentley, Mayor Evans, Sewell, Reverend Strong, members of Congress, elected officials, foot soldiers, friends, fellow Americans:

As John noted, there are places and moments in America where this nation's destiny has been decided. Many are sites of war—Concord and Lexington, Appomattox, Gettysburg. Others are sites that symbolize the daring of America's character—Independence Hall and Seneca Falls, Kitty Hawk and Cape Canaveral.

Selma is such a place. In one afternoon 50 years ago, so much of our turbulent history—the stain of slavery and anguish of civil war; the yoke of segregation and tyranny of Jim Crow; the death of four little girls in Birmingham; and the dream of a Baptist preacher—all that history met on this bridge.

It was not a clash of armies, but a clash of wills; a contest to determine the true meaning of America. And because of men and women like John Lewis, Joseph Lowery, Hosea Williams, Amelia Boynton, Diane Nash, Ralph Abernathy, C.T. Vivian, Andrew Young, Fred Shuttlesworth, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and so many others, the idea of a just America and a fair America, an inclusive America, and a generous America—that idea ultimately triumphed.

As is true across the landscape of American history, we cannot examine this moment in isolation. The march on Selma was part of a broader campaign that spanned generations; the leaders that day part of a long line of heroes.

We gather here to celebrate them. We gather here to honor the courage of ordinary Americans willing to endure billy clubs and the chastening rod; tear gas and the trampling hoof; men and women who despite the gush of blood and splintered bone would stay true to their North Star and keep marching towards justice.

They did as Scripture instructed: "Rejoice in hope, be patient in tribulation, be constant in prayer." And in the days to come, they went back again and again. When the trumpet call sounded for more to join, the people came—black and white, young and old, Christian and Jew, waving the American flag and singing the same anthems full of faith and hope. A white newsman, Bill Plante, who covered the marches then and who is with us here today, quipped that the growing number of white people lowered the quality of the singing. To those who marched, though, those old gospel songs must have never sounded so sweet.

In time, their chorus would well up and reach President Johnson. And he would send them protection, and speak to the nation, echoing their call for America and the world to hear: "We shall overcome." What enormous faith these men and women had. Faith in God, but also faith in America.

The Americans who crossed this bridge, they were not physically imposing. But they gave courage to millions. They held no elected office. But they led a nation. They marched as Americans who had endured hundreds of years of brutal violence, countless daily indignities—but they didn't seek special treatment, just the equal treatment promised to them almost a century before.

What they did here will reverberate through the ages. Not because the change they won was preordained; not because their victory was complete; but because they proved that nonviolent change is possible, that love and hope can conquer hate.



As we commemorate their achievement, we are well-served to remember that at the time of the marches, many in power condemned rather than praised them. Back then, they were called Communists, or half-breeds, or outside agitators, sexual and moral degenerates, and worse—they were called everything but the name their parents gave them. Their faith was questioned. Their lives were threatened. Their patriotism challenged.

And yet, what could be more American than what happened in this place? What could more profoundly vindicate the idea of America than plain and humble people—unsung, the downtrodden, the dreamers not of high station, not born to wealth or privilege, not of one religious tradition but many, coming together to shape their country's course?

What greater expression of faith in the American experiment than this, what greater form of patriotism is there than the belief that America is not yet finished, that we are strong enough to be self-critical, that each successive generation can look upon our imperfections and decide that it is in our power to remake this nation to more closely align with our highest ideals?

That's why Selma is not some outlier in the American experience. That's why it's not a museum or a static monument to behold from a distance. It is instead the manifestation of a creed written into our founding documents: "We the People . . . in order to form a more perfect union." "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

These are not just words. They're a living thing, a call to action, a roadmap for citizenship and an insistence in the capacity of free men and women to shape our own destiny. For founders like Franklin and Jefferson, for leaders like Lincoln and FDR, the success of our experiment in self-government rested on engaging all of our citizens in this work. And that's what we celebrate here in Selma. That's what this movement was all about, one leg in our long journey toward freedom.

The American instinct that led these young men and women to pick up the torch and cross this bridge, that's the same instinct that moved patriots to choose revolution over tyranny. It's the same instinct that drew immigrants from across oceans and the Rio Grande; the same instinct that led women to reach for the ballot, workers to organize against an unjust status quo; the same instinct that led us to plant a flag at Iwo Jima and on the surface of the Moon.

It's the idea held by generations of citizens who believed that America is a constant work in progress; who believed that loving this country requires more than singing its praises or avoiding uncomfortable truths. It requires the occasional disruption, the willingness to speak out for what is right, to shake up the status quo. That's America.

That's what makes us unique. That's what cements our reputation as a beacon of opportunity. Young people behind the Iron Curtain would see Selma and eventually tear down that wall. Young people in Soweto would hear Bobby Kennedy talk about ripples of hope and eventually banish the scourge of apartheid. Young people in Burma went to prison rather than submit to military rule. They saw what John Lewis had done. From the streets of Tunis to the Maidan in Ukraine, this generation of young people can draw strength from this place, where the powerless could change the world's greatest power and push their leaders to expand the boundaries of freedom.

They saw that idea made real right here in Selma, Alabama. They saw that idea manifest itself here in America.

Because of campaigns like this, a Voting Rights Act was passed. Political and economic and social barriers came down. And the change these men and women wrought is visible here today in the presence of African Americans who run boardrooms, who sit on the bench, who serve in elected office from small towns to big cities; from the Congressional Black Caucus all the way to the Oval Office.

Because of what they did, the doors of opportunity swung open not just for black folks, but for every American. Women marched through those doors. Latinos marched through those doors. Asian Americans, gay Americans, Americans with disabilities—they all came through those doors. Their endeavors gave the entire South the chance to rise again, not by reasserting the past, but by transcending the past.

What a glorious thing, Dr. King might say. And what a solemn debt we owe. Which leads us to ask, just how might we repay that debt?

First and foremost, we have to recognize that one day's commemoration, no matter how special, is not enough. If Selma taught us anything, it's that our work is never done. The American experiment in self-government gives work and purpose to each generation.

Selma teaches us, as well, that action requires that we shed our cynicism. For when it comes to the pursuit of justice, we can afford neither complacency nor despair.

Just this week, I was asked whether I thought the Department of Justice's Ferguson report shows that, with respect to race, little has changed in this country. And I understood the question; the report's narrative was sadly familiar. It evoked the kind of abuse and disregard for citizens that spawned the Civil Rights Movement. But I rejected the notion that nothing's changed. What happened in Ferguson may not be unique, but it's no longer endemic. It's no longer sanctioned by law or by custom. And before the Civil Rights Movement, it most surely was.

We do a disservice to the cause of justice by intimating that bias and discrimination are immutable, that racial division is inherent to America. If you think nothing's changed in the past 50 years, ask somebody who lived through the Selma or Chicago or Los Angeles of the 1950s. Ask the female CEO who once might have been assigned to the secretarial pool if nothing's changed. Ask your gay friend if it's easier to be out and proud in America now than it was thirty years ago. To deny this progress, this hard-won progress—our progress—would be to rob us of our own agency, our own capacity, our responsibility to do what we can to make America better.

Of course, a more common mistake is to suggest that Ferguson is an isolated incident; that racism is banished; that the work that drew men and women to Selma is now complete, and that whatever racial tensions remain are a consequence of those seeking to play the "race card" for their own purposes. We don't need the Ferguson report to know that's not true. We just need to open our eyes, and our ears, and our hearts to know that this nation's racial history still casts its long shadow upon us.

We know the march is not yet over. We know the race is not yet won. We know that reaching that blessed destination where we are judged, all of us, by the content of our

character requires admitting as much, facing up to the truth. "We are capable of bearing a great burden," James Baldwin once wrote, "once we discover that the burden is reality and arrive where reality is."

There's nothing America can't handle if we actually look squarely at the problem. And this is work for all Americans, not just some. Not just whites. Not just blacks. If we want to honor the courage of those who marched that day, then all of us are called to possess their moral imagination. All of us will need to feel as they did the fierce urgency of now. All of us need to recognize as they did that change depends on our actions, on our attitudes, the things we teach our children. And if we make such an effort, no matter how hard it may sometimes seem, laws can be passed, and consciences can be stirred, and consensus can be built.

With such an effort, we can make sure our criminal justice system serves all and not just some. Together, we can raise the level of mutual trust that policing is built on—the idea that police officers are members of the community they risk their lives to protect, and citizens in Ferguson and New York and Cleveland, they just want the same thing young people here marched for 50 years ago—the protection of the law. Together, we can address unfair sentencing and overcrowded prisons, and the stunted circumstances that rob too many boys of the chance to become men, and rob the nation of too many men who could be good dads, and good workers, and good neighbors.

With effort, we can roll back poverty and the roadblocks to opportunity. Americans don't accept a free ride for anybody, nor do we believe in equality of outcomes. But we do expect equal opportunity. And if we really mean it, if we're not just giving lip service to it, but if we really mean it and are willing to sacrifice for it, then, yes, we can make sure every child gets an education suitable to this new century, one that expands imaginations and lifts sights and gives those children the skills they need. We can make sure every person willing to work has the dignity of a job, and a fair wage, and a real voice, and sturdier rungs on that ladder into the middle class.

And with effort, we can protect the foundation stone of our democracy for which so many marched across this bridge—and that is the right to vote. Right now, in 2015, 50 years after Selma, there are laws across this country designed to make it harder for people to vote. As we speak, more of such laws are being proposed. Meanwhile, the Voting Rights Act, the culmination of so much blood, so much sweat and tears, the product of so much sacrifice in the face of wanton violence, the Voting Rights Act stands weakened, its future subject to political rancor.

How can that be? The Voting Rights Act was one of the crowning achievements of our democracy, the result of Republican and Democratic efforts. President Reagan signed its renewal when he was in office. President George W. Bush signed its renewal when he was in office. One hundred members of Congress have come here today to honor people who were willing to die for the right to protect it. If we want to honor this day, let that hundred go back to Washington and gather four hundred more, and together, pledge to make it their mission to restore that law this year. That's how we honor those on this bridge.

Of course, our democracy is not the task of Congress alone, or the courts alone, or even the President alone. If every new voter-suppression law was struck down today, we



would still have, here in America, one of the lowest voting rates among free peoples. Fifty years ago, registering to vote here in Selma and much of the South meant guessing the number of jellybeans in a jar, the number of bubbles on a bar of soap. It meant risking your dignity, and sometimes, your life.

What's our excuse today for not voting? How do we so casually discard the right for which so many fought? How do we so fully give away our power, our voice, in shaping America's future? Why are we pointing to somebody else when we could take the time just to go to the polling places? We give away our power.

Fellow marchers, so much has changed in 50 years. We have endured war and we've fashioned peace. We've seen technological wonders that touch every aspect of our lives. We take for granted conveniences that our parents could have scarcely imagined. But what has not changed is the imperative of citizenship; that willingness of a 26-year-old deacon, or a Unitarian minister, or a young mother of five to decide they loved this country so much that they'd risk everything to realize its promise.

That's what it means to love America. That's what it means to believe in America. That's what it means when we say America is exceptional.

For we were born of change. We broke the old aristocracies, declaring ourselves entitled not by bloodline, but endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights. We secure our rights and responsibilities through a system of self-government, of and by and for the people. That's why we argue and fight with so much passion and conviction—because we know our efforts matter. We know America is what we make of it.

Look at our history. We are Lewis and Clark and Sacajawea, pioneers who braved the unfamiliar, followed by a stampede of farmers and miners, and entrepreneurs and hucksters. That's our spirit. That's who we are.

We are Sojourner Truth and Fannie Lou Hamer, women who could do as much as any man and then some. And we're Susan B. Anthony, who shook the system until the law reflected that truth. That is our character.

We're the immigrants who stowed away on ships to reach these shores, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free—Holocaust survivors, Soviet defectors, the Lost Boys of Sudan. We're the hopeful strivers who cross the Rio Grande because we want our kids to know a better life. That's how we came to be.

We're the slaves who built the White House and the economy of the South. We're the ranch hands and cowboys who opened up the West, and countless laborers who laid rail, and raised skyscrapers, and organized for workers' rights.

We're the fresh-faced GIs who fought to liberate a continent. And we're the Tuskegee Airmen, and the Navajo code-talkers, and the Japanese Americans who fought for this country even as their own liberty had been denied.

We're the firefighters who rushed into those buildings on 9/11, the volunteers who signed up to fight in Afghanistan and Iraq. We're the gay Americans whose blood ran in the streets of San Francisco and New York, just as blood ran down this bridge.

We are storytellers, writers, poets, artists who abhor unfairness, and despise hypocrisy, and give voice to the voiceless, and tell truths that need to be told.

We're the inventors of gospel and jazz and blues, bluegrass and country, and hip-hop

and rock and roll, and our very own sound with all the sweet sorrow and reckless joy of freedom.

We are Jackie Robinson, enduring scorn and spiked cleats and pitches coming straight to his head, and stealing home in the World Series anyway.

We are the people Langston Hughes wrote of who "build our temples for tomorrow, strong as we know how." We are the people Emerson wrote of, "who for truth and honor's sake stand fast and suffer long;" who are "never tired, so long as we can see far enough."

That's what America is. Not stock photos or airbrushed history, or feeble attempts to define some of us as more American than others. We respect the past, but we don't pine for the past. We don't fear the future; we grab for it. America is not some fragile thing. We are large, in the words of Whitman, containing multitudes. We are boisterous and diverse and full of energy, perpetually young in spirit. That's why someone like John Lewis at the ripe old age of 25 could lead a mighty march.

And that's what the young people here today and listening all across the country must take away from this day. You are America. Unconstrained by habit and convention. Unencumbered by what is, because you're ready to seize what ought to be.

For everywhere in this country, there are first steps to be taken, there's new ground to cover, there are more bridges to be crossed. And it is you, the young and fearless at heart, the most diverse and educated generation in our history, who the nation is waiting to follow.

Because Selma shows us that America is not the project of any one person. Because the single-most powerful word in our democracy is the word "We." "We The People." "We Shall Overcome." "Yes We Can." That word is owned by no one. It belongs to everyone. Oh, what a glorious task we are given, to continually try to improve this great nation of ours.

Fifty years from Bloody Sunday, our march is not yet finished, but we're getting closer. Two hundred and thirty-nine years after this nation's founding our union is not yet perfect, but we are getting closer. Our job's easier because somebody already got us through that first mile. Somebody already got us over that bridge. When it feels the road is too hard, when the torch we've been passed feels too heavy, we will remember these early travelers, and draw strength from their example, and hold firmly the words of the prophet Isaiah: "Those who hope in the Lord will renew their strength. They will soar on [the] wings like eagles. They will run and not grow weary. They will walk and not be faint."

We honor those who walked so we could run. We must run so our children soar. And we will not grow weary. For we believe in the power of an awesome God, and we believe in this country's sacred promise.

May He bless those warriors of justice no longer with us, and bless the United States of America. Thank you, everybody.

#### TRAIN DERAILMENT IN GALENA, ILLINOIS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, hundreds of firefighters are in town this week to talk about legislative issues. I was honored to speak at the International Association of Fire Fighters conference and meet with firefighters

from Illinois on Monday to thank them for keeping us safe.

Their visit is particularly timely given a couple of serious train accidents in the past few days. One accident, a derailment, happened in Galena, IL, last Thursday. Twenty-one cars carrying Bakken crude oil from North Dakota derailed there and five of them caught fire. Fortunately, the accident happened 2 miles outside the city, so no one was killed or injured. It was a potentially deadly accident, though, and we are very lucky no one was hurt. The fire burned for days.

Brave men and women from the Galena Fire Department were the first on the scene. Like many fire departments throughout the U.S., the Galena Fire Department is an entirely volunteer force. The area where the crash occurred is in a wetland where the Galena River meets the Mississippi. The first responders had to use a bike path to get to the crash site. I want to thank Galena Fire Chief Randy Beadle for his leadership in tackling this disaster. Galena Assistant Fire Chief Bob Conley also helped coordinate the first response. While most people would run away from something like this, firefighters run toward the flames. We owe a debt of gratitude to them.

I spoke with Galena Mayor Terry Renner the evening of the crash. I let him know I was ready to help in any way I could. Others on the ground whose efforts were critical to the local response include: Galena City Administrator Mark Moran, Jo Daviess County Board Chairman Ron Smith, County Administrator Dan Reimer, County Sheriff Kevin Turner, and County Emergency Management Agency Director Chuck Pedersen.

First responders were not sure if the oil from the derailed train cars might make its way to the Mississippi River—just half a mile away. To be on the safe side, BNSF erected a berm in the river to catch any runoff, either from the train cars themselves or from runoff from firefighters' hoses. Now the clean-up really begins. The EPA will vacuum up the spilled oil from the ground and test the soil below for contamination. Even if the oil did not reach the Mississippi, this was too close a call.

These types of accidents are happening more frequently and the potential for catastrophe is great. This is not the first time Illinois has seen such a derailment. In 2009, one person was killed in Cherry Valley; and in 2011, 800 residents of Tiskilway were evacuated after a massive explosion. The National Transportation Safety Board found the weakness of these cars added to the severity of both explosions.

Recently we have seen these dangerous derailments across the country and in Canada. It happened in West Virginia last month, and another yet this weekend in Ontario, Canada. Of course, the most severe incident occurred in Quebec in 2013, when a train

carrying crude oil derailed and exploded, killing 47 people.

I urge the administration to act swiftly to finalize rules that increase safety standards for the train cars. We need to ensure these cars have the strongest safety measures and that the old tank cars are taken off the track. Booming oil production in the Bakken region has caused an exponential increase in crude oil shipments in recent years. Last year, railroads carried almost 650,000 carloads of oil. In 2008 they carried just 9,500 carloads. Not only are the quantities greater, but some of this crude oil is believed to be more volatile. More traffic and more volatile crude means more disasters. Improving freight rail safety is more critical than ever before.

We feel this impact in Illinois, where we have the second most railroad track in the country. Approximately 25 percent of all U.S. rail traffic passes through densely populated Chicago.

We are lucky that the fiery train derailment in Galena was not closer to homes, businesses, and schools. Trains just like the one that crashed travel through cities and suburbs on a daily basis. If a wreck like this one happens closer to a developed area, we might see thousands of people evacuated—not to mention the potential for injuries or fatalities. It is not a risk we should be willing to take.

#### CONGRATULATING A.B. COMBS LEADERSHIP MAGNET ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate A.B. Combs Leadership Magnet Elementary School, in Raleigh, NC, for being recognized as the top magnet school in the country. On May 16, 2014, A.B. Combs was awarded the prestigious Dr. Ronald P. Simpson School of Merit Excellence Award, which recognizes one school for innovative programming, academic achievement, and promoting diversity. A.B. Combs Leadership Magnet Elementary School prides themselves on their leadership model program, which is based on Dr. Steven Covey's book "The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People." It seeks to educate the whole child, not just academically but socially, emotionally, and culturally.

A.B. Combs has set the standard for magnet schools. Annually, they host an international leadership day, where educators from around the world come to learn from their success. Magnet schools such as A.B. Combs provide parents with expanded options for their child's education—options that will ensure students aren't confined to schools that might not be serving their individual needs. For that reason, I am proud of the success A.B. Combs has achieved as recognized by this award. Congratulations to the staff, parents, students, and the community at A.B.

Combs for this award. It is well deserved.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### MOYNIHAN REPORT

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks at the Hoover Institution.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### MOYNIHAN REPORT

I first met Pat Moynihan four years after he released his explosive report on the circumstances of African-American families in the middle of the civil rights era. I was 28 years old then, and by a stroke of providence, had found myself sitting at a desk in the West Wing of the White House next to Bryce Harlow, President Nixon's first senior staff appointment. My job was answering Mr. Harlow's mail, returning his phone calls, and absorbing his wisdom. It was a perfect PhD in politics and government for a young man.

Downstairs were two real PhD's. At one end of the Hall, Gen. Alexander Haig performed the same sort of services for Henry Kissinger. At the other end was Professor Daniel Patrick Moynihan. By another stroke of Providence, President Nixon had attracted these Harvard professors to the West Wing where they joined one of the most talented and intellectually diverse teams of White House advisers of any first term President of the United States.

I have always thought, by the way, that if the president had paid more attention to his wiser, more broad gauged advisors in the White House—Harlow, Arthur Burns, Kissinger, Moynihan, and cabinet officials George Schultz and Mel Laird—instead of the advance men who guarded access to the Oval Office that there never would have been a Watergate affair.

The White House then was brimming with talent. Jim Keogh, the former editor of TIME, shepherded a quartet of young speechwriters: Bill Safire, Pat Buchanan, Lee Heubner, Ray Price. Liddy Hanford—now Elizabeth Dole—worked in the consumer affairs office.

And Pat himself brought with him from Harvard four of his brightest students: Checker Finn, later the nation's foremost education gadfly; the Rhodes Scholar John Price; Chris DeMuth, later head of American Enterprise Institute; and Dick Blumenthal, now my colleague in the United States Senate.

Steve Hess, Pat's Deputy in 1969, has detailed in his new book, "The Professor and the President", how fascinated Nixon was with Moynihan who "advised the President on what books to read, to whom he should award the Presidential Medal of Freedom and how not to redecorate the Oval Office." Moynihan persuaded Nixon to recommend the Family Assistance Plan, a negative income tax that was the forerunner of today's Earned Income Tax Credit.

Looking back 50 years, that the author of such a controversial report could have been hired at all by a president of the United States and then that later this author could have been elected to the U.S. Senate three times from New York suggests the wiliness and courage of this professor with the cheerful soul of an Irish immigrant. Let's just say

Pat followed the advice of his favorite character, Tammany Hall boss George Washington Plunkitt, "I seen my opportunities, and I took 'em."

Today, 50 years after it was written, the trend Moynihan was detailing—the rise of households led by single mothers—has grown more dramatic and cuts across all racial groups. Today more than four in 10 children in the U.S. are born outside of marriage.

In 2013, the average income for households with married couples was more than double that of households led by women with no spouse present.

Today's panelists will discuss the implications of the Moynihan Report released 50 years ago as well as the proper policy responses. In my remarks, I will be less ambitious. I will focus on what this trend means for the school—the most important secular institution designed to help children reach our country's goal for them—that every child, as much as possible, have the opportunity to begin at the same starting line.

And in case you want to step out for coffee at this point, I can jump straight to my conclusion: the school can't come close to doing it all. And neither can the government. If we want our children to be at the same starting line, there must be a revival of interest in these children and their parents from traditional sources: the religious institutions, families, and communities.

To begin with, what is a school supposed to do anyway? Professor James Coleman is often quoted as having said that the purpose of the school is to help parents do what parents don't do as well. So what have our schools traditionally done that parents did not do as well?

In 1988, I attended a conference in Rochester at which the president of Notre Dame asked, "What is the rationale for a public school?"—schools which 90 percent of our children attend. Albert Shanker offered this answer: "A public school is for the purpose of teaching immigrant children reading, writing and arithmetic and what it means to be an American with the hope they'll go home and teach their parents."

But obviously in today's world, Shanker's vision of the school does not come close to doing all the things that many parents are not able to do for their children. In a Washington Post story earlier this year, Sonya Romero-Smith, a veteran teacher at Lew Wallace Elementary School in Albuquerque, said this: "When they first come in my door in the morning, the first thing I do is an inventory of immediate needs: Did you eat? Are you clean? A big part of my job is making them feel safe."

The article was reporting that, for the first time in at least 50 years, more than half of public school students are eligible for the federal program that provides free or reduced-price school lunches. That means that their family's income is less than 185 percent of the federal poverty line, or below about \$44,000 for a family of four. Many of them, of course, are far poorer than that.

Romero-Smith said she helps her students clean up with bathroom wipes and toothbrushes, and stocks a drawer with clean socks, underwear, pants and shoes. The job of teacher has expanded to "counselor, therapist, doctor, parent, attorney," she said.

If parents are unable to meet the needs of these children, should the school try to meet those needs? If the school does not, who does?

Part of understanding the answer to that question may come from a study last year that was not unlike the Moynihan report in

that the news it delivered was uncomfortable but important. This study came from the Equality of Opportunity Project, made up of economists from Harvard and Berkeley, who looked at intergenerational mobility across areas of the U.S.—how likely a child from a low-income family is to make more money as an adult than their parents did.

The researchers determined that we are, in fact, a collection of societies—some of us live in “lands of opportunity” with high rates of [upward] mobility across generations,” and others in places where few children raised in low-income homes escape poverty.

The researchers looked at the anonymous tax records of millions of Americans born between 1980 and 1982, measuring their income in 2011–2012, when they were roughly 30 years old. They found five key variables that seemed to explain why some places had more upward mobility than others:

The first was segregation: Areas that are more residentially segregated by race and income have lower levels of upward mobility. The second was income inequality. The third was the quality of the K–12 school system, as measured by factors like test scores and dropout rates. The fourth was social capital—rates of civic and religious involvement.

The fifth was the strongest correlation—they found that the strongest predictor of upward mobility is family structure, such as the fraction of single parents in the area. “Parents’ marital status does not matter purely through its effects at the individual level. Children of married parents also have higher rates of upward mobility if they live in communities with fewer single parents,” the researchers write. Put another way, if our goal is to help every child begin at the same starting line, many children raised in single parent families have a harder time getting there.

The Equality of Opportunity Project also did a second study. This one found that economic mobility has not changed much over time and is lower in the U.S. than in most developed countries.

They write: “For example, the probability that a child reaches the top fifth of the income distribution given parents in the bottom fifth of the income distribution is 8.4% for children born in 1971, compared with 9.0% for those born in 1986.” In other words, your chances of moving up the economic ladder depend a lot upon who your parents are, how much money they make—and whether or not they’re married.

These are not easy conclusions to reach or easy discussions to have.

But the evidence of these long odds is strong enough that our 100,000 public schools—as well as our private schools—should do all they reasonably can to help today’s American children—and their parents—to succeed.

School policies can help low-income, single-parent families get their children to the same starting line as children from better off families.

Here are 8 ideas:

1. More parental choice of schools: The most obvious and important step the federal government can take to improve the education of children is to give their parents a choice of schools.

First, we know that one of the best ways to lift a child out of poverty is to give them a good education.

Second, we know that many low-income parents are seeking these opportunities for their children and will work to get their children into better schools if they are able.

A single mom who is busy working two jobs may have a harder time getting to a parent-teacher conference, but we see in the D.C. voucher program and elsewhere that some of the fiercest advocates for school choice are single parents of children enrolled in the program.

Researchers at the American Enterprise Institute conducted a series of focus-group sessions and personal interviews with low-income urban families enrolled in the D.C. voucher program. They found that “parents report that they want to be respected as advocates of their child’s education and will fight hard to keep their child’s private-school choice program if that program’s future is threatened.”

A 2007 study published in *Education Next* found that “parents in high-poverty schools strongly value a teacher’s ability to raise student achievement and appear indifferent to student satisfaction.” It was parents in schools serving better-off families who seemed to place less weight on academics when requesting a particular teacher for their child.

2. More charter schools: One promising way to provide more low-income parents with school choice is by creating more charter schools. In fact, one of the most exciting developments in American education in the past two decades has been the emergence of a growing number of charter schools that have demonstrated remarkable success educating disadvantaged children. The success of these schools is attributable to many factors, from close attention to student behavior and discipline to the flexibility their leaders have to put together an excellent teaching staff. But one thing that many of them have in common is that they have expanded the amount of time students spend in school, usually with longer school days.

Low-income parents, many of them single-parents, are rushing to enroll their children in these schools. I suspect that one reason is school schedules that make it easier for parents to make ends meet while knowing that their children are well cared for.

3. Different school schedules: It shouldn’t be just charters that experiment with different schedules. School schedules that follow traditional work schedules—year-round, 7 am to 6 pm—would make it easier for parents to keep full-time jobs and still have the ability to be there with their child before and after school to make sure they’ve had breakfast in the morning, or make sure they’ve done their homework in the evening.

4. Flexible workplace schedules: I intend to try putting in statute authorization for employers to negotiate schedule and overtime with employees, so they know they have the full support of federal law in enabling employees to find arrangements that suit their needs. This would help working parents have the flexibility to attend parent-teacher conferences.

5. Work-site day care: Years ago in my private life, I helped start a company with Bob Keeshan of Captain Kangaroo, and my wife and a couple of others that later merged with Bright Horizons and became the largest work-site daycare provider in the country. We recognized that the number of mothers of young children working outside the home had created a need, and we helped corporations provide worksite daycare centers that were safe and good for those moms and dads as well.

6. Work-site schools: A few dozen large U.S. corporations have partnered with their local school districts to open public schools in their corporate facilities. It’s a similar

idea to work-site day care—it provides working parents with choice, as well as makes it easier for them to be involved with their children’s care and education.

Federal policy ought to enable and at least not discourage states and local school districts and businesses from these kinds of arrangements. Policymakers can support states and school districts to take these steps to enable low-income families to get their children the education they deserve.

7. Better Teaching, Better schools: Over the long run, improving schools so that they serve students well regardless of their circumstances may have a direct effect on the challenges of single parenthood.

For example, the Harvard economist Raj Chetty has done studies showing that a good teacher improves earnings and, for girls, reduces teenage pregnancy. A study at Promise Academy in the Harlem Children’s Zone found that girls attending that school, a high-performing charter school, were 12.1 percentage points less likely to have a child as a teenager.

Results like these show how great teachers and schools can put their students on track to college and, eventually, the kinds of jobs that enable them to move out of the cycle of poverty.

8. Wraparound services: Professor Coleman’s suggestion was that if parents don’t do it, schools should—in which case we should look at a whole range of services schools ought to be providing. This takes us far afield from the traditional role of the school described by Albert Shanker.

There are today many social programs that are not school-based—many funded by the federal government, other by the states—that are designed to support families that need help.

For example, welfare programs, child-care vouchers, Earned-Income Tax Credit, the housing allowance. The total amount spent by the federal government on these kinds of safety net programs was \$398 billion in 2013, or about 12 percent of the total federal budget.

Some suggest that these services should be “wrapped around” the school—that the school should become the dominant institution through which children whose families are unable to provide basic supports receive them. I am not so sure. There is a limit to what the school can do and, for that matter, what the government can do.

If the challenges single parents face are so great, at the very least the government can make sure it “does no harm” and does nothing to discourage marriage. Yet there is strong evidence that that is precisely what the government does.

In testimony before the Senate Budget Committee last year, Robert Doar of American Enterprise Institute said that our “policies aimed at assisting low- and moderate-income households with children often penalize marriage.

Doar said that “A single parent with two children who earns \$15,000 enjoys an [Earned Income Tax Credit] benefit of about \$4100. The credit decreases by 21.06 cents for every dollar a married couple earns above \$15040. . . . [I]f the single parent marries someone earning \$10,000, for a combined income of \$25,000, [the tax credit] benefit will drop to about \$2,200. The couple faces a marriage tax penalty of . . . \$1,900.”

He continued: “Similar penalties are embedded in Medicaid, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), food stamps, housing assistance, and child care—all of which apply to low- and moderate-income

Americans. Efforts to mitigate marriage penalties have largely taken the form of tax cuts directed toward married couples. But . . . 81 percent of that relief flowed to couples earning above \$75,000."

Doar suggests that a "host of reforms could alleviate this burden" including: "implementing a maximum marginal tax rate for low-income families would tamp marriage-induced hikes in rates. Providing a subsidy on individual earnings—not combined earnings (like the EITC)—would enable a low-wage American to marry someone with a child, but do so without sacrificing significant income or transfer payments. And mandatory individual filing, as done in Canada, Australia, Italy and Japan, would either require or allow low-income individuals to avoid income tax penalties."

Perhaps the wisest advice comes from AEI fellow W. Bradford Wilcox, who says this: "Government's role when it comes to strengthening marriage and family life is necessarily limited. Any successful twenty-first century effort to renew the fortunes of marriage in America will depend more on civic institutions, businesses, and ordinary Americans than upon federal and state efforts to strengthen family life."

What would Pat Moynihan say today?

Well, surely it would be creative, entertaining, insightful and probably controversial. And since those on today's panels are among those who knew him best and know this subject the best, we'll let them answer that question.●

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. KENNETH DOBBINS

● Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to honor Dr. Kenneth W. Dobbins on the occasion of his retirement. Dr. Dobbins has served as the president of Southeast Missouri State University for more than 15 years. The people of Missouri are grateful for Dr. Dobbins' contributions and commitment to Southeast Missouri State University and the Redhawk community.

Dr. Dobbins became the seventeenth president of Southeast Missouri State University in 1999 after serving as the university's vice president of finance and administration and executive vice president. Prior to his time with Southeast Missouri State University, he held several positions in the higher education administration at Kent State University in Ohio.

Growing up in Ohio, he earned his bachelor of science degree in accounting from the University of Akron in 1971. He then served his country as a commissioned officer and civilian executive in the U.S. Air Force for almost 10 years and was named the 1978 Air Force Audit Agency Outstanding Civilian Auditor of the Year. In 1979, he received his master's degree in business administration from Old Dominion University and later his Ph.D. in higher education administration from Kent State University. His commitment to leadership was recognized in the form of the 2001 Distinguished Alumni Award from Old Dominion University and the 2011 Alumni Leadership Award for the College of Education, Health

and Human Services Annual Hall of Fame Awards from Kent State University.

As president at Southeast Missouri State University, academic programs have flourished and expanded, including the establishment of the College of Science, Technology, and Agriculture and the Earl and Margie Holland School of Visual and Performing Arts. In addition, Dr. Dobbins increased access to higher education in the university's 25-county service region through the development of new regional campuses in Sikeston and Kennett to serve place-bound students in rural communities. More than \$400 million in capital construction and building improvement projects have enhanced the university during Dr. Dobbins' presidency.

Dr. Dobbins' knowledge and leadership have been valued by his peers in higher education. He has served on the board of directors of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and as chairman of the Finance Committee of the American Leadership Institute.

On behalf of the grateful constituents of Missouri, I congratulate Dr. Ken Dobbins on his well-deserved retirement. We congratulate him on his remarkable career and extend a huge thank-you for all the wonderful contributions he has made to our Bootheel communities and our State. I wish the very best to Dr. Dobbins and his wife Jeanine, along with his son and daughter-in-law, Paul and Stacey Dobbins, and his two grandsons, Lincoln Kenneth Dobbins and Brady Larson Dobbins.●

#### ARKANSAS GAME AND FISH COMMISSION CENTENNIAL

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate a century of the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, AGFC. Enjoying our wildlife and outdoors is a way of life for residents of the Natural State, and the efforts of AGFC help preserve this time-honored tradition through management of our State's fish and wildlife populations.

In the early 1900s, maintaining healthy wildlife populations was desperately needed in the State. Elk, bison, and swan populations in Arkansas were extinct, and deer, duck, quail, and fish species were near extinction.

Following the leadership of President Teddy Roosevelt, Gov. George Washington Hays signed Act 124 creating the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission on March 11, 1915. One of the commission's first orders of business was improving hunting, fishing, and trapping regulations. Thanks to these efforts we have seen extinct animal populations flourish, while creating an excellent environment for fishing and hunting. This has allowed tourism to become a leading sector of Arkansas's economy. Our State now has a thriving elk popu-

lation with a regulated hunting season. We have also seen growth in the deer population. More than 200,000 deer are harvested annually in Arkansas, up from just over 200 checked in the 1938 hunting season. Once known as the Bear State, black bear in Arkansas neared extinction with fewer than 50 believed to be in the State in the 1930s. Today there are more than 5,000 bears in the State, making it one of the most successful reintroductions of a large carnivore in history.

The AGFC laid the foundation for Arkansas to become the "Duck Hunting Capitol of the World" in 1948 with the establishment of Bayou Meto Wildlife Management Area. Today Bayou Meto WMA consists of 33,832 publicly owned acres, providing world class duck hunting that attracts hunters from all over the world.

The AGFC's five fish hatcheries help stock some of the finest lakes, streams, and rivers in Arkansas that attract anglers from around the world. More than 12.5 million fish are harvested from these hatcheries annually.

While the mission is the same, the agency has experienced many changes in the last century. The first nine game wardens were paid \$80 a month and had to provide their own horse. Today the agency operates an \$88 million annual budget and employs thousands of Arkansans.

In the past 100 years, the AGFC has created policies that maintain the natural beauty and abundance of wildlife in the Natural State so Arkansans and visitors from across America and around the world can enjoy the great outdoors. From restoring habitat, managing wildlife and protecting the public, the men and women of the AGFC help preserve the Natural State's beauty and natural resources. But this mission comes at a cost: throughout its history AGFC has lost five brave officers in the last line of duty. I thank them and all the men and women of the AGFC for their service and commitment to making sure future generations can experience the natural resources and outdoor activities that we enjoy today.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER  
COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-905. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Review Group, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Biomass Crop Assistance Program" (RIN0560-A127) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-906. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Defense Stockpile (NDS) Annual Materials Plan (AMP) for fiscal year 2016 and the succeeding 4 years, fiscal years 2017-2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-907. A communication from the Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2013"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-908. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule revising the NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (RIN2700-AE01 and RIN2700-AE09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-909. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Parts 0, 1, 2, and 15 of the Commission's Rules Regarding Authorization of Radiofrequency Equipment; Amendment of Part 68 regarding Approval of Terminal Equipment; Amendment of Part 68 regarding Approval of Terminal Equipment by Telecommunications Certification Bodies" ((ET Docket No. 13-44) (FCC 14-208)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-910. A communication from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements" ((FCC 15-9) (PS Docket No. 07-114)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-911. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Pumped Storage and Potential Hydropower from Conduits"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-912. A communication from the Chief of the Aquatic Invasive Species Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Injurious Wildlife Species; Listing Three Anaconda Species and One Python Species as Injurious Reptiles" (RIN1018-AV68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-913. A communication from the Chief of the Recovery and State Grants Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Oregon Chub From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" (RIN1018-BA28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-914. A communication from the Chief of the Recovery and State Grants Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reinstatement of Final Rules for the Gray Wolf in Wyoming and the Western Great Lakes in Compliance With Court Orders" (RIN1018-BA64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-915. A communication from the Wildlife Biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Migratory Bird Harvest in Alaska; Harvest Regulations for Migratory Birds in Alaska During the 2015 Season" (RIN1018-BA48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-916. A communication from the Chief of the Listing Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Adding Five Species of Sawfish to the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife" (RIN1018-BA68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-917. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluation for Technical Report NEI 14-05, 'Guidelines for the Use of Accreditation in Lieu of Commercial Grade Surveys for Procurement of Laboratory Calibration and Test Services,' Revision 1" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-918. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Interim Staff Guidance—Reviewing and Assessing the Financial Condition of Operating Power Reactor Licensees, Including Requests for Additional Information (OL/FR-ISG-2014-01)" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-919. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-094); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-920. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, five (5) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Justice, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-921. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corpora-

tion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-922. A joint communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness) and the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the activities of the Extremity Trauma and Amputation Center of Excellence during fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-923. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Veterans Affairs Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-924. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Policy and Management Office of the General Counsel, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Department of Veterans Affairs Acquisition Regulation: Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned and Veteran-Owned Small Business Status Protections" (RIN2900-AN92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-925. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agreement Between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Russian Federation on Mutual Fisheries Relations; to the Committees on Foreign Relations; and Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND  
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 702. A bill to strengthen the prohibitions on insider trading, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 703. A bill to reauthorize the weatherization and State energy programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 704. A bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 705. A bill to amend section 213 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the Transportation Alternatives Program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 706. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. Kaine):

S. 707. A bill to provide certain protections from civil liability with respect to the emergency administration of opioid overdose drugs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 708. A bill to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BURR, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HELLER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. KING):

S. 709. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 710. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 711. A bill to amend section 520J of the Public Service Health Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 712. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to exempt certain flights from increased aviation security service fees; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KIRK, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 713. A bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 714. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly conduct a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of expanding the use by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs of physician assistants specializing in psychiatric medicine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 715. A bill to improve the provision of mental health care to members of the Armed Forces and veterans from the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HELLER, Mr. COONS, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 716. A bill to allow seniors to file their Federal income tax on a new Form 1040SR; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 717. A bill to designate certain non-Department mental health care providers who treat members of the Armed Forces and veterans as providers who have particular knowledge relating to the provision of men-

tal health care to members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 718. A bill to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 719. A bill to rename the Armed Forces Reserve Center in Great Falls, Montana, the Captain John E. Moran and Captain William Wylie Galt Armed Forces Reserve Center; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BENNET, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 720. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 721. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 722. A bill to extend the date after which interest earned on obligations held in the wildlife restoration fund may be available for apportionment; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 53

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 53, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify eligibility for the child tax credit.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were

added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

S. 358

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 358, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that women members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 388

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require humane treatment of animals by Federal Government facilities.

S. 409

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 409, a bill to amend the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act to require the Secretary of Defense to inform the Attorney General of persons required to register as sex offenders.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 474

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. McCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 474, a bill to require State educational agencies that receive funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to have in effect policies and procedures on background checks for school employees.



S. 488

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 665, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when

a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of S. 667, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 674

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to expand programs with respect to women's health.

S. 683

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 683, a bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a limitation on certain aliens from claiming the earned income tax credit.

S. 698

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 698, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 271

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 271 proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

## AMENDMENT NO. 279

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 279 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

## AMENDMENT NO. 281

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 281 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

## AMENDMENT NO. 284

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of

amendment No. 284 proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 702. A bill to strengthen the prohibitions on insider trading, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am joined by Senator MENENDEZ in introducing the Stop Illegal Insider Trading Act to finally define the offense of insider trading. The need for this legislation is long overdue because, in the absence of a statutory definition, an inconsistent and complicated body of common law has developed as the courts have used varying interpretations of anti-fraud statutes in order to decide insider trading cases.

For illustrative purposes, consider the following example. A financial analyst receives information from an insider at XYZ Corporation, which contains XYZ's earnings before this information is publicly released. This analyst then shares this inside information with his portfolio manager who subsequently trades in XYZ stock.

Based on this hypothetical, I suspect most Americans would be skeptical about someone who learned of a company's earnings before this information was publicly released and then subsequently traded on such information. Indeed, I believe most would agree that such a person was given an unfair advantage in our securities markets.

However, on December 10, 2014, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in *United States v. Newman* decided that the portfolio managers in this case were not guilty of insider trading because as the *New York Times* summarized it, "prosecutors had to show that both men knew that the original source of the inside information had breached a fiduciary duty and had received a personal benefit in return."

This decision defies common sense. It should not matter whether someone, who traded on material information that was not publicly available, knew whether the source of such information breached a fiduciary duty and additionally received a personal benefit in return for sharing this inside information. Such a decision is one of many that has caused too many of our citizens to lose faith in government and our courts. Indeed, some prosecutors have noted that the Second Circuit's decision in *Newman* "might make it difficult to file charges against a parent who passes on a confidential stock tip to one of his children without receiving anything in return." This is plainly not right and contributes to a larger sense of injustice.



The greater irony, however, is that those who deal with insider trading law the most agree that something must be done to restore reason.

For example, Duke Law School Professor James D. Cox noted that “all studies of significant corporate events document that a significant portion of the market movement associated with corporate events occurs before the event is announced; for example, forty to fifty percent of the price gain associated with a merger or takeover occurs before the transaction’s announcement . . . One can thus surmise not only that corporate insiders are not very good about keeping secrets, but that their tippees are delighted that they do not. That is, remote tippees are likely both pervasive and truly are insidious. Newman pours gas onto this raging fire.”

Most ironically, Judge Barrington Parker of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals who delivered the Newman opinion remarked during oral arguments, “I’m concerned the government’s position on key points of the law seems to vary based depending on which judge you’re talking to.”

Moreover, University of North Carolina Law School Professor Thomas Lee Hazen recently stated, “no matter how narrow or broad people believe the definition of insider trading should be, virtually everyone is now in agreement that we’d be a lot better off if Congress would simply bite the bullet and define it . . . the situation is a mess. That’s how you end up with cases like Newman.”

This is precisely what Senator MENENDEZ and I are doing in introducing this legislation today. We are seeking to finally define the offense of insider trading with a clear and simple bright line rule. Simply put, if a person trades a security on the basis of material information that the person knows or has reason to know is not publicly available, then they have engaged in unlawful insider trading.

Under our legislation, it is irrelevant whether the trader knew of the source’s fiduciary duty or whether the source derived any personal benefit. What matters is whether the trader knew or has reason to know that such trader had an unfair advantage in being given material information that was not shared with the broader public. In addition, we have taken care to ensure that those who take the time to independently develop their own information from publicly available sources can trade on this independently developed information so that publicly available information can be analyzed and interpreted without fear of liability. Lastly, because there may be situations that do not necessarily rise to the level of unlawful insider trading, we have provided the Securities and Exchange Commission with the flexibility to provide exemptions from in-

sider trading liability as long as such exemptions are necessary or appropriate in the public interest and consistent with the protection of investors.

In short, by making it an offense for those who contribute to a securities market rigged in favor of the well connected, our legislation focuses on providing everyday investors with a fair shot at seeing some returns after investing their hard-earned savings. Incidents of insider trading, and the perceived pervasiveness of the practice, have for years served to validate the public’s worst assumptions about Wall Street culture. It is time we clearly define what is appropriate under the law and take this meaningful step towards improving the integrity of our securities markets for professional traders and amateur investors alike.

I would like to thank Senator MENENDEZ for working with me on this legislation. I also thank Public Citizen, Americans for Financial Reform, and the Consumer Federation of America for their support, and I urge our colleagues to join us in supporting the Stop Illegal Insider Trading Act.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 285. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 286. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 287. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 288. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 289. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 290. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 291. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 292. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 293. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 294. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 295. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 296. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 297. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 285.** Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### TITLE —SCHOOL EMPLOYEE BACKGROUND CHECKS

##### SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act”.

##### SEC. 02. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

(a) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each State educational agency, or local educational agency in the case of a local educational agency designated under State law, that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) shall have in effect policies and procedures that—

(1) require that a criminal background check be conducted for each school employee that includes—

(A) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

(C) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

(D) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919);

(2) prohibit the employment of a school employee as a school employee if such employee—

(A) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under paragraph (1);

(B) makes a false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

(i) murder;

(ii) child abuse or neglect;

(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

(iv) spousal abuse;

(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

(vi) kidnapping;

(vii) arson; or

(viii) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed on or after the date that is 5 years before the date of such employee’s criminal background check under paragraph (1); or

(D) has been convicted of any other crime that is a violent or sexual crime against a minor;

(3) require that each criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) be periodically repeated or updated in accordance

with State law or the policies of local educational agencies served by the State educational agency;

(4) upon request, provide each school employee who has had a criminal background check under paragraph (1) with a copy of the results of the criminal background check;

(5) provide for a timely process, by which a school employee may appeal, but which does not permit the employee to be employed as a school employee during such appeal, the results of a criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) which prohibit the employee from being employed as a school employee under paragraph (2) to—

(A) challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information produced by such criminal background check; and

(B) establish or reestablish eligibility to be hired or reinstated as a school employee by demonstrating that the information is materially inaccurate or incomplete, and has been corrected;

(6) ensure that such policies and procedures are published on the website of the State educational agency and the website of each local educational agency served by the State educational agency; and

(7) allow a local educational agency to share the results of a school employee's criminal background check recently conducted under paragraph (1) with another local educational agency that is considering such school employee for employment as a school employee.

(b) **TRANSFER PROHIBITION.**—A State educational agency, or local educational agency in the case of a local educational agency designated under State law, that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) shall be subject to a State or local law (including regulations), or have a regulation or policy, that prohibits the transfer, or facilitation of the transfer, of any school employee if the agency knows, or has substantive reason to believe, that such employee engaged in sexual misconduct with an elementary school or secondary school student.

(c) **FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—

(1) **CHARGING OF FEES.**—The Attorney General, attorney general of a State, or other State law enforcement official may charge reasonable fees for conducting a criminal background check under subsection (a)(1), but such fees shall not exceed the actual costs for the processing and administration of the criminal background check.

(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.**—A local educational agency or State educational agency may use administrative funds received under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) to pay any reasonable fees charged for conducting such criminal background check.

(3) **FEDERAL FUNDS TO SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT, NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.**—A State educational agency or local educational agency using Federal funds in accordance with paragraph (2) shall use such Federal funds only to supplement the funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for the purposes of this title, and not to supplant such funds.

(d) **PROHIBITION.**—Nothing in this title, or any other Federal law, regulation, policy, or directive, shall authorize the Secretary, or any other employee of the Federal Government, to regulate, provide guidance, or otherwise direct the State or local policies or procedures required under this title.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this title:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The terms “elementary school”, “secondary school”, “local edu-

cational agency”, “State”, and “State educational agency” have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) **SCHOOL EMPLOYEE.**—The term “school employee” means—

(A) a person who—

(i) is an employee of, or is seeking employment with, a local educational agency, or State educational agency, that receives Federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); and

(ii) as a result of such employment, has (or will have) a job duty that results in unsupervised access to public elementary school or public secondary school students; or

(B)(i) any person, or an employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services with a public elementary school, public secondary school, local educational agency, or State educational agency, that receives Federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); and

(ii) such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that results in unsupervised access to public elementary school or public secondary school students.

**SA 286.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title II, add the following:

**SEC. 212. EXPANDED DEFINITION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.**

The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(2) (42 U.S.C. 5101 note), by inserting “(including commercial sexual exploitation)” after “exploitation”; and

(2) in section 111(4)(A) (42 U.S.C. 5106g(4)(A)), by inserting “for commercial purposes or” before “for the purpose of”.

**SA 287.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 118. EDUCATION AND OUTREACH TO TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS.**

The Attorney General shall make available, on the website of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, a database for trafficking victim advocates, crisis hotline personnel, foster parents, law enforcement personnel, and crime survivors that contains information on—

- (1) counseling and hotline resources;
- (2) housing resources;
- (3) legal assistance; and
- (4) other services for trafficking survivors.

**SA 288.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 118. EXPANDED STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR CIVIL ACTIONS BY CHILD TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS.**

Section 1595(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “not later than 10 years after the cause of action arose.” and inserting “not later than the later of—

“(1) 10 years after the cause of action arose; or

“(2) 10 years after the victim reaches 18 years of age, if the victim was a minor at the time of the alleged offense.”.

**SA 289.** Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. REQUIRED EMERGENCY DISCLOSURE OF CALL LOCATION INFORMATION.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Kelsey Smith Act”.

(b) **IN GENERAL.**—Title II of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 222 the following:

**“SEC. 222A. REQUIRED EMERGENCY DISCLOSURE OF CALL LOCATION INFORMATION.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 222, at the request of a law enforcement agency, a telecommunications carrier shall provide call location information concerning the user of a commercial mobile service (as such term is defined in section 332(d)) or the telecommunications device of the user of an IP-enabled voice service (as such term is defined in section 7 of the Wireless Communications and Public Safety Act of 1999 (47 U.S.C. 615b)) to a law enforcement official, in order to respond to the user's call for emergency services or to respond to an emergency situation that involves the risk of death or serious physical harm if the telecommunications carrier believes that an emergency involving danger of death or serious physical injury to any person or response to a user's call for emergency services requires disclosure without delay of location records relating to the emergency or user request.

“(b) **FORM OF REQUEST.**—A request for call location information under subsection (a) shall be accompanied by a sworn written statement from the law enforcement agency stating facts that support such agency's probable cause to believe that disclosure without delay is required—

“(1) by an emergency involving risk of death or serious physical injury; or

“(2) in order to respond to the user's call for emergency services.

“(c) **HOLD HARMLESS.**—No cause of action shall lie in any court nor shall any civil or administrative proceeding be commenced by a governmental entity against any telecommunications carrier, or its directors, officers, employees, agents, or vendors, for providing in good faith call location information or other information, facilities, or assistance in accordance with subsection (a) and any regulations promulgated under this section.

“(d) **COURT ORDER.**—Not later than 48 hours after a law enforcement agency makes a request for call location information under subsection (a), the law enforcement agency shall request a court order stating whether such agency had probable cause to believe that the conditions described in subsection (b)(1) or subsection (b)(2) existed at the time of the request under subsection (a).

“(e) **DEFINITION.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘emergency services’ has the meaning given such term in section 222; and “(2) the term ‘law enforcement agency’ means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.”.

**SA 290.** Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this section an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision, the amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.).

(c) **FINDINGS.**—Section 302 (42 U.S.C. 5701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and” before “linguistically appropriate”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “outside the welfare system and the law enforcement system” and inserting “, in collaboration with public assistance systems, the law enforcement system, and the child welfare system”;

(3) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting “a safe place to live and” after “youth need”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) runaway and homeless youth are at a high risk of becoming victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking in persons.”.

(d) **BASIC CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.**—Section 311(a) (42 U.S.C. 5711(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “services” and all that follows through the period and inserting “safe shelter and services, including trauma-informed services, for runaway and homeless youth and, if appropriate, services for the families of such youth, including (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “mental health.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “21 days; and” and inserting “30 days.”;

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “individual”;

(bb) by inserting “, as appropriate,” after “group”; and

(cc) by striking “as appropriate” and inserting “including (if appropriate) counseling for individuals identified by such youth as family.”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) suicide prevention services; and”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (ii), by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “home-based services”;

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(III) in clause (iv), by striking “diseases.” and inserting “infections.”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) trauma-informed and gender-responsive services for runaway or homeless youth, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

“(vi) an assessment of family engagement in support and reunification (if reunification is appropriate), interventions, and services for parents or legal guardians of such youth, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.”.

(2) **ELIGIBILITY; PLAN REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 312 (42 U.S.C. 5712) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by inserting “, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family,” after “parents or legal guardians”;

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking “cultural minority and persons with limited ability to speak English” and inserting “cultural minority, persons with limited ability to speak English, and runaway or homeless youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation”;

(iii) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) shall keep adequate statistical records profiling the youth and family members of such youth whom the applicant serves, including demographic information on and the number of—

“(A) such youth who are not referred to out-of-home shelter services;

“(B) such youth who are members of vulnerable or underserved populations;

“(C) such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation, disaggregated by—

“(i) such youth who have been coerced or forced into a commercial sex act, as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

“(ii) such youth who have been coerced or forced into other forms of labor; and

“(iii) such youth who have engaged in a commercial sex act, as so defined, for any reason other than by coercion or force;

“(D) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

“(E) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

“(F) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system.”;

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (13) as paragraphs (9) through (14);

(v) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) shall ensure that—

“(A) the records described in paragraph (7), on an individual runaway or homeless youth, shall not be disclosed without the consent of the individual youth and of the parent or legal guardian of such youth or (if appropriate) an individual identified by such youth as family, to anyone other than another agency compiling statistical records or a government agency involved in the disposition of criminal charges against an individual runaway or homeless youth; and

“(B) reports or other documents based on the statistics described in paragraph (7) shall not disclose the identity of any individual runaway or homeless youth.”;

(vi) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated, by striking “statistical summaries” and inserting “statistics”;

(vii) in paragraph (13)(C), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking clause (i) and inserting:

“(i) the number and characteristics of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of family separation, who participate in the project, including such information on—

“(I) such youth (including both types of such participating youth) who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation, disaggregated by—

“(aa) such youth who have been coerced or forced into a commercial sex act, as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

“(bb) such youth who have been coerced or forced into other forms of labor; and

“(cc) such youth who have engaged in a commercial sex act, as so defined, for any reason other than by coercion or force;

“(II) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

“(III) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

“(IV) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system; and”;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(viii) in paragraph (14), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “for natural disasters, inclement weather, and mental health emergencies.”; and

(ix) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) shall provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to runaway and homeless youth; and

“(16) shall assist youth in completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090).”;

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” after “provide”;

(II) by striking “families (including unrelated individuals in the family households) of such youth” and inserting “families of such youth (including unrelated individuals in the family households of such youth and, if appropriate, individuals identified by such youth as family)”;

(III) by inserting “suicide prevention,” after “physical health care.”; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, including training on trauma-informed and youth-centered care” after “home-based services”.

(3) **APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.**—Section 313(b) (42 U.S.C. 5713(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “priority to” and all that follows through “who” and inserting “priority to eligible applicants who”;

(B) by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2).

(e) **TRANSITIONAL LIVING GRANT PROGRAM.**—Section 322(a) (42 U.S.C. 5714-2(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “information and counseling services”; and

(B) by striking “job attainment skills, and mental and physical health care” and inserting “job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, and suicide prevention services”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) and (9) through (16) as paragraphs (5)

through (10) and (12) through (19), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) to provide counseling to homeless youth and to encourage, if appropriate, the involvement in such counseling of their parents or legal guardians, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family;

“(4) to provide aftercare services, if possible, to homeless youth who have received shelter and services from a transitional living youth project, including (to the extent practicable) such youth who, after receiving such shelter and services, relocate to a State other than the State in which such project is located;”;

(4) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” after “referral of homeless youth to”;

(B) by striking “and health care programs” and inserting “mental health service and health care programs, including programs providing wrap-around services to victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation.”; and

(C) by striking “such services for youths;” and inserting “such programs described in this paragraph;”;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (10), as so redesignated, the following:

“(11) to develop a plan to provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable that address the needs of homeless and street youth;”;

(6) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated, by striking “the applicant and statistical” through “who participate in such project,” and inserting “the applicant, statistical summaries describing the number, the characteristics, and the demographic information of the homeless youth who participate in such project, including the prevalence of trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of such youth.”; and

(7) in paragraph (19), as so redesignated, by inserting “regarding responses to natural disasters, inclement weather, and mental health emergencies” after “management plan”.

(f) COORDINATING, TRAINING, RESEARCH, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.—

(1) COORDINATION.—Section 341 (42 U.S.C. 5714-21) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “safety, well-being,” after “health.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “other Federal entities” and inserting “the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice”.

(2) GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 342 (42 U.S.C. 5714-22) is amended by inserting “, including onsite and web-based techniques, such as on-demand and online learning,” before “to public and private entities”.

(3) GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DEMONSTRATION, AND SERVICE PROJECTS.—Section 343 (42 U.S.C. 5714-23) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “violence, trauma, and” before “sexual abuse and assault”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “sexual abuse and assault; and” and inserting “sexual abuse or assault, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation;”;

(III) in subparagraph (C), by striking “who have been sexually victimized” and inserting “who are victims of sexual abuse or assault, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) best practices for identifying and providing age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to—

“(i) vulnerable and underserved youth populations; and

“(ii) youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

“(E) verifying youth as runaway or homeless to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090);”;

(ii) in paragraph (9), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (10), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) examining the intersection between the runaway and homeless youth populations and trafficking in persons, including noting whether such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons were previously involved in the child welfare or juvenile justice systems.”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(B), by inserting “, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation” after “runaway or homeless youth”.

(4) PERIODIC ESTIMATE OF INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF YOUTH HOMELESSNESS.—Section 345 (42 U.S.C. 5714-25) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “13” and inserting “12”; and

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) that includes demographic information about and characteristics of runaway or homeless youth, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

“(4) that does not disclose the identity of any runaway or homeless youth.”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “13” and inserting “12”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) incidences, if any, of—

“(i) such individuals who are victims of trafficking in persons; or

“(ii) such individuals who are victims of sexual exploitation; and”; and

(v) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting “, including mental health services;”;

(II) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) access to education and job training; and”.

(g) SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM.—Section 351 (42 U.S.C. 5714-41) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “public and” before “non-profit”; and

(B) by striking “prostitution, or sexual exploitation.” and inserting “violence, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an applicant shall certify to the Secretary that such applicant has systems in place to ensure that such applicant can provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to all youth described in subsection (a).”.

(h) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) REPORTS.—Section 382(a) (42 U.S.C. 5715(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (C) through (E), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) collecting data on trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of runaway and homeless youth;”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) the number and characteristics of homeless youth served by such projects, including—

“(i) such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation;

“(ii) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

“(iii) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

“(iv) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking “intrafamily problems” and inserting “problems within the family, including (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.”.

(2) NONDISCRIMINATION.—Part F is amended by inserting after section 386A (42 U.S.C. 5732-1) the following:

#### “SEC. 386B. NONDISCRIMINATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No person in the United States shall, on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity (as defined in section 249(c)(4) of title 18, United States Code), sexual orientation, or disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this title, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with amounts appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, or other assistance administered under this title.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—If sex segregation or sex-specific programming is necessary to the essential operation of a program, nothing in this section shall prevent any such program or activity from consideration of an individual’s sex. In such circumstances, grantees may meet the requirements of this section by providing comparable services to individuals who cannot be provided with the sex-segregated or sex-specific programming.

“(c) DISQUALIFICATION.—The authority of the Secretary to enforce this section shall be the same as that provided for with respect to section 654 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9849).

“(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed, interpreted, or applied to supplant, displace, preempt, or otherwise limit the responsibilities and liabilities under other Federal or State civil rights laws.”.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 387 (42 U.S.C. 5732a) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6), and paragraphs (7) and (8), as paragraphs (2) through (7), and paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY APPROPRIATE.—The term ‘culturally and linguistically appropriate’, with respect to services, has the meaning given the term ‘culturally and linguistically appropriate services’ in the ‘National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services in Health and Health Care’, issued in April 2013, by the Office of Minority Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.”;

(C) in paragraph (6)(B)(v), as so redesignated—

(i) by redesignating subclauses (II) through (IV) as subclauses (III) through (V), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after subclause (I), the following:

“(II) trafficking in persons.”;

(iii) in subclause (IV), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “diseases” and inserting “infections”;

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in subclause (V), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(VI) suicide.”;

(D) in paragraph (7)(B), as so redesignated, by striking “prostitution,” and inserting “trafficking in persons.”;

(E) by inserting after paragraph (7), as so redesignated, the following:

“(8) TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term ‘trafficking in persons’ has the meaning given the term ‘severe forms of trafficking in persons’ in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).”;

(F) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting “to homeless youth” after “provides”;

(ii) by inserting “, to establish a stable family or community supports,” after “self-sufficient living”;

(G) in paragraph (10)(B), as so redesignated—

(i) in clause (ii)—

(I) by inserting “or able” after “willing”;

(II) by striking “or” at the end;

(iii) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) who is involved in the child welfare or juvenile justice system, but who is not receiving government-funded housing.”.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 388(a) (42 U.S.C. 5751(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “for fiscal year 2009,” and all that follows through the period and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.” and inserting “\$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “for fiscal year 2009” and all that follows through the period and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”.

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . RESPONSE TO MISSING CHILDREN AND VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) MISSING CHILDREN’S ASSISTANCE ACT.—Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children’s Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking “child prostitution” and inserting “child sex trafficking”.

(b) CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1990.—Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) a recent photograph of the child, if available.”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “60 days” and inserting “30 days”;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting “State and local child welfare systems and” before “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children”;

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) grant permission to the National Crime Information Center Terminal Contractor for the State to update the missing person record in the National Crime Information Center computer networks with additional information learned during the investigation relating to the missing person.”.

**SA 291.** Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### TITLE \_\_\_\_ —SCHOOL EMPLOYEE BACKGROUND CHECKS

##### SEC. \_\_\_\_ 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act”.

##### SEC. \_\_\_\_ 02. BACKGROUND CHECKS.

(a) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each State educational agency, or local educational agency in the case of a local educational agency designated under State law, that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) shall have in effect policies and procedures that—

(1) require that a criminal background check be conducted for each school employee that includes—

(A) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

(C) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

(D) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919);

(2) prohibit the employment of a school employee as a school employee if such employee—

(A) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under paragraph (1);

(B) makes a false statement in connection with such criminal background check;

(C) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

(i) murder;

(ii) child abuse or neglect;

(iii) a crime against children, including child pornography;

(iv) spousal abuse;

(v) a crime involving rape or sexual assault;

(vi) kidnapping;

(vii) arson; or

(viii) physical assault, battery, or a drug-related offense, committed on or after the date that is 5 years before the date of such employee’s criminal background check under paragraph (1); or

(D) has been convicted of any other crime that is a violent or sexual crime against a minor;

(3) require that each criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) be periodically repeated or updated in accordance with State law or the policies of local educational agencies served by the State educational agency;

(4) upon request, provide each school employee who has had a criminal background check under paragraph (1) with a copy of the results of the criminal background check;

(5) provide for a timely process, by which a school employee may appeal, but which does not permit the employee to be employed as a school employee during such appeal, the results of a criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) which prohibit the employee from being employed as a school employee under paragraph (2) to—

(A) challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information produced by such criminal background check; and

(B) establish or reestablish eligibility to be hired or reinstated as a school employee by demonstrating that the information is materially inaccurate or incomplete, and has been corrected;

(6) ensure that such policies and procedures are published on the website of the State educational agency and the website of each local educational agency served by the State educational agency; and

(7) allow a local educational agency to share the results of a school employee’s criminal background check recently conducted under paragraph (1) with another local educational agency that is considering such school employee for employment as a school employee.

(b) TRANSFER PROHIBITION.—A State educational agency, or local educational agency in the case of a local educational agency designated under State law, that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) shall be subject to a State or local law (including regulations), or have a regulation or policy, that prohibits the transfer, or facilitation of the transfer, of any school employee if the agency knows, or has substantive reason to believe, that such employee engaged in sexual misconduct with an elementary school or secondary school student.

(c) FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(1) CHARGING OF FEES.—The Attorney General, attorney general of a State, or other State law enforcement official may charge reasonable fees for conducting a criminal background check under subsection (a)(1), but such fees shall not exceed the actual costs for the processing and administration of the criminal background check.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.—A local educational agency or State educational agency may use administrative funds received under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) to pay any reasonable fees charged for conducting such criminal background check.

(3) FEDERAL FUNDS TO SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT, NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.—A State educational agency or local educational

agency using Federal funds in accordance with paragraph (2) shall use such Federal funds only to supplement the funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available from non-Federal sources for the purposes of this title, and not to supplant such funds.

(d) **PROHIBITION.**—Nothing in this title, or any other Federal law, regulation, policy, or directive, shall authorize the Secretary, or any other employee of the Federal Government, to regulate, provide guidance, or otherwise direct the State or local policies or procedures required under this title.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this title:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The terms “elementary school”, “secondary school”, “local educational agency”, “State”, and “State educational agency” have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(2) **SCHOOL EMPLOYEE.**—The term “school employee” means—

(A) a person who—

(i) is an employee of, or is seeking employment with, a local educational agency, or State educational agency, that receives Federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); and

(ii) as a result of such employment, has (or will have) a job duty that results in unsupervised access to public elementary school or public secondary school students; or

(B)(i) any person, or an employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services with a public elementary school, public secondary school, local educational agency, or State educational agency, that receives Federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); and

(ii) such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that results in unsupervised access to public elementary school or public secondary school students.

**SA 292.** Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 63, line 15, insert “or a tribal organization (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b))” after “government”.

On page 76, line 9, insert “, tribal,” after “State”.

On page 81, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(7) **TRIBAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “tribal law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of an Indian tribe (as that term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b)) authorized by law or by the Indian tribe to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

On page 81, line 17, insert “tribal,” after “State.”.

On page 89, line 8, insert “, tribal,” after “State”.

**SA 293.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which

was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 118. PROTECTING CHILD TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Child Trafficking Victims Protection Act”.

(b) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term “unaccompanied alien children” has the meaning given such term in section 462 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279).

(c) **MANDATORY TRAINING.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and independent child welfare experts, shall mandate live training of all personnel who come into contact with unaccompanied alien children in all relevant legal authorities, policies, practices, and procedures pertaining to this vulnerable population.

(d) **CARE AND TRANSPORTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all unaccompanied children who will undergo any immigration proceedings before the Department of Homeland Security or the Executive Office for Immigration Review are duly transported and placed in the care and legal and physical custody of the Office of Refugee Resettlement not later than 72 hours after their apprehension absent narrowly defined exceptional circumstances, including a natural disaster or comparable emergency beyond the control of the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

(2) **PRESENCE OF FEMALE OFFICERS.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that female officers are continuously present during the transfer and transport of female detainees who are in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security.

(e) **QUALIFIED RESOURCES.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide adequately trained and qualified staff resources at each major port of entry (as defined by the U.S. Customs and Border Protection station assigned to that port having in its custody during the past 2 fiscal years an yearly average of 50 or more unaccompanied alien children), including the accommodation of child welfare professionals in accordance with subsection (f).

(f) **CHILD WELFARE PROFESSIONALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Senior Advisor on Trafficking in Persons in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for the Administration for Children and Families shall ensure that qualified child welfare professionals with expertise in culturally competent, trauma-centered, and developmentally appropriate interviewing skills are available at each major port of entry described in subsection (e).

(2) **DUTIES.**—Child welfare professionals described in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Assistant Secretary for the Administration for Children and Families, develop guidelines for treatment of unaccompanied alien children in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security;

(B) conduct screening, on behalf of the Department of Homeland Security, of all unaccompanied alien children in accordance with section 235(a)(4) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232(a)(4));

(C) notify the Department of Homeland Security and the Office of Refugee Resettle-

ment of children that meet the notification and transfer requirements set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of section 235 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1232); and

(D) interview adult relatives accompanying unaccompanied alien children; and

(E) provide an initial family relationship and trafficking assessment and recommendations regarding unaccompanied alien children's initial placements to the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which shall be conducted in accordance with the time frame set forth in subsections (a)(4) and (b)(3) of section 235 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1232); and

(F) ensure that each unaccompanied alien child in the custody of U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) receives emergency medical care when necessary;

(ii) receives emergency medical and mental health care that complies with the standards adopted pursuant to section 8(c) of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 15607(c)) whenever necessary, including in cases in which a child is at risk to harm himself, herself, or others;

(iii) is provided with climate appropriate clothing, shoes, basic personal hygiene and sanitary products, a pillow, linens, and sufficient blankets to rest at a comfortable temperature;

(iv) receives adequate nutrition;

(v) enjoys a safe and sanitary living environment;

(vi) has access to daily recreational programs and activities if held for a period longer than 12 hours;

(vii) has access to legal services and consular officials; and

(viii) is permitted to make supervised phone calls to family members.

(3) **FINAL DETERMINATIONS.**—The Office of Refugee Resettlement, in consultation with the Senior Advisor on Trafficking in Persons, in accordance with applicable policies and procedures for sponsors, shall submit final determinations on family relationships to the Secretary of Homeland Security, who shall consider such adult relatives for community-based support alternatives to detention.

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Senior Advisor on Trafficking in Persons shall submit a report to Congress that—

(A) describes the screening procedures used by the child welfare professionals to screen unaccompanied alien children;

(B) assesses the effectiveness of such screenings; and

(C) includes data on all unaccompanied alien children who were screened by child welfare professionals;

(g) **IMMEDIATE NOTIFICATION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall immediately notify the Office of Refugee Resettlement of an unaccompanied alien child in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security to effectively and efficiently coordinate the child's transfer to and placement with the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

(h) **NOTICE OF RIGHTS AND RIGHT TO ACCESS TO COUNSEL.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that all unaccompanied alien children, upon apprehension, are provided—

(A) an interview and screening with a child welfare professional described in subsection (f)(1); and

(B) a video orientation and oral and written notice of their rights under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), including—



(i) their right to relief from removal;  
 (ii) their right to confer with counsel (as guaranteed under section 292 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1362)), family, or friends while in the temporary custody of the Department of Homeland Security; and

(iii) relevant complaint mechanisms to report any abuse or misconduct they may have experienced.

(2) **LANGUAGES.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure that—

(A) the video orientation and written notice of rights described in paragraph (1) is available in English and in the 5 most common native languages spoken by the unaccompanied children held in custody at that location during the preceding fiscal year; and

(B) the oral notice of rights is available in English and in the most common native language spoken by the unaccompanied children held in custody at that location during the preceding fiscal year.

(i) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall maintain the privacy and confidentiality of all information gathered in the course of providing care, custody, placement and follow-up services to unaccompanied alien children, consistent with the best interest of the unaccompanied alien child, by not disclosing such information to other government agencies or nonparental third parties unless such disclosure is—

(1) recorded in writing and placed in the child's file;

(2) in the child's best interest; and

(3)(A) authorized by the child or by an approved sponsor in accordance with section 235 of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (Public Law 104-191); or

(B) provided to a duly recognized law enforcement entity to prevent imminent and serious harm to another individual.

(j) **OTHER POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall adopt fundamental child protection policies and procedures—

(1) for reliable age determinations of children, developed in consultation with medical and child welfare experts, which exclude the use of fallible forensic testing of children's bone and teeth;

(2) to ensure the safe and secure repatriation and reintegration of unaccompanied alien children to their home countries through specialized programs developed in close consultation with the Secretary of State, the Office of the Refugee Resettlement, and reputable independent child welfare experts, including placement of children with their families or nongovernmental agencies to provide food, shelter, and vocational training and microfinance opportunities;

(3) to utilize all legal authorities to defer the child's removal if the child faces a risk of life-threatening harm upon return including due to the child's mental health or medical condition; and

(4) to ensure, in accordance with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.), that unaccompanied alien children, while in detention, are—

(A) physically separated from any adult who is not an immediate family member; and

(B) separated by sight and sound from—

(i) immigration detainees and inmates with criminal convictions;

(ii) pretrial inmates facing criminal prosecution; and

(iii) inmates exhibiting violent behavior.

(k) **TRANSFER OF FUNDS.**—

(1) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in accordance with a written agreement between the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall transfer such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the duties described in subsection (f)(2) from amounts appropriated for U.S. Customs and Border Protection to the Department of Health and Human Services.

(2) **REPORT.**—Not later than 15 days before any proposed transfer under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit a detailed expenditure plan that describes the actions proposed to be taken with amounts transferred under such paragraph to—

(A) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(l) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt or alter any other rights or remedies, including any causes of action, available under any Federal or State law.

**SA 294.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ GAO STUDY AND REPORT.**

(a) **STUDY.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on each program or initiative authorized under this Act and the following statutes and evaluate whether any program or initiative is duplicative:

(1) Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-164; 119 Stat. 3558).

(2) Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

(3) Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.).

(4) Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.).

(5) Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5771 et seq.).

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), which shall include—

(1) a description of the cost of any duplicative program or initiative studied under subsection (a); and

(2) recommendations on how to achieve cost savings with respect to each duplicative program or initiative studied under subsection (a).

**SA 295.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.**

Except as provided in section 890A(e) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by

section 302 of this Act, no funds are authorized to be appropriated by this Act to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act.

**SA 296.** Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IV—STOPPING EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING**

**SEC. 401. SAFE HARBOR INCENTIVES.**

Part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1701(c), by striking “where feasible” and all that follows, and inserting the following: “where feasible, to an application—

“(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

“(2) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law that—

“(A) treats a minor who has engaged in, or has attempted to engage in, a commercial sex act as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons;

“(B) discourages or prohibits the charging or prosecution of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution or sex trafficking offense, based on the conduct described in subparagraph (A); and

“(C) encourages the diversion of an individual described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate service providers, including child welfare services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services.”; and

(2) in section 1709, by inserting at the end the following:

“(5) ‘commercial sex act’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

“(6) ‘minor’ means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

“(7) ‘severe form of trafficking in persons’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).”.

**SEC. 402. REPORT ON RESTITUTION PAID IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN TRAFFICKING OFFENSES.**

Section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after “1590,” the following: “1591.”;

(2) by striking “and 1594” and inserting “1594, 2251, 2251A, 2421, 2422, and 2423”;

(3) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in clause (v), by striking “and” at the end; and

(5) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

“(vi) the number of individuals required by a court order to pay restitution in connection with a violation of each offense under title 18, United States Code, the amount of restitution required to be paid under each such order, and the amount of restitution actually paid pursuant to each such order; and

“(vii) the age, gender, race, country of origin, country of citizenship, and description of the role in the offense of individuals convicted under each offense; and”.



**SEC. 403. NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOT-LINE.**

Section 107(b)(1)(B) of the Victims of Crime Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Subject” and inserting the following:

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOT-LINE.—Beginning in fiscal year 2017, and in each fiscal year thereafter, of amounts made available for grants under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make grants for a national communication system to assist victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons in communicating with service providers. The Secretary shall give priority to grant applicants that have experience in providing telephone services to victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.”.

**SEC. 404. JOB CORPS ELIGIBILITY.**

Section 144(a)(3) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3194(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) A victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)). Notwithstanding paragraph (2), an individual described in this subparagraph shall not be required to demonstrate eligibility under such paragraph.”.

**SEC. 405. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.**

Section 566(e)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) assist State, local, and other Federal law enforcement agencies, upon the request of such an agency, in locating and recovering missing children.”.

**SEC. 406. ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall implement and maintain a National Strategy for Combating Human Trafficking (referred to in this section as the “National Strategy”) in accordance with this section.

(b) REQUIRED CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.—The National Strategy shall include the following:

(1) Integrated Federal, State, local, and tribal efforts to investigate and prosecute human trafficking cases, including—

(A) the development by each United States attorney, in consultation with State, local, and tribal government agencies, of a district-specific strategic plan to coordinate the identification of victims and the investigation and prosecution of human trafficking crimes;

(B) the appointment of not fewer than 1 assistant United States attorney in each district dedicated to the prosecution of human trafficking cases or responsible for implementing the National Strategy;

(C) the participation in any Federal, State, local, or tribal human trafficking task force operating in the district of the United States attorney; and

(D) any other efforts intended to enhance the level of coordination and cooperation, as determined by the Attorney General.

(2) Case coordination within the Department of Justice, including specific integra-

tion, coordination, and collaboration, as appropriate, on human trafficking investigations between and among the United States attorneys, the Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit, the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(3) Annual budget priorities and Federal efforts dedicated to preventing and combating human trafficking, including resources dedicated to the Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit, the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and all other entities that receive Federal support that have a goal or mission to combat the exploitation of adults and children.

(4) An ongoing assessment of the future trends, challenges, and opportunities, including new investigative strategies, techniques, and technologies, that will enhance Federal, State, local, and tribal efforts to combat human trafficking.

(5) Encouragement of cooperation, coordination, and mutual support between private sector and other entities and organizations and Federal agencies to combat human trafficking, including the involvement of State, local, and tribal government agencies to the extent Federal programs are involved.

**SA 297.** Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**TITLE IV—STOP SEXUAL ABUSE BY SCHOOL PERSONNEL ACT OF 2015****SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Stop Sexual Abuse by School Personnel Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 402. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR SCHOOL EMPLOYEES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 2 of part E of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 9537. CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR SCHOOL EMPLOYEES.**

“(a) CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency and local educational agency that receives funds under this Act shall have in effect policies and procedures that require a criminal background check for each school employee in each covered school served by such State educational agency and local educational agency.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A background check required under paragraph (1) shall be conducted and administered by—

“(A) the State;

“(B) the State educational agency; or

“(C) the local educational agency.

“(b) STATE AND LOCAL USES OF FUNDS.—A State educational agency or local educational agency that receives funds under this Act may use such funds to establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures on background checks for school employees required under subsection (a) to—

“(1) expand the registries or repositories searched when conducting background checks, such as—

“(A) the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

“(B) the State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

“(C) the Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System; and

“(D) the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919);

“(2) provide school employees with training and professional development on how to recognize, respond to, and prevent child abuse;

“(3) develop, implement, or improve mechanisms to assist covered local educational agencies and covered schools in effectively recognizing and quickly responding to incidents of child abuse by school employees;

“(4) develop and disseminate information on best practices and Federal, State, and local resources available to assist local educational agencies and schools in preventing and responding to incidents of child abuse by school employees;

“(5) develop professional standards and codes of conduct for the appropriate behavior of school employees;

“(6) establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures for covered State educational agencies, covered local educational agencies, or covered schools to provide the results of background checks to—

“(A) individuals subject to the background checks in a statement that indicates whether the individual is ineligible for such employment due to the background check and includes information related to each disqualifying crime;

“(B) the employer in a statement that indicates whether a school employee is eligible or ineligible for employment, without revealing any disqualifying crime or other related information regarding the individual;

“(C) another employer in the same State or another State, as permitted under State law, without revealing any disqualifying crime or other related information regarding the individual; and

“(D) another local educational agency in the same State or another State that is considering such school employee for employment, as permitted under State law, without revealing any disqualifying crime or other related information regarding the individual;

“(7) establish, implement, or improve procedures that include periodic background checks, which also allows for an appeals process as described in paragraph (8), for school employees in accordance with State policies or the policies of covered local educational agencies served by the covered State educational agency;

“(8) establish, implement, or improve a process by which a school employee may appeal the results of a background check, which process is completed in a timely manner, gives each school employee notice of an opportunity to appeal, and instructions on how to complete the appeals process;

“(9) establish, implement, or improve a review process through which the covered State educational agency or covered local educational agency may determine that a school employee disqualified due to a crime is eligible for employment due to mitigating circumstances as determined by a covered local educational agency or a covered State educational agency;

“(10) establish, implement, or improve policies and procedures intended to ensure a covered State educational agency or covered local educational agency does not knowingly transfer or facilitate the transfer of a school employee if the agency knows that employee has engaged in sexual misconduct, as defined

by State law, with an elementary school or secondary school student;

“(11) provide that policies and procedures are published on the website of the covered State educational agency and the website of each covered local educational agency served by the covered State educational agency;

“(12) provide school employees with training regarding the appropriate reporting of incidents of child abuse under section 106(b)(2)(B)(i) of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (42 U.S.C. 5106a(b)(2)(B)(i)); and

“(13) support any other activities determined by the State to protect student safety or improve the comprehensiveness, coordination, and transparency of policies and procedures on criminal background checks for school employees in the State.

“(c) NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to create a private right of action if a State, covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, or covered school is in compliance with State regulations and requirements concerning background checks.

“(d) BACKGROUND CHECK FEES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as prohibiting States or local educational agencies from charging school employees for the costs of processing applications and administering a background check as required by State law, provided that the fees charged to school employees do not exceed the actual costs to the State or local educational agency for the processing and administration of the background check.

“(e) STATE AND LOCAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS.—Each plan submitted by a State or local educational agency under title I shall include—

“(1) an assurance that the State and local educational agency has in effect policies and procedures that meet the requirements of this section; and

“(2) a description of laws, regulations, or policies and procedures in effect in the State for conducting background checks for school employees designed to—

“(A) terminate individuals in violation of State background check requirements;

“(B) improve the reporting of violations of the background check requirements in the State;

“(C) reduce the instance of school employee transfers following a substantiated violation of the State background check requirements by a school employee;

“(D) provide for a timely process by which a school employee may appeal the results of a criminal background check;

“(E) provide each school employee, upon request, with a copy of the results of the criminal background check, including a description of the disqualifying item or items, if applicable;

“(F) provide the results of the criminal background check to the employer in a statement that indicates whether a school employee is eligible or ineligible for employment, without revealing any disqualifying crime or other related information regarding the individual; and

“(G) provide for the public availability of the policies and procedures for conducting background checks.

“(f) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, AND SCHOOLS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General, shall provide technical assistance and support to States, local educational agencies, and schools, which shall include, at a minimum—

“(1) developing and disseminating a comprehensive package of materials for States, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, and schools that outlines steps that can be taken to prevent and respond to child sexual abuse by school personnel;

“(2) determining the most cost-effective way to disseminate Federal information so that relevant State educational agencies and local educational agencies, child welfare agencies, and criminal justice entities are aware of such information and have access to it; and

“(3) identifying mechanisms to better track and analyze the prevalence of child sexual abuse by school personnel through existing Federal data collection systems, such as the School Survey on Crime and Safety, the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System, and the National Crime Victimization Survey.

“(g) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) REPORTS TO THE SECRETARY.—A covered State educational agency or covered local educational agency that uses funds pursuant to this section shall report annually to the Secretary on—

“(A) the amount of funds used; and

“(B) the purpose for which the funds were used under this section.

“(2) SECRETARY'S REPORT CARD.—Not later than July 1, 2017, and annually thereafter, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Institute of Education Sciences, shall transmit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives a national report card that includes—

“(A) actions taken pursuant to subsection (f), including any best practices identified under such subsection; and

“(B) incidents of reported child sexual abuse by school personnel, as reported through existing Federal data collection systems, such as the School Survey on Crime and Safety, the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System, and the National Crime Victimization Survey.

“(h) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

“(1) NO FEDERAL CONTROL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to—

“(A) mandate, direct, or control the background check policies or procedures that a State or local educational agency develops or implements under this section;

“(B) establish any criterion that specifies, defines, or prescribes the background check policies or procedures that a State or local educational agency develops or implements under this section; or

“(C) require a State or local educational agency to submit such background check policies or procedures for approval.

“(2) PROHIBITION ON REGULATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to permit the Secretary to establish any criterion that—

“(A) prescribes, or specifies requirements regarding, background checks for school employees;

“(B) defines the term ‘background checks’, as such term is used in this section; or

“(C) requires a State or local educational agency to report additional data elements or information to the Secretary not otherwise explicitly authorized under this section or any other Federal law.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘covered local educational agency’ means a local educational agency that receives funds under this Act;

“(2) the term ‘covered school’ means a public elementary school or public secondary school, including a public elementary or secondary charter school, that receives funds under this Act;

“(3) the term ‘covered State educational agency’ means a State educational agency that receives funds under this Act; and

“(4) the term ‘school employee’ includes, at a minimum—

“(A) an employee of, or a person seeking employment with, a covered school, covered local educational agency, or covered State educational agency and who, as a result of such employment, has (or, in the case of a person seeking employment, will have) a job duty that includes unsupervised contact or interaction with elementary school or secondary school students; or

“(B) any person, or any employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services with a covered school, covered local educational agency, or covered State educational agency, and such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that includes unsupervised contact or unsupervised interaction with elementary school or secondary school students.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 9536 the following:

“Sec. 9537. Criminal background checks for school employees.”.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 11, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Three Years Later: Are We Any Closer to a Nationwide Public Safety Wireless Broadband Network.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 11, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “State Regulators’ Perspectives on the Clean Power Plan.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The

President's Request for Authorization to Use Force against ISIS: Military and Diplomatic Efforts."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 11, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 11, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 11, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, March 12, at 1:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 20 and Calendar No. 16; that

there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 12; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the time be equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half; finally, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Senators should expect a vote on the Hart nomination at approximately 2 p.m. tomorrow. The other nomination at that time is expected to go by voice vote.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Sen-

ate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:03 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 12, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

ERIC MARTIN SATZ, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2018, VICE NEIL G. MCBRIDE, TERM EXPIRED.

##### CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

VANESSA LORRAINE ALLEN SUTHERLAND, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE RAFAEL MOURE-ERASO, TERM EXPIRING.

VANESSA LORRAINE ALLEN SUTHERLAND, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE RAFAEL MOURE-ERASO, TERM EXPIRING.

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID HALE, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN.

##### NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

EDWARD L. AYERS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2020, VICE DAVID HERTZ, TERM EXPIRED.

KATHRYN K. MATTHEW, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE SUSAN H. HILDRETH.

##### UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

STEPHEN CRAWFORD, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2015, VICE ALAN C. KESSLER, RESIGNED.

STEPHEN CRAWFORD, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2022. (REAPPOINTMENT)  
JAMES C. MILLER, III, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

##### GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

CAROL FORTINE OCHOA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION, VICE BRIAN DAVID MILLER, RESIGNED.

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

##### To be brigadier general

COL. DENNIS HUNSICKER

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 12, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

## MEETINGS SCHEDULED

## MARCH 16

4 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine Federal improper payments and errors in the Death Master File.

SD-342

## MARCH 17

9 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services  
To receive a closed briefing on cyber, space and strategic competition with China and Russia in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SVC-217

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Agriculture.

SD-192

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine the state of technological innovation related to the electric grid.

SD-366

Committee on Environment and Public Works  
Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife  
To hold hearings to examine S. 659, to protect and enhance opportunities for

recreational hunting, fishing, and shooting.

SD-406

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine building a competitive United States international tax system.

SD-215

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues  
To hold hearings to examine the deepening political and economic crisis in Venezuela, focusing on implications for United States interests and the Western Hemisphere.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine America's health information technology (IT) transformation, focusing on translating the promise of electronic health records into better care.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine securing the Southwest border, focusing on perspectives from beyond the beltway.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine immigration reform, focusing on the American worker.

SD-226

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the military services.

SD-124

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security  
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2016 for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

SR-253

## MARCH 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine S. 697, to amend the Toxic Substances Control

Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act.

SD-406

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Forest Service.

SD-124

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Transportation.

SD-562

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the impact of patent litigation practices on the American economy.

SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation from multiple veterans service organizations.

SD-G50

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Missile Defense Agency.

SD-192

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the postures of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-106

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission.

SR-253

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 35, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, S. 438, to provide for the repair, replacement, and maintenance of certain Indian irrigation projects, S. 465, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and the nomination of Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine an original bill, entitled

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

“the Reauthorization of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act of 2015”.

SD-628

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President 2015.

SD-562

MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Strategic Command, U.S. Transportation Command, and U.S. Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine U.S. crude oil export policy.

SD-366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine Federal rulemaking challenges and areas of improvement within the existing regulatory process.

SD-342

2 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the United States Secret Service.

SD-138

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Airland

To hold hearings to examine Air Force force structure and modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

MARCH 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine management reforms to improve forest health and socioeconomic opportunities on the nation's forest system.

SD-366

MARCH 25

9 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for

fiscal year 2016 for the Defense Health Program.

SD-192

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

MARCH 26

10 a.m.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the Administration's Quadrennial Energy Review.

SD-366

POSTPONEMENTS

MARCH 17

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine opportunities and challenges for agriculture trade with Cuba.

SR-328A

**SENATE—Thursday, March 12, 2015**

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, most high, thank You for being light in our darkness, food for our hunger, peace for our pressures, joy for our sorrow, forgiveness for our failures, strength for our weakness, guidance for our confusion, and health for our sickness.

May our Senators labor today with the knowledge that You are everything they need. When they feel uncertain about the next step to take, supply their needs from Your bountiful riches. Lord, keep them from stumbling or slipping as they strive to live lives that honor You. May they ever do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with You.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

**HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act is one of the most bipartisan pieces of legislation one could possibly imagine. Ever since this bipartisan human rights bill was introduced by a Democrat and a Republican in January and made publicly available for any person to read, Members of both parties have sung its praises repeatedly. This bipartisan bill has gained the support of 13 Democratic cosponsors.

Recently, Democrats voted unanimously to approve it in committee. This week Democrats consented unanimously to advance it on the floor. Even the Democratic leader himself said he “underscore[d], appreciate[d], and agree[d]” with my call to pass this bipartisan legislation overwhelmingly. “I doubt there will be problems on my

side,” he said. “If there are, I will work to clear them.”

That was Monday.

By Tuesday, Democrats seemed to be threatening to filibuster human rights legislation for abused and neglected victims and children. Let me repeat that. Democrats are now threatening to filibuster human rights legislation for abused and neglected victims and children. So why?

Democrats now say they don’t like language that has been in the bill since it was introduced months ago that does nothing more than reaffirm the bipartisan law of the land. That is all that language does. This bipartisan provision was on page 4 of this modest-sized bill, so Democrats obviously knew it was there to begin with. Democrats obviously wouldn’t have cosponsored the bill or voted for it in committee or called for passage on the floor if they hadn’t read the bill first.

These Democrats surely don’t want to see more quotes such as this one from an official with the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women. She said: “Senate Democrats are choosing a phantom problem over real victims.”

So if these Democrats keep their word to the victims of human trafficking, then a partisan filibuster attempt will fail overwhelmingly. If these Democrats keep their word to the vulnerable and the oppressed, then the Senate will pass a bipartisan human rights bill.

But if these Democrats truly are having second thoughts about supporting such important human rights legislation, they are free to offer an amendment. But let’s not filibuster bipartisan help for vulnerable victims just to make a point for leftwing special interest groups.

Our Democratic friends have to resist the siren song of their pollsters who tell them that the path to victory lies in turning bipartisan bills into manufactured fights over cultural issues. Americans are looking for statesmen and stateswomen on the Democratic side to stand up—stand up—and help us emancipate the victims of modern slavery, not score another empty political point.

So I am calling on these Democrats to help us do that. Help is almost there for the vulnerable victims of these awful crimes. Surely no leftwing special interest group is more important than fighting modern-day slavery. So the Democratic cosponsors and declared supporters of this bill need to keep working with us in a bipartisan way to ensure that help comes.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

**FOREIGN POLICY**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, McClatchy News has a story that I think is worth talking about, a part of it at least, this morning. It says:

Newspaper editorial pages around the country have not been kind to Senate Republicans this week. A collective “Seriously?” has emerged in reaction to the open letter that 47 Republicans penned to the Iranian leadership, which seemed designed to undercut nuclear talks with the Obama administration.

Here are some of the things they said:

“A blot on 114th U.S. Senate,” from the Detroit Free Press.

“The Senators who signed the letter should be ashamed,” said the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Some sounded embarrassed.

“Cringe-worthy buffoonery on the global stage,” says the Salt Lake Tribune.

Others seemed just weary of Capitol Hill’s continuing dysfunction.

“Has Congress gone crazy?” wondered the Courier-Journal in Louisville, KY.

Senator MARK KIRK of Illinois “has not been among the crazies in Congress, particularly on foreign policy matters. But he joined them here,” wrote the Peoria Journal Star.

Noting her signature endorsing the letter, the Concord Monitor said of New Hampshire Republican Senator KELLY AYOTTE:

“It’s not every day that a United States senator attempts to undermine U.S. foreign policy and weaken the nation in one cursive swoop.”

In Phoenix, AZ, the Arizona Republic editorial board concluded that the Republican Senators “are effectively declaring a congressional right to conduct subversive foreign policy proxy wars with the president, with threats to blow up agreement negotiations as their weapon of choice.”

**HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in the last Congress legislation to combat human trafficking was a bipartisan matter. Senators KLOBUCHAR and LEAHY have long been leaders on this issue. But this year—and we could talk about how it got in the bill, many believe it was sleight of hand—there is an abortion

provision in this bill that is now before this body.

For well more than 25 years I had the pleasure of serving with Henry Hyde in the House of Representatives, who was famous for a number of reasons, but one is that he has penned the Hyde language which deals with abortion. In all these 25-plus years, that matter has been put over 1 year at a time. We have never chosen to make that permanent law.

This year Republicans have sought to inject into this consensus bill one of the most controversial issues of the last 40 years—a woman's right to choose.

Don't take my word for it. Leading Republicans acknowledge that abortion politics is extraneous to the bill before us.

Yesterday JOHN CORNYN said: "This bill is being hijacked and being used to debate something that it really doesn't have very much to do about, and that is the subject of abortion."

ORRIN HATCH said: "I can't believe that this Senate has become so political that we would raise that issue at this time on this bill."

The solution is so simple. Take the abortion language out of the bill.

The bill dealing with human trafficking is going to pass. If we don't do it now, we will do it. It is something that is imperative that we accomplish, but it should not be dealt with in relation to abortion. Take the abortion language out of the bill.

The Republican Senators have a choice, to legislate or to hijack the legislation. If they want to get something done, they need to take abortion politics out of this bill. If they want to leave abortion politics in the bill, then the Republicans will only continue this session's record of dysfunction.

This is the second day my friend, the Republican leader, has come to the floor and quoted something I said a few days ago. Every word he quotes is perfect—that is what I said—but here is the context in which I said it. I am an expert on motions to proceed. During the last 6 years I have had to file cloture as a leader here hundreds and hundreds of times—in the last Congress more than 200 times. Virtually all of the cloture motions were filed because Republicans wouldn't let us get on the bill. They simply wouldn't let us get on the bill—every bill—even bills they favored. We would have to spend a couple of days getting it ripe for a vote on cloture, and once that was done, then we had to wait 30 hours. What I said the other day is true, human trafficking is something that needs to get done, and we Democrats are not going to ask you, the Republican leadership, to file abortion language. Get on the bill. And we are on the bill. We could finish this bill in 20 minutes. The only thing that needs to be done is the language relating to abortion should come out of this

bill. Abortion and human trafficking have nothing to do with each other.

So my friend the Republican leader can come and quote me any time he wants, and I know he will quote me correctly, but it should be put in the proper context, and that context is this: We have proven during the first few months of this Congress that on issues that we believe should be debated, we will allow the Senate to get on the bill. We are not going to be stalling, as has been done for the last 6 years, just to kill time. We are on this human trafficking legislation because it is something that needs to be completed, and the only way at this stage it is going to happen is the abortion language must come out of the bill.

Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided, and with the majority controlling the first half.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the votes are scheduled today at 2 p.m.; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### KELSEY SMITH ACT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about my amendment to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking bill that would make a minor but nevertheless important common-sense update to the current telecommunications law to provide law enforcement with access to information that should and could help locate individuals in life-or-death situations. My amendment—identical to the stand-alone legislation I plan to reintroduce later this month—is aptly named after the young Kansan whose life and bright future was cut short by a senseless act of violence and whose case is the inspi-

ration for why we desperately need to update this law.

Almost 8 years ago. On June 2, 2007, 18-year-old Kansan Kelsey Smith—a lovely girl—was abducted in broad daylight from an Overland Park, KS, parking lot. Kelsey's abduction was captured on the closed circuit camera, therefore leaving little doubt of the emergency situation.

Here is the tragedy. Four days after Kelsey disappeared, authorities were finally able to locate her body after her wireless provider released the "ping" or call location information from her cell phone. It took 4 days to get that vital information. Providing this information as fast as possible is absolutely critical to ensure law enforcement officials can rescue victims in imminent danger of death or serious physical harm and hopefully prevent future cases similar to Kelsey's.

This amendment is a culmination of years of work between legislatures at both the Federal and State level, industry stakeholders, private advocates and, most importantly, Kelsey's brave parents who spearheaded this initiative and advocated to create commonsense reforms that properly balance the needs of law enforcement with the Fourth Amendment protections of all citizens.

Through their advocacy and tireless efforts, Missey and Greg Smith have helped enact laws in 17 States, including my home State of Kansas, to provide law enforcement with the necessary tools to rescue individuals in emergency situations where the threat of death or serious bodily injury is imminent.

The impact of this law at the State level has been real and measurable. For example, in May of 2012, 1 month after the enactment of the State's version of the Kelsey Smith Act, local authorities in Tennessee were successful in saving the life of a child who had been abducted by a suspected child rapist. Because the child was believed to be in imminent danger, police were able to receive the location of the suspect's cell phone in a window of time that led to the safe recovery of the child alive and before she was assaulted.

According to the Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the first 3 hours are critical to recovering a child alive. This is why it is necessary that in these few isolated instances where a person's very life is at stake, an exemption should be made to release the whereabouts of that individual. Understanding this, my amendment would provide law enforcement with the ability to recover the location of children and other missing individuals in only very specific emergency situations, namely when there is risk of death or serious bodily injury, but in order to obtain the location, law enforcement must first provide a sworn written statement to the telecommunications



providers stating the facts that support probable cause to believe that disclosure of the location is required to prevent death or serious bodily injury. Furthermore, 48 hours after the location is disclosed to law enforcement, they must request a court order stating whether such agency had probable cause to believe the facts surrounding the rescue or recovery were warranted.

The privacy of every Kansan, and every individual for that matter, is extremely important and that is why my amendment includes this language to put into place safeguards against possible abuses of authority by law enforcement. I believe my amendment strikes the appropriate balance between the ability for law enforcement to help individuals in grave danger while also ensuring that proper checks are in place to guard against any overreach by the government.

Kelsey was never given the opportunity to attend college or get married or have children and experience the American dream that many of us take for granted every day, but what she did do was inspire her mother and father to make it their mission in life to help educate and empower communities and children to help prevent another case like this from happening again.

Kelsey's father, Greg, a former law enforcement officer himself and a Kansas State Senator representing parts of Johnson County, said it best when he quoted Abraham Lincoln to describe what Kelsey had accomplished: "In the end, it's not the years in your life that counts. It's the life in your years."

I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to speak on the floor today, and I would have liked to have offered my commonsense amendment that would help prevent tragedies like Kelsey's, so I ask every colleague in this body to ask one question: If it were your child, your grandchild, your spouse, would you not want law enforcement to have immediate access to this information?

Let's honor Kelsey's memory by passing this legislation whether it is stand-alone legislation or in amendment form. I had every intention to ask for a vote on my amendment. I believe I would have had my colleagues' support on both sides of the aisle. This legislation is long overdue and so is the trafficking bill.

At this time we are grateful for those who use their abilities and skills in ways that promote justice and goodwill in our land and to promoting the good of every citizen. That is, unfortunately, not happening at this time. We have objections from the minority over a provision that has been in law for 36 years.

This is delay again for Kelsey Smith and amendments such as mine that I think have bipartisan support. In this regard I am frustrated, and I think it is shameful.

I yield the floor.

It would appear to the Senator from Kansas that there is not a quorum.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am proud to join several of my colleagues this morning in submitting a substitute amendment to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015.

Human trafficking is a global scourge, and we should be working on a bipartisan basis and on a bicameral basis to stop it. However, I am deeply concerned to learn that our friends on the other side of the aisle have inserted a worrisome provision into this year's version of the bill. This provision would expand upon the so-called Hyde amendment which restricts funds for women's reproductive health choices. The new language, which has been offered by Senator CORNYN from Texas, would set a new, dangerous precedent by enabling Hyde restrictions to apply to nontax funding streams set forth in this bill.

This language paves the way for political leaders in the future to interfere even more with a woman's basic personal health decisions, and it sets the tone for a dramatic expansion of abortion restriction for years to come.

I am upset about this provision in that it shouldn't be in this bill. This bill is not about abortion, it is about human trafficking. Instead, this provision has now become another opportunity for political speeches and delay.

The good news is the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act can still be bipartisan, and we have high hopes it will be. Democrats are ready to work with Republicans to fix this bill and move past the partisan obstacle which literally stopped us this week from doing anything.

The substitute amendment removes the Hyde restrictions from the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. It includes two important bipartisan pieces of legislation, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, originally offered by Senator LEAHY, and the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act sponsored by Senator KLOBUCHAR.

We know that colleagues can work on a bipartisan basis to effectively address this issue. I urge my colleagues, when we look at what we have done so far in this session of Congress, we have very little to show for the time we have

spent here. This is an opportunity to pass a bipartisan human trafficking bill—not a grab bag for every notion or idea any Senator has on any subject, but one that addresses a very serious issue.

I also know that another Senator from Louisiana on the Republican side has an amendment which he wishes to offer on this bill which, again, has nothing to do with human trafficking.

Senator VITTER offers an amendment that would deny citizenship at birth to children born in the United States unless one of the parents of the child is a U.S. citizen, national permanent resident, or an actively serving armed services member.

As the ranking member of the constitution subcommittee on the Judiciary Committee, let me begin with the obvious for my colleagues in the Senate: Birthright citizenship is a constitutional right. Congress can't amend that amendment with a statute. I would think that every Senator knows that. To put this provision before us is merely to try to provoke a debate on a bill which has no impact on the Constitution.

The citizenship clause of the 14th Amendment states: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside."

I urge my colleagues, particularly the one offering this amendment, to pick up the Constitution and read it. The 14th Amendment is as clear as can be.

The citizenship clause has been restated and established by four centuries of Anglo-American jurisprudence. The 14th Amendment raised the short-lived exception to birthright citizenship that was established by the infamous Dred Scott decision of 1857. We certainly remember that. It was one of the provocations that led to a civil war in this country. We should take this issue extremely seriously.

The Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that the 14th Amendment applies to U.S.-born children of noncitizens. What part of that does the author of this amendment not understand?

The Court rejected arguments that the son of Chinese nationals, who were forbidden under the Chinese Exclusion Act from ever becoming U.S. citizens, could be deprived of citizenship because of his parents' status.

The Supreme Court ruled that: "Nothing is better settled at the common law than the doctrine that the children, even of aliens . . . are subjects at birth." Subsequent decisions have backed that up.

The famous case of *Plyer v. Doe* basically said—the Court reasoned that even if the Court wanted to control the conduct of adults, "legislation directing the onus of the parent's misconduct against his children does not comport

with fundamental concepts of justice.” The law is clear.

So this amendment being offered by Senator VITTER is a provocative, unnecessary, and basically feckless effort to stall an important bill that should be passed on a bipartisan basis.

I hope my colleagues, whatever their feelings on this issue, will understand, you cannot amend the Constitution by a statute. I thought that was in basic Senate 101, but we have to get back to it to make clear that my colleagues understand this important human trafficking bill should not be bogged down or stopped with issues such as abortion—as important as it is—which should be saved for a separate debate, or this effort to amend the U.S. Constitution with an amendment on the floor to a statute. That certainly is not a good way for us to accomplish things in the Senate.

#### FOR-PROFIT SCHOOLS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have been coming to this floor for a long time. The Presiding Officer is new to the body so I know he has been spared my speeches on the subject talking about for-profit colleges.

This is an industry that lures students with flashy ads and misleading promises, gobbles up the Federal loan and grant money these students can bring to them and then ends up producing students—if they are lucky enough to get a diploma—who can’t find good-paying jobs. To understand the for-profit college industry in America today, you only need to know three numbers—and for those who are listening, this will be on the final. Here are the three numbers: For-profit colleges enroll ten percent of college students in the United States of America. When you think of for-profit colleges, think of University of Phoenix, DeVry, Kaplan. There are a lot of them. Ten percent of college students go to these schools.

These schools, the for-profit schools, receive 20 percent of the Federal aid to education.

Why do they get so much if they only have 10 percent of the students? They charge so much. Their tuition goes through the roof. Ten percent of the students, 20 percent of the Federal aid to education. But this is the number I don’t want you to forget—44.

Forty-four percent of all student loan defaults are students of for-profit schools. What does that tell us? It tells us these students are getting in over their heads. They are borrowing too much money. It tells us these students are dropping out and unable to pay their loans or end up with a worthless diploma and can’t find a job.

How can the Senate stand back and say this is acceptable? For-profit colleges are the most heavily subsidized private companies in America today—the most heavily subsidized.

In the home State of the Presiding Officer and mine, we have some farmers. Our farmers get kicked around a little bit about all of the Federal money they receive. Our farmers don’t hold a candle to the for-profit colleges and universities.

These folks have turned siphoning money out of the Federal Treasury into an art form. The money they pay the CEOs who engineer these arrangements is in the millions of dollars each year, all Federal dollars, virtually all, 90, 95 percent of Federal dollars. How can you call yourself a private, for-profit company, when 80 to 90 percent of your money is coming directly from the Federal Government?

As a matter of fact, this industry, the for-profit college industry, if we took the money we spent in subsidies to these schools, would be the ninth largest Federal agency in Washington.

Yet many flinty conservatives who hate subsidies and hate deficits look the other way: Oh, it is a private company—10 percent of the students, 20 percent of the aid in Federal education, 44 percent of all the student loan defaults—and they are getting 80 to 90 percent from the Federal Treasury and we are supposed to look the other way?

From time to time, students come and sit in our galleries. Many of them are soon to graduate from high school. They will be inundated by these for-profit schools.

As soon as you reach a certain age, you can’t log onto your computer without these schools roaring at you about the great deals they have to offer. I took a look back in recent memory. They actually ran an ad before the Presiding Officer was elected, and it was an ad that was on local television here. It showed a very attractive young lady in her pajamas, lounging on her bed, and she had her laptop computer. She said in this ad: I am going to college in my pajamas. I am going to a for-profit college—I don’t even have to get out of my pajamas, I can go to college.

That is a bad joke, and unfortunately too many people are lured into this belief: I can just log on and get a degree. Well, it turns out many times it is too darned expensive—and it is worthless, if you ever get it.

The stories that come to my office of young people who signed up for these for-profit schools and ended up with more debt than they could ever possibly imagine are horrifying. Imagine a 30-year-old woman in the suburbs of Chicago with over \$100,000 in debt and a worthless degree from Westwood College, one of the for-profit colleges in the Chicagoland area.

She watched all these crime shows on television, and they told her she could go into law enforcement with this degree. She spent 5 years, over \$100,000 in debt, and not a single law enforcement agency in the Chicagoland area would recognize that degree.

Was she ever told that along the way with all those fancy ads? Never. So I say to students: Think twice about these for-profit schools.

But I want to say a word about one particular instance that bothers me a lot. Corinthian was one of the largest—most people didn’t know Corinthian as a for-profit school, but they knew some of the schools that were involved in it. Everest Colleges were owned by Corinthian.

Well, it turned out that Corinthian ran into a problem. Corinthian Colleges was falsifying information they gave to the Federal Government. The Federal Government asked Corinthian Colleges, as it asks all of these other for-profit colleges: How many of your students get jobs after they graduate?

Corinthian was falsifying the students getting jobs. In fact, Corinthian had this arrangement with many companies. They would give them \$1,000 and say: Can you hire our graduates for a month? You can let them go, but hire them after graduation for a month or two, and we will give you some money to do it. The companies went along with that, subsidized employees, then they let the employees go.

Then Corinthian would report to the Federal Government: our graduates are working.

Well, when we called them on it and they couldn’t produce the real information, Corinthian stock started plummeting and eventually went out of business. It was more than 1 year ago that I wrote to the Department of Education asking them to investigate Corinthian Colleges about falsifying job placement rates. It was originally reported by the Huffington Post. According to the Department, they looked into it. Corinthian was, in fact, lying, falsifying placement rates and creating attendance records at several of its institutions. Corinthian would use inflated placement rates to lure other unsuspecting students into the school. After the Department of Education placed financial sanctions on the company and delayed their title IV disbursements, Corinthian reported they didn’t have enough cash flow and would have to close.

That is exactly what would have happened. Unfortunately, the Department of Education kept the school afloat even after this, shoveling hundreds of millions of dollars to the failed Corinthian company, allowing it to continue advertising and signing up students. At a point when private investors were jumping ship, the Department of Education was jumping in. Now, in a transaction blessed by the Department of Education, most of the former Corinthian campuses have been sold to ECMC.

This is a corporation that has served historically as a debt collector for the Department of Education. This is one of the companies that goes after students when they are not paying their

student loans. Now this debt collection agency is going to own one of these for-profit colleges, what is left of Corinthian.

We are told this new debt collection university will operate as a not-for-profit entity. That was enticing, and I thought, well, at least they are not in the for-profit world. Despite being a not-for-profit company in name at least, I am troubled that ECMC is already—just weeks into owning and operating these schools—failing to live up to the promises they made to the students and to me.

This is an example. I wrote ECMC's head, David Hawn, in December, asking him to discontinue Corinthian's use of mandatory arbitration clauses as part of the school's enrollment agreement. What are these clauses? These clauses, signed by students, take away the rights of students to bring grievances before a court. And once students end up in arbitration proceedings, they find the rules stacked against them and in favor of the corporate players.

The associations that represent not-for-profit schools have informed me that their member schools do not use these mandatory arbitration clauses. These clauses are essentially only used by companies in the for-profit college sector. I told Mr. Hawn if he was truly going to run a not-for-profit institution, he should follow the clear model of nonprofit education—no mandatory arbitration clauses for students.

In his response to me, Mr. Hawn certainly said the right thing. He told me that ECMC had “eliminated Corinthian's policy of binding mandatory arbitration.”

The reason this is important is that if a student has been defrauded, and they signed one of these mandatory arbitration clauses, they can never get their case and their facts before an impartial jury or judge. It is going to be decided in an arbitration hearing instead.

Mr. Hawn summed up their policy and the issue as follows:

Bottom line: We believe that students have an unquestioned right to seek redress for grievances, including the right to file a lawsuit. We will not stand in the way of any student who wants to pursue litigation based on his or her personal experience.

It couldn't have been stated more clearly and better. It meant that this debt collection company that is taking over the failing for-profit school is saying that we are truly not-for-profit and we are truly going to play this on the square. If students feel they have been treated unfairly, they have every legal right to go to court so they do not end up with tens of thousands of debt because we defrauded them.

I felt pretty good about that response. Well, then we read the fine print. We found out that ECMC uses a combination of carrots and sticks to try to keep students out of court.

First, ECMC's new enrollment document requires students to irrevocably waive their right to seek a trial by jury and waive their ability to join any class action lawsuit against the school.

That isn't what Mr. Hawn told me was going to happen. In other words, students who were wronged by ECMC have to challenge the school alone. They have to stand by themselves, and they can't make a court case in front of a jury.

Then there are carrots. ECMC's enrollment agreement does everything it can to scare students into arbitration. They offer to pay half the cost of a student's filing fee for arbitration if—and only if—the student waives his or her right to appeal the arbitrator's decision to court or bring a lawsuit against the school. And if a student demonstrates hardship, for example, because the student is saddled with enormous student loan debt and no job, ECMC will offer to pay the entire arbitration filing fee but, again, only if the student will forfeit their right to bring a lawsuit, which means the arbitrator's decision becomes binding.

I see another colleague of mine on the floor, and I know she wants to make a statement, so I will wrap up here.

Meanwhile, Corinthian executives seem to be off the hook. They have faded into obscurity. They took millions of dollars in Federal subsidies, they lured students into worthless schools, and the students ended up with the debt and worthless diplomas. They falsified the results of their activities to the Federal Government. Then they basically went bankrupt, took their million dollar salaries, and faded away. What is left behind? How about all the students with all the debt for the worthless courses at the worthless school?

That is the reality of the for-profit college industry, and Corinthian is exhibit A. It doesn't appear that any prosecution of these individuals who ran Corinthian into the ditch is likely. They have literally taken their money, and they are off to some other pursuit. Maybe they are looking for some new Federal subsidy that can make them rich. But the former students are left with worthless educations and more debt than they can ever repay—students such as Dawn Thompson from my State of Illinois.

Dawn has a parallel degree from Everest—part of Corinthian—but never ever could find a job in her field. She has over \$100,000 in student loan debt to become a parallel. How about that? She has Federal and private loans. After graduating, she was working a minimum-wage job now as a bank teller. She tried to file for bankruptcy a couple of years ago and—you guessed it—student loan debt is not dischargeable in bankruptcy. Dawn, it is with you for your lifetime. It is one of the few debts that are not dischargeable.

Dawn Thompson thought at that point her only option was to go back to school. She went back to Everest, the original school she went to. She thought that getting a master's degree from Everest would make a difference. It did. Her student loan debt went from \$100,000 to \$170,000. She is still struggling to find a job.

How can we stand by and let this happen? How can the Federal Government recognize these as real schools? How can we allow students to be misled into believing these are real colleges and universities? How can we continue to give these outrageous scandalous subsidies to these worthless companies where the CEOs are taking out millions of dollars?

It is time for us to do something about this. Shame on us if we sit here and make speeches about how bad the deficit is and how much we care about struggling students and ignore the obvious. For-profit colleges and universities as an industry are basically an industry that needs to be thoroughly investigated, carefully monitored, and most of their players need to go out of business—and not at the expense of the students.

We are talking about 10 percent of students, 20 percent of the Federal aid to education, and 44 percent of student loan defaults from for-profit colleges and universities. It is time for the Senate, when it reauthorizes the Higher Education Act, to change this.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about what I believe may be one of the most critical pieces of legislation to address human trafficking in the United States, and that is the piece of legislation authored by Senator LEAHY—the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation and to add my name to the amendment Senator LEAHY submitted yesterday that adds this important piece of legislation to this current debate.

Senator LEAHY, as we all know, has been a tireless advocate for homeless and runaway youth and for LGBT individuals and for victims of human trafficking. His bill would provide the necessary services and additional protections for all of these young children. So

I thank Senator LEAHY again for his continued work on behalf of some of our most vulnerable—our runaway and homeless youth.

As a former attorney general, I certainly believe that additional tools need to be made available to prosecutors so they can prosecute traffickers and johns and that we need to intervene and provide recovery services for victims. I think that need has never been greater. But why I am speaking today on this legislation is because it goes to that critical element of prevention. It supports those who are most susceptible to human trafficking, and that is our runaway and homeless youth.

Preventing one of the most vulnerable segments of our population from falling prey to this modern-day slavery should be one of the top priorities of this Nation. When we talk about trafficking, frequently people think these are young girls who may be coming into our country in containers or are trafficked from elsewhere. But we know that over 80 percent of the people trafficked, especially in the sex trade in this country, are citizens of our country. They are our children. They are American children. So we cannot simply put a face on this that doesn't recognize that American children are being trafficked.

Who among these children are the most vulnerable? It is runaway and homeless youth. So it is our responsibility to do everything we can to prevent those children from being in a place where they are extraordinarily vulnerable.

We have heard some people say they do not believe that homeless and runaway youth are more susceptible to being trafficked and that we shouldn't single out special services for LGBT youth. I don't believe that, and I know better, because I have been to facilities that provide services for runaway and homeless youth. I don't believe people who say this have ever spoken to the social workers and the professionals who deal with these children every day.

I don't believe people who say that understand that runaway and homeless youth, unfortunately, have been, more than likely, already sexually and physically abused or told every day they are worthless or told that because of who they are, they are no longer welcome in their home. And when you diminish the spirit of a child, you then create a vulnerability in that child to be a target for traffickers.

A lot of people also think this is just a big-city problem. Well, let me tell you some of the stories of North Dakota. Just last June, a 13-year-old runaway from Minneapolis was rescued and her traffickers were arrested in Fargo-Moorhead. Police believe the traffickers were more than likely on their way out to our oil patch with the victim, and they stopped over in Fargo-

Moorhead to make a little cash by selling these children in the Fargo-Moorhead area. This is a story we hear over and over again—the vulnerability of children, the trafficking of children into the oil patch in western North Dakota.

In fact, talking to the experts who track advertising of young children, whether it is in the deep or dark Net or whether it is in things such as backpage, they will tell you the spike in trafficking and ads in western North Dakota alarms them and should alarm us. So this is not a big-city problem. We know this is a problem that affects North Dakota. If traffickers are willing to snatch up a runaway in the Twin Cities and bring them out to North Dakota, you can be sure they are trying to prey on this vulnerable population in North Dakota as well.

This is personal for me. I know a lot about this topic because my sister works in this area, and I have spent a lot of time with her staff. They are the largest agency in North Dakota serving runaway and homeless youth populations in Fargo-Moorhead. I have heard stories of how vulnerable these children are. I have heard them tell stories about how the trafficking victims, with whom they have already worked, are sometimes recruited by those bold enough to try to cycle through waiting rooms where they are waiting for these kids.

I have heard the stories of guys waiting just down the block or in parking lots of shelters to snatch up these kids. Also I have heard stories of how once a young child is involved in this, they then become recruiters of other young runaway children.

These stories are why it is so imperative to take action. And we can take action here in the Senate. We can take action by taking up the Runaway and Homeless Youth Trafficking Prevention Act. This bill reauthorizes vital programs that provide short-term shelter for youth who do not have a place to sleep—imagine that: youth, our children, do not have a place to sleep; crisis interventions and referrals to youth on the street and at drop-in centers—a hand up; we will take you and we will help you recover from whatever has happened in your life; long-term residential services; training and education; and employment support to help get these kids off the street and permanently provide a safe and secure path forward.

Importantly, this bill makes sure that LGTB runaway and homeless youth are not discriminated against when it comes to providing resources and services. We can have an opinion about this, but we all know that no human should be subjected to those kinds of conditions, and we must do everything we can to help them seek and receive the same services as any other child.

By ensuring that runaway and homeless youth have a safe place to stay and the resources they need, we can stem the tide of human trafficking in our country. By identifying vulnerable youth early and as effectively as possible, we can reduce the number of child sex trafficking victims by preventing them from becoming victims in the first place.

We can and we must do everything in our power to not only identify, prosecute, and help victims recover, we must do everything we can to prevent human trafficking. We can take a huge step forward on that by focusing attention and resources on our runaway and homeless youth population.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

Portman amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking.

Portman amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth.

Vitter amendment No. 284 (to amendment No. 271), to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy from the distinguished Republican leader, Senator CORNYN, in letting me go forward for a few moments.

I would like to note that the executive director of the Vermont Coalition of Runaway & Homeless Youth Programs—a group I know well for the important work they have done—wrote to me yesterday to express the concern of

the coalition and to express their support for the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act and encourage us to put aside our differences and work together to support those in need.

He wrote:

Difference of opinion and the deliberative role of the Senate is part of what makes our democracy strong, but sometimes unity of purpose should prevail, particularly in efforts involving protections for the most vulnerable among us. There should be no doubt that legislation involving the well-being of individuals who have been victimized by the most base of human behavior should be free of partisan wrangling. I . . . encourage your efforts to remove partisan language from the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act in an effort to ensure that the Act and the Runaway and Homeless Youth amendment that Senator Collins and you introduced [will] move forward unimpeded.

I believe that reflects the views of Vermonters of all political stripes.

I know the distinguished Senator from Texas and I and others want to help these greatly abused and abandoned children, and I hope we can continue to work to find a way forward.

I yield the floor, and I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with my colleagues—the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Ohio, and I think we are going to be joined by the Senator from South Dakota and perhaps others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, before I turn to Senator PORTMAN, I would like to put up a quote from one of the leaders of the anti-trafficking movement, the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, who expresses my sentiments exactly, my frustration over a partisan filibuster of a piece of legislation which has enjoyed broad bipartisan support and how somehow partisanship has infected what should be a bipartisan commitment to helping the victims of human trafficking. She says, “Senate Democrats are choosing a phantom problem over real victims.” I think that expresses the facts and certainly my sentiment.

I want to turn to the Senator from Ohio first, who has been one of the leaders in this effort. He has offered an important piece of legislation which has already been incorporated in the bill which perhaps he will talk about but also has some additional amendments that I know he would like to get a chance to get a vote on to further improve the bill—in particular, his provision Bringing Missing Children Home Act with Senator SCHUMER, the Senator from New York, which is already in the base bill, and then with Senator FEINSTEIN, the Senator from California—who offered the Combat

Human Trafficking Act, which is already included in the base bill.

So with that, I would yield to the Senator from Ohio for any remarks he would care to make, and then perhaps we could engage in a colloquy with our colleagues.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank my colleague from Texas. I thank him for his leadership on this legislation, along with Senator KLOBUCHAR and others, in bringing this to the floor. Senator GRASSLEY, the chair of the committee, is with us. I appreciate the fact that these two bills which we have worked on over the last few years are included in the legislation the Senator mentioned.

Sadly, some of the most vulnerable youth are those who are missing or are in foster care, kids who end up being, unfortunately, exposed to human trafficking, sometimes sexual trafficking. So the idea of the missing children legislation is really very simple. It says: Let's help find these children as quickly as possible by having better information on them.

I will give one example of that. In Ohio we have had 71 kids who have gone missing since January 1. These are 71 children who are out there somewhere—minors. For those 71 children, we only have 22 photographs. This is since January 1. One thing this legislation does is it says: Let's get the data, including photographs, so all of us can have an opportunity to find these young people before they become subject to human trafficking.

In Ohio we, unfortunately, have this issue in all of our regions, including in some of our smaller communities as well as our bigger urban centers where we have sex trafficking. They say the average age of children who are getting involved in this is between 11 and 13 years old.

We have talked a lot on the floor over the last several days. I have been out here talking about these issues. These are the most vulnerable among us. These are crimes against children.

This is in the bill, and if we can pass this legislation, getting this additional information and better awareness and training of child welfare agency officials and better training for law enforcement is all part of this.

The other legislation the Senator mentioned is about increasing the penalties on those who are involved in trafficking. That is important because we haven't had a major bill on this for 15 years, and we have learned a lot in this process. What we have learned is there are better ways to give prosecutors and other law enforcement the tools they need to be able to take these cases, prosecute them, and stop this heinous crime.

There are some really good provisions in this legislation that I have worked on, on a bipartisan basis. As was said, one is with Senator FEINSTEIN

with regard to increasing the penalties, and the other piece of legislation is with Senator SCHUMER on bringing children home. There are also a couple of amendments we would love to offer. In fact, we offered them, but we haven't been able to get votes on them because this week we haven't moved forward on the legislation.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to allow us to move forward with the process. Let's go ahead and start having votes. There might be disagreements on some parts of the bill. I thought because it had gotten out of committee by a unanimous vote that there wouldn't be disagreements, but if there are, let's have that discussion and debate. Let's not let the most vulnerable among us wait for us to work this out. Let's move forward on this legislation in a way that allows everybody to have their views heard.

Some of the legislation I talked about comes out of meeting with folks back home on this issue and talking to victims who have been through this horrible process and gone through the very difficult process of recovering from it. Some of the amendments we are going to offer would help with regard to that issue, help to respond to these young people—often children—who are involved in this.

It also comes out of the work that has been done right here in the Senate through a caucus we formed about 2½ years ago. Senator BLUMENTHAL and I cofounded this caucus, we cochair it, and we meet every month and bring people in from around the country who are experts on this issue. Some are experts on child welfare, law enforcement, people who are involved in trying to stop this. Others are experts because, unfortunately, they found themselves in very difficult situations. Among others, some have come forward and talked about how as a young girl they were taken in by a trafficker. Increasingly—this is true in Ohio, unfortunately—drug abuse is part of this, so they become dependent on the trafficker. It is, to me, a form of bondage because these are young people who become addicted. In Ohio it is typically heroin now. So it is keeping these young people trapped in this dependency. The drug treatment and the drug recovery are tough, but so is the recovery from having been trafficked.

This is an opportunity for us to take the information we have received through this caucus we have formed. I think the Members who are involved in that caucus, including the Members here today, would agree it has been a good experience for our staff and for us to raise the awareness and consciousness on this issue. Now we have taken some of this information and put it in this legislation. Let's get it passed. We will have plenty of time for politics around here, trust me. We will have

lots of that next week and the week after and over the next couple years. That is part of the process; we understand that. But there are certain issues where we should be able to move forward on not a bipartisan basis but I would say on a nonpartisan basis, and this is one of them.

I thank my colleague from Texas for allowing me to speak briefly and my colleagues from South Dakota and Illinois who are here to talk about this issue.

My hope is that even today we can begin the process of having votes, moving forward with amendments, and getting this good work done to help the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. CORNYN. Briefly, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his leadership on these issues. He has worked hard and long to address them and to bring us to the point where we are today.

I wish to emphasize one point the Senator made at the beginning, and that is that the average age of the people who are targeted for human trafficking are girls between the ages of 12 and 14. So this is a very vulnerable part of our country. I know we get wrapped around the axle up here about procedure, about politics, about a lot of different issues, but we ought to keep our focus on them, on the victims, these children, these girls who are the hapless victims of these pimps and johns and other people who make money selling their bodies. We ought to be trying to figure out what can we do to help them. They are the ones who will be the real losers. We get so balled up around here because of all of the political maneuvers, we take our eye off the ball. That is why our friends at the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women talked about a phantom problem over real victims. The focus should be on the victims.

The phantom problem—the shiny object they are trying to hold up and relitigate—is something that has been the law of the land since 1976. It has been included in a lot of pieces of legislation they voted for. This is a phony diversion from what should be our real focus, which should be the victims.

I wish to turn to the Senator from Illinois who has also been a leader on this issue. He has been a warrior in dealing with people who run some of these Web sites, [backpage.com](http://backpage.com) in particular. My friend is also trying to figure out a way to integrate some of our veterans who are leaving military service to lead the investigation of these crimes.

I turn to the Senator from Illinois for any comments he cares to make.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for moving this legislation, especially including the text of the HERO Act, S. 575, which is bipartisan, thanks to the help of Senator BLUMENTHAL, that would also have us find wounded warriors to search on the Internet to find these exploiters.

With the amendment I was trying to offer earlier this week on the SAVE Act, I intended to go after [backpage.com](http://backpage.com), which is the largest provider of slavery-related services in the country. They make about \$30 million a year off of slavery. We really ought to be able to charge them to clean up the mess they have created.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois. His focus is exactly where we ought to be having our focus, which is how to take the profit out of this modern-day slavery and redirect it to help the victims, and that is what this bill does. It ends some of the impunity that some of these purveyors of human flesh—the rewards they are reaping—and plows it back in to help the victims. I know the SAVE Act has been a particular focus for the Senator from Illinois.

Earlier I talked to Senator FEINSTEIN, the Senator from California, about this issue. She is very concerned about how the Internet is becoming integrated as part of the business model of some of these perpetrators of this crime.

I am also told—and the Senator from Illinois may be aware of this—that veterans will participate.

Mr. KIRK. Under the HERO Act, we have ICE hiring veterans to get on the Internet to find some of the slave dealers online.

We should thread the needle very carefully when it comes to matters such as [backpage.com](http://backpage.com). Under the Communications Decency Act, freedom in America does not mean you have the freedom to enslave others.

With the victory in the Civil War—and I apologize to the Senator from Texas for mentioning it—we have established the real principle of the ever expanding rule of freedom here in the United States and that does not include human slavery empowered by the Internet.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I take no offense for talking about the fact that the South lost the Civil War.

Mr. KIRK. I believe a recent statement by my colleague referred to it as the recent unpleasantness.

Mr. CORNYN. I hold the Senate seat that was first held by Senator Sam Houston who actually resigned his seat as Governor of Texas rather than participate in secession. He was a Union man and believed in the Union.

I know the Senator from Illinois has worked very hard on a bipartisan basis with Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the Senator from Connecticut, and others on this legislation, and that is why I find this situation so baffling. What has been a uniquely bipartisan effort has now turned into a partisan filibuster and, frankly, I am perplexed by that. Maybe some of our friends on the other side of the aisle will come out and explain why they are filibustering the bill they

voted for in the Judiciary Committee. We had a unanimous vote in the Judiciary Committee. We had 10 Democratic cosponsors. Yet the Democratic leader, Senator REID, now says they will not allow a vote on any amendments and they are going to kill this bill because they don't want to vote for a bill that has a provision they have voted for time and time again, and indeed has been the law of the land for 39 years.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

We are joined by the Senator from South Dakota who is head of our Republican conference and has been very concerned about the dysfunction in this place. We actually saw this legislation as an opportunity to start demonstrating that we can do the people's business once again after coming off of a very tough election—tougher for our Democratic friends than it was for our side of the aisle. It was an election where voter after voter said they were sick and tired of the dysfunction here. We want to show we can be responsive to the needs of the most vulnerable people in our country.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for any comments he cares to make.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his leadership on this issue, as well as the Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, for moving this legislation to the floor.

As the Senator from Texas—who has authored and been involved with this legislation for a long time—knows, if there was ever an issue we have dealt with here in the Senate that goes beyond the line of partisan politics, it is this. We are talking about untold stories of thousands of American children and adults who are sold into modern-day slavery. Those stories are bone chilling and undeniably some of the most deplorable acts of humankind.

What the Senator from Texas' bill is designed to do is to start attacking this issue in a way we have not seen for a very long time. It gives law enforcement the tools in order to target these traffickers, bring them to justice, and provides the tools that are necessary to help restore the lives of the victims of these heinous crimes.

It is interesting to me that we are where we are. This is clearly a bipartisan issue. My understanding is when this bill was marked up, debated, and voted on in the Judiciary Committee, it came out unanimously. In other words, all the Democrats on the committee voted for it. Is that correct? Is that the way it proceeded from the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I will respond to my friend from South Dakota to say he is absolutely correct, which is one reason I am so perplexed we find ourselves where we are today.

We have 10 cosponsors from the Democratic side for this underlying bill which was filed on January 13. It

was marked up in the Judiciary Committee a month later and got a unanimous vote. I will add to that, in response to my friend's question, we also saw something we have not seen here in a long time on the Senate floor, and that is an agreement by all 100 Senators that we would proceed to consider this bill and begin the amendment and debate process without having to jump through all of the procedural hoops we traditionally have to do on cloture motions and the like.

What happened a couple of days ago when apparently some of our friends woke up and found out about this issue—what has been called a phantom problem—is very disturbing.

Mr. THUNE. My understanding is the bill itself is approximately 68 pages long. Is that correct?

Mr. CORNYN. I will say to my friend that he is correct. That includes the strikeout provisions of the substitute, so actually the text is roughly half of that.

The provisions our friends across the aisle suddenly woke up and discovered—apparently a couple of days ago—were written in plain sight and incorporate by reference a bill they voted for, which was the last appropriations bill we voted for in the lameduck session.

Mr. THUNE. This bill was filed on what date?

Mr. CORNYN. On January 13, I say to my friend.

Mr. THUNE. When was it marked up at the committee level?

Mr. CORNYN. I say to my friend, it was marked up or passed out of the Judiciary Committee roughly a month later.

Mr. THUNE. This legislation has been here in the Senate for weeks or months.

Mr. CORNYN. Months.

Mr. THUNE. It is 68 pages long. It was introduced back in January. It was reported out unanimously. All the Democrats on the committee voted for it when it left the Judiciary Committee. When it was brought up on the floor of the Senate, all 100 Senators, including every single Democrat, voted to get on this bill.

All of a sudden, here at the 11th hour, we are being held up on a piece of legislation that clearly has unanimous support, or at least I thought should have had unanimous support. They are now objecting because of the language in this legislation. Evidently it is only 68 pages long, which is not a lot to read.

ObamaCare was obviously a story where it was argued that after it was passed, we had to figure out what was in it, but that was several thousand pages long. This is a 68-page bill.

When the bill was filed, there was an opportunity for people to look at this when the bill went to markup. Countless staffers and Members of Congress have looked at and read this legisla-

tion. Now all of a sudden—at the 11th hour—there is an objection because there is language included in this bill which was voted on by 55 Democrats as recently as December. Is that correct? Was there a spending bill that came out of the Congress in December of 2014?

Mr. CORNYN. I say to my friend that was the so-called CROMnibus. It was the continuing resolution omnibus bill that passed in November during the lameduck session and it included the same or very similar language. It was actually incorporated by reference into the Justice for Victims of Trafficking bill. It is the same language our Democratic friends voted for then, and now they are complaining about it being in this bill for no apparent reason.

Mr. THUNE. Is it correct that that particular provision, referred to as the Hyde amendment, has been a part of spending bills dating back to 1976? So for literally 40 years the Hyde amendment language has been included in bills we have passed here, particularly bills that are appropriations bills and spending and funding bills?

Mr. CORNYN. I say to my friend from South Dakota, he is exactly correct. This has been the law of the land for 39 years. This is an area that has been very controversial—that is abortion, generally—and this has been a rare area of bipartisan consensus that no tax dollars be used to fund abortion.

Again, this is a red herring and a phantom problem, as it has been referred to here, and I can't believe our friends on the other side would throw their staff under the bus who were responsible to bring this language in the legislation to their attention, and I can't believe they would throw the victims who will benefit from this bill under the bus and say they should have to pay the price for this phantom problem they discovered. To me it is not plausible. It doesn't make any sense whatsoever.

Mr. THUNE. I say to my colleague from Texas, again, who has been so instrumental in getting this to the floor, that a 68-page bill is certainly readable. They have had several months to look at and read it. When a bill is reported out of a committee, it means it has been analyzed, looked at, and open to debate and amendments, and it came out unanimously. Every Democrat voted for it. They voted for a provision that literally has been a matter of policy and law in this country dating back to 1976 and was voted on as recently as December of last year.

We had 55 Democrats in this Chamber who voted for this language—very similar language—in December of last year and now they are objecting to a piece of legislation they reported out unanimously in the Judiciary Committee which does something to stop the brutal violation of the innocent in this country, and they are objecting to it over this language.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, if I could interject. The Senator from South Dakota is exactly right. I will add to that that not only does this enjoy broad bipartisan support within the Senate and Congress, we have more than 200 law enforcement and victim rights organizations that have endorsed this bill and they are begging us to pass it.

One of those groups includes the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women. They know we need to focus on not only taking the profit out of this crime but, just as importantly, we need to get the services to the victims to begin to let them heal and get on with their lives.

As we said earlier, these are typically young girls who are 12 to 14 years of age. Can you imagine the scars, both physical and psychological, they bear having experienced this terrible crime?

Every day we delay in getting this bill passed because of the political shenanigans here is another day these victims of this terrible crime are denied access to the services they need.

Mr. THUNE. If they survive, imagine how messed up some of these young victims are going to be for the rest of their lives. We have an opportunity to do something about it.

The Democratic leader has described this as a sleight of hand. That is not what this is. This is a clear choice. This is a clear choice by Democrats to choose partisan politics over the victims of human trafficking. It is as simple as that.

I urge my Democratic colleagues to stop—stop the partisan politics, stop derailing this important opportunity to come together in a spirit of bipartisanship to end human trafficking. Putting partisan politics over the lives of 100,000 American children who fall victim to the brutal reality of human trafficking every year is absolutely wrong.

To quote our distinguished colleague from the State of Maryland, Senator MIKULSKI: "Let's get it done and let's get it done now."

I would say to my colleague from Texas, life is too precious. These crimes are too serious for this issue to be caught up in the crosshairs of Washington politics. This has to stop. This has to end.

This is a piece of bipartisan legislation that will help literally hundreds of thousands—millions, I would say—of Americans across this country. It is time we begin to right the wrongs of injustice by turning the tide in law enforcement's favor to help those who are trying to combat these terrible, heinous crimes to succeed and to help the victims of these crimes restore their lives.

I appreciate the good work of the Senator from Texas and others who have been involved with this.

I urge my colleagues to end this shenanigan, this charade that is going on



before the Senate. Let's get this bill passed and on the President's desk.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, how much time remains in our time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from South Dakota.

We have neglected perhaps the most important person in this process; that is, the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who responded to a letter written by all 20 female Senators, asking him to have a hearing on this important topic and to move this bill forward.

The Senator from South Dakota mentioned Senator MIKULSKI. She came to testify, along with Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire and Senator KLOBUCHAR, and she talked about how important this was to all 20 of our women Senators and how proud they were of the fact that it moved forward. It wouldn't have happened without the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, willing to take that challenge up and to move the bill to the floor in such a unanimous fashion.

I wish to close by saying that all Members of the Senate presumably came here to try to do something important—not just to march in place or fill up space. Presumably, they spend the time away from their families, they go through the rigors of political campaigns, they suffer the slings and arrows of partisan politics in order to try to do something good, to try to help people who cannot help themselves.

Here is a perfect opportunity to do exactly that. We are not asking people to do anything extraordinary. We are certainly not asking them to do anything they haven't done before, which is to vote on language that is included and has been the law of the land for 39 years and that they have voted on before. We are not asking to change the status quo. We are just asking them to focus on the victims.

As Ms. Gaetan, who is with the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women, said: "Senate Democrats are choosing a phantom problem over real victims."

Shame on us if we allow that to happen. Shame on us. We can do better. These victims deserve better. The people we work for in the 50 States around this country deserve better. Shame on us if we don't get this problem solved and if we don't pass this piece of bipartisan legislation and get it to the President's desk where he will gladly sign it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, our Republican colleagues say they are here fighting for women. If that were the case, then they wouldn't have snuck

into this bill a provision that hurts women. It is not just me saying this; it is a story in the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 2015]  
ANTI-HUMAN-TRAFFICKING BILL GETS CAUGHT  
UP IN ABORTION POLITICS IN SENATE  
(By Mike DeBonis)

Proving that there is virtually no issue that cannot get mired in partisan combat, an anti-human trafficking bill now under Senate consideration is in limbo after Democrats accused Republicans of sneaking anti-abortion language into the legislation before it hit the Senate floor.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, authored by Sen. John Cornyn (R-Tex.) and sporting a bipartisan stable of cosponsors, was supposed to be a turn toward comity after a couple of contentious weeks on Capitol Hill. What's not to like about a bill that would increase penalties for those convicted of slavery, human smuggling and sexual exploitation of children and provide for additional compensation for their victims?

On Monday, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) and Minority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) locked arms in calling on their colleagues to support the measure. "I doubt if there will be problems on my side," Reid said, according to The Hill. "If there is, I will work to clear them."

But by midday Tuesday, the good feelings had eroded into a bout of finger-pointing, with Senate Democrats accusing Republicans of subterfuge in slipping language into the bill that would extend the longstanding Hyde Amendment barring the use of taxpayer funds for abortions to the new Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund.

The word "abortion" does not appear in the trafficking bill, but there is language specifying that the victims' fund "shall be subject to the limitations on the use or expending of amounts described in sections 506 and 507 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 . . . to the same extent as if amounts in the Fund were funds appropriated under division H of such Act."

That would apply the Hyde Amendment language to the new fund, which is supported by a proposed \$5,000 assessment on those convicted of a wide variety of federal crimes related to sexual abuse and human trafficking.

Sen. Patty Murray (D-Wash.) accused Republicans of "trying to pull a fast one" in inserting the abortion provision. Two Democratic leaders, Richard Durbin (D-Ill.) and Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), both said Democrats had been advised that it was not among the changes made to the bill since it was taken up last year by a Democratic-controlled Senate. Earlier in the day, Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.), ranking member of the committee that unanimously forwarded the bill, said Judiciary Committee Democrats were "assured" the provision was not included.

In an early January e-mail reviewed by the Post, a Republican Judiciary Committee staffer sent a Democratic staffer a summary of changes to the previous version of the bill, in seven bullet points. The abortion provision was not among them.

"This bill will not be used as an opportunity for Republicans to double down on their efforts to restrict a woman's health-care choices," Murray said. "It is absolutely

wrong and, honestly, it is shameful. I know there are a whole lot of us who are going to fight hard against any attempt to expand the Hyde Amendment and permanently impact women's health."

But Republican leaders—including Cornyn, the majority whip—pushed back on the notion that the abortion language represented any kind of subterfuge. A Cornyn aide suggested that Democrats knew very well about the language before the committee vote—including, the aide said, Leahy staffers—and thus were being "disingenuous."

"It was out in the public domain for a month before it was marked up in Judiciary Committee on Feb. 26, and all members of the Judiciary Committee voted to support it," Cornyn said. "So that leads me to believe that some of the suggestions being made now that there were provisions in the legislation that people didn't know about are simply untrue. That presupposes that none of their staff briefed the senators on what was in the legislation, that nobody read a 68-page bill and that senators would vote for a bill, much less co-sponsor it, without reading it and knowing what's in it. None of that strikes me as plausible."

Republicans and Democrats are also sparing about the impact of the abortion language. Adam Jentleson, a spokesman for Reid, called it a "significant expansion of the scope of the Hyde amendment" by applying it to fees and fines, not just taxpayer funds. He also said the rider in the trafficking bill would be permanent—unlike the Hyde Amendment, which must be continually attached to each year's appropriations—and thus "could lead to a dramatic expansion of abortion restrictions in future years."

Cornyn took to the Senate floor late Tuesday to rebut that notion, noting that the 2009 health reform law included a similar restriction. "Democrats have supported legislation consistent with the Hyde Amendment for a long, long time," he said. "My hope is this: that members of the United States Senate will rise above this—this agreement, this posturing, this attempt to try to play gotcha at the expense of these victims of human trafficking."

Reid said debate would continue Wednesday on the bill, and a Democratic aide suggested the tiff could be overcome if McConnell allows a vote on an amendment removing the abortion language from the bill—an amendment that is likely to fail.

"You can blame it on staff, blame it on whoever you want to blame it on, but we didn't know it was in the bill," Reid said. "And . . . this bill will not come off this floor as long as that language is in the bill."

Mrs. BOXER. The article states in part:

In an early January e-mail reviewed by the Post, a Republican Judiciary Committee staffer sent a Democratic staffer a summary of changes to the previous version of the bill, in seven bullet points.

Guess what. They left out the change they made to women's reproductive health.

Now, I have been around here a long time and I thought there was trust in this body, but don't stand up and say it is a phantom problem when the Washington Post confirms it. They have the email that proves this change was made and was not told to the Democrats on the committee. If it had been told to the Democrats on the committee, we would have worked this out.

If they want to fight for women, take the provision out that harms the victims of trafficking. If they want to help women, bring up Loretta Lynch for confirmation—a fantastic woman, qualified—held up by the Republicans longer than any other Attorney General nominee ever. If they want to help women, those are two ways to do it.

Solve this problem. Don't stand up and say it is a phantom problem when the Washington Post saw the email.

We know the bill before us has an extremely worthy goal. We want to help victims of human trafficking. I wish to ask rhetorically, How does it help women who have been brutally trafficked when we don't let them access their legal right to end a pregnancy that resulted from their enslavement? A woman is enslaved. She becomes pregnant. Shouldn't she have the ability to get the same kind of health care as any other woman? But, no, in this bill, they say she can't use that victims compensation fund for that legal right.

Republicans are doing this all over the place. They attached immigration to the homeland security bill. They are threatening to attach the Keystone Pipeline to a highway bill. Now they include abortion in a human trafficking bill. And then they tell us we are seeing phantom problems? I don't think so. They have been in charge for more than 8 weeks and all we see is them taking hostage after hostage after hostage legislatively to get their way on their philosophy.

Roe v. Wade is the law of the land. If they don't like it, why don't they just propose doing away with it. Let's have that out. This bill singles out and hurts vulnerable women—women who have been the victims of a heinous crime. Women who face deplorable conditions, ripped out of their homes, taken advantage of, treated brutally, women who many times are forced into pregnancy by their captors, and in an unprecedented manner, because of sneaking this language into this bill, the bill imposes abortion restrictions on private funds—private funds that have been collected from the criminals and the perpetrators of these unspeakable acts.

Don't these women deserve better? Shouldn't these victims have access to services that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution?

My friends on the other side don't like it. They want to tell women what to do. They want to get into the most personal decisions that women and their families make. Let them do that for their families. But if they want to change the law of the land, Roe v. Wade, and tell women they are criminals—and doctors, make them criminals too—then why don't they just have the courage to bring it to the floor directly, not sneak it into a bill and have the staffers write a note to their colleagues saying, Oh, they are

silent. Oh, we didn't do anything on that. Oh, no.

I will tell my colleagues there is one advantage to being around here for a long time. One has a sense of what used to be decent around here, when one's word was one's word and one's bond was one's bond. Thank goodness we have proof. We have proof that the Republicans left this out of a memo in which they told the Judiciary Committee the changes that were made. We have proof. Don't call this a phantom problem because we have it in writing.

This is a clear path of injecting these unrelated, extremely politically charged provisions into key pieces of legislation. I have not seen it. We used to have a little bit of an understanding around here that if we agreed on a piece of legislation, we would keep out the poison pills. We wouldn't put them into bills, whether they were written by Democrats or Republicans. We know at the end of the day what happens. Everybody gets hurt because nothing gets done. If this is the new way it is going to be around here, it is a bad way for the people.

We should be working on a bill that protects the victims of the most heinous crime: human trafficking. We should be protecting our society's most vulnerable people and making sure they are not denied their rights. The Republican provision that was added in secret and tried to be kept quiet would hurt every single woman we are trying to help. They inserted language that was not in the same bill last year that was supported by Democrats and Republicans. They added the new language quietly, hoping nobody would notice, and then we would all march down there—I put my name on this bill, by the way, because my staff trusted the Republican staff when they said there wasn't any change in abortion language. How awful it was for my staff that they said to me, Senator, we feel terrible. We took their word. So I got my name off this bill.

Why on Earth would anyone want to single out these victims of human trafficking and take away their constitutional rights?

At least own up to it, I say to my Republican friends. They got caught. We have the email. Don't get up here and say it is a phantom problem. Don't make these speeches about how Democrats want to hurt women, when they put a poison pill in the bill, hurt the very women they say they want to protect, did it in secret, and then call us out for it as if we are doing something wrong.

The American people were not born yesterday. They are pretty darn smart. If I stopped one of them on the street—I don't care if they are a Republican or Democrat or what their view is on abortion—and I said to them: If a friend tells you they have made no changes to a letter you asked them to

write, and you took their word for it and signed the letter and later found out there was something in that letter that they knew would hurt you, would you be angry, they would probably say: I don't even want to deal with that person anymore; they can't be trusted.

One thing I have learned around here is your word is your bond, and the relationships we have with one another across the aisle are precious. They are important.

So let's not make these phony arguments. Let's fix the problem. Let's remove this offending language. Let's come together, for once. Let's pass a bill that helps these victims.

Then my colleague says: Well, all the groups want this bill anyway. Let me quote from one of them, the Polaris Project: "The bipartisan support to address modern slavery should not be held up by a separate debate on partisan issues."

That is a direct quote.

If ever there was a partisan issue, it is the right to choose. That is a partisan issue.

Then there is a letter from the National Network For Youth: "This legislation is desperately needed and we cannot let this moment pass us by because of the addition of partisan and divisive provisions."

Let me read that again: "This legislation is desperately needed and we can't let this moment pass us by because of the addition of partisan and divisive provisions."

Again, we are offering Republicans a simple solution: Remove the language. Go back to the same language that was in the bill last year which enjoyed broad support.

If Republicans do that today, we would pass this bill today.

I know this is the Democratic time to talk, so I am going to allow Senator HIRONO to continue. We need to end this sneak attack on women's health so we can get the victims of human trafficking the services and support they need.

We are ready, willing, and able to sit down and work with our friends on the other side to drop this provision. The Senate is not going to get things done if the Republican majority continues to insist on putting politically charged, extreme measures on bills that should pass with bipartisan support. I hope my colleagues will work with us. I certainly want to be able to trust the staffers again and trust my colleagues again, and it would start with removing this provision.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Hawaii.

**Ms. HIRONO.** Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my friend from California, Senator BOXER. I rise today to speak against attempts to turn this bill—the Justice for Trafficking Victims Act—into a political football. While there are many

issues that may divide this Congress—and certainly the issue of choice for women is one of them—human trafficking should not be one of those divisive issues.

This bill started off as a bipartisan bill, but along the way a provision was added to the bill that brings me to the floor today in opposition to that provision. Not only do I oppose the substance of that provision, but I very much object to how the provision was added to the bill unbeknownst to the sponsors of this bill such as myself. Buried in this bill is a provision that allows government to dictate a woman's health care options, and this provision would limit choices for women who have been victimized by human trafficking.

Women are often forced to endure rape and violence on a daily basis. That is what human trafficking is. This is an unprecedented and, I have to say, appalling expansion of government's role in women's health care decisions. The provision is anti-women and anti-victim. This body should be working to help these victims of trafficking violence, not playing politics with their lives. But that is not what we are seeing today.

The truth is there are some in this body who have time and again put their own ideological agenda and need to score political points ahead of consensus-driven legislation.

We have seen this before. A few weeks ago Congress came close to shutting down the Department of Homeland Security—the third largest Department in the Federal Government—because a few Members wanted to hold funding national security priorities hostage to score points against the President's immigration actions. We saw it during the shutdown. We saw it during the debate over the Shaheen-Portman energy bill. We saw it during Congress's drawn-out debate over the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, yet another issue that should be free of partisan politics.

This body shouldn't let ideological grandstanding on divisive issues stall and kill bipartisan legislation that will make a difference for people—particularly for the most vulnerable people in this country, victims of trafficking.

This bill is no exception. A bill on human trafficking should not be a method of expanding the government's powers to dictate women's personal choices, women's health care decisions.

I join my colleagues in urging the Senate to stop using this legislation and others like it to advance an ideological agenda, and help the women, men, and children who are being trafficked across this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I don't seek the floor to speak now because I think I am

infringing upon some other Democrats who wanted to speak before I spoke. I assume they are on their way.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, yesterday I came to the floor with a very clear message for my Republican colleagues: A bill about combatting human trafficking is no place for partisanship. It is not an opportunity to try to get a political victory for your base, and it absolutely should not be a vehicle for policies that would roll back a woman's right to make her own choices about her own body. Instead, a bill like the Justice for Trafficking Victims Act should be focused only on protecting the rights and the safety and the health of survivors of sex trafficking, who have faced truly extraordinary violence and hardship.

I called on Republicans to work with Democrats to ensure this legislation gets back on track as the bipartisan effort it should be—by simply removing a provision that would expand the so-called Hyde amendment, allowing politicians to interfere even more with the most deeply personal health decisions a woman can make.

I am disappointed that so far my Republican colleagues have said no and continued to push for a completely unnecessary fight over women's health. So today I am back on the floor, joined by several of my Democratic colleagues, to tell the other side of the aisle that we are not taking no for an answer. We Democratic women believe a bill intended to help women should be about helping women, period.

There is no reason for a political restriction on women's health in the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, just as there wasn't a reason for Republicans to threaten the government with a shutdown over Planned Parenthood funding back in 2011 or try to jam through reproductive health riders on spending bills.

The women Senators who have joined us on the floor today have seen this kind of inappropriate, disappointing political stunt geared at rolling back women's rights before. Republicans are going to get the same response they have gotten every other time: not on our watch.

Right now the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary is working on alternative legislation that would take out the divisive, harmful expansion of the Hyde amendment and keep this effort focused on survivors who need support and deserve justice. Democrats are laying out a path to

keep this bill bipartisan and get it done.

I hope our Republican colleagues will reconsider the partisan approach they have taken and work with us. I hope they will think about why it doesn't make sense to choose partisanship over trying to just address a truly horrific problem in our country, especially one we all agree needs to be solved. I hope they will commit to putting the politics aside and join us to make this bill the bipartisan effort we all hoped it would be.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, we just heard Members of the minority party complaining there are things in this bill nobody knew anything about. On our side, I think we have done a good job of refuting it.

I am going to suggest again they ought to read the legislation. They had plenty of time to read the legislation. But it is kind of remindful of the story about Speaker PELOSI saying after the 2,700-page ObamaCare bill was written that you have to pass it to find out what is in it.

Obviously this legislation before us isn't law. It is a proposal. But it is just like people evidently don't read this legislation before it gets out of committee with a strong bipartisan vote of 20-0. The fact is this legislation was on the Web site several weeks before it was voted out of committee, and this language was in it. So you have to wait until a bill gets out of committee before you read the language? No. There are 20 people on the Committee on the Judiciary who had an opportunity to read this legislation before it ever got out of committee. There were no concerns about this language that we hear from the minority of the Senate that they have all of a sudden found obnoxious and somehow it was sneaked into a piece of legislation, which is not true. That is what I am going to speak about.

As one example of what I referred to, yesterday we heard from the Senator from Vermont—my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the committee and former chairman of the committee—that an organization called ATEST is urging that we strike the Hyde amendment language in this bill. ATEST is one of many organizations that had the opportunity to review and comment on this legislation prior to the committee markup of this bill. They met with my staff in February to discuss this bill and never

raised any concern with the Hyde amendment at that time. So now I can legitimately question why they are coming forward with this concern only now, weeks after the Senate Committee on the Judiciary reported this legislation.

Then we also heard the Senator from California comment on emails. I want her to know there are emails that clearly show the other side was aware of the Hyde provision, and it is not our majority saying the Democrats are raising a phantom problem. The Senator from California is criticizing a human trafficking advocate who is saying that very point.

It is pretty bad around here when you have Senators attacking anti-trafficking advocates. We learned last week that law enforcement officials in Texas arrested 29 people in an online trafficking sting. As reported in Texas in the Waco Tribune-Herald on March 10:

The sting was designed to catch suspects seeking underage escorts for sexual acts or trying to become "pimps" by trafficking underage prostitutes.

This is only the latest in a string of news stories showing that the commercial exploitation of children is a problem in the United States. The reality that adolescents are victims in many of these cases makes the situation all the more wrenching.

It is vital that we act now to pass legislation to further protect these and other domestic victims of human trafficking. These reports are reasons why this bill should not be stalled by the minority Members of the Senate, particularly when we in the majority pledged, as a result of the last election, that we were going to have an open amendment process.

This bill is under the open amendment process so anybody who doesn't like this language ought to offer an amendment, and let us see where the votes are—whether their side prevails or whether the people who want to pass an antitrafficking bill prevail.

I take this opportunity to again urge my colleagues to support this Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which would establish strong antitrafficking measures that target predators who exploit innocent, young people. The measure focuses both on sex and labor trafficking. It would benefit both children and adult victims of these despicable crimes.

The legislation would equip law enforcement with new tools to fight trafficking, enhance services for victims, and increase penalties for perpetrators. The bill would help fight demand for domestic sex trafficking by ensuring that any person who is trafficking an adult or purchasing a child for sex will be punished under the full force of law. In other words, it goes after the demand side as well as the supply side of these terrible crimes. So it is a mean-

ingful solution that is supported by a large bipartisan group of Senators and more than 200 outside organizations.

The other day, one human trafficking advocate characterized the concern raised by the minority with the Hyde amendment provision in this bill as a phantom problem, and I agree.

The minority leader is focusing on a provision that passed the Senate Judiciary Committee in February unanimously, after committee members debated the bill and had the opportunity to even strike this provision that they find so obnoxious at this particular time. Not only has this language, called the Hyde amendment language, been in a part of this bipartisan bill for months, it is the law of the land today—a consensus measure adopted in 1976. It has been included in appropriations bills every year for decades.

As I mentioned yesterday, it has been included in authorizing legislation on occasions as well.

Why, when we have agreed on the inclusion of Hyde amendment language in bills on so many prior occasions over a 39-year period of time, would we at this time be unable to agree to its inclusion in a bill to help human trafficking victims?

It is fitting that this bill includes such Hyde amendment language. The bill creates a Federal victims fund, and money in the fund will derive from fines imposed on human traffickers. The fund will be a federally administered program.

If the fund is used to support abortion services, then it constitutes Federal funding of abortion. Including the Hyde language is consistent, then, with what we have always done in such cases. This is not the appropriate time or place for the minority party Members of the Senate to seek a rollback of consensus legislation that was adopted as far back as 1976 and has been extended every year since that time.

I urge my colleagues to find another place and another time for congressional debate on taxpayer funding of abortions—not to do it on a bill that has broad, bipartisan support and definitely not on a bill that was reported out of committee 20 to 0, which means 11 Republicans and 9 Democrats supported it.

The argument that this Hyde amendment language was included by—you have heard these words—"sleight of hand" is simply disingenuous. This bill, after its introduction, was put into the public domain—not after it was voted out of committee, not just 1 day before it was in committee, but weeks before the committee considered it. So it was in the public domain. Nobody could say it wasn't there. So you could read it and know this Hyde language was in it.

It was distributed by email to numerous organizations and congressional offices for their input. It has been posted

for 2 months on the U.S. Government Web site, accessible to any congressional staffer or member of the public. So we have people who come to the Senate saying they didn't know this was in there. Well, then, did they not read the bill? Did they not have their staff read the bill? For a long period of time it has been right out there where 300 million people could access it on the Web site.

If lawmakers then are asserting that they did not know the Hyde amendment was included in the bill, then it means they simply didn't read this legislation.

I again call on my colleagues to support the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, focusing on helping survivors of trafficking heal and protect others from becoming victims of such a terrible crime.

It is a meaningful solution that is supported by large bipartisan groups of Senators. We have a real opportunity to provide survivors of trafficking with the kind of support that is essential to their recovery and future success.

Working together, in a bipartisan way, we can restore dignity to survivors. That is why we need to pass this act right now.

It also gives this Senate an opportunity to do what I hear from the people of grassroots Iowa so often in my town meetings, such as Saturday when I was in Truro, IA, and 33 people showed up. I was in Norwalk, IA, and 66 people showed up. At those meetings they keep asking: Why can't you Republicans and Democrats get together?

This is one of those bills where Republicans and Democrats are getting together. Now we find some people—who evidently don't read legislation until the midnight hour—coming to the floor of the Senate saying something along the lines of: We snuck something into the bill.

Snuck something into the bill when the bill has been out there on the Web site for a couple of months already? No, that is disingenuous. So the bill is not moving along. But when this bill is brought up for a final vote, the people will see that Republicans and Democrats can work together if we can get over this hurdle of the stonewalling by the minority party of the Senate, holding up this bill for a disingenuous reason.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Madam President, I rise today in support of the bill that is currently pending before us, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I commend the chairman for his hard work and effort on this piece of legislation and for ushering it through the Senate.

I also thank and commend the senior Senators from Texas and Minnesota for coming together in a bipartisan fashion

on this vitally important human rights legislation.

Because this is such a bipartisan bill—frankly, a nonpartisan issue—I am frustrated that we are at an impasse on moving this bill forward with an open debate.

Let me repeat. This is a nonpartisan issue. I encourage my colleagues across the aisle to move forward with an open debate on this vitally important human rights legislation.

Every day countless innocent victims are bought and sold into modern-day slavery in America. All too often, many of these victims are children.

As the father of four and a grandfather of two, I believe every child should have the opportunity to grow up in a loving and safe environment. I know the Presiding Officer agrees with that. I know everybody in this Chamber agrees with that today. Unfortunately, that is not the case for too many children.

Recognizing this is an important issue. My home State of Nevada has taken action over the past several years not only to assist victims of trafficking but also to ensure these victims have the opportunity to seek compensation for their traffickers. Given Nevada's unique location, especially southern Nevada, this is a crime that is all too prevalent within my home State. Just to give us an idea, 2 years ago the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department reported that 2,144 sex trafficking victims under the age of 18 were rescued in Las Vegas since 1994. That is an average of 126 per year. Even more daunting, that is 1 person rescued every 3 days. This is one city in one State. More than half of these victims were from Nevada, and the rest of them were trafficked through the State.

While Nevada is taking important steps forward in providing restitution of victims of trafficking, much more needs to be done to stop this crime from occurring in the first place. All too often, trafficking is a crime that is hidden from plain sight. It occurs in every single State. That is why it is vitally important to recognize the warning signs of someone who may be a victim of human trafficking, as well as those who are committing these crimes.

I am pleased to see this underlying bill recognizes this need, especially for local law enforcement, especially for health providers, and especially for first responders.

The bill, however, fails to recognize the important role of our Nation's ports of entry and how they play into our Nation's domestic and international transportation system, and the opportunity they provide for human trafficking. That is why I filed an amendment to this legislation, to ensure that victims of human trafficking and perpetrators of this crime will not be able to pass through such

places without additional law enforcement awareness.

My amendment requires the Department of Homeland Security to train TSA, CBP, and other relevant departments' personnel to effectively deter, detect, and disrupt human trafficking. Recognizing the different needs of States and the critical role of local law enforcement in combatting human trafficking, it also allows DHS to provide training to any State, local or tribal government or private organization in order to establish a human trafficking awareness training program.

Finally, this amendment requires DHS to keep records of the number of human trafficking cases reported or confirmed and to report these numbers annually to Congress. That way we can measure progress in our efforts to end human trafficking.

Instead of creating another layer of bureaucracy, my amendment simply complements and enhances the current efforts by DHS to equip its personnel with effective strategies to combat human trafficking at our Nation's ports of entry and other high-risk areas.

Earlier this year, I was pleased to see similar legislation pass the House of Representatives with unanimous support.

I think most of us can agree that this issue of human trafficking is not a partisan issue; it is a human rights issue. Whether one is a parent, a sibling, a child or a relative, this issue is real. That is why I am so pleased to see this Chamber come together in a bipartisan manner to bring this bill to the floor. Once again, I only hope we can come together and move this debate forward.

As I tell Nevadans back home, I came to Washington, DC, to work. I work with Republicans and I work with Democrats. There are issues we may at times have to agree to disagree on, but moving forward on a bipartisan bill such as this should not be one of them.

We need to do all we can to end this disgraceful and disgusting crime once and for all. We should move forward in providing much needed help to these victims, including children.

There is more work to do on this bill and ways to make it a better product through the amendment process, but we should be moving forward instead of stalling out.

I hope I have the opportunity to call up my amendment, and I would urge my colleagues to support my amendment so we can ensure that DHS personnel are properly trained to prevent the serious threat of human trafficking. Help is almost there for these victims. I hope we can come to a resolution today to move forward on this bill.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I support S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. The bill supports

law enforcement officers and prosecutors in their efforts to prevent, respond to, and combat human trafficking. Of particular importance, the domestic trafficking victims' fund created by this legislation would help States and localities develop training and services for survivors.

In February, I was proud to join all the women in the Senate in requesting that the Judiciary Committee hold a hearing on human trafficking. I appreciate the work of Chairman GRASSLEY and Ranking Member LEAHY in quickly scheduling that hearing and thank them for inviting Senators MIKULSKI, AYOTTE, GILLIBRAND, and me to testify before the committee on behalf of all of the women in the Senate. I applaud the committee's bipartisan work in shining a light on some of the darkest stories imaginable.

No State is immune from the evils of sex trafficking. Traffickers lure vulnerable victims with the promises of a better life and use violence, threats, lies, money, drugs, and other forms of coercion to trap them in a life of commercial sex. Many criminals who once worked in drugs have now turned to sex trafficking because it is more profitable.

The stories of victims are shocking. Just this past January, police in Bangor, ME, arrested a man and woman for allegedly forcing a 13-year-old girl into prostitution. This child, who was listed as a missing person, was being sold for sex through ads on the Internet. Unfortunately, there are many horrific cases like this occurring across the country.

The policies and tools for law enforcement, prosecutors, and survivors included in S. 178 are important pieces of a strong Federal response to human trafficking, and I commend Senators CORNYN and KLOBUCHAR for their work on this legislation.

I also hope the Senate will adopt an amendment I have cosponsored with Senator LEAHY that would reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs, which provide critical preventive and treatment services that help homeless youth around the country. Runaway and homeless youth are especially vulnerable to becoming victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation. A meaningful response to the very serious problem of human trafficking must also ensure that those most vulnerable to human trafficking—including our Nation's homeless youth—have the resources they need. The preventive measures provided by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs can help stem the tide of potential trafficking victims.

The State of Maine is doing its part to end the scourge of human trafficking, where the Not Here Justice in Action Network and other partnerships between law enforcement and service providers are helping to raise awareness and help victims. Our health care

workers in Maine are also tremendous partners. St. Joseph Hospital in Bangor, ME, for example, has focused its efforts on educating and training clinicians, nurses, and emergency medical providers to recognize the signs of human trafficking among their patients. With the proper tools and training, these nurses can intervene. They are learning how to identify victims and how to ask the right questions, which are critically important to keeping these atrocities from continuing.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act offers important supports for victims and enhanced tools for our law enforcement. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE AND DONNA GUNNING AND BURT TRUMAN

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise to share some good news from my home State of Maine. It is the story of veterans helping veterans—of three people from Maine who have positively impacted the lives of thousands of veterans in my State and have done so in a unique way. They make personalized wooden canes with a bold and intricate bald eagle head carved into the handle for any Maine veteran who wants one.

I have some pictures that show a large number of the canes and a close-up. As I noted when one of these canes appeared in my office recently, this eagle has an attitude and he is positive about the future of this country.

About 8 years ago, George and Donna Gunning from Windsor, ME, heard about a project in Oklahoma called the Eagle Cane Project. The mission was to help post-9/11 veterans who had trouble walking because of leg disabilities due to combat-related action by providing them with a unique hand-carved cane.

As a Navy veteran, George and his wife Donna Gunning, who grew up in a Navy family, were both intimately familiar with the sacrifices and difficulties that accompany military service. This project touched their hearts and they quickly recognized it as an opportunity to give back to veterans in Maine. They brought their own version of the project to our State, offering a personalized eagle cane to any Maine veteran who had served anywhere in the world in any conflict across the globe.

It wasn't long before the Gunnings were joined by another fellow named Burt Truman from Hallowell, ME, who spent two decades in the military, in the Navy, Army Reserve, and the Air National Guard. The trio worked together on each cane they made—crafting them, painting them, personalizing each one by etching the veteran's name and molding medals to show their branch of the service and any honors they received.

As impressive as each of these masterpieces is, the number that these

three people have produced is what is astounding and remarkable. The current count is 2,474 of these personally hand-made canes, made free of charge and funded for Maine veterans entirely through donations.

For all their hard work and dedication, the trio remains adamant that they deserve no special recognition, although I am giving it to them here today. Instead, they would rather the attention and admiration and thanks of all of our people be directed toward the veterans who are receiving these canes, who have borne so much for our country.

That is the true magic of this project. It is about recognizing our veterans, supporting them, and giving them something to lean on, both literally, physically, and emotionally.

In recent months, as the Presiding Officer knows, there have been a number of efforts in the Congress to further support our veterans—to improve their access to care and support services. While the Choice Act, which was signed into law last August, made progress in this area, more work needs to be done. To ensure that provisions of this legislation we all voted for and supported last year are implemented in accordance with our intent, Senator JERRY MORAN, Senator SUSAN COLLINS, myself and others have introduced a bill to improve how the VA determines eligibility for the Choice Program.

Currently, veterans can only use their Choice cards if they cannot get an appointment within 30 days at a VA facility and face an excessive burden of travel, such as a body of water, or if they live more than 40 miles as the crow flies from any VA facility, regardless of whether it provides the type of care they need.

In my opinion this isn't what Congress intended. In rural States such as Maine, as the crow flies is not a good definition of distance. We have to take into account whether the VA facility in question can provide our veterans with the specific care services they require. So the bill sponsored by Senators MORAN, COLLINS, myself, and others offers a fix by requiring the VA to use its existing authority to offer community care to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the nearest VA facility that provides the type of care they need.

I hope in the coming weeks the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and the similar committee in the House will hold hearings on this issue so we are able to provide a path forward and correct what I think is certainly a fixable portion of the Choice Act we passed last year.

As we look for that path, and as we think about veterans' issues, I think these eagle canes provide some inspiration. The bald eagle of course is a national symbol of freedom and independence, and with these canes it has also

come to symbolize in Maine the debt of gratitude we owe to our Nation's veterans. Each cane is a treasured reminder that someone cares, someone notices, and someone appreciates what they have done.

I have seen firsthand the powerful effect these canes have. Earlier this month I was meeting with members of the Maine Veterans of Foreign Wars and one of the gentlemen who sat right next to me in my office had with him this beautifully carved eagle cane. Thinking it was the only one of its kind, I asked him where he found something so unique and interesting and powerful. He said: Well, it was made right here in Maine, and I am not the only person who has one. It was one of thousands made in a Windsor, ME, workshop.

Even more telling was how quickly and enthusiastically the VFW members, also in my office that day, jumped in to explain where the canes came from and how glowingly they spoke of this project and what it has meant to veterans in Maine. They knew the history of the project, they described the meticulousness of the craftsmanship—which we can see here—and they quickly gave me George Gunning's name. Their enthusiasm underscored their true appreciation for the support and recognition this Eagle Cane Project in Maine had given to them and their fellow veterans.

Burt, George, and Donna's work is a true testament to the strength of our veterans community in Maine, and that is what it is all about.

Good news from Maine, Madam President. Good news about our commitment to each other and our commitment to our veterans. It is often said that Maine is a big small town with very long streets. We know each other, we care about each other, and in this case we deeply care about our veterans.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor incredibly disappointed that we can't seem to move forward on what should be a non-controversial, powerful, and bipartisan effort.

I think we can all agree in the Senate that we must do more to combat human trafficking and help the victims of this heinous act, and I was looking forward to, I believe, Senator CORKER offering an amendment on legislation that passed out of the Foreign Relations Committee that would establish a private, nonprofit grantmaking institution known as the End Slavery Initiative Foundation to reduce the worst



forms of forced labor and sexual servitude around the world. I was looking forward to having a serious debate about this important issue, and it is truly unfortunate that the debate has been sidelined by matters that are not to the core of the trafficking issue.

I rise to specifically address an amendment that I understand is pending to attempt to hijack our debate about human trafficking. This amendment is out of place and out of step with everything I believe we stand for in the Senate. It is an amendment to a bill that seeks to amend the Constitution of the United States. It is an amendment offered by a Republican colleague that grows the government and increases taxes. It is an amendment to a trafficking bill that could make people more likely to be trafficked.

I am talking about the amendment to eliminate birthright citizenship and end the people's right to be citizens by being born on American soil.

Birthright citizenship is a bedrock principle found not in law but in the Constitution. The 14th Amendment states clearly that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside."

For 115 years the obvious and plain meaning that people born on American soil are American citizens has been affirmed before the Supreme Court and can only be changed by a constitutional amendment. My colleague from Louisiana instead presents a bill and tries to argue with the Supreme Court and the English language by claiming undocumented immigrants are not subject to the jurisdiction thereof. Is he suggesting, for example, that if an undocumented immigrant was brought to court, he or she wouldn't be subject to the court's jurisdiction? Clearly not. And the civil rights leaders who drafted the 14th Amendment didn't think so either.

Instead, the 14th Amendment was adopted after the infamous Dred Scott decision to make sure the United States never has an unequal class system. This principle, that America isn't a country club, is a profound American value. If my friend from Louisiana wants to change the Constitution, he should abide by the framework our Founding Fathers set up.

If a Senator wants to make a monumental change to how our Nation defines citizenship in the Constitution, he or she must go to the constitutional amending process our Founding Fathers set up to make sure we have widespread and overwhelming consensus. That is why the Founders created a process in which amending the Constitution needed a broad swath of the American population to say, yes, that is worthy of changing the Constitution that has worked so well for us

for so many years. We are here to protect the Constitution, and the 14th Amendment is sacrosanct and too important to be defined by the political and discriminatory impulses of any Member of Congress.

But beyond trying to change our Constitution with a piece of legislation, my friend from Louisiana's amendment to a human trafficking bill could make human trafficking worse. Eliminating birthright citizenship would create a perpetual class of undocumented immigrants, ironically growing the undocumented population by ensuring that undocumented children, and their children born here, would become undocumented, and their children and their children's children could never come out of the shadows and be equal under the law.

This new permanent underclass would inevitably lead to some without any citizenship in any country; in other words, they would be stateless. This new underclass would be subject to the worst forms of exploitation, including, for some, becoming victims of human trafficking themselves.

But the irony doesn't stop there. For the party of limited government and low taxes, my friend from Louisiana proposes an amendment that would put the Department of Homeland Security in every delivery room and require the creation of a brandnew, extensive bureaucracy with burdensome procedures. It would also create a de facto birth tax for people to have to go back and prove their citizenship.

My friend from Louisiana tries to justify all this by saying it will prevent people from coming to the United States solely to give birth, but I don't even know if he truly believes that explanation. It ignores the plain fact that the practice he describes is already illegal under the law.

If he wants to get into a discussion about enforcing the existing law, I am always willing to talk about the need for more resources for the men and women in law enforcement in order to be able to do that. This amendment wouldn't make the practice he describes one bit more illegal, but it would change the Constitution of the United States by a simple passage of the Senate, not as an amendment to the Constitution.

This isn't the time and this isn't the place for an amendment attacking birthright citizenship. A bill isn't the place or the venue to change the Constitution. A bill on human trafficking isn't the time for a measure that might increase human trafficking.

Frankly, for someone who wants limited government, they shouldn't put the Department of Homeland Security in the delivery room. This is just another attack on immigrants that is against American values and in this case against our Constitution. We can do far better than that.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise today to speak in support of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act legislation that has been drafted and introduced by my good friends Senator JOHN CORNYN of Texas and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota. The bill helps survivors of human trafficking and child pornography and aids law enforcement in discouraging demand for these serious crimes.

This is a bill they originally introduced in 2013. I was a cosponsor of that bill, and I am also an original cosponsor of this bipartisan legislation which was introduced earlier this year because I believe it is very important legislation. It is important because it not only compensates victims of human trafficking and other crimes of exploitation for their injuries but also provides resources to help law enforcement prevent such crimes in the future by targeting demand.

The need for this bill is real and it is troubling. Every year across America, children and adults are bought and sold for reprehensible purposes. According to the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children, at least 100,000 American children each year are the victims of commercial child prostitution and child trafficking. It is not just a big-State, big-city problem. Every State in the country is facing this issue, including my home State of North Dakota, but we currently have trouble addressing this problem because of the many needs, including the need for resources.

After consultation with the attorney general's office, we learned that North Dakota has had difficulty applying for anti-human trafficking grants because to be eligible, the Department of Justice requires at least 2 years of local data on human trafficking. In recent years, North Dakota has been the fastest growing State in the country in terms of both population and income growth. Consequently, North Dakota has only recently seen a sudden increase in human trafficking issues. To remedy that, I have offered an amendment to the Cornyn-Klobuchar bill to make sure it does not mandate a required time period of collected data. The proposed amendment clarifies that a local or State government with a worthy trafficking initiative will not be precluded from receiving funds under the Cornyn-Klobuchar legislation because they, like North Dakota, have only recently begun collecting



data on human trafficking. They only have to demonstrate a valid need, which is, of course, significant and growing across the country.

Here is what a group of victims support groups and law enforcement organizations had to say:

Women and children, especially girls, are advertised online where buyers purchase them with ease, anonymity, and impunity. This happens in every city, in every State.

There are few issues that we as a governing body can be more unified on than that our children are precious and that it is our duty to protect them. For this reason, the Cornyn-Klobuchar bill has strong bipartisan support in the Senate, and I believe it will also be supported in the House. While it may need some amending here and there, we all recognize we could be doing more to help victims of human trafficking, child pornography, and other crimes of exploitation against children and vulnerable adults. These often-invisible victims not only need to be rescued from their situation, but they also need medical, mental health, housing, legal, and other important services.

The Cornyn-Klobuchar bill addresses the need to do more head-on. It establishes the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund, which is paid for through fines on persons convicted of child pornography, human trafficking, child prostitution, sexual exploitation, and human smuggling offenses.

Under current law those convicted of child abuse, trafficking, and related crimes must pay just a \$100 special assessment fee. Under this legislation that fee is increased to \$5,000 for every individual convicted of human trafficking, child pornography, and other forms of child exploitation. Those funds go to the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund, which will be used to increase the Federal resources available for human trafficking victims by \$7 million a year over a 5-year timeframe, for a total of \$35 million.

Funding will be awarded as block grants to State and local governments under the Victim-Centered Human Trafficking Deterrence Block Grant Program. The purpose of these grants is to develop and implement victim-centered programs that train law enforcement to rescue trafficking survivors, prosecute traffickers and pornographers, and help to restore the lives of their innocent victims.

In addition, the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Act does a number of things, including making sure that victims get restitution and witnesses get rewards for cooperating with law enforcement before others, encouraging prosecutors to get training on restitution in human trafficking cases, and giving law enforcement greater authority to seize the assets of convicted human traffickers.

It protects victims and witnesses by requiring human traffickers to be

treated as violent criminals for purposes of pretrial release and detention pending judicial proceedings.

It ensures that Federal crime victims are informed of any plea bargain or deferred prosecution agreement in their case and clarifies that the ordinary standard of appellate review applies in cases concerning Federal crime victims' rights petitions.

It recognizes that child pornography production is a form of human trafficking and ensures that victims have access to direct services at child advocacy centers to help them heal.

It allows State and local human trafficking task forces to get wiretap warrants within their own State courts without Federal approval. That will help them to more effectively investigate crimes of child pornography, child exploitation, and human trafficking.

In addition, the bill improves nationwide communications so that law enforcement can better track and capture traffickers and child pornographers. It ensures regular reporting on the number of human trafficking crimes for purposes of the FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program. It also requires law enforcement to upload photos of missing individuals into the National Criminal Information Center database and notifies the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children of any child reported missing from foster care.

Finally, it strengthens the current law to reduce demand for human trafficking by encouraging police, prosecutors, judges, and juries to target all persons involved in the buying and selling of human trafficking victims. It is wrong to prosecute victims and to fail to prosecute those who prey on them.

The value and importance of this bill are reflected in the broad coalition of victims' rights and law enforcement organizations that support it. It has been endorsed by nearly 200 groups, from the Fraternal Order of Police, to the National Center For Missing and Exploited Children.

We need to pass the Cornyn-Klobuchar legislation because crimes such as human trafficking and child pornography target the most vulnerable among us in a most despicable way. I urge all of my colleagues to pass this bill to put an end to modern-day slavery and to help victims get the support they need.

Again, I would like to close with my request to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we be allowed to proceed on the bill and again reference the importance of including my amendment, which ensures that all States, including those that have seen a recent real increase in human trafficking, have access to funds so that they can truly help victims in their State combat human trafficking in their State in conjunction with local law enforcement.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Madam President.

All this week I have come to the floor to talk about this issue of birthright citizenship and to offer my amendment that would end that policy. I come to the floor again on that issue.

I have an amendment pending on this bill to change that policy, to end birthright citizenship. I would like to read a statement on the subject:

The American people are upset, and I think they have a right to be upset, but they are upset for a reason. Our immigration policies, regulating all aspects of entry to the United States, have simply ceased to function in the national interest. "Immigration policy" and "national interest" are terms that are rarely heard in the context of immigration. We seem to have lost sight of the fact that it is a public policy and, like all public policies, our immigration policy should serve the public interest. But they do not.

Let us talk about legal immigration.

We now admit the equivalent of a major city every year, without having the vaguest idea of how we will educate all the new children, care for the sick, provide housing, jobs, build infrastructure, or attend to any of the human needs of the newcomers or those already here.

Mr. President, each year, we admit—I repeat—the equivalent of a major city. We admit more people each year than make up some of our States. We admit a new State with legal immigrants every year.

At a time of huge budget deficits and severe financial constraints, we have no idea of how these huge costs will be borne. We just do it.

We admit the equivalent of a major city without any assessment of whether these newcomers are likely to be contributing members of our society. Only a tiny fraction of those admitted each year enter because they have skills and abilities that will benefit our country. The rest come merely because they happen to be relatives of other recent immigrants. The result of this so-called policy is that there is now a backlog of almost 3½ million people—the population of a city the size of Los Angeles—who have a claim to immigrate to the United States for no other reason than they are somebody's relative. Is this really a way to run immigration policy?

If making it easy to be an illegal alien is not enough, how about offering a reward for being an illegal immigrant? No sane country would do that, right? Guess again. If you break our laws by entering this country without permission and give birth to a child, we reward that child with U.S. citizenship and guarantee full access to all public and social services this society provides. And that is a lot of services. Is it any wonder that two-thirds of the babies born at taxpayer expense in county-run hospitals in Los Angeles are born to illegal alien mothers?

This is not my statement. This is Senator HARRY REID's statement on the floor of the Senate, including his strong support for an end to birthright citizenship, that he gave on September 20, 1993, to which I refer my colleagues' attention.

In closing, I thank Senator REID for his prior words in strong support of

what he yesterday called, quote, VITTER's stupid amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WILDFIRE PREVENTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this morning, in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, there was a very valuable hearing on a bipartisan piece of legislation called the Sportsmen's Act, obviously designed to promote hunting and fishing activities which are so important to Oregonians and something our people just enjoy immensely.

I was not able to sit through the whole hearing because we had important business in the Finance Committee, but I got a flavor of it by listening to parts of it here and there. When it came to my turn to ask questions, I pointed out that one cannot go into the woods and hunt and fish if the woods are burning up. My sense is—particularly after what I learned last weekend—that is exactly what we are going to be facing, particularly in the West, and we are going to be facing it sooner rather than later.

We all know the Senate left on Wednesday in order to avoid the snowstorms, so I basically flew all night to make it to Medford, OR, for a fire briefing on Thursday. The idea that we would need to have a fire briefing in March was pretty much unheard of years ago. The fire season was something we faced in the summer or maybe in the early summer we would have a briefing on the challenges and what resources the local officials and Forest Service would need, such as tankers and the like.

Fires are now a year-round proposition. They are getting bigger, hotter, lasting longer, and they are infernos.

What I was told last week in my home State in Medford is that they are facing the driest fire season in 25 years. They took out the map and showed us California, which looks bone dry. After that eye-opening briefing, I went on to Lane County, which is closer to Portland. It is further up the valley. They said they had the least snow in 10 years and so they were just as concerned as Medford.

Malheur County has already asked our Governor to declare a State drought emergency due to record low snowpack and below average water runoff, and these drought declarations usually don't come until months and months later.

One of the reasons I wanted to come to the floor is to highlight how serious this fire season is going to be. This ought to be a wake-up call for all Americans because this is going to put

pressure on scarce resources, in my view, like we have never seen before.

These firefighters, as the Presiding Officer knows, are incredibly dedicated and patriotic people. But when we have fires in multiple areas, trying to move resources around quickly becomes a huge challenge, and it is particularly challenging when the system of fighting wildfires in America is broken. I can't describe it any other way than it being essentially broken and badly in need of repair.

The heart of the problem is that Federal policy has consistently shorted the prevention accounts. So what they need to do is go in there and thin forests out and deal with underbrush, such as small trees that pose the greatest risk of fire, and those accounts have been shortchanged for quite some time.

It gets hotter and drier on the forest floor. We can have a debate about why that is. I happen to think climate change is a part of it, others will cite other considerations, but what is indisputable is what is happening. It is hotter, drier, and in our part of the country there are frequent lightning strikes which can cause an inferno that leaps across Federal and State and private lines.

When we have a huge fire on our hands, often what happens is the government runs out of money to fight that megafire, and the handful of others like it, so the government then—really the agencies—borrow from the prevention fund in order to put the fire out, and the problem just gets worse and worse and worse.

What Senator CRAPO and I have proposed in the Senate—and there is a similar bipartisan effort in the House—is to change that. What we have said is that it is time for the government to fight these megafires—just the 1 percent or so of megafires—from the disaster account and not shortchange the prevention fund because that is how we prevent these infernos from taking place. We go in there and do the thinning, we deal with the small trees and underbrush, and we prevent those big fires.

The budget office has actually given us an analysis that this is pretty close to a wash from a budget standpoint, because if we only fight those megafires—the 1 or 2 percent—and we get solid, substantial benefits from prevention because we have prevented a megafire, we really have not added to the budget.

By clearing away the fuels and reducing both the number and intensity of future fires, reducing the amount of fuel on the ground simply makes it easier for our courageous firefighters to stop a fire in its tracks.

I brought this poster to the floor this afternoon. It is not too hard to tell what the benefits are when we actually go out and receive these fuel treatments. It is clear this is a useful tool for holding down the damage for com-

munities and taxpayers. These fuel treatments can be particularly beneficial for reducing wildfires and protecting our populated areas.

My hope is that now we are finally starting to see what this fire season is going to be like, that focusing on prevention and not raiding the prevention fund to deal with those 1 percent of the megafires will help us get out ahead of the problem instead of spending substantially more money and trying to play catchup as the infernos rip their way through the West.

I will close by saying that I think the bill Senator CRAPO and I have introduced is not the only answer to what we are going to be dealing with this fire season, but it is an important one. Another approach I think makes a great deal of sense is the Forest Service Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Programs because, again, these help bring together people of differing political views and differing philosophies to clear flammable materials from our forests while producing saleable timber for the mills.

In the Malheur National Forest in my home State, for one, the Southern Blues Collaborative Project is a real success story. The stewardship contracts there not only helped clear the forests of unhealthy snags and hazardous wildfire fuels, they helped to bring the Malheur Lumber Company mill back from the brink of closure at least once.

There is an effort at the U.S. Department of Agriculture to encourage these collaborative partnerships across the country. I commend the Department of Agriculture, Chief Tidwell in particular, for these collaboratives because they are vital to the health and vitality of our country's forests, and they are a solid foundation for wildfire response.

I would also like to thank the President and the Forest Service for supporting the bipartisan efforts of Senator CRAPO and me, and a similar one that is underway in the House. To me, the bottom line is if we can pass the legislation I have described here today and shore up our priority as being prevention while, at the same time, making better use of existing money by saving the megafires we deal with for the disaster fund, that gets us off to the races in terms of having a more sensible system for fighting wildfires; then, if we support the collaboratives I have just described that are really floundering across the country, and we are seeing more of them, we are seeing bigger collaboratives; that is the kind of policy that helps us get out in front of what is going to be, in my view, another dangerous fire season. If we are just crossing our fingers and hoping somehow this fire season isn't going to be as bad as I was told last week in Medford and in Eugene—that doesn't make any sense to me, particularly

given some of the other activities in the Senate that have been bipartisan priorities.

That is why I felt compelled to come to the floor this afternoon because of the hearing this morning on sportsmen. We want to have those opportunities for sportsmen and fishermen and all of the people who want to use our great natural resources. They are part of our heritage and they are a big shot in the arm economically as well. We are not going to be able to go into those woods this summer to hunt and fish if they are burning up.

So I am very hopeful we can quickly pass the bipartisan legislation to change the way in which we fight wildfires, that we can shore up our collaboratives which, dollar for dollar, are about as useful as anything that is done in the natural resources area. I encourage my colleagues this afternoon, given what is looking us in the eye with respect to this fire season, to join me in fixing the wildfire budget and encouraging collaborative partnerships that get us out in front of the fires and end this catastrophic growth of wildfires, particularly in the Western United States.

Mr. President, I note that one of my colleagues is ready to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

My good friend from Wyoming was on the floor yesterday, I believe. He is a frequent critic of the Affordable Care Act. He made a pretty simple point that was reported in the press yesterday critical of the administration for holding so many events talking about the success of the Affordable Care Act.

His suggestion was that we shouldn't be celebrating—the administration shouldn't be celebrating—the success of the Affordable Care Act in terms of the number of people who are gaining access to it, the stabilizing cost curve of health care expenditures all across the country, and the number of people whose emotional well-being is much better today because they don't have to worry about ever losing their health care simply because they get sick, or losing all of their savings simply because their child comes down with an expensive illness.

I guess I would beg to differ because I talk to people all across my State of Connecticut who are celebrating today because the ACA works. They are celebrating because their lives have been transformed by the fact that we now have finally made a commitment as a nation to make sure that if someone's son gets sick, they won't lose their savings, their college 529, their house, their car, just because of an illness.

I think the Affordable Care Act is something to celebrate because a lot of

my constituents believe the same thing. Betsy from Litchfield, CT, said that without the Affordable Care Act, she would not have health insurance at all due to her preexisting condition. One month before the ACA was implemented, she was sick with stage 4 cancer and her insurance company gave her 2 weeks' notice that it was going to end her coverage early. Luckily, Betsy was able to resolve that issue. But she says: "The bottom line is that before the Affordable Care Act, health insurance could and did kick sick people off of their rolls and 'pre-existing conditions' left many uninsured indefinitely."

She says:

If you are not insured and have to pay the outrageous costs of U.S. health care out-of-pocket, you will quickly spend all of your retirement savings. That was the situation I was facing in December 2013 and it was an unsettling prospect.

Linda from Winsted, CT, says she is grateful for affordable health care because she has multiple chronic illnesses such as diabetes, hypertension, and osteoarthritis. She was unable to buy health insurance at any price because the health insurance companies were charging her more because of her preexisting conditions. In Linda's view, this issue boils down to people having basic rights, the freedom to be healthy, the freedom for her to live a life in which she knows she is going to be able to afford coverage for herself.

She said this in an email to me: "There is no freedom in poverty and certainly none in needless human suffering."

So Betsy is celebrating today. Linda is celebrating today. There are millions of others like them all across the country who know the Affordable Care Act is working.

But it is not just those individuals, it is newspapers, from the New York Times to USA TODAY, and the Washington Post on down, that are saying with a clear voice: "The Affordable Care Act has achieved nearly all of its ambitious goals," and "11.4 million Americans are now signed up for health care."

This is a success story all across the country, but a success story that is at risk. It is at risk because of a Supreme Court which is considering an evisceration of the Affordable Care Act that would be a stunning act of judicial overreach if the plaintiffs were to succeed in the King v. Burwell case. Their contention is simply that it was the intent of Congress to only provide insurance subsidies to States that had State exchanges and not Federal exchanges. I haven't found a single Senator or Representative who voted for that law who says it was their intent to punish States that didn't establish State exchanges by withholding subsidies from millions of Americans. In fact, there is no way to plainly read the statute

without coming to the conclusion that subsidies were not just intended but written into the law to go to every single State, no matter what kind of exchange they decided to establish. The law says that because it specifically states that States that don't choose to set up their own exchange will have a Federal exchange take the place of that State exchange.

The totality of the law is clear as well. If the Federal Government had intended to give subsidies only to States that had State exchanges, they would have also made the insurance reforms contingent upon those State exchanges being established. Instead, the insurance reforms are nationwide, meaning that, clearly, the statute was set up to make subsidies nationwide, because the insurance reforms cannot exist—cannot exist—without those subsidies being available to people to be able to buy affordable insurance.

It is not just the individuals who voted for this law who are clear that subsidies should be available; it is the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office reads statutes we pass, independently interprets them, and then assesses a cost to the laws we pass. Doug Elmendorf was before the Appropriations Committee yesterday and I asked him a simple question: When you independently reviewed the Affordable Care Act, did you come to the conclusion that it allowed for subsidies to go to State and Federal exchanges? His answer was clear: Yes. We read the Affordable Care Act as to provide insurance subsidies to both State exchanges and Federal exchanges and, thus, we priced the bill accordingly.

The law is clear. The law's intent is clear. The voices of those who voted for it are clear. The independent Congressional Budget Office is clear. The Affordable Care Act only works if subsidies flow to both States that have Federal exchanges and States that have State exchanges.

For families such as those of Betsy in Litchfield, CT, and Linda in Winsted, CT, who continue celebrating the success of the Affordable Care Act on the ground floor for the millions of lives that have been transformed, this body needs to continue to stand up for the premise that the Affordable Care Act continues to work. That is absolutely something to celebrate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would ask my friend and colleague from Connecticut—we have worked closely together on a number of items—a question or two relating to the fact that the CBO report recently came out—just on Monday—and mentioned that the benchmark policy next year is going to be up 8 percent across the board. The benchmark policy will

go up 8 percent, meaning higher premiums not just next year, but the year after that, another 8 percent, and then another 8 percent. I would like to know, as a Senator representing people and as a doctor, how many people in his State believe that is actually a good deal. The President promised the people from his State that premiums would drop by \$2,500 per family. NANCY PELOSI, the Speaker of the House—and my friend from Connecticut was a Member of the House at the time—said premiums would drop for everyone.

So we are talking about specifically people buying policies on the exchange. Yet the numbers that came out Monday that the President of the United States is celebrating—and my friend and colleague has a sign up about how this health care law is supposedly working—how that works for people when next year they are going to pay 8 percent more and the year after that 8 percent more, and these are people who are actually getting subsidies who are buying the benchmark insurance through the exchange.

I know we are running short on time, but I would ask my colleague to address that specific component because I hear about it every day.

Mr. MURPHY. I appreciate my friend's question and I will be quick in the answer because I know we are running short on time.

I actually asked the CBO Director a question very similar to the one the Senator from Wyoming proposes. I said: Explain to me why your report actually says the Affordable Care Act is going to cost 10 percent less than you originally estimated and explain to me why the insurance subsidies are going to cost 20 percent less than you originally estimated.

His answer was very clear: It is because premiums have come in lower than CBO initially estimated.

In fact, this year, Kaiser reviewed premiums within these exchanges all across the country and said the average premium increase from last year to this year is 1 percent all across the country. In Connecticut, our biggest insurer increased their premiums by 1 percent. One of the other offerers on the exchange decreased their premiums by 10 percent. The reason the Affordable Care Act is costing much less today is because our actual experience—not our estimated experience into the future—is that premiums are being stabilized in large part because of the reforms in this act.

So if we want to talk about actual experience—what is happening on the ground today—it is that we are seeing premiums coming in almost exactly where they were last year, this year, in comparison to 5 years ago and 10 years ago when we were seeing double-digit increases in premiums from year to year.

So part of the reason I am celebrating this law, quite frankly, I say to

my good friend, is because the actual experience from this year to last year is that premiums are remaining stable and in some places like Connecticut are actually coming down, and the Affordable Care Act is costing less money than was initially estimated by CBO, in large part because premiums are lower than expected.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would point out to my friend that the actual reason which he never addressed is that they are going up next year. CBO has suggested they are going to go up 8 percent next year, and 8 percent the year after that, and 8 percent the year after that.

The other issue, as he says, is the amount of money spent is because fewer people are signing up. People realize it is not a good deal. I think the CBO at one point thought there would be 14 million people signed up by this point and now it is only 11 million. So the fact that people are deciding to not sign up—to not sign up—is one of the reasons the government, while still spending more money than they were in the past, is spending not quite as much as they thought they might have to, had all the people the President thought would sign up for his idea signed up. So that seems to be the situation, when we actually go into the CBO report.

I agree the total dollar figure is less than the high figure anticipated. It has come down some, but it is because fewer people have actually chosen to participate which is because the health care law continues to be unpopular. Many people think it is not a good deal for them; that even though they have subsidies, they can't afford to meet their copay, meet their deductible. Many have insurance, but they can't see a doctor. They have lost their doctor.

Those are some of the issues that I think were highlighted in that CBO report that the President ought to be honest about with the American people. The reason for the celebration I think is very premature and actually in error because so many people have been harmed by this law.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I think I might not be alone, I say to my good friend from Wyoming, in suggesting that most people probably would not suggest that 11 million people signing up for health care means the law is unpopular. Indeed, we have seen a reduction by 25 percent in those across the country who do not have insurance, in a year's worth of time. I think that is a pretty stunning uptake, and it shows how desperately people wanted insurance. But, again, I asked the same question to the CBO head yesterday. His review of why there has been a slight differential—it is a pretty small one between what they initially estimated and why people signed up—is because more companies are maintaining

their own health care insurance, less cancellations are happening, and, thus, there are fewer people who are uninsured. So this second argument as to how the sky was going to fall after health care reform, that you were going to see mass cancellations of policies, the CBO Director is saying the reason the number is coming in slightly below where it was initially estimated—albeit 11 million people have insurance because of this law—is because employers are holding on to their insurance, even though we heard from many detractors of the law there was going to be a mass exodus of private insurance plans. Twenty-five percent fewer people have no insurance today. That is the bottom line. In Connecticut, 50 percent fewer people have no insurance. There is just no way to argue that we have not made a big dent in the number of uninsured because of this law's passage.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes be reserved for Senator CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. I point out that on Saturday, I am going to be in Buffalo, WY, at a health fair. As a doctor, I continue to attend health fairs around the State which are designed to bring low-cost health care screenings to people. I know I will hear from folks there who are concerned with the fact that the CBO has come out and said the premiums are going to go up 8 percent next year, and 8 percent the year after that. Some of them are actually going to be on the ObamaCare exchange. I know some of them are people who had insurance that worked well for them before the President passed his law, and their insurance was canceled.

The President and the Senator from Connecticut may list them as successes, but they don't believe it is that way. They had insurance. They had insurance that they liked. It worked for them, and it worked for their family. They had the benefits that were important for their family, things for which they needed insurance. The President, on the health care law, came out with this mandate that everyone buy health insurance, and not just what worked for them. The President described it as essential benefits. I described them as excessive benefits, because there is a lot of insurance they are forced to buy, according to the law, that they do not need, do not want, cannot afford, and it does not even apply to their families. They have no choice in the matter.

They have had to lose insurance that worked for them and buy insurance that the President said they had to buy, even though it wasn't what was best for them and their families. They know what is best for them and their families, not President Obama.

I expect while I am in Buffalo, WY, visiting people, listening to what they

have to say at a health fair, I will hear stories such as that because I do every weekend in Wyoming. People are concerned about the cost. Even those who have been getting subsidies through the exchanges are noticing that deductibles are higher than their previous insurance, and copays are higher. They are paying more. They are paying more and getting less, which is why this health care law continues to be unpopular across the country.

Take a look at any of the national numbers that are coming out, and you are going to find many more people who feel they were harmed by the law than helped by the law. There is a ratio of more people who think they were harmed than helped. More people want it repealed than continued. That is what we are seeing across the country with this health care law.

The President and I would say we should listen to the American people who have these stories to tell. I was on the floor yesterday, and I talked about a woman from Maine. There was an article in the paper in Maine. She found the whole experience that she has been going through now frightening, and she has insurance through the exchange. She said it is a frightening experience. She did her taxes and found out that she ended up owing a lot of money in taxes that she didn't know she was going to owe because of mistakes that were being made and the way the book-keeping works. That is what is happening. H&R Block, the insurance folks who do the calculation to help people file their policies, are saying, on average, half of the people filing their returns this year are finding they are getting shocked and surprised that their amount of money coming in to the returns is a lot less, by an average of \$530, according to H&R Block. This is across the board.

There are a lot of disgruntled people who are disappointed in a President who made promises to them about a health care law, people who can't keep their doctors, high deductibles they can't afford. A study came out yesterday that many people with insurance can't afford anything close to the deductibles they are forced to be paying under the President's insurance that they had to buy, many of whom lost the insurance they liked. We see these problems, and the amount of government waste in this program is incredible.

Oregon earlier this week shut down their exchange. The State of Oregon spent \$248 million putting together their own State exchange, and the Governor just signed something saying we are done with it. They have not signed up one single person on the Oregon computer exchange ever—\$248 million, taxpayer dollars, gone. Gone. The only people who could sign up in Oregon had to do it by filling it out with paper and pen. This is supposed to be—I heard

President Obama—as easy as shopping on Amazon; insurance is cheaper than your cell phone; keep your doctor if you like your doctor. That is not what happened under this health care law. People lost their doctors and can't afford their policies. It is a very complicated situation related to this. Then you get Washington State. It is State after State—13,000 people had too much money taken out of their checking account as just part of the regular process of the monthly withdrawals.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER A. HART TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

##### NOMINATION OF THO DINH-ZARR TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Christopher A. Hart, of Colorado, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years; and Tho Dinh-Zarr, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

Who yields time?

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be divided equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to speak on a number of issues. I rise in support of the nominations of Christopher Hart to be chairman and Bella Dinh-Zarr to be a board member of the National Transportation Safety Board.

The National Transportation Safety Board helps keep all of us safe. When a terrible crash happens, we watch on television or read about the crash and wonder what happened. But it is the National Transportation Safety Board that steps in. During those first moments, they get in, preserve evidence,

sift through the debris, and then figure out what went wrong.

They play a difficult role. They must put aside all differences between jurisdictions, politics, and partisanship to get the job done. In the last month alone, the board has launched investigations into a ship collision in Texas, a plane veering off the runway in New York, two terrible and fatal train crashes in New York and California, and a tragic incident in DC where smoke filled one of the Metro tunnels and resulted in a passenger dying.

They are also helping with an oil train derailment in West Virginia and one in Illinois that sparked fires and an evacuation. Their work plays a critical role in guiding our decisions about safety and their recommendations have influenced safety improvements. They have played a role in everything from drunk driving and seatbelt laws to the amount of rest that pilots and truck drivers should get, and they are also helping to shape the safety requirements of travel in the future.

In October of last year, a test flight for commercial space flight ended in tragedy when an experimental spacecraft broke apart in midflight over the desert in California.

The National Transportation Safety Board stepped in to investigate the tragic accident. They are still conducting the investigation, and the results are going to help us better address the future safety of commercial space flight to and from the edge of space, which is what that spacecraft was designed to do. This is why it is so critical that we select people with technical knowledge and human compassion to put the pieces of these tragedies back together.

We have two great nominees. Christopher Hart is a dedicated public servant with an extensive career in transportation safety. He has served as Vice Chairman of the NTSB for 5 years; and since April 2014, he has served as the Acting Chairman of that agency.

Like Mr. Hart, Dr. Bella Dinh-Zarr has a distinguished career in transportation safety. She currently serves as the director of the FIA Foundation, which is dedicated to promoting safe and sustainable transportation.

Previously, Dr. Dinh-Zarr worked in various safety capacities with the Make Roads Safe campaign, the American Automobile Association, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

They are both good leaders, and I ask the Senate to join me in supporting their nominations.

#### TAKATA AIRBAGS

Mr. President, I wish to provide the Senate with an update on what every Senator has had their attention called to—the Takata airbag recall. We have seen five deaths. We have seen a spate of serious injuries related to these defective airbags. One of the deaths occurred in my home State of Florida.

Through my position of working with Chairman JOHN THUNE of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, I have been pushing Takata and the automakers to speed up fixes for these defective airbags.

People are driving around with a lethal bomb in their steering wheel. If it is defective and it goes off, they are filled with shrapnel. That has killed five people. It is documented in this country that it has killed five people.

Nobody ought to be driving, therefore, a car for months when, in fact, they have a known defect that can seriously kill them.

Well, it is just not acceptable, and the progress has been painfully slow. We received a letter from NHTSA noting that only 2 million of the vehicles recently recalled—2 million of 17 million—are all that have been repaired as of the end of last year.

That letter notes that Takata has continued to stonewall NHTSA's request for documents related to the defect. It is now being fined \$14,000 a day until they start cooperating fully. They have also failed to produce a number of critical documents that the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee has requested as part of its investigation into this mess.

Earlier today, Senator THUNE and I sent a letter to Takata again requesting that they turn over these documents to the committee as soon as possible so that we can complete our investigation into how this mess happened and, very importantly, how we can get people's cars fixed so they are not driving around with this bomb about to explode in their steering wheel. Safety can't wait.

BOB LEVINSON

Mr. President, sadly, this week is the eighth year that Bob Levinson, a retired FBI agent who disappeared on a tourist island in Iran called Kish Island, has not been seen or heard from. He has a wife and seven children.

A couple of years ago, the family received a video. A few months after that, they received a photo.

In these extensive discussions with Iran over matters of war and peace as to whether Iran is going to be willing to step down and not have a nuclear weapon, one of the discussion items also is not only the three known Americans in captivity in Iran but Bob Levinson, who has been missing for 8 years.

Only the Iranian Government can produce the evidence of what has happened to Bob and where he is, and we continue that vigil.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, later today, the Senate will vote on two nominees who are critical to ensuring the safety of our Nation's transportation network: Christopher Hart, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, also known as

the NTSB, and Bella Dinh-Zarr to be a member of the Board.

Mr. Hart has a distinguished career in aviation safety and has served with distinction as acting chair in recent months.

Dr. Dinh-Zarr has a distinguished career in auto safety and will bring an important perspective and background to the board.

Right now, the NTSB only has three members, with one—Mr. Hart—serving as Acting Chairman. Today's vote will add another member and ensure Mr. Hart is Chairman in an official capacity. It is imperative that we have a strong, long-term team at the helm. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I know there is much important work ahead for the agency.

The NTSB is charged by Congress with investigating every civil aviation accident in the United States as well as significant accidents in the other modes of transportation—railroad, highway, marine, and pipeline—and issuing safety recommendations to agencies and others in the transportation industry aimed at preventing future accidents.

It is not a regulatory or oversight agency; rather, it has a unique task—investigating safety issues and accidents and then making recommendations on how we can save lives. It is independent, and this ensures that agencies that regulate and oversee safety aren't investigating themselves when and if there are potential lapses in their oversight.

The NTSB's work is critical—and it has been very busy recently—especially in my region. Last month, we saw a horrific collision at a railway crossing just outside of New York City on our commuter railroad, Metro-North. The tragic incident killed six, including a resident of Danbury, CT. The NTSB is investigating that crash, and its finding will help us so we don't have to witness similar disasters again. Having a full board helps this important work move forward.

This recent investigation comes after the NTSB dedicated tremendous resources and hours into investigating other horrific incidents on Metro-North in 2013 and 2014. At one point, all of the NTSB's rail investigators worked on that one investigation, which resulted in a substantial report last November. The NTSB's conclusions in that report have been a guidepost for reform. At the same time, the NTSB has been busy investigating other major incidents such as rail-grade crossings elsewhere in our country, like in southern California, derailments of trains carrying crude oil, like in West Virginia, plane crashes, major highway disasters, and significant transit incidents.

The NTSB is also evaluating other issues, such as the safety of passenger vehicle tires, distracted driving, sub-

stance abuse in the transportation sector, and ensuring procedural compliance by transportation providers. It is a long and extensive list of projects.

We need these nominees in their posts immediately so they can keep these investigations moving forward and bolster the NTSB's critical work. And I note that here in Congress, we need to do our part as well to advance the NTSB's efforts and findings, which include ensuring railroads install positive train control, or PTC, which was first urged by NTSB after a rail collision in 1969 in Darien; requiring advanced technology like cameras in trains; requiring railroads to have redundant signal protection, which, had it been in place, would have saved the life of one of my constituents; requiring better fatigue management in all modes of transportation; improving the crashworthiness of passenger rail cars; and ensuring labor has a voice in safety investigations, among many key reforms.

Thankfully, we have before us today two supremely qualified nominees who will help us advance these key initiatives and make our transportation network safer, more secure, and more reliable. Again, I urge my colleagues to support them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, all week we have been on an important piece of legislation on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Just to remind everybody, this is a bill to treat child prostitutes not as criminals but as the victims they are—obviously, beneath the age of consent—and to recognize that the criminal organizations that traffic in human flesh for sale, economic, sex, and other reasons, are a real problem in our society. So much of what happens in this trade is really nothing more or nothing less than modern-day slavery—something we thought was relegated to the history books and didn't exist in the United States of America, the freest country in the world.

We got here through a rather strange set of circumstances, because the legislation that I introduced was broadly bipartisan—which is a novelty these days. We had 10 Democratic cosponsors of the legislation.

Then, when we had a vote in the Senate Judiciary Committee—Chairman GRASSLEY kindly called up that bill in February—we had a unanimous vote of the Senate Judiciary Committee. All Republicans and all Democrats voted for it.

Then we had another unusual development. Majority Leader MCCONNELL



was left wondering: Am I going to have to go through procedural steps to get the bill to the floor? The minority, our Democratic friends, said, I think, fairly: This is not a controversial piece of legislation. We are going to agree to get on the legislation.

But then something very strange happened. All of a sudden, some of our Democratic friends, including the Democratic leader, said: We are going to filibuster this legislation. You can imagine my surprise after that bipartisan record of cooperation leading up to that point.

I was even more surprised when the stated reason for that was a provision in the bill, which was as plain as the nose on your face, and it actually was a provision of the law that was voted on unanimously by all of our Democratic friends late last year.

So it is a provision that has been the law of the land for 39 years, which they reaffirmed with their vote just late last year.

This is what one of the 200 groups—law enforcement and victims groups—had to say about this discovery this week of this appropriations provision known as the Hyde amendment. It said: “Senate Democrats are choosing a phantom problem over real victims.”

So I wish to take a minute to think about who is actually paying the price for the political games that are going on in the Senate. Who is bearing the consequences? Is it going to be the Republican Party or the Democratic Party in the next election? That seems to be the rage in Washington, DC. People want to talk about the politics.

But here we have children, typically between the age of 12 and 14, mainly girls, who are trafficked for sex and who have nowhere to turn. Our bill gives them an opportunity to begin to heal by penalizing the very people who demand this sex trade, taking that money and diverting it into services for the victims.

Reflecting on what has happened this week and thinking that surely we can all get together on something as bipartisan as combatting human sex trafficking for children, surely we can finally come together, all join hands together and support this important legislation, I had to reflect: Why in the world would they ever want to come to the Senate if they are not going to try to help make the lives of these victims of human trafficking just a little better? I mean, we are all used to the hardball of elections and politics. We get it. We are all volunteers. We are grownup men and women. But these children shouldn't have to pay the price for the political games that are going on in the Senate. And it is not only this legislation.

I think it really speaks to: Why in the world would anybody want to serve in a body where all we are doing is filling space and throwing obstacles to the

passage of bipartisan legislation that is going to help some of the vulnerable people in our society?

If this is our legacy, I just have to say: Shame on us. Shame on those who would put partisan political games and phantom problems ahead of the welfare of these child victims of human trafficking.

Is this the legacy that any Member of the Senate, Republican or Democratic, would want to be known by? Yes, they served in the Senate, the greatest deliberative body in the world. But do you know what they are remembered for? For stopping help for child victims of human trafficking. That is their legacy. Does anyone want that? I don't think so.

Why in the world would we squander a perfectly good opportunity to do everything we can? This isn't a panacea. This isn't going to all of a sudden wipe out the issue of human trafficking in America, but it is a small first step to dedicate \$30 million in a crime victims compensation fund—paid for by the very people who purchased these services and who are convicted and pay fines. This is a first step to take that \$30 million and to divert it to help the victims of this sordid crime to begin to heal.

So I ask our colleagues to reconsider, to reflect on why they are here—just to play partisan games, or are they actually here to do some good? Is this what they want to be known by? Is this how you want to be remembered by your children and grandchildren? Is this how you want to be remembered in our history books? And why in the world would you come to the Senate only to squander the opportunity to do something good for the most vulnerable people in our country by blocking this legislation over a provision of law which has been the law of the land for 39 years and which all of our Democratic friends have repeatedly voted for time and time again, as recently as late last year in the Omnibus appropriations bill?

This is a phantom problem, and they are choosing a phantom problem over real victims. It is beyond belief and I think deeply depressing. But there is an opportunity for our colleagues to rise above this partisanship they have displayed and to do the right thing. One would think the 10 people who have been cosponsors of the legislation would be for advancing this legislation, as well as all the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Republicans and Democrats alike. One would think that since they have already voted for this provision, they would do so again and let us consider it, along with an open amendment process.

In the end, this isn't hurting us or other Senators. This isn't just poisoning the well here in Washington, DC, making it harder and harder for us to get things done; this isn't just poi-

soning our reputation in the eyes of the people we represent around the country who look to Washington and see nothing but dysfunction; it is squandering an opportunity to help vulnerable children who are the victims of this sordid sex trafficking. I hope my colleagues will reconsider and allow us to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 178

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the bipartisan Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will go a long way to fight the scourge of modern-day human slavery. It was introduced back in January by a Republican, Senator CORNYN, and a Democrat, Senator KLOBUCHAR. As is done with all legislation, it was posted on the Internet for everyone to read.

Not long after, 14 female senators on the Democrat side joined their female counterparts on the Republican side to call for a Judiciary Committee hearing on the matter. Chairman GRASSLEY is committed to fighting human trafficking. So not only did he hold the hearing they requested, he promptly scheduled a markup on legislation to combat modern human slavery, including the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. That markup was conducted in an open and transparent way. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act was debated and amended in committee.

For example, the senior senator from Connecticut offered an amendment to this bipartisan bill on behalf of himself and the junior senator from Illinois. That amendment was approved.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act was reported unanimously to the floor. Every single Democrat on the Judiciary Committee voted for it. Every single one. Soon after, the junior Senator from North Dakota called on me to take up this bill, which I was happy to do.

The Democratic Majority did not bring this bill to the floor in the last Congress, and I was determined to try to do something about the terrible problem of human trafficking. Just a few days ago, every single Democrat consented to the Senate taking up this bipartisan bill. The Democrat Leader even committed to work to clear any problems that would arise on his side of the aisle, although he said he doubted that any would.

Well, no sooner had these words been uttered, then our Democrat colleagues began complaining about a provision that was sitting on page four of the bill. This provision was in there when this bipartisan bill was introduced. It was in there when the committee held a hearing on it. It was in there when the committee marked it up—at which point every single Democrat voted for it. And it was in there when every Democrat in the Senate agreed to proceed to it on the floor. But now they



are complaining about it and even threatening to filibuster this critical human rights bill over it.

Now, I understand threatening to filibuster a bill that you oppose. But our colleagues are threatening to filibuster a bipartisan bill that they have cosponsored, voted for, or in some cases, done both.

We have been reasonable throughout this process. Consistent with that approach, I suggest we resolve this bizarre issue the way the Senate has traditionally done. I will be proposing a consent agreement where our friends on the other side of the aisle will get to offer a motion to strike a provision that so many Democrats voted to support in the past. As part of my offer, I would further propose that such an amendment be the first amendment in order, and that it be decided as a simple up-or-down vote. That is as fair as one can be. An up-or-down vote at a simple majority threshold.

Not only is that the regular order way to resolve this issue, it is also the way that leading antitrafficking groups have said we should resolve this issue. For example, an official from the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women said, "Senate Democrats are choosing a phantom problem over real victims." She said Senate Democrats should offer an amendment to strip out the provision if they don't like it. And then she said, "Win or lose and move on."

I think that is good advice, Mr. President. That is precisely what I am going to suggest. And I hope my Democratic colleagues will take "yes" for an answer.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas, who has been a leader on this issue and is the craftsman of this bill—as has Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the committee—has laid out how we got to where we are. It is sort of a mind-boggling, twisted path that makes almost no sense even to the casual observer. The dilemma seems to be that our Democratic friends, having read and signed off on this bill all along the way, have suddenly discovered a piece of it they do not like. Well, of course, the way to eliminate a piece you don't like would be to vote on it.

So I am going to offer a unanimous consent agreement that would give our friends on the other side an opportunity for an up-or-down, simple majority vote on the provision they have recently discovered, after reading the bill for 2 months, that they find offensive. I will give them an opportunity with a simple majority vote to strike the provision which they find objectionable and which Senator CORNYN has pointed out has been part of the law for 39 years.

In that regard, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. 178, that it be in order for Senator LEAHY or his des-

ignee to offer an amendment to strike the limitations language; that there be up to 1 hour of debate on the amendment equally divided between the managers or their designees; and that following the use or yielding back of the time, the Senate vote on the amendment; further, that following disposition of this amendment, the managers or their designees be allowed to offer amendments in an alternating fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the senior Senator from Texas could write a book on how the Senate has been dysfunctional. That chapter, which would become a huge part of what he would be writing about, would be on what has happened in the last 6 years. Talk about dysfunction. The Republicans have basically filibustered everything, and I mean everything—everything. The decision was made after Obama was elected that they weren't going to support anything, and to your credit, I say to the Presiding Officer and all Republicans, you stuck with it. You supported nothing Obama wanted to get done. So let's not talk about the dysfunction of the Senate because the book on that has been written by the Republican minority for the last 6 years.

Mr. President, the legislation dealing with human trafficking is going to pass this Congress, but it is going to pass this Congress without abortion language in it.

There has been a lot of talk in the last couple of days about how to handle this issue, and the way to handle the issue is very simple: Just take it out of the bill. It could be done with a consent agreement in the matter of a second or two. So that is what we proposed, and we have been proposing it for the last several days. Take the abortion language out of this bill. If my Republican colleagues want to get something done, just take the abortion politics out of this bill. Unfortunately, for those who want to see this trafficking bill pass, Republicans are ignoring the obvious path forward while setting a new low standard on all bipartisan business that is conducted in the Senate.

By saying that Democrats should always assume their Republican partners are just not being forthright, I guess it is our fault because time and time again, whether it is on the funding of Homeland Security or whether it is trying to solve a problem we have in the Middle East, there is always something that comes out of nowhere—something so unusual, so unbelievable that we would have 47 Senators sign a letter directed to the Ayatollah. Never in the 200 years of this body has there

been this level of interference in negotiations by the President until just a few days ago.

The bottom line is this: Democratic Senators have been working in good faith on this critical legislation for years. Assuming their Republican partners were being forthright when they provided a list of changes that did not include the addition of the Hyde language, Republicans are now saying that trusting them was a mistake.

There is a clear path forward to passing this trafficking bill, which is the goal shared, I hope, by Democrats and Republicans. Republicans should work with us to remove the unrelated abortion language that has no business being in this bill. Democrats are open to any number of ways to improve the language in this bill, but it is so simple: Just take it out. Take the abortion language out.

Today, Senator LEAHY, a senior Member of this body, submitted text that omits the abortion language. One way forward would be for the Senate to adopt, not simply vote on, this text. Voting to reject the change Democrats are seeking, as Senator MCCONNELL says he wants to do today, is not a viable path forward since it does not address Democrats' concern that abortion language has no place in a bill designed to protect victims of human trafficking.

This trafficking bill could pass quickly if the abortion language were removed, as I said. We hope Republicans will do the right thing in the interest of passing this bill and will work with us to remove the completely unrelated abortion language that has no business being in this bill.

I, therefore, object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to make sure everybody understands what has been objected to. The provision that was in the bill has been in there for 2 months. Everybody had a chance to read it. It came out of committee unanimously. No one objected to proceeding to it on the floor.

I just offered the minority an opportunity for a simple up-or-down vote to strike the provision they recently discovered, and they have objected to it.

Senator CORNYN, Senator GRASSLEY, and a number of others of you have worked very hard on this extremely important legislation. I brought it to the floor the other day, open for amendment, but we have not been able to offer any amendments because the minority doesn't want to have an open amendment process and is insisting on trying to kill this important bill because of a provision they claim somehow they missed. After its being in there for 2 months, they now suddenly find it offensive.

So where we are is we are still on the bill, and we are going to pass this bill,

I assure you. I want to assure Senators CORNYN, GRASSLEY, and all the people out in America who have been clamoring for this bill—and I might ask Senator CORNYN, how many groups are there that are supporting this measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. If I could respond, Mr. President, there are about 200 different law enforcement and victims' rights organizations, including the one from the chart I mentioned earlier, the Coalition Against Trafficking of Women. This is one of those rare subjects where people have genuinely come together in revulsion to this terrible crime but also in an attempt to do something meaningful to address it.

Mr. MCCONNELL. So what I want to say to those groups is that we are going to stay on this bill until we pass it. I have offered the minority an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote to take out the provision they have suddenly discovered is offensive to them even after having it in the bill for 2 months. Even the most casual observer would have to conclude that the minority is going to great lengths to prevent the Senate from even doing business on things that are overwhelmingly supported. But I will say this to everybody out there who cares about this bill: We are going to stay on it until we finish it.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON HART NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Christopher A. Hart, of Colorado, to be Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term of two years?

Mr. INHOFE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Ex.]

#### YEAS—97

Alexander	Booker	Carper
Ayotte	Boozman	Casey
Baldwin	Brown	Cassidy
Barrasso	Burr	Coats
Bennet	Cantwell	Cochran
Blumenthal	Capito	Collins
Blunt	Cardin	Coons

Corker	Johnson	Reid
Cornyn	Kaine	Risch
Cotton	King	Roberts
Crapo	Kirk	Rounds
Cruz	Klobuchar	Sasse
Daines	Lankford	Schatz
Donnelly	Leahy	Schumer
Durbin	Lee	Scott
Enzi	Manchin	Sessions
Ernst	Markey	Shaheen
Feinstein	McCain	Shelby
Fischer	McCaskill	Stabenow
Flake	McConnell	Sullivan
Franken	Menendez	Tester
Gardner	Merkey	Thune
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Tillis
Graham	Moran	Toomey
Grassley	Murkowski	Udall
Hatch	Murphy	Vitter
Heinrich	Murray	Warner
Heitkamp	Nelson	Warren
Heller	Paul	Whitehouse
Hirono	Perdue	Wicker
Hoeven	Peters	Wyden
Inhofe	Portman	
Isakson	Reed	

#### NOT VOTING—3

Boxer	Rubio	Sanders
-------	-------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

#### VOTE ON DINH-ZARR NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Tho Dinh-Zarr, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 2018?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the committee-reported amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, James Lankford, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton, Ron Johnson, Richard Burr, Daniel Coats, Roy Blunt, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Pat Roberts, Bill Cassidy, Jerry Moran.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send another cloture motion to the desk for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, James Lankford, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton, Ron Johnson, Richard Burr, Daniel Coats, Roy Blunt, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Pat Roberts, Bill Cassidy, Jerry Moran.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived with respect to these cloture motions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first-degree filing deadline be at 5 p.m. on Monday, March 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015. I am proud to join with my colleagues to co-sponsor this important legislation, and I applaud Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR for putting together this bipartisan bill.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act is a call to action. We heard a lot of discussion about it on the floor over the last several days. The horrible crime of human trafficking impacts thousands of Americans—mostly women and children—each year, and it occurs in cities, suburbs, and in rural towns. We cannot allow this horrendous crime to continue.

Last year, I hosted a forum at West Virginia State University to discuss how we could help in West Virginia to combat human trafficking. The event was very well attended and featured law enforcement advocates, academics,

and State lawmakers. I also supported several bills when I was in the House of Representatives to further this fight and end this vicious crime.

It is monstrous to consider the sexual exploitation of a human being, especially a child. We must stand up for those voices that have been silenced and say “no more.”

While not in large numbers, trafficking occurs in West Virginia’s small communities and towns, in our hotels and in our truck stops, in schools, and online. Several things contribute to trafficking in the Mountain State—the interstates running in and around, our high poverty and unemployment rates. We also have a drug epidemic which contributes to this problem.

I am working in a bipartisan way with Senator JOE DONNELLY to address this drug epidemic, but we must also say “no more” to this shameful crime.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act will make it easier for law enforcement to identify and address patterns of human trafficking. It takes a needed two-pronged approach. It bolsters the tools available to law enforcement to crack down on human traffickers and helps victims restore their lives through increased Federal resources.

We need to take care of our sons, our daughters, and our neighbors and keep our eyes and our ears open. This is not a Republican or Democratic issue; it is a human issue. Now is the time to stand up and say “no more” to human trafficking. Now is the time to show broad support for these victims and punish traffickers to the fullest extent of the law.

This bill has gone through a very transparent process. It was carefully considered and unanimously approved in the Senate Judiciary Committee. It has been available for every Senator or member of the public to read for months. Earlier this week each and every Senator consented to consider this bill on the Senate floor. It has widespread support from over 200 advocacy groups, including the NAACP, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Rights4Girls, the National Association to Protect Children, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Conference of State Legislatures.

The innocent victims of human trafficking have suffered enough. Now is the time for us to join together and pass this legislation and take a significant step to end this crime.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to speak on behalf of the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General of the United States.

It is interesting that this is a week when we have been engaged in a dialogue about human trafficking, which is a serious and significant issue, obviously. But it, along with many other issues, demands a strong Justice Department, and a strong Justice Department is not possible without a confirmed Attorney General as a leader.

Ms. Lynch has now been nominated over 4 months ago. It has been 124 days since her nomination, and she has still yet to be confirmed. I rise to speak on her behalf.

I have visited with Loretta Lynch in person. I have observed her throughout the nominations process. My brother-in-law worked as an assistant U.S. attorney with her in the Eastern District of New York in the late 1990s. I am impressed, as are many of my colleagues, by her credentials and her extensive experience, and I was gratified to see that the Judiciary Committee reported her nomination to the floor.

I am disappointed that it has taken 124 days to get to this point. I was pleased to hear the majority leader indicate that the Senate may take up her nomination next week, but I think it is important for the Nation to recognize how critical this appointment is and how we should not have let it go this long.

I want to reflect back to probably the hardest elected office I held or will hold, which was mayor of Richmond. When I was a city councilman and mayor from 1994 to 2000, my city had the burden of having the second highest homicide rate in the United States. We worked in our community together with everyone, especially law enforcement and community leaders, to try to bring down that scourge of violent crime that was affecting neighborhoods, especially the poorest neighborhoods.

We were able, over the course of 7 years, to achieve some very dramatic success to make our city safer, but along the way I learned a couple of very important things. The first was this. One can’t tackle major public safety challenges without a strong relationship between the community and the local police department. It is impossible to make progress if that does not happen. Secondly, I also learned that one cannot tackle a difficult public safety challenge without a strong Department of Justice. We relied upon that partnership with our local U.S. attorney’s office in the Eastern District of Virginia—all the way up through main Justice and the Attorney General—in order to try to tackle and turn our city’s public safety situation around.

Today there are critical issues facing this country—urgent issues facing this country—that deal with the relationship between our communities and law enforcement agencies. If there were ever a time when we would want to

have a confirmed Attorney General in office without question marks surrounding when that confirmation will take place, it would be now.

Over the last few months, we have seen a series of controversies that have torn at all of us as we have watched challenges and distrust between communities and law enforcement agencies. In early August, Michael Brown, an unarmed 18-year-old, was shot during a confrontation with an officer in Ferguson, MO. That shooting spurred nationwide protests and concerns against what many in Ferguson and elsewhere viewed as overly aggressive tactics by the police.

A month prior to the death of Michael Brown, Eric Garner died as a result of a police chokehold in July in New York when he was confronted over the selling of untaxed cigarettes. There have been similar instances in Cleveland and Madison. It is not limited to one part of the country. It is not limited to North, South, East, or West. There have been similar instances that have raised serious concerns about the connection between law enforcement and communities.

There have also been horrible atrocities committed against members of the law enforcement community, the deaths of two NYPD officers, Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, who were shot pointblank weeks ago in New York City while they sat in their patrol car. Yesterday, as we heard reported, there were shootings of police officers in Ferguson, MO.

These instances in cities around the country demonstrate a significant level of tension and even distrust between the police and communities they serve, which are often minority communities or communities of color.

I am here to say these tensions do not have to exist. They can be bridged. They can be solved. But it takes a fully functioning Department of Justice with a leader at the helm who has been confirmed to solve these issues.

The Department of Justice has, throughout history and today, played a critical role in investigating cases such as this and some of the situations I mentioned. The DOJ has been able to come in and be involved and provide some calm to situations, provide some level of confidence that there would not be a sugarcoating or an effort to sweep legitimate questions into the closet in the community.

In the State of Virginia, there is currently a DOJ investigation concerning the police shooting death of John Geer, an unarmed Caucasian who was shot on the steps of his residence in August of 2013. Local officials in that county have welcomed the involvement of the Department of Justice because they knew that citizens would have a greater confidence in the outcome if it was being done by someone other than the officials who had been elected locally.

There is a critical need at this point to provide some confidence to communities that have questions about the relationship between their own concerns and the service of law enforcement departments, just as law enforcement departments want to have a way to build bridges with the communities they represent.

Loretta Lynch understands the significance of the Attorney General's role in these situations. She testified that one of her key priorities would be to work to strengthen the bonds between law enforcement personnel, whom she has worked with during her entire career, and the communities they serve which she well understands.

Last week, the DOJ released a report from their investigation into the Ferguson policing practices that laid out a number of significant concerns that, if left unaddressed, will continue to lead to distrust in Ferguson and elsewhere. A strong Justice Department that can help mediate and bring the sides together is a part of the solution.

I raised these issues only to highlight that right now we are at a critical time in the Nation's criminal justice system. A delay of confirming an Attorney General for 4-plus months is never warranted, given the importance of the position. A delay is not warranted in this case, given these strong credentials of Loretta Lynch, but the delay is especially unwelcome, given the urgent need to have leadership at the Department of Justice. They can try to calm any potential situations and build confidence in communities and among law enforcement agencies.

We need our incoming AG to be on the job, taking on these challenges in a manner that will bring different aspects of the community together, to make changes as necessary and to strengthen the equality of our criminal justice system for all.

Of course, beyond the issue of community policing, we face so many other challenges, such as national security and terrorism, and in that respect the Eastern District of New York, which is where Ms. Lynch has served, has had one of the most significant dockets of antiterrorism cases of any jurisdiction in the country. She is an expert in those areas. Cyber security, the very human trafficking issues we have been discussing on the floor today, are issues Ms. Lynch has worked on significantly in her role, protecting voting rights, and so many more.

Ms. Lynch is a no-nonsense, hard-working prosecutor known for her aplomb, her demeanor, her intelligence, and her ability to work with a wide variety of stakeholders. I am absolutely confident Ms. Lynch will approach these issues with the same focus, fairness, and expertise with which she has approached her work in the past.

I stand today to urge my colleagues to not wait, and to support Loretta

Lynch as our next Attorney General. It has been said to the point where it is a cliché, but nevertheless a true one, that justice delayed is justice denied. The refusal to confirm a leader to head the most important law enforcement agency in the United States is a delay of justice that for many seems to be a denial of justice. We can rectify that concern in communities across this country if we act with dispatch to confirm a person who is eminently qualified to hold the Nation's highest law enforcement position.

With that, I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi has graciously allowed me to speak before him, and I ask unanimous consent that Senator WICKER be recognized immediately upon the conclusion of my comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have been working on the issue of human trafficking on a bipartisan basis for almost a year, and it is usually bipartisan.

I know when we included my amendment on the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, most Senators voted for it. Only 20 current Republican senators voted against that victims act, and the rest voted for it. All the Democrats voted for it.

But on this issue today, the Judiciary Committee reported out a comprehensive bill with strong bipartisan support. We did that last fall. This year we reported out a less comprehensive bill with fewer protections for those at risk of human trafficking, and despite that setback, I agreed to keep working across the aisle to make it stronger, including the crucial prevention piece that was in last year's committee-reported bill.

We have been on this bill for 3 days. I think we can all admit the progress has been thwarted by the inclusion of a divisive provision that would limit the services available to victims of human trafficking.

I wish to propose a way forward. I know all Senators want to work together to end human trafficking. And just as we saw on my bill, the Violence Against Women Act, 78 Senators voted for that act with its provision on trafficking. We want to support a bill that will pass the Senate.

I filed a substitute amendment, Senate Amendment 300, to get us around our current impasse. It includes three

things. First, the Klobuchar-Cornyn bill as reported earlier this month by the Judiciary Committee; second, the Cornyn-Klobuchar bill, also reported earlier this month by the Judiciary Committee, but without the divisive language that limits victims services; third, the Leahy-Collins-Murkowski-Ayotte amendment that was filed yesterday to protect runaway and homeless youth from trafficking.

This trafficking prevention bill was reported by the Judiciary Committee last year with the support of Senator GRASSLEY, Senator CORNYN, and nearly all of the other Judiciary Committee members, but has been narrowed here at the request of Republicans this year.

I hope the combination of these three bills—and I do it in good faith—can bring us together. More importantly, it is responsive to the requests of survivors and the many dedicated people who work with them to remove the unnecessary partisan provision that has resulted in this impasse. They need us to find a way forward. They need the Senate to stop playing politics and pass a meaningful bill.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that letters written by a number of groups and others who support the removal of this divisive provision so that we can move forward on this trafficking legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL NETWORK FOR YOUTH,  
March 11, 2015.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: The National Network for Youth is grateful for your leadership on human trafficking which is a dark mark on our modern society. Slavery has no place in America and we stand proudly with you to prevent and end human trafficking in America.

The National Network for Youth, founded in 1974, champions the needs of runaway, homeless, and other disconnected youth through strengthening the capacity of community-based services, facilitating resource sharing, and educating the public and policy makers. NN4Y members work collaboratively to prevent youth homelessness and the inherent risks of homelessness, including exploitation, human trafficking, criminal justice involvement, and death.

Human trafficking is a bipartisan and non-partisan issue. Together, we stand united against modern day slavery, including both sex and labor trafficking. Presently, we are at an important moment in the Senate with both parties unified to take a strong stand against human trafficking, from prevention to law enforcement, and service provision to survivors. We are so pleased that the Runaway and Homeless and Youth Trafficking Prevention has become a part of this important conversation and we thank you for your support of that legislation last Congress.

The National Network for Youth is writing this letter with the hope that the U.S. Senate will remove the partisan piece of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This legislation is desperately needed and we cannot

let this moment pass us by because of the addition of partisan and divisive provisions.

Respectfully, thank you for your work. Please work across the aisle to ensure that this critical trafficking legislation becomes the law of the land.

Best regards,

DARLA BARDINE, J.D.,  
Executive Director, National Network  
for Youth.

VERMONT COALITION OF RUNAWAY &  
HOMELESS YOUTH PROGRAMS,  
Montpelier, VT, March 11, 2015.

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,  
Russell Senate Building, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY, The Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs wishes to express our ongoing appreciation for your efforts to move the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act. As a longstanding champion of Federal support for efforts to assist vulnerable runaway, homeless and trafficked young people, I know that you must be as frustrated as we are in recent efforts to insert an element of partisanship into what should be a broadly bi-partisan effort to protect victims of human trafficking. The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act and the broader legislation it's amended to should be important opportunities for citizens of the United States and lawmakers on both sides of the aisle to unite in moral outrage over the realities of victims of human trafficking.

Difference of opinion and the deliberative role of the Senate is part of what makes our democracy strong, but sometimes unity of purpose should prevail, particularly in efforts involving protections for the most vulnerable among us. There should be no doubt that legislation involving the well-being of individuals who have been victimized by the most base of human behavior should be free of partisan wrangling. It's disappointing and deeply distressing that this isn't always the case.

I write this letter to encourage your efforts to remove partisan language from the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act in an effort to ensure that the Act and the RHY amendment that Senator Collins and you introduced move forward unimpeded.

Again, thank you for your efforts on this issue.

Sincerely,

KREIG PINKHAM,  
Executive Director,  
Washington County  
Youth Service Bu-  
reau/Boys & Girls  
Club, VT Coalition  
of Runaway &  
Homeless Youth Pro-  
grams Board Mem-  
ber.

HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN,  
Washington, DC, March 12, 2015.

DEAR SENATORS: On behalf of the Human Rights Campaign's (HRC) more than 1.5 million members and supporters nationwide, I write to support the Leahy substitute amendment to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act which would ensure critical protections for victims of trafficking and add necessary protections for runaway and homeless youth that does not include an expansion of the Hyde Amendment language. Each of the components of this substitute amendment has strong bipartisan support.

This amendment will help many vulnerable populations including the lesbian, gay,

bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community. LGBT individuals are particularly impacted by human trafficking and are at an increased risk for victimization globally. In fact, 10 percent of all trafficking victims identify as LGBT. They also make up a disproportionate amount of the total homeless youth population. Recent studies have found that while LGBT youth comprise only 10 percent of the total youth population, up to 40 percent of youth living on the streets today identify as LGBT.

Increased incidence of homelessness and family rejection make LGBT individuals—especially youth—particularly vulnerable to trafficking. According to the Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families, one in four LGBT youth is rejected by their families because of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Due to this rejection, many LGBT youth find themselves homeless and living on the streets. Once on the street, these youth are targeted for exploitation and trafficking.

Because homelessness can often lead to trafficking, inclusion of protections for runaway and homeless youth will result in a more effective Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs provide critical funding for support systems that serve youth who become homeless. The programs funded by the act—including emergency shelters, street outreach, transitional living and assistance for homeless youth in rural areas—can serve as critical, final safety nets for youth who would otherwise become victims of trafficking.

According to the American Bar Association, for LGBT people who are trafficked the societal stigma around their sexual orientation or gender identity is an additional factor that prevents them from accessing help or reporting abuse. This amendment provides important protections against discrimination for LGBT youth by prohibiting any program funded by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act from discriminating on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, or disability.

We greatly appreciate your commitment to improving the lives of young people across America, including those who are LGBT. Thank you for your leadership on this critical issue.

Sincerely,

DAVID STACY,  
Government Affairs Director,  
Human Rights Campaign.

Planned Parenthood Action Fund  
For Immediate Release: Tuesday, March 10,  
2015

Contact: Planned Parenthood Action Fund  
media office: 212-261-4433

PLANNED PARENTHOOD CONDEMNS EFFORT TO  
INSERT EXTREME ANTI-ABORTION AGENDA  
INTO BILL ON HUMAN TRAFFICKING

WASHINGTON DC.—Planned Parenthood Action Fund condemned efforts by Senator John Cornyn (R-TX) to advance an extreme abortion restriction as part of important bi-partisan efforts to establish greater protections for victims of human trafficking. Following is a statement by Cecile Richards, President, Planned Parenthood Action Fund: "It's outrageous that some politicians are using a bill to protect victims of sex trafficking to push an extreme anti-abortion, anti-immigrant agenda. This is politics at its worst. A bill that was supposed to help women is instead being used to hurt women. "The Senate should protect victims of human trafficking but should not do so at

the expense of women's access to safe and legal abortion. The majority of human trafficking victims are women and girls, and they need access to the full range of reproductive health care services without barriers."

LEGAL MOMENTUM,

Washington, DC, March 12, 2015.

NEW YORK, NY.—Today, Legal Momentum, the Women's Legal Defense and Education Fund, urged that a provision harmful to women's health be removed from a human trafficking bill being considered by the Senate, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (S. 178).

"The intent of this bill—to support survivors of trafficking—will be subverted if the provision is left intact. Human trafficking survivors—survivors of the worst kind of exploitation, which our government has called 'modern slavery'—who were raped and became pregnant should have access to the full spectrum of health services, including abortion," said Legal Momentum's President and CEO, Carol Robles-Román.

Legal Momentum fully supports the aims of the bill minus the troubling provisions. The bill would enhance services for runaway and homeless victims of youth trafficking, improve the response to victims of child sex trafficking, and establish an interagency task force to monitor and combat trafficking. Harmful provisions that deny health care to victims, restrict women's health options, are harmful to immigrants, or fail to adequately protect the LGBT community, should be removed so that the bill can help victims of one of the most heinous crimes, human trafficking, which has been condemned by the whole world. We urge all senators to vote for the Leahy Comprehensive Substitute Amendment, which adheres to the bi-partisan compromises made when the JVTFA was reported out of the Judiciary Committee.

GIVE WAY TO FREEDOM,

Essex Junction, VT, March 11, 2015.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,  
Russell Senate Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY, Thank you for your ongoing leadership in the fight to protect victims of human trafficking and ensure that they receive full support and services to which they are entitled under federal law. Give Way to Freedom is a private operating Foundation based in Vermont that works with victims of trafficking throughout New England and southeast New York. Through this work we see first-hand the complex needs of victims of trafficking.

As Vermont and New England continue to build our response to this heinous crime it is vital that victims remain the core focus of all efforts. We applaud your dedication to this principal, and support your efforts to ensure that victims of trafficking receive the full range of support and services they need to recover and rebuild their lives.

Sincerely,

EDITH KLIMOSKI,  
Director.

CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS,  
Washington, DC, March 12, 2015.  
Ranking Member PATRICK LEAHY,  
Senate Judiciary Committee, Russell Senate  
Building, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR RANKING MEMBER LEAHY, I write today to thank you for your leadership in helping victims of trafficking and resolving

the unacceptable situation with the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act (S. 178). The Center for American Progress extends our deep support for your Comprehensive Substitute Amendment that removes abortion restrictions for the funds to help victims of trafficking and retains nondiscrimination provisions in the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

Thank you again for your leadership in moving these important pieces of legislation forward without harmful restrictions.

Sincerely,

DONNA BARRY,  
*Director of Women's Health and  
Rights Program.*

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor, and I thank the Senator from Mississippi for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Vermont is quite welcome, and I am glad we were able to accommodate each other.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss the gravity of the current situation with regard to the administration's negotiations with Iran for a nuclear agreement.

I believe it is important to note that we received some important information today in the Senate Armed Services Committee that is helpful to us in this regard.

This morning the Armed Services Committee heard from ADM Bill Gortney. He gave us his assessment of Iran's capabilities and ongoing efforts to thwart international agencies. Admiral Gortney is the commander of the U.S. Northern Command. He is personally responsible for defending Americans in the United States mainland. He is an appointee of President Obama, and here are the words given to us today by Admiral Gortney: Iran has "committed considerable resources to enhancing its ballistic missile capabilities and has already placed another satellite into orbit this year using a new booster that could serve as a demonstrator for ICBM, intercontinental ballistic technologies. Despite international condemnation and sanctions, Iran has failed to cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency to resolve all outstanding concerns regarding its nuclear program, particularly those concerning its possible military dimensions."

These are the words from the head of the Northern Command in this administration, and this regime, which Admiral Gortney described, is the very regime our President and Secretary of State have confidence will live up to any nuclear agreement.

As the Admiral went on to say, the hope for a diplomatic solution should not come without vigilance, and that is what Members on this side of the aisle are trying to insist upon. We cannot ig-

nore these warning signs of noncompliance and uncooperative behavior while expecting Iran to make good on its promises.

A few days ago Prime Minister Netanyahu stressed Iran's record of misconduct and sinister objectives in his powerful address to Congress. He emphasized that a nuclear Iran would have serious implications for the world, the region, and of course for Israel, one of our most steadfast allies. These concerns are important for lawmakers, and I am glad we had a chance to hear them in person.

With a record of foreign policy failures, I regret to say President Obama is under intense scrutiny to hold Iran accountable at this critical moment. He is under intense scrutiny because of these foreign policy failures. Like many of my colleagues, I am concerned and I think Americans are concerned that the administration might be too generous with concessions to Iran, as it has been with deals in the past.

The time is running out for the President to establish his legacy—a dangerous motivation for negotiations with the unreliable and volatile nation Admiral Gortney described today.

At the very least, the Senate should insist on the passage of a partisan bill to ensure that the American people have a say in any agreement between the White House and Iran. Congressional approval would add legitimacy to any agreement, and I think that is important. Any foreign nation negotiating with the United States should be mindful of our constitutional system of checks and balances. Congress should also be discussing the appropriate steps to take if an agreement is not reached by the deadline this month.

The President is now threatening to veto legislation that puts tougher sanctions on Iran. But shouldn't there be consequences for Iran if they refuse to cooperate with international investigators? Mistakes are too high to make excuses for stalled negotiations or to rely on wishful thinking about Iran's intentions.

As Mr. Netanyahu said in his speech, "If Iran wants to be treated like a normal country, let it act like a normal country."

Instead Iran continues to support terrorist groups and oppressive authoritarian regimes. We cannot afford to ignore its influence in unstable areas and how this influence could dramatically change should they be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon.

Prime Minister Netanyahu's speech is a reminder that Iran has made no excuses for its belligerent aims and ties to terrorist groups. A bad deal would spell disaster for Israel, whose very existence has been threatened by Iranian leaders.

Israel and the United States share an unwavering commitment to keeping Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

It is unfortunate that criticism from the Obama administration surrounded the Prime Minister's earlier visit.

Meanwhile, the world is not safer. Global threats continue to multiply, posing complex challenges to America's national security issues. One looks at the unrest around the world, and it is easy to see how America is failing to lead.

Another member of this administration, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper, underscored the widespread instability when he testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee last month. It is important to compare Director Clapper's testimony with that of the Secretary of State earlier. Director Clapper, our Director of National Intelligence, said there were more deaths from state-sponsored mass killings, more people displaced from their homes, and a higher rate of political instability last year than we have seen in decades. In fact, 2014 was the most lethal year on record for terrorism. We are now facing unpredictable instability as the "new normal," according to this administration's Director of National Intelligence.

The White House's foreign policy team, however, seems unwilling to accept these harsh truths. Listen to the words of Secretary of State John Kerry, our chief negotiator with Iran, in contrast to the words of our Director of National Intelligence. Senator Kerry said:

We are actually living in a period of less daily threat to Americans and to people in the world than normally; less deaths, less violent deaths today, than through the last century.

It is hard to square the testimony of our chief negotiator with Iran with the words of our Director of National Intelligence.

Particularly troubling is the administration's past reliance on empty promises from adversaries. Under President Obama's watch, Vladimir Putin has invaded and annexed part of Ukraine, continued to support the brutal regime of Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad, and violated the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

On February 27, we saw yet another troubling development in Moscow. Opposition leader Boris Nemtsov was gunned down in cold blood on the street after dinner in a secure, well-protected part of Moscow, just steps away from the Kremlin. The Russian Government has denounced Mr. Nemtsov's assassination, but this is not the first time one of President Putin's opponents or critics has been murdered. I will only note that Mr. Nemtsov is only the latest in a line of Putin critics who have mysteriously met their demise over time, and Russia's record of corruption and shameful disregard for human rights continues.

In conclusion, U.S. leadership is of the utmost importance to global security and stability at this pivotal time.



Director Clapper was frank in his testimony that “pervasive uncertainty makes it all the harder to predict the future.” That is why we must remain vigilant. America can succeed if we demonstrate the fortitude and resolve necessary to defend freedom and stop those who threaten it. This includes taking an honest look at Iran’s past and present behavior before we cut a deal we will later regret.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in morning business and to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to make reference to the famous letter by Senator COTTON to the Iranians conveying to them the realities of the U.S. Constitution and the situation as it will prevail, hopefully, and that is that the Congress of the United States must ratify any agreement between the United States and Iran. Anybody who says we shouldn’t ignore history and ignores the impact of this treaty.

I signed that letter, and I believe it is a direct result of the President’s statement that he would veto any role the U.S. Congress should play in the ratification or nonratification of a pending agreement. That is what triggered the letter from Senator COTTON, and that is why I stand by it.

Seventy-one percent of Americans believe negotiation with Tehran will not make a difference in preventing Iran from producing nuclear weapons, and 71 percent of the American people are right.

Now I wish to speak with my friend from South Carolina about the situation in Iraq today—specifically, the role Iran is playing and, even more specifically, the combat that is taking place around the city of Tikrit.

Tikrit is the hometown of Saddam Hussein. Tikrit is a Sunni stronghold. Tikrit is now under attack—the ISIS people who are occupying it—by Shia militia, including, specifically, the Badr brigades, and they are led and trained by Iranians. An individual named Soleimani, who is the head of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, is now the most visible leader. Soleimani is the same guy who sent copper-tipped IEDs into Iraq which killed hundreds of American soldiers and marines. We now are somehow accommodating the individual who is responsible for the deaths of brave young Americans. That is not only unbelievable, it is totally unacceptable.

The question is, When these Shia militias get into Tikrit, how are they

going to behave? There are well-documented human rights abuses by these Shia militias. Again, these are the same Badr brigades that we fought against in the Battle of Sadr City during the surge. And now the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of staff said in January: “As long as the Iraqi government remains committed to inclusivity of all the various groups inside the country, then I think Iranian influence will be positive.” I am not making that up.

There is an AP story today that I wish to quote from entitled “Little progress in key plank of Obama anti-IS struggle.”

Instead of reaching out for Sunnis, the Iraqi government has bolstered its already close ties to Iran and to Iranian-backed Shiite militias that have been credibly accused of massacring Sunnis, U.S. officials acknowledge. The Iraqi military’s reliance on Shiite militias this week to retake Tikrit, a Sunni stronghold, has complicated the prospects of political reconciliation, experts say.

Human Rights Watch said in a March 4 report that it has documented “numerous” atrocities against Sunni civilians by the Shiite militias . . .

“They see it as a Persian invasion of the Sunni heartland,” said John Maguire, a former CIA case officer with long Middle East experience who travels frequently to Iraq.

I am interested in the reaction of my friend from South Carolina to this:

After meeting with Abadi, Dempsey—

That is our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

told reporters he was given firm assurances that the Shiite-led government is committed to reconciling with the Sunnis. Asked in an interview whether he considered those assurances credible Dempsey said, “They seemed credible today.”

Dempsey noted that during his helicopter flight over Baghdad, he saw worrisome signs of Iranian influence. He spotted a “plethora of flags” at checkpoints and elsewhere in the capital, “only one of which happens to be the Iraqi flag,” he said, alluding to the banners of Iranian-backed Shiite militias.

Can we get real, I ask my friend from South Carolina, as to what is taking place?

The Iranians are now in Sana’a, they are in Baghdad, they are in Beirut, they are in Damascus, and they are on the move. Meanwhile, this administration, this President, and this Secretary of State pursue the mirage of a nuclear agreement that will somehow change the entire equation.

I would also be interested in the views of the Senator from South Carolina of what the Saudis are doing, which is accommodating in their own way and possibly making plans to acquire their own nuclear weapons along with other nations in the Middle East.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, just to sum it up, our foreign policy is in a free-for-all. It is incompetent at its core.

No one can feel good about Shia-led groups going into Tikrit with Iranian command and control. If we know any-

thing about Iraq, the hope for Iraq is for the Sunnis, the Shias, and the Kurds to accommodate each other’s interests and to work together. So when we see a Shia-led effort against, as the Senator from Arizona said, the Sunni stronghold, with an Iranian commander on the ground who was responsible for killing Americans, and we think that is a good day for us, that is nuts. That is a bad day for America.

Let’s talk a little bit about the Iranian nuclear negotiations. I did not sign Senator COTTON’s letter until the President threatened to veto congressional legislation to make sure that we would have a say about relieving the sanctions we created. When President Obama told the Congress—a bipartisan group was being formed to make sure that Congress would have a say about relieving the sanctions that were created—that “I will veto your efforts to have a say,” then all bets were off at that point for me.

So I want the Iranians to know, in case they are listening, the Obama administration, the P5+1, the U.N., cannot relieve congressional sanctions without our approval. I don’t know what kind of system they have in Iran; I am pretty well sure it is not Democratic.

To President Obama: When you indicated that the letter that was written—the open letter to the Ayatollahs about Congress’s insistence that we have a say about sanctions we are creating—you said: You have empowered the hard-liners.

All I can say is that if the President of the United States believes there is a hard line and moderate split in Iran, I want to look at the deal now more than ever. Please name the moderate elements who are in the Government in Iran. And if these people are moderate, God forbid the hard-liners ever get in charge. The idea that there is a split is ridiculous. The President of Iran, the Foreign Minister of Iran are playing the oldest game in the Mideast. The moderates were gunned down in 2009. I can show my colleagues a moderate who was a young lady who was killed in the streets. Every moderate voice was crushed by force of arms, and our President in 2009 sat on the sidelines because he didn’t want to disrupt his chance to reach an agreement with the Ayatollahs.

Mr. President: You scare me when you say you believe there is a moderate element in charge of Iran. Look what they are doing as you negotiate regarding their nuclear ambitions. They have taken down a pro-American government in Yemen that allowed us a platform to watch and attack Al Qaeda in the Arabian peninsula, the terrorist organization responsible for the terrorist attack. The Houthis, an Iranian-backed group within Yemen, was able to take down the government that we were working with in providing us counterterrorism platforms. The Iranians are



supporting Assad, who has killed 220,000 of his own people, and the instability from Assad's brutality is putting the King of Jordan and everyone else at risk. Over 1 million Syrians have left Syria to go to Lebanon and Jordan. That is not a moderate regime. Moderate regimes do not support insurgencies that, through the force of arm, take down elected governments. Hezbollah is not a moderate voice in Lebanon. They are supported by the Iranians. They have had a record of attacking Israel and killing us for decades. So Iran's support of Hezbollah, of the Houthis, and of Assad—that is not what moderate people do. Now, in Iraq itself, the Shia militia who are roaming around Iraq are committing war crimes as I speak.

So you are completely disconnected from the behavior of the people you are negotiating with, and you don't understand the Iranians at all. You are dangerously in denial or delusional about the threats we face and whom we are dealing with.

So I am glad we wrote the letter to bring some certainty to the process. If the President of the United States negotiates a deal with Iran and that deal includes lifting the congressional sanctions and he does it without our input, he will change a balance of power that has existed for hundreds of years in this country.

We created congressional sanctions by a 100-0 vote over your objection. We are not going to let you tell us we have no voice in lifting the sanctions we created. We are not going to let the United Nations lift sanctions we created.

The Iranians need to understand the following: If there is a deal between the P5+1 and they are telling you congressional sanctions will be lifted by signing the deal, that is not accurate. They won't be lifted unless we agree. I would vote to lift sanctions if I thought we had a good deal. I would vote against a bad deal because a bad deal will start a new arms race in the Middle East.

I will sum this up. I have never been more worried than I am today with what is happening in the Middle East. You have people in our military celebrate Iranian ground activity in Iraq that will expand sectarian conflict. When the Iranians are marching on Tikrit, that is not a sign that Iraq is coming together. To anybody on the American side who believes that is a good idea, what movie have been you been watching?

To the President of the United States: We are going to insist to have a say about sanctions we created before you can negotiate their relief. I am sorry you may not like that. You may find this inconvenient, but we have a say, too.

The bill we are talking about only deals with the sanctions we created. So I hope my Democratic colleagues who

are so disappointed will understand why we, at least on this side, are pretty offended at the idea that the President can negotiate away sanctions we created without an input. You should be equally worried. The Israelis and the Arabs have told us one thing: Iran is the most destabilizing force in the Middle East. This President and this administration negotiate a nuclear deal without saying a word about the havoc Iran is creating on the ground.

If I were President, I would tell the Iranians we are not going to talk to you anymore about your nuclear ambitions until you stop destabilizing the region and invading your neighbors. We are not going to talk to you about your nuclear ambitions until you stop building ICBMs that can threaten us, until you stop sponsoring terrorist organizations. But not only has the President remained silent about Iran's wreaking havoc throughout the region, he is negotiating a deal—at least from what I have been able to find out about it—that is a North Korea in the making, and he wants us to be silent.

To my Democratic colleagues and the President, we are not going to be silenced. We are going have a say. We are going to have a vote. I hope in a bipartisan fashion, we will vote a good deal in and a bad deal down. Under the construct, you have to get 60 votes to disapprove the deal, so Republicans alone cannot kill it.

If it is a good deal, we will know it. It will be a deal that gives the Iranians what they say they want, a peaceful nuclear power program. A bad deal is a deal that will allow them to have a nuclear weapon one day. The only thing between a nuclear weapon, us, and Israel is the United Nations. Forget that. That is what we had in North Korea.

Mr. McCAIN. Could I ask my friend if he recalls the recent testimony by Henry Kissinger, probably the most highly regarded individual in America today? He voiced his concern. His fundamental problem was that, as he put it, we have gone from negotiations to rid Iran from ever having the capability of developing nuclear weapons to delaying it. So that on its face—and again, I want to remind my friend from South Carolina that he and I and our beloved friend, former Member of this body, Joe Lieberman, made visit after visit to Baghdad and to Iraq. We probably were everywhere in that country on many occasions. And how well we remember the fight the surge brought on to bring stability to Iraq. It did bring stability. You remember the battle of Sadr City. Who was it that our forces, our young men and women, were fighting against, the Badr Brigades? Guess who is fighting in Tikrit today. The Badr Brigades.

The Senator and I have been to Walter Reed and many other places like that and have seen our wounded.

Wounded by what? By IEDs, the copper-tipped IEDs that Soleimani made sure came into Iraq, that would penetrate armor and wreak havoc and wounded so many and killed so many young Americans.

It is now Soleimani who is visibly leading the fight in Tikrit. Strangely enough, our Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff saw so many flags—guess what—with the banners of the Iranian-backed Shia militias.

I would ask my friend, isn't this in some ways a Greek tragedy? Isn't this in some ways a situation where we sacrifice so much? And thanks to the inspired, fantastic leadership of General Petraeus and Colonel McFarland and all of those individuals who fought so well and led so well, we had it won, it was stabilized. And now because of the President's decision not to leave a residual force, we are seeing capitals in the Middle East—whether it be Sana'a, Baghdad, Beirut, or Damascus—we are now seeing an overwhelming Iranian presence that is dedicated, among other things, to the extinction of the State of Israel.

Mr. GRAHAM. All I can say is to the soldiers and to the military personnel who participated in the Iraq fight, you did your job. President Bush made mistakes. To his credit, he adjusted. He made a lot of mistakes upfront, but he did adjust because the surge did work.

President Obama was dealt a pretty good hand when it came to Iraq. Things were better on the security front. Economic and political progress was well noted. His decision not to leave a residual force behind has come back to haunt us, Iraq, and the entire region. It was his decision. We tried to blame the Iraqis. That is just rewriting the history. When he decided to turn down the entire recommendation of his national security team—the national security team's entire recommendation—about doing a no-fly zone and helping the Free Syrian Army 3 years ago, everything Senator McCAIN said about that decision has come true. Radical Islamists filled in that vacuum.

What you see in the Middle East is as a result of bad policy choices, but what you see today is the beginning of the worst decision, which would be a bad deal with Iran in dealing Congress out.

To the American people, here is one thing I promise you. We and the Congress in a bipartisan fashion will make sure that any deal, if there is one, negotiating with the Iranians, will come to this body to be openly debated so you will know what is in it, and every Member of this Senate is going to take a vote as to whether it is good enough to lift congressional sanctions that we created.

I promise we are not going to allow the most historic decision any President will make any time soon to go without checks and balances. It will come to this body. We will have a vote.

I promise you this: If this administration believes there is a hard-line moderate split between those who govern Iran, it should scare you because it scares me. Given what Senator McCain has described, do you really believe there is a moderate element in Iran?

I hope we can reach a diplomatic conclusion to the Iranian nuclear ambitions. They have been lying about their nuclear program for 20 years. I would like to see a good deal, but I will insist on voting on a deal that leads to congressional sanctions.

To the Germans, our friends in Germany, the Foreign Minister of Germany said the letter empowered the Iranians. With all due respect to our German allies, that is the most ridiculous statement I think I have ever heard. Requiring a deal between the Iranians and involving congressional sanctions to come back to the Congress should not embolden anybody. I don't know if the deal you are negotiating goes to the Parliament—the Bundestag in Germany—but we do things a certain way. The efforts of the French and the Germans to discipline Putin, how well has that turned out? We have a group of nations trying to deal with the most thuggish regime in the world acting like the Keystone Kops, in my view.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I remind the Senator that it is the same German Foreign Minister who criticized us and sat by and watched the dismemberment of a European nation for the first time in 70 years; the same Foreign Minister who keeps threatening Vladimir Putin if he keeps this up, and Vladimir Putin continues his aggression and will continue his aggression as well.

I can't give up the floor without mentioning, again, my sorrow at the passage of and murder of my friend, Boris Nemstov. The recent arrests by Vladimir Putin's crack law enforcement team is reminiscent—they rounded up some Chechens—of everybody's favorite film “Casablanca” where at the end, Claude Raine says, “Round up the usual suspects.” We have seen a scene from that movie again as the Russians have rounded up the usual suspects. Under this regime in Russia, we will never know who the murderers are of Boris Nemstov; and that, my friends, is a tragedy.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, today I rise to support the Justice for Traf-

ficking Victims Act, and I want to commend the numerous Senators—CORNYN, KLOBUCHAR, and so many others—who have worked so hard to move this act forward.

I realize there are many of us who are new to this body, and I certainly am still learning my way around the procedural maze here. However, it is easy to see how frustrating this maze can be and how it keeps us from getting good things done for the people who elected us and sent us here.

Last year I traveled my State, Alaska, and one of the top concerns I heard from Alaskans is that they were tired of the gridlock, and they want to see a functioning government and an open process in the Senate. So here we are on a bill that is of immense importance to the country and to Alaska—a bill that has very broad bipartisan support. It comes to the floor with a promise of an open amendment process so all Senators can be heard. Yet, a few of my friends on the other side of the aisle are preventing us from moving forward on a bill that will protect some of the Nation's most vulnerable citizens. Evidently a provision in the bill that has been the law of the land for decades has now become an excuse among some not to move the bill forward.

That is a shame for the country, and particularly for the victims who have been snared in the heinous world of human trafficking. As a former attorney general of the great State of Alaska, I have seen the horrible pain and suffering that human trafficking and cases of domestic violence and sexual assault can cause among our fellow citizens. I hail from a great State. We are proud Alaskans, proud of many things that are wonderful about our State. But like most States, we have problems. We have some of the highest rates of sexual abuse and exploitation in the country. Human trafficking is a big problem in my State, just as it is throughout the rest of the country. Since the human trafficking bill was placed on the calendar, I have been working closely with all of my colleagues, not only on this bill but on an amendment that I plan on offering with many others, the Mann Act cooperation amendment. This is an amendment that would be a rare thing in Washington today, a truly win-win amendment for the Federal Government, State governments, and most importantly, for victims of human trafficking.

Now, human trafficking is a problem that, unfortunately, comes in many forms and in many States—all States, in fact—in all corners of our Nation. In order to best combat human trafficking, we must work toward a seamless Federal and State partnership in order to stop this growing problem.

To that end, I have been proud to have worked with many Senators on both sides of the aisle—Senators

HEITKAMP, GILLIBRAND, AYOTTE, and MURKOWSKI—on a simple yet straightforward amendment that incentivizes State and Federal cooperation on this important issue.

The Mann Act cooperation amendment will free Federal resources by allowing State attorneys general and local DAs to prosecute human trafficking cases that would otherwise be assigned to Federal Government prosecutors; or if Federal Government prosecutors do not have the resources to take on such cases, oftentimes they are not going to be pursued.

At the same time, this amendment preserves the Federal prosecutor's ability to exercise prosecutorial options while, importantly, increasing transparency about decisions made on human trafficking cases.

In human trafficking cases, it is often local investigators and local prosecutors who have the most information on these cases. As Alaska's attorney general, I saw this firsthand. We usually had great cooperation with our partners in the Federal Government.

But when the Feds can't take on human trafficking cases due to limited resources, they should be encouraged to allow State officials to take on such cases. That is the key goal of this amendment—to enable the resources and cooperation between State and Federal prosecutors to ensure that all cases of human trafficking are pursued, victims have justice, and perpetrators pay penalties. That is what this amendment will do. That is why I believe it is such a win-win approach to State and Federal prosecutions with regard to human trafficking.

This amendment also provides oversight and transparency by assuring there must also be communication between the States and the Federal Government when making human trafficking prosecution decisions.

However, as to the broader human trafficking bill that so many Members of this body have been working on—so many on both sides of the aisle—if that bill dies on the Senate floor, so will the numerous amendments that would also advance justice for the victims of human trafficking, including the Mann Act cooperation amendment. This is just one of many amendments on this important topic. We should not allow this to happen.

We need to get to work for the victims of human trafficking, who are looking for the Senate's leadership to help stamp out this scourge of human trafficking, which is affecting our country in so many different areas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST  
FUND

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak again on the impending exhaustion of reserves in the disability insurance program or the disability insurance trust fund.

As we know, disability insurance, or DI, is an important program administered by Social Security Administration, or SSA. The impending exhaustion of the DI trust fund threatens disabled American workers with benefit cuts, under current law, toward the end of calendar year 2016.

Once again, I am committed to working with anyone to ensure that those cuts do not occur. Unfortunately, the administration and SSA have yet to show they are committed to addressing this problem.

As chair of the Senate Finance Committee, I will continue speaking on the floor about the imminent challenge that we face with the DI trust fund and about solutions.

I will continue to reach out to shareholders and to anyone who is interested in bipartisan discussions aimed at achieving solutions. And I will be acting to at least begin to chip away at the financial challenges facing the DI program, which I have been warning people about for years—that it is going to go broke unless we do something to improve them. I do believe we should act at least to begin to chip away at the financial challenges the DI program is facing, while examining ways we can help improve and modernize the Social Security system itself.

I once again call on my friends on the other side of the aisle and in the administration to join me in this effort.

I wish to take a moment to note that some recent proposals to reform Social Security that have been put forward by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle are, simply put, irresponsible. We have seen proposals recently to raise taxes in the Social Security Program, usually to increase net progressivity in an already progressive structure and then spend most of the revenue on benefit expansion without adequately considering the fact that even under their proposal we have gaping long-run holes in Social Security's finances. Raising taxes and increasing some benefits now, while still leaving an unsustainable financial structure in place, would be fundamentally unfair to younger generations of workers who will have to eventually pay even more taxes, suffer from benefit cuts or, more likely, both.

The so-called progressive reform plans that tax more and promise more benefits, even though the promises are unsustainable, are surely poll-tested with demographic groups who probably do not scoff at promises of more benefits and higher taxes on the so-called rich. Those plans may help in fundraising for numerous groups who try to

benefit from the politics of fear surrounding the Social Security system.

But those plans do nothing for younger generations of workers, aside from sending them a clear message that they are on their own.

Again, this is irresponsible.

More generally, some believe that we could solve all or most of the financial challenges facing the DI program and Social Security, in general, through higher taxes.

To investigate whether that is the case, I made several requests of the Congressional Budget Office regarding this strategy. Recent analysis performed in response to those requests shows how difficult this approach can be.

Most proposals to reform Social Security by raising payroll taxes would result in massive tax increases, particularly on the middle class—on middle-class Americans—which would negatively impact job growth and harm middle-income families. That is hardly what our economy needs.

For example, according to CBO, if you wanted to generate long-term balance between inflows and outflows for the DI program—using a DI payroll tax increase alone—you would have to increase the tax rate by 39 percent, which would hit low-, middle-, and upper-income earners alike, and it would hit hard.

If you wanted to generate long-term balance for Social Security, generally, including DI and retirement, and try to do it by eliminating the maximum on earnings subject to the payroll tax and resulting benefits, according to CBO, a worker earning \$150,000 a year would pay about 26 percent more in payroll taxes. A worker earning \$200,000 a year would pay about 68 percent more, and a worker earning \$250,000 a year would pay 109 percent more.

Now, it may be that raising taxes by 26 percent to more than 100 percent on those earners is something that my friends on the other side of the aisle are comfortable with—under the notion of taxing the so-called rich.

I would note, of course, that while a family headed by someone earning \$150,000 a year may be comfortable in many areas of the country, it appears that the ever-changing definition of rich is descending lower and lower into the middle class, as my friends on the other side have lectured more and more over recent years about inequality.

Even if you were to eliminate the taxable minimum entirely but still provide corresponding benefits to upper earners in accordance with current law, only around 45 percent of Social Security's long-run financial challenges would be addressed. You would still need to hike taxes more, cut benefits, or both, to fully address the program's long-term fiscal problems. Because upper earners will pay more taxes but also receive corresponding

benefits, since Social Security was designed to have such a correspondence, the policy of increasing the taxable maximum ends up giving higher replacement rates to upper earners.

That hardly seems to be a workable solution—since it doesn't solve the financial problem, and it doesn't solve the inequality problem that is so bothersome to my friends on the other side.

Perhaps just for the sake of argument, we should consider eliminating the taxable minimum, thereby raising taxes substantially on upper earners, and not giving them any corresponding benefits for those increased tax payments.

Of course, such a policy is bothersome to some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, since it breaks the connection in Social Security between what people put in and what they get out.

Some would say that this would convert Social Security into another welfare program focused on redistribution and away from a program focused more on self-financed retirement security and protection against income losses from disability. So, instead, maybe we should consider eliminating the taxable maximum and give some small benefit return in exchange.

Well, in such a case, according to CBO, you would still not be able to solve the financial challenges facing Social Security. Using scheduled benefits and replacement rates “would increase noticeably only for people in the highest quintile of lifetime household earnings.” I don't think that result would be desirable to the tax-the-rich coalition.

Let me continue by noting some recent remarks on the Senate floor from the junior Senator from Vermont and the ranking member of the Budget Committee, who promises to put forward what he suggests is a courageous way to confront Social Security's financial challenges.

Of course, he has not put forward any legislation or plan in this Congress. So if we want to talk specifics, we have to look at his previous plan, which he released in the 113th Congress.

Under that plan, the current taxable maximum is preserved, as are current payroll tax rates. The new twist is that his plan imposes current payroll tax rates on earnings above \$250,000 a year, which, evidently, is where the distinction between the so-called rich and everyone else lies, in their opinion.

That \$250,000 threshold is not—let me repeat—is not indexed to inflation. Earnings subject to the tax above \$250,000 a year would not be included in earnings used to compute benefits, which is to say that under this plan a worker would pay Social Security taxes on earnings above \$250,000 a year, with no corresponding increase in Social Security benefits.

Again, this would move the system away from a self-financed insurance

program toward what some would call welfare and redistribution. Since the new \$250,000 threshold is not indexed, eventually more and more earnings will become subject to increased Social Security taxes without getting anything in terms of benefits and return.

In around 20 years, middle-class earners who today have just surpassed the taxable maximum will be pushed into the earnings category where they lose the connection between Social Security taxes and corresponding benefits.

At that time, an indexed income equivalent of what is around \$120,000 a year today will be deemed to be rich, with earnings above that amount worthy of being taxed more for Social Security but not worthy of receiving any additional Social Security benefits.

So what does the Senator's scheme that, once again, was put forward in the last Congress, accomplish? Admittedly, it does extend the solvency of Social Security by around 28 years or so, but it still does not make the system financially sustainable in the long run, leaving an assured financial shortfall and attendant need for yet more taxes or benefits cuts, and leaving it to younger generations or workers to figure it out. More than likely it will, in many respects, sever the connection between what people pay in to Social Security and what they can expect to get out of this program in terms of benefits. Once again, this represents a fundamental shift in Social Security policy, one that some may support but few are now willing to openly defend.

I look forward to debating, discussing, and voting on any plan that any of my friends on the other side of the aisle put forward to tackle Social Security's financial challenges, including any new plan the junior Senator from Vermont wants to put forward, particularly if it resembles the plan he introduced last Congress. Indeed, I would be anxious to see how many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to go on record in support of yet more tax increases and a fundamental shift in the nature of the Social Security Program.

In the meantime, we still have the pending depletion of reserves in the DI trust fund, which is something we will have to address before the end of calendar year 2016.

From my perspective, the sooner we tackle this challenge the better, but it is hard to act when we have an administration that refuses to engage in discussion and seems to want to make this a partisan issue by putting forward a plan to reallocate payroll taxes from one trust fund to another without any further discussion or debate.

What I continue to hear from the administration and many of its allies in Congress are stale talking points, many of which are wrong or distorted, and a "take it or leave it" approach to deliberating over the reallocation

scheme devised unilaterally by this administration. The only thing this administration appears willing to discuss when it comes to Social Security is its own kick-the-can strategy coupled with additional administrative funds for the SSA, either funded with yet more Federal debt or by crowding out spending on other discretionary programs.

Meanwhile, I am comforted by many in the disability advocacy community who are at least willing to have conversations about how we can work to improve Social Security's programs while also paying attention to its financial challenges. There are several groups currently hard at work analyzing options and having debate and discussion about what we could look at for program improvements and fiscal responsibility.

There is certainly more we can do to improve the DI system and help make it work better for beneficiaries. There is certainly more we can do to improve Social Security's retirement side to help make it work better for modern family situations. There is certainly more we can do on the program integrity side, including some of the President's proposals and more. There is certainly more we can do to protect against frivolous decisionmaking by administrative law judges in the DI program—and there is plenty of that which is costing us arms and legs. There is certainly more we can do to reduce fraud in the DI program, which literally robs resources from those truly in need.

Sadly, the Obama administration's approach to DI and Social Security in general has thus far been largely to remain silent, even in the face of the impending DI trust fund exhaustion. The only major structural change the administration briefly considered was adoption of the chained CPI in governmentwide price indexation coupled with benefit enhancements for vulnerable populations. However, the President has since withdrawn even that modest proposal and has publicly stated he would not even discuss the idea unless he was assured of getting yet another tax hike for the general fund to go along with it.

As I have said before, it is premature to kick the can down the road again by agreeing on some payroll tax reallocation between the two trust funds in Social Security as a temporary patch of convenience and a patch that was unilaterally constructed by this administration.

Yes, there have been reallocations among many trust funds in the past, under many varying circumstances, and, yes, many of them have had bipartisan support, but we have known about this coming shortfall for roughly 20 years. In other words, Congress has had roughly 20 years to come up with solutions to help put the DI program

and perhaps Social Security in general on a path to long-term financial sustainability, and Congress has failed.

We are now being asked by the current administration to double down on that failed approach—to do another reallocation of push the problem further down the road and hope that in the interim Congress will not fail again.

President Obama, in other policy areas, has argued that if decades show a policy is not working, then "it's time for a new approach." Sadly, that sentiment does not seem to apply when he is talking about Social Security.

As I have said before, it seems we have two paths to choose from; one is the path I prefer, involving examination and discussion of what we can do to enhance the DI program and its finances and what we can agree upon; the other is to engage in divisive political rhetoric and demagogue the issue even further, which is irresponsible, in my view, and not what disabled American workers and all workers insured by the DI program should tolerate.

I repeat my previous call to my colleagues in the Senate: To anyone from either party who wishes to engage in a constructive dialogue about how to fix and improve the DI program and Social Security in general, my door is open. In the meantime, I plan to take whatever steps I can as the chairman of the committee of jurisdiction to help preserve these programs for beneficiaries in the near and long term.

We can't keep going down this way of always demanding more taxes and more spending to solve problems we could have solved a long time ago. We are going to have to get serious about this, and I intend to see that we do.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SPORTSMEN'S ACT

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak on the Sportmen's Act of 2015, and I will start out by acknowledging the great work by the chair of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska, who has been a great partner in quickly moving this legislation forward.

The Sportsmen's Act of 2015 is gaining new momentum and earning widespread bipartisan support from both sides of the aisle, from the east coast to the west coast and, frankly, everywhere in between. Improving access for hunters and anglers, restoring wildlife habitat, and protecting the way of life

that so many of us cherish are things we can all agree on because as Americans we all have a unique and deep connection to the outdoors.

The Sportmen's Act of 2015 includes a broad array of bipartisan measures to enhance opportunities for hunters, anglers, and outdoor recreation enthusiasts. It reauthorizes key conservation programs, improves access to our public lands, and helps boost the outdoor recreation economy. Hunting is a way of life for me and for many families across this great Nation.

Similar to many New Mexicans, my 11-year-old son and I went out hunting on public land last fall. The bull elk we brought home will feed our family for most of the coming year, but more importantly the experience of backpacking into the Sangre de Cristos and Carson National Forest, sleeping on the ground, and hearing the elk bugle all around us will feed my son's imagination for decades to come.

The Sportmen's Act will help ensure that American families can pass on these outdoor traditions year after year and for generations to come.

When I travel around New Mexico and talk with sportsmen and sportswomen, their No. 1 issue is access, and that is why I am so pleased that a provision I have been championing to unlock countless public lands is included in this package. Public lands, such as the Gila Wilderness, Valles Caldera National Preserve, and the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument are some of the most special places to hunt and fish left on the planet.

The HUNT Act directs all Federal public land management agencies to identify our shared lands where hunting and fishing and outdoor recreation are permitted but where access is non-existent or significantly restricted and develop plans to provide that access.

Additionally, a provision led by my colleague, Montana Senator JON TESTER, is also included in this bill to require a percentage of our annual Land and Water Conservation Funds to be made available to improve recreational access to difficult-to-reach public lands.

Among many other bipartisan, pragmatic efforts to enhance opportunities for hunters and anglers, the Sportmen's Act would reauthorize NAWCA, the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, and the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act.

It is clear these efforts increase and reaffirm our country's commitment to the conservation of fish and wildlife habitat, but they are just as important for the future of our economy across the West.

Nationally, according to the Outdoor Industry Association, more than 140 million Americans either make their living off the outdoors or make outdoor activity a priority in their daily lives.

When they do that, they end up spending \$646 billion on outdoor recreation, resulting in quality jobs for another 6.1 million Americans.

In my home State of New Mexico—a small State with just 2 million people—outdoor recreation generates more than \$6 billion a year. It provides 68,000 jobs and \$1.7 billion in wages and annual salaries.

A survey done recently by New Mexico Game and Fish found that sportsmen alone spend more than \$613 million per year in our State. This boost to our economy is felt by business owners, outfitter guides, hotels, restaurants, gas stations, and the entire local community—especially in our rural communities. The truth is our deep connection to the outdoors is part of the American experience and it is part of our heritage and culture in the West. It is something we learn from our mothers and fathers and pass down to our sons and our daughters.

The Sportmen's Act will help protect that heritage and ensure it continues for generations to come.

I thank the Presiding Officer for indulging me, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MS. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

MS. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, today I rise to speak about and honor our Nation's Vietnam veterans, particularly North Dakota's Vietnam veterans. Since I took office, I have made it a priority to travel throughout North Dakota to meet with my State's veterans, so many wonderful men and women who continue to serve not only their country but also our State and their communities. All these veterans deserve a place of honor in our society.

We are in the midst of the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam war. On May 25, 2012, President Obama issued this proclamation calling on the Nation to honor Vietnam veterans and to honor particularly those brave servicemembers who gave their lives in service to their country.

This special period of honoring our Vietnam veterans runs through 2025. Today I follow up on a commitment I made last year. I want to focus on North Dakota's soldiers who lost their lives in Vietnam. In this effort, I have partnered with students from Bismarck High School in researching these soldiers. I want to thank their instruc-

tors, Lori Forde, Sara Rinas, and Allison Wendel for coordinating this project and sharing their students' research with my office. I think this is a wonderful partnership to explain and to research a war that was long forgotten for many of these young students.

Throughout this effort I want to make sure our Nation never forgets the needs of our Vietnam veterans. I want to make sure our Nation continues further to honor them. I have a poster that we have created that will be placed in every one of our offices, both in Washington, DC, and in my various State offices. I am hopeful we will be able to distribute this poster throughout all of the veterans service organizations in North Dakota as we continue this period of remembrance.

In North Dakota, we take much pride in our history and devotion to service. When our Nation, our State, and our community are called, North Dakotans stand up—no matter what the cost. And 198 sons of North Dakota did not make it home from the Vietnam war; 198 sons of North Dakota gave their lives in service to the freedom of this country. These sons, brothers, and fathers have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Today, I want to honor them individually by talking about the lives of these individuals—some of these individual members. I intend throughout this Congress to come to the floor and remember each one of them individually and remember each one of their sacrifices.

DAVID ELSBERND

So today, I begin with David Elsbernd. He was born June 28, 1949, and he was from the community of Crosby. He served in the Army in the 196th Light Infantry Brigade. The date of his death was September 9, 1969. He was 20 years old. David had a sister and three brothers—one who also served. The brother who also served was injured in Vietnam. David's father remembers him as a kind, generous person who thought of everyone else first.

Fellow soldier Paul Hughes wrote the book "The Light Within," which includes an account of David's death. David's family is thankful to his fellow soldiers and friends for taking care of him.

ELROY BEIER

Elroy Beier was born February 26, 1947, and grew up in Langdon. He served in the Army in the 101st Airborne Division. His date of death was May 5, 1968. He was 21 years old. He had three brothers and one sister. His mother Violet was proud to be a Gold Star Mother and was a member of the VFW and the American Legion Auxiliary.

Elroy played basketball for Langdon Area High School. In Vietnam, Elroy was injured while firing at opposing forces to help his fellow soldiers return to safety. Despite his injury, Elroy refused to return to the United States.

After healing, he bravely stood his ground in a firefight to help his fellow soldiers but was fatally wounded.

Elroy's nephew, Marcus, was inspired by Elroy's bravery and sacrifice and, as a result, he joined the military.

JOHN LUNDIN

John Lundin was born February 3, 1932. His hometown was Sentinel Butte. He served in the Army, Advisory Team 91. The date of his death was April 25, 1970. He was 38 years old. John was the oldest of eight children.

While stationed in Germany, he met and married Charlotte. When he was killed in action, he left behind Charlotte and 3 children, ages 14, 9, and 4.

Before his deployment to Vietnam, the Army taught him the Vietnamese language. He was posthumously awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action and the Bronze Star for valor. John's family cherishes the letter the Army gave them describing John's heroism the day he died, when he sacrificed himself by drawing fire away from his fellow soldiers.

I want to give special thanks to Bismarck High School students Emily Schmid, Brittany Hawkinson, McKenzie Rittel, and Shelby Wittenberg for reaching out to John Lundin's family and learning this important information about John's life and his extraordinary service.

MARVIS BRISS

Marvis Briss was born November 6, 1948. He grew up in Binford. He served in the Army, 11th Battalion, 9th Infantry Division. He died May 28, 1969, at the age of 20.

Marvis grew up on a farm, and his siblings remember him as a wonderful brother. His family is honored that he was so brave. He earned the Air Medal for meritorious achievement, outstanding degree of professionalism, and devotion to duty, and the Army Commendation Medal for heroic actions in keeping with the highest traditions of military service.

Marvis was pictured in the 1969 LIFE magazine article about the 242 American soldiers killed in 7 days in the Vietnam war.

KENYON BEAN

Kenyon "Ken" Bean was born May 25, 1946. He grew up in Williston. He served in the Army, 35th Infantry, 25th Infantry Division. His date of death was May 19, 1967. He was 20 years old. Ken was the oldest of three. Ken's sister Cheryl and brother Lowell remember his wonderful sense of humor and his strong desire to farm.

He earned the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, and the National Defense Service Medal for heroism in his attempt to move his critically injured platoon leader to safety while under sniper fire.

His commanding officer cited Ken's courageous self-sacrifice and inspiring bravery as reflecting great credit upon himself and the U.S. Army.

PAUL WOLOS

Paul Wolos was born July 22, 1947. He is from Canada, but he enlisted in Fargo. He served in the Marine Corps, 1 Marine Expeditionary Force, 1st Marine Division. He died May 28, 1967. At the time of his death, he was 20 years old.

His uncle, a U.S. Marine, sponsored him so that as a Canadian he could enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps. Paul was proud to volunteer and to serve the United States as a marine so he could fight communism.

Paul signed a noncitizen waiver so he could serve in-country in Vietnam with his unit. One story that his friends recall is on a hunting trip Paul was so proud of his service as a U.S. Marine, that when he went home for Christmas after basic training, his friends joked that Paul didn't take his uniform off once.

DAVID BERDAHL

David Berdahl was born January 16, 1953. He grew up in Minot. He served in the Army, 101st Airborne Division. His date of death is stated to be January 20, 1972. He was 19 years old when he went missing.

David is the first son born of 13 children. His family remembers him as always helping others. During the Minot floods of 1969, the family moved to safety, but David stayed in town, sandbagging all night long.

At age 17, David expressed interest in joining the Army, but his mom asked him to wait. At 18, he joined on his own.

In Vietnam, he started as a helicopter mechanic. He offered to go on a helicopter rescue mission, but the helicopter was shot down, causing it to catch fire and costing David his life.

RICHARD "DICK" OLSON

Richard "Dick" Olson, born June 8, 1949, grew up in Grand Forks. He was in the Marine Corps, 1st Battalion, 4th Marines. His date of death was April 26, 1968. He went missing at age 18.

Richard was survived by his parents, two sisters, and a brother. He loved to sing and was in a band for some of his teenage years. His sister, Roberta, remembers his generosity and tells about how Dick once bought groceries for a friend in need and how once Dick literally gave the shirt off his back so his friend would have a nice shirt to wear the day he enlisted in the Marines. Dick entered the Marine Corps at age 17 and was killed in action 1 year later.

MERLIN LABER

Merlin Laber was born September 5, 1947, and grew up in Sykeston. He served in the Army, 198th Light Infantry Brigade. The date of his death was May 14, 1969. He was 21 years old.

He was the oldest of nine children; he had four brothers and four sisters. His father served in World War II. Two of his brothers also served in the military, one in Korea and Vietnam and

the other in the Middle East. Merlin loved cars, and he held the Sykeston record in track. He was also featured in the 1969 LIFE magazine article about the 242 American soldiers killed in 7 days in the Vietnam war.

THOMAS "TOM" BEYER

Tom Beyer was born March 10, 1941. He grew up in Fargo. He served in the Air Force, 20th Tactical Support Squadron. His date of death was July 30, 1968. He was 27 years old when he went missing.

He was survived by his wife Karen and his two children, Sandra and Steven. He was preceded in death by one son, John. The family remembers Thomas as a wonderful person. He graduated from NDSU and enjoyed his family, flying, playing the piano, hunting, and golf. After his death, he was promoted from captain to major. His remains were recovered and laid to rest in Fargo in 2010.

CHARLES WENDT

Charles Wendt was born February 24, 1947, and grew up in Dickinson. He served in the Army, 4th Infantry Division. His date of death was June 5, 1968, and he was 21 years old. His father, also named Charles Wendt, served in the Army.

Prior to joining the Army at age 20, Charles worked for Viegell Engineering, which is now KLJ, one of the most prominent engineering firms in the State of North Dakota.

DOUGLAS PIERCE

Douglas Pierce was born September 24, 1952. He was from Illinois, but he was living in Fargo when he enlisted. He served in the Army, 1st Cavalry Regiment. His date of death was November 26, 1971, and he was 19 years old.

His father worked as a VA hospital administrator in several cities, including Fargo. Two brothers, Vince and Mark, also died as a result of the Vietnam conflict. Doug was a straight-A student, an A-plus student who wanted to serve his country. He loved Appaloosa horses. His twin sister, Debby, fondly remembers the day when, as children, they attended a Hollywood parade and Doug ran into the street to pick up and keep the horseshoe that fell off of the foot of Roy Rogers' horse, Trigger.

DALE AMUNDSON

Dale Amundson was born July 11, 1948. He was from Finley and served in the Army, 1st Infantry Regiment. October 30, 1968, was his date of death at the age of 20.

One of his nephews is named after him. His nephew is named Dale. In high school, he was one of the charter members of the first FAA chapter in Finley. Private First Class Amundson died about 2 months after beginning his service in Vietnam.

WILLIAM BACKER

William Backer was born June 28, 1949. He was from Mandan. He served in

the Marine Corps, 2nd Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment. His date of death was January 12, 1968. He died at the age of 18.

William was a third-generation veteran. His grandfather served in the Army in World War I and was awarded the Silver Star. His father served in the Army in World War II. William had three brothers: Paul, Jim, and John. William's brothers remember him as a dedicated marine who gave his life for a cause in which he strongly believed. They cherish the memories and the stories they keep in their hearts today about their brother.

GILBERT "GIL" BARGMANN

Gil Bargmann was born July 26, 1950. He grew up in Hannover, served in the Army, 4th Battalion, 9th Infantry Regiment. He died on June 19, 1969, at the age of 18.

Gil had three brothers and two sisters. He grew up on a dairy farm in the Hannover area. One of his squad brothers credits Gil for saving his life by covering his flank the day Gil died.

Gil's niece, Briana, connected three men who served with Gil in Vietnam with Gil's family. Three of Gil's friends and two of their wives traveled to Hannover to meet Gil's mother and siblings.

I am struck as I go through these names and as I review all of the people, and I am struck, sitting by children who are maybe just 2 years younger than these brave men who served our country. I know it is impossible to predict what amazing things they would have done had they not sacrificed their lives. So it is so important that we recognize their heroism, that we recognize their sacrifice, and that we honor them during this period of recognition of the sacrifices of the Vietnam war.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ATF PROPOSAL ON M855 AMMUNITION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, in my home State of Kansas, we enjoy a special way of life. I have talked about it many times on the Senate floor. That special way of life includes a rich tradition of hunting, target shooting, and other law-abiding activities covered by our Second Amendment rights. Our State welcomes nearly 300,000 hunters each year, and in turn those individuals create jobs and economic opportunity for many Kansans.

I was disturbed to learn of a recent proposal by the Bureau of Alcohol, To-

bacco, Firearms and Explosives. On Friday, February 13, the ATF proposed—without any instruction from Congress, on its own volition—a framework to determine whether M855 ammunition, which is popular for hunting and target shooting, is primarily intended to be used for sporting or if it is more likely to be used in handguns by criminals. ATF indicated it wants to ban the ammunition, which has been used by law-abiding citizens, including Kansans, for decades because it is "armor piercing" and, therefore, poses a risk to the safety of law enforcement officials.

The fact is that almost all rifle ammunition is armor-piercing. The Law Enforcement Protection Act of 1986, which ATF cites as a statutory authority to ban this ammunition, specifically exempts armor-piercing ammunition "which the Attorney General finds is primarily intended to be used for sporting purposes." Congress's intent for providing this exemption was clear: Law-abiding citizens should not be deprived of their right to use this ammo for legitimate purposes, such as target shooting, hunting, and shooting competitions. In fact, Kansans, who expressed their concern to me about this issue in recent weeks, have consistently indicated that the proposed ban would directly interfere with their sporting uses and, more broadly, their Second Amendment rights.

Most troubling about the ATF proposal was how it intended to judge "likely use" of this ammunition. ATF planned to judge that M855 ammunition is more likely to be used in a handgun for criminal purposes rather than for sporting purposes simply based upon the bullet's weight and type of firearm in which it could be loaded. What was missing was any interest by ATF in the law-abiding ammunition consumers across the county. How might they use the ammunition? How could ATF determine primary intended use without conducting a study on how that ammunition actually would be used by the public?

The ATF framework failed to make any objective conclusions and would have served as nothing more than a tool for increased gun restrictions—and I would say increased gun restrictions that weren't passed by Congress.

Last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee chairman, Senator GRASSLEY, circulated a letter among my colleagues and to me directed at ATF Director B. Todd Jones outlining these and many other concerns related to the proposed framework to ban this ammunition. I join Senator GRASSLEY in signing this letter, and I am thankful it appears that our message was received because on Tuesday of this week the ATF announced that it will "formally delay" the implementation of the proposed ammunition ban. I thank the thousands—in fact, tens of thou-

sands of Americans who voiced their concerns both to Congress and to ATF. ATF received an incredible 80,000 public comments on the proposed framework.

Congress has never banned this ammunition and has never intended to ban it. In the future, the ATF should not propose to ban any widely used form of ammunition favored by law-abiding civilians for lawful purposes.

Again, I am thankful that the proposed framework has now been rescinded, and I will continue my efforts in the Senate to support the Second Amendment freedoms of all Americans. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate the good work of the Senator from Kansas. We have worked on, in the Banking Committee, a number of issues together, and I appreciate the work we have been able to do across party lines. So I thank the Senator for that.

#### TRADE TRANSPARENCY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am joined on the floor this evening by Senator CASEY. Just 2 weeks ago, he and I and a half dozen other Senators came to the floor in an unusual configuration. It is not something Senators do all that often. We came as a group, but each spoke individually about our concerns with trade promotion authority and the Trans-Pacific Partnership, both the so-called fast track and the trade agreement that is being negotiated among the United States, Canada, Mexico, some Pacific nations, and Peru, I believe, too, as well as nations in Asia.

The concerns we have and the concerns an increasing number of Senators have about trade promotion authority, about fast track—they changed the name because they knew the public did not like fast track, so they tried to obscure it by coming up with some technical-sounding name—trade promotion authority. We have increasingly seen the public rising up against these trade agreements because we have watched them for some 20 years, and we have seen the damage the North American Free Trade Agreement did to the United States, to our economy, and to workers around the world. We have seen that has been sort of a prototype for the next generation of CAFTA and other agreements in Colombia and Peru and now the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

I want to discuss this, in part, because we know so little about the U.S. Trade Representative's upcoming trade agenda and specifically the Trans-Pacific Partnership. The way we pass trade agreements, and it is important for colleagues to understand this, stands in a class by itself. No other legislation we do is as hidden not only



from public view but even those in this body whose constitutional duty it is to approve or reject them.

Senator CASEY and I stood here in the well of the Senate, we raised our right hands—Senator CASEY and I were honored to come in at the same time, as of January 2007 and then again in January 2013. We raised our right hands and took an oath understanding our constitutional duty to approve or reject trade agreements.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution entrusts in Congress the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations, but the current TPP language is being guarded as though it were a State secret. Members of this body were permitted to view the language only with U.S. Trade Representative staff there, not with their personal staff.

Nora Todd, in my office, who has great skills and expertise and has worked on trade issues for years, because she is not committee staff is not able to view this. The USTR refuses to put down in writing their policy for restricting access. So the access is restricted, but we can't even find out from the U.S. Trade Rep what this actually means, except we know access is restricted. It means few Senators and fewer of our staff—and damn the public who have worked on this issue—have ever seen the text at all.

Trade agreements such as this affect our entire economy. Forty percent of world GDP is included in this Trans-Pacific Partnership, with countries as big as Japan, the United States, and economies as big as Canada's and Mexico's. This will affect the entire economy and cause ripple effects for decades.

We know what CAFTA did, and that was only three countries—the United States, Canada, and Mexico. This is four times that many countries. They should be debated in a transparent process. The public should know, Senators and Members of Congress should know. We don't know enough. Yet the Finance Committee fairly soon is going to push this trade agreement out of fast track and the agreement out onto the Senate Floor, when we simply don't have access to information.

Let me give an example. Last year, the U.S. Trade Rep developed a proposal on something called the rules of origin for automobiles. That really matters in my State. It matters in Senator CASEY's State because they are such a major part of the steel and other supply chain items for autos. I have been trying to work with the USTR to better understand this proposal since last October. I personally spoke again last week with Ambassador Froman to understand it better.

Rules of origin are very important provisions in a trade agreement. They determine how much of a product's components need to come from TPP

countries in order to qualify under the agreement. What that means is we know as American consumers it is hard to find a suit, it is hard to find much of anything made in the U.S.A., but we also know many American consumers would like to buy products that are 40 or 50 or 80 percent from the United States—made by workers in Kansas or workers in Pennsylvania or workers in Ohio. But we aren't able to tell under the rules of origin what that number is and where those components come from.

So if there is going to be a trade advantage to Japan—and they have had plenty of trade advantages when it comes to autos—we don't know if those automobile components come 70 or 80 percent from Japan and maybe 20 percent from China or 60 percent from China. We don't know that because the U.S. Trade Rep will not tell us. So what we are concerned about—and China is not in TPP—is that the People's Republic of China will manufacture so much of the supply chain, so many of these components, backdoor it into China, so people in China are hired instead of people in the United States or the people in these countries we are trading with.

These provisions are critical for the auto supply chain in our country because they are already facing fierce competition with China. We need to make sure we have strong rules of origin so cars are made and assembled in TPP countries, not China. The auto supply chain employs 120,000 people in Ohio. It will be affected by the auto rules of origin in TPP.

To understand how important that is, our country, from 2000 to 2010, the end of the Clinton administration until 2 years into the Obama administration—mostly the 8 Bush years—we lost 5 million manufacturing jobs, 60,000 plants in places such as Pennsylvania and Ohio. We know that. Our economy has been growing, however, since two things: the Recovery Act of 2009 and the auto rescue of 2010. We have seen 58, 59, 60 months of economic growth, consecutive months, since then. That underscores how important auto is in my State, where, as I said, 120,000 people are in the auto supply chain.

But we continue to face roadblocks just to getting the basic information on a plan that would have a major effect on Ohio's auto supply chain. What I don't understand is why would this body, why would the 100 people who took that oath, as Senator CASEY and I did in 2013 and 2007 in this Chamber, vote for something we can't get information about? Why would anybody who took an oath of office do that?

We worked with the administration to rescue the auto manufacturing sector, and it helped save our auto industry—tens of thousands of jobs in that supply chain—so I want to make sure the TPP rules of origin for autos will

not benefit China. I want it to benefit American companies, and I want it to benefit American workers.

I grew up in Mansfield, OH. I have seen what globalization has done for jobs, and I have seen what globalization has done to wages. Mansfield, OH, is a city of 50,000. We have a lot of Mansfields in my State: Zanesville, Chillicothe, Ravenna, Lima, Springfield. These are cities that used to be prosperous manufacturing hubs that have lost so many jobs. Not all jobs were lost due to globalization, but a big part of that is globalization. That is why, when USTR will not share the information we need to understand this proposal, it is particularly troubling.

We can see what has happened. This trade agreement—corporate handout, worker sellout—look what has happened since 1980. These are the average salaries, the blue line, of the richest 1 percent in America. Look what has happened to the richest 1 percent starting in the early days of the Reagan administration. Look what has happened to everyone else. We have the richest 1 percent who have seen their incomes go up about 130 percent. We have everybody else's incomes that have gone up around 10, 12 or 15 percent—and that is not for here, that is for overall.

Again, globalization is not the entire reason, but when they will not share, when USTR will not tell us what is going on, it is particularly troubling when we look at this chart. We know our workers—we know Ohio workers and manufacturers can compete with anyone in the world, but they need fair rules and they need a level playing field. They do not have that here. It is clear. The rules of origin aren't the only part of the deal being developed in the dark. News reports yesterday revealed the USTR may be negotiating side letters on intellectual property provisions. The same report indicates the side letters might cover other issues as well.

We remember the NAFTA side letters on labor and the environment and we know how effective they were. They weren't. Clearly, they were sort of the Bush administration, the first, negotiating and then the Clinton administration, trying to get support in the Senate and the House, adding these side agreements that amounted to nothing. It was to placate workers and to placate the environmentalists, but it did very little. We can't make the same mistake with the TPP.

Will the side letters be covered by the agreement's dispute settlement? When will Members of Congress be able to see these letters? What impact will they have on the overall agreement? These are questions Members of Congress are asking and we are not getting answers from Ambassador Froman or the U.S. Trade Rep's office. It is time the USTR provided some real answers.

It is our job to scrutinize every trade proposal to ensure it creates a level

playing field. It isn't just another corporate handout that shifts jobs overseas.

This lack of transparency isn't limited to TPP. I have asked the USTR to make the United States-European Union—the so-called TTIP agreement—proposal public. Once again, these requests for more transparency have been met with nothing but secrecy. Meanwhile, the EU makes their proposals public.

This isn't about protecting the privileges of Senator CASEY and me—the privilege of Senators, this is about protecting our small companies, our manufacturing companies that get obliterated when large companies move offshore. This is about protecting the workers in places such as Toledo and Akron, OH. This is about protecting these communities. When plants close in Jackson, OH, and plants close in Waverly and Portsmouth and St. Clairsville and Lisbon, school districts lay off teachers, police departments lay off cops, and cities lay off firefighters.

We have been down this road too many times in this country. It has been more than 20 years since NAFTA. Too many plants shut down in Ohio, too many shut down in Pennsylvania, and too many shut down in the State of Louisiana—the State of the Presiding Officer. Too many good jobs were shipped abroad, and if they were replaced at all it is with low-wage jobs with little benefits.

Bad trade deals exacerbate the rise in inequality, corporate profits go up, and middle-class families struggle to get by. These trade agreements are all about corporate handouts and worker sellouts. Over the past four decades, worker productivity rose 75 percent, wages rose 9 percent. What that says, since 1946 into the Reagan years, productivity went like this, workers were this much more productive, and wages stayed parallel to that. But since the Reagan years, as productivity went up workers wages have been flat, except for the richest 1 percent, who saw their salaries explode. Everybody else has lived in an economy where things just don't get better.

The report of the Commission on Inclusive Prosperity, cochaired by Larry Summers, concluded that “powerful forces of globalization . . . must be navigated or inequalities will continue to widen, and for many, precarious low-skill work will increasingly become the norm.”

Fast-tracking—that is what TPA is—fast-tracking proposals such as TPP, without congressional input, without congressional knowledge, let alone public knowledge of this—without congressional input, without oversight, even the bare facts of the deal—reduces our ability to navigate the forces of globalization and to advocate for the workers, which is what Senator CASEY

and I spend most of our time doing here. It perpetuates the USTR's approach to trade negotiations. I am in the middle of reading a book, “The House of Morgan,” about J.P. Morgan, Sr., and J.P. Morgan, Jr. I can't help thinking, that attitude, the public be damned, is what the USTR is doing to us right now. They don't care to share information with Senator CASEY and me and the rest of this body, supporters of the USTR and opponents of the USTR, and they sure don't care about the public learning more about this. All of this will only lead to more inequality.

I want trade; I support trade; I want more trade. Ohio workers want access to new markets for our products. But we need trade that works. The way we get trade that works is not by rushing into more corporate-sponsored trade agreements without even knowing what we are signing. The USTR needs to open up the process; otherwise, the public is convinced they are going to see more corporate handouts and more worker sellouts.

I yield the floor to my friend, Senator CASEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to address the same issue Senator BROWN raised, the issue of trade, and I thank him and commend him for not only his leadership on this issue for many years, his time in the U.S. House of Representatives and now in the Senate for the last 8 years, but especially his work and his focus on this issue most recently because we are moving into a period now of great debate about trade promotion authority and trade agreements that will be debated here in the Senate and throughout the country. So I commend him for that.

What Senator BROWN spoke to was a basic economic insecurity that so many Americans feel. It didn't just arise in the last couple of years. This is a long-standing problem and a long-standing threat to people's economic insecurity. Trade agreements play a role in it.

I spoke the last time when the Senator and I were here about the concerns I had about these trade agreements, but also the specific concern about jobs or the adverse impact on jobs since the North American Free Trade Agreement and then subsequent trade agreements in the intervening years. Today I rise to talk about a related but very urgent issue, and that is the issue of wages. Senator BROWN spoke to this as well.

We know that middle-class spending power is the main driver of our economic growth and the foundation of the American dream. If people have money in their pockets because they have reasonable and fair wages, they are going to drive the economy in a much more substantial way. But in re-

cent years this spending power that I speak of, of most Americans, has fallen dramatically.

According to the Federal Reserve, the average worker's weekly earnings were 15 percent lower in 2012 than in 1972, when adjusted for inflation. So just in that roughly 40-year time period, wages were down in real dollars by 15 percent.

Senator BROWN referred to a disconnect between productivity and wage growth, and there was a recent chart that was developed by the Economic Policy Institute. The source for this is the Economic Policy Institute analysis of Bureau of Labor Statistics and Bureau of Economic Analysis. I hold it up. It is not big enough for people to see, but there is a big line in the middle of this chart. Because it is a chart, I won't enter it into the RECORD, but I will refer to it.

The basic conclusion is, when we look at the question of productivity growth and wage growth from 1948 to 2013, here is what we find. It is a two-chapter book. Chapter 1 is a positive chapter; chapter 2 is really disturbing. It is one of the most significant charts I have ever seen of what has happened to the wages of working Americans.

Here is what it says. From 1948 to 1973, productivity up 96.7 percent, hourly compensation up 91.3. So the difference between productivity increase and wage increase basically from World War II to 1973 was a differential of about 6 percentage points.

As Senator BROWN mentioned, an alignment over that time period between wages and productivity makes sense. When workers are producing more, when the economy is, as it was after World War II, producing so much more, wages should go up in a commensurate manner. Unfortunately, that is chapter 1. Chapter 2 of this book starts in 1973 and it ends on this chart in 2013. In that 40-year time period, productivity was up again. It wasn't up 96.7 percent, but it was up 74.4 percent, so still a strong productivity increase between 1973 and 2013.

What, we might ask, happened to wages? Was it still a line? Was there a gap? Was it exactly the same? Unfortunately, the story is a terribly sad story. Hourly compensation, 1973 to 2013, was up a grand total of 9.2 percent.

So in the first period, wages were up 91.3 percent. In the second period, 1973 to 2013, wages were only up 9.2 percent. No one in this body, no one in the other body in Congress—no one who represents the American people in Congress or any State legislature, no one who represents our country, can be satisfied with a 9.2-percent wage growth over 40 years when we are still having robust productivity increases.

There are a lot of reasons for it. There are a lot of causes we could make that we could attribute to that

terrible diminution, but we have to do something about it. Part of that is having an agenda that will speak to wages and the middle class, and not to the issues that are in front of us, including these trade agreements.

I would argue without a doubt that our trade agreements have made this problem significantly worse over the last 20 or 25 years, and I am afraid we are headed down that path were trade promotion authority, the so-called Trans-Pacific Partnership, enacted into law.

Here is what the wage diminution meant in Pennsylvania in a shorter period of time, about 15 years. Pennsylvania median household income fell by 3 percent in the years between 1998 and 2013, according to the Census Bureau.

But this trend we are talking about continues today. Even as our economy recovers and stock markets reach a record high, the average American's paycheck is barely keeping up with the rising cost of living. So this problem of a lack of wage growth is nowhere near being solved.

The decline in middle-class workers' purchasing power—another way of saying wages—is not just unfair, but economic analysis also shows it is a drag on our economy, which is primarily driven by consumption. So this isn't just a story of a worker and his or her family being pulled down by very powerful forces, only having their wages go up 9 percent in 40 years, it is also about the wider economy. If folks don't have fair wages, it is going to drag down the economy, and we are seeing evidence of that over those 40 years.

But instead of enacting policies that help the middle class and focus on this issue of wages or the lack of growth of wages, like policies such as increasing the minimum wage—that would be one of the right things to do to go at this problem—or facilitating access to high-quality childcare, for a lot of families the second highest cost they have other than housing and maybe some other expense, usually housing or some other expense—No. 2 is usually the cost of childcare. It is a barrier to work. If you can't afford childcare, you can't go to work or you have to accept a job that pays less.

Extended relief to workers displaced by foreign competition. I would put the word "unfair" foreign competition. That is something else we should work on.

So if we are working on raising the minimum wage, growing the middle class, helping families pay for childcare, helping families pay for the terribly high cost of higher education, maybe no other number is more disturbing than this "wage, 9 percent in 40 years" number that I mentioned. Maybe the only other number more disturbing is the cost of college education going up higher than anything in our lives the last couple of decades.

Middle-class workers know this type of policy that some are pursuing is headed in the wrong direction. Instead of them seeing us working on policies that will advance and support the middle class, they see Congress considering a massive trade agreement with 11 Asia Pacific countries. So these same middle-class families who look to us for progress and action and results for the middle class and for their wages are seeing a lot of folks in Washington focus on trade agreements that will make the problem worse.

A recent Pew poll of the Nation found that 83 percent of Americans said free trade does not raise their wages and 45 percent said so-called free trade lowers American wages. For many years, many economists have argued that trade was a net positive for Americans and did not have a noticeable impact on wages. However, recently I think other economists are having a different perspective.

A 2009 paper by three economists, one from the University of Pennsylvania, found that when workers are displaced by trade and switch jobs, they suffer real wage loss of between 12 and 17 percent. So in light of this data by economists that says when you have a job switch or a job change because of trade and your wages are going to go down 12 to 17 percent, and all the other data that we have about what has happened in States such as Pennsylvania, or Ohio, which Senator BROWN represents—what has happened to those communities and those people—why would we go down the same path of ratifying agreements which will do the same over time? I don't think we should, and that is why this debate is very important.

Another analysis by the Economic Policy Institute, a standard economic model shows that American workers without a college degree earn \$1,800 less each year as a result of expanded trade. Again, further exacerbation of the same problem that trade agreements lead to.

I know people in my home State of Pennsylvania—and I am sure this is true in Ohio and a number of other States—are skeptical of these trade deals because they have experienced these pressures firsthand. This is real life for them. So before we cut another deal, we should work to level the playing field for our own companies and workers, including ensuring workers and companies get real relief from unfair trade practices.

Pennsylvanians and, I think, Americans want Congress and the administration to focus on policies that lead to both good jobs and good wages. Fundamentally, I argue that these agreements cause major concerns on both fronts, the jobs front as well as the wage front.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## SAVING THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about an issue that all Senators should be concerned about, and that is the future of the Organization of American States.

The origin of the OAS dates to the First International Conference of American States held in Washington from October 1889 to April 1890. The OAS was formally established in 1948 with the signing of the OAS Charter, which entered into force in 1951.

As the OAS Charter states, its mission is to achieve among its members "an order of peace and justice, and to promote their solidarity, to strengthen their collaboration, and to defend their sovereignty, their territorial integrity, and their independence." That is an important and inspiring responsibility, and no less so today than when the OAS was founded, although many of the challenges of one-half century ago have been replaced by new challenges today.

Today the OAS consists of 35 independent States and is, at least in composition and tradition, the primary political, judicial, and social governmental forum in this hemisphere. Another 69 States and the European Union have permanent observer status.

The OAS supports programs and activities in four principle areas to carry out its mission—democracy, human rights, security, and development—and it does so in a myriad of ways, some far more successfully than others.

Few here may be aware that the United States is by far the largest contributor to the OAS, paying 60 percent of its annual budget. Two other countries pay 22 percent and the remaining 32 countries together pay only 12 percent.

Of course, the United States has by far the largest economy and should pay its fair share, but no country should be assessed to pay more than 50 percent. Other members should also pay their fair share, and we should all expect the OAS to be competently managed and to deliver tangible results that justify its expenditures.

The OAS can be proud of the indispensable work of the Inter-American Human Rights Commission and the Inter-American Court, its internationally respected election observer missions, and other activities to support democracy and promote transparent and accountable governance. These priorities should be strengthened, as I will mention shortly.

But the reputation of the OAS as a hemispheric leader has taken a beating. This is partly due to ideological polarization driven primarily by the viscerally anti-United States rhetoric and policies of the leaders of four of its member States, and partly due to the fact that the OAS has failed to exercise effective leadership in response to key

issues and events, while recent sub-hemispheric groupings have taken up much of the slack and become the region's principal fora.

The OAS has allowed itself to be spread too thin, accepting too many mandates from its member States without rigorous assessment of the costs and benefits. Scarce resources have been spent on employees—without regard to transparent hiring and promotion practices—some of whom contribute little to the organization. At the same time, the OAS is facing severe budget constraints and there is no monetary reserve to respond to contingencies. It is astounding that because some countries, including Brazil, stopped paying their quotas or are in arrears, and the OAS had nothing in reserve, it had to obtain a loan in order to pay employee salaries. This is not the kind of management the OAS needs; it is mismanagement.

The Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court play essential roles as institutions of last resort for victims of human rights violations in countries where impunity is the norm. When corrupt, dysfunctional judicial systems fail to provide access to justice for victims of crimes against humanity or other violations of human rights, the OAS helps fill that void. Likewise, the Special Rapporteur for Freedom of Expression plays a critical role at a time when some governments, such as Venezuela and Ecuador, are engaged in a systematic effort to intimidate and silence their critics in the independent press, while others, including Mexico and Honduras, fail to protect journalists from threats and attacks by gangs or violence related to drug trafficking.

Yet a shortage of funding and the failure of some member States to comply with the decisions of the Commission and the rulings of the Court undermine their effectiveness. Some governments have actively sought to weaken these key institutions by withholding financial support and proposing to limit the legal authority of the Commission and the Court. They and the Special Rapporteur for Freedom and Expression need sufficient resources to do their jobs, and it is time to establish a mechanism for sanctioning noncompliance.

The United States is not blameless, having signed but not yet ratified the American Convention on Human Rights. This provides a convenient excuse for other governments to accuse us of hypocrisy as we urge their adherence to human rights norms. It is time for the Congress to act on this piece of unfinished business.

I would add, however, that the United States is part of the Inter-American Commission, as are all OAS member States, regardless of whether or not they have ratified the Convention. In fact, the United States has more cases

at the Commission than any other country, and we strive to implement its decisions.

The OAS needs to strengthen its election monitoring capability—including insisting on timely and equal participation by opposition political parties, freedom of the press and association—to ensure a level playing field when some Latin governments refuse to allow early access by the OAS. Many Latin Americans are becoming cynical about the ability of democratic governments to deliver basic services in a manner that is transparent and accountable. Elected governments which are corrupt and neglect, or are unable to protect their people, erode support for democracy.

Similarly, the OAS and the Secretary General in particular need to respond swiftly to political crises, and exercise stronger leadership in defense of democratic institutions and human rights when they are under assault, consistent with the OAS Charter and the Inter-American Democratic Charter.

There is also the issue of hemispheric security. During the Cold War there was a single-minded, concerted effort to prevent the Soviet Union from gaining another foothold in Latin America. Countless innocent people were threatened, disappeared, tortured, or killed in the name of fighting communism by Central and South American security forces, many of them encouraged, trained and equipped by the United States, and only a token number of the individuals responsible have been punished.

Today the hemisphere faces new threats, such as drug cartels, gang violence, transnational crime, money laundering, and natural disasters. But the plans to address them like the Merida Initiative and the Alliance for Prosperity, while identifying such priorities as police and judicial reform, poverty, fiscal transparency, and corruption, tend to be long on goals and short on specifics of how to achieve them. Cooperation on multi-dimensional security threats is not a matter of ideology. Cuba and the United States are already cooperating against drug-traffickers, as we are with other countries. But there is a lot more that can and should be done to identify the causes and develop and implement more effective regional strategies to address these problems.

Several Latin countries have made notable strides in the past decade and are providing greater opportunities for their people. The OAS can play a role in convening a debate, identifying solutions, and facilitating an alliance of key development organizations, including the Inter-American Development Bank and the Pan American Health Organization, to address areas of shared interest such as achieving sustained, equitable economic growth, strengthening public education and health, and protecting natural resources.

The OAS has an important, under-utilized role to play in interfacing with the wide range of civil society organizations which are essential to any democracy and are often under-appreciated, under-funded, and persecuted. With OAS offices throughout the hemisphere, its under-utilized employees could engage far more actively with academia, civil society, and the media. This should include any such entities that reject violence, not just those that are “registered” by local governments which sometimes use the registration process to silence legitimate voices whose views the government disagrees with.

Finally, the OAS needs to decide how to interact with other hemispheric multilateral organizations in a manner that strengthens the OAS and encourages cooperation. Cuba's suspension, and then refusal to return, provided an impetus for the creation of new entities like CELAC, the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, that are anti-OAS and anti-United States and have sowed division within the hemisphere.

The next Secretary General of the OAS, who will be selected on March 18, has his work cut out for him. I say “him” because there is only one candidate, which says volumes about how the job is perceived. The Secretary General plays a crucial role as the strategic leader, but not the day-to-day manager, of the organization. The next Secretary General needs an Assistant Secretary General with the managerial expertise and mandate to right this sinking ship.

It will mean tough budgetary decisions, including the ability to say no to new programs and mandates and to focus instead on doing better at what it does best.

As soon as possible after they assume their positions I urge them to review Public Law 113-41, the “Organization of American States Revitalization and Reform Act of 2013.” That Act, which received bipartisan support, identifies key issues that need to be addressed—many of which I have touched on here—and provides recommendations for how to address them.

I wish them both well because the people of every country in the hemisphere, including those whose governments have sought to harm the OAS, need the OAS. But absent significant and rapid reforms beginning with the quota issue, the OAS's decline may be irreversible.

#### CONTINUING AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP IN MEDICAL INNOVATION FOR PATIENTS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks at the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee hearing this week.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINUING AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP IN  
MEDICAL INNOVATION FOR PATIENTS

We've got three major objectives in this committee: Fixing No Child Left Behind, Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, and third—one we're all looking forward to without exception—improving biomedical innovation, including the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

Today is the first hearing Ranking Member Murray and I are holding on our bipartisan initiative to examine how we get drugs, devices and treatments from the discovery process through the regulatory process into our medicine cabinets and doctors' offices.

Today discoveries supported by NIH often do not come to FDA's door for six, eight, ten, or even twelve years. And the average cost to get a single drug from the laboratory through the approval process to the medicine cabinet is, according to some estimates, about \$1 billion. Other estimates say it's double that or even more.

This initiative builds on work the committee has done—legislation was passed in 1997 and as recently as 2012—to try to get at the same goal of speeding up review and approval of drugs and devices while still ensuring they are safe.

This is a subject that has a lot of interest. President Obama this year announced his new Precision Medicine Initiative, saying: "21st century businesses will rely on American science, technology, research and development. I want the country that eliminated polio and mapped the human genome to lead a new era of medicine—one that delivers the right treatment at the right time. In some patients with cystic fibrosis, this approach has reversed a disease once thought unstoppable."

In the House, Energy and Commerce Chairman Fred Upton and Representative Diana DeGette have been working on parallel tracks on their 21st Century Cures initiative to accelerate the pace of cures in America.

In late January, Sen. Burr and I released a report titled "Innovation for Healthier Americans" that examined the process we have in place today for drug and device development.

We have received over 80 comments already, and have shared those with the staff of all members on the committee.

Our committee also has a bipartisan staff working group that has been meeting for around a month now, learning more about the key agencies involved in biomedical research and development.

We have with us today Dr. Francis Collins, Director of the National Institutes of Health, which funds and enables much of the early stage research that leads to medical breakthroughs. And Dr. Margaret Hamburg, the head of the Food and Drug Administration, which regulates all the medical products we come in contact with.

Dr. Collins wrote in 2013 that: "Drugs exist for only about 250 of the more than 4,400 conditions with defined molecular causes. And it takes far too long and far too much money to get a new drug into our medicine cabinets. This is an old problem that cries out for new and creative solutions."

Since Dr. Collins wrote that, the number of conditions with defined molecular causes has increased to more than 5,400, yet the number of new drugs approved has not kept pace with these discoveries.

Dr. Hamburg has said that "we are left relying on the 20th century approaches for the

review, approval and oversight of the treatments and cures of the 21st century."

So today's hearing is a perfect place for us to start—with the heads of these two critical agencies, both of whom have sounded the alarm on our existing process for drug and device development.

This work will affect every single American—from a very ill patient who has run out of treatment options and is counting on the most cutting-edge drug, to an active child with asthma who's hoping to run faster and farther with the aid of a new drug.

I look forward to hearing from the witnesses more about their thoughts on these five issues that Senator Burr and I identified in our report: First, it costs too much to bring medical products through the pipeline to patients. Second, as science and technology advance, the discovery and development process takes too long for medical products to make their way to patients. Third, FDA's responsibilities have grown to include many activities unrelated to the core function of regulating medical products to advance the public health. Fourth, the disparity in scientific knowledge at FDA and the fast pace of biomedical innovation are slowing, and in some cases, stifling innovation in American medicine. Fifth, a working FDA is essential to continuing biomedical innovation in the United States and maintaining America's global leadership in medical innovation.

In the words of Andrew Eschenbach, the former Commissioner of the FDA and Director of the National Cancer Institute: "We stand on the cusp of a revolution in health care. Advances in molecular medicine will allow us to develop powerful new treatments that can cure or even prevent diseases like Alzheimer's and cancer. Tomorrow's high-tech cures can also slash health-care costs and eliminate ineffective treatments."

I look forward to taking the first step toward addressing these important issues. If we do it right, our work here will help improve the lives of every single American.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

• Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, this week marks the 50th anniversary of the signing of legislation to create the Appalachian Regional Commission, ARC.

In the decade of the 1960s, intense poverty and economic struggle characterized the existence for many people and towns running down the spine of the Appalachian Mountains. At the time, more than 19 million Americans were living in the Appalachian region and struggling to achieve the American dream.

The magnitude and vastness of the challenges in Appalachia, which spread across many States, led the region's Governors in 1960 to form the Conference of Appalachian Governors to develop a regional approach for resolving these complex issues.

In 1961, they took their case to newly elected President John F. Kennedy, who had been deeply moved by the poverty he saw during campaign trips to West Virginia. Their efforts led to the

creation of the Appalachian Regional Commission and a broad bipartisan coalition in Congress passed the Appalachian Regional Development Act, ARDA, early in 1965. President Lyndon B. Johnson signed it into law on March 9, 1965. It is a unique agency to this day, made up of one Federal co-chair and 13 Governors who serve as State co-chairs. It also receives local input on allocation of resources from the local development districts.

Over the last 50 years, it has been able to inject Federal funds and leverage State and private resources to address the deep needs of this region. Much success has been achieved, but yet much remains to be done.

Poverty has been cut in half in Appalachia from nearly 31 percent of the region's people in 1960 to about 16 percent today.

In 1960, only 32 percent of the Appalachian population completed high school and 5 percent had a college degree. Since then, the number of college graduates had increased four-fold to 21 percent.

One of the most critical challenges facing the Appalachian region in 1964 was its relative isolation. With the aid of the Appalachian Regional Commission, nearly 2,700 miles of highway development routes have been built.

Since 1965, ARC has financed nearly 25,000 separate strategic investments in non-highway activities in the region, which includes \$3.8 billion in Federal funds. The positive result has been that nearly three times that amount, \$9 billion has been forthcoming in matching funds from other Federal, State and local funding sources. Better yet, ARC-financed investments in Appalachia have also leveraged nearly \$16 billion in added private investment.

I want to congratulate the Appalachian Regional Commission on its 50th Anniversary. I look forward to working with and supporting the future efforts of ARC and the local development districts as they continue to work with the States, localities and the private sector to build the economy of the Appalachian region. •

### CELEBRATING KEMP MILL SYNA- GOGUE'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY AND THE SERVICE OF RABBI YAAKOV "JACK" BIELER

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this Saturday, I will have the privilege and pleasure of visiting Kemp Mill Synagogue, KMS, for a Melava Malka on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. KMS held its first service on March 17, 1990, attended by a group of 50 worshippers in a Kemp Mill home, and held its first services in its current location on Kemp Mill Road on Shabbat of September 19, 1998. The Modern Orthodox

Synagogue is a vibrant and loving community where members of the congregation gather to daven, learn, celebrate, and observe lifecycle events, smachot, and rituals together.

In 1994, Rabbi Yaakov (Jack) Bieler officially became the first rabbi of KMS. As the leader of the KMS community, Rabbi Bieler has led and inspired the development of an ambitious program of shiurim, study groups, scholars-in-residence and educational programs. Weekly Divrei Tora by men and women enlighten the congregation by offering a diversity of perspectives. Youth groups and social activities contribute to creating a warm and engaged community.

Rabbi Bieler is a great friend and true leader in Maryland's faith-based community. While he has been at KMS for over 20 years, his commitment to his faith and community has been a lifelong passion. Rabbi Bieler was raised in Bayside, Queens, and attended local public schools. In 1969, he graduated from the James Striar School of Jewish Studies in New York, where he honed his mastery of Jewish texts. He spent the years of 1969 to 1971 studying at Yeshivat Kerem B'Yavneh in Israel.

When Rabbi Bieler returned to New York, he studied at Yeshiva University, where he was ordained by the Rabbi Isaac Eichanan Theological Seminary. This prestigious program, which dates back to 1886, challenges and trains leaders of Judaism to hold fast to the ways of the Torah while responding to the questions and demands of modern society. During this time, he also pursued a master of arts in Jewish Education from the Ferkauf Graduate School of Education, completing his studies in 1974.

While Rabbi Bieler's studies prepared him to be a Jewish religious leader, he always sought new ways to share his knowledge with others. To this end, Rabbi Bieler has spent much of his life in the classroom. He served on the faculty and was a chairman of the Talmud Department of the Joseph H. Lookstein Upper School of Ramaz from 1974 to 1988. In these roles, he helped to educate children in Judaic and general studies, holding himself and others to high standards in the classroom and in the community. And he has always been committed to *menschlichkeit*, or the values of human dignity and mutual respect, and the strength of Jewish heritage. Today, he is still guided by these commitments.

Rabbi Bieler served concurrently on the faculty of the Adult Education Institute of the Lincoln Square Synagogue between 1971 and 1977 and as a permanent scholar-in-residence of Congregation Kehilath Jeshurun from 1977 to 1988. This service speaks to Rabbi Bieler's belief that our education—in faith and in life—never ends; we are always learning, always seeking to become better versions of ourselves. His

role as an educator grew and changed before he found his way to Kemp Mill Synagogue. In 1988, he assumed the position of lead teacher and chairman of the Judaic Studies Department at the Hebrew Academy of Greater Washington, now the Melvin J. Berman Hebrew Academy, a Modern Orthodox Jewish day school in Rockville, MD. He worked at the Hebrew Academy of Washington for a number of years and in a variety of roles, becoming the Upper School assistant principal in charge of Judaic Studies in 1991. During his tenure, Rabbi Bieler strove to provide students with a firm foundation in Torah and Jewish law, to encourage creativity and critical thinking, and promoted a deep sense of community and personal responsibility in students.

Rabbi Bieler is a man who is much loved and respected by his community. And he is a humble man, so it falls to others to recite his many achievements. During his tenure at Ramaz, he was awarded the Gruss Outstanding Educator award. In 1985, he received a prestigious Jerusalem Fellows fellowship and spent the year with family, including his beloved wife Dr. Joanie Bieler, in Jerusalem. Among other achievements, Rabbi Bieler has published numerous articles on Jewish education and issues facing Judaism today, especially concerning Modern Orthodoxy.

Rabbi Bieler will be retiring from his service as the leader of the Kemp Mill Synagogue community on June 30, 2015. He has faithfully served KMS for most of its 25-year history, leading and inspiring the development of an ambitious educational program indicative of his love for teaching, learning, and sharing Judaism. Under his leadership, KMS has encouraged a congregation of mutual enlightenment and diversified perspectives. Furthermore, youth groups and social activities have been cultivated and grown, creating a warm and engaged community. KMS is an important hub of community and faith in Silver Spring. KMS members are leaders in the Jewish Federation, local day schools, the Rabbinical Council, the Emunah Society, the Kemp Mill Civic Association, the Orthodox Union, and the larger community. They are committed to worship and to service, to the United States, and to the State of Israel.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating KMS on its 25th anniversary and acknowledging the inspired service, dedication, and leadership of Rabbi Yaakov and Dr. Joanie Bieler who will undoubtedly continue to be involved in their community and inspire others to serve even when their formal leadership roles at KMS come to an end. I wish them all the best.●

#### REMEMBERING PAUL CHRISTENSEN

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, we honor the life and service of Paul Christensen, whose passing signifies a great loss for Nevada. I send my condolences and prayers to his wife Norma and the entire family in this time of mourning. Mr. Christensen was a man committed to his country, his State, and his community. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. Christensen moved with his father and mother to Las Vegas in 1939 when his father started the family's jewelry business. He graduated from Las Vegas High School in 1950 and continued his studies at Brigham Young University, where he earned his bachelor's degree. He then enlisted in the U.S. Air Force as a pilot, serving in the Korean war. As one of our Nation's servicemembers, he made exceptional sacrifices for our country. I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. Christensen for his courageous contributions to the United States of America. His service to his country and his bravery earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation and will never be forgotten.

After serving in the U.S. Air Force, Mr. Christensen returned to Las Vegas in 1957 and worked in the family jewelry store. It was during this time that he married Mrs. Christensen and began his lifelong legacy of commitment to his local community. He served in the Nevada Assembly in the 1950s and then the Nevada Senate in the 1960s. In 1977 and 1981, Christensen was elected to the Las Vegas City Council, during which time he focused on the safety of southern Nevada communities by improving police presence and increasing the number of firefighters. He also worked to improve road conditions, specifically widening Jones Boulevard.

Mr. Christensen then continued his service to the great State of Nevada by working tirelessly on the Clark County Commission until 1996. During his decades spent working to better the Silver State, he was also chairman of the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority, president of the Las Vegas Valley Water District, and was appointed by Governor Kenny Guinn to serve on the Transportation Services Authority. In October of 2013, the Paul J. Christensen Bridge was named after him in honor of his work in his local community, a distinction well deserved. Mr. Christensen continued philanthropic work for the Las Vegas community until his health declined.

Throughout his life, Mr. Christensen worked tirelessly to make southern Nevada the best it could be, which I am honored to commend. He was a role model and his legacy will live on. Today, I join the Las Vegas community and citizens of the Silver State to celebrate the life of an upstanding Nevadan, Paul Christensen.●



# RECOGNIZING GOODWILL OF SOUTHERN NEVADA

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Goodwill of Southern Nevada for its commitment and dedication to providing our veterans, military servicemembers, and their families with supportive services to aid in securing a job and financial solidarity. The Veterans Integration Program, VIP, is a unique service that assists our Nation's bravest as they return from the battlefield and readjust to life in their communities.

These heroes who served the United States and fought to protect our freedom frequently arrive home to a struggling economy. All too often, returning veterans and their families are unable to find a job and struggle with financial uncertainty. Goodwill of Southern Nevada is a positive light in the local Las Vegas community, working to change this reality. As of the end of January 2015, VIP has helped 507 local veterans in southern Nevada and their immediate families find work. The program offers help in job training and job placement and provides necessary tools to fluidly transition from the military back into the local community successfully. Although there is no way to ever adequately thank our military men and women, Goodwill of Southern Nevada stands as a shining example of an organization that has gone above and beyond to positively impact the lives of our heroes who so bravely fought for our freedom.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know the struggles that our veterans face after returning home from the battlefield. Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals but also to ensure they receive the quality care they have earned and deserve. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. I am very pleased that veterans service organizations like Goodwill of Southern Nevada are committed to ensuring that the needs of our veterans are being met.

Today, I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing Goodwill of Southern Nevada, an organization with a mission that is both noble and charitable. I am humbled and honored to recognize the Goodwill of Southern Nevada and its tireless efforts in providing veterans with the skills necessary to reintegrate into the local community. This organization's commitment to helping veterans, military servicemembers, and their families get back on their feet is admirable, and I wish it the best of luck in all of its future endeavors.●

# RECOGNIZING DR. KENNETH DOBBINS

• Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Dr. Kenneth Dob-

bins on his retirement and to thank him for his many years of leadership and service to the field of higher education. For 24 years, including the last 16 years as president, Ken Dobbins has served Southeast Missouri State University in Cape Girardeau, MO. Ken considered his job as president the position of a lifetime, and his dedication and passion for the University and its students is unparalleled. It is my pleasure to honor him today.

Ken received a B.S. in accounting from the University of Akron in 1971. Upon graduation, Ken served as a commissioned officer and civilian executive in the U.S. Air Force for nearly 10 years and was awarded the 1978 Air Force Audit Agency Outstanding Civilian Auditor of the Year. Ken also received an M.B.A. from Old Dominion University in 1979 and a Ph.D. in higher education administration from Kent State University in 1987.

Before his tenure with Southeast Missouri State, Ken held positions in higher education administration at Kent State. At Southeast Missouri State, Ken served as the University's vice president of finance and administration from 1991 to 1993 and executive vice president from 1993 until his appointment as president in 1999.

During Ken's presidency, the university reached significant milestones in enrollment and diversity, academic partnerships, programs, and construction. Ken's effective leadership shaped Southeast Missouri State University into the outstanding school it is today. As president, one of his greatest accomplishments was the significant increase in enrollment of students. In 1994, there were 7,500 students. Today there are over 12,000 students.

In addition, Ken oversaw more than \$400 million in new construction and building improvement projects, including the Seabaugh Polytechnic Building and the \$58 million River Campus. New academic programs, including the College of Science, Technology, and Agriculture and the Earl and Margie Holland School of Visual and Performing Arts were established. Ken instituted a comprehensive review of all academic and nonacademic programs to minimize student fee increases in the face of extensive State appropriation reductions. He was also responsible for developing an innovative postprofessorial merit program, which provides base salary increases and professional development funds for faculty members.

As president, Ken held numerous leadership positions in higher education administration. He served a 2-year term as president of the Missouri Council on Public Higher Education, and served 3 years as president of the Ohio Valley Conference. He currently serves on the board of directors for the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Outside his work in higher education, Ken serves on the Greater St. Louis

Area Council for the Boy Scouts of America, and was elected by local council associates to serve on the National Council for the Boy Scouts of America. Ken was awarded the Silver Beaver Award, the highest honor given to a Boy Scout volunteer by a council. Additionally, Ken has been elected to the St. Louis Regional Chamber board of directors and is a member of the Hawthorne Foundation.

Ken is looking forward to spending more time with his wife Jeanine, son Paul, daughter-in-law Stacey, and his two grandchildren. I know they will enjoy the opportunity to spend more time with him. Ken will continue to be involved in higher education during his retirement by serving as a consultant with the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

It is my pleasure to honor Ken Dobbins today. He has touched the lives of many and immensely improved the quality of Southeast Missouri State University and the Cape Girardeau community. His dedication to higher education and the State of Missouri has been invaluable.

I ask that the Senate join me in congratulating and honoring Dr. Kenneth Dobbins.●

# 103RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

• Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 103rd anniversary of the Girl Scouts of America. What started out as a group of 18 girls in Georgia organized by Juliette Low has grown into an organization of more than 3.2 million girls and women and more than 59 million alumnae, including myself. As a former Girl Scout, I know firsthand how important the Girl Scouts are for learning about leadership, service, and personal development.

When the Girl Scouts started, women couldn't vote, women couldn't have property in their name, and in some States women couldn't go to college. The founding of the Girl Scouts started a revolutionary movement to empower girls. Now, Girl Scouts is working to bring gender balance to leadership roles, whether it is creating jobs in the private sector or representing constituents in public office. I believe in that mission, and I know it can be achieved.

What I love about the Girl Scouts is that it is always reinventing itself and looking to the future. Whether it is new uniforms or new badges, the Girl Scouts are engaging in a new generation of leadership. Their core programs focused on environmental stewardship, healthy living, financial literacy, and global citizenship help girls develop a solid and well-rounded foundation in leadership. Their award-winning Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics—STEM—Program helps girls build strong, hands-on foundations to become future leaders and



meet the growing need for skilled science and technology professionals in the United States. And last year, the Girl Scouts joined the STEM mentoring initiative, Million Women Mentors, a national initiative to increase interest for girls and women to pursue STEM career paths. This program would help close the gender gap in the field and gives girls the confidence and the ability to believe that they too can be those female scientists, engineers, and doctors who are serving as mentors for the program.

I have taken the lessons I learned from the Girl Scouts with me to the U.S. Senate every day and in every way. These lessons include: Let's help people at all times. Let's be honest and fair. Let's be friendly and helpful. Let's be considerate and caring, courageous and strong and responsible. Let's respect ourselves and others, respect authority, use resources wisely, make the world a better place, and be a sister to every Girl Scout whether she is here or around the world. For all of these reasons and more, I am honored to recognize the 103rd anniversary of the Girl Scouts of America.●

#### RECOGNIZING GIRL SCOUTS OF THE USA

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to honor Girl Scouts of the USA. As the proud father of two Girl Scouts, I join them as they celebrate Girl Scout Day. On this day in 1912, Juliette Gordon Low founded the first Girl Scout troop with just 18 girls in Savannah, GA. Over 100 years later, Girl Scouts serves 2 million girls and has 59 million alumnae across the United States.

Juliette Gordon Low believed that all girls should be given the opportunity to develop physically, mentally, and spiritually. Gordon sought to bring girls out of isolated home environments and into community service in order to become well rounded members of society. By building courage, confidence, and character, Girl Scouts raised awareness on important issues. They became leaders and made their way into American hearts.

Girl Scouts today participate in numerous activities that foster and strengthen their leadership abilities, financial literacy, outdoor and environmental awareness, and teach them the value of service. They learn new skills that help them develop their full individual potential, and take action to improve the world around them. Girls who earn the Gold Award, the highest achievement a Girl Scout can earn, take extraordinary steps to effect positive change and make a sustainable impact in their communities and beyond.

Today's Girl Scouts are tomorrow's leaders. Former Girl Scouts are at the top of their fields in science, media, medicine, business, and politics. With one-half of the women in the 114th Con-

gress being former Girl Scouts, it is evident that Girl Scouts builds girls of courage, confidence and character.

On this Girl Scout Day, I wish to applaud the work of Girl Scout councils throughout Michigan and across our country. Their commitment to diversity and service, tied with their dedication, makes them true leaders of society.●

#### TRIBUTE TO PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY

● Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, a beloved American icon recently celebrated her 90th birthday. For more than one-half century, Phyllis Schlafly has been a leading voice in defense of our Constitution, our values, and our way of life. Fearlessly, tirelessly, Phyllis has championed the American family and American values. As a speaker, author, activist, and radio commentator, Phyllis has inspired and mobilized generations of conservatives.

Her 1964 book, "A Choice Not an Echo," took direct aim at the establishment class and helped pave the way for Goldwater and Reagan. Her advocacy presaged many of the political challenges we face today in ensuring that the voiceless have a voice and that the everyday worker, mother, father, and citizen is not drowned out by special interests. As one profile noted, Phyllis "continues comforting the afflicted conservative, afflicting the comfortable Republican."

I remember well reading "A Choice Not an Echo" while in high school and her arguments helped shape my political philosophy as it shaped the philosophy of many others. I also remember attending her speech at the University of Alabama dealing with the national defense issues she wrote about while I was in law school. Dynamic, smart, beautiful, and articulate, she played an important role in establishing a sound conservative philosophy.

An unrelenting critic of big government, Phyllis has spoken out time and again on the need for the family—not the bureaucracy—to form the center of American life. She has explained that we cannot strengthen our financial system without also strengthening our families and our communities. She knows that no nation can be better than the people who make it up and that families, communities, and churches are vital to developing good people.

The values Phyllis embodies are not merely traditional but enduring—just as she is. Enduring values are a national compass, a guide for all times—always pointing true north in even the stormiest weather.

Congratulations to Phyllis on her remarkable 90th year and her even more remarkable life.●

#### RECOGNIZING THE LEARNING TRAIN

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, American small businesses across the country possess the ability to recognize and fill unique service gaps in their local towns and cities. This is especially important when these small businesses work with the children in our communities. Such is the case with this week's Small Business of the Week, The Learning Train, located in Lafayette, LA.

Keri and Matt Hebert opened The Learning Train as a way to promote the physical, emotional, educational, and social development of children aged 6 months to 4 years old through a variety of weekly classes and camps. A mother of two, Mrs. Hebert designed The Learning Train to offer small group classes that promote learning and bonding between parents and their children. A typical 45-minute session at the center provides children and their parents with a safe, fun space to hone age-appropriate developmental skills through enjoyable playtime with peers. The center's structured learning activities aid in developing crucial skills, including symbolic thinking, active listening, problem solving, and knowledge retention.

In addition to the sharpening of technical skills, children are afforded quality time strengthening and developing healthy social bonds, as well. Having spent thirteen years as an educator, Mrs. Hebert noticed a growing need for a safe, fun environment for young children to be nurtured. She maintains that a child's time spent playing with their guardian reinforces social development and builds trust between the two. The Learning Center's diverse classes provide ample space, opportunity, and variety to reinforce bonds between a child's parents as well as with their peers. Since its establishment in 2013, the Learning Train also regularly partners with local organizations to give back to their community, including participating in food drives.

I am honored to recognize a business that provides the high quality care and attention that our future generations deserve. Congratulations again to The Learning Train for being selected as Small Business of the Week, and I thank them for the important work they do for the families and children in the Lafayette region.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

##### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 4:15 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 1213. An act to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. COATS, and Mr. COONS):

S. 723. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide guidance on utility energy service contracts used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 724. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide enhanced penalties for marketing candy-flavored controlled substances to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 725. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. COATS:

S. 726. A bill to establish the prudential regulator of community and independent depository institutions as the conduit and arbiter of all Federal financial oversight, examination, and reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 728. A bill to provide for programs and activities with respect to the prevention of underage drinking; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. HIRONO):

S. 729. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 730. A bill to permanently extend the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 731. A bill to enhance Social Security benefits and ensure the long-term solvency of the Social Security program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 732. A bill to amend the Act of June 18, 1934, to reaffirm the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. REID, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 733. A bill to exempt children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 734. A bill to provide for the equitable distribution of Universal Service funds to rural States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 735. A bill to require that any trade agreement eligible for expedited consideration by Congress include requirements with respect to paying adequate wages and maintaining sustainable production methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 736. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 737. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 738. A bill to reduce the risks associated with genetically altered salmon in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Res. 100. A resolution to provide sufficient time for legislation to be read; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. Res. 101. A resolution relating to proceedings of the Senate in the event of a partial or full shutdown of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 23

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 23, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with respect to the definition of "widow" and "widower", and for other purposes.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 163

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 163, a bill to establish a grant program to help State and local law enforcement agencies reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism and other disabilities.

S. 164

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 164, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the General Schedule and other statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 3.8 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. DAINES, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, *supra*.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 370

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 467

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 467, a bill to reduce recidivism and increase public safety, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 568, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 570, a bill to improve access to oral health care for vulnerable and underserved populations.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 628

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the designation of maternity care health professional shortage areas.

S. 636

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 636, a bill to reduce prescription drug misuse and abuse.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Michigan

(Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 273

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 273 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

AMENDMENT NO. 279

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 279 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

AMENDMENT NO. 290

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 290 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

AMENDMENT NO. 297

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 297 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 724. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide enhanced penalties for marketing candy-flavored controlled substances to minors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator GRASSLEY in re-introducing the Protecting Kids from Candy-Flavored Drugs Act of 2015, formerly known as the Saving Kids from Dangerous Drugs Act.

For years, law enforcement has seen drug dealers flavor and market their illegal drugs to entice minors, using techniques like combining drugs with chocolate and fruit flavors, and even packaging them to look like actual candy and soda. This bill would address this serious and dangerous problem by providing stronger penalties when drug dealers alter controlled substances by combining them with beverages or candy products, marketing or packaging them to resemble legitimate products, or flavoring or coloring them, all with the intent to sell the drugs to minors.

Recent reports by law enforcement and by the media demonstrate the need for this legislation. Last year, a captain in the Drugs and Vice Division of an Oregon police department told my office that he "routinely encounter[s]" ecstasy; it is "often found packaged with cartoon characters on the labeling[,] shaped in pacifier form[,] or with the outline of various animals stamped [on the] drug when in pill form." He continued that "[c]andy" bracelets of MDMA [ecstasy] are also common. Various unique colors of pills are also frequently encountered with the clear intent to market and make the drug appealing to the young."

Also last year, a narcotics team member in an Oregon sheriff's office told my office that he frequently encounters gummy bears laced with Xanax. The "only customers are juveniles," according to the officer. He noted that if a youth gets hooked, he will become a regular customer.

Law enforcement has made several notable busts of large productions of candied or flavored drugs. In January 2013, the Drug Enforcement Administration seized THC-laden soft drinks, cookies, brownies, and candy from two phony medical marijuana dispensaries in my home state of California. These dispensaries grossed an estimated \$3.5 million annually. The names of the products seized show how the purveyors of these drugs marketed them under names that resembled popular soda and candy products: bottles were labeled "7 High," "Dr. Feelgood," and "Laughing Lemonade"; cookies and brownies had such names as "White Chip Hash Brownie" and "Reese's Crumbled Hash Brownie; and candy was named "Jolly Stones THC Medicated Hard Candies" and "Stone Candy."

Around Halloween 2013, police seized more than 40 pounds of THC-laced

candy from a campus apartment at West Chester University, outside of Philadelphia. This candy was vividly colored, in a virtual rainbow assortment—pink, yellow, orange, blue, and red. When college students are peddling these drugs, it is not hard to see how minors can become targets of the operation.

Many recent incidents involve methamphetamine, a drug whose users face a “very high” risk of “developing psychotic symptoms—hallucinations and delusions,” according to a recent Harvard Medical School publication. A 2007 article in *USA Today* entitled “DEA: Flavored meth use on the rise” stated that “[r]eports of candy-flavored methamphetamine are emerging around the nation, stirring concern among police and abuse prevention experts that drug dealers are marketing the drug to younger people.” In March of 2012, police in Chicago warned parents about a drug that “looks and smells like candy,” called “strawberry quick” or “strawberry meth.” Because of the drug’s similarity to candy, police urged parents to tell their children not to take candy from anyone, not even a classmate.

Regrettably, this is a problem that has persisted for many years, with drug dealers trying various methods to lure kids to try many dangerous drugs. The dealers’ logic is simple: the best way to create a life-long customer is to hook that person when he or she is young. According to an Indiana sheriff quoted in a 2007 article entitled “Fruity meth aimed at kids,” flavoring a drug like methamphetamine makes it “more attractive to teens, because it takes away meth’s normally bitter taste, and some dealers will tell potential users this meth is safer, and has less side effects.”

That is why the practice of flavoring or coloring drugs to entice youth is so dangerous. It deceives the young customer into believing that he or she is not actually ingesting drugs, or at least not ingesting drugs that are as potent as non-flavored drugs. One in three teens already believes there is “only a slight or no risk in trying [methamphetamine],” according to the 2007 National Meth Use & Attitudes Survey. When you flavor methamphetamine or market it as candy or soda, the number of teens who believe that the drug is not harmful is surely higher.

The size and sophistication of some of these operations is particularly alarming. In March of 2006, DEA discovered large-scale marijuana cultivation and production facilities in Emeryville and Oakland, CA. Thousands of marijuana plants, and hundreds of marijuana-related soda, candy, and other products were seized from the drug dealers’ facilities. The products were designed and packaged to look like legitimate products, includ-

ing an item called “Munchy Way” candy bars.

Similarly, in March of 2008, Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, agents seized cocaine near Modesto, CA, that was valued at \$272,400; a significant quantity had been flavored like cinnamon, coconut, lemon, or strawberry. After that raid, one DEA agent stated that “[a]ttempting to lure new, younger customers to a dangerous drug by adding candy ‘flavors’ is an unconscionable marketing technique.”

I completely agree. That is why we need to act now to stop those who alter drugs to make them more appealing to youth.

Under current Federal law, there is no enhanced penalty for a person who alters a controlled substance to make the drug more appealing to youth. Someone who alters a controlled substance in ways prohibited by the legislation we are introducing today would be subject to an additional penalty of up to 10 years, in addition to the penalty for the underlying offense. If someone is convicted of a second offense that is prohibited by the act, that person would face an additional penalty of up to 20 years. Furthermore, a prosecutor who does not charge the separate crime of candying or flavoring a drug may still seek an enhancement at sentencing, under this bill.

This bill sends a strong and clear message to drug dealers—if you flavor or candy up your drugs to try to entice our children, there will be a very heavy price to pay. It will help stop drug dealers from engaging in these activities, and punish them appropriately if they don’t.

I am pleased that many of the leading national law enforcement and anti-drug organizations support this bill: the Fraternal Order of Police, the National District Attorneys Association, the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and the National High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, HIDTA, Directors’ Association have all endorsed this legislation. The individuals that these organizations represent are on the front lines working to keep these drugs out of our communities.

The Senate passed a similar version of this legislation by unanimous consent in the 111th Congress, but it was not considered in the House. The time is now for Congress to finish this work, and enact this bill into law.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator GRASSLEY in supporting this bill.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 729. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 729

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Fairness for Struggling Students Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 2. EXCEPTIONS TO DISCHARGE.

Section 523(a)(8) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by striking “dependents, for” and all that follows through the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “dependents, for an educational benefit overpayment or loan made, insured, or guaranteed by a governmental unit or made under any program funded in whole or in part by a governmental unit or an obligation to repay funds received from a governmental unit as an educational benefit, scholarship, or stipend;”.

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 100—TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT TIME FOR LEGISLATION TO BE READ

Mr. PAUL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 100

*Resolved*, That (a) it shall not be in order for the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, message, conference report, amendment between the Houses, amendment, treaty, or any other measure or matter until 1 session day has passed since introduction for every 20 pages included in the measure or matter in the usual form plus 1 session day for any number of remaining pages less than 20 in the usual form.

(b)(1) Any Senator may raise a point of order that consideration of any bill, resolution, message, conference report, amendment, treaty, or any other measure or matter is not in order under subsection (a). No motion to table the point of order shall be in order.

(2) Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. All motions to waive under this paragraph shall be debatable collectively for not to exceed 3 hours equally divided between the Senator raising the point for order and the Senator moving to waive the point of order or their designees. A motion to waive the point of order shall not be amendable.

(3) This resolution is enacted pursuant to the power granted to each House of Congress to determine the Rules of its Proceedings in clause 2 of section 5 of article I of the Constitution of the United States.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 101—RELATING TO PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE IN THE EVENT OF A PARTIAL OR FULL SHUTDOWN OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 101

*Resolved,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “Shutdown Accountability Resolution”.

## SEC. 2. PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE DURING A FULL OR PARTIAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “Government shutdown” means a lapse in appropriations for 1 or more agencies of the Federal Government.

(b) CONVENING OF THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any rule or order of the Senate, during the period of a Government shutdown—

(A) the Senate shall convene at 8:00 a.m. each day, unless the body is in continuous session; and

(B) it shall not be in order to ask for, and the Presiding Officer shall not entertain a request for, unanimous consent to change the hour or day on which the Senate shall convene under subparagraph (A).

(2) SENATE NOT IN SESSION.—If the Senate is not in session on the first calendar day of a Government shutdown, the majority leader, after consultation with the minority leader, shall notify Members of the Senate that, pursuant to this standing order, the Senate shall convene at 8:00 a.m. on the next calendar day of the Government shutdown.

(c) PRESENCE OF A QUORUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—During the period of a Government shutdown, and notwithstanding any provision of the Standing Rules of the Senate—

(A) immediately after the Presiding Officer takes the chair in accordance with rule IV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall direct the Clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum; and

(B) 1 hour after the presence of a quorum has last been demonstrated, the Presiding Officer shall direct the Clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

(2) LACK OF QUORUM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If, upon a calling of the roll under paragraph (1), it shall be ascertained that a quorum is not present—

(i) the Presiding Officer shall direct the Clerk to call the names of any absent Senators; and

(ii) following the calling of the names under clause (i), the Presiding Officer shall, without intervening motion or debate, submit to the Senate by a yeas-and-nays vote the question: “Shall the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators?”.

(B) DIRECTION TO COMPEL ATTENDANCE.—If a quorum is not present 15 minutes after the time at which the vote on a question submitted under subparagraph (A)(ii) starts, the Presiding Officer shall, without intervening motion or debate, submit to the Senate by a yeas-and-nays vote the question: “Shall the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to compel the attendance of absent Senators?”.

(C) ARREST OF ABSENT SENATORS.—Effective 1 hour after the Sergeant-at-Arms is di-

rected to compel the attendance of absent Senators under subparagraph (B), if any Senator not excused under rule XII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is not in attendance, the Senate shall be deemed to have agreed an order that reads as follows: “Ordered, That the Sergeant at Arms be directed to arrest absent Senators; that warrants for the arrests of all Senators not sick nor excused be issued under the signature of the Presiding Officer and attested by the Secretary, and that such warrants be executed without delay.”.

(D) REPORTS.—Not less frequently than once per hour during proceedings to compel the attendance of absent Senators, the Sergeant at Arms shall submit to the Senate a report on absent Senators, which shall—

(i) be laid before the Senate;

(ii) identify each Senator whose absence is excused;

(iii) identify each Senator who is absent without excuse; and

(iv) for each Senator identified under clause (iii), provide information on the current location of the Senator.

(3) REGAINING THE FLOOR.—If a Senator had been recognized to speak at the time a call of the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum was initiated under paragraph (2)(A), and if the presence of a quorum is established, that Senator shall be entitled to be recognized to speak.

(d) ADJOURNING AND RECESSING.—During the period of a Government shutdown—

(1) a motion to adjourn or to recess the Senate shall be decided by a yeas-or-nays vote;

(2) if a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall not entertain a request to adjourn or recess the Senate by unanimous consent or to vitiate the yeas and nays on such a motion by unanimous consent;

(3) a motion to adjourn or a motion to recess made during the period beginning at 8:00 a.m. and ending at 11:59 p.m., shall only be agreed to upon an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting, a quorum being present; and

(4) if the Senate must adjourn due to the absence of a quorum, the Senate shall reconvene 2 hours after the time at which it adjourns and ascertain the presence of a quorum in accordance with subsection (c)(1).

(e) NO SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENTS.—The Presiding Officer may not entertain a request to suspend the operation of this standing order by unanimous consent or motion.

(f) CONSISTENCY WITH SENATE EMERGENCY PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES.—Nothing in this standing order shall be construed in a manner that is inconsistent with S. Res. 296 (108th Congress) or any other emergency procedures or practices of the Senate.

(g) STANDING ORDER.—This section shall be a standing order of the Senate.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 298. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 299. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 300. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. REID, Mrs. FEIN-

STEIN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

## TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 298. Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 48, line 21, strike “human smuggling)” and all that follows through page 49, line 2 and insert “human smuggling)”.

SA 299. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 60, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

“(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES COLLECTING DATA ON CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—No eligible entity shall be precluded from being awarded a grant under subsection (a) on the grounds that the eligible entity has only recently begun collecting data on child human trafficking.”.

SA 300. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. REID, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

## TITLE I—JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

Sec. 101. Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund.

Sec. 102. Clarifying the benefits and protections offered to domestic victims of human trafficking.

Sec. 103. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.

Sec. 104. Direct services for victims of child pornography.

Sec. 105. Increasing compensation and restitution for trafficking victims.

Sec. 106. Streamlining human trafficking investigations.

Sec. 107. Enhancing human trafficking reporting.

Sec. 108. Reducing demand for sex trafficking.

Sec. 109. Sense of Congress.

Sec. 110. Using existing task forces and components to target offenders who exploit children.

- Sec. 111. Targeting child predators.
- Sec. 112. Monitoring all human traffickers as violent criminals.
- Sec. 113. Crime victims' rights.
- Sec. 114. Combat Human Trafficking Act.
- Sec. 115. Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act.
- Sec. 116. Bringing Missing Children Home Act.
- Sec. 117. Grant accountability.

#### TITLE II—COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

##### Subtitle A—Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking

- Sec. 201. Amendments to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

##### Subtitle B—Improving the Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking

- Sec. 211. Response to victims of child sex trafficking.

##### Subtitle C—Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking

- Sec. 221. Victim of trafficking defined.
- Sec. 222. Interagency task force report on child trafficking primary prevention.
- Sec. 223. GAO Report on intervention.
- Sec. 224. Provision of housing permitted to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking.

#### TITLE III—HERO ACT

- Sec. 301. Short title.
- Sec. 302. HERO Act.

#### TITLE IV—RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

- Sec. 401. Runaway and homeless youth and trafficking prevention.
- Sec. 402. Response to missing children and victims of child sex trafficking.

#### TITLE V—STOP EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING ACT

- Sec. 501. Short title.
- Sec. 502. Safe Harbor Incentives.
- Sec. 503. Report on restitution paid in connection with certain trafficking offenses.
- Sec. 504. National human trafficking hotline.
- Sec. 505. Job corps eligibility.
- Sec. 506. Clarification of authority of the United States Marshals Service.
- Sec. 507. Establishing a national strategy to combat human trafficking.

#### TITLE I—JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

##### SEC. 101. DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

###### “§ 3014. Additional special assessment

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 and ending on September 30 2019, in addition to the assessment imposed under section 3013, the court shall assess an amount of \$5,000 on any non-indigent person or entity convicted of an offense under—

- “(1) chapter 77 (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons);
- “(2) chapter 109A (relating to sexual abuse);
- “(3) chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation and other abuse of children);
- “(4) chapter 117 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes); or

“(5) section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) (relating to human smuggling), unless the person induced, assisted, abetted, or aided only an individual who at the time of such action was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter (and no other individual) to enter the United States in violation of law.

“(b) SATISFACTION OF OTHER COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS.—An assessment under subsection (a) shall not be payable until the person subject to the assessment has satisfied all outstanding court-ordered fines and orders of restitution arising from the criminal convictions on which the special assessment is based.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ‘Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Fund’), to be administered by the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(d) DEPOSITS.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, or any other law regarding the crediting of money received for the Government, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts in the Fund, in addition to any other amounts available, and without further appropriation, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, use amounts available in the Fund to award grants or enhance victims' programming under—

“(A) sections 202, 203, and 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a, 14044b, and 14044c);

“(B) subsections (b)(2) and (f) of section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105); and

“(C) section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(2) GRANTS.—Of the amounts in the Fund used under paragraph (1), not less than \$2,000,000, if such amounts are available in the Fund during the relevant fiscal year, shall be used for grants to provide services for child pornography victims under section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(f) TRANSFERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the day after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, on September 30 of each fiscal year, all unobligated balances in the Fund shall be transferred to the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be available for any authorized purpose of the Crime Victims Fund; and

“(B) shall remain available until expended.

“(g) COLLECTION METHOD.—The amount assessed under subsection (a) shall, subject to subsection (b), be collected in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases.

“(h) DURATION OF OBLIGATION.—Subject to section 3613(b), the obligation to pay an assessment imposed on or after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 shall not cease until the assessment is paid in full.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 201

of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3013 the following:

“3014. Additional special assessment.”.

##### SEC. 102. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS OFFERED TO DOMESTIC VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) NO REQUIREMENT OF OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in this subsection or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (H), as redesignated, by striking “subparagraph (F)” and inserting “subparagraph (G)”.

##### SEC. 103. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended to read as follows:

###### “SEC. 203. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may award block grants to an eligible entity to develop, improve, or expand domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims' services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

“(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

“(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

“(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

“(B) address the unique needs of child victims of human trafficking;

“(C) facilitate the rescue of child victims of human trafficking;

“(D) investigate and prosecute acts of human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking; and

“(E) utilize, implement, and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of child sex trafficking victims for prostitution offenses, and other laws aimed at the investigation and prosecution of child human trafficking;

“(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child

human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

“(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer's time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

“(i) wire taps;  
“(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;  
“(iii) travel; and  
“(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

“(C) dedicated anti-trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenders, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims' services through coordination with—

“(i) child advocacy centers;  
“(ii) social service agencies;  
“(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

“(iv) housing agencies;  
“(v) legal services agencies; and

“(vi) nongovernmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking; and

“(E) the establishment or enhancement of other necessary victim assistance programs or personnel, such as victim or child advocates, child-protective services, child forensic interviews, or other necessary service providers; and

“(3) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for trafficking victims that include—

“(A) mandatory and regular training requirements for judicial officials involved in the administration or operation of the court program described under this paragraph;

“(B) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking, including case worker or child welfare supervision in collaboration with judicial officers, who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

“(C) the development of a specialized and individualized, court-ordered treatment program for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

“(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;  
“(ii) life skills training;  
“(iii) housing placement;  
“(iv) vocational training;  
“(v) education;  
“(vi) family support services; and  
“(vii) job placement;

“(D) centralized case management involving the consolidation of all of each child human trafficking victim's cases and offenses, and the coordination of all trafficking victim treatment programs and social services;

“(E) regular and mandatory court appearances by the victim during the duration of the treatment program for purposes of ensuring compliance and effectiveness;

“(F) the ultimate dismissal of relevant non-violent criminal charges against the victim, where such victim successfully complies with the terms of the court-ordered treatment program; and

“(G) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and nongovernmental organizations with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

“(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

“(B) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant;

“(C) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section; and

“(D) disclose—

“(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

“(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period ending on the date of the submission of an application under this section.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

“(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b); or

“(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

“(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 3 years after the date of award of the grant.

“(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 2 times and for a period of not greater than 2 years.

“(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall—

“(1) enter into a contract with a nongovernmental organization, including an academic or nonprofit organization, that has experience with issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct periodic evaluations of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section;

“(2) instruct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to review evaluations issued under paragraph (1) to determine the methodological and statistical validity of the evaluations; and

“(3) submit the results of any evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

“(f) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity awarded funds under this section that is found to have used grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the block grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

“(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if within the 5 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section, the grantee has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

“(h) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount expended to carry out this section.

“(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section shall be—

“(1) 70 percent in the first year;  
“(2) 60 percent in the second year; and  
“(3) 50 percent in the third year, and in all subsequent years.

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING; FULLY OFFSET.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, is authorized to award not more than \$7,000,000 of the funds available in the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund, established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘child’ means a person under the age of 18;

“(2) the term ‘child advocacy center’ means a center created under subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

“(3) the term ‘child human trafficking’ means 1 or more severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving a victim who is a child; and

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State or unit of local government that—

“(A) has significant criminal activity involving child human trafficking;

“(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing child human trafficking;

“(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat child human trafficking, including—

“(i) the establishment of a shelter for victims of child human trafficking, through existing or new facilities;

“(ii) the provision of trauma-informed, gender-responsive rehabilitative care to victims of child human trafficking;



“(iii) the provision of specialized training for law enforcement officers and social service providers for all forms of human trafficking, with a focus on domestic child human trafficking;

“(iv) prevention, deterrence, and prosecution of offenses involving child human trafficking, including soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing human acts with children;

“(v) cooperation or referral agreements with organizations providing outreach or other related services to runaway and homeless youth;

“(vi) law enforcement protocols or procedures to screen all individuals arrested for prostitution, whether adult or child, for victimization by sex trafficking and by other crimes, such as sexual assault and domestic violence; and

“(vii) cooperation or referral agreements with State child welfare agencies and child advocacy centers; and

“(D) provides an assurance that, under the plan under subparagraph (C), a victim of child human trafficking shall not be required to collaborate with law enforcement officers to have access to any shelter or services provided with a grant under this section.

“(I) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY; SPECIALIZED VICTIMS’ SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—No grant funds under this section may be awarded or transferred to any entity unless such entity has demonstrated substantial experience providing services to victims of human trafficking or related populations (such as runaway and homeless youth), or employs staff specialized in the treatment of human trafficking victims.”

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7101 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 203 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 203. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.”

#### SEC. 104. DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(5) (42 U.S.C. 13001a(5)), by inserting “, including human trafficking and the production of child pornography” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 214 (42 U.S.C. 13002)—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director and with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, may make grants to develop and implement specialized programs to identify and provide direct services to victims of child pornography.”

#### SEC. 105. INCREASING COMPENSATION AND RESTITUTION FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18.—Section 1594 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “that was used or” and inserting “that was involved in, used, or”; and

(ii) by inserting “, and any property traceable to such property” after “such violation”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or any property traceable to such property” after “such violation”;

(2) in subsection (e)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking “used or” and inserting “involved in, used, or”; and

(B) by inserting “, and any property traceable to such property” after “any violation of this chapter”;;

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) TRANSFER OF FORFEITED ASSETS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General shall transfer assets forfeited pursuant to this section, or the proceeds derived from the sale thereof, to satisfy victim restitution orders arising from violations of this chapter.

“(2) PRIORITY.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall have priority over any other claims to the assets or their proceeds.

“(3) USE OF NONFORFEITED ASSETS.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not reduce or otherwise mitigate the obligation of a person convicted of a violation of this chapter to satisfy the full amount of a restitution order through the use of nonforfeited assets or to reimburse the Attorney General for the value of assets or proceeds transferred under this subsection through the use of nonforfeited assets.”

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.—Section 524(c)(1)(B) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “chapter 77 of title 18,” after “criminal drug laws of the United States or of”.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 9703 (as added by section 638(b)(1) of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-393; 106 Stat. 1779)) as section 9705; and

(B) in section 9705(a), as redesignated—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (I)—

(aa) by striking “payment” and inserting “Payment”; and

(bb) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(II) in subparagraph (J), by striking “payment” and inserting “Payment”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) in clause (iii)—

(AA) in subclause (I), by striking “or” and inserting “of”; and

(BB) in subclause (III), by striking “and” at the end;

(bb) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(cc) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement with respect to a violation of chapter 77 of title 18 (relating to human trafficking);”

(II) in subparagraph (G), by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) in subparagraph (H), by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CROSS REFERENCES.—

(i) TITLE 28.—Section 524(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking “section 9703(g)(4)(A)(ii)” and inserting “section 9705(g)(4)(A)”;

(II) in paragraph (10), by striking “section 9703(p)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”;

(III) in paragraph (11), by striking “section 9703” and inserting “section 9705”.

(ii) TITLE 31.—Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in section 312(d), by striking “section 9703” and inserting “section 9705”; and

(II) in section 5340(1), by striking “section 9703(p)(1)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”.

(iii) TITLE 39.—Section 2003(e)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 9703(p)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”.

(B) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“9701. Fees and charges for Government services and things of value.

“9702. Investment of trust funds.

“9703. Managerial accountability and flexibility.

“9704. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility.

“9705. Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund.”

#### SEC. 106. STREAMLINING HUMAN TRAFFICKING INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (a), by inserting a comma after “weapons”;

(B) in subparagraph (c)—

(i) by inserting “section 1581 (peonage), section 1584 (involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),” before “section 1591”;

(ii) by inserting “section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),” before “section 1751”;

(iii) by inserting a comma after “virus”;

(iv) by striking “, section” and inserting a comma;

(v) by striking “or” after “misuse of passports,”; and

(vi) by inserting “or” before “section 555”;

(C) in subparagraph (j), by striking “pipeline,” and inserting “pipeline,”; and

(D) in subparagraph (p), by striking “documents, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)” and inserting “documents, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “human trafficking, child sexual exploitation, child pornography production,” after “kidnapping”.

#### SEC. 107. ENHANCING HUMAN TRAFFICKING REPORTING.

Section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) PART 1 VIOLENT CRIMES TO INCLUDE HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘part 1 violent crimes’ shall include severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).”

#### SEC. 108. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “or maintains” and inserting “maintains, patronizes, or solicits”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “or maintained” and inserting “, maintained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) by striking “knew that the person” and inserting “knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person”.

(b) **DEFINITION AMENDED.**—Section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) is amended by striking “or obtaining” and inserting “obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting”.

(c) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the amendments made by this section is to clarify the range of conduct punished as sex trafficking.

#### **SEC. 109. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, defines a sex trafficker as a person who “knowingly . . . recruits, entices, harbors, transports, provides, obtains, or maintains by any means a person . . . knowing, or in reckless disregard of the fact, that means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion . . . or any combination of such means will be used to cause the person to engage in a commercial sex act, or that the person has not attained the age of 18 years and will be caused to engage in a commercial sex act”;

(2) while use of the word “obtains” in section 1591, United States Code, has been interpreted, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, to encompass those who purchase illicit sexual acts from trafficking victims, some confusion persists;

(3) in *United States vs. Jungers*, 702 F.3d 1066 (8th Cir. 2013), the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit ruled that section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, applied to persons who purchase illicit sexual acts with trafficking victims after the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota erroneously granted motions to acquit these buyers in two separate cases; and

(4) section 108 of this title amends section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, to add the words “solicits or patronizes” to the sex trafficking statute making absolutely clear for judges, juries, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials that criminals who purchase sexual acts from human trafficking victims may be arrested, prosecuted, and convicted as sex trafficking offenders when this is merited by the facts of a particular case.

#### **SEC. 110. USING EXISTING TASK FORCES AND COMPONENTS TO TARGET OFFENDERS WHO EXPLOIT CHILDREN.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall ensure that—

(1) all task forces and working groups within the Innocence Lost National Initiative engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the investigative capabilities of State and local law enforcement officers in the detection, investigation, and prosecution of persons who patronize, or solicit children for sex; and

(2) all components and task forces with jurisdiction to detect, investigate, and prosecute cases of child labor trafficking engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the capacity of such components to deter and punish child labor trafficking.

#### **SEC. 111. TARGETING CHILD PREDATORS.**

(a) **CLARIFYING THAT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PRODUCERS ARE HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.**—Section 2423(f) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “means (1) a” and inserting the following: “means—

“(1) a”;

(2) by striking “United States; or (2) any” and inserting the following: “United States;

“(2) any”; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; or

“(3) production of child pornography (as defined in section 2256(8)).”.

(b) **HOLDING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACCOUNTABLE.**—Section 2423(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “a preponderance of the evidence” and inserting “clear and convincing evidence”.

#### **SEC. 112. MONITORING ALL HUMAN TRAFFICKERS AS VIOLENT CRIMINALS.**

Section 3156(a)(4)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “77,” after “chapter”.

#### **SEC. 113. CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea bargain or deferred prosecution agreement.

“(10) The right to be informed of the rights under this section and the services described in section 503(c) of the Victims’ Rights and Restitution Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 10607(c)) and provided contact information for the Office of the Victims’ Rights Ombudsman of the Department of Justice.”;

(2) in subsection (d)(3), in the fifth sentence, by inserting “, unless the litigants, with the approval of the court, have stipulated to a different time period for consideration” before the period; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “this chapter, the term” and inserting the following: “this chapter:

“(1) COURT OF APPEALS.—The term ‘court of appeals’ means—

“(A) the United States court of appeals for the judicial district in which a defendant is being prosecuted; or

“(B) for a prosecution in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

“(2) CRIME VICTIM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term”;

(B) by striking “In the case” and inserting the following:

“(B) MINORS AND CERTAIN OTHER VICTIMS.—In the case”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) DISTRICT COURT; COURT.—The terms ‘district court’ and ‘court’ include the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.”.

(b) **CRIME VICTIMS FUND.**—Section 1402(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601(d)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting “section” before “3771”.

(c) **APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: “In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.”.

(2) **APPLICATION.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

#### **SEC. 114. COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMMERCIAL SEX ACT; SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS; STATE; TASK FORCE.**—The terms “commercial sex act”, “severe forms of trafficking in persons”,

“State”, and “Task Force” have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(2) **COVERED OFFENDER.**—The term “covered offender” means an individual who obtains, patronizes, or solicits a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(3) **COVERED OFFENSE.**—The term “covered offense” means the provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(4) **FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “Federal law enforcement officer” has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(5) **LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “local law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a unit of local government authorized by law or by a local government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(6) **STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “State law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(c) **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TRAINING AND POLICY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, PROSECUTORS, AND JUDGES.**—

(1) **TRAINING.**—

(A) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice, including each anti-human trafficking training program for Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers, includes technical training on—

(i) effective methods for investigating and prosecuting covered offenders; and

(ii) facilitating the provision of physical and mental health services by health care providers to persons subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(B) **FEDERAL PROSECUTORS.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice for United States attorneys or other Federal prosecutors includes training on seeking restitution for offenses under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that each United States attorney or other Federal prosecutor, upon obtaining a conviction for such an offense, requests a specific amount of restitution for each victim of the offense without regard to whether the victim requests restitution.

(C) **JUDGES.**—The Federal Judicial Center shall provide training to judges relating to the application of section 1593 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to ordering restitution for victims of offenses under chapter 77 of such title.

(2) **POLICY FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that Federal law enforcement officers are engaged in activities, programs, or operations involving the detection, investigation, and prosecution of covered offenders.

(d) **MINIMUM PERIOD OF SUPERVISED RELEASE FOR CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT COMMERCIAL CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.**—Section 3583(k) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “1594(c),” after “1591.”.

(e) **BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS REPORT ON STATE ENFORCEMENT OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING PROHIBITIONS.**—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

- (1) prepare an annual report on—
  - (A) the rates of—
    - (i) arrest of individuals by State law enforcement officers for a covered offense;
    - (ii) prosecution (including specific charges) of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and
    - (iii) conviction of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and
  - (B) sentences imposed on individuals convicted in State court systems for a covered offense; and
- (2) submit the annual report prepared under paragraph (1) to—
  - (A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;
  - (B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;
  - (C) the Task Force;
  - (D) the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)); and
  - (E) the Attorney General.

#### SEC. 115. SURVIVORS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING EMPOWERMENT ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act”.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking (referred to in this section as the “Council”), which shall provide advice and recommendations to the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)) (referred to in this section as the “Group”) and the President’s Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established under section 105(a) of such Act (referred to in this section as the “Task Force”).

##### (c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) **COMPOSITION.**—The Council shall be composed of not less than 8 and not more than 14 individuals who are survivors of human trafficking.

(2) **REPRESENTATION OF SURVIVORS.**—To the extent practicable, members of the Council shall be survivors of trafficking, who shall accurately reflect the diverse backgrounds of survivors of trafficking, including—

(A) survivors of sex trafficking and survivors of labor trafficking; and

(B) survivors who are United States citizens and survivors who are aliens lawfully present in the United States.

(3) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint the members of the Council.

(4) **TERM; REAPPOINTMENT.**—Each member of the Council shall serve for a term of 2 years and may be reappointed by the President to serve 1 additional 2-year term.

##### (d) FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall—

(1) be a nongovernmental advisory body to the Group;

(2) meet, at its own discretion or at the request of the Group, not less frequently than annually to review Federal Government policy and programs intended to combat human trafficking, including programs relating to the provision of services for victims and serve as a point of contact for Federal agencies reaching out to human trafficking survivors for input on programming and policies relating to human trafficking in the United States;

(3) formulate assessments and recommendations to ensure that policy and programming efforts of the Federal Government conform, to the extent practicable, to the best practices in the field of human trafficking prevention; and

(4) meet with the Group not less frequently than annually, and not later than 45 days before a meeting with the Task Force, to formally present the findings and recommendations of the Council.

(e) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and each year thereafter until the date described in subsection (h), the Council shall submit a report that contains the findings derived from the reviews conducted pursuant to subsection (d)(2) to—

- (1) the chair of the Task Force;
- (2) the members of the Group;
- (3) the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Appropriations, and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and
- (4) the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Judiciary of the Senate.

(f) **EMPLOYEE STATUS.**—Members of the Council—

(1) shall not be considered employees of the Federal Government for any purpose; and

(2) shall not receive compensation other than reimbursement of travel expenses and per diem allowance in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The Council shall not be subject to the requirements under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(h) **SUNSET.**—The Council shall terminate on September 30, 2020.

#### SEC. 116. BRINGING MISSING CHILDREN HOME ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Bringing Missing Children Home Act”.

(b) **CRIME CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.**—Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) a recent photograph of the child, if available;”; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “60 days” and inserting “30 days”; and

(ii) by inserting “and a photograph taken during the previous 180 days” after “dental records”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children of each report received relating to a child reported missing from a foster care family home or childcare institution;”; and

(F) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated—

(i) by inserting “State and local child welfare systems and” before “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) grant permission to the National Crime Information Center Terminal Con-

tractor for the State to update the missing person record in the National Crime Information Center computer networks with additional information learned during the investigation relating to the missing person.”.

#### SEC. 117. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “covered grant” means a grant awarded by the Attorney General under section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b), as amended by section 103.

(b) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All covered grants shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

##### (1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of a covered grant to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of a covered grant that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a covered grant during the following 2 fiscal years.

(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding covered grants the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for a covered grant.

(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded a covered grant during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

##### (2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and covered grants, the term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General may not award a covered grant to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a covered grant and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous

substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts transferred to the Department of Justice under this title, or the amendments made by this title, may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this title, or the amendments made by this title, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.

(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all approved conference expenditures referenced in this paragraph.

(D) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification that—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued;

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(iv) includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(4) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts awarded under this title, or any amendments made by this title, may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a covered grant has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another covered grant for not less than 5 years.

## TITLE II—COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

### Subtitle A—Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking

#### SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 343(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 5714–23(b)(5))—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))” before the semicolon at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting “, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))” after “assault”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by inserting “, including such youth who are victims of trafficking (as defined in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)))” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 351(a) (42 U.S.C. 5714–41(a)) by striking “or sexual exploitation” and inserting “sexual exploitation, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))”.

### Subtitle B—Improving the Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking

#### SEC. 211. RESPONSE TO VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking “child prostitution” and inserting “child sex trafficking, including child prostitution”.

### Subtitle C—Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking

#### SEC. 221. VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term “victim of trafficking” has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

#### SEC. 222. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE REPORT ON CHILD TRAFFICKING PRIMARY PREVENTION.

(a) REVIEW.—The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, established under section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103), shall conduct a review that, with regard to trafficking in persons in the United States—

(1) in consultation with nongovernmental organizations that the Task Force determines appropriate, surveys and catalogs the activities of the Federal Government and State governments—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(2) surveys academic literature on—

(A) deterring individuals from committing trafficking offenses;

(B) preventing children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(C) the commercial sexual exploitation of children; and

(D) other similar topics that the Task Force determines to be appropriate;

(3) identifies best practices and effective strategies—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking; and

(4) identifies current gaps in research and data that would be helpful in formulating effective strategies—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available in electronic format, a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (a).

#### SEC. 223. GAO REPORT ON INTERVENTION.

On the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that includes information on—

(1) the efforts of Federal and select State law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking in the United States; and

(2) each Federal grant program, a purpose of which is to combat human trafficking or assist victims of trafficking, as specified in an authorizing statute or in a guidance document issued by the agency carrying out the grant program.

#### SEC. 224. PROVISION OF HOUSING PERMITTED TO PROTECT AND ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting “, including programs that provide housing to victims of trafficking” before the period at the end.

## TITLE III—HERO ACT

#### SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Human Exploitation Rescue Operations Act of 2015” or the “HERO Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 302. HERO ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The illegal market for the production and distribution of child abuse imagery is a growing threat to children in the United States. International demand for this material creates a powerful incentive for the rape, abuse, and torture of children within the United States.

(2) The targeting of United States children by international criminal networks is a threat to the homeland security of the United States. This threat must be fought with trained personnel and highly specialized counter-child-exploitation strategies and technologies.

(3) The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security serves a critical national security role in protecting the United States from the growing international threat of child exploitation and human trafficking.

(4) The Cyber Crimes Center of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement is a vital national resource in the effort to combat international child exploitation, providing advanced expertise and assistance in investigations, computer forensics, and victim identification.

(5) The returning military heroes of the United States possess unique and valuable skills that can assist law enforcement in combating global sexual and child exploitation, and the Department of Homeland Security should use this national resource to the maximum extent possible.

(6) Through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program, the returning military heroes of the United States are trained and hired to investigate crimes of child exploitation in

order to target predators and rescue children from sexual abuse and slavery.

(b) CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, AND COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 890A. CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT, AND CYBER CRIMES UNIT.**

**“(a) CYBER CRIMES CENTER.—**

**“(1) IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary shall operate, within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a Cyber Crimes Center (referred to in this section as the ‘Center’).

**“(2) PURPOSE.—**The purpose of the Center shall be to provide investigative assistance, training, and equipment to support United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s domestic and international investigations of cyber-related crimes.

**“(b) CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT.—**

**“(1) IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Child Exploitation Investigations Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CEIU’).

**“(2) FUNCTIONS.—**The CEIU—

**“(A) shall coordinate all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement child exploitation initiatives, including investigations into—**

- “(i) child exploitation;**
- “(ii) child pornography;**
- “(iii) child victim identification;**
- “(iv) traveling child sex offenders; and**
- “(v) forced child labor, including the sexual exploitation of minors;**

**“(B) shall, among other things, focus on—**

- “(i) child exploitation prevention;**
- “(ii) investigative capacity building;**
- “(iii) enforcement operations; and**
- “(iv) training for Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel, upon request;**

**“(C) shall provide training, technical expertise, support, or coordination of child exploitation investigations, as needed, to cooperating law enforcement agencies and personnel;**

**“(D) shall provide psychological support and counseling services for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel engaged in child exploitation prevention initiatives, including making available other existing services to assist employees who are exposed to child exploitation material during investigations;**

**“(E) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of the recruiting, training, equipping and hiring of wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program; and**

**“(F) shall collaborate with other governmental, nongovernmental, and nonprofit entities approved by the Secretary for the sponsorship of, and participation in, outreach and training activities.**

**“(3) DATA COLLECTION.—**The CEIU shall collect and maintain data concerning—

**“(A) the total number of suspects identified by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;**

**“(B) the number of arrests by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, disaggregated by type, including—**

**“(i) the number of victims identified through investigations carried out by United**

**States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and**

**“(ii) the number of suspects arrested who were in positions of trust or authority over children;**

**“(C) the number of cases opened for investigation by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and**

**“(D) the number of cases resulting in a Federal, State, foreign, or military prosecution.**

**“(4) AVAILABILITY OF DATA TO CONGRESS.—**In addition to submitting the reports required under paragraph (7), the CEIU shall make the data collected and maintained under paragraph (3) available to the committees of Congress described in paragraph (7).

**“(5) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—**The CEIU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3).

**“(6) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—**

**“(A) IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Taskforce, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CEIU.

**“(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—**Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

**“(7) REPORTS.—**Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the HERO Act of 2015, and annually for the following 4 years, the CEIU shall—

**“(A) submit a report containing a summary of the data collected pursuant to paragraph (3) during the previous year to—**

- “(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;**
- “(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;**
- “(iii) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;**

**“(iv) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;**

**“(v) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and**

**“(vi) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and**

**“(B) make a copy of each report submitted under subparagraph (A) publicly available on the website of the Department.**

**“(c) COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—**

**“(1) IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Computer Forensics Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CFU’).

**“(2) FUNCTIONS.—**The CFU—

**“(A) shall provide training and technical support in digital forensics to—**

**“(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and**

**“(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;**

**“(B) shall provide computer hardware, software, and forensic licenses for all computer forensics personnel within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;**

**“(C) shall participate in research and development in the area of digital forensics, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and**

**“(D) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of recruiting, training, equipping, and hiring wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program.**

**“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—**The CFU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

**“(4) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—**

**“(A) IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Task Force, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CFU.

**“(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—**Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

**“(d) CYBER CRIMES UNIT.—**

**“(1) IN GENERAL.—**The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Cyber Crimes Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CCU’).

**“(2) FUNCTIONS.—**The CCU—

**“(A) shall oversee the cyber security strategy and cyber-related operations and programs for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;**

**“(B) shall enhance United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s ability to combat criminal enterprises operating on or through the Internet, with specific focus in the areas of—**

- “(i) cyber economic crime;**
- “(ii) digital theft of intellectual property;**
- “(iii) illicit e-commerce (including hidden marketplaces);**

**“(iv) Internet-facilitated proliferation of arms and strategic technology; and**

**“(v) cyber-enabled smuggling and money laundering;**

**“(C) shall provide training and technical support in cyber investigations to—**

**“(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and**

**“(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;**

**“(D) shall participate in research and development in the area of cyber investigations, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and**

**“(E) is authorized to recruit participants of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program for investigative and forensic positions in support of the functions of the CCU.**

**“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—**The CCU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

**“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—**There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.”.

**(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—**The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 890 the following:

“Sec. 890A. Cyber crimes center, child exploitation investigations unit, computer forensics unit, and cyber crimes unit.”.

(c) **HERO CORPS HIRING.**—It is the sense of Congress that Homeland Security Investigations of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement should hire, recruit, train, and equip wounded, ill, or injured military veterans (as defined in section 101, title 38, United States Code) who are affiliated with the HERO Child Rescue Corps program for investigative, intelligence, analyst, and forensic positions.

(d) **INVESTIGATING CHILD EXPLOITATION.**—Section 307(b)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) conduct research and development for the purpose of advancing technology for the investigation of child exploitation crimes, including child victim identification, trafficking in persons, and child pornography, and for advanced forensics.”.

#### **TITLE IV—RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT**

##### **SEC. 401. RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this section an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision, the amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.).

(c) **FINDINGS.**—Section 302 (42 U.S.C. 5701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and” before “linguistically appropriate”; and

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “outside the welfare system and the law enforcement system” and inserting “, in collaboration with public assistance systems, the law enforcement system, and the child welfare system”;

(3) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting “a safe place to live and” after “youth need”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) runaway and homeless youth are at a high risk of becoming victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking in persons.”.

(d) **BASIC CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.**—Section 311(a) (42 U.S.C. 5711(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “services” and all that follows through the period and inserting “safe shelter and services, including trauma-informed services, for runaway and homeless youth and, if appropriate, services for the families of such youth, including (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “mental health,”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “21 days; and” and inserting “30 days;”; and

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “individual”; and

(bb) by inserting “, as appropriate,” after “group”; and

(cc) by striking “as appropriate” and inserting “including (if appropriate) counseling for individuals identified by such youth as family”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) suicide prevention services; and”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (ii), by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “home-based services”; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(III) in clause (iv), by striking “diseases,” and inserting “infections;”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) trauma-informed and gender-responsive services for runaway or homeless youth, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

“(vi) an assessment of family engagement in support and reunification (if reunification is appropriate), interventions, and services for parents or legal guardians of such youth, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.”.

(2) **ELIGIBILITY; PLAN REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 312 (42 U.S.C. 5712) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by inserting “, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family,” after “parents or legal guardians”; and

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking “cultural minority and persons with limited ability to speak English” and inserting “cultural minority, persons with limited ability to speak English, and runaway or homeless youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation”; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) shall keep adequate statistical records profiling the youth and family members of such youth whom the applicant serves, including demographic information on and the number of—

“(A) such youth who are not referred to out-of-home shelter services;

“(B) such youth who are members of vulnerable or underserved populations;

“(C) such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation, disaggregated by—

“(i) such youth who have been coerced or forced into a commercial sex act, as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

“(ii) such youth who have been coerced or forced into other forms of labor; and

“(iii) such youth who have engaged in a commercial sex act, as so defined, for any reason other than by coercion or force;

“(D) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

“(E) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

“(F) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system;”; and

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (13) as paragraphs (9) through (14);

(v) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) shall ensure that—

“(A) the records described in paragraph (7), on an individual runaway or homeless youth, shall not be disclosed without the consent of the individual youth and of the parent or

legal guardian of such youth or (if appropriate) an individual identified by such youth as family, to anyone other than another agency compiling statistical records or a government agency involved in the disposition of criminal charges against an individual runaway or homeless youth; and

“(B) reports or other documents based on the statistics described in paragraph (7) shall not disclose the identity of any individual runaway or homeless youth;”; and

(vi) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated, by striking “statistical summaries” and inserting “statistics”; and

(vii) in paragraph (13)(C), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking clause (i) and inserting:

“(i) the number and characteristics of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of family separation, who participate in the project, including such information on—

“(I) such youth (including both types of such participating youth) who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation, disaggregated by—

“(aa) such youth who have been coerced or forced into a commercial sex act, as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

“(bb) such youth who have been coerced or forced into other forms of labor; and

“(cc) such youth who have engaged in a commercial sex act, as so defined, for any reason other than by coercion or force;

“(II) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

“(III) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

“(IV) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system; and”; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(viii) in paragraph (14), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “for natural disasters, inclement weather, and mental health emergencies;”; and

(ix) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) shall provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to runaway and homeless youth; and

“(16) shall assist youth in completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090).”; and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” after “provide”; and

(II) by striking “families (including unrelated individuals in the family households) of such youth” and inserting “families of such youth (including unrelated individuals in the family households of such youth and, if appropriate, individuals identified by such youth as family)”; and

(III) by inserting “suicide prevention,” after “physical health care,”; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, including training on trauma-informed and youth-centered care” after “home-based services”.

(3) **APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.**—Section 313(b) (42 U.S.C. 5713(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “priority to” and all that follows through “who” and inserting “priority to eligible applicants who”; and

(B) by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2).

(e) **TRANSITIONAL LIVING GRANT PROGRAM.**—Section 322(a) (42 U.S.C. 5714-2(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “information and counseling services”; and

(B) by striking “job attainment skills, and mental and physical health care” and inserting “job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, and suicide prevention services”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) and (9) through (16) as paragraphs (5) through (10) and (12) through (19), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) to provide counseling to homeless youth and to encourage, if appropriate, the involvement in such counseling of their parents or legal guardians, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family;

“(4) to provide aftercare services, if possible, to homeless youth who have received shelter and services from a transitional living youth project, including (to the extent practicable) such youth who, after receiving such shelter and services, relocate to a State other than the State in which such project is located.”;

(4) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” after “referral of homeless youth to”;

(B) by striking “and health care programs” and inserting “mental health service and health care programs, including programs providing wrap-around services to victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation.”; and

(C) by striking “such services for youths;” and inserting “such programs described in this paragraph.”;

(5) by inserting after paragraph (10), as so redesignated, the following:

“(11) to develop a plan to provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable that address the needs of homeless and street youth.”;

(6) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated, by striking “the applicant and statistical” through “who participate in such project,” and inserting “the applicant, statistical summaries describing the number, the characteristics, and the demographic information of the homeless youth who participate in such project, including the prevalence of trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of such youth.”; and

(7) in paragraph (19), as so redesignated, by inserting “regarding responses to natural disasters, inclement weather, and mental health emergencies” after “management plan”.

(f) COORDINATING, TRAINING, RESEARCH, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.—

(1) COORDINATION.—Section 341 (42 U.S.C. 5714-21) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting “safety, well-being,” after “health.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “other Federal entities” and inserting “the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice”.

(2) GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 342 (42 U.S.C. 5714-22) is amended by inserting “, including onsite and web-based techniques, such as on-demand and online learning,” before “to public and private entities”.

(3) GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DEMONSTRATION, AND SERVICE PROJECTS.—Section 343 (42 U.S.C. 5714-23) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “violence, trauma, and” before “sexual abuse and assault”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “sexual abuse and assault; and” and inserting “sexual abuse or assault, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation.”;

(III) in subparagraph (C), by striking “who have been sexually victimized” and inserting “who are victims of sexual abuse or assault, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation.”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) best practices for identifying and providing age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to—

“(i) vulnerable and underserved youth populations; and

“(ii) youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

“(E) verifying youth as runaway or homeless to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090).”;

(ii) in paragraph (9), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (10), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(11) examining the intersection between the runaway and homeless youth populations and trafficking in persons, including noting whether such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons were previously involved in the child welfare or juvenile justice systems.”; and

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(B), by inserting “, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation” after “runaway or homeless youth”.

(4) PERIODIC ESTIMATE OF INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF YOUTH HOMELESSNESS.—Section 345 (42 U.S.C. 5714-25) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “13” and inserting “12”; and

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) that includes demographic information about and characteristics of runaway or homeless youth, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

“(4) that does not disclose the identity of any runaway or homeless youth.”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “13” and inserting “12”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) incidences, if any, of—

“(i) such individuals who are victims of trafficking in persons; or

“(ii) such individuals who are victims of sexual exploitation; and”;

(v) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking “; and” and inserting “, including mental health services.”; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) access to education and job training; and”.

(g) SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM.—Section 351 (42 U.S.C. 5714-41) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting “public and” before “non-profit”; and

(B) by striking “prostitution, or sexual exploitation.” and inserting “violence, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an applicant shall certify to the Secretary that such applicant has systems in place to ensure that such applicant can provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to all youth described in subsection (a).”.

(h) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) REPORTS.—Section 382(a) (42 U.S.C. 5715(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (C) through (E), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) collecting data on trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of runaway and homeless youth.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) the number and characteristics of homeless youth served by such projects, including—

“(i) such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation;

“(ii) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

“(iii) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

“(iv) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking “intrafamily problems” and inserting “problems within the family, including (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.”.

(2) NONDISCRIMINATION.—Part F is amended by inserting after section 386A (42 U.S.C. 5732-1) the following:

#### “SEC. 386B. NONDISCRIMINATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No person in the United States shall, on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity (as defined in section 249(c)(4) of title 18, United States Code), sexual orientation, or disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this title, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with amounts appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, or other assistance administered under this title.

“(b) EXCEPTION.—If sex segregation or sex-specific programming is necessary to the essential operation of a program, nothing in this section shall prevent any such program or activity from consideration of an individual’s sex. In such circumstances, grantees may meet the requirements of this section by providing comparable services to individuals who cannot be provided with the sex-segregated or sex-specific programming.

“(c) DISQUALIFICATION.—The authority of the Secretary to enforce this section shall be the same as that provided for with respect to section 654 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9849).



“(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed, interpreted, or applied to supplant, displace, preempt, or otherwise limit the responsibilities and liabilities under other Federal or State civil rights laws.”.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 387 (42 U.S.C. 5732a) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6), and paragraphs (7) and (8), as paragraphs (2) through (7), and paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

“(1) CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY APPROPRIATE.—The term ‘culturally and linguistically appropriate’, with respect to services, has the meaning given the term ‘culturally and linguistically appropriate services’ in the ‘National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services in Health and Health Care’, issued in April 2013, by the Office of Minority Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.”;

(C) in paragraph (6)(B)(v), as so redesignated—

(i) by redesignating subclauses (II) through (IV) as subclauses (III) through (V), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after subclause (I), the following:

“(II) trafficking in persons;”;

(iii) in subclause (IV), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “diseases” and inserting “infections”; and

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in subclause (V), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(VI) suicide.”;

(D) in paragraph (7)(B), as so redesignated, by striking “prostitution,” and inserting “trafficking in persons.”;

(E) by inserting after paragraph (7), as so redesignated, the following:

“(8) TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.—The term ‘trafficking in persons’ has the meaning given the term ‘severe forms of trafficking in persons’ in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).”;

(F) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting “to homeless youth” after “provides”; and

(ii) by inserting “, to establish a stable family or community supports,” after “self-sufficient living”; and

(G) in paragraph (10)(B), as so redesignated—

(i) in clause (ii)—

(I) by inserting “or able” after “willing”; and

(II) by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) who is involved in the child welfare or juvenile justice system, but who is not receiving government-funded housing.”.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 388(a) (42 U.S.C. 5751(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “for fiscal year 2009,” and all that follows through the period and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.” and inserting “\$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “for fiscal year 2009” and all that follows through the period and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”.

#### SEC.

402. RESPONSE TO MISSING CHILDREN AND VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.—

(a) MISSING CHILDREN’S ASSISTANCE ACT.—Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children’s Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking “child prostitution” and inserting “child sex trafficking”.

(b) CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1990.—Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) a recent photograph of the child, if available;”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “60 days” and inserting “30 days”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting “State and local child welfare systems and” before “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) grant permission to the National Crime Information Center Terminal Contractor for the State to update the missing person record in the National Crime Information Center computer networks with additional information learned during the investigation relating to the missing person.”.

#### TITLE V—STOP EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING ACT

##### SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015”.

##### SEC. 502. SAFE HARBOR INCENTIVES.

Part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1701(c), by striking “where feasible” and all that follows, and inserting the following: “where feasible, to an application—

“(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

“(2) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law that—

“(A) treats a minor who has engaged in, or has attempted to engage in, a commercial sex act as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons;

“(B) discourages or prohibits the charging or prosecution of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution or sex trafficking offense, based on the conduct described in subparagraph (A); and

“(C) encourages the diversion of an individual described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate service providers, including child welfare services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services.”; and

(2) in section 1709, by inserting at the end the following:

“(5) ‘commercial sex act’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

“(6) ‘minor’ means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

“(7) ‘severe form of trafficking in persons’ has the meaning given the term in section

103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).”.

##### SEC. 503. REPORT ON RESTITUTION PAID IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN TRAFFICKING OFFENSES.

Section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after “1590,” the following: “1591.”;

(2) by striking “and 1594” and inserting “1594, 2251, 2251A, 2421, 2422, and 2423”;

(3) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in clause (v), by striking “and” at the end; and

(5) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

“(vi) the number of individuals required by a court order to pay restitution in connection with a violation of each offense under title 18, United States Code, the amount of restitution required to be paid under each such order, and the amount of restitution actually paid pursuant to each such order; and

“(vii) the age, gender, race, country of origin, country of citizenship, and description of the role in the offense of individuals convicted under each offense; and”.

##### SEC. 504. NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.

Section 107(b)(1)(B) of the Victims of Crime Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Subject” and inserting “(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.—Beginning in fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, of amounts made available for grants under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make grants for a national communication system to assist victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons in communicating with service providers. The Secretary shall give priority to grant applicants that have experience in providing telephone services to victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.”.

##### SEC. 505. JOB CORPS ELIGIBILITY.

Section 144(a)(3) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3194(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) A victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)). Notwithstanding paragraph (2), an individual described in this subparagraph shall not be required to demonstrate eligibility under such paragraph.”.

##### SEC. 506. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.

Section 566(e)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C), the following:

“(D) assist State, local, and other Federal law enforcement agencies, upon the request of such an agency, in locating and recovering missing children.”.

##### SEC. 507. ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall implement and maintain a National Strategy for Combating Human Trafficking

(referred to in this section as the “National Strategy”) in accordance with this section.

(b) **REQUIRED CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.**—The National Strategy shall include the following:

(1) Integrated Federal, State, local, and tribal efforts to investigate and prosecute human trafficking cases, including—

(A) the development by each United States attorney, in consultation with State, local, and tribal government agencies, of a district-specific strategic plan to coordinate the identification of victims and the investigation and prosecution of human trafficking crimes;

(B) the appointment of not fewer than 1 assistant United States attorney in each district dedicated to the prosecution of human trafficking cases or responsible for implementing the National Strategy;

(C) the participation in any Federal, State, local, or tribal human trafficking task force operating in the district of the United States attorney; and

(D) any other efforts intended to enhance the level of coordination and cooperation, as determined by the Attorney General.

(2) Case coordination within the Department of Justice, including specific integration, coordination, and collaboration, as appropriate, on human trafficking investigations between and among the United States attorneys, the Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit, the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(3) Annual budget priorities and Federal efforts dedicated to preventing and combating human trafficking, including resources dedicated to the Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit, the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and all other entities that receive Federal support that have a goal or mission to combat the exploitation of adults and children.

(4) An ongoing assessment of the future trends, challenges, and opportunities, including new investigative strategies, techniques, and technologies, that will enhance Federal, State, local, and tribal efforts to combat human trafficking.

(5) Encouragement of cooperation, coordination, and mutual support between private sector and other entities and organizations and Federal agencies to combat human trafficking, including the involvement of State, local, and tribal government agencies to the extent Federal programs are involved.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled “Examining the Presi-

dent’s Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Protecting Taxpayers from Schemes and Scams During the 2015 Tax Filing Season.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Visa Waiver Program: Implications for U.S. National Security.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 12, 2015, at 10:30 a.m., in room SD-562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Bridging the Gap: How Prepared are Americans for Retirement.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 16, 2015, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 17 and Calendar No. 18; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar No. 3 and Calendar No. 4; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Michael Greco, of New York, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of New York for the term of four years.

Ronald Lee Miller, of Kansas, to be United States Marshal for the District of Kansas for the term of four years.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF GEORGIA JONES-AYERS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 85.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 85) honoring the life and legacy of Georgia Jones-Ayers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 85) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 25, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Con. Res. 7 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution is printed in the RECORD of March 3, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 16, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, March 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; finally, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators should expect a rollcall vote at 5:30 p.m. on Monday on confirmation of the Assistant Secretary of Transportation. I filed cloture on the trafficking bill earlier today, and that vote will occur on Tuesday morning under the regular order.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 16, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:01 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 16, 2015, at 3 p.m.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 12, 2015:

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL GRECO, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

RONALD LEE MILLER, OF KANSAS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

##### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

THO DINH-ZARR, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018.

CHRISTOPHER A. HART, OF COLORADO, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, March 13, 2015

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 13, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BARBARA COMSTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

Reverend Peter Frank, Church of the Epiphany, Herndon, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, maker and ruler of us all: You have given us a good land and made us into a great Nation.

Today we ask Your blessing and guidance for the Members of the House of Representatives, their staff, and all who, in this place, support the work of government.

Give them wisdom that they may fulfill with honor their responsibilities to those they represent.

Defend them from the temptations that come with the authority they bear, so that they may serve You, serve each other, and serve the United States of America in humility and love.

Comfort and care for those here today who are suffering private hurts as they do this public work. All this we ask in the name of Your Son, our Savior, Jesus Christ.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 134, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 11, 2015 at 11:20 a.m.:

Appointments:  
Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 10, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 10, 2015 at 9:12 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1213.

Appointments:  
Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,  
*Deputy Clerk.*

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

MARCH 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2

U.S.C. 803(a)), I am pleased to appoint Mr. Romero Brown of Acworth, Georgia, to the Congressional Award Board.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVE,  
Washington, DC, March 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 4(d) of House Resolution 5, One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and section 1(k)(2) of House Resolution 895, One Hundred Tenth Congress, I transmit to you notification that Porter J. Goss, David E. Skaggs, Judy Biggett, Jay Eagen, Karan L. English, Allison Hayward, Belinda Pinckney, Michael D. Barnes, Omar Ashmawy, Kelly Brewington, William H. Cable, Helen Eisner, Mary K. Flanagan, Scott Gast, Bryson Baird Morgan, Paul Solis, and Nate Wright, each have signed an agreement not to be a candidate for the office of Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress for purpose of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 until at least 3 years after he or she is no longer a member of the board or staff of the Office of Congressional Ethics.

Copies of the signed agreements shall be retained by the Office of the Clerk as part of the records of the House.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Appropriations:

MARCH 12, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House,*  
House of Representatives.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I will be taking a leave of absence from the House Appropriations Committee for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

As you are aware, I was selected by the Democratic Caucus to serve as the Ranking Member on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence this Congress. I intend to return to the Appropriations Committee in the future.

Thank you for your help with this matter.  
Sincerely,

ADAM B. SCHIFF,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1213. An act to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

H.R. 431. To award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Foot Soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final Selma to Montgomery Voting Rights March in March of 1965, which served as a catalyst for the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 134, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday, March 16, 2015, for morning-hour debate.

Thereupon (at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 16, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by Speaker pro tempore THORNBERRY on Thursday, March 12, 2015:

H.R. 1213, to make administrative and technical corrections to the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on March 4, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 240. Making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

#### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

##### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ANDER CRENSHAW, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 25, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Ander Crenshaw .....	1/23	1/25	Switzerland .....		1,430.00		11,494.00				12,924.00
Committee total .....					1,430.00		11,494.00				12,924.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW, Feb. 25, 2015.

##### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOHN K. DELANEY, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 25, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. John K. Delaney .....	1/23	1/25	Switzerland .....		1,430.00		12,409.00				13,839.00
Committee total .....					1,430.00		12,409.00				13,839.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN K. DELANEY, Feb. 24, 2015.

##### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MARIO DIAZ-BALART, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 25, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Mario Diaz-Balart .....	1/23	1/25	Switzerland .....		1,430.00		14,937.00				16,367.00
Committee total .....					1,430.00		14,937.00				16,367.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Feb. 25, 2015.

##### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JEFF FORTENBERRY, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 25, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Jeff Fortenberry .....	1/23	1/25	Switzerland .....		1,430.00		12,049.00				13,479.00
Committee total .....					1,430.00		12,049.00				13,479.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF FORTENBERRY, Feb. 24, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, GEORGE HOLDING, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 25, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. George Holding .....	1/23	1/25	Switzerland .....		824.00		12,924.00				13,748.00
Committee total .....					824.00		12,924.00				13,748.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. GEORGE HOLDING, Feb. 24, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DARRELL E. ISSA, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 25, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Darrell E. Issa .....	1/23	1/25	Switzerland .....		1,430.00		12,409.00				13,839.00
Committee total .....					1,430.00		12,409.00				13,839.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. DARRELL E. ISSA, Feb. 24, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, KENNY MARCHANT, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 24, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Kenny Marchant .....	1/22	1/24	Switzerland .....						1,076.00		1,076.00
Committee total .....									1,076.00		1,076.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. KENNY MARCHANT, Feb. 24, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PATRICK T. McHENRY, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 25, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Patrick T. McHenry .....	1/23	1/25	Switzerland .....		1,430.00		12,409.00				13,839.00
Committee total .....					1,430.00		12,409.00				13,839.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PATRICK T. McHENRY, Feb. 24, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PETER J. ROSKAM, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 25, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Peter J. Roskam .....	1/23	1/25	Switzerland .....		824.00		13,015.00				13,839.00
Committee total .....					824.00		13,015.00				13,839.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM, Feb. 23, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MARK SANFORD, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 22 AND JAN. 26, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Mark Sanford .....	1/23	1/26	Switzerland .....		1,373.00		12,389.00				13,762.00
Committee total .....					1,373.00		12,389.00				13,762.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MARK SANFORD, Feb. 23, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DAVID M. ADAMS, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 5 AND FEB. 8, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
David M. Adams .....	2/5	2/8	Germany .....	756	822.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	756	822.00
Committee total .....					822.00						822.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAVID M. ADAMS, Mar. 2, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, ERIK LESNEWSKY, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 5 AND FEB. 8, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Erik Lesnewsky .....	2/5	2/8	Germany .....	837	910.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	837	910.00
Committee total .....					910.00						910.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ERIK LESNEWSKY, Mar. 2, 2015.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, VALERIE J. ROBERTS, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 5 AND FEB. 8, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Valerie J. Roberts .....	2/5	2/8	Germany .....	756	822.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	756	822.00
Committee total .....					822.00						822.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

VALERIE J. ROBERTS, Mar. 6, 2015.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

724. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Rural Development Loan Servicing (RIN: 0570-AA88) received March 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

725. A letter from the Board Chair and CEO, Office of General Counsel, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Disclosure to Shareholders; Pension Benefit Disclosures (RIN: 3052-AD02) received March 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

726. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Defense Stockpile (NDS) Annual Materials Plan (AMP) for Fiscal Year 2016 and for the succeeding four years, FY 2017-2020, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 98h-2; to the Committee on Armed Services.

727. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the "Strategic and Critical Materials 2015 Report on Stockpile Requirements", pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 98h-5; to the Committee on Armed Services.

728. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the "Strategic and Critical Materials Operations Report to Congress: Operations Under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act

During Fiscal Year 2014", pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 98 et seq; to the Committee on Armed Services.

729. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department of Defense Chemical Demilitarization Program Semi-Annual Report to Congress for March 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1521(j), as amended by Sec. 1421 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013; to the Committee on Armed Services.

730. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter notifying that the Department intends to assign women to certain previously closed positions in the Army, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 652; to the Committee on Armed Services.

731. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Richmond County, VA, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8375] received March 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

732. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Jefferson County, IN, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8373] received March 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

733. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Obsolete Section 8 Rental

Assistance Certificate Program Regulations [Docket No.: FR-5827-F-01] (RIN: 2577-AC93) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

734. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Federal Home Loan Bank Capital Stock and Capital Plans (RIN: 2590-AA71) received March 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

735. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the nineteenth report on "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran", pursuant to Sec. 1245(d)(4)(A) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

736. A letter from the Chair, Advisory Council on Alzheimer's Research, Care, and Services, transmitting the 2015 Recommendations of the Public Members of the Advisory Council on Alzheimer's Research, Care, and Services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

737. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's semi-annual Implementation Report on Energy Conservation Standards Activities, pursuant to Sec. 141 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and Secs. 305 and 321 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

738. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule —



Medical Device Reporting: Electronic Submission Requirements; Correcting Amendments [Docket No.: FDA-2008-N-0393] (RIN: 0910-AF86) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

739. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Vehicle Fleet Report on Alternative Fuel Vehicles for fiscal year 2014, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 13218; Public Law 102-486, section 310; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

740. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0851; FRL-9923-07-Region 9] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

741. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Steam Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0234; FRL-9923-98-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS39) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

742. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dimethomorph; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0483; FRL-9923-59] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

743. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties, Issuance of Compliance or Corrective Action Orders, and the Revocation, Termination or Suspension of Permits; Correction [EPA-HQ-OECA-2014-0551; FRL-9922-62-OECA] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

744. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0797; FRL-9921-01] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

745. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Region 4 States; 2008 Lead, 2008 Ozone and 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide Prevention of Significant Deterioration Infrastructure Plans [EPA-R04-OAR-2014-0610; FRL-9924-47-Region 4] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

746. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Minor NSR for Title V and PESOP Sources [EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0780; FRL-9924-22-Region 5] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

747. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's

final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Amendments to Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements for Illinois [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0123; FRL-9922-71-Region 5] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

748. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Low Emission Vehicle Program [EPA-R01-OAR-2010-0121; A-1-FRL-9915-05-Region 1] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

749. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rule — Standards of Performance for New Residential Wood Heaters, New Residential Hydronic Heaters and Forced-Air Furnaces [EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0734; FRL-9920-50-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AP93) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

750. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Policy Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of Sections 101, 103 and 105 of the STELA Reauthorization Act of 2014 [MB Docket No.: 15-37] received March 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

751. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Wireless E911 Location Accuracy Requirements [PS Docket No.: 07-114; FCC 15-9] received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

752. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Parts 0, 1, 2, and 15 of the Commission's Rules regarding Authorization of Radiofrequency Equipment; Amendment of Part 68 regarding Approval of Terminal Equipment by Telecommunications Certification Bodies [ET Docket No.: 13-44; RM-11652; FCC 14-208] received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

753. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Interim Staff Guidance — Reviewing and Assessing the Financial Condition of Operating Power Reactor Licensees, Including Requests for Additional Information (OL/FR-ISG-2014-01) received March 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

754. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Final Safety Evaluation for Technical Report NEI 14-05, "Guidelines for the Use of Accreditation in Lieu of Commercial Grand Surveys for Procurement of Laboratory Calibration and Test Services", Revision 1 received March 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

755. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certi-

fication of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services (Transmittal No. DDTC 14-094); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

756. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services (Transmittal No. DDTC 14-131); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

757. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination, pursuant to Sec. 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

758. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency with respect to Iran, originally declared on March 15, 1995, by Executive Order 12957, as amended and extended, is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 114-17); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

759. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "Certified Business Enterprise Expenditures of Public-Private Development Construction Projects for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

760. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

761. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Implementation of Executive Order 13672 Prohibiting Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity by Contractors and Subcontractors (RIN: 1250-AA07) received March 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

762. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the final version of the NCUA 2015-2016 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

763. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Endowment's annual report for FY 2014 prepared in accordance with Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

764. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting five reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

765. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Oregon Chub From the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2014-0002] (RIN: 1018-BA28) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

766. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Listing, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the

Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Adding Five Species of Sawfish to the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2014-0066; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BA68) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

767. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Aquatic Invasive Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Injurious Wildlife Species; Listing Three Anacosta Species and One Python Species as Injurious Reptiles [Docket No.: FWS-R9-FHC-2008-0015] (RIN: 1018-AV68) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

768. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Reinstatement of Final Rules for the Gray Wolf in Wyoming and the Western Great Lakes in Compliance With Court Orders [Docket No.: FWS-R6-ES-2014-0059; FXES1113090000C2-156-PF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BA64) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

769. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Subsistence Harvest in Alaska; Harvest Regulations for Migratory Birds in Alaska During the 2015 Season [Docket No.: FWS-R7-MB-2014-0036] (RIN: 1018-BA48) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

770. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 131021878-4158-02] (RIN: 0648-XD747) received March 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

771. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Pacific Whiting Allocations and Fishery Closure; Pacific Whiting Seasons [Docket No.: 131119977-4381-02] (RIN: 0648-XD640) received March 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

772. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measures for Gray Triggerfish in the Gulf of Mexico; Reduced Annual Catch Limit and Annual Catch Target and Closure [Docket No.: 121004518-3398-01] (RIN: 0648-XD723) received March 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

773. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Ves-

sels Using Pot Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 130925836-4174-02] (RIN: 0648-XD715) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

774. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No.: 140811659-5070-02] (RIN: 0648-XD437) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Russian Federation Extending the Agreement Between the Government of the United States and the Government of Soviet Socialist Republics on Mutual Fisheries Relations of May 31, 1988, with annex, as extended; (H. Doc. No. 114—18); to the Committee on Natural Resources and ordered to be printed.

776. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the AFT 2014 PACT Act Report, pursuant to the Prevent All Cigarette Trafficking Act of 2009, pursuant to Pub. L. 111-154, 15 U.S.C. 378(f), covering the period February 28, 2013, through October 15, 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

777. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the "Office of Refugee Resettlement: Annual Report to Congress, FY 2013", pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

778. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs and Corporate Communications, Amtrak, transmitting Amtrak's FY 2016 Grant Request package and FY 2016 General and Legislative Annual Report, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 24315(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

779. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's 2015 annual "Report to Congress from the Intelligent Transportation Systems Program Advisory Committee", pursuant to Sec. 53003 of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

780. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for PHMSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pipeline Safety: Miscellaneous Changes to Pipeline Safety Regulations [Docket No.: PHMSA-2010-0026; Amdt. Nos.: 191-23; 192-120; 195-100] (RIN: 2137-AE59) received March 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

781. A letter from the Chief, Impact Analyst, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02 REG), Acquisition, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Department of Veterans Affairs Acquisition Regulation: Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned and Veteran-Owned Small Business Status Protests (RIN: 2900-AM92) received March 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

782. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Depart-

ment's final rule — Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Certain Categories of Archaeological Material From the Pre-Hispanic Cultures of the Republic of El Salvador (RIN: 1515-AE01) received March 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

783. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; and the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the FY 2014 report on the activities of the Extremity Trauma and Amputation Center of Excellence (EACE), pursuant to Sec. 723 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act of FY 2009, Pub. L. 110-417; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

784. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the "National Security Education Program (NSEP) 2014 Annual Report", pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1906(a); jointly to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select) and Education and the Workforce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of the rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 284. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-38, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 876. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals; with an amendment (Rept. 114-39, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 887. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-40, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 876 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. GRIF-FITH):

H.R. 1353. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend the

period of exclusivity with respect to certain drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 1354. A bill to permanently extend the Protecting Tenants at Foreclosure Act of 2009; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT):

H.R. 1355. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to expand the purposes of advances and collateral available to community development financial institutions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1356. A bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 1357. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to limit the designation of certain Department of Veterans Affairs employees as beneficiaries under Veterans' Group Life Insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1358. A bill to enact into law a framework for deciding whether certain projectiles are "primarily intended for sporting purposes" for purposes of determining whether the projectiles are armor piercing ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1359. A bill to authorize the establishment of American Dream Accounts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FATTAH (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1360. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to use revenue generated by certain fines, penalties, and settlements that are not designated for restitution or any other purpose to fund evidence-based youth mentoring projects, justice reinvestment efforts, and innovations in medical research and development; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1361. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to eliminate the State option to reduce the home equity exemption amount for purposes of eligibility for long-

term care assistance under Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1362. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to submit an annual report on sources of funds used to finance the non-Federal share of expenditures under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself and Mr. HUELSKAMP):

H.R. 1363. A bill to repeal a certain rule relating to nutrition standards in the national school lunch and school breakfast programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself and Mr. HECK of Nevada):

H.R. 1364. A bill to require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to obtain the consent of affected State and local governments before authorizing the construction of a nuclear waste repository; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Res. 149. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of March 15, 2015, through March 21, 2015, as National Young Audiences Arts for Learning Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

12. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to Senate Memorial 99, commending the long-standing traditions of tolerance, inclusion and interfaith harmony in the Republic of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1353.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which gives the Congress the authority to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Additionally, under Article I, Section 8, Clause 8 which gives Congress the power to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3 and Clause 18.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 1356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 1357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I Section 8 clause 3

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Congress shall have the power "[t]o regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. FATTAH:

H.R. 1360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, the Congress shall have the power "[t]o regulate commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 1363.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation repeals a rule made by an Executive agency pursuant to an act of Congress. This bill is intended to correct the agency's errant interpretation of Congress' intent as expressed in the authorizing legislation, and, as such, follows the responsibility that Congress has, under Article 1, Section 1, to exercise all legislative powers of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, clause 3

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Ms. MOORE and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 156: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 222: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 244: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 284: Mr. LONG, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 306: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 413: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 420: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 452: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 531: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 556: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. MESSER, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 592: Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 624: Mr. TURNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
 H.R. 653: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. ROSS.  
 H.R. 658: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. ISRAEL.  
 H.R. 690: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
 H.R. 699: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 703: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. HARRIS.  
 H.R. 704: Mr. BYRNE.  
 H.R. 762: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 777: Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
 H.R. 818: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BOUTANY, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. AMODEI.  
 H.R. 880: Mr. PAULSEN.  
 H.R. 885: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DELANEY.  
 H.R. 910: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 918: Mr. HENSARLING.  
 H.R. 932: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
 H.R. 953: Mr. SARBANES.  
 H.R. 985: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
 H.R. 997: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1017: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. JOYCE.  
 H.R. 1021: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of ILLINOIS.  
 H.R. 1037: Mr. FARR, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 1105: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. RIBBLE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. WILLIAMS.  
 H.R. 1106: Mr. HENSARLING.  
 H.R. 1137: Mr. BLUM.  
 H.R. 1149: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. OLSON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1174: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.  
 H.R. 1188: Mr. TAKAI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 1197: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PITTENGER, Ms. HAHN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms.

MENG, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
 H.R. 1212: Mr. LONG, Mr. BUCK, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BLUM, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOHMERT, and Mr. HENSARLING.  
 H.R. 1282: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FARR, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. SIRE.  
 H.R. 1298: Mr. HENSARLING.  
 H.R. 1306: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
 H.R. 1329: Mr. WEBER of Texas.  
 H.R. 1331: Mr. JOLLY.  
 H. Res. 15: Miss RICE of New York.  
 H. Res. 94: Ms. TITUS.

---

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

##### Under clause 3 of rule XII,

6. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, CA, relative to Resolution No. 36-15, supporting a full investigation into the disappearance of 43 students from Iguala, Guerrero, Mexico; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

STEPHEN AND KATHLEEN HUVANE

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure when neighborhood groups in my district pick incredibly deserving community members to fill important positions of prominence. This year, the planning committee of the Eastchester Irish American Social Club (EIASC) has outdone themselves with the selection of Stephen and Kathleen Huvane as Honorees of the annual Eastchester St. Patrick's Day Parade.

Like me, Stephen and Kathleen are both Bronx natives, with families who immigrated to America searching for a better life. Stephen's parents came from the counties Mayo and Galway in Ireland, while Kathleen's came from County Kerry.

A graduate of Manhattan College, Stephen received his B.S. in Computer Science and Engineering, while Kathleen earned her B.S. in Nursing from the College of Mt. St. Vincent. Today, Kathleen is a Registered Pediatric Nurse at the Eastchester Pediatric Medical group, and Stephen works at Purdue Pharma LLP.

Both Stephen and Kathleen are active in the community, especially the EIASC, of which they have been members for over 16 years. They are also five year members of Swazi Legacy, a not-for-profit that helps marginalized and homeless young people in Swaziland.

Today Stephen and Kathleen live in Eastchester, where together they have raised four wonderful children; Kaitlin, Eilish, Stephen, and Kieran. They are active members of various school functions and fundraisers, in addition to Stephen's work on the EIASC St. Patrick's Parade Committee, which he has been a part of for the past 10 years.

As this year's St. Patrick's Day Parade approaches, I want to congratulate Stephen and Kathleen for their selection as Parade Honorees, and thank them on the occasion for all they have done to better our community.

HONORING VERA TELLER

**HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 2015*

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Verna Teller, a remarkable woman whose steadfast political leadership and tireless civic activism has had a lasting impact on the people in her community.

In March of each year, we celebrate Women's History month to honor women who have made invaluable contributions to their communities and the world. Verna is one such woman. Verna has never tired of fighting for the community she loves. In the face of gender discrimination, Verna ushered in a new era of leadership, becoming the first female governor of Isleta Pueblo in 1987. By spearheading passage of a constitutional amendment requiring tribal leadership positions to be elected, as well as fighting to make tribal council meetings more open and accessible, Verna ensured that women's voices were not only heard but amplified within the Pueblo community.

Following her tenure as governor, Verna continued to serve Isleta Pueblo as Chief Justice, President of the Tribal Council, and council member. Under her watchful guidance, Isleta Pueblo became the first tribe in the United States to assert their right under federal law to establish water quality standards to protect their community.

Verna went on to serve as project manager for the Native Peoples-Native Homelands Southwest Initiative, a project sponsored by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to examine the effects of climate change on Native Americans. As Project Director for Tribal Tobacco Health, Education and Outreach, Verna helped develop cancer prevention programs through Indian Health Services, the Centers for Disease Control, and the American Cancer Society. She also ran a consulting business, ATV Enterprises; served as a member of the All Indian Pueblo Council; was named "Indian Woman of the Year;" and has received numerous other accolades.

It is astonishing to think of all that Verna has accomplished in her life. In the face of adversity, discrimination, and uncertainty, Verna's determination to lead her community never faltered. As Eleanor Roosevelt once said: "We gain strength, and courage, and confidence by each experience in which we really stop to look fear in the face—we must do that which we think we cannot." Verna's enduring legacy of community development, service and sacrifice will continue to be an inspiration for future generations of young women.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF SUMGAIT  
POGROMS

**HON. DAVID N. CICILLINE**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 2015*

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the 27th Anniversary of the horrific Sumgait Pogroms. On February 27, 1988 organized mobs of Azerbaijanis aimed at kill-

ing and driving Armenian Christians living in Sumgait from their homes. Police allowed the pogroms to go on for 3 days, during which Armenians were burned alive and thrown from windows.

The Sumgait massacre is a black mark on history and sadly, this event sparked further violence as Armenians would be targeted less than 9 months later in Kirovbad and again in Baku in 1990.

The Azerbaijani Government has shamefully continued to undermine prospects for a lasting peace in the Southern Caucasus, recently they were reported violating the ceasefire and killing several Armenian soldiers on the border.

From the earliest days of its formation, the people of Nagorno Karabakh have fought and died for their independence and held open and transparent elections, a tradition of democracy that the United States should honor and respect.

As we reflect on these horrific outbreaks of ethnic violence, I join with Armenians in Rhode Island, and across the world in remembering these victims and renewing our commitment to justice, independence and finding lasting peace.

HONORING JOSEPH B. HOULIHAN

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the story of America is the story of men and women emigrating from foreign lands to make a better life for themselves and their families. Joseph Houlihan's success, a result in part of the sacrifices his great grandparents made in coming to America from county Kerry in Ireland, is exactly what that American story is about.

The Houlihan's came to America and found success in real estate, a family business that endured the generations. Joe, a graduate of Iona College with a degree in Business Administration, followed suit, earning a CPA before commencing his own real estate career.

As the Managing Partner of the Residential Sales Group at Houlihan & O'Malley Real Estate Services in Bronxville, Joe has had tremendous success. His work has been recognized by the Hudson Gateway Association of Realtors, where he won the Diamond Award for sales over \$15,000,000, while also receiving the Westchester County Five Star Real Estate Agent Award on several occasions.

Outside of work, Joe is an active member of St. Joseph's Parish in Bronxville, and the Eastchester Irish American Social Club (EIASC). He has also been on the Board of Trustees at the School of the Holy Child in Rye, and currently resides in Fleetwood with

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

his beautiful wife, Anna Filipkowski, and their three incredible daughters, Kasia, Julia, and Emily.

This year, the EIASC selected Joe to be the Grand Marshal of the annual Eastchester St. Patrick's Day Parade. Joe was shocked and amazed by the nomination, a testament to his humble nature and belief that you work hard not for accolades or adulation, but simply to improve your life and the lives around you.

Joe's selection, however, was no accident. For all he has accomplished and all he has done to improve the community, I can't think of a better honoree to be Eastchester's St. Patrick's Day Parade Grand Marshal. Congratulations to Joe and to the entire Houlihan family on this honor.

---

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DOCHIKI CIVIC AND SOCIAL CLUB, INC.

**HON. ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 2015*

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 75th anniversary of the Dochiki Civic and Social Club in Newport News, Virginia.

Originally known as "Los Amigas," the club was founded on March 15, 1940 by eleven businessmen gathered at the Odessa Barber Shop located at 29th Street and Chestnut Avenue in Newport News. Two years later, the name of the club was changed to "Dochiki," a word of Chinese origin meaning love and friendship. The founders of the club were Homer Hines, Ward Bridgeforth, Virgil Evans, B. C. Anthony, Oliver Hawkins, James Hawkins, Harold Heath, James Jones, Irving Thomas, Robert Whitney, and Howard Ovest.

The club initially met in members' homes, and in 1948 they relocated to a room above a club member's garage which they nicknamed "Alley Inn." As membership increased, the club leased larger space to accommodate its growing membership, and, on August 7, 1952, the club purchased property at 2705 Chestnut Avenue in Newport News, where it still meets today. In addition to this property, the club has acquired additional property along Chestnut Avenue through donations of club members, including Cornelius Glover, which allowed the club to significantly expand its facilities. Today, the club occupies much of the 2700 block of Chestnut Avenue and includes numerous amenities, such as a 300-seat ballroom, a commercial kitchen, restroom suites, office space, recreational and storage areas, lounges, a 24-seat bar with adjacent kitchen, a locker room, and ample parking, all of which are accessible for individuals with disabilities. The club offers its facilities for use free of charge to many community groups and has also served as the Chestnut Avenue voting precinct for many years.

While Dochiki remains a place for men to socialize, debate politics, and enjoy sports, women have also played an active role in the club for much of its history. In 1960, the

Dochiki Wives Auxiliary, Inc. was established to compliment the men's club and support its educational, social, health and civic projects targeted at aiding charities, youth programs, and senior citizens.

Since its founding 75 years ago, the Dochiki Civic and Social Club has been actively involved in the Newport News community providing outstanding civic, social and philanthropic leadership to their fellow citizens. The club has raised tens of thousands of dollars for local charities, youth programs, and senior citizen projects. It has also strongly encouraged all of its members and fellow citizens in the community to be actively engaged in the electoral process.

Today, the club's membership includes businessmen, educators, elected officials, members of the military and other professionals throughout the community, all of whom are devoted to supporting and improving the Newport News community through active civic engagement.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Dochiki Civic and Social Club on their 75th anniversary and I thank them for all that they have done to make Newport News a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

---

HONORING LELA KASKALLA

**HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 2015*

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lela Kaskalla, a passionate woman who has remained steadfast in her commitment to support economic growth and cultural development in her community.

This past Sunday marked a special moment for women across the globe; it was International Women's Day, a time when we come together to remember the progress that women have made and recognize the many firsts that have opened doors for younger generations of female leaders. It made me think of Lela Kaskalla, who in 1996 became the first woman elected governor of Navajo Nation.

During her term as governor, Lela worked tirelessly to defeat anti-tribal legislation that proposed a tax on tribal gasoline distribution and went on to become the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) recording secretary. Lela's presence made an immediate impact, and she was instrumental in NCAI's 54th annual meeting in Albuquerque.

Lela is a natural leader who understands the importance of a strong, united community. In an interview with the Albuquerque Journal she explained: "You don't do much standing alone, but together you can do more." Lela's passion, commitment and ability to build a coalition around a common cause caught Governor Gary Johnson's attention.

In 1998, Governor Johnson appointed Lela to the New Mexico State Fair Commission, where she later became Vice Chair of the State Board. Whether it is through Lela's active engagement with the Navajo Women's Group and the Northern New Mexico Commu-

nity College Pueblos Institutes, her time as a member of the board of directors for the Indian Pueblo Cultural Center/Indian Pueblos Marketing, Inc., or in her current role with the Branch of Administration for the Bureau of Indian Affairs at the Northern Pueblos Agency, Lela's commitment to tribal communities in New Mexico has never wavered.

Lela's groundbreaking achievement set an example for other women in New Mexico. It reminds me of the progress women before us have made in our nation's history, and in particular, the large, white, rough-hewn statue of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony and Lucretia Mott that sits in the Capitol Building in Washington D.C. It is a striking figure featuring the faces of the three revolutionary women, carefully etched and chiseled into the unfinished block of marble. The unfinished composition represents the unfinished work left with respect to equal rights for women. With the help of leaders like Lela right here in New Mexico we can, and we will, finish that work. Lela's commitment to her community will continue to be an inspiration for future generations of young women.

---

HONORING HATTIE L. LUCAS

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Friday, March 13, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, communities thrive when hard work, dedication, and sacrifice are set by voluntary example. Hattie L. Lucas's actions embody these ideals for her community in Co-op City.

Hattie Lucas was born in Bramberg, South Carolina. Her family decided to relocate to New York City when Hattie was six years old, living in both Manhattan and Brooklyn. Eventually, Hattie settled in Co-op City in the Bronx, where she has lived for 40 years.

Hattie began her long career of service in Co-op, serving the NYC Department for the Aging, Co-op City NORC Advisory Board, and the Bronx Preparatory Charter School Parents Association Executive Board. She also has been active in her church, Co-op City Baptist Church, the Dreiser Retirees, and the Co-op City NAACP. Hattie has also been an outspoken supporter of our young people through the Youth and Community Affairs Committees.

Even with her busy schedule, Hattie worked hard to receive a Bachelor's degree from Mercy College, and a Master's of Social Work from Fordham University.

As a professional, Hattie dedicated herself to her work at the City of New York, where she served for 35 years. She was admired for her efforts with the Human Resources Administration, Health and Hospital Corporation, and as Director of Advocacy at the Administration for Children's Services.

As dedicated as she has been to the community, Hattie's true pride is the family she's raised in the Bronx, including one son, six grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. She also raises her 17-year-old granddaughter, Ashley.

*March 13, 2015*

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 161, Pt. 3

**3531**

Following Hattie's retirement from the City, she became the Program Director of the Co-op City Grandparent Connection Program. The program, under her leadership, grew into a necessity for her neighborhood; becoming the

largest relative caregiver programs in New York City, which includes a myriad of services for deserving grandparents, adolescents, and children.

After retiring in November 2014, Hattie continues to volunteer and use her sharp skills for her Co-op City community. It is an honor to join the JASA Grandparents Connection in celebrating Hattie on her retirement.



## SENATE—Monday, March 16, 2015

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our conquering King, thank You for providing us with wings of faith to soar above life's challenges and vicissitudes. Empower our lawmakers to use faith's wings to live lives that are lofty and laudable. May they stand for right and be willing to accept the consequences as they strive to please You in all that they think, say, and do. Lord, give them the wisdom to follow Your unfailing guidance, seeking to be patient even with difficult people. Open their minds to discern Your will as You give them the courage to obey You.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Democratic leader is recognized.

### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION AND LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Madam President, Confucius said, "Life is very simple, but we insist on making it complicated." That is true.

Right now, the Republican Senate leadership is insisting on making a good piece of legislation far more complicated than it should be. This human trafficking and child pornography bill before the Senate has wide bipartisan support. Unfortunately, it also includes a previously unreported abortion provision that has brought us to a screeching halt in this legislation.

But there is a quick and very easy solution to this dilemma: Take the abortion language out of the bill. The Republican leadership doesn't seem to be interested in a solution.

The Senate Republican leadership is anxious to shut down debate without fixing the problem. We can stand here all week and question how the abortion

language got in the legislation. Many believe it was by sleight of hand, but it doesn't matter. It is a fact that Republicans included abortion language in this bill that is completely unrelated to human trafficking, and by doing so Republicans turned a bipartisan bill into a political fight.

Republican Congressman ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota drafted the House version of the same human trafficking bill. He wrote the bill. It passed the House. Even he believes that inclusion of the abortion provision in the Senate bill is not appropriate.

Here is what he said:

There is no reason it should be included in these bills. This issue is far too important to tie it up with an unrelated fight with politics as usual.

This is his bill, and he says we should take that language out. He is a Republican.

The path forward is clear: Take the abortion language out of the bill and we can pass it right now. That is it.

But if hijacking the human trafficking bill with an unrelated abortion provision wasn't already bad enough—listen to this—the majority leader is now holding Loretta Lynch's nomination hostage too. It is hard to comprehend, but that is what is happening.

Just last Tuesday, the Republican leader gave his word that he would bring up a vote this week on President Obama's Attorney General nominee. President Obama's Attorney General is well qualified and no one questions her qualifications.

Now Senator McCONNELL is saying the Senate will not confirm Loretta Lynch until we pass the trafficking bill—abortion language and all.

Loretta Lynch was nominated by the President 128 days ago. Since that time, Senate Republicans have found reason after reason after reason to delay her confirmation. First, it was just wait until the next Congress. In fact, the Republican leader said last year:

Ms. Lynch will receive fair consideration by the Senate. And her nomination should be considered in the new Congress through regular order.

But when this Congress got underway, her nomination had to wait until after the Keystone legislation. Everyone will remember it was a bill to construct a massive pipeline to import foreign oil, only to turn around and export it to other countries.

Then Ms. Lynch's nomination had to wait until after a new Defense Secretary was confirmed. Then Republicans on the Judiciary Committee needed more time and said just one

more week. Then she had to wait until after the February recess. As I said, it has been delay after delay after delay, and now we are here in the middle of March and Loretta Lynch has yet to get a vote on the Senate floor.

Why can't we get this incredibly qualified woman confirmed? She has waited 128 days. That is the longest any Attorney General has ever waited in the last four decades.

As I have said, a vote on the Lynch nomination has nothing to do with the trafficking bill and it certainly has nothing to do with abortion.

The majority leader can choose to keep the Senate stuck on this abortion provision, but he does so at the detriment of so many other bills that require the Senate's attention. The majority leader gave his word that we would consider the Lynch nomination through regular order, and that has not happened. He gave his word that we would vote on confirmation this week, but now he is hedging on that. There is no reason my friend, the majority leader, cannot live up to his numerous commitments.

Loretta Lynch's nomination is on the Executive Calendar, meaning the Senate can consider her nomination and then immediately move back to the trafficking bill. Any attempt to hold her nomination hostage because of the abortion provision is a sham.

This Congress is barely 2 months old. Yet this is just the latest on a growing list of examples proving Republicans simply cannot govern.

The American people need a human trafficking bill, and the American people need an Attorney General. Let's confirm Loretta Lynch as soon as possible.

Madam President, what is the business of the day?

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Texas.

### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, tomorrow morning the Senate will be

casting a very important vote. We will be voting on a piece of legislation called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which currently has 12 Democratic cosponsors and virtually an equal number of Republican cosponsors. In other words, this is generally bipartisan legislation.

As further evidence of its bipartisan support, this bill passed unanimously out of the Senate Judiciary Committee in February, and it enjoys the support of more than 200 victims' rights and law enforcement organizations. But as everyone in this Chamber knows, Senate Democrats have said they will filibuster this bipartisan legislation that is designed to provide justice for victims of trafficking because it contains a particular provision they have voted for on a number of occasions and, indeed, have chosen to cosponsor. It is unconscionable and shameful and more than that it is just simply baffling to me.

The reason it is so shameful is because there are children waiting for our help. The average victim of human trafficking in the United States is a young girl between the age of 12 and 14 years of age. Children are being abused and literally sexually assaulted while apparently some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have decided to try to make a political point. It is baffling because my colleagues have voted for essentially this very same provision in one form or another time and time again.

Apparently, the Democratic leader, who is pressuring Members of his caucus to filibuster this bill is—well, he says we need to take out the language they object to, but I was standing on the floor just a few days ago when—I guess it was Thursday afternoon—the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, offered them an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote to strip that language out of the bill and they objected to it. So it is getting harder and harder to believe the sincerity of their protests, and it is appearing more and more likely that what they want to do is have the Senate return to the same dysfunctional nature it was under for the last 4 years by the previous majority.

I wish to pose several questions to our colleagues who insist on filibustering this bipartisan piece of legislation. The first question I have is: Isn't it the case that only 3 months ago 50 Democrats voted for the 2015 Defense authorization bill? Isn't that a bill a piece of authorizing legislation much like the underlying justice for victims of trafficking bill? If 50 Democrats voted for similar language with regard to the limitations on the use of funding just a few months ago, how in the world can they filibuster this bill for including the same language they voted for, more or less, just a few short months ago? In fact, it is true that in 2009 all of the Senate Democrats—in a

partisan vote—voted to include this similar language as part of ObamaCare. Groups such as NARAL, the National Abortion Rights Action League, protested that the language “went far beyond even the Hyde Amendment.” Yet 60 Democrats, including the then-majority leader—now minority leader—voted for that in the wee hours of Christmas Eve 2009.

Again, I ask our friends who are filibustering this bipartisan piece of legislation designed to help the victims of human trafficking: Isn't it true that in 2009, 58 Senate Democrats voted to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, which like Medicaid is subject to the Hyde Amendment?

To each of those questions, the record would demonstrate they should be answered with a resounding yes.

So time and time again, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who now find themselves in the inexplicable position of filibustering a bill they are cosponsoring or which they have already voted for in the Judiciary Committee and which contains very similar restrictions on the use of the funding—how in the world have they decided to make the stand, here and now, denying even the opportunity they have been given by the majority leader to have an up-or-down vote to strip the language out that they object to?

Well, despite the hypocrisy of their position, the question this really boils down to is this. This is the question, the only question that really matters: To our colleagues who are filibustering this legislation, Are you prepared to turn your back on the thousands of people living every day in bondage and who are desperately clinging to the hope that someone—someone—will lend them a helping hand? Are you prepared to abandon these children and these other victims of human trafficking who deserve a roof over their head, someone to lean on, and somehow, some way to get a fresh start in life?

Do our colleagues who are filibustering this legislation really want to play politics with such a sensitive and vulnerable part of our population over an issue that some advocates have called a phantom problem? The reason why some advocates who support this legislation have called the objection of the Democratic leader a phantom problem is because not only have they voted for similar provisions over and over and over again, this essentially has been the settled law of the land for 39 years—since 1976. Just in case our colleagues think that the examples I mentioned are exclusive, there are a number of other provisions—32 Democrats voted for the so-called CR omnibus, the continuing resolution omnibus, in December. Thirty-two Democrats voted for that which contained very similar language. And I mentioned several others.

I want to conclude with the Washington Post editorial for today. I do not always find myself in agreement with the Washington Post editorial board, but this morning I think they encapsulated the Democratic filibuster of the bipartisan antitrafficking bill perfectly. In urging the Senate to pass this legislation, they wrote: “[T]his week the question will be whether Senators can put the interests of scared, abused children ahead of the chance to score political points.” I could not agree more.

So tomorrow morning, an hour after we convene, we will have a vote that will decide whether this legislation goes on to final passage. We need six brave Democrats—six brave Democrats—to join all the Republicans on this side to keep hope alive for these victims of human trafficking. We need six Democrats who are willing to break away from the tyranny of their party's own leadership here in the Senate and do what they know is the right thing to do. They know it in their heart, and they know it in their mind, and they know they have supported similar language in legislation time and time again.

We need six Democrats willing to break away from the mindless, heartless filibuster of this legislation. I hope they will examine their conscience. I hope they will ask themselves, Isn't this exactly the kind of vote that I came here to the U.S. Senate to cast? I hope they will pray on it, and I hope they will think long and hard before saying no to the abused children and the victims of human trafficking.

That is what this is all about. It is not based on any Hyde amendment language in this legislation. It is based on a determination to render this institution dysfunctional, not because of any principal policy disagreement, because, as I point out, our colleagues on the other side have voted for similar language time and time and time again.

Our colleagues on the other side realize that on November 4, the voters rejected the then-majority and gave this side of the aisle the opportunity to serve in the majority because, frankly, they were sick and tired of the way that Washington operates and the dysfunction that prevailed here for so long. I had higher hopes that after the election we would all learn something from what the voters were telling us on November 4 and thereafter and that we would take advantage of the opportunity to try to work together to find areas where we could agree, in a bipartisan way, to actually move the ball forward and help people who need our help. If we cannot do that on an antihuman trafficking bill, what can we possibly work together on?

This whole phony issue of the Hyde amendment provision in this bill is a joke. It is a sick, sad joke, after time

and time again voting for similar provisions in other legislation. As I pointed out, you have 12 Democratic cosponsors of the legislation. Do you think they did not read the legislation? That is ridiculous. Do you think their staff did not tell them what was in the legislation? Do you think before the Judiciary Committee voted unanimously to pass it out people did not know what they were voting on? I do not believe that for a minute. I have too much respect for our colleagues and their professionalism to think they missed it.

Our colleagues have an important choice to make tomorrow morning. I hope they will say yes to these victims of human trafficking and no to the kind of political gamesmanship that gives this institution a bad name.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### SENATE AGENDA AND NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

MR. DURBIN. Madam President, I listened to the impassioned speech by my colleague from Texas on the issue of human trafficking. There is no dispute here. This legislation is bipartisan. Democrats and Republicans are prepared to support the bill that has been offered on human trafficking by Republican Senator CORNYN and Democratic Senator KLOBUCHAR. There are amendments pending I think which improve the bill—one by Senator LEAHY about runaway children. In fact, we are so prepared to do this that we have put together a comprehensive substitute amendment to what has just been described which could be quickly passed on the floor. I do not believe there would be more than a handful of Senators voting no. I certainly would support the passage of the Leahy version.

What is the difference? Senator CORNYN has injected into this important issue a side issue, but not an inconsequential one, on the Hyde amendment.

Henry Hyde was a Congressman from Illinois who served in the House of Representatives with me for a period of time. He authored the Hyde amendment that said no Federal funds shall be used to pay for abortion procedures except in very limited circumstances—rape, incest, and the life of the mother. That has been put in appropriations bills every year since—without question, without challenge.

What Senator CORNYN is trying to do is to make this permanent law, and make it part of a human trafficking bill. I do not doubt this is an important issue. I know it is because I have served in the House and the Senate. But I do question whether we should make every bill that comes along a vehicle or carrier for debating abortion or other really controversial issues.

This question of passing a human trafficking bill to protect the scores—

thousands—of victims of human trafficking is one which would pass in a heartbeat in the Senate if the Senator from Texas would remove this controversial section. Senator LEAHY has offered that substitute. I hope we will have an opportunity to vote on it, and vote on it soon.

As to whether this is a reflection of a dysfunctional Congress, well, most of the people back in Illinois and Chicago whom I run into—particularly this weekend—have raised that issue from time to time, and I can see where the argument could be made. We now have a Congress controlled by Republicans—the House and the Senate—and the White House, obviously, with a Democratic President. It is a tough political terrain under the best of circumstances, and we certainly have not been facing the best of circumstances for a long time. There are just a lot of differences between the House and the Senate and the President and the White House, and many of those are manifest.

What was the first bill the Republican majority in the Senate called—No. 1, Senate bill 1? The Keystone Pipeline—a bill to authorize the construction of a pipeline owned by a Canadian company in the United States. That was the highest priority for the Senate Republicans. The President said at the outset: Do not try to preempt my authority as President. I will veto it.

But they insisted. We went through several weeks—2 or 3 weeks—of amendments, and we cooperated on the Democratic side. I think there might have been 30 or more amendments offered during that period of time. In the end, the bill passed with six or eight Democratic votes, was sent to the President, and was vetoed.

So the first 3 weeks were spent on this politically controversial issue, for which, at the end of the day, the President's veto was sustained, and it was wiped off the slate.

Then we went into a rather bizarre chapter here where the House Republicans insisted that before—before—they would fund the Department of Homeland Security—you know, the folks at the airport, the people who are guarding our borders—before they would fund the Department of Homeland Security to guard us against terrorism, we had to vote on five separate riders relative to the President's immigration Executive orders.

They held up this appropriation—giving partial funding to it week after week after week—until we finally said: Enough is enough. Fund this agency that keeps us safe. Stop playing political games with this issue. It went back and forth and back and forth. Another 3 weeks were wasted on this issue before finally—finally—on a bipartisan basis we passed this measure funding the Department of Homeland Security

and said to the House of Representatives: Please, stop putting extraneous issues on important matters like funding our government.

I thought perhaps we turned the corner and moved in a more positive way, but we are mired now over this one, small provision in this bill which Senator CORNYN could remove in a heartbeat.

Then last week came a blockbuster issue. I did not realize a week ago today that still a week later I would be going on Chicago television being questioned about a letter signed by 47 Republican Senators which was sent to the Ayatollah of Iran, a letter sent by 47 Republican Senators to the Ayatollah of Iran telling him and his government not to negotiate with the President of the United States in an effort to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons. The author of this letter, Senator COTTON of Arkansas, and those who signed it, went to great lengths describing how they would, in fact, have the last word on anything negotiated by this President and that they planned on being around for a long, long time, urging the Ayatollah to not enter into negotiations with the President of the United States of America.

There is no historic precedent for what just occurred—none. We have never had 47 Senators of any party send a letter to a head of state and say: Stop negotiating with the United States of America. And they did it. The press reaction across the United States has been overwhelmingly negative to this action that was taken by these 47 Senators. I could go through the long list here of what newspapers across America have said about that letter.

The Detroit Free Press said: "A blot on the 114th U.S. Senate."

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette: "The senators who signed the letter should be ashamed."

The Salt Lake Tribune: "Cringe-worthy buffoonery on the global stage" is how they described that letter.

The Courier-Journal in Louisville, KY, asked the question: "Has Congress gone crazy?" when they reflected on this letter. The Courier-Journal went on to call those who signed it: "Senate Saboteurs." Those are their words, not mine.

The Salt Lake Tribune said: "... the foolish, dangerous and arguably felonious attempt by the Obama Derangement Caucus of the Senate. . . ."

The Kansas City Star said: "Was Iran letter traitorous or just treacherous for GOP [Senators]. . . ."

The Los Angeles Times called it "insulting." They said: "The Republican senators' meddling in that responsibility is outrageous."

It goes on and on. I won't read them all. It doesn't get any better. It gets worse. And to think that 47 Republican Senators would try to preempt any President of the United States.

Today in Geneva, Switzerland, former Senator and current Secretary of State John Kerry sits down at a negotiating table across from Iran. On our side of the table are major allies trying to stop the development of a nuclear weapon in Iran. They will struggle. Maybe they will never reach an agreement. But what the 47 Senators said in a letter to the Ayatollah of Iran will not help.

What is the alternative? If these negotiations fail, the alternative is Iran develops a nuclear weapon and endangers not only Israel but the Middle East and far beyond, and triggers an arms race in the Middle East for nuclear weapons. That is an outrageous, unacceptable outcome. Or, military action. Military action by Israel, perhaps, as Prime Minister Netanyahu suggested 2 weeks ago; military action by the United States. Is it worth our time to be negotiating to try to find a peaceful resolution, to try to find a way for Iran to stop developing nuclear weapons with verifiable inspections? We won't take them at their word. There have to be inspections. Or is it better, as these 47 Republican Senators insisted, to walk away from the table? I think it is far better to continue these negotiations. I don't know if they will end up with a good agreement, but don't we owe it to our President, our Secretary of State, our government, our country, to at least see these negotiations through and then to read the agreement before 47 Senators send a letter condemning it and rejecting it? It was a sad day. But now let's turn the corner.

The first thing we should do this week—the absolute first thing we should do—is approve the President's nominee to be Attorney General. Loretta Lynch appeared before our Judiciary Committee. Senator HATCH was there, and I think he may even concede what I am about to say: No one laid a glove on this magnificent lady—a prosecutor with a spotless record; an African American with a life story about witnessing the civil rights movement as it unfolded in this country in the 1960s; an extraordinarily good person—good family, good background, impeccable credentials. There wasn't a single thing said about her that would stop anyone voting for her.

Now her nomination has been sitting for 128 days since it was announced. They are trying to set a record on the Republican side: No nominee for Attorney General has languished that long in the last 30 years. If they have a complaint about this lady, let them say so. Their complaint: She was chosen by President Barack Obama. That is not good enough.

This week, let us rise above the politics which have dominated the Senate since this session began. Let us do something constructive—approve this Attorney General, take this offensive

section out of this bill, and move it for passage. We can get it done in a matter of hours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, today we will again resume consideration of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This is an important bill to me. I have been working on it for many years. Without a doubt, this legislation is incredibly important.

Right now in this country there are thousands of human beings—mainly young people—living as slaves. Women and children are stolen from their homes, stripped of their God-given rights, and robbed of their human dignity. These individuals live among us. They live in our neighborhoods and in our suburbs, our biggest cities and our smallest towns. They live in a world of silence, fear, hopelessness, and unspeakable suffering.

The State Department estimates that up to 17,500 individuals are trafficked to the United States every year. The majority of these are women and children. Some of them are forced into a life of unpaid servitude, many others into sex work. Worldwide, the International Labor Organization estimates that 4.5 million people are currently enslaved through sex trafficking. These numbers are staggering, but they only illustrate the scope of the problem. The suffering of each individual victim should not be lost in a sea of statistics. For victims of human trafficking, the surreal horror of their lives bears testimony to the gravity of the crime.

A number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have worked tirelessly to update our legal framework for fighting this scourge. I wish to commend them for their efforts, especially the senior Senator from Texas, the senior Senator from Minnesota, and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. Their efforts represent exactly the sort of work that should be the mission of this body: working across the aisle to produce workable solutions to the most pressing problems facing our Nation.

The majority leader also merits praise for his decision to take up this bill and his unwavering support for it. Far too often, his predecessor focused the Senate's time and efforts on taking partisan messaging votes and abusing the rules to score political points. By prioritizing the consideration of important bipartisan legislation such as this—and by restoring this body's traditions of fulsome debate, an open amendment process, and regular order through the committee system—our new majority is putting the Senate back to work for the American people.

While the sailing has not always been totally smooth—it rarely is—the progress we have seen in restoring this institution to its proper role as a productive legislative body is both real and meaningful.

Given the progress we have made thus far, the logjam that is currently impeding our progress on this important legislation is extremely disappointing. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have claimed that we somehow supposedly snuck a controversial abortion provision into an otherwise uncontroversial bill.

This claim is unequivocally ridiculous. First, the language in question was by no means snuck into the bill. It was in the bill when it was introduced at the beginning of this Congress. It was in the bill when those of us on the Judiciary Committee took part in an extensive markup of the bill. It was in the bill when it passed unanimously out of committee. It was in the bill when we undertook its consideration here on the floor. In fact, there were Democratic cosponsors of this bill.

Moreover, not only was this language in the bill from the beginning, but it has also been the law of the land for nearly four decades. Democrats in this body have supported countless other bills with similar language, including even ObamaCare.

Abortion is obviously a divisive and sensitive issue. While I am strongly pro-life, I recognize that many of my friends passionately disagree with me on this issue. As Members of this institution, it is incumbent upon us to respect the sincere beliefs of our colleagues with whom we disagree and to work toward responsible governing arrangements.

The Hyde amendment represents such a sensible and appropriate arrangement. It is predicated on the commonsense notion that while we may vigorously disagree on whether life should be protected before birth, we can broadly agree that taxpayer money should not be used—should not be used—to fund a procedure that many Americans—in fact a majority, according to a number of polls—consider to be murder.

The responsible way for each of us to approach this bill, regardless of our view on abortion, is to embrace this long-standing, commonsense compromise on abortion funding and focus on passing the underlying measure—a bill that is so critical to our efforts to fight human trafficking and help alleviate the suffering of victims.

To hold up the passage of this bill to pick a fight over the Hyde amendment represents an unambiguous dereliction of Senators' individual duties to responsibly legislate.

Unfortunately, that is exactly what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have done. They are now threatening a filibuster unless we agree to

their extreme pro-abortion position on this issue. There ought to be six of them who will stand up and vote with us and get this bill passed.

In response, the majority leader offered an eminently reasonable compromise—an up-or-down vote on an amendment to strip out the language to which they are suddenly objecting. But the minority leader objected, demanding a guarantee that the provision be removed. By doing so, the minority leader is once again resorting to outrageous “my way or the highway” tactics that are the antithesis of how the Senate should work. It is a move out of the same playbook that he used to give us a calendar full of messaging votes last year meant to produce political theater rather than meaningful legislation.

This ploy plainly demonstrates the desire of the minority leadership to muck up the majority’s efforts to exercise reliable leadership, no matter the cost to the victims of human trafficking. By resorting to this sort of obstruction, they have demonstrated how desperately they want to derail our efforts to legislate responsibly and instead resort to their tired and discredited war-on-women rhetoric to win cheap political points.

Let me repeat a point I have repeatedly made about this impasse—words that the minority leader has tried to manipulate to support his shameful gambit. For all of my colleagues who are tempted by this irresponsible strategy: It would be pathetic to hold up this bill. This bill is absolutely critical to our families and our children.

I cannot believe the Senate has become so political that my colleagues would raise this issue—this tangential, long-settled issue at this time—after the same transparently clear language passed unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee.

For my colleagues to hold up this bill in an effort to impose their extreme policy, to overturn the law of the land that has long enjoyed bipartisan support, to pick a false fight over abortion, or to try to embarrass the majority is itself embarrassing.

I urge my colleagues in the minority in the strongest possible terms to reconsider their position and allow the Senate, once again, to do the people’s business.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### A NUCLEAR IRAN

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I rise to discuss what many believe is the

most dangerous threat to our national security, and that is a nuclear Iran.

Over the past few weeks, there have been a lot of discussions about the Obama administration’s ongoing negotiations with Iran and what the role of Congress should be. I believe the debate this past week in Congress over how to best address this issue has distracted us from what I believe are the two key objectives in our effort to prevent Iran from achieving nuclear weapons capability. First, Iran must be prevented from getting the bomb, and second, we in the Senate must decide the best way to guarantee that result.

For the past 10 years, I have been working hard to find the most acceptable and best way to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons capability. Note that word “capability.”

For me, it has long been not enough to just announce that we must not allow Iran to get a nuclear weapon. I am determined that Iran must not get the technical capability to manufacture such a weapon because a nuclear weapons-capable Iran is as dangerous as a nuclear-armed Iran because it throws up a cloud of ambiguity about its formal intentions.

There are many in the policy communities who find some mistaken sense of comfort from the intelligence agencies’ current view that Iran has not yet made a formal decision to develop a nuclear weapon. This is a delusion. Iran’s industrial-strength uranium enrichment enterprise has gone from 600 centrifuges 6 years ago when the international community first expressed alarm to 19,000 today. We know the Ayatollah is on a quest for 190,000 centrifuges as soon as international constraints are removed.

Let’s state the obvious: The Iranian pursuit of uranium enrichment is not being created to manufacture medical isotopes and reactor fuel for producing electricity; its purpose is to produce nuclear bombs.

Throughout my many years of involvement on this issue—as cochair of the task force at the Bipartisan Policy Center along with former Senator Chuck Robb and a distinguished panel of experts and in the last 4 years here in the Senate—I have called for using the full range of tools to prevent Iran from reaching its nuclear goal. These include negotiations coupled with ever-increasing sanctions pressure and a credible threat of the use of military force if the negotiations and sanctions fail to lead to Iran’s commitment to cease its pursuit of nuclear weapons capability. This continues to be my view.

I do believe in diplomacy. I would very much like to see effective negotiations take place, led by insightful diplomats, focused on the right results. I would like to see that lead to a settlement that brings security and confidence. But we have every reason to fear this is not now happening.

I don’t want to destroy the negotiations track, but I do want to refocus it with the firm backing it requires to achieve the goal we need to reach. I don’t want to demand everything from the Iranians, but I do want to require enough to guarantee they give up on their nuclear weapons ambitions. I don’t want to torpedo the administration’s diplomatic efforts, but I do want to require that Congress have the final say on whether the results of negotiations are acceptable and achieve the goals of preventing Iran’s nuclear weapons capability.

For me and I trust for the Senate, this is our most important task of the moment—to force the President to accept a congressional role. He has said repeatedly that he will deny us that role when it comes to approving any agreement. We must not let that happen.

The reason I did not sign the open letter to Iran is not because I disagreed with the goals of the letter. All Senate Republicans and, I believe, many Senate Democrats, are in agreement on the overall objective of avoiding a bad deal with Iran. But the strategy we need to accomplish this essential goal is now in question, and we are divided now in a way that makes this goal harder to achieve.

There are two bills pending that would require the President to present any Iran deal to us for review and action, and this is the course I believe we should take. One, which I cosponsored, has been introduced by both Senators KIRK and MENENDEZ—a bipartisan effort. The other, coauthored by Senators CORKER and MENENDEZ—also bipartisan—I also support. The latter bill, which would require Congress to approve any deal with Iran, is very close to achieving the support of 67 or more Senators needed to overturn President Obama’s promised veto of any legislation on this topic.

Lack of bipartisan consensus at this moment on this issue is likely to lead to a fatally flawed deal that destroys more than a decade of effort to bring Iran to cease its goal of nuclear weapons capability.

We all know now that the Obama administration abandoned the core objectives at the very outset, even before these talks began. Four U.N. Security Council resolutions; frequent and constant demands coming from this Chamber; four Presidents—two Republicans and two Democrats—saying a nuclear-capable Iran is unacceptable; the firm position of AIPAC and other friends of Israel—all stated the necessity that Iran give up and shut down all its uranium-enriching centrifuges. Yet this goal was jettisoned before the talks even started. The Obama administration spokesmen, including Secretary Kerry himself, have explained repeatedly that it was just too hard to achieve. We must be more realistic, we

are told. The Iranians, we are told, can never be expected to agree to the demands laid down years ago by the Security Council. That was then, they said. This is now. Everything has changed. We have to set that goal aside, and we have to reach some reasonable agreement with a reasonable process with a reasonable country. The word we need to question there is "reasonable."

Madam President, it appears my time is running out, but I notice that no other Member is here to speak, so I ask unanimous consent to speak for just 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I thank the Chair.

But even leaving that shocking capitulation aside, we can never expect that the Iranians would negotiate under those conditions. We can now focus on the key fatal flaw of this agreement. It has been simmering for months, but it is now boiling over onto the front pages of our national attention thanks to the presentation by the Prime Minister of Israel, and that is the sunset clause.

We now see that even if Iran is constrained by this agreement and even if in the most unlikely of worlds Iran fully complies with the agreement, at the end of a decade or so, Iran will be fully liberated to pursue nuclear capabilities with no limitations or constraints whatsoever—a free hand, a blank check to go forward, an Iran that will have wealth, the technical expertise, industrial infrastructure, the will, and, if given a sunset provision, the international acquiescence to do whatever they like to pursue their goal without any ability of us to stop it. They can do whatever they like.

Ten years—oh, that is a long time out. Ten years is tomorrow afternoon. It is a blink of the eye.

Such a sunset clause makes this entire enterprise unacceptable. Any agreement that contains a sunset clause must be rejected, and any agreement with Iran that does not impose permanent restraints on their nuclear ambitions is no agreement at all. We in the Senate have it within our ability and mandate to guarantee that happens, but to do so, we need to reach consensus across the aisle. We need to work together as Republicans and Democrats for the future security of our Nation, and for that matter, all nations.

There are a number of issues on which we don't agree. There are a number of things on which we have different thoughts about how to proceed. But this is an issue of such historic consequence and such potential harm that we must find a way to work together to ensure our ability to undo what looks like is coming our way. So I plead with and I urge my colleagues—

all my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats—to rise above any political considerations and work together to ensure that this Senate can prevent Iran from getting the bomb. History and future generations and our children and our grandchildren will judge what we do here now, and may that judgment be the right judgment for not just the future of our Nation but for the future of the world.

Madam President, with that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, last week the majority leader announced that he would finally schedule a vote for this week on the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be our next Attorney General. But as of today no date has been set. The Senate majority leader is now threatening to further delay a vote on this highly qualified nominee until after the Senate has concluded its debate on the human trafficking bill.

Now, there is really no good reason for Senate Republicans to continue dragging their feet on scheduling a vote on Ms. Lynch's nomination. I have been here long enough to know we can debate legislation and vote on nominations at the same time, and to say otherwise is a hollow excuse. In fact, last Thursday we voted on four other executive nominations while we were on the human trafficking bill. We are actually going to vote on two more executive nominations this evening while we are on the human trafficking bill.

All Senators who agree on the importance of ending human trafficking also know it is important to confirm Loretta Lynch as our Nation's top law enforcement officer. She has a proven track record of prosecuting human trafficking and child rape crimes. This is not just somebody who just talks about it and says how much they are opposed to human trafficking, as though anybody were in favor of human trafficking.

This not just someone who says she is opposed to child rape cases, as though anybody here were going to say they are in favor of it. She has actually prosecuted them. Over the course of the last decade, the U.S. attorney's office that Ms. Lynch leads has indicted over 55 defendants in sex trafficking cases and rescued over 110 victims of sex trafficking. We stand here on the floor talking about these issues. She actually does it.

So I think she and the American people have waited long enough. President Obama announced the nomination of Ms. Lynch 4 months ago. The Judiciary Committee reported her nomination with bipartisan support 18 days ago. By tomorrow—we talk about whether we move fast or not. By tomorrow, her nomination will have been pending on the Senate floor longer than all of the past five attorneys general combined.

Take a look at this. Here is Loretta Lynch. She has been pending on the floor now for 18 days. This is, of course, with the months she had to wait before that. Now, Attorneys General Holder, Mukasey, Gonzales, Ashcroft, and Reno had to wait a total of 18 days pending after their nominations came out—so five of them, one of her. She has had to wait as long as five of them had to wait.

We also pointed out the amount of time—I look at the amount of time it took—for the four men who preceded her. All four of those men went through so much faster than she has. We happened to have a vote out of committee. Janet Reno took 1 day. John Ashcroft, who I helped get through the committee, although I did not support him, took 2 days. Alberto Gonzales took 8 days; Michael Mukasey, 2 days, and Eric Holder, 5 days.

This delay is an embarrassment to the Senate. Her qualifications are beyond reproach. But the Senate Republican leadership continues to delay a vote on her confirmation despite her impeccable credentials. Now, when she is confirmed, we know that Loretta Lynch will be the first African-American woman to serve our country as Attorney General. But instead of moving forward with this historic nomination, Senate Republicans appear intent on making history for all of the wrong reasons.

As David Hawkings wrote in a Roll Call article dated March 12:

Lynch is on a course to be confirmed this month after the longest wait ever for a nominee to be attorney general—and very likely by the closest vote ever to put a new person in charge of the Justice Department.

We want to send the signal that we are tough on crime. We want to send the signal that we want to get these traffickers. We want to send a signal that people who commit crimes, whether they are Republicans or Democrats, should go to jail. Yet we refuse to confirm the person who has actually done all of those things. It appears that some want to simply refuse to allow a vote on her nomination, effectively shirking the constitutional duty of the Senate to provide advice and consent.

One Republican Senator even tweeted on the weekend about the need to block her historic nomination. Then, in case you overlooked why he was doing that, he included a link to a political fundraising Web site. We have always kept law enforcement—the FBI Director, the Attorney General, anybody in

law enforcement—out of politics. For a Senator to tweet that we have to block this person, and oh, by the way, here is where you can contribute to a political campaign—that is wrong.

It seems likely the Senate will have to file a cloture motion to vote to overcome the filibuster of her nomination. That is unprecedented; it is unwarranted. No other Attorney General nomination in our history has ever been met with a filibuster. We have never needed to have a cloture vote on an Attorney General nomination. Yet it seems Republican leadership wants to make history for all the wrong reasons.

I mention this to give us an idea. President George Bush in the last 2 years of his term—now a lameduck President—nominated Michael Mukasey for Attorney General.

Michael Mukasey was being sent because the last Attorney General had done a disastrous job—even though he had been voted for by, I think, all Republicans—people will accept the fact now that he politicized the prosecutors' offices and everything else, and finally the Bush administration had to get rid of him.

I had just become chairman again, as Democrats had taken back the Senate. I moved Attorney General Mukasey through even though I did not support him. I felt the President should have a vote on his Attorney General. I moved him through in record time.

She has waited so much more time, multiple times longer than Mukasey.

This is especially troubling and unfair because Ms. Lynch's qualifications for the job are so extraordinary. And her life story is equally extraordinary. Born in Greensboro and raised in Durham, NC, Loretta Lynch is the daughter of a fourth-generation Baptist preacher and a school librarian. They instilled in her the American values of fairness and equality, even when those around them were not living up to those values. Ms. Lynch has spoken about riding on her father's shoulders to their church where students organized peaceful protests against racial segregation. The freedom songs and the church music that went hand-in-hand with those protests undoubtedly made up the soundtrack of her childhood. The Judiciary Committee was honored to have her father, Rev. Lorenzo Lynch, with us not only at both days of her historic hearing in January but also with us when the committee considered his daughter's nomination in February.

When Loretta Lynch was a young child, Reverend Lynch bravely opened his church's basement to the students and others who organized lunch counter sit-ins in North Carolina. He taught his only daughter that "ideals are wonderful things, but unless you can share them with others and make this world a better place, they're just

words." The fact that she has dedicated the majority of her career to public service reaffirms that she has lived those ideals of justice in the service of others. And yet, Senate Republicans appear intent on preventing her from continuing her service—service that we should be honored to have.

Two weekends ago, Ms. Lynch traveled to Selma to honor the 50th anniversary of the historic march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, where scores of courageous Americans were beaten and trampled on Bloody Sunday because they refused to be silent about the need for equal protection under the law. It was a weekend when both Democrats and Republicans came together. President Obama stood there with President George W. Bush beside him, who had signed the last Voting Rights Act. They honored the civil rights activists of 50 years ago.

But I also felt it was a time to reaffirm our shared commitment to Americans, as Americans, and the ideals of justice and equality that so many of our predecessors have fought and bled for, from our Founding Fathers to the foot soldiers for justice on that bridge in Selma.

Loretta Lynch embodies these ideals. She has devoted her career to making them a reality. It is time for Republicans and Democrats to come together to confirm this outstanding woman to be the next Attorney General. It is time to stop delaying and making excuses for how she is being treated. It is time to vote.

This is reflecting badly on all law enforcement. I hear from so many in law enforcement saying: Why are you politicizing this nomination? Republicans and Democrats have usually kept law enforcement out of politics. Why is this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Senators are limited to 10 minutes each.

Mr. LEAHY. Are we on the trafficking act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, we are in morning business.

Mr. LEAHY. When do we go on the trafficking act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business has expired.

Mr. LEAHY. I seek recognition.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

Portman amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking.

Portman amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth.

Vitter amendment No. 284 (to amendment No. 271), to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, earlier this month, two Florida men were charged with human trafficking. They drugged a runaway 16-year-old girl. Then they forced her to have sex with up to 10 men a day. They sold her to men in a gas station bathroom. They sold her on the street and they sold her in the back of a car.

She was 16 years old. She had run away from home. She was terribly vulnerable. They promised her food, then they beat her, drugged her, and sold her. When she escaped, they tracked her down, beat her, and sold her again.

All of us—I think we should have an agreement that Democrats and Republicans alike must remember the many other survivors of this heinous crime.

We have been working for almost 1 year on bipartisan proposals to protect these vulnerable children, count the survivors, and then punish those who put them through this hell. This effort had strong bipartisan support until partisan politics was injected into the debate.

The fight against human trafficking should not be made into a partisan issue to score political points. That is unfortunately where we are today. Everyone expected this legislation to move smoothly through the Senate, I know I did, just as it did through the House. Instead, Senate Republicans have turned away from a comprehensive solution that can garner broad support.

I am deeply saddened by this partisan fight. It is both destructive and unnecessary. It is destructive because it threatens to derail important legislation that would make a difference in the lives of survivors—such as the 16-year-old girl in Florida.

This partisan fight is unnecessary because abortion politics have no place in this debate. Congress has a long history of passing legislation to address human trafficking. We have consistently done so without abortion politics being injected into the discussion.

I know we have passed the Violence Against Women Act. We included a trafficking amendment of mine in that. While I was disappointed that a number of my Republicans colleagues voted



against the Violence Against Women Act, which had the sex trafficking amendment in it, we still passed it by a bipartisan majority, as did the House of Representatives, and the President signed it into law.

So I was pleased we were able to get that significant piece of legislation passed, even though many in this body who say why aren't we passing this voted against the Violence Against Women Act with the sexual trafficking amendment.

But I wish to make clear to everyone that this partisan provision that has now popped up is not something that survivors of human trafficking are asking for. It is not something experts in the field who work with them every day are asking for. We should look at these experts who know what is going on and ask them what it is they want. They do not want this.

In fact, those who are closest to the damage wreaked by this terrible crime are asking all of us, Senate Republicans and Democrats, to take out this provision. They are asking us to put politics aside and to focus on the needs of those who have lived through a hell we will never understand.

Holly Austin Smith, a survivor, was a girl who ran away at the age of 14 and was bought and sold for sex. She put it this way when she testified before our committee:

Politics should not govern the options available to victims of sex trafficking—especially when such victims often have had their basic human rights taken away by criminals who had only their own agendas in mind.

So I think we have to stand with these human trafficking survivors. We have to put aside our agendas. They are asking us to take out this unnecessary provision and move the bill forward to address their urgent needs.

I support the rest of Senator CORNYN's bill, and that is why I included it in the comprehensive substitute amendment I filed last week. Also included in my substitute is a vital component to prevent human trafficking by focusing on runaway and homeless youth.

If we are serious about helping to end this heinous crime, we should be talking about all the good ideas to expand the protections of trafficking victims. Don't try to score partisan points. We should all come together to protect these vulnerable kids. That is why we are here. I am confident that if we remember these children, Republicans and Democrats, we can move forward and return to the bipartisan path we have always walked on this issue.

One of the reasons I have that amendment—talking about preventing is one thing and we should prosecute those people who do this—but wouldn't it be that much better for the victims if we could prevent it from happening in the first place?

I have spoken before of the nightmares I still have from some of the cases I prosecuted when I was 26 years old and the chief prosecutor for one-quarter of my State. I looked at these victims and the ages of my own children, and all I wanted to do was to get—and did—the people who perpetrated these crimes, prosecute them, and convict them.

We should prosecute people who do this, but I also thought how much better it would have been if we had programs that would have given these people somewhere they could turn to before they became victims, some way to protect them so we wouldn't see it afterward.

I said on the floor the other night that in preparing for these trials, the people I prosecuted, I wouldn't bring paperwork home in the evening to do it. I stayed in my office and prepared it. One, I didn't want to take the chance that one of my then-young children might see some of the photographs I was going to introduce into evidence—but I also didn't want them to see their father crying and wonder why, because I always tried to tell them the truth. I was not about to tell these young children the truth of what I was seeing.

Instead, I would tell the truth to the jury and the jury would convict, but even the jury wishes it had never happened in the first place.

The National Network for Youth sent a letter saying:

The National Network for Youth is writing this letter with the hope that the U.S. Senate will remove the partisan piece of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This legislation is desperately needed and we cannot let this moment pass us by because of the addition of partisan and divisive provisions.

The National Network for Youth is saying: Let's go back to why both Republicans and Democrats wanted this legislation—to stop trafficking, to help the victims of trafficking, and not to score political points.

Just as the majority of this body voted for the Leahy-Crapo bill, the Violence Against Women Act, which had a provision on sexual trafficking, a majority voted for it, Republicans and Democrats—I wish that others—I wish everybody in this body voted for it.

I understand that some who now strongly support the partisan part of the trafficking bill voted against the Violence Against Women Act. Each Senator has the right to vote as he or she wants.

But I find it strange that they say: Let's go forward with this partisan provision, when only 1 year ago or so those same Senators who are now saying we should go forward with this voted against the Violence Against Women Act. The very same Senators voted against it.

Let's get out of politics. That was a good act. It had a very strong sex traf-

ficking provision, which fortunately also was accepted by the House of Representatives and signed into law by the President. Senator CRAPO and I set aside politics so we could pass that bill. That is what we should do today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate the work my colleagues have done on this trafficking bill. It is an important issue that deserves debate and a vote.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Madam President, I will say why I believe the Lynch nomination should not go forward. I think it is for a very important reason and, unfortunately, it is one that I think Congress has to address.

In their wisdom, our Founders gave Congress certain powers as a coequal branch of government, and one of those powers was the power to confirm or not confirm nominees. Long before Ms. Lynch's nomination was announced, I said I could not vote to confirm any candidate for Attorney General who supported the President's unlawful Executive amnesty. That Executive amnesty presents big constitutional issues that we have to talk about and understand, and it relates directly to the powers of the executive branch versus the legislative branch.

The Attorney General is the top law enforcement officer in this country, and anyone who occupies that office, must have fidelity to the laws of the United States duly passed, and to the Constitution of the United States. It is that simple. The Senate cannot confirm any individual, must never confirm an individual to such an office as this—the one most responsible for maintaining fidelity to law—who would support and advance a scheme that violates our Constitution and eviscerates congressional authority. No person should be confirmed who would do that.

Congress makes the laws, not the President, and Congress has repeatedly rejected legislation to provide amnesty, work permits, and benefits to those who have entered our country unlawfully. If you want to receive benefits in the United States, you should wait your turn and come lawfully.

We rejected such proposals in 2006, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2014. President Obama's unlawful and unconstitutional Executive actions nullify the immigration laws we do have that are on the books—the Immigration and Nationality Act—and replaces them with the very measures Congress refused to

enact. That is where we are. Even King George III lacked the power to legislate without Parliament.

President Obama's Executive action provides illegal immigrants—those who come into our country contrary to the immigration laws of the United States, which are generous indeed, allowing a million people a year to come to our country—with work authorization, photo IDs, trillions in Social Security and Medicare benefits, and tax credits of up to \$35,000 a year, according to the Congressional Research Service. I think the IRS Commissioner has admitted that as well.

The President's action has even made chain migration and citizenship a possibility, which he said repeatedly he couldn't do and wouldn't do. Despite those assurances, his action opens up these possibilities as well, it appears. And, again, all of these measures were rejected by Congress.

I discussed these issues with Ms. Lynch. I asked her plainly whether she supported the President's unilateral decision to make his own immigration rules and laws. Here is the relevant portion of that hearing transcript, because I wanted to be clear about it. This was during the Judiciary Committee hearing when she was there as part of her confirmation process.

Mr. Sessions: I have to have a clear answer to this question: Ms. Lynch, do you believe the Executive action announced by President Obama on November 20th is legal and constitutional? Yes or no?

Ms. Lynch: As I've read the [Office of Legal Counsel] opinion, I do believe it is, Senator.

Well, first, we need to understand something. I served 5 years as a Federal prosecutor in the Department of Justice, and this is the way it works. The Office of Legal Counsel is a part of the Department of Justice. The Office of Legal Counsel is the one that has been credited with writing this pathetic memorandum that justified the President's actions. But the Office of Legal Counsel works directly for the Attorney General. The Attorney General is really the one responsible for forwarding to the President a memorandum that says the President can do what he wanted to do.

The President said on over 20 different occasions over a period of years, "I am not an emperor," "I do not have the power to do this," "this would be unconstitutional." He made similar statements over 20 different times. Then he changed his mind as we got close to an election, for reasons that I don't fully intend to speculate about at this time, and then he asked that he be given the power to do this.

This puts great pressure on the Office of Legal Counsel, but that is one of the historic roles they fulfill—to analyze these things. They take an oath to the Constitution, and they are required to say no if the President is asking for something he is not entitled to do.

They are supposed to say no, and the Attorney General is supposed to say no.

The Attorney General could review the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel and take it upon himself or herself to write their own opinion and submit it as the position of the Department of Justice and say the President can do this if he so desires. So that is the way the system works.

But what I want to say, colleagues, is the Attorney General played a key role in this Presidential overreach. It was the Attorney General's office that approved this overreach. And this nominee says she believes this is correct. She indicated her approval, and I am sure will defend it in every court around the country and advocate for it. Some say: Well, she works for the President. No, she works for the people of the United States of America. Her salary comes from the taxpayers of this country. Her duty, on occasion, is to say no to the President; to try to help him accomplish his goals, like a good corporate lawyer would, but at some point you have to say: Mr. Corporate CEO, Mr. President of the United States, this goes too far. You can't do this. But Ms. Lynch has indicated she is unwilling to do that.

One of the most stunning features of the President's actions is the mass grant of work permits for up to 5 million illegal immigrants. These immigrants will take jobs directly from American citizens and directly from legal immigrants who have come into the country. U.S. Civil Rights Commission member Peter Kirsanow has discussed this issue and written at length about how allowing illegal immigrants to take jobs undermines the rights of U.S. workers—the legal rights of U.S. workers—especially African-American workers and Hispanic workers suffering from high unemployment today.

At her confirmation hearing, I, therefore, asked Ms. Lynch about what she might do to protect the lawful rights of U.S. workers. Here is the simple question I placed to the person who would be the next top law enforcement officer for America. And in my preamble to the question, I noted Attorney General Holder had said that people who came to our country unlawfully and who are in our country unlawfully today have a civil right and a human right to citizenship in America, contrary to all law. So I asked her what she thought about this.

Mr. Sessions: Who has more right to a job in this country; a lawful immigrant who's here or [a] citizen or a person who entered the country unlawfully?

Ms. Lynch: I believe that the right and the obligation to work is one that's shared by everyone in this country regardless of how they came here. And certainly, if someone is here regardless of status, I would prefer they would be participating in the workplace than not participating in the workplace.

What a stunning and breathtaking statement that is for the top law en-

forcement officer in America—to say that a person has a right to work in this country regardless of how they came here. So people who enter don't have to follow the steps that are required? They do not have to establish that they have lawful justification to enter the United States and work in the United States anymore? If you can just get into the country unlawfully, then you have a right to work? And our current Attorney General Holder says they have a civil right to citizenship.

This is not law. I don't know what this is, but it is so far from law I don't know how to express my concern about it effectively. It is unprecedented for someone who is seeking the highest law enforcement office in America to declare that someone who is in this country illegally has a right to a job. Make no mistake, we are at a dangerous time in our Nation's history, particularly for our Republic's legal system and our Constitution.

I would like to quote now from Prof. Jonathan Turley, a Shapiro Professor of Public Interest Law at George Washington University Law School, a nationally recognized constitutional scholar, and a self-described supporter of President Obama and most of his policies. He has been called as an expert witness on various issues by Senator LEAHY and other Democrats over the years. He described the current state of affairs as "a constitutional tipping point." He is referring to the Presidential overreach. I would like to take a moment to read from the testimony he delivered before the House of Representatives in February of last year—9 months before the President even announced this amnesty, but after the first DACA amnesty. This is what he said:

The current passivity of Congress represents a crisis of faith for members willing to see a president assume legislative powers in exchange for insular policy gains. The short-term insular victories achieved by this President will come at a prohibitive cost if the current imbalance is not corrected. Constitutional authority is easy to lose in the transient shifts of politics. It is far more difficult to regain. If a passion for the Constitution does not motivate members, perhaps a sense of self-preservation will be enough to unify members. President Obama will not be our last president. However, these acquired powers will be passed to his successors. When that occurs, members may loathe the day that they remained silent as the power of government shifted so radically to the Chief Executive. The powerful personality that engendered this loyalty will be gone, but the powers will remain. We are now at the constitutional tipping point for our system. If balance is to be reestablished, it must begin before this President leaves office and that will likely require every possible means to reassert legislative authority.

Now that is Professor Turley, a supporter of President Obama, and a fine constitutional scholar, who is warning the U.S. Congress of the dangers to its powers that have been eroded in the recent months. To stop it, he says that

will require Congress to use “every possible means to reassert its legislative authority.”

So stopping an Attorney General nominee—not voting to confirm an individual as Attorney General—is that a legitimate power of Congress? Well, of course it is. Should we feel obligated and required to confirm someone who has announced they intend to pursue and advance legally through the powers of their office an unconstitutional overreach, because the President nominates that person? Is that our duty? Doesn't Congress have a right to say: Oh no, Mr. President, we understand how this system works. You get to nominate, but you have overreached here and we are not going to ratify. We are not going to consent or approve someone who is going to continue to promote these kinds of unlawful activities.

One glaring result of Congress's passivity is that executive branch nominees no longer feel the need to be responsive to congressional oversight. We are not getting sufficient answers from them. That is for sure. I think Congress has too often been quiet and slept on its watch.

In the past, Members could perform their constitutional duty of advice and consent, for example, by withholding consent until a nominee provided information to which Congress was entitled. That is how coequal branches of government are supposed to function. Congress has a duty to demand accurate information from the executive branch before providing funds to that branch, and they have a right to insist on it. They don't have to fund any branch of government they believe is unworthy.

When Ms. Lynch came before the committee, it quickly became apparent that she had no intention of being frank and providing real answers. That is a problem I think we have to confront.

I think the most telling example of this concern was illustrated by an answer I was given to a straightforward question I asked, which goes to the very core of this debate that we are having in America about the President's powers and what we should do about establishing a lawful system of immigration—one that we could be proud of, one that is systemically and fairly applied day after day.

The question I asked her was simply this:

Do you believe that President Obama has exceeded his executive authority in any way? If so, how?

She answered:

As United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, I have not been charged with determining when and whether the President has exceeded his executive authority.

But that was really not a good-faith answer or an attempt to answer the question.

I will wrap up and just say, in conclusion, that we are dealing with huge constitutional issues. I wish it weren't so. It is not anything personal that causes me to complain about this nominee. But in truth, we need to use the means this Congress has to defend its legitimate constitutional rights, the power it has been given to legislate. And the President's duties, as the chief law and executive officer of the country, are to execute the laws passed by Congress. One of the key players on his team is the Attorney General, and the Attorney General in this situation has taken a position contrary to the fundamental principles of the Constitution, as Professor Turley has delineated with force and clarity.

That being the case, I think Congress has a duty to this institution, to the laws and Constitution of this country, and to the American people not to confirm someone who is not committed to those principles and, indeed, has asserted boldly that she would continue in violation of them.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### DEATH MASTER FILE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I am going to defer to my colleague from Connecticut, since at 5 p.m. we will be discussing the nominees which I will speak to. But before we do, I just want to point out two things to the Senate.

First of all, the lead story of “60 Minutes” last night was about the death master file which is put out by Social Security.

Interestingly, the story was from the extraordinary standpoint that a number of people are told they are dead when in fact they are very much alive and all of the horror they go through in trying to correct somebody's having made a mistake—a clerical error—that in fact they were dead by the alteration of one number or a name or just sheer overlook.

But there is another problem with the death master file, and we have tried and tried to get that from Social Security. Unless you have an immediate use—a legitimate use for the death master file to be made public, such as a life insurance company—they would have a legitimate use to know who had died so they could stop the payments. Something else the “60 Minutes” program pointed out was that Medicare did not catch a lot of payments going out. But unless you have a legitimate use, by suddenly putting online the death master file, it opens up all of these Social Security numbers for criminals to come in and create a new identity, file a tax return, and get a refund on a fictitious tax return.

I want to continue to encourage the Social Security Administration. They claim they don't have the legal authority until we can give them the legal authority they are looking for. We think

they have it administratively in their power not to put it out there. That is the right thing to do.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

As I yield to the very distinguished Senator from Connecticut, a tremendous member of our commerce committee, I want to say I was sad last week—and am still sad this week—that nearly half of the Senators of the Senate sought to inject themselves by writing to the Ayatollah, trying to derail the negotiations that are ongoing on matters of life and death. If they don't think Iran having a nuclear weapon is a matter of life and death, they have another thing coming. Trying to derail the negotiations, while in fact the negotiations are going on at the very hour of the writing of that letter, and still are—and we won't know until the 24th of this month if in fact they are successful.

I will come back when we get into the executive session about the nominees. I look forward to hearing from the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I am proud to follow the distinguished Senator from Florida, and I join him in his observations of the “60 Minutes” show, but equally, if not more importantly, in his views on the letter that was sent to the rulers of Iran and its divisive and destructive impact on a matter that should be above partisan politics. To inject a partisan political issue into, literally, a matter of life and death, in my view, is unfortunate, inappropriate, and truly regrettable.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Equally unfortunate, regrettable, and inappropriate is to inject politics into law enforcement. The nomination of the chief law enforcement officer in our Nation, the Attorney General—that position truly ought to be above politics. In fact, as we know from the structure of our government, it is generally regarded to be above politics.

The President of the United States has his or her legal counsel to provide advice to the President, but the Attorney General of the United States enforces laws for this Nation—not for one party, not for one official, not on one issue, but on all issues for all people in the United States.

When my colleagues have said on the floor that the President deserves his nominee, really it is the Nation that deserves a nominee to be confirmed.

This nominee has been delayed longer than any in recent history. As my colleagues have observed and as this chart illustrates, 129 days have passed since Loretta Lynch's nomination. From announcement to confirmation, her nomination has been delayed longer than any in recent history—in fact, longer than any in modern history, putting aside the Meese nomination, which was delayed because of an

ongoing investigation into alleged improprieties.

There is no investigation here. There is no question of impropriety. There has been no hint of any reason to reject the Loretta Lynch nomination.

The American people could be forgiven for thinking that some of the Members of this body are simply looking for an excuse to delay or deny her nomination.

First, it was in our hearing questions about her capacity and qualifications. Those reasons or potential excuses for delaying or denying her nomination were quickly extinguished. Then it was the immigration issue. That too, as an excuse for delaying or denying this nomination, has been dispensed. Now it is the antitrafficking bill.

No reason for delay could be more inappropriate, because the fact of the matter is the threat to delay again her nomination is antithetical to the very goal of stopping human trafficking. If my colleagues really want to end sex exploitation and human trafficking, they should confirm the chief law enforcement official who is responsible for fighting it. They should confirm the nominee who has indicated an anathema to this kind of abuse, who has shown her determination to fight it and to use all of the laws and potentially this new law in the war against human trafficking.

The Senate is perfectly capable of filling this crucial position—the top law enforcement job in the Nation—even as it debates antitrafficking legislation. In fact, it has shown itself capable of doing so just last week when two nominees to Department of Transportation positions—important transportation positions, as I can say personally, because they involve the safety and reliability of our system—even as it continued to debate the antitrafficking legislation.

Holding the Lynch nomination hostage—which is what is happening here—is a disservice to the Department of Justice but even more so to our system of justice. It undermines the integrity and trust in the nonpolitical nature of justice in this Nation. It does so at a time when vigorous and effective leadership is more important and necessary than ever.

The Nation could be forgiven for assuming, as increasingly appears to be so, that the Lynch nomination is being held hostage or is simply a cynical excuse to prevent her from getting to work on protecting the American public from human trafficking, which is so important.

There are legitimate points of debate between our sides on this issue. Those points of debate and differences need to be resolved, and I hope they will be. I trust they will be. I believe that they are resolvable and that extraneous or irrelevant provisions now in the bill can be removed so that we can focus on

stopping modern-day slavery, which is what the—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. If I may have another minute to finish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Which is what we should be doing here, and I believe we will do it.

Loretta Lynch has a stellar record. She served with incredible distinction during her time as U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. I suggest to my colleagues that the best way to serve the purpose of stopping trafficking is to confirm her so she can get to work on enforcing that new law.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we have had competing claims about who is really at fault. I think the answer to that question is becoming unquestionably undeniable to any fair observer. Actions speak louder than words and there is no denying the actions of the minority party, which, before this Congress, was the majority party in the Senate for 8 years.

Even in the minority, they are up to their old tricks of blocking amendments and grinding the Senate to a halt. Given the distortion of the Senate rules during those 8 years, it is no wonder the American public, and perhaps even some Senators, are confused about how the Senate rules are supposed to work. So I wish to take a few moments to talk about a procedure in the Senate called the cloture motion.

With cloture, the Senate is actually voting on the question: Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close? The proper use of cloture is when the Senate has had time for debate and consideration of amendments and it seems as though the Senate is getting bogged down. If a cloture vote fails, then that means the Senate has decided, as a body, to keep on considering a particular piece of legislation. This is a crucial point and one that was routinely distorted under the previous majority, and they did it for partisan ends.

A vote against cloture is a vote to continue considering a bill until at least 60 Senators are satisfied they have had their say and are ready to vote a bill up or down, yea or nay. It is not always clear when the Senate has reached that point, so the bill can sometimes require several cloture votes.

Under the previous majority leadership—and now that group happens to be the Senate minority—we saw unprecedented abuses of Senate rules to block Senators from participating in the deliberative process. This included the repeated abuse of the cloture rule. In order to shield his Members from having to take tough votes, the previous majority leader routinely moved to shut down all consideration of a bill

even before any debate took place and even before any amendments could be considered.

As I stated, cloture is supposed to be used after the Senate has considered a measure for a period of time and a preponderance of the Senate thinks it has deliberated enough, and not do it to end consideration of a bill before it has begun, as the previous majority leadership did for several years prior to this year.

Let's contrast how our majority leader, Senator McCONNELL, has been running the Senate. He has not tried to block minority amendments, as was done to us when we were in the minority. In fact, we have already had more than twice as many amendment votes as all of last year.

As the manager of this bill, I have been running an open amendment process, and I am not afraid to have votes on amendments of all kinds. In fact, if you are fortunate enough to be elected to represent your State as a U.S. Senator, it seems to me you have an obligation to the people of your State to offer amendments on issues that are important to your State. The American people saw that we were serious about restoring the Senate tradition of having an open amendment process with the very first major bill we took up in this new Congress.

Supporters of the Keystone Pipeline bill had the 60 votes to end debate, but we didn't try to ram through the bill without consideration of amendments. We had a full, open amendment process as we are supposed to have in the U.S. Senate, because it is a deliberative and amending body. There were more than a few "gotcha" types of amendments from the other side, but that is OK because that is how the Senate is supposed to operate. There was also an opportunity, for the first time in a very long time, for Senators to get votes on substantive issues that are important to the people of their individual States. That should be a big deal for every Senator, but it was not a very big deal the way the Senate was run previous to this year. When Senators are blocked from participating in the legislative process, the people they represent are disenfranchised. We were not elected to serve our party leadership, but to represent our State, and that is why it was so disappointing under the previous majority to see Senators repeatedly voting in lockstep with their party leadership to block amendments and end debate before it started. I think it is pretty clear from the last election that that strategy backfired in a very major way. Yet the same leaders, now in the minority, are up to their old tricks.

The previous Senate leadership routinely used a tactic called filling the tree, where a former majority leader used his right of first recognition to call up his amendments and thus block

out amendments from other Senators of both political parties.

When the Senate is considering a number of amendments at once, it then requires unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up a new amendment, and that is a way to prevent other Senators from then offering their amendments. If you don't get unanimous consent to take down an amendment to make room for your amendment, you don't get the chance to offer your amendment, and usually that was blocked, and that is why there were only 18 roll-call votes on amendments all last year, compared to this year. The last time I counted, so far this year we had 43 votes.

Elections are supposed to have consequences, and the consequences of the last election are that the new majority decided the Senate ought to operate as a deliberative and amending body where every Senator can participate, so Majority Leader MCCONNELL has not filled the amendment tree.

We have substantive amendments pending as we speak. Nevertheless, the minority leadership has been objecting to even setting aside the pending amendment or proceeding to a vote on pending amendments just as when they used the procedure of filling the amendment tree.

After reporting the human trafficking bill out of the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously, they have decided there is one provision they don't like, so after 3 days of consideration last week the bill has not moved forward. It looks as though the same trick is going on right now. Since there is an open amendment process—and that is the way Senator MCCONNELL runs the Senate—we have naturally suggested that they offer an amendment if they don't like something in this bill. They have refused to do so, and instead are holding up the entire bill from being amended and finally passed.

So after opening the bill up to amendments and having considered the bill for a week, the majority leader has now filed cloture. I want to be clear what this means. Again, a vote against cloture is a vote to continue debate and consider amendments. I have voted against ending debate many times in recent years out of principle when Senators were being denied their right to offer amendments. No one can say this is the case right now on this human trafficking bill. We have had a week of debate, and it is the minority party that is blocking amendments.

Remember that many Members of the now minority party, when they were in the majority, were adamant that a vote against cloture is a filibuster and that it is illegitimate to filibuster. I say to my colleagues, if they truly believe filibusters are wrong and it was not just cynical political posturing, then you had better vote for cloture tomorrow.

I will also note that a couple of Senators sent out a "Dear Colleague" letter at the beginning of this Congress calling again for what they term the "talking filibuster." By this, those Senators mean that if you vote against ending debate, you should be prepared to talk nonstop on the Senate floor. Under their proposal, as soon as there are no Senators talking on the Senate floor, the Senate would move to a final vote. The problem with this idea under the previous leadership was that amendments were routinely blocked so it meant Senators would have to talk nonstop to preserve their right to offer an amendment with no guarantee they would ever get the chance. That is not the issue this time.

We have allowed an open amendment process, and it is the minority party that is blocking amendments. So I would say to all the advocates of the so-called talking filibuster, if you do vote against cloture, you are saying you want to debate this bill more before a vote is taken. In that case, you better put your money where your mouth is.

To all of my colleagues who support this so-called filibuster and vote against this cloture motion, I expect to see you come down to the Senate floor and talk nonstop. You can use the time to explain to the American people why you object to moving forward with this very important bipartisan legislation to combat sex trafficking. Then when you are ready to move forward with the vote, let us know.

I yield the floor.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

##### NOMINATION OF CARLOS A. MONJE, JR., TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

##### NOMINATION OF MANSON K. BROWN TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Carlos A. Monje, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation; and Manson K. Brown, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I would like to speak on the confirmation of both nominees, but first of all, I want

to render a courtesy to the Senator from Connecticut—if he needs to complete his statement, I will yield to him and he can ask it in the form of a question.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I want to express my appreciation to the Senator from Florida, whose model I am seeking to follow not only in expertise but also in graciousness and generosity.

It appears to me that we are in the midst of yet again considering nominations, so I would ask the Senator from Florida whether in his view his speaking now and our voting now on these nominations will detract in any way from the Senate's consideration of the trafficking bill and whether our voting on Loretta Lynch would in any way detract from our consideration of the trafficking bill.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, my response to the Senator is that, just as with the two nominees we will favorably consider today, which have been bipartisan, with the great support of Senator THUNE, the chairman of the Commerce Committee—those are not going to interfere with the trafficking bill. So, too, the President's choice—which came overwhelmingly out of the Committee on the Judiciary—for Attorney General likewise would not in any way hinder the trafficking bill if, in fact, we could get up the nominee, because the votes would obviously be there. So my answer to the Senator is that clearly it would not hinder the trafficking bill.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the confirmation of two public servants into leadership roles at NOAA—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—and the Department of Transportation. One is Admiral Manson Brown. Admiral Brown has served our country with distinction for over 30 years, most recently as an officer in the U.S. Coast Guard. What made him successful in the Coast Guard is going to be put to great use as Assistant Secretary for Environmental Observation and Prediction at NOAA. Hurricane season is right around the corner. His position is going to provide crucial guidance and accountability if that big storm starts swirling in a counterclockwise fashion headed to the mainland. So I, this Senator from Florida, am particularly appreciative of Senator THUNE for helping expedite this confirmation.

This role will also oversee continued efforts to modernize NOAA. Now we are frequently launching up-to-date best technology weather satellites. NASA builds them, NASA launches them, and NOAA operates them. They are critical in giving us the refined capability to determine the ferociousness of a storm and its track.

As a highly regarded officer, Admiral Brown has honed significant expertise in his leadership in the Coast Guard maritime stewardship, safety, and national security. He is an engineer.

In our Senate Commerce Committee, we hold Admiral Brown in such high regard that we have reported his nomination favorably twice—once last Congress and again during our very first markup—and it was unanimous.

The second nominee is Mr. Carlos Monje, an Assistant Secretary for Policy. He will play a major, important role in shaping national transportation policy and priorities.

The Department of Transportation, for example, plays a critical role in helping ensure safety in the airspace as well as protecting consumers.

Last Friday, since I did not go back to my State, I went with the FAA Administrator to the Next Generation air traffic control modernization to see progress that is being made in the FAA research and development center at the Atlantic City Airport. NextGen capitalizes on existing technologies, such as the GPS capability provided by the Department of Defense satellite network, and what it will do is make our air traffic control system safer and more efficient.

How that works is right now we have a series of radars, and if it is an up-to-date radar, it will go around every 20 seconds. So you know where the airplane was, but you don't know where it is for the next 20 seconds—until the radar comes back around. If it is where it should be, it is in the path that was filed by the crew.

The next generation of air traffic control will track that aircraft from satellites, so there will be a continuous feed of data from the aircraft to the satellites, back to the controllers on the ground. Because of that, they can space aircraft closer, and they can give them a direct route into the airport instead of a lot of the circular patterns they have because of the delay in the continuous tracking. As a result, they can save a lot of money for the airlines because they can be more fuel efficient, instead of the present step system—if you own an airliner and you are going into an airport, you are going to go through a series of steps. Air traffic control is going to tell you to descend to such-and-such at such-and-such heading, and you are going to go there. All of this continuous conversation is going on and having to be acknowledged by the cockpit crew until they tell you to descend to the next step down.

What the new Next Generation system will do is it will eliminate that step system because there will be a continuous feed. It will eliminate a lot of the human conversation, some of which gets misunderstood, because all of that continuous communication will be between the air traffic controller and the aircraft via communication of satellite. As a result, they will be able to give an aircraft a direct route—not through steps, not all that conversation—of descent into the airport, sav-

ing a lot of potential mistakes in human communication as well as saving a lot of fuel instead of having to power up and power down as the aircraft goes through each of those steps.

Implementing the Next Generation air traffic control modernization is going to be just one of the many transportation policy challenges that we will face and that we are developing and that we have already implemented on a trial basis in a couple of airports and in some airplanes.

The Department of Transportation also plays a critical role in ensuring vehicle safety through its National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. And, of course, you have been reading the stories there—brakes that don't work, ignition switches that accidentally turn off when jostled by key chains, and now deadly airbag failures that cause the steering wheel containing an airbag to be a lethal weapon because it is faulty and it shreds metal in the explosion. We have had five deaths in this country alone that have already been reported.

So these nominees are assuming extremely important roles in the U.S. Government. I think the way Senator THUNE has handled these nominees as our chairman in the Commerce Committee has been admirable, and I thank him for the bipartisanship he has shown. We commend to the Senate these two nominees who will be voted on at 5:30.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the kind Senator from Iowa yield for one request? I neglected to say something earlier.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa. He is very kind.

Our former colleague, Senator Landrieu, is in the Gallery in order to see the confirmation vote of Carlos Monje, who is from her State of Louisiana.

I thank the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY are printed in today's RECORD during consideration of S. 178.)

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield back all of our remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

#### VOTE ON MONJE NOMINATION

Under the previous order, the question occurs on the Monje nomination.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Carlos A. Monje, Jr., of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Ex.]

#### YEAS—94

Alexander	Fischer	Nelson
Ayotte	Franken	Paul
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Boxer	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Cantwell	Isakson	Schatz
Capito	Johnson	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Scott
Carper	King	Sessions
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cassidy	Lankford	Shelby
Coats	Leahy	Stabenow
Cochran	Lee	Sullivan
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Thune
Corker	McCain	Tillis
Cornyn	McCaskill	Toomey
Cotton	McConnell	Udall
Crapo	Menendez	Warner
Daines	Merkley	Warren
Donnelly	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Wyden
Ernst	Murphy	
Feinstein	Murray	

#### NOT VOTING—6

Cruz	Graham	Sanders
Flake	Kirk	Vitter

The nomination was confirmed.

#### VOTE ON BROWN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Manson K. Brown, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.



## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The majority leader.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## TRIBUTE TO DR. MICHAEL COLEGROVE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to recognize a great Kentuckian who has recently received a great honor. Dr. Michael Colegrove, who has been employed with the University of the Cumberland in various capacities over the last 40 years and is currently the vice president for student services and the director of leadership studies, recently received the Tri-County 2015 Leader of the Year award from the Leadership Tri-County organization in Kentucky.

Leadership Tri-County focuses on civic, business, and community leadership in Laurel, Knox, and Whitley Counties in southeastern Kentucky. A nonprofit organization founded in 1987, it identifies potential, emerging, and current leaders from the three counties and nurtures their continued development.

Dr. Colegrove graduated from Cumberland College, currently known as the University of the Cumberland, in 1971. In addition to working for the school for 40 years, he spent 30 years in the U.S. Army Reserve and retired with the rank of colonel in 2003. Dr. Colegrove earned a master of arts from Eastern Kentucky University and a doctor of philosophy from Vanderbilt University. He is also a graduate of the U.S. War College.

Dr. Colegrove is the author of six books. His first book, "Climbing the Pyramid: The How To's of Leadership," was published in 2004. It came about because of the need for a textbook for a leadership seminar conducted by the University of the Cumberland. He has also volunteered with the American Red Cross and the Kiwanis Club.

Dr. Colegrove and his wife Donna live in Williamsburg, KY, and have a daughter Kimberly who resides in Indiana with her husband Matthew and their two sons Jackson and William. I am sure Dr. Colegrove's family members are very proud of him and all that he has accomplished. I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Dr. Michael Colegrove on his receipt of the Tri-County 2015 Leader of the Year award.

An area newspaper, the Times Tribune, published an article about Dr. Colegrove receiving his award. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sentinel Echo, Feb. 25, 2015]

U OF C'S COLEGROVE HONORED AT LTC

(By Nita Johnson)

The influence he has made on his colleagues was evident—first with the University of the Cumberland's marching band's Honor Guard presenting the flags, and then by the two tables of students and co-workers seated at the Corbin Technology Center on Monday evening.

His dedication is the quality that earned University of the Cumberland's Dr. Michael Colegrove the 2015 Leader of the Year award from the Leadership Tri-County organization during their yearly awards banquet.

Colegrove can be described with many words: author, Sunday School teacher, deacon, military veteran, and long-time employee at the Williamsburg college that focuses on helping students achieve success through faith and discipline.

Hon. Eugene Siler Jr., a Williamsburg native who serves as the Sixth Judicial Circuit Judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals, introduced Colegrove and described him as "as organized as anybody you'll ever see."

As a personal friend and member of the Sunday School class that Colegrove teaches, Siler said Colegrove had achieved success through his faith and dedication to family, his job, and his role as a Christian.

"He's a great person," Siler said.

Colegrove's record speaks for itself. He earned a bachelor's degree from then-Cumberland College, his master of arts degree from Eastern Kentucky University and his doctor of philosophy from Vanderbilt University. He also graduated from the United States Army War College and served in the Army Reserves for 30 years, retiring with the rank of colonel.

He has been involved with a number of civic organizations ranging from the American Red Cross to serving as lieutenant governor for the Kiwanis Club for the Kentucky-Tennessee Region 6.

But Colegrove's humility has remained intact throughout his many achievements.

"I am a man most blessed," he told the crowd. "I had the opportunity at the University of the Cumberland to teach faith with discipline with my colleagues and co-workers. I had the opportunity to serve the students, and I have two mentors."

His mentors were the past two presidents of the Williamsburg institution—Drs. Jim Taylor and Jim Boswell. Both men saw extensive growth of the college over their tenure as president, which Colegrove credited to their vision for the future.

His involvement with Leadership Tri-County, he said, has also taught him lessons—one being a book about leadership and the other being one of life's simplest but sometimes most difficult qualities—the art of listening.

The book, Colegrove said, had five major areas to consider.

"Challenge the process," he said, "then inspire and share the vision. You have to have a vision. Enable others to act, and model the way you want."

The last aspect of that, he added, was to "encourage the heart."

Listening, he said, came not from his years of experience in the military or the collegiate arena, but more so from his own family.

"I don't know if Kimberly (Colegrove's only child) remembers this or not, but she was talking to me and I guess I drifted off in my own thoughts," he said. "She squared me up—which in the Army is when you take someone's face in your hands. She turned my head so I was looking her straight in the eyes and she kept on talking. She showed me that I needed to listen to her."

Oddly enough, Colegrove's second lesson came from Kimberly's son, William.

"William Joyce made this in a Sunday School class," Colegrove explained while he took out a handmade set of ears. "It's a paper plate cut in two with a piece of pipe cleaner connecting it. The paper plate has two ears drawn on it and I guess the pipe cleaner is to do this."

Putting the piece across his head, Colegrove demonstrated how the "listening ears" worked. Amid the laughter of the crowd, he reminded everyone that "listening is an empowering ability."

## RECOGNIZING THE AVIATION MUSEUM OF KENTUCKY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to recognize and congratulate the Aviation Museum of Kentucky, the official aviation museum of the Commonwealth, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary. The museum, located at 4316 Hangar Drive at the Blue Grass Airport in Lexington, KY, first opened its doors on April 15, 1995.

The Aviation Museum of Kentucky has welcomed guests from all 50 States and from over 80 foreign countries. It serves as an educational and cultural resource for my State and for the Nation, focusing on aviation history and the important roles many Kentuckians have played in it.

The museum's exhibits attract approximately 10,000 students each year to learn about the science of flight. Through the study of aviation, students learn about math, physics, geography, and more. They also learn about the history of aviation.

The museum educates young people about potential careers in aviation and the importance of the aviation industry, which supports thousands of jobs in Kentucky. Pilots, mechanics, engineers, flight controllers, meteorologists, and more are all spotlighted.

The Aviation Museum of Kentucky holds summer camps to give 10- to 15-year-old Kentuckians a hands-on introduction to flight. To date, they have engaged with over 5,000 youth to help them explore aviation, aerospace, and the possibility of productive and fulfilling careers in the field. Students learn from professional educators and go aloft with licensed instructors. And thanks to the museum's scholarship program, nearly one-third of all campers attend at no charge.

In 1996, the Aviation Museum established the Kentucky Aviation Hall of Fame to recognize famous Kentuckians



in aviation. To date, 45 Kentuckians have been honored. The Hall of Fame pays homage to Kentuckians like Matthew Sellers of Carter County, who gave us retractable landing gear; Solomon Van Meter of Lexington, who gave us the lifesaving pack parachute; and Noel Parrish of Versailles, who flew with the legendary Tuskegee Airmen.

The museum also hosts historic aviation events, giving the public the chance to see in person restored and vintage aircraft. Thousands each year come to view them. And the museum hosts quarterly lectures with speakers from around the world who come to share their stories.

The Aviation Museum of Kentucky was founded by the Kentucky Aviation Roundtable, a group of aviation enthusiasts that was first organized in 1978 in Lexington. The group worked for nearly two decades to see the dream of an aviation museum become reality, and now the Aviation Museum of Kentucky is a great asset to the State, to the industry, and to the Nation.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Aviation Museum of Kentucky and the many fine Kentuckians who run and support it. I am proud of all they have achieved in 20 years, and I look forward to many more years of excellence from this unique Kentucky institution. I wish the Aviation Museum of Kentucky many more years of continued success.

#### REMEMBERING REVEREND WILLIE T. BARROW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week Chicago—and America—lost a civil rights leader and an icon. Rev. Willie T. Barrow passed away at the age of 90. Known as the “Little Warrior,” Reverend Barrow stood up to anyone who would deny equality.

In 1936, 10 years before the Montgomery bus boycott, 12-year-old Willie Barrow challenged the segregated Texas school system that refused to bus African-American kids to school. In a recent interview, Reverend Barrow described it this way. One day, Barrow had enough and confronted the bus driver and school officials. “You got plenty room,” Barrow said she told the bus driver and school officials. “Why you want me to get off? Because I’m black? We got to change that.”

She was right. And from that moment, she dedicated her life to fighting for social justice and standing up for the most vulnerable in our society.

In 1945, she came to Chicago and worked as a youth minister and a field organizer with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. At the height of the civil rights movement, she followed Dr. King to Atlanta, where she organized meetings, rallies and transportation for volunteers who came to participate in the marches and sit-ins. She also helped organize the 1963 march on Washington.

Reverend Barrow didn’t just fight for racial equality, she fought for women’s rights, labor rights and gay rights too. While she helped Rev. Jesse Jackson start Operation Breadbasket on the South Side of Chicago, she was fighting sexism within the civil rights movement. During meetings, some even asked Reverend Jackson why he brought his secretary.

But as Operation Breadbasket evolved into the Rainbow/PUSH Coalition, Reverend Barrow became the first woman to lead the organization. As the chairman of the board and CEO, Reverend Barrow brought women together from the Chicago Network—an organization comprised of Chicago’s most distinguished professional women—to talk about their leadership roles and the underrepresentation of women on corporate boards.

Around Chicago, she was known as “godmother” for the work she did with many young community activists—including Barack Obama. She took on causes ranging from AIDS awareness to traveling on missions of peace to Vietnam, Russia, Nicaragua, Cuba and South Africa when Nelson Mandela was released from prison.

Last Sunday, 70,000 people gathered in Selma, AL, to remember and celebrate the civil rights leaders who marched 50 years ago. Sadly, Reverend Barrow couldn’t be there. But 50 years ago, Reverend Barrow was on the front lines, marching alongside Dr. King and future Congressman JOHN LEWIS.

Years ago, I made the trip to Selma and stood on the Edmund Pettus Bridge where Reverend Barrow marched and JOHN LEWIS was beaten unconscious and nearly killed by Alabama State troopers. It was profoundly moving to see the places where leaders like these risked their lives to redeem the promises of America for all of us. And it’s because of civil rights leaders like Reverend Barrow that our Nation has made progress in the pursuit of social justice. But we know that bridges run both ways. We can move ahead, or we can turn back. Without the courage, the leadership, and the determination of Rev. Willie T. Barrow, the fight to move forward just got a little harder.

#### ASSAULT ON PRESS FREEDOM IN TURKEY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the Senate floor in defense of press freedom because it is a fundamental cornerstone of a democratic society. Today I want to briefly draw the Senate’s attention to the situation in Turkey, one of the many countries in the world where this basic right is under threat by officials in the government who seek to silence their critics.

Recently, in the latest assault on press freedom, Turkish police arrested and detained nearly two dozen mem-

bers of the news media, including Ekrem Dumanli and Hidayet Karaca, two prominent journalists who are well known to be affiliated with Fethullah Gulen, a vocal critic of President Erdogan. The sweeping charges levied against them were not only intended to stop their criticism, but to intimidate anyone who is critical of the Turkish Government. While Mr. Dumanli has since been released, Mr. Karaca remains in prison.

This case reflects a broader pattern of repression in Turkey, where targeted reprisals against outspoken critics have become a common practice for that government. In fact, Reporters Without Borders ranked Turkey 154 out of 180 nations for press freedom in its 2014 World Press Freedom Index, and Turkey has consistently been among the top jailers of journalists, along with China and Iran. This latest censorship continues the abuse of the Turkish penal code and further erodes what remains of press freedom in Turkey.

Not only are these actions inconsistent with the norms and values expected of Turkey, a NATO ally; they violate Turkey’s own commitments under international law, foment further dissent, and serve to affirm the allegations being made against the Erdogan administration. I am disappointed with the backsliding from democracy that we have seen in Turkey, and I am concerned that it will weaken our important strategic partnership in the region. I join the many government officials, advocates, journalists and others who have called for a prompt resolution of these cases, and an end to the Turkish Government’s jailing of people for exercising their right to free expression. The international community and people of good will everywhere expect better from the government of that great nation. The people of Turkey deserve better.

#### 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF BURLINGTON, VERMONT POLICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, next week I will join many Vermonters to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Burlington Police Department, which was established in early 1865 with the appointment of the city’s first constable, Luman A. Drew. For the sake of historical perspective: Mr. Drew was chosen for this high post after his service in the pursuit and capture of a group of Confederate cavalrymen who had raided nearby St. Albans, robbing its banks and burning its buildings before fleeing toward Canada.

For many months now, Burlington Detective Jeffrey Beerworth has been compiling that bit of history and other stories in his research of the department’s history, and his vignettes are both entertaining and informative.

They are particularly interesting to me, as I reflect on my work as a prosecutor with law enforcement agencies in Burlington and other communities as State's attorney for Chittenden County earlier in my career. Most importantly, they show us how the role of law enforcement officers has evolved over the years. I imagine that First Constable Drew could not have foreseen police wearing body cameras in 2015, nor would he recognize the challenges that heroin and other drugs pose to our society. Back in his day, First Constable Drew's main concerns were horse theft and public drunkenness.

A visit to the Burlington Police Department website today offers a glimpse of the many investigative units, programs and community outreach services that fall under today's rubric of police work. I am proud of the efforts of Police Chief Michael Schirling and his team in connecting one-on-one with the residents of Burlington. Community policing is alive and well in Vermont's largest city, and other departments around the country could learn much from what Burlington has done. The Junior Community Police Academy creates relationships among police officers and the city's youths, who someday may become officers themselves. In partnering with the Howard Center, officers work with the Street Outreach Team to support those with psychiatric and substance abuse issues, or those who cope with homelessness or other behavioral challenges. These cases traditionally account for a large percentage of police calls, yet this innovative program allows for trained professionals to address social service needs and allow police officers to focus on public safety.

The Daily Activity Log of the Burlington Police Department offers a glimpse of the range and volume of calls to which today's officers must respond. In a recent 2-day period, 223 records were logged, ranging from the minor to the tragic. Of course, there are many that are recorded simply as "traffic stops," but we know that every traffic stop has the potential for the unknown. That is why I have worked hard over many years to support these officers by providing Federal funds for bulletproof vests. Officers need this protection and deserve nothing less.

Chief Schirling has laid out a series of upcoming events to mark the department's 150 years of service. These will include a community barbecue and open house, along with his monthly "Coffees with the Chief." This is all in keeping with his vision of community policing, and this celebration will be shared by all who benefit from the work of a highly professional and dedicated police force.

On this historic occasion, I thank Chief Schirling and the entire Burlington Police Department for their continued service and dedication, up-

holding a long and valued tradition. The Queen City is most fortunate for their service.

#### LICKING COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CENTENNIAL

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the Licking County Chamber of Commerce as it celebrates its 100th anniversary of service to the residents of Licking County and to the State of Ohio. The chamber supports around 1,000 businesses of all sizes throughout the county and strives to enhance the quality of life in the region.

The chamber was initially created "to advance the economic well-being of the area and its citizens" and it continues to do so today. The organization focuses on growth opportunities and advocacy for its members so that businesses may have a positive impact on the community. The chamber has helped Licking County build a vibrant workforce, pro business attitude, robust infrastructure, and great industrial parks like the Central Ohio Aerospace and Technology Center campus. These efforts have helped the chamber achieve numerous successes, including an accreditation through the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I have had the opportunity to work directly with the chamber during my time in the Senate, and have seen firsthand its commitment to economic development and serving the business community.

I congratulate the Licking County Chamber of Commerce and all who were involved in making its first 100 years a success.

#### BRYN DU MANSION 150TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the Bryn Du Mansion as it celebrates its 150th anniversary. This historic 52-acre property is located in the charming village of Granville, OH. Among its many features, the home has 53 rooms and 12 fireplaces. Henry Wright originally constructed the mansion in 1865 from sandstone quarried from the property.

The Bryn Du Mansion is on the National Registry for Historic Places because of its significant history and importance to the region. The home has had many owners over the years who were entrepreneurs in the community.

The Bryn Du Mansion is now owned by the Village of Granville and is managed by a local commission with a mission of "historic preservation and to provide program and event facilities for the benefit of the community." The mansion houses several community programs and annual events to promote the arts, civic engagement, and athletics for the village of Granville.

I am here today to honor the success and longevity of the Bryn Du Mansion,

and I would like to congratulate everyone involved in making its first 150 years a success.

#### CONGRATULATING ANOMATIC CORPORATION ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Anomatic Corporation as it celebrates its 50th anniversary of supplying anodized aluminum to companies around the world. Anomatic was founded in 1965 by William Rusch when he developed an idea for a continuous motion machine for anodizing aluminum. Today, Scott Rusch and his brother William B. Rusch continue the legacy their father started 50 years ago.

The company is headquartered in New Albany, OH, with manufacturing facilities in Newark, OH and around the world. Anomatic creates products in the fields of automotive, beauty and personal care, consumer electronics, pharmaceuticals and medical devices, and spirits.

Anomatic's in-house capabilities include full package design, high volume anodizing, rapid 3D prototyping, metal stamping, screen printing, double anodizing, laser engraving, and assembly. Anomatic also features the world's largest anodizing capacity, producing more than 1 billion units last year alone.

I have had the opportunity to work on issues important to the growth of Anomatic and its employees and look forward to the company's future expansion in Ohio. I congratulate Anomatic Corporation and everyone involved in making its first 50 years a success.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### RECOGNIZING PROTECTORS OF ANIMALS

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, it is with great admiration that I wish to recognize the laudable achievements of Protectors of Animals, a wonderful and innovative no-kill rescue and shelter organization based in East Hartford, CT. I am proud to highlight the occasion of their 40th Anniversary, and I wish to convey my deepest congratulations to them on this auspicious occasion.

Protectors of Animals was founded in 1975 by a group of dedicated individuals brought together by their shared love for animals and commitment to animal welfare. Two of these individuals, Dru Harder and Phyllis Pavel, truly started off at the grassroots level, knocking on doors in their community in Portland, CT, in order to raise awareness and funds for their local pound.

Over the years, Protectors of Animals' passion and tireless fight against animal cruelty has led them to great

successes and enabled them to save countless abandoned and abused animals from being euthanized. They have also aided more than 14,000 cats and 7,000 dogs in finding caring homes across our State.

The dedicated staff and volunteers at Protectors of Animals not only give animals shelter but help them to heal from past trauma and allow them to recreate caring relationships with humans that are built on trust. It is no surprise that this work has garnered deep and abiding support from animal lovers around Connecticut. This joint effort, backed by genuine values of humaneness and caring, has allowed them to meet the highest standards of accountability, as well as program and cost effectiveness. Protectors of Animals has been recognized by the Independent Charities of America with that organization's "Best in America" seal of approval, which is offered to a select few of the highest performing nonprofits in our Nation.

Having personally supported Protectors of Animals over the years, I can attest to the devotion, commitment, and enthusiasm of everyone involved with their organization. I know how hard their founders, board of directors, staff, and volunteers have worked to support these goals. For its legacy of safeguarding animals and combating cruelty, I am proud to congratulate and celebrate Protectors of Animals on its 40th anniversary. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO WAYNE MASON

● Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, It is a great honor for me to pay tribute to a great Georgian and a great friend, Wayne Mason. It is Wayne's 75th birthday, and for a minute I want to share with the Senate the greatest example I know of how much difference one man can make. I would not be where I am today and Gwinnett County—one of America's most dynamic counties—would not be what it is today were it not for the support and leadership of Wayne Mason.

Wayne is generous in giving back to his community and passionate in his love of country. A successful real estate developer, Wayne has said he lives for the deal and will die seeking his final one. Wayne began a life of hard work and deal-making as a boy by plowing his family's gardens with a one-eyed mule, and he honed his marketing skills by selling eggs and Christmas wreaths. A clever young man, Wayne understood what was needed in a budding community and he opened many of the entities needed to develop one—including a bonding company, ceramic tile store, funeral home, liquor store and a bank. Between 1959 and 1972, he built 1,800 homes in the growing community of Snellville, GA, and by that time, he was a millionaire.

Wayne didn't stop building his community credentials there. He became

chairman of the Gwinnett County Commission in 1977 and served in that capacity until 1981. Wayne's successful development and investment projects in Gwinnett County include names and places all metro Atlantans know such as Discover Mills and The Villages at Global Forum. He also served as a member of the Atlanta Regional Commission, which is the regional planning and intergovernmental coordination agency for much of the metro Atlanta area.

Another area he conquered in more recent years that is also essential for a thriving community is higher education. It has also become a particular passion and point of pride for Wayne in the form of Georgia Gwinnett College, which he helped to make a reality. In 1994, Gwinnett County was the largest county east of the Mississippi without a 4-year college. So Wayne and a group of leaders in Gwinnett County purchased 160 acres of land in Lawrenceville, GA, and designated it specifically for the development of a college campus. Georgia Gwinnett College opened its doors in 2006 as the first 4-year college founded in Georgia in more than 100 years, and the first 4-year, public college created in the U.S. in the 21st century. In less than 10 years, Georgia Gwinnett College's enrollment is approaching 11,000 students and Wayne still serves on the college foundation's board.

Wayne Mason is the foundation upon which Gwinnett County's success is based. So I want to wish happy birthday to a great Georgian and friend. ●

#### RECOGNIZING ELLEN GOLDEN AND DR. BARBARA WOODLEE

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to honor two remarkable women, Ellen Golden and Dr. Barbara Woodlee, who are new inductees to the Maine Women's Hall of Fame. Like all members of this prestigious group, Ellen and Barbara have had a tremendous impact on the lives of family and friends in their communities and on women throughout the State of Maine. Indeed, to be considered for the Maine Women's Hall of Fame, nominees' achievements must have had significant statewide impact, must have improved the lives of women in Maine, and must have made contributions with enduring value for women. I am pleased to say that Ellen and Barbara have not only met these criteria, they have far exceeded them.

Ellen Golden, from Woolwich, ME, is the senior vice president and founder of the Women's Business Center at Coastal Enterprises, Inc., CEI. She has played a leading role in supporting women business owners and microenterprise growth through research, policy, and program development. She has also been at the forefront of expanding small business opportunities for minorities and immigrants in Maine.

Ellen's efforts through CEI and a number of other boards and civic organizations have provided financial and career possibilities that would otherwise have been unavailable to many Mainers. Ellen's work truly embodies the spirit of American opportunity.

Dr. Barbara Woodlee, from Vassalboro, ME, was the president of Kennebec Valley Community College in Fairfield, ME for nearly 30 years. A trailblazer in her field, she served as the first woman president within the Maine Community College System. Throughout her presidency, Barbara strove to increase educational opportunities for Maine women by developing programs, particularly in the health care field, that met the needs of the many women who used the college to launch their careers. Her efforts to open up opportunities for women to access higher education, and the well-paying jobs that come with it, are commendable. But it is not just women at the college who have benefited from her work; thanks to her, Maine community college students pay the lowest in-state tuition and fees in all of New England. She kept costs low while facing difficult budget challenges—a task with which we here in Congress can sympathize.

Congratulations to both Ellen and Barbara for their induction into the Maine Women's Hall of Fame. With this well-deserved honor, they join the likes of Senator Margaret Chase Smith, who in 1950 courageously stood here, on the Senate floor, to denounce McCarthyism. I thank Ellen and Barbara for all that they have done for Maine women and for our State as a whole. Maine is fortunate to have such tireless advocates promoting education and fighting for economic opportunity. ●

#### CONGRATULATING THE WELLS RESERVE AND LAUDHOLM TRUST

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve and Laudholm Trust on the completion of the final stage of their solar energy project. On March 20, 2015, they will officially finish the project and be 100 percent energy self-sufficient. They are the first nonprofit organization in Maine to reach this milestone.

The solar array project represents only the most recent environmental conservation landmark on the Wells Reserve. In fact, the land on which the Wells Reserve sits has been a key link between the community and the environment for not just decades but centuries. It was settled for farming in 1643 and was the largest saltwater farm in York County at one time, shipping its products to Boston weekly. By 1978, the farm was derelict, but devoted community members decided to join together to revitalize it. Laudholm

Trust was soon born from that initiative. Officially established in 1982, the Laudholm Trust has been a vital supporter of stewardship, research, and education efforts surrounding Maine's coastal communities, enabling the success of the Wells Reserve. Due in part to the Trust's efforts, the 2,250 acres of farmland were designated a National Estuarine Research Reserve in 1984.

The solar array project is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished when stakeholders at all levels work together. The \$200,000 in funding to purchase the solar panels was made possible by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association, NOAA, the Mattina R. Proctor Foundation, the Davis Conservation Foundation, the Town of Wells, Efficiency Maine, and, of course, Wells Reserve and Laudholm members. A Maine company, Revision Energy of Portland, ME, installed the array. Through the hard work of this community, the project was completed a full two years ahead of schedule. For such a significant project to be finished years ahead of schedule proves the dedication of the organizations and individuals involved with completing this venture.

The local initiative and collaboration demonstrated on the Wells Reserve for this project represents the very best of Maine community moxie. On the occasion of the completion of the Wells Reserve and Laudholm Trust solar array, I extend my congratulations to the two leading organizations and all those involved in making the project possible.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-926. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Secretary of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-927. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Strategic and Critical Materials 2015 Report on Stockpile Requirements"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-928. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-929. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-930. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorization in the People's Republic of China: Samsung China Semiconductor Co. Ltd." (RIN0694-AG50) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-931. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 on March 15, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-932. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-933. A communication from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Pipeline, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pipeline Safety: Miscellaneous Changes to Pipeline Safety Regulations" (RIN2137-AE59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-934. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustments to 2015 Annual Catch Limits" (RIN0648-XD536) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-935. A communication from the Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Section 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 as amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protec-

tion and Competition Act of 1992" (MB Docket No. 05-311) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-936. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Child Support Program for fiscal year 2012; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-937. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, eight (8) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-938. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Office of Refugee Resettlement: Annual Report to Congress, FY 2013"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-939. A communication from the General Counsel, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-940. A communication from the Chair, Advisory Council on Alzheimer's Research, Care, and Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report that includes recommendations for improving federally and privately funded Alzheimer's programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 739. A bill to modify the treatment of agreements entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish nursing home care, adult day health care, or other extended care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 740. A bill to improve the coordination and use of geospatial data; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. REID):

S. 741. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase the resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 742. A bill to appropriately limit the authority to award bonuses to employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 743. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, Mr. COATS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 744. A bill to rescind certain Federal funds identified by States as unwanted and use the funds to reduce the Federal debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 745. A bill to provide debt and tax transparency to taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HELLER, Mr. REED, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 746. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 747. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 748. A bill to prohibit the issuance of social security numbers to individuals given deferred action under the President's immigration executive actions; to the Committee on Finance.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 148

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify safe harbor requirements applicable to automatic contribution arrangements, and for other purposes.

S. 288

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 288, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to reform the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of the General Counsel, and the process for appellate review, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 308

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 308, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to amend the charter school program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

S. 379

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 379, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and modify the credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers.

S. 402

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 402, a bill to establish a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Master Teacher Corps program.

S. 431

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to permanently extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to terminate Operation Choke Point.

S. 492

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 492, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to improve environmental literacy to better prepare students for postsecondary education and careers, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 605

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 605, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to invest in innovation for education.

S. 609

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 609, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and increase the exclusion for benefits provided to volunteer firefighters and emergency medical responders.

S. 628

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the designation of maternity care health professional shortage areas.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a

cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes.

S. 698

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 698, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 711

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 711, a bill to amend section 520J of the Public Service Health Act to authorize grants for mental health first aid training programs.

S. 712

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 712, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to exempt certain flights from increased aviation security service fees.

S. 713

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 713, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 716

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 716, a bill to allow seniors to file their Federal income tax on a new Form 1040SR.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to amend title 11, United States Code, with respect to certain exceptions to discharge in bankruptcy.

S. 736

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 736, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in deci-

sionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 290

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 290 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

AMENDMENT NO. 298

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 298 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

AMENDMENT NO. 300

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 300 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. REID):

S. 741. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase the resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to introduce the Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Act with colleagues the Democratic Leader and the Ranking Member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. The condition of our water infrastructure is in a state of crisis that is only exacerbated by the effects of climate change. The longer we ignore the problem, the more it costs us. The truth is that we are in a crisis that can be averted. There is no need to lose revenue from disrupted business and flooded streets. Our water infrastructure may be buried and out of sight and out of mind; but today we must elevate these systems to the priority level they deserve.

Each year within my home State of Maryland I witness stark reminders of what cities across the nation are facing. In July of last year, Prince George's County, Maryland, experienced a breakdown of its most essen-

tial public infrastructure when a water main serving 100,000 people began to fail. Mandatory water restrictions were instituted, limiting access to water for homes and businesses during an intense heat wave that saw the heat index repeatedly reach the triple digits. At the National Harbor, one hotel evacuated three thousand guests and was forced to cancel upcoming reservations. Included in the affected area is Joint Base Andrews, which publicized plans to shut down a long list of services, including appointments at its medical center.

There are incidents like this happening across America. The reports are startling. They confirm what every water utility professional knows: we need massive reinvestment in our water infrastructure now and over the coming decades. The Nation's drinking water infrastructure—especially the underground pipes that deliver safe drinking water to America's homes and businesses—is aging. Like many of the roads, bridges, and other public assets on which the country relies, most of our buried drinking water infrastructure was built 50 or more years ago, in the post-World War II era of rapid demographic change and economic growth. Some of our systems are even older; in Baltimore, where I live, many of the pipes were installed in the 1800s. Some of these "pipes" are wooden. We need investment to deal with changing population needs and changing hydrological conditions. We have no other choice but to elevate it to a public safety priority and to take action now.

The Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Act aims to help local communities meet the challenges of upgrading water infrastructure systems to meet the hydrological changes we are seeing today. The bill directs the EPA to establish a Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability program. Grants will be awarded to eligible water systems to make the necessary upgrades. Communities across the country will be able to compete for Federal matching funds, which in turn will help finance projects to help communities overcome these threats.

Improving water conservation, adjustments to current infrastructure systems, and funding programs to stabilize communities' existing water supply are all projects WIRS grants will fund. WIRS will never grant more than 50 percent of any project's cost, ensuring cooperation between local communities and the federal government. The EPA will try to award funds that use new and innovative ideas as often as possible.

It is estimated that by 2020, the forecasted deficit for sustaining water delivery and wastewater treatment infrastructure, will trigger a \$206 billion increase in costs for businesses. In a

worst case scenario, a lack of water infrastructure investment will cause the United States to lose nearly 700,000 jobs by 2020.

A healthy water infrastructure system is as important to America's economy as paved roads and sturdy bridges. Water and wastewater investment has been shown to spur economic growth. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has found that for every dollar invested in water infrastructure, the Gross Domestic Product is increased to more than \$6. The Department of Commerce has found that that same dollar yields close to \$3 worth of economic output in other industries. Every job created in local water and sewer industries creates close to four jobs elsewhere in the national economy.

We know that a reactive mode causes us to lose billions in revenue in the short-term. Let us instead take a proactive approach, making strategic investments in innovative projects designed to meet the current and future needs of our water systems. That is the purpose of the Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 741

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) **HYDROLOGIC CONDITION.**—The term "hydrologic condition" means the quality, quantity, or reliability of the water resources of a region of the United States.

(3) **OWNER OR OPERATOR OF A WATER SYSTEM.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term "owner or operator of a water system" means an entity (including a regional, State, tribal, local, municipal, or private entity) that owns or operates a water system.

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term "owner or operator of a water system" includes—

(i) a non-Federal entity that has operational responsibilities for a federally, tribally, or State-owned water system; and

(ii) an entity established by an agreement between—

(I) an entity that owns or operates a water system; and

(II) at least 1 other entity.

(4) **WATER SYSTEM.**—The term "water system" means—

(A) a community water system (as defined in section 1401 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f));

(B) a treatment works (as defined in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1292)), including a municipal separate storm sewer system (as that term is used in that Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.));

(C) a decentralized wastewater treatment system for domestic sewage;

(D) a groundwater storage and replenishment system;

(E) a system for transport and delivery of water for irrigation or conservation; or

(F) a natural or engineered system that manages floodwater.

#### SEC. 3. WATER INFRASTRUCTURE RESILIENCY AND SUSTAINABILITY.

(a) **PROGRAM.**—The Administrator shall establish and implement a program, to be known as the "Water Infrastructure Resiliency and Sustainability Program", under which the Administrator shall award grants for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 to owners or operators of water systems for the purpose of increasing the resiliency or adaptability of the water systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes (based on the best available research and data) to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States.

(b) **USE OF FUNDS.**—As a condition on receipt of a grant under this Act, an owner or operator of a water system shall agree to use the grant funds exclusively to assist in the planning, design, construction, implementation, operation, or maintenance of a program or project that meets the purpose described in subsection (a) by—

(1) conserving water or enhancing water use efficiency, including through the use of water metering and electronic sensing and control systems to measure the effectiveness of a water efficiency program;

(2) modifying or relocating existing water system infrastructure made or projected to be significantly impaired by changing hydrologic conditions;

(3) preserving or improving water quality, including through measures to manage, reduce, treat, or reuse municipal stormwater, wastewater, or drinking water;

(4) investigating, designing, or constructing groundwater remediation, recycled water, or desalination facilities or systems to serve existing communities;

(5) enhancing water management by increasing watershed preservation and protection, such as through the use of natural or engineered green infrastructure in the management, conveyance, or treatment of water, wastewater, or stormwater;

(6) enhancing energy efficiency or the use and generation of renewable energy in the management, conveyance, or treatment of water, wastewater, or stormwater;

(7) supporting the adoption and use of advanced water treatment, water supply management (such as reservoir reoperation and water banking), or water demand management technologies, projects, or processes (such as water reuse and recycling, adaptive conservation pricing, and groundwater banking) that maintain or increase water supply or improve water quality;

(8) modifying or replacing existing systems or constructing new systems for existing communities or land that is being used for agricultural production to improve water supply, reliability, storage, or conveyance in a manner that—

(A) promotes conservation or improves the efficiency of use of available water supplies; and

(B) does not further exacerbate stresses on ecosystems or cause redirected impacts by degrading water quality or increasing net greenhouse gas emissions;

(9) supporting practices and projects, such as improved irrigation systems, water banking and other forms of water transactions, groundwater recharge, stormwater capture,

groundwater conjunctive use, and reuse or recycling of drainage water, to improve water quality or promote more efficient water use on land that is being used for agricultural production;

(10) reducing flood damage, risk, and vulnerability by—

(A) restoring floodplains, wetland, and upland integral to flood management, protection, prevention, and response;

(B) modifying levees, floodwalls, and other structures through setbacks, notches, gates, removal, or similar means to facilitate reconnection of rivers to floodplains, reduce flood stage height, and reduce damage to properties and populations;

(C) providing for acquisition and easement of flood-prone land and properties in order to reduce damage to property and risk to populations; or

(D) promoting land use planning that prevents future floodplain development;

(11) conducting and completing studies or assessments to project how changing hydrologic conditions may impact the future operations and sustainability of water systems; or

(12) developing and implementing measures to increase the resilience of water systems and regional and hydrological basins, including the Colorado River Basin, to rapid hydrologic change or a natural disaster (such as tsunami, earthquake, flood, or volcanic eruption).

(c) **APPLICATION.**—To seek a grant under this Act, the owner or operator of a water system shall submit to the Administrator an application that—

(1) includes a proposal for the program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement to be planned, designed, constructed, implemented, or maintained by the water system;

(2) provides the best available research or data that demonstrate—

(A) the risk to the water resources or infrastructure of the water system as a result of ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic system of a region, including rising sea levels and changes in precipitation patterns; and

(B) the manner in which the proposed program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement would perform under the anticipated hydrologic conditions;

(3) describes the manner in which the proposed program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement is expected—

(A) to enhance the resiliency of the water system, including source water protection for community water systems, to the anticipated hydrologic conditions; or

(B) to increase efficiency in the use of energy or water of the water system; and

(4) describes the manner in which the proposed program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement is consistent with an applicable State, tribal, or local climate adaptation plan, if any.

(d) **PRIORITY.**—

(1) **WATER SYSTEMS AT GREATEST AND MOST IMMEDIATE RISK.**—In selecting grantees under this Act, subject to section 4(b), the Administrator shall give priority to owners or operators of water systems that are, based on the best available research and data, at the greatest and most immediate risk of facing significant negative impacts due to changing hydrologic conditions.

(2) **GOALS.**—In selecting among applicants described in paragraph (1), the Administrator shall ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the final list of applications funded for each year includes a substantial



number that propose to use innovative approaches to meet 1 or more of the following goals:

(A) Promoting more efficient water use, water conservation, water reuse, or recycling.

(B) Using decentralized, low-impact development technologies and nonstructural approaches, including practices that use, enhance, or mimic the natural hydrological cycle or protect natural flows.

(C) Reducing stormwater runoff or flooding by protecting or enhancing natural ecosystem functions.

(D) Modifying, upgrading, enhancing, or replacing existing water system infrastructure in response to changing hydrologic conditions.

(E) Improving water quality or quantity for agricultural and municipal uses, including through salinity reduction.

(F) Providing multiple benefits, including to water supply enhancement or demand reduction, water quality protection or improvement, increased flood protection, and ecosystem protection or improvement.

(e) COST-SHARING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The share of the cost of any program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement that is the subject of a grant awarded by the Administrator to the owner or operator of a water system under subsection (a) paid through funds distributed under this Act shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement.

(2) CALCULATION OF NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—In calculating the non-Federal share of the cost of a program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement proposed by a water system in an application submitted under subsection (c), the Administrator shall—

(A) include the value of any in-kind services that are integral to the completion of the program, strategy, or infrastructure improvement, including reasonable administrative and overhead costs; and

(B) not include any other amount that the water system involved receives from the Federal Government.

(f) DAVIS-BACON COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors on projects funded directly by or assisted in whole or in part by this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on projects of a character similar in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with subchapter IV of chapter 31 of part A of subtitle II of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the “Davis-Bacon Act”).

(2) AUTHORITY.—With respect to the labor standards specified in this subsection, the Secretary of Labor shall have the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. App.) and section 3145 of title 40, United States Code.

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 3 years thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) describes the progress in implementing this Act; and

(2) includes information on project applications received and funded annually under this Act.

#### SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.

(b) REDUCTION OF FLOOD DAMAGE, RISK, AND VULNERABILITY.—Of the amount made avail-

able to carry out this Act for a fiscal year, not more than 20 percent may be made available to grantees for activities described in subsection (b)(10).

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 747. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research; to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 747

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “American Innovation Act”.

#### SEC. 2. CAP ADJUSTMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C), the following:

“(D) BASIC SCIENCE RESEARCH.—

“(i) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the National Science Foundation, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such programs for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$397,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$831,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$1,275,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$1,765,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$2,290,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$2,867,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(ii) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICE OF SCIENCE.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the Office of Science of the Department of Energy, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such programs for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$275,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$566,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$867,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$1,198,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$1,555,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$1,946,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(iii) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the Department of Defense science and technology programs, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of addi-

tional new budget authority provided in that Act for such programs for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$636,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$1,309,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$2,007,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$2,773,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$3,603,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$4,512,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(iv) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the Scientific and Technical Research and Services within the National Institute of Standards and Technology of the Department of Commerce, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such programs for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$31,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$62,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$96,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$132,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$173,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$216,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(v) NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION SCIENCE DIRECTORATE.—If a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a fiscal year is enacted that specifies amounts for the Science Mission Directorate of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, then the adjustments for that fiscal year shall be the amount of additional new budget authority provided in that Act for such program for that fiscal year, but shall not exceed—

“(I) for fiscal year 2016, \$267,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(II) for fiscal year 2017, \$559,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(III) for fiscal year 2018, \$876,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(IV) for fiscal year 2019, \$1,222,000,000 in additional new budget authority;

“(V) for fiscal year 2020, \$1,598,000,000 in additional new budget authority; and

“(VI) for fiscal year 2021, \$2,006,000,000 in additional new budget authority.

“(vi) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this subparagraph:

“(I) ADDITIONAL NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The term ‘additional new budget authority’ means—

“(aa) with respect to the National Science Foundation, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year 2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the National Science Foundation;

“(bb) with respect to the Department of Energy Office of Science, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year 2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the Department of Energy Office of Science;

“(cc) with respect to the Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year

2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs;

“(dd) with respect to the National Institute of Standards and Technology Scientific and Technical Research Services, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year 2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the National Institute of Standards and Technology Scientific and Technical Research Services; and

“(ee) with respect to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Science Directorate, the amount provided for a fiscal year, in excess of the amount provided in fiscal year 2015, in an appropriation Act and specified to support the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Science Directorate.

“(II) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—The term ‘National Science Foundation’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the National Science Foundation.

“(III) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY OFFICE OF SCIENCE.—The term ‘Department of Energy Office of Science’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the Department of Energy Office of Science.

“(IV) DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS.—The term ‘Department of Defense Science and Technology programs’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the Department of Defense Science and Technology programs.

“(V) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES.—The term ‘National Institute of Standards and Technology Scientific and Technical Research and Services’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the National Institute of Standards and Technology Scientific and Technical Research and Services.

“(VI) NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION SCIENCE DIRECTORATE.—The term ‘National Aeronautics and Space Administration Science Directorate’ means the appropriations accounts that support the various institutes, offices, and centers that make up the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Science Directorate.”

(b) FUNDING.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated—

(1) for the National Science Foundation, the amounts provided for under clause (i) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year;

(2) for the Department of Energy Office of Sciences, the amounts provided for under clause (ii) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year;

(3) for the Department of Defense Science and Technology programs, the amounts provided for under clause (iii) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year;

(4) for the National Institute of Standards and Technology Scientific and Technical Research and Services, the amounts provided for under clause (iv) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year; and

(5) for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Science Directorate, the amounts provided for under clause (iv) of such section 251(b)(2)(D) in each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and such sums as may be necessary for each subsequent fiscal year.

(c) MINIMUM CONTINUED FUNDING REQUIREMENT.—Amounts appropriated for each of the programs and agencies described in section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as added by subsection (a)) for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2021, and each subsequent fiscal year, shall not be less than the amounts appropriated for such programs and agencies for fiscal year 2015.

(d) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after “Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds (16-0327-0-1-600).” the following:

“Appropriations under the American Innovation Act.”

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 301. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 302. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 303. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 304. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 305. Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 306. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 307. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 308. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 309. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 310. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 311. Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S.

178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 312. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 313. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 314. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 315. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 316. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

## TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 301. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

### 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

### TITLE I—JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

- Sec. 101. Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund.
- Sec. 102. Clarifying the benefits and protections offered to domestic victims of human trafficking.
- Sec. 103. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.
- Sec. 104. Direct services for victims of child pornography.
- Sec. 105. Increasing compensation and restitution for trafficking victims.
- Sec. 106. Streamlining human trafficking investigations.
- Sec. 107. Enhancing human trafficking reporting.
- Sec. 108. Reducing demand for sex trafficking.
- Sec. 109. Sense of Congress.
- Sec. 110. Using existing task forces and components to target offenders who exploit children.
- Sec. 111. Targeting child predators.
- Sec. 112. Monitoring all human traffickers as violent criminals.
- Sec. 113. Crime victims’ rights.
- Sec. 114. Combat Human Trafficking Act.
- Sec. 115. Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act.
- Sec. 116. Bringing Missing Children Home Act.
- Sec. 117. Grant accountability.

### TITLE II—COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Subtitle A—Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking

Sec. 201. Amendments to the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

Subtitle B—Improving the Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking

Sec. 211. Response to victims of child sex trafficking.

Subtitle C—Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking

- Sec. 221. Victim of trafficking defined.  
 Sec. 222. Interagency task force report on child trafficking primary prevention.  
 Sec. 223. GAO Report on intervention.  
 Sec. 224. Provision of housing permitted to protect and assist in the recovery of victims of trafficking.

TITLE III—HERO ACT

- Sec. 301. Short title.  
 Sec. 302. HERO Act.

TITLE IV—RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

- Sec. 401. Runaway and homeless youth and trafficking prevention.  
 Sec. 402. Response to missing children and victims of child sex trafficking.

TITLE V—STOP EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING ACT

- Sec. 501. Short title.  
 Sec. 502. Safe Harbor Incentives.  
 Sec. 503. Report on restitution paid in connection with certain trafficking offenses.  
 Sec. 504. National human trafficking hotline.  
 Sec. 505. Job corps eligibility.  
 Sec. 506. Clarification of authority of the United States Marshals Service.  
 Sec. 507. Establishing a national strategy to combat human trafficking.

TITLE I—JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING

SEC. 101. DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 3014. Additional special assessment

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 and ending on September, 30 2019, in addition to the assessment imposed under section 3013, the court shall assess an amount of \$5,000 on any non-indigent person or entity convicted of an offense under—

“(1) chapter 77 (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons);

“(2) chapter 109A (relating to sexual abuse);

“(3) chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation and other abuse of children);

“(4) chapter 117 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes); or

“(5) section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) (relating to human smuggling), unless the person induced, assisted, abetted, or aided only an individual who at the time of such action was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter (and no other individual) to enter the United States in violation of law.

“(b) SATISFACTION OF OTHER COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS.—An assessment under subsection (a) shall not be payable until the person subject to the assessment has satisfied all outstanding court-ordered fines and orders of restitution arising from the criminal convictions on which the special assessment is based.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ‘Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Fund’), to be administered by the Attor-

ney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(d) DEPOSITS.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, or any other law regarding the crediting of money received for the Government, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—From amounts in the Fund, in addition to any other amounts available, and without further appropriation, the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, use amounts available in the Fund to award grants or enhance victims' programming under—

“(A) sections 202, 203, and 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a, 14044b, and 14044c);

“(B) subsections (b)(2) and (f) of section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105); and

“(C) section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(2) GRANTS.—Of the amounts in the Fund used under paragraph (1), not less than \$2,000,000, if such amounts are available in the Fund during the relevant fiscal year, shall be used for grants to provide services for child pornography victims under section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(f) TRANSFERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the day after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, on September 30 of each fiscal year, all unobligated balances in the Fund shall be transferred to the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be available for any authorized purpose of the Crime Victims Fund; and

“(B) shall remain available until expended.

“(g) COLLECTION METHOD.—The amount assessed under subsection (a) shall, subject to subsection (b), be collected in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases.

“(h) DURATION OF OBLIGATION.—Subject to section 3613(b), the obligation to pay an assessment imposed on or after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 shall not cease until the assessment is paid in full.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3013 the following:

“3014. Additional special assessment.”.

SEC. 102. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS OFFERED TO DOMESTIC VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) NO REQUIREMENT OF OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of traf-

ficking to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in this subsection or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (H), as redesignated, by striking “subparagraph (F)” and inserting “subparagraph (G)”.

SEC. 103. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 203. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may award block grants to an eligible entity to develop, improve, or expand domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims' services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

“(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

“(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

“(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

“(B) address the unique needs of child victims of human trafficking;

“(C) facilitate the rescue of child victims of human trafficking;

“(D) investigate and prosecute acts of human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking; and

“(E) utilize, implement, and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of child sex trafficking victims for prostitution offenses, and other laws aimed at the investigation and prosecution of child human trafficking;

“(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

“(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer's time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

“(i) wire taps;

“(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

“(iii) travel; and

“(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

“(C) dedicated anti-trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for

State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenders, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims’ services through coordination with—

“(i) child advocacy centers;  
“(ii) social service agencies;  
“(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

“(iv) housing agencies;  
“(v) legal services agencies; and  
“(vi) nongovernmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking; and

“(E) the establishment or enhancement of other necessary victim assistance programs or personnel, such as victim or child advocates, child-protective services, child forensic interviews, or other necessary service providers; and

“(3) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for trafficking victims that include—

“(A) mandatory and regular training requirements for judicial officials involved in the administration or operation of the court program described under this paragraph;

“(B) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking, including case worker or child welfare supervision in collaboration with judicial officers, who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

“(C) the development of a specialized and individualized, court-ordered treatment program for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

“(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

“(ii) life skills training;

“(iii) housing placement;

“(iv) vocational training;

“(v) education;

“(vi) family support services; and

“(vii) job placement;

“(D) centralized case management involving the consolidation of all of each child human trafficking victim’s cases and offenses, and the coordination of all trafficking victim treatment programs and social services;

“(E) regular and mandatory court appearances by the victim during the duration of the treatment program for purposes of ensuring compliance and effectiveness;

“(F) the ultimate dismissal of relevant non-violent criminal charges against the victim, where such victim successfully complies with the terms of the court-ordered treatment program; and

“(G) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and nongovernmental organizations with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

“(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

“(B) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant;

“(C) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section; and

“(D) disclose—

“(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

“(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period ending on the date of the submission of an application under this section.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

“(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b); or

“(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

“(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 3 years after the date of award of the grant.

“(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 2 times and for a period of not greater than 2 years.

“(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall—

“(1) enter into a contract with a nongovernmental organization, including an academic or nonprofit organization, that has experience with issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct periodic evaluations of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section;

“(2) instruct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to review evaluations issued under paragraph (1) to determine the methodological and statistical validity of the evaluations; and

“(3) submit the results of any evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

“(f) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity awarded funds under this section that is found to have used grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the block grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

“(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if within the 5 fiscal

years before submitting an application for a grant under this section, the grantee has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

“(h) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount expended to carry out this section.

“(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section shall be—

“(1) 70 percent in the first year;

“(2) 60 percent in the second year; and

“(3) 50 percent in the third year, and in all subsequent years.

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING; FULLY OFFSET.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, is authorized to award not more than \$7,000,000 of the funds available in the Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund, established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘child’ means a person under the age of 18;

“(2) the term ‘child advocacy center’ means a center created under subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

“(3) the term ‘child human trafficking’ means 1 or more severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving a victim who is a child; and

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State or unit of local government that—

“(A) has significant criminal activity involving child human trafficking;

“(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing child human trafficking;

“(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat child human trafficking, including—

“(i) the establishment of a shelter for victims of child human trafficking, through existing or new facilities;

“(ii) the provision of trauma-informed, gender-responsive rehabilitative care to victims of child human trafficking;

“(iii) the provision of specialized training for law enforcement officers and social service providers for all forms of human trafficking, with a focus on domestic child human trafficking;

“(iv) prevention, deterrence, and prosecution of offenses involving child human trafficking, including soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing human acts with children;

“(v) cooperation or referral agreements with organizations providing outreach or other related services to runaway and homeless youth;

“(vi) law enforcement protocols or procedures to screen all individuals arrested for prostitution, whether adult or child, for victimization by sex trafficking and by other crimes, such as sexual assault and domestic violence; and

“(vii) cooperation or referral agreements with State child welfare agencies and child advocacy centers; and

“(D) provides an assurance that, under the plan under subparagraph (C), a victim of child human trafficking shall not be required

to collaborate with law enforcement officers to have access to any shelter or services provided with a grant under this section.

“(1) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY; SPECIALIZED VICTIMS’ SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—No grant funds under this section may be awarded or transferred to any entity unless such entity has demonstrated substantial experience providing services to victims of human trafficking or related populations (such as runaway and homeless youth), or employs staff specialized in the treatment of human trafficking victims.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7101 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 203 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 203. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.”.

#### SEC. 104. DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.

The Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(5) (42 U.S.C. 13001a(5)), by inserting “, including human trafficking and the production of child pornography” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 214 (42 U.S.C. 13002)—

(A) by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) DIRECT SERVICES FOR VICTIMS OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—The Administrator, in coordination with the Director and with the Director of the Office of Victims of Crime, may make grants to develop and implement specialized programs to identify and provide direct services to victims of child pornography.”.

#### SEC. 105. INCREASING COMPENSATION AND RESTITUTION FOR TRAFFICKING VICTIMS.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18.—Section 1594 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “that was used or” and inserting “that was involved in, used, or”; and

(ii) by inserting “, and any property traceable to such property” after “such violation”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, or any property traceable to such property” after “such violation”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(1)(A)—

(A) by striking “used or” and inserting “involved in, used, or”; and

(B) by inserting “, and any property traceable to such property” after “any violation of this chapter”; and

(3) by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) TRANSFER OF FORFEITED ASSETS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General shall transfer assets forfeited pursuant to this section, or the proceeds derived from the sale thereof, to satisfy victim restitution orders arising from violations of this chapter.

“(2) PRIORITY.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall have priority over any other claims to the assets or their proceeds.

“(3) USE OF NONFORFEITED ASSETS.—Transfers pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not reduce or otherwise mitigate the obligation of a person convicted of a violation of this chapter to satisfy the full amount of a res-

titution order through the use of non-forfeited assets or to reimburse the Attorney General for the value of assets or proceeds transferred under this subsection through the use of nonforfeited assets.”.

(b) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.—Section 524(c)(1)(B) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting “chapter 77 of title 18,” after “criminal drug laws of the United States or of”.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating section 9703 (as added by section 638(b)(1) of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102-393; 106 Stat. 1779)) as section 9705; and

(B) in section 9705(a), as redesignated—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (I)—

(aa) by striking “payment” and inserting “Payment”; and

(bb) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(II) in subparagraph (J), by striking “payment” and inserting “Payment”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (B)—

(aa) in clause (iii)—

(AA) in subclause (I), by striking “or” and inserting “of”; and

(BB) in subclause (III), by striking “and” at the end;

(bb) in clause (iv), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(cc) by inserting after clause (iv) the following:

“(v) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement with respect to a violation of chapter 77 of title 18 (relating to human trafficking);”;

(II) in subparagraph (G), by adding “and” at the end; and

(III) in subparagraph (H), by striking “; and” and inserting a period.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) CROSS REFERENCES.—

(i) TITLE 28.—Section 524(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking “section 9703(g)(4)(A)(ii)” and inserting “section 9705(g)(4)(A)”;

(II) in paragraph (10), by striking “section 9703(p)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”;

(III) in paragraph (11), by striking “section 9703” and inserting “section 9705”.

(ii) TITLE 31.—Title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(I) in section 312(d), by striking “section 9703” and inserting “section 9705”; and

(II) in section 5340(1), by striking “section 9703(p)(1)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”.

(iii) TITLE 39.—Section 2003(e)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 9703(p)” and inserting “section 9705(o)”.

(B) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“9701. Fees and charges for Government services and things of value.

“9702. Investment of trust funds.

“9703. Managerial accountability and flexibility.

“9704. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility.

“9705. Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund.”.

#### SEC. 106. STREAMLINING HUMAN TRAFFICKING INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (a), by inserting a comma after “weapons”;

(B) in subparagraph (c)—

(i) by inserting “section 1581 (peonage), section 1584 (involuntary servitude), section 1589 (forced labor), section 1590 (trafficking with respect to peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),” before “section 1591”; and

(ii) by inserting “section 1592 (unlawful conduct with respect to documents in furtherance of trafficking, peonage, slavery, involuntary servitude, or forced labor),” before “section 1751”; and

(iii) by inserting a comma after “virus”;

(iv) by striking “, section” and inserting a comma;

(v) by striking “or” after “misuse of passports,”; and

(vi) by inserting “or” before “section 555”; and

(C) in subparagraph (j), by striking “pipeline,” and inserting “pipeline,”; and

(D) in subparagraph (p), by striking “documents, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)” and inserting “documents, section 1028A (relating to aggravated identity theft)”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting “human trafficking, child sexual exploitation, child pornography production,” after “kidnapping”.

#### SEC. 107. ENHANCING HUMAN TRAFFICKING REPORTING.

Section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) PART 1 VIOLENT CRIMES TO INCLUDE HUMAN TRAFFICKING.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘part 1 violent crimes’ shall include severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).”.

#### SEC. 108. REDUCING DEMAND FOR SEX TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking “or maintains” and inserting “maintains, patronizes, or solicits”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “or obtained” and inserting “obtained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “or maintained” and inserting “, maintained, patronized, or solicited”; and

(B) by striking “knew that the person” and inserting “knew, or recklessly disregarded the fact, that the person”.

(b) DEFINITION AMENDED.—Section 103(10) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)) is amended by striking “or obtaining” and inserting “obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting”.

(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the amendments made by this section is to clarify the range of conduct punished as sex trafficking.

#### SEC. 109. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, defines a sex trafficker as a person who “knowingly . . . recruits, entices, harbors, transports, provides, obtains, or maintains by any means a person . . . knowing, or in reckless disregard of the fact, that means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion . . . or any combination of such means will be used

to cause the person to engage in a commercial sex act, or that the person has not attained the age of 18 years and will be caused to engage in a commercial sex act”;

(2) while use of the word “obtains” in section 1591, United States Code, has been interpreted, prior to the date of enactment of this Act, to encompass those who purchase illicit sexual acts from trafficking victims, some confusion persists;

(3) in *United States vs. Jungers*, 702 F.3d 1066 (8th Cir. 2013), the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit ruled that section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, applied to persons who purchase illicit sexual acts with trafficking victims after the United States District Court for the District of South Dakota erroneously granted motions to acquit these buyers in two separate cases; and

(4) section 108 of this title amends section 1591 of title 18, United States Code, to add the words “solicits or patronizes” to the sex trafficking statute making absolutely clear for judges, juries, prosecutors, and law enforcement officials that criminals who purchase sexual acts from human trafficking victims may be arrested, prosecuted, and convicted as sex trafficking offenders when this is merited by the facts of a particular case.

#### **SEC. 110. USING EXISTING TASK FORCES AND COMPONENTS TO TARGET OFFENDERS WHO EXPLOIT CHILDREN.**

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall ensure that—

(1) all task forces and working groups within the Innocence Lost National Initiative engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the investigative capabilities of State and local law enforcement officers in the detection, investigation, and prosecution of persons who patronize, or solicit children for sex; and

(2) all components and task forces with jurisdiction to detect, investigate, and prosecute cases of child labor trafficking engage in activities, programs, or operations to increase the capacity of such components to deter and punish child labor trafficking.

#### **SEC. 111. TARGETING CHILD PREDATORS.**

(a) **CLARIFYING THAT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PRODUCERS ARE HUMAN TRAFFICKERS.**—Section 2423(f) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “means (1) a” and inserting the following: “means—

“(1) a”;

(2) by striking “United States; or (2) any” and inserting the following: “United States; “(2) any””; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “; or

“(3) production of child pornography (as defined in section 2256(8)).”.

(b) **HOLDING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACCOUNTABLE.**—Section 2423(g) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “a preponderance of the evidence” and inserting “clear and convincing evidence”.

#### **SEC. 112. MONITORING ALL HUMAN TRAFFICKERS AS VIOLENT CRIMINALS.**

Section 3156(a)(4)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “77,” after “chapter”.

#### **SEC. 113. CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The right to be informed in a timely manner of any plea bargain or deferred prosecution agreement.

“(10) The right to be informed of the rights under this section and the services described in section 503(c) of the Victims’ Rights and Restitution Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 10607(c)) and provided contact information for the Office of the Victims’ Rights Ombudsman of the Department of Justice.”;

(2) in subsection (d)(3), in the fifth sentence, by inserting “, unless the litigants, with the approval of the court, have stipulated to a different time period for consideration” before the period; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “this chapter, the term” and inserting the following: “this chapter:

“(1) COURT OF APPEALS.—The term ‘court of appeals’ means—

“(A) the United States court of appeals for the judicial district in which a defendant is being prosecuted; or

“(B) for a prosecution in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

“(2) CRIME VICTIM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term”;

(B) by striking “In the case” and inserting the following:

“(B) MINORS AND CERTAIN OTHER VICTIMS.—In the case”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) DISTRICT COURT; COURT.—The terms ‘district court’ and ‘court’ include the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.”.

(b) **CRIME VICTIMS FUND.**—Section 1402(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601(d)(3)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting “section” before “3771”.

(c) **APPELLATE REVIEW OF PETITIONS RELATING TO CRIME VICTIMS’ RIGHTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a)(2) of this section, is amended by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: “In deciding such application, the court of appeals shall apply ordinary standards of appellate review.”.

(2) **APPLICATION.**—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to any petition for a writ of mandamus filed under section 3771(d)(3) of title 18, United States Code, that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

#### **SEC. 114. COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Combat Human Trafficking Act of 2015”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COMMERCIAL SEX ACT; SEVERE FORMS OF TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS; STATE; TASK FORCE.**—The terms “commercial sex act”, “severe forms of trafficking in persons”, “State”, and “Task Force” have the meanings given those terms in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

(2) **COVERED OFFENDER.**—The term “covered offender” means an individual who obtains, patronizes, or solicits a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(3) **COVERED OFFENSE.**—The term “covered offense” means the provision, obtaining, patronizing, or soliciting of a commercial sex act involving a person subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(4) **FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “Federal law enforcement officer” has the meaning given the term in section 115 of title 18, United States Code.

(5) **LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “local law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a unit of local government authorized by law or by a local government agency to engage in or su-

pervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(6) **STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.**—The term “State law enforcement officer” means any officer, agent, or employee of a State authorized by law or by a State government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law.

(c) **DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE TRAINING AND POLICY FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS, PROSECUTORS, AND JUDGES.**—

(1) **TRAINING.**—

(A) **LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice, including each anti-human trafficking training program for Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers, includes technical training on—

(i) effective methods for investigating and prosecuting covered offenders; and

(ii) facilitating the provision of physical and mental health services by health care providers to persons subject to severe forms of trafficking in persons.

(B) **FEDERAL PROSECUTORS.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that each anti-human trafficking program operated by the Department of Justice for United States attorneys or other Federal prosecutors includes training on seeking restitution for offenses under chapter 77 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that each United States attorney or other Federal prosecutor, upon obtaining a conviction for such an offense, requests a specific amount of restitution for each victim of the offense without regard to whether the victim requests restitution.

(C) **JUDGES.**—The Federal Judicial Center shall provide training to judges relating to the application of section 1593 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to ordering restitution for victims of offenses under chapter 77 of such title.

(2) **POLICY FOR FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that Federal law enforcement officers are engaged in activities, programs, or operations involving the detection, investigation, and prosecution of covered offenders.

(d) **MINIMUM PERIOD OF SUPERVISED RELEASE FOR CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT COMMERCIAL CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.**—Section 3583(k) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “1594(c),” after “1591.”.

(e) **BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS REPORT ON STATE ENFORCEMENT OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING PROHIBITIONS.**—The Director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics shall—

(1) prepare an annual report on—

(A) the rates of—

(i) arrest of individuals by State law enforcement officers for a covered offense;

(ii) prosecution (including specific charges) of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(iii) conviction of individuals in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(B) sentences imposed on individuals convicted in State court systems for a covered offense; and

(2) submit the annual report prepared under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Task Force;

(D) the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)); and

(E) the Attorney General.

**SEC. 115. SURVIVORS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING EMPOWERMENT ACT.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Survivors of Human Trafficking Empowerment Act”.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established the United States Advisory Council on Human Trafficking (referred to in this section as the “Council”), which shall provide advice and recommendations to the Senior Policy Operating Group established under section 105(g) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(g)) (referred to in this section as the “Group”) and the President’s Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking established under section 105(a) of such Act (referred to in this section as the “Task Force”).

(c) **MEMBERSHIP.**—

(1) **COMPOSITION.**—The Council shall be composed of not less than 8 and not more than 14 individuals who are survivors of human trafficking.

(2) **REPRESENTATION OF SURVIVORS.**—To the extent practicable, members of the Council shall be survivors of trafficking, who shall accurately reflect the diverse backgrounds of survivors of trafficking, including—

(A) survivors of sex trafficking and survivors of labor trafficking; and

(B) survivors who are United States citizens and survivors who are aliens lawfully present in the United States.

(3) **APPOINTMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall appoint the members of the Council.

(4) **TERM; REAPPOINTMENT.**—Each member of the Council shall serve for a term of 2 years and may be reappointed by the President to serve 1 additional 2-year term.

(d) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Council shall—

(1) be a nongovernmental advisory body to the Group;

(2) meet, at its own discretion or at the request of the Group, not less frequently than annually to review Federal Government policy and programs intended to combat human trafficking, including programs relating to the provision of services for victims and serve as a point of contact for Federal agencies reaching out to human trafficking survivors for input on programming and policies relating to human trafficking in the United States;

(3) formulate assessments and recommendations to ensure that policy and programming efforts of the Federal Government conform, to the extent practicable, to the best practices in the field of human trafficking prevention; and

(4) meet with the Group not less frequently than annually, and not later than 45 days before a meeting with the Task Force, to formally present the findings and recommendations of the Council.

(e) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and each year thereafter until the date described in subsection (h), the Council shall submit a report that contains the findings derived from the reviews conducted pursuant to subsection (d)(2) to—

(1) the chair of the Task Force;

(2) the members of the Group;

(3) the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Homeland Security, Appropriations, and the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Judiciary of the Senate.

(f) **EMPLOYEE STATUS.**—Members of the Council—

(1) shall not be considered employees of the Federal Government for any purpose; and

(2) shall not receive compensation other than reimbursement of travel expenses and per diem allowance in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(g) **NONAPPLICABILITY OF FACA.**—The Council shall not be subject to the requirements under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

(h) **SUNSET.**—The Council shall terminate on September 30, 2020.

**SEC. 116. BRINGING MISSING CHILDREN HOME ACT.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Bringing Missing Children Home Act”.

(b) **CRIME CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS.**—Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) a recent photograph of the child, if available;”; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “60 days” and inserting “30 days”; and

(ii) by inserting “and a photograph taken during the previous 180 days” after “dental records”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(D) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(E) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

“(C) notify the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children of each report received relating to a child reported missing from a foster care family home or childcare institution;”; and

(F) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated—

(i) by inserting “State and local child welfare systems and” before “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) grant permission to the National Crime Information Center Terminal Contractor for the State to update the missing person record in the National Crime Information Center computer networks with additional information learned during the investigation relating to the missing person.”.

**SEC. 117. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.**

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “covered grant” means a grant awarded by the Attorney General under section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b), as amended by section 103.

(b) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All covered grants shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of a covered grant to prevent

waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term “unresolved audit finding” means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of a covered grant that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a covered grant during the following 2 fiscal years.

(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding covered grants the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible entities that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years prior to submitting an application for a covered grant.

(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded a covered grant during the 2-fiscal-year period in which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

(i) deposit an amount equal to the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and covered grants, the term “nonprofit organization” means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General may not award a covered grant to a nonprofit organization that holds money in off-shore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a covered grant and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subsection available for public inspection.

(3) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts transferred to the Department of Justice under this title, or the amendments made by this title, may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or organization awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this title, or the amendments made by this title, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in Department funds, unless the Deputy Attorney General or such Assistant Attorney Generals, Directors, or principal deputies as the Deputy Attorney General may designate, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host a conference.



(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food and beverages, audiovisual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and any entertainment.

(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all approved conference expenditures referenced in this paragraph.

(D) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this title, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification that—

(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued;

(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

(iv) includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

(4) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING ACTIVITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts awarded under this title, or any amendments made by this title, may not be utilized by any grant recipient to—

(i) lobby any representative of the Department of Justice regarding the award of grant funding; or

(ii) lobby any representative of a Federal, State, local, or tribal government regarding the award of grant funding.

(B) PENALTY.—If the Attorney General determines that any recipient of a covered grant has violated subparagraph (A), the Attorney General shall—

(i) require the grant recipient to repay the grant in full; and

(ii) prohibit the grant recipient from receiving another covered grant for not less than 5 years.

## TITLE II—COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

### Subtitle A—Enhancing Services for Runaway and Homeless Victims of Youth Trafficking

#### SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 343(b)(5) (42 U.S.C. 5714-23(b)(5))—

(A) in subparagraph (A) by inserting “, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), and sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))” before the semicolon at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B) by inserting “, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))” after “assault”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C) by inserting “, including such youth who are victims of trafficking (as defined in section 103(15) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(15)))” before the semicolon at the end; and

(2) in section 351(a) (42 U.S.C. 5714-41(a)) by striking “or sexual exploitation” and inserting “sexual exploitation, severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103(9) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102(9))), or sex trafficking (as defined in section 103(10) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 7102(10)))”.

### Subtitle B—Improving the Response to Victims of Child Sex Trafficking

#### SEC. 211. RESPONSE TO VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.

Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children's Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking “child prostitution” and inserting “child sex trafficking, including child prostitution”.

### Subtitle C—Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking

#### SEC. 221. VICTIM OF TRAFFICKING DEFINED.

In this subtitle, the term “victim of trafficking” has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

#### SEC. 222. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE REPORT ON CHILD TRAFFICKING PRIMARY PREVENTION.

(a) REVIEW.—The Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, established under section 105 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103), shall conduct a review that, with regard to trafficking in persons in the United States—

(1) in consultation with nongovernmental organizations that the Task Force determines appropriate, surveys and catalogs the activities of the Federal Government and State governments—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(2) surveys academic literature on—

(A) deterring individuals from committing trafficking offenses;

(B) preventing children from becoming victims of trafficking;

(C) the commercial sexual exploitation of children; and

(D) other similar topics that the Task Force determines to be appropriate;

(3) identifies best practices and effective strategies—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking; and

(4) identifies current gaps in research and data that would be helpful in formulating effective strategies—

(A) to deter individuals from committing trafficking offenses; and

(B) to prevent children from becoming victims of trafficking.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Task Force to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall provide to Congress, and make publicly available in electronic format, a report on the review conducted pursuant to subparagraph (a).

#### SEC. 223. GAO REPORT ON INTERVENTION.

On the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that includes information on—

(1) the efforts of Federal and select State law enforcement agencies to combat human trafficking in the United States; and

(2) each Federal grant program, a purpose of which is to combat human trafficking or

assist victims of trafficking, as specified in an authorizing statute or in a guidance document issued by the agency carrying out the grant program.

#### SEC. 224. PROVISION OF HOUSING PERMITTED TO PROTECT AND ASSIST IN THE RECOVERY OF VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING.

Section 107(b)(2)(A) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(2)(A)) is amended by inserting “, including programs that provide housing to victims of trafficking” before the period at the end.

## TITLE III—HERO ACT

### SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Human Exploitation Rescue Operations Act of 2015” or the “HERO Act of 2015”.

### SEC. 302. HERO ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The illegal market for the production and distribution of child abuse imagery is a growing threat to children in the United States. International demand for this material creates a powerful incentive for the rape, abuse, and torture of children within the United States.

(2) The targeting of United States children by international criminal networks is a threat to the homeland security of the United States. This threat must be fought with trained personnel and highly specialized counter-child-exploitation strategies and technologies.

(3) The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security serves a critical national security role in protecting the United States from the growing international threat of child exploitation and human trafficking.

(4) The Cyber Crimes Center of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement is a vital national resource in the effort to combat international child exploitation, providing advanced expertise and assistance in investigations, computer forensics, and victim identification.

(5) The returning military heroes of the United States possess unique and valuable skills that can assist law enforcement in combating global sexual and child exploitation, and the Department of Homeland Security should use this national resource to the maximum extent possible.

(6) Through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program, the returning military heroes of the United States are trained and hired to investigate crimes of child exploitation in order to target predators and rescue children from sexual abuse and slavery.

(b) CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, AND COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 890A. CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT, AND CYBER CRIMES UNIT.

“(a) CYBER CRIMES CENTER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a Cyber Crimes Center (referred to in this section as the ‘Center’).

“(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Center shall be to provide investigative assistance, training, and equipment to support United

States Immigration and Customs Enforcement's domestic and international investigations of cyber-related crimes.

“(b) CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Child Exploitation Investigations Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CEIU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CEIU—

“(A) shall coordinate all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement child exploitation initiatives, including investigations into—

- “(i) child exploitation;
- “(ii) child pornography;
- “(iii) child victim identification;
- “(iv) traveling child sex offenders; and
- “(v) forced child labor, including the sexual exploitation of minors;

“(B) shall, among other things, focus on—

- “(i) child exploitation prevention;
- “(ii) investigative capacity building;
- “(iii) enforcement operations; and
- “(iv) training for Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel, upon request;

“(C) shall provide training, technical expertise, support, or coordination of child exploitation investigations, as needed, to cooperating law enforcement agencies and personnel;

“(D) shall provide psychological support and counseling services for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel engaged in child exploitation prevention initiatives, including making available other existing services to assist employees who are exposed to child exploitation material during investigations;

“(E) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of the recruiting, training, equipping and hiring of wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program; and

“(F) shall collaborate with other governmental, nongovernmental, and nonprofit entities approved by the Secretary for the sponsorship of, and participation in, outreach and training activities.

“(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The CEIU shall collect and maintain data concerning—

“(A) the total number of suspects identified by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(B) the number of arrests by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, disaggregated by type, including—

“(i) the number of victims identified through investigations carried out by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(ii) the number of suspects arrested who were in positions of trust or authority over children;

“(C) the number of cases opened for investigation by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(D) the number of cases resulting in a Federal, State, foreign, or military prosecution.

“(4) AVAILABILITY OF DATA TO CONGRESS.—In addition to submitting the reports required under paragraph (7), the CEIU shall make the data collected and maintained under paragraph (3) available to the committees of Congress described in paragraph (7).

“(5) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CEIU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3).

“(6) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Taskforce, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CEIU.

“(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

“(7) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the HERO Act of 2015, and annually for the following 4 years, the CEIU shall—

“(A) submit a report containing a summary of the data collected pursuant to paragraph (3) during the previous year to—

- “(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;
- “(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;
- “(iii) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(iv) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

“(v) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(vi) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) make a copy of each report submitted under subparagraph (A) publicly available on the website of the Department.

“(c) COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Computer Forensics Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CFU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CFU—

“(A) shall provide training and technical support in digital forensics to—

“(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

“(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

“(B) shall provide computer hardware, software, and forensic licenses for all computer forensics personnel within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(C) shall participate in research and development in the area of digital forensics, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and

“(D) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of recruiting, training, equipping, and hiring wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program.

“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CFU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

“(4) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Task Force, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CFU.

“(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

“(d) CYBER CRIMES UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall operate, within the Center, a Cyber Crimes Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CCU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CCU—

“(A) shall oversee the cyber security strategy and cyber-related operations and programs for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(B) shall enhance United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement's ability to combat criminal enterprises operating on or through the Internet, with specific focus in the areas of—

- “(i) cyber economic crime;
- “(ii) digital theft of intellectual property;
- “(iii) illicit e-commerce (including hidden marketplaces);

“(iv) Internet-facilitated proliferation of arms and strategic technology; and

“(v) cyber-enabled smuggling and money laundering;

“(C) shall provide training and technical support in cyber investigations to—

“(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

“(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

“(D) shall participate in research and development in the area of cyber investigations, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and

“(E) is authorized to recruit participants of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program for investigative and forensic positions in support of the functions of the CCU.

“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CCU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.”.

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 890 the following:

“Sec. 890A. Cyber crimes center, child exploitation investigations unit, computer forensics unit, and cyber crimes unit.”.

(c) HERO CORPS HIRING.—It is the sense of Congress that Homeland Security Investigations of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement should hire, recruit, train, and equip wounded, ill, or injured military veterans (as defined in section 101, title 38, United States Code) who are affiliated with the HERO Child Rescue Corps program for investigative, intelligence, analyst, and forensic positions.

(d) INVESTIGATING CHILD EXPLOITATION.—Section 307(b)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) conduct research and development for the purpose of advancing technology for the investigation of child exploitation crimes, including child victim identification, trafficking in persons, and child pornography, and for advanced forensics.”.

#### **TITLE IV—RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT**

##### **SEC. 401. RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH AND TRAFFICKING PREVENTION.**

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Except as otherwise specifically provided, whenever in this section an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision, the amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to a provision of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.).

(c) **FINDINGS.**—Section 302 (42 U.S.C. 5701) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and” before “linguistically appropriate”;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking “outside the welfare system and the law enforcement system” and inserting “, in collaboration with public assistance systems, the law enforcement system, and the child welfare system”;

(3) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by inserting “a safe place to live and” after “youth need”; and

(B) by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) runaway and homeless youth are at a high risk of becoming victims of sexual exploitation and trafficking in persons.”.

(d) **BASIC CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **GRANTS FOR CENTERS AND SERVICES.**—Section 311(a) (42 U.S.C. 5711(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “services” and all that follows through the period and inserting “safe shelter and services, including trauma-informed services, for runaway and homeless youth and, if appropriate, services for the families of such youth, including (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “mental health.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “21 days; and” and inserting “30 days.”;

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “individual”;

(bb) by inserting “, as appropriate,” after “group”; and

(cc) by striking “as appropriate” and inserting “including (if appropriate) counseling for individuals identified by such youth as family”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) suicide prevention services; and”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (ii), by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “home-based services”;

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end;

(III) in clause (iv), by striking “diseases.” and inserting “infections.”; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

“(v) trauma-informed and gender-responsive services for runaway or homeless youth,

including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

“(vi) an assessment of family engagement in support and reunification (if reunification is appropriate), interventions, and services for parents or legal guardians of such youth, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.”.

(2) **ELIGIBILITY; PLAN REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 312 (42 U.S.C. 5712) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by inserting “, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family,” after “parents or legal guardians”;

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking “cultural minority and persons with limited ability to speak English” and inserting “cultural minority, persons with limited ability to speak English, and runaway or homeless youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation”;

(iii) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

“(7) shall keep adequate statistical records profiling the youth and family members of such youth whom the applicant serves, including demographic information on and the number of—

“(A) such youth who are not referred to out-of-home shelter services;

“(B) such youth who are members of vulnerable or underserved populations;

“(C) such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation, disaggregated by—

“(i) such youth who have been coerced or forced into a commercial sex act, as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

“(ii) such youth who have been coerced or forced into other forms of labor; and

“(iii) such youth who have engaged in a commercial sex act, as so defined, for any reason other than by coercion or force;

“(D) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

“(E) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

“(F) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system.”;

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (8) through (13) as paragraphs (9) through (14);

(v) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

“(8) shall ensure that—

“(A) the records described in paragraph (7), on an individual runaway or homeless youth, shall not be disclosed without the consent of the individual youth and of the parent or legal guardian of such youth or (if appropriate) an individual identified by such youth as family, to anyone other than another agency compiling statistical records or a government agency involved in the disposition of criminal charges against an individual runaway or homeless youth; and

“(B) reports or other documents based on the statistics described in paragraph (7) shall not disclose the identity of any individual runaway or homeless youth.”;

(vi) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated, by striking “statistical summaries” and inserting “statistics”;

(vii) in paragraph (13)(C), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking clause (i) and inserting:

“(i) the number and characteristics of runaway and homeless youth, and youth at risk of family separation, who participate in the project, including such information on—

“(I) such youth (including both types of such participating youth) who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation, disaggregated by—

“(aa) such youth who have been coerced or forced into a commercial sex act, as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102);

“(bb) such youth who have been coerced or forced into other forms of labor; and

“(cc) such youth who have engaged in a commercial sex act, as so defined, for any reason other than by coercion or force;

“(II) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

“(III) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

“(IV) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system; and”;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking “and” at the end;

(viii) in paragraph (14), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “for natural disasters, inclement weather, and mental health emergencies.”; and

(ix) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) shall provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to runaway and homeless youth; and

“(16) shall assist youth in completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090).”;

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” after “provide”;

(II) by striking “families (including unrelated individuals in the family households) of such youth” and inserting “families of such youth (including unrelated individuals in the family households of such youth and, if appropriate, individuals identified by such youth as family)”;

(III) by inserting “suicide prevention,” after “physical health care.”; and

(ii) in paragraph (4), by inserting “, including training on trauma-informed and youth-centered care” after “home-based services”.

(3) **APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.**—Section 313(b) (42 U.S.C. 5713(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking “priority to” and all that follows through “who” and inserting “priority to eligible applicants who”;

(B) by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (2).

(e) **TRANSITIONAL LIVING GRANT PROGRAM.**—Section 322(a) (42 U.S.C. 5714-2(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable” before “information and counseling services”; and

(B) by striking “job attainment skills, and mental and physical health care” and inserting “job attainment skills, mental and physical health care, and suicide prevention services”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (8) and (9) through (16) as paragraphs (5) through (10) and (12) through (19), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) to provide counseling to homeless youth and to encourage, if appropriate, the involvement in such counseling of their parents or legal guardians, or (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family;

“(4) to provide aftercare services, if possible, to homeless youth who have received shelter and services from a transitional living youth project, including (to the extent

practicable) such youth who, after receiving such shelter and services, relocate to a State other than the State in which such project is located;";

(4) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting "age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate to the extent practicable" after "referral of homeless youth to";

(B) by striking "and health care programs" and inserting "mental health service and health care programs, including programs providing wrap-around services to victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation,"; and

(C) by striking "such services for youths;" and inserting "such programs described in this paragraph;";

(5) by inserting after paragraph (10), as so redesignated, the following:

"(11) to develop a plan to provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable that address the needs of homeless and street youth;";

(6) in paragraph (12), as so redesignated, by striking "the applicant and statistical" through "who participate in such project," and inserting "the applicant, statistical summaries describing the number, the characteristics, and the demographic information of the homeless youth who participate in such project, including the prevalence of trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of such youth,"; and

(7) in paragraph (19), as so redesignated, by inserting "regarding responses to natural disasters, inclement weather, and mental health emergencies" after "management plan";

(f) COORDINATING, TRAINING, RESEARCH, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES.—

(1) COORDINATION.—Section 341 (42 U.S.C. 5714-21) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by inserting "safety, well-being," after "health,"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking "other Federal entities" and inserting "the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Justice";

(2) GRANTS FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 342 (42 U.S.C. 5714-22) is amended by inserting "including onsite and web-based techniques, such as on-demand and online learning," before "to public and private entities";

(3) GRANTS FOR RESEARCH, EVALUATION, DEMONSTRATION, AND SERVICE PROJECTS.—Section 343 (42 U.S.C. 5714-23) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "violence, trauma, and" before "sexual abuse and assault";

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking "sexual abuse and assault; and" and inserting "sexual abuse or assault, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation;";

(III) in subparagraph (C), by striking "who have been sexually victimized" and inserting "who are victims of sexual abuse or assault, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation"; and

(IV) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) best practices for identifying and providing age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to—

"(i) vulnerable and underserved youth populations; and

"(ii) youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

"(E) verifying youth as runaway or homeless to complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid described in section 483 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1090);";

(ii) in paragraph (9), by striking "and" at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (10), by striking the period and inserting "and"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(11) examining the intersection between the runaway and homeless youth populations and trafficking in persons, including noting whether such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons were previously involved in the child welfare or juvenile justice systems."; and

(B) in subsection (c)(2)(B), by inserting "including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation" after "runaway or homeless youth";

(4) PERIODIC ESTIMATE OF INCIDENCE AND PREVALENCE OF YOUTH HOMELESSNESS.—Section 345 (42 U.S.C. 5714-25) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking "13" and inserting "12"; and

(II) by striking "and" at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period

and inserting a semicolon; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) that includes demographic information about and characteristics of runaway or homeless youth, including such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation; and

"(4) that does not disclose the identity of any runaway or homeless youth."; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "13" and inserting "12";

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(iii) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C);

(iv) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) incidences, if any, of—

"(i) such individuals who are victims of trafficking in persons; or

"(ii) such individuals who are victims of sexual exploitation; and"; and

(v) in subparagraph (C), as so redesignated—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking "and" and inserting "including mental health services"; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) access to education and job training; and";

(g) SEXUAL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM.—Section 351 (42 U.S.C. 5714-41) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting "public and" before "non-profit"; and

(B) by striking "prostitution, or sexual exploitation." and inserting "violence, trafficking in persons, or sexual exploitation."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an applicant shall certify to the Secretary that such applicant has systems in place to ensure that such applicant can provide age, gender, and culturally and linguistically appropriate services to the extent practicable to all youth described in subsection (a)."

(h) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) REPORTS.—Section 382(a) (42 U.S.C. 5715(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) through (D) as subparagraphs (C) through (E), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

"(B) collecting data on trafficking in persons and sexual exploitation of runaway and homeless youth;"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) the number and characteristics of homeless youth served by such projects, including—

"(i) such youth who are victims of trafficking in persons or sexual exploitation;

"(ii) such youth who are pregnant or parenting;

"(iii) such youth who have been involved in the child welfare system; and

"(iv) such youth who have been involved in the juvenile justice system;"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (F), by striking "intrafamily problems" and inserting "problems within the family, including (if appropriate) individuals identified by such youth as family.";

(2) NONDISCRIMINATION.—Part F is amended by inserting after section 386A (42 U.S.C. 5732-1) the following:

#### **"SEC. 386B. NONDISCRIMINATION.**

"(a) IN GENERAL.—No person in the United States shall, on the basis of actual or perceived race, color, religion, national origin, sex, gender identity (as defined in section 249(c)(4) of title 18, United States Code), sexual orientation, or disability, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with funds made available under this title, or any other program or activity funded in whole or in part with amounts appropriated for grants, cooperative agreements, or other assistance administered under this title.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—If sex segregation or sex-specific programming is necessary to the essential operation of a program, nothing in this section shall prevent any such program or activity from consideration of an individual's sex. In such circumstances, grantees may meet the requirements of this section by providing comparable services to individuals who cannot be provided with the sex-segregated or sex-specific programming.

"(c) DISQUALIFICATION.—The authority of the Secretary to enforce this section shall be the same as that provided for with respect to section 654 of the Head Start Act (42 U.S.C. 9849).

"(d) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed, interpreted, or applied to supplant, displace, preempt, or otherwise limit the responsibilities and liabilities under other Federal or State civil rights laws."

(3) DEFINITIONS.—Section 387 (42 U.S.C. 5732a) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6), and paragraphs (7) and (8), as paragraphs (2) through (7), and paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively;

(B) by inserting before paragraph (2), as so redesignated, the following:

"(1) CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY APPROPRIATE.—The term 'culturally and linguistically appropriate', with respect to services, has the meaning given the term 'culturally and linguistically appropriate services' in the 'National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services in Health and Health Care', issued in April 2013, by the Office of Minority Health of the Department of Health and Human Services.";

(C) in paragraph (6)(B)(v), as so redesignated—

(i) by redesignating subclauses (II) through (IV) as subclauses (III) through (V), respectively;

(ii) by inserting after subclause (I), the following:

“(II) trafficking in persons;”;

(iii) in subclause (IV), as so redesignated—

(I) by striking “diseases” and inserting “infections”; and

(II) by striking “and” at the end;

(iv) in subclause (V), as so redesignated, by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(VI) suicide.”;

(D) in paragraph (7)(B), as so redesignated, by striking “prostitution,” and inserting “trafficking in persons,”;

(E) by inserting after paragraph (7), as so redesignated, the following:

“(8) **TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.**—The term ‘trafficking in persons’ has the meaning given the term ‘severe forms of trafficking in persons’ in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).”;

(F) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated—

(i) by inserting “to homeless youth” after “provides”; and

(ii) by inserting “, to establish a stable family or community supports,” after “self-sufficient living”; and

(G) in paragraph (10)(B), as so redesignated—

(i) in clause (ii)—

(I) by inserting “or able” after “willing”; and

(II) by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) who is involved in the child welfare or juvenile justice system, but who is not receiving government-funded housing.”.

(4) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 388(a) (42 U.S.C. 5751(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “for fiscal year 2009,” and all that follows through the period and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(B), by striking “such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013.” and inserting “\$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”; and

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking “for fiscal year 2009” and all that follows through the period and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”.

#### **SEC. 402. RESPONSE TO MISSING CHILDREN AND VICTIMS OF CHILD SEX TRAFFICKING.**

(a) **MISSING CHILDREN’S ASSISTANCE ACT.**—Section 404(b)(1)(P)(iii) of the Missing Children’s Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5773(b)(1)(P)(iii)) is amended by striking “child prostitution” and inserting “child sex trafficking”.

(b) **CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1990.**—Section 3702 of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5780) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) a recent photograph of the child, if available;”;

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking “60 days” and inserting “30 days”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting “State and local child welfare systems and” before “the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children”; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) grant permission to the National Crime Information Center Terminal Contractor for the State to update the missing person record in the National Crime Information Center computer networks with additional information learned during the investigation relating to the missing person.”.

#### **TITLE V—STOP EXPLOITATION THROUGH TRAFFICKING ACT**

##### **SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act of 2015”.

##### **SEC. 502. SAFE HARBOR INCENTIVES.**

Part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1701(c), by striking “where feasible” and all that follows, and inserting the following: “where feasible, to an application—

“(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

“(2) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law that—

“(A) treats a minor who has engaged in, or has attempted to engage in, a commercial sex act as a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons;

“(B) discourages or prohibits the charging or prosecution of an individual described in subparagraph (A) for a prostitution or sex trafficking offense, based on the conduct described in subparagraph (A); and

“(C) encourages the diversion of an individual described in subparagraph (A) to appropriate service providers, including child welfare services, victim treatment programs, child advocacy centers, rape crisis centers, or other social services.”; and

(2) in section 1709, by inserting at the end the following:

“(5) ‘commercial sex act’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

“(6) ‘minor’ means an individual who has not attained the age of 18 years.

“(7) ‘severe form of trafficking in persons’ has the meaning given the term in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).”.

##### **SEC. 503. REPORT ON RESTITUTION PAID IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN TRAFFICKING OFFENSES.**

Section 105(d)(7)(Q) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(d)(7)(Q)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after “1590,” the following: “1591.”;

(2) by striking “and 1594” and inserting “1594, 2251, 2251A, 2421, 2422, and 2423”; and

(3) in clause (iv), by striking “and” at the end;

(4) in clause (v), by striking “and” at the end; and

(5) by inserting after clause (v) the following:

“(vi) the number of individuals required by a court order to pay restitution in connection with a violation of each offense under title 18, United States Code, the amount of restitution required to be paid under each such order, and the amount of restitution actually paid pursuant to each such order; and

“(vii) the age, gender, race, country of origin, country of citizenship, and description of the role in the offense of individuals convicted under each offense; and”.

##### **SEC. 504. NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.**

Section 107(b)(1)(B) of the Victims of Crime Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Subject” and inserting “(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(ii) **NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING HOTLINE.**—Beginning in fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter, of amounts made available for grants under paragraph (2), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall make grants for a national communication system to assist victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons in communicating with service providers. The Secretary shall give priority to grant applicants that have experience in providing telephone services to victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons.”.

##### **SEC. 505. JOB CORPS ELIGIBILITY.**

Section 144(a)(3) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3194(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) A victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)). Notwithstanding paragraph (2), an individual described in this subparagraph shall not be required to demonstrate eligibility under such paragraph.”.

##### **SEC. 506. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE.**

Section 566(e)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C), the following:

“(D) assist State, local, and other Federal law enforcement agencies, upon the request of such an agency, in locating and recovering missing children.”.

##### **SEC. 507. ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO COMBAT HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General shall implement and maintain a National Strategy for Combating Human Trafficking (referred to in this section as the “National Strategy”) in accordance with this section.

(b) **REQUIRED CONTENTS OF NATIONAL STRATEGY.**—The National Strategy shall include the following:

(1) Integrated Federal, State, local, and tribal efforts to investigate and prosecute human trafficking cases, including—

(A) the development by each United States attorney, in consultation with State, local, and tribal government agencies, of a district-specific strategic plan to coordinate the identification of victims and the investigation and prosecution of human trafficking crimes;

(B) the appointment of not fewer than 1 assistant United States attorney in each district dedicated to the prosecution of human trafficking cases or responsible for implementing the National Strategy;

(C) the participation in any Federal, State, local, or tribal human trafficking task force operating in the district of the United States attorney; and

(D) any other efforts intended to enhance the level of coordination and cooperation, as determined by the Attorney General.

(2) Case coordination within the Department of Justice, including specific integration, coordination, and collaboration, as appropriate, on human trafficking investigations between and among the United States attorneys, the Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit, the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(3) Annual budget priorities and Federal efforts dedicated to preventing and combating human trafficking, including resources dedicated to the Human Trafficking Prosecution Unit, the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and all other entities that receive Federal support that have a goal or mission to combat the exploitation of adults and children.

(4) An ongoing assessment of the future trends, challenges, and opportunities, including new investigative strategies, techniques, and technologies, that will enhance Federal, State, local, and tribal efforts to combat human trafficking.

(5) Encouragement of cooperation, coordination, and mutual support between private sector and other entities and organizations and Federal agencies to combat human trafficking, including the involvement of State, local, and tribal government agencies to the extent Federal programs are involved.

**SA 302.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### **TITLE IV—PROTECTING STUDENTS FROM SEXUAL AND VIOLENT PREDATORS**

##### **SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act”.

##### **SEC. 402. DEFINITIONS.**

In this title—

(1) the terms “elementary school”, “local educational agency”, “secondary school”, “State”, and “State educational agency” have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801);

(2) the term “covered local educational agency” means a local educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.);

(3) the term “covered school” means an elementary school or secondary school that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.);

(4) the term “covered State” means a State that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.);

(5) the term “covered State educational agency” means a State educational agency that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.);

(6) the term “current school employee” means a school employee who has begun employment with a covered school, covered State educational agency, or covered local educational agency or an employee of any person or company who has a contract or agreement to provide services with a covered school, covered local educational agency, or covered State educational agency before the effective date of this title;

(7) the term “designated State agency” means the agency designated in section 403(d)(1)(A); and

(8) the term “school employee” means—

(A) an employee of, or a person seeking employment with, a covered school, covered local educational agency, or covered State educational agency and who, as a result of such employment, has (or, in the case of a person seeking employment, will have) a job duty that includes unsupervised contact or interaction with elementary school or secondary school students; or

(B) any person, or an employee of any person, who has a contract or agreement to provide services with a covered school, covered local educational agency, or covered State educational agency, and such person or employee, as a result of such contract or agreement, has a job duty that includes unsupervised contact or interaction with elementary school or secondary school students.

##### **SEC. 403. BACKGROUND CHECKS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each covered State shall ensure that the State has in effect laws, regulations, or policies and procedures requiring that—

(1) a criminal background check be conducted for each school employee in a manner that is consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) and otherwise meets the requirements of this section, including—

(A) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the school employee resides;

(B) a search of State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the school employee resides;

(C) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System, conducted in accordance with section 406; and

(D) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919); and

(2) each criminal background check conducted under paragraph (1) be periodically repeated or updated in accordance with State law or the policies of the covered State educational agency or the covered local educational agencies in the State.

(b) TIMING OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(1) CURRENT SCHOOL EMPLOYEES.—For a current school employee—

(A) the criminal background check required under subsection (a) shall be completed by not later than 3 years after the effective date of this title or by the date of the current school employee's next scheduled performance review as provided by State law (including regulations), whichever is first; and

(B) the employment of the current school employee shall not be terminated by reason of this title while the criminal background check is being conducted.

(2) ALL OTHER SCHOOL EMPLOYEES.—For any school employee who is not a current school employee, the criminal background check required under subsection (a) shall be completed before the school employee begins employment.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR CURRENT SCHOOL EMPLOYEES WITH PRIOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered State shall not be required to obtain a criminal background check under subsection (a)(1) for a current school employee if—

(A)(i) the current school employee has received 1 or more criminal background checks (whether on one occasion or on separate occasions) that included—

(I) a search of the State criminal registry or repository of the State in which the current school employee resides;

(II) a search of the State-based child abuse and neglect registries and databases of the State in which the current school employee resides;

(III) a Federal Bureau of Investigation fingerprint check using the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System, conducted in accordance with section 406; and

(IV) a search of the National Sex Offender Registry established under section 119 of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16919); or

(ii) the current school employee has received 1 or more criminal background checks (whether on one occasion or on separate occasions) that included 1 or more of the searches and checks described in subclauses (I) through (IV) of clause (i), and the designated State agency ensures that a criminal background check including all of the remaining searches and checks described in such subclauses is conducted for the current school employee within the timeframe established by subsection (b)(1)(A);

(B) each of the searches and checks described in subclauses (I) through (IV) of subparagraph (A)(i) were conducted for the school employee, whether as part of 1 criminal background check or on separate occasions, on or after the date that is 5 years before the effective date of this title;

(C) the appropriate Federal, State, or local agency provides the results of all the searches and checks described in subclauses (I) through (IV) of subparagraph (A)(i) to the appropriate body, as designated by State law or the policies of the covered State educational agency or the employing covered local educational agency; and

(D) the appropriate body, as designated by State law or the policies of the covered State agency or covered local educational agency, takes steps to verify all criminal background checks in accordance with State law or the policies of the covered State educational agency or the employing covered local educational agency.

(2) CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT DURING VERIFICATION PERIOD.—

(A) CONTINUED EMPLOYMENT.—During any period during which the requirements of paragraph (1) are being verified for a current school employee—

(i) the employing covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, or covered school shall not terminate the employment of the covered school employee or reduce the employee's pay or benefits by reason of this title; and

(ii) nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit the covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, or covered school from transferring the employee to a position not meeting the criteria of section 402(8) during such period of verification.

(3) PERIODIC UPDATING.—Each covered State shall ensure that the State has in effect laws, regulations, or policies and procedures requiring that, for each current school employee who meets the requirements of this title through paragraph (1), all of the searches and checks described in paragraph (1)(A)(i) be periodically repeated or updated through a criminal background check, in accordance with State law or the policies of the covered State educational agency or the covered local educational agencies in the State.

(d) CONFIDENTIALITY OF AND ACCESS TO BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(1) **CONFIDENTIALITY.**—Each covered State shall have in effect laws, regulations, or policies and procedures that—

(A) designate a single State agency to administer the criminal background checks required under subsection (a) and paragraphs (1)(A)(ii) and (3) of subsection (c); and

(B) require that information obtained through a criminal background check under subsection (a) or (c) shall only be revealed to the school employee, the designated representative of the school employee, and persons authorized by the State to receive the information in order to make employment decisions.

(2) **COPY OF BACKGROUND CHECK RESULTS.**—

(A) **UPON REQUEST.**—Upon a request by a school employee, the designated State agency shall directly provide a copy of the results of the criminal background check conducted pursuant to subsection (a) or (c) to the school employee or to the school employee's designated representative.

(B) **UPON TERMINATION OR DISQUALIFICATION.**—If a school employee is terminated or disqualified from employment under subparagraphs (B) through (D) of section 404(a)(3), the designated State agency shall provide the school employee with a copy of the results of any criminal background check conducted under this title.

(e) **APPEALS PROCESS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each covered State shall have in effect laws, regulations, or policies and procedures—

(A) providing for a process by which a school employee may appeal the results of a criminal background check conducted pursuant to subsection (a) or (c) to challenge the accuracy or completeness of the information yielded by the criminal background check; and

(B) ensuring that—

(i) each school employee shall be given prompt notice of the opportunity to appeal;

(ii) each school employee will receive instructions about how to complete the appeals process; and

(iii) the appeals process is completed no later than 30 days after the appeal is filed for each school employee.

(2) **EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF CURRENT SCHOOL EMPLOYEES FILING AN APPEAL.**—If a current school employee is disqualified from employment under section 404(a) but files an appeal under this subsection, during the pendency of the appeal, such employee shall not lose employment or face a reduction in pay or benefits. During the pendency of the appeal, the employing covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, or covered school may place the school employee in a capacity where the school employee's job duties do not include unsupervised contact or interaction with children.

(f) **PUBLICATION OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—Each covered State shall ensure that the laws, regulations, or policies and procedures required under this section are published on the website of the covered State educational agency and the website of each covered local educational agency that has a website as of the effective date of this title.

(g) **FEES FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT FOR REASONABLE FEES.**—The Attorney General of the United States, and the State Attorney General or other State law enforcement official of a covered State, may charge a fee for conducting a criminal background check under subsection (a) or (c) if the amount of the fee does not exceed the actual costs to the Federal Government or the State, as the case may be, for processing and administration.

(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS.**—A covered State educational agency or covered local educational agency may use administrative funds received under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) to pay any reasonable fees charged for conducting criminal background checks under subsection (a) or (c).

#### SEC. 404. PROHIBITION ON HIRING & TRANSFER.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON HIRING.**—Each covered State shall have in effect laws, regulations, or policies and procedures that prohibit any covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, or covered school from employing an individual as a school employee if such employee—

(1) refuses to consent to a criminal background check under section 403;

(2) makes a knowingly false statement in connection with a criminal background check under section 403; or

(3) has been convicted of a felony consisting of—

(A) murder, as described in section 1111 of title 18, United States Code;

(B) child abuse;

(C) child pornography; or

(D) a crime involving rape or sexual assault, except for statutory rape where the victim and perpetrator engaged in consensual sexual conduct, the victim and perpetrator were both under the age of 21, and the victim and perpetrator differed in age by not more than 3 years at the time of the offense.

(b) **REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each covered State shall have in effect laws, regulations, or policies and procedures that establish a timely review process, not to exceed 30 days from the date that an appeal is received by the State, through which the State may determine that, notwithstanding paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a), a school employee identified under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (a) is eligible for employment with the covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, or covered school. The review process shall be an individualized assessment consistent with title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000e et seq.) and may include consideration of the following factors:

(A) Nature and seriousness of the offense.

(B) Circumstances under which the offense was committed.

(C) Lapse of time since the offense was committed or the individual was released from prison.

(D) Individual's age at the time of the offense.

(E) Social conditions that may have fostered the offense.

(F) Relationship of the nature of the offense to the position sought.

(G) Number of criminal convictions.

(H) Honesty and transparency of the candidate in admitting the conviction record.

(I) Individual's work history, including evidence that the individual performed the same or similar work, post-conviction, with the same or different employer, with no known incidents of criminal conduct.

(J) Evidence of rehabilitation, as demonstrated by the individual's good conduct while in correctional custody or in the community, counseling or psychiatric treatment received, acquisition of additional academic or career or technical schooling, successful participation in a correctional work-release program, or the recommendation of a current or former supervisor of the individual.

(K) Whether the individual is bonded under a Federal, State, or local bonding program.

(L) Any other factor that may lead to the conclusion that the individual does not pose a risk to children.

(2) **EMPLOYMENT DURING REVIEW.**—During the pendency of the review described in paragraph (1) of a school employee, the employing covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, or covered school may place the school employee in a capacity where the employee's job duties do not include unsupervised contact or interaction with children.

(c) **PROHIBITION ON TRANSFER.**—A covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, covered school, or any employee or agent of a covered State educational agency, covered local educational agency, or covered school, shall not knowingly transfer or facilitate the transfer of any school employee if the agency, school, employee, or agent knows or has reasonable cause to believe that the school employee engaged in abuse of a child, unless—

(1) the allegations of abuse have been properly reported as required by Federal, State, or local law, including title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) and the regulations implementing such title under part 106 of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(2) with respect to the allegations—

(A) no prosecution is undertaken by local or Federal prosecutors within 1 year of the report;

(B) the local prosecutors have indicated that the individual will not be charged; or

(C) the school employee has been charged and exonerated of the charges, as defined by law or by regulations or policies of the State, covered State educational agency, or applicable covered local educational agency.

#### SEC. 405. REPORTING OF ABUSE ALLEGATIONS.

(a) **PROHIBITION ON AGREEMENTS TO WITHHOLD ALLEGATIONS.**—Each covered State shall have laws, regulations, or policies and procedures that—

(1) prohibit any State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, secondary school, or employee or agent of any State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, or secondary school, from making any agreement—

(A) to withhold, from any law enforcement authority, State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, or secondary school, the reporting of the fact that an allegation of child abuse in an educational setting has been made against a school employee or volunteer; or

(B) to waive any portion of subsection (c); and

(2) provide that the punishment for any violation of paragraph (1) is not less than the punishment for a violation of the State's law requiring mandatory reporting of concerns of child abuse and neglect.

(b) **IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY FOR REPORTING.**—Each covered State shall have laws, regulations, or policies and procedures ensuring that, notwithstanding any other Federal, State, or local law or any agreement or contract, any State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, secondary school, or employee or agent of any State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, or secondary school who reasonably and in good faith reports to law enforcement officials information regarding allegations of child abuse or a resignation or voluntary suspension due to circumstances described in subsection (a)(1) shall have immunity from any civil or criminal liability.



(c) **WARNINGS TO OTHER EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AND SCHOOLS.**—Each covered State shall have in effect laws, regulations, or policies and procedures ensuring that, notwithstanding any other Federal, State, or local law or any agreement or contract, if the State educational agency or any local educational agency, elementary school, secondary school, or employee or agent of the State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, or secondary school, has reasonably and in good faith reported to law enforcement officials information regarding allegations of child abuse in an educational setting made against a school employee, and the circumstances described in section 404(c)(2) do not apply to such allegations, the agency, school, employee, or agent may share the report with any other State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, or secondary school that is considering hiring that school employee.

(d) **TRAINING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a local educational agency may use funds provided under part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.) to train school employees in—

(1) recognizing signs of abuse, neglect, or sexual abuse in students;

(2) properly identifying and reporting suspected child physical or sexual abuse, including appropriate behaviors by school personnel and inappropriate behaviors, such as grooming behaviors (defined as actions deliberately undertaken with the aim of befriending and establishing an emotional connection with a child to lower the child's inhibitions in order to sexually abuse the child); and

(3) effectively responding to incidents of child physical and sexual abuse, including linking students and families to law enforcement, school, community, mental health, or medical supports.

#### **SEC. 406. FBI REQUIREMENTS FOR FINGERPRINT CHECKS.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a fingerprint check by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, conducted pursuant to section 403(a) or in accordance with section 403(c) after the effective date of this title, reveals a record that indicates that an individual was arrested or criminal proceedings were instituted against an individual, but that does not include the final disposition of the arrest or proceeding, the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall—

(1) further investigate the school employee's criminal history until the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Bureau is able to determine whether a final disposition was reached and what the final disposition was; or

(B) 3 business days (exclusive of the day on which the initial request is made) after the date of the initial request;

(2) notify the State through the designated State agency of the results of the further investigation; and

(3) promptly correct the record, including by making deletions to the record, if the Federal Bureau of Investigations determined that the record was inaccurate.

#### **SEC. 407. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this title shall be construed to—

(1) alter or otherwise affect the rights and remedies provided for school employees residing in a State that disqualifies individuals for employment as a school employee based on convictions for crimes not specifically listed in this title;

(2) prevent a State or locality from applying the requirements of this title to State educational agencies, local educational agencies, elementary schools, or secondary schools that do not receive funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.); or

(3) create a private right of action against a State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, secondary school, or an employee or agent of a State educational agency, local educational agency, elementary school, or secondary school that is in compliance with this title and with any laws, regulations, or policies and procedures promulgated pursuant to this title.

#### **SEC. 408. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

This title shall take effect on the date that is 2 years from the date of enactment of this Act.

**SA 303.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

#### **TITLE —HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS RELIEF AND EMPOWERMENT ACT**

##### **SECTION 01. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Human Trafficking Survivors Relief and Empowerment Act of 2015”.

##### **SEC. 02. PROTECTIONS FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING SURVIVORS.**

Section 1701(c) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(c)) is amended by striking “where feasible” and all that follows, and inserting the following: “where feasible, to an application—

“(1) for hiring and rehiring additional career law enforcement officers that involves a non-Federal contribution exceeding the 25 percent minimum under subsection (g); or

“(2) from an applicant in a State that has in effect a law—

“(A) that—

“(i) provides a process by which an individual who is a human trafficking survivor can move to vacate any arrest or conviction records for a non-violent offense committed as a direct result of human trafficking, including prostitution or lewdness;

“(ii) establishes a rebuttable presumption that any arrest or conviction of an individual for an offense associated with human trafficking is a result of being trafficked, if the individual—

“(I) is a person granted nonimmigrant status pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(T)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(T)(i));

“(II) is the subject of a certification by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 107(b)(1)(E) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)(E)); or

“(III) has other similar documentation of trafficking, which has been issued by a Federal, State, or local agency; and

“(iii) protects the identity of individuals who are human trafficking survivors in public and court records; and

“(B) that does not require an individual who is a human trafficking survivor to provide official documentation as described in subclause (I), (II), or (III) of subparagraph (A)(ii) in order to receive protection under the law.”.

**SA 304.** Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 103 and insert the following:

#### **SEC. 103. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended to read as follows:

##### **“SEC. 203. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.**

“(a) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—The Attorney General may award block grants to an eligible entity to develop, improve, or expand domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims' services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

“(b) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

“(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

“(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

“(B) address the unique needs of child victims of human trafficking;

“(C) facilitate the rescue of child victims of human trafficking;

“(D) investigate and prosecute acts of human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking; and

“(E) utilize, implement, and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of child sex trafficking victims for prostitution offenses, and other laws aimed at the investigation and prosecution of child human trafficking;

“(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

“(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer's time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

“(i) wire taps;

“(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

“(iii) travel; and

“(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

“(C) dedicated anti-trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for

State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution of child human trafficking offenders, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims’ services through coordination with—

“(i) child advocacy centers;

“(ii) social service agencies;

“(iii) Federal, tribal, or State governmental health service agencies;

“(iv) housing agencies;

“(v) legal services agencies; and

“(vi) nongovernmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking; and

“(E) the establishment or enhancement of other necessary victim assistance programs or personnel, such as victim or child advocates, child-protective services, child forensic interviews, or other necessary service providers; and

“(3) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for trafficking victims that include—

“(A) mandatory and regular training requirements for judicial officials involved in the administration or operation of the court program described under this paragraph;

“(B) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking, including case worker or child welfare supervision in collaboration with judicial officers, who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

“(C) the development of a specialized and individualized, court-ordered treatment program for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

“(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

“(ii) life skills training;

“(iii) housing placement;

“(iv) vocational training;

“(v) education;

“(vi) family support services; and

“(vii) job placement;

“(D) centralized case management involving the consolidation of all of each child human trafficking victim’s cases and offenses, and the coordination of all trafficking victim treatment programs and social services;

“(E) regular and mandatory court appearances by the victim during the duration of the treatment program for purposes of ensuring compliance and effectiveness;

“(F) the ultimate dismissal of relevant non-violent criminal charges against the victim, where such victim successfully complies with the terms of the court-ordered treatment program; and

“(G) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, tribal services, where appropriate, and nongovernmental organizations with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking to provide services to victims and

encourage cooperation with law enforcement.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

“(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

“(B) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant;

“(C) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section; and

“(D) disclose—

“(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

“(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period ending on the date of the submission of an application under this section.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

“(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b);

“(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award; or

“(C) the application includes a plan by an Indian tribe, State, or unit of local government to reduce the occurrence of trafficking of Indian children or provide support services to Indian children who are victims of human trafficking.

“(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 3 years after the date of award of the grant.

“(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 2 times and for a period of not greater than 2 years.

“(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall—

“(1) enter into a contract with a nongovernmental organization, including an academic or nonprofit organization, that has experience with issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct periodic evaluations of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section;

“(2) instruct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to review evaluations issued under paragraph (1) to determine the methodological and statistical validity of the evaluations; and

“(3) submit the results of any evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

“(f) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity awarded funds under this section that is found to have used grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unal-

lowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the block grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

“(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if within the 5 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section, the grantee has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

“(h) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount expended to carry out this section.

“(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section shall be—

“(A) 70 percent in the first year;

“(B) 60 percent in the second year; and

“(C) 50 percent in the third year, and in all subsequent years.

“(2) AWARDS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—The Attorney General may waive the cost sharing requirements in paragraph (1) for a grant awarded under this section to an Indian tribe.

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDING; FULLY OFFSET.—For purposes of carrying out this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, is authorized to award not more than \$7,000,000 of the funds available in the Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund, established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

“(k) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘child’ means a person under the age of 18;

“(2) the term ‘child advocacy center’ means a center created under subtitle A of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13001 et seq.);

“(3) the term ‘child human trafficking’ means 1 or more severe forms of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)) involving a victim who is a child;

“(4) the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State, Indian tribe, or unit of local government that—

“(A) has significant criminal activity involving child human trafficking;

“(B) has demonstrated cooperation between Federal, State, local, and, where applicable, tribal law enforcement agencies, prosecutors, and social service providers in addressing child human trafficking;

“(C) has developed a workable, multi-disciplinary plan to combat child human trafficking, including—

“(i) the establishment of a shelter for victims of child human trafficking, through existing or new facilities;

“(ii) the provision of trauma-informed, gender-responsive rehabilitative care to victims of child human trafficking;

“(iii) the provision of specialized training for law enforcement officers and social service providers for all forms of human trafficking, with a focus on domestic child human trafficking;

“(iv) prevention, deterrence, and prosecution of offenses involving child human trafficking, including soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing human acts with children;

“(v) cooperation or referral agreements with organizations providing outreach or

other related services to runaway and homeless youth;

“(vi) law enforcement protocols or procedures to screen all individuals arrested for prostitution, whether adult or child, for victimization by sex trafficking and by other crimes, such as sexual assault and domestic violence; and

“(vii) cooperation or referral agreements with State child welfare agencies and child advocacy centers; and

“(D) provides an assurance that, under the plan under subparagraph (C), a victim of child human trafficking shall not be required to collaborate with law enforcement officers to have access to any shelter or services provided with a grant under this section;

“(5) the term ‘Indian child’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Child Welfare Act (25 U.S.C. 1903); and

“(6) the term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

“(1) GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY; SPECIALIZED VICTIMS’ SERVICE REQUIREMENT.—No grant funds under this section may be awarded or transferred to any entity unless such entity has demonstrated substantial experience providing services to victims of human trafficking or related populations (such as runaway and homeless youth), or employs staff specialized in the treatment of human trafficking victims.”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7101 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 203 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 203. Victim-centered child human trafficking deterrence block grant program.”.

**SA 305.** Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . MENTAL HEALTH FIRST AID TRAINING GRANTS.**

Section 520J of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 290bb-41) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS” before “TRAINING”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “ILLNESS” and inserting “HEALTH”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and other categories of individuals, as determined by the Secretary,” after “emergency services personnel”;

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “grant to—” and inserting “grant for evidence-based programs for the purpose of—”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (C) and inserting the following:

“(A) recognizing the signs and symptoms of mental illness; and

“(B)(i) providing education to personnel regarding resources available in the community for individuals with a mental illness and other relevant resources; or

“(ii) the safe de-escalation of crisis situations involving individuals with a mental illness.”; and

(D) in paragraph (7), by striking “, \$25,000,000” and all that follows through the period and inserting “\$20,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.”.

**SA 306.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 118. INCREASE IN U VISA ANNUAL LIMIT.**

Section 214(p)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(p)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “10,000” and inserting “30,000”.

**SA 307.** Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . REVOCATION OF IMMIGRATION BENEFITS FOR ALIENS CONVICTED OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—If an alien is convicted of human trafficking or any conspiracy related to human trafficking, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) revoke any immigration benefit granted to such alien, including deferred action or other relief from removal provided pursuant to policies implemented under, or substantially similar to policies implemented under, an Executive action set out under subsection (b); and

(2) place such alien in expedited proceedings for removal from the United States after the alien completes any term of imprisonment for such a conviction.

(b) EXECUTIVE ACTIONS.—The Executive actions set out under this subsection are the following:

(1) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Civil Immigration Enforcement: Priorities for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens” dated March 2, 2011.

(2) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion Consistent with the Civil Immigration Enforcement Priorities of the Agency for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens” dated June 17, 2011.

(3) The memorandum from the Principal Legal Advisor of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Case-by-Case Review of Incoming and Certain Pending Cases” dated November 17, 2011.

(4) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Civil Immigration Enforcement: Guidance on the Use of Detainers in the Federal, State, Local, and Tribal Criminal Justice Systems” dated December 21, 2012.

(5) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Southern Border and Approaches Campaign” dated November 20, 2014.

(6) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies for the Apprehension, Detention and Removal of Undocumented Immigrants” dated November 20, 2014.

(7) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Secure Communities” dated November 20, 2014.

(8) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Who Are the Parents of U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents” dated November 20, 2014.

(9) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Expansion of the Provisional Waiver Program” dated November 20, 2014.

(10) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies Supporting U.S. High-Skilled Businesses and Workers” dated November 20, 2014.

(11) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Families of U.S. Armed Forces Members and Enlistees” dated November 20, 2014.

(12) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Directive to Provide Consistency Regarding Advance Parole” dated November 20, 2014.

(13) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies to Promote and Increase Access to U.S. Citizenship” dated November 20, 2014.

(14) The memorandum from the President entitled “Modernizing and Streamlining the U.S. Immigrant Visa System for the 21st Century” dated November 21, 2014.

(15) The memorandum from the President entitled “Creating Welcoming Communities and Fully Integrating Immigrants and Refugees” dated November 21, 2014.

**SA 308.** Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**TITLE \_\_\_\_ —TRAFFICKING AWARENESS TRAINING FOR HEALTH CARE**

**SEC. \_\_\_\_01. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015”.

**SEC. \_\_\_\_02. DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.**

(a) GRANT OR CONTRACT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BEST PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, and in consultation with the Administration on Children and Families and other agencies with experience in serving victims of human trafficking, shall award, on a competitive basis, a grant or contract to an eligible entity to train health care professionals to recognize and respond to victims of a severe form of trafficking.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF EVIDENCE-BASED BEST PRACTICES.—An entity receiving a grant under paragraph (1) shall develop evidence-based best practices for health care professionals to recognize and respond to victims of a severe form of trafficking, including—

(A) consultation with law enforcement officials, social service providers, health professionals, experts in the field of human trafficking, and other experts, as appropriate, to inform the development of such best practices;

(B) the identification of any existing best practices or tools for health professionals to recognize potential victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(C) the development of educational materials to train health care professionals on the best practices developed under this subsection.

(3) REQUIREMENTS.—Best practices developed under this subsection shall address—

(A) risk factors and indicators to recognize victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(B) patient safety and security;

(C) the management of medical records of patients who are victims of a severe form of trafficking;

(D) public and private social services available for rescue, food, clothing, and shelter referrals;

(E) the hotlines for reporting human trafficking maintained by the National Human Trafficking Resource Center and the Department of Homeland Security;

(F) validated assessment tools for the identification of victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(G) referral options and procedures for sharing information on human trafficking with a patient and making referrals for legal and social services as appropriate.

(4) PILOT PROGRAM.—An entity receiving a grant under paragraph (1) shall design and implement a pilot program to test the best practices and educational materials identified or developed with respect to the recognition of victims of human trafficking by health professionals at health care sites located near an established anti-human trafficking task force initiative in each of the 10 administrative regions of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(5) ANALYSIS AND REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the date on which an entity implements a pilot program under paragraph (4), the entity shall—

(A) analyze the results of the pilot programs, including through an assessment of—

(i) changes in the skills, knowledge, and attitude of health care professionals resulting from the implementation of the program;

(ii) the number of victims of a severe form of trafficking who were identified under the program;

(iii) of those victims identified, the number who received information or referrals for services offered; and

(iv) of those victims who received such information or referrals—

(I) the number who participated in follow up services; and

(II) the type of follow up services received;

(B) determine, using the results of the analysis conducted under subparagraph (A), the extent to which the best practices developed under this subsection are evidence-based; and

(C) submit to the Secretary of Health and Human Services a report concerning the pilot program and the analysis of the pilot program under subparagraph (A), including an identification of the best practices that were identified as effective and those that require further review.

(b) DISSEMINATION.—Not later than 30 months after date on which a grant is awarded to an eligible entity under subsection (a), the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall—

(1) collaborate with appropriate professional associations and health care professional schools to disseminate best practices identified or developed under subsection (a) for purposes of recognizing potential victims of a severe form of trafficking; and

(2) post on the public website of the Department of Health and Human Services the best practices that are identified by the as effective under subsection (a)(5).

#### SEC. 03. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) The term “eligible entity” means an accredited school of medicine or nursing with experience in the study or treatment of victims of a severe form of trafficking.

(2) The term “eligible site” means a health center that is receiving assistance under section 330, 399Z–1, or 1001 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b, 280h–5, and 300).

(3) The term “health care professional” means a person employed by a health care provider who provides to patients information (including information not related to medical treatment), scheduling, services, or referrals.

(4) The term “HIPAA privacy and security law” has the meaning given to such term in section 3009 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300jj–19).

(5) The term “victim of a severe form of trafficking” has the meaning given to such term in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102).

#### SEC. 04. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title, and this title shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

**SA 309.** Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 101, strike line 1 and all the follows through page 112, line 24 and insert the following:

#### SEC. 302. HERO ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The illegal market for the production and distribution of child abuse imagery is a growing threat to children in the United States. International demand for this material creates a powerful incentive for the rape, abuse, and torture of children within the United States.

(2) The targeting of United States children by transnational criminal networks is a threat to the homeland security of the United States. This threat must be fought with trained personnel and highly specialized counter-child-exploitation strategies and technologies.

(3) The United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security serves a critical national security role in protecting the United States from the growing international threat of child exploitation and human trafficking.

(4) The Cyber Crimes Center of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement is a vital national resource in the effort to combat international child exploitation, providing advanced expertise and assistance in investigations, computer forensics, and victim identification.

(5) The returning military heroes of the United States possess unique and valuable skills that can assist law enforcement in combating global sexual and child exploitation, and the Department of Homeland Security should use this national resource to the maximum extent possible.

(6) Through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program, the returning military heroes of the United States are trained and hired to investigate crimes of child exploitation in order to target predators and rescue children from sexual abuse and slavery.

(b) CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, AND COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle H of title VIII of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 451 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “SEC. 890A. CYBER CRIMES CENTER, CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT, COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT, AND CYBER CRIMES UNIT.

“(a) CYBER CRIMES CENTER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may operate, within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, a Cyber Crimes Center (referred to in this section as the ‘Center’).

“(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Center shall be to provide investigative assistance, training, and equipment to support United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s domestic and international investigations of cyber-related crimes.

“(b) CHILD EXPLOITATION INVESTIGATIONS UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may operate, within the Center, a Child Exploitation Investigations Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CEIU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CEIU—

“(A) shall coordinate all United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement child exploitation initiatives, including investigations into—

“(i) child exploitation;

“(ii) child pornography;

“(iii) child victim identification;

“(iv) traveling child sex offenders; and

“(v) forced child labor, including the sexual exploitation of minors;

“(B) shall, among other things, focus on—

“(i) child exploitation prevention;

“(ii) investigative capacity building;

“(iii) enforcement operations; and

“(iv) training for Federal, State, local, tribal, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

“(C) may provide training, technical expertise, support, or coordination of child exploitation investigations, as needed, to cooperating law enforcement agencies and personnel;

“(D) shall provide psychological support and counseling services for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel engaged in child exploitation prevention initiatives, including making available other existing services to assist employees who are exposed to child exploitation material during investigations;

“(E) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of the recruiting, training, equipping and hiring of wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program; and

“(F) shall collaborate with other governmental, nongovernmental, and nonprofit entities approved by the Secretary for the sponsorship of, and participation in, outreach and training activities.

“(3) DATA COLLECTION.—The CEIU shall collect and maintain data concerning—

“(A) the total number of suspects identified by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(B) the number of arrests by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, disaggregated by type, including—

“(i) the number of victims identified through investigations carried out by United

States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(i) the number of suspects arrested who were in positions of trust or authority over children;

“(C) the number of cases opened for investigation by United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(D) the number of cases resulting in a Federal, State, foreign, or military prosecution.

“(4) AVAILABILITY OF DATA TO CONGRESS.—In addition to submitting the reports required under paragraph (7), the CEIU shall make the data collected and maintained under paragraph (3) available to the committees of Congress described in paragraph (7).

“(5) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CEIU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3).

“(6) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Taskforce, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CEIU.

“(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

“(7) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the HERO Act of 2015, and annually for the following 4 years, the CEIU shall—

“(A) submit a report containing a summary of the data collected pursuant to paragraph (3) during the previous year to—

“(i) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(ii) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

“(iii) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

“(iv) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

“(v) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

“(vi) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

“(B) make, to the extent feasible, a copy of each report submitted under subparagraph (A) publicly available on the website of the Department.

“(C) COMPUTER FORENSICS UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may operate, within the Center, a Computer Forensics Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CFU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CFU—

“(A) shall provide training and technical support in digital forensics to—

“(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

“(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

“(B) shall provide computer hardware, software, and forensic licenses for all computer forensics personnel within United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(C) shall participate in research and development in the area of digital forensics, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and

“(D) is authorized to collaborate with the Department of Defense and the National Association to Protect Children for the purpose of recruiting, training, equipping, and hiring wounded, ill, and injured veterans and transitioning service members, through the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program.

“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CFU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).

“(4) ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to accept monies and in-kind donations from the Virtual Global Task Force, national laboratories, Federal agencies, not-for-profit organizations, and educational institutions to create and expand public awareness campaigns in support of the functions of the CFU.

“(B) EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Gifts authorized under subparagraph (A) shall not be subject to the Federal Acquisition Regulation for competition when the services provided by the entities referred to in such subparagraph are donated or of minimal cost to the Department.

“(d) CYBER CRIMES UNIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may operate, within the Center, a Cyber Crimes Unit (referred to in this subsection as the ‘CCU’).

“(2) FUNCTIONS.—The CCU—

“(A) shall oversee the cyber security strategy and cyber-related operations and programs for United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement;

“(B) shall enhance United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s ability to combat criminal enterprises operating on or through the Internet, with specific focus in the areas of—

“(i) cyber economic crime;

“(ii) digital theft of intellectual property;

“(iii) illicit e-commerce (including hidden marketplaces);

“(iv) Internet-facilitated proliferation of arms and strategic technology; and

“(v) cyber-enabled smuggling and money laundering;

“(C) shall provide training and technical support in cyber investigations to—

“(i) United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement personnel; and

“(ii) Federal, State, local, tribal, military, and foreign law enforcement agency personnel engaged in the investigation of crimes within their respective jurisdictions, upon request and subject to the availability of funds;

“(D) shall participate in research and development in the area of cyber investigations, in coordination with appropriate components of the Department; and

“(E) is authorized to recruit participants of the Human Exploitation Rescue Operative (HERO) Child Rescue Corps program for investigative and forensic positions in support of the functions of the CCU.

“(3) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The CCU is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements to accomplish the functions set forth in paragraph (2).”

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 890 the following:

“Sec. 890A. Cyber crimes center, child exploitation investigations unit, computer forensics unit, and cyber crimes unit.”

(c) HERO CORPS HIRING.—It is the sense of Congress that Homeland Security Investiga-

tions of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement should, to the maximum extent possible, hire, recruit, train, and equip wounded, ill, or injured military veterans (as defined in section 101, title 38, United States Code) who are affiliated with the HERO Child Rescue Corps program for investigative, analyst, and forensic positions.

(d) INVESTIGATING CHILD EXPLOITATION.—Section 307(b)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 187(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) conduct research and development for the purpose of advancing technology for the investigation of child exploitation crimes, including child victim identification, trafficking in persons, and child pornography, and for advanced forensics.”

#### TITLE IV—COMPLIANCE WITH STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO ACT

##### SEC. 401. BUDGET COMPLIANCE.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

**SA 310.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 57, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

“(3) activities of law enforcement agencies to find homeless and runaway youth, including salaries and associated expenses for retired Federal law enforcement officers assisting the law enforcement agencies in finding homeless and runaway youth; and

**SA 311.** Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### TITLE ————RAPE SURVIVOR CHILD CUSTODY

##### SEC. ———01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Rape Survivor Child Custody Act”.

##### SEC. ———02. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COVERED FORMULA GRANT.—The term “covered formula grant” means a grant under—

(A) part T of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796gg et seq.) (commonly referred to as the “STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program”); or

(B) section 41601 of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14043g) (commonly referred to as the “Sexual Assault Services Program”).

## (2) TERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “termination” means, when used with respect to parental rights, a complete and final termination of the parent’s right to custody of, guardianship of, visitation with, access to, and inheritance from a child.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require a State, in order to receive an increase in the amount provided to the State under the covered formula grants under this title, to have in place a law that terminates any obligation of a person who fathered a child through rape to support the child.

**SEC. 03. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds the following:

(1) Men who father children through rape should be prohibited from visiting or having custody of those children.

(2) Thousands of rape-related pregnancies occur annually in the United States.

(3) A substantial number of women choose to raise their child conceived through rape and, as a result, may face custody battles with their rapists.

(4) Rape is one of the most under-prosecuted serious crimes, with estimates of criminal conviction occurring in less than 5 percent of rapes.

(5) The clear and convincing evidence standard is the most common standard for termination of parental rights among the 50 States, territories, and the District of Columbia.

(6) The Supreme Court established that the clear and convincing evidence standard satisfies due process for allegations to terminate or restrict parental rights in *Santosky v. Kramer* (455 U.S. 745 (1982)).

(7) Currently only 10 States have statutes allowing rape survivors to petition for the termination of parental rights of the rapist based on clear and convincing evidence that the child was conceived through rape.

(8) A rapist pursuing parental or custody rights causes the survivor to have continued interaction with the rapist, which can have traumatic psychological effects on the survivor, and can make it more difficult for her to recover.

(9) These traumatic effects on the mother can severely negatively impact her ability to raise a healthy child.

(10) Rapists may use the threat of pursuing custody or parental rights to coerce survivors into not prosecuting rape, or otherwise harass, intimidate, or manipulate them.

**SEC. 04. INCREASED FUNDING FOR FORMULA GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**

The Attorney General shall increase the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants in accordance with this title if the State has in place a law that allows the mother of any child that was conceived through rape to seek court-ordered termination of the parental rights of her rapist with regard to that child, which the court is authorized to grant upon clear and convincing evidence of rape.

**SEC. 05. APPLICATION.**

A State seeking an increase in the amount provided to the State under the covered formula grants shall include in the application of the State for each covered formula grant such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require, including information about the law described in section 04.

**SEC. 06. GRANT INCREASE.**

The amount of the increase provided to a State under the covered formula grants under this title shall be equal to not more than 10 percent of the average of the total

amount of funding provided to the State under the covered formula grants under the 3 most recent awards to the State.

**SEC. 07. PERIOD OF INCREASE.**

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall provide an increase in the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants under this title for a 2-year period.

(B) LIMIT.—The Attorney General may not provide an increase in the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants under this title more than 4 times.

**SEC. 08. ALLOCATION OF INCREASED FORMULA GRANT FUNDS.**

The Attorney General shall allocate an increase in the amount provided to a State under the covered formula grants under this title such that—

(1) 25 percent the amount of the increase is provided under the program described in section 02(1)(A); and

(2) 75 percent the amount of the increase is provided under the program described in section 02(1)(B).

**SEC. 09. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.

**SA 312.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

**Subtitle D—Expanded Training****SEC. 231. EXPANDED TRAINING RELATING TO TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.**

Section 105(c)(4) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(c)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking “Appropriate personnel” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Appropriate personnel”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), as redesignated, by inserting “, including members of the Service (as such term is defined in section 103 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3903))” after “Department of State”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) TRAINING COMPONENTS.—Training under this paragraph shall include—

“(i) a distance learning course on trafficking-in-persons issues and the Department of State’s obligations under this Act, which shall be designed for embassy reporting officers, regional bureaus’ trafficking-in-persons coordinators, and their superiors;

“(ii) specific trafficking-in-persons briefings for all ambassadors and deputy chiefs of mission before such individuals depart for their posts; and

“(iii) at least annual reminders to all personnel referred to in clauses (i) and (ii), including appropriate personnel from other Federal departments and agencies, at each diplomatic or consular post of the Department of State located outside the United States of—

“(I) key problems, threats, methods, and warning signs of trafficking in persons specific to the country or jurisdiction in which each such post is located; and

“(II) appropriate procedures to report information that any such personnel may acquire about possible cases of trafficking in persons.”.

**SA 313.** Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

**Subtitle D—Prioritization Within the Department of State****SEC. 231. SENSE OF CONGRESS.**

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State will be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Office status is changed to that of a Bureau within the Department hierarchy;

(2) the change in status from Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to a Bureau can be accomplished without increasing the number of personnel or the budget of the current Office;

(3) a Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking would be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Bureau were headed by an Assistant Secretary with direct access to the Secretary of State, rather than an Ambassador-at-Large; and

(4) the Secretary of State should review the current use of the 24 Assistant Secretary positions authorized by section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) and make appropriate revisions, consolidations, and eliminations, to ensure that those positions reflect the highest Departmental needs and foreign policy priorities of the United States, including efforts to combat trafficking in persons.

**SEC. 232. BUREAU TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.**

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 105(e) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(e)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking “Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking” and inserting “Bureau To Combat Trafficking in Persons”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking” and inserting “Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons”;

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “Office” and inserting “Bureau”; and

(C) in the sixth sentence, by striking “Office” and inserting “Bureau”; and

(3) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2), by striking “Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking” and inserting “Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons”.

(B) REFERENCE.—Any reference in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 or in any other Act to the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall be deemed to be a reference to the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

**SEC. 233. REPORT REGARDING DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.**

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, a report detailing—

(1) for each current Assistant Secretary of State position—

(A) the title of that Assistant Secretary of State;

(B) how long that particular Assistant Secretary designation has been in existence; and

(C) whether that particular Assistant Secretary designation was legislatively mandated or authorized and, if so, the relevant statutory citation for such mandate or authorization; and

(2) whether the Secretary intends to designate 1 of the Assistant Secretary of State positions authorized under section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) as the Assistant Secretary of State to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and the reasons for that decision.

#### SEC. 234. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for "Diplomatic and Consular Programs" to carry out the provisions of this subtitle.

**SA 314.** Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

#### Subtitle D—Prioritization Within the Department of State

##### SEC. 231. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State will be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Office status is changed to that of a Bureau within the Department hierarchy;

(2) the change in status from Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking to a Bureau can be accomplished without increasing the number of personnel or the budget of the current Office;

(3) a Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking would be more effective in carrying out duties mandated by Congress in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 if the Bureau were headed by an Assistant Secretary with direct access to the Secretary of State, rather than an Ambassador-at-Large; and

(4) the Secretary of State should review the current use of the 24 Assistant Secretary positions authorized by section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) and make appropriate revisions, consolidations, and eliminations, to ensure that those positions reflect the highest Departmental needs and foreign policy priorities of the United States, including efforts to combat trafficking in persons.

#### SEC. 232. BUREAU TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105(e) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(e)) is amended—

(1) in the heading, by striking "Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking" and inserting "Bureau To Combat Trafficking in Persons";

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking" and inserting "Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons";

(B) in the second sentence, by striking "Office" and inserting "Bureau"; and

(C) in the sixth sentence, by striking "Office" and inserting "Bureau"; and

(3) in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2), by striking "Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking" and inserting "Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons".

(b) REFERENCE.—Any reference in the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 or in

any other Act to the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking shall be deemed to be a reference to the Bureau to Combat Trafficking in Persons.

#### SEC. 233. REPORT REGARDING DESIGNATION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE TO COMBAT TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit, to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, a report detailing—

(1) for each current Assistant Secretary of State position—

(A) the title of that Assistant Secretary of State;

(B) how long that particular Assistant Secretary designation has been in existence; and

(C) whether that particular Assistant Secretary designation was legislatively mandated or authorized and, if so, the relevant statutory citation for such mandate or authorization; and

(2) whether the Secretary intends to designate 1 of the Assistant Secretary of State positions authorized under section 1(c)(1) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a(c)(1)) as the Assistant Secretary of State to Combat Trafficking in Persons, and the reasons for that decision.

#### SEC. 234. COST LIMITATION.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for "Diplomatic and Consular Programs" to carry out the provisions of this subtitle.

**SA 315.** Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

#### Subtitle D—Special Watch List

##### SEC. 231. COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.

Section 110(b)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(F) COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (D) and (E), a country that—

"(i) was included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for 4 consecutive years after the date of the enactment of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008; and

"(ii) was subsequently included on the list of countries described in paragraph (1)(C), may not thereafter be included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for more than 1 consecutive year."

**SA 316.** Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

#### Subtitle D—Special Watch List

##### SEC. 231. COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.

Section 110(b)(2) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7107(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(F) COUNTRIES ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST FOR 4 CONSECUTIVE YEARS THAT ARE DOWNGRADED AND REINSTATED ON SPECIAL WATCH LIST.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (D) and (E), a country that—

"(i) was included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for 4 consecutive years after the date of the enactment of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008; and

"(ii) was subsequently included on the list of countries described in paragraph (1)(C), may not thereafter be included on the special watch list described in subparagraph (A) for more than 1 consecutive year."

#### NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Continuing America's Leadership: Advancing Research and Development for Patients."

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-1409.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 16, 2015, at 4 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining Federal Improper Payments and the Death Master File."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to the following member of my staff: Francis Cissna, during the pendency of the remainder of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106-286, hereby notifies the Senate of an amendment to the majority membership appointment made in the Senate on February 25, 2015, to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: the Honorable MARCO RUBIO of Florida, Co-Chair.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d-



276g, as amended, appoints the following Senator as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 114th Congress: the Honorable AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Democratic leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276l, appoints the following Senator as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 114th Congress: the Honorable PATRICK J. LEAHY of Vermont.

The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276n, as amended, appoints the following Senator as vice chairman of the U.S.-China Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 114th Congress: the Honorable MAZIE HIRONO of Hawaii.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, and upon the recommendation of the Democratic leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h-276k, as amended, appoints the following Senator as vice chairman of the Senate delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 114th Congress: the Honorable TIM KAINE of Virginia.

#### FILING DEADLINE—S. 178

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to S. 178 be set for 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, March 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 17; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 178, with the time until the cloture vote at 11 a.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, at 11 a.m. tomorrow, the Senate will vote on cloture on the committee substitute to the antitrafficking bill. If cloture is

not invoked, there will be a second immediate vote on cloture on the underlying bill.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator COTTON for up to 45 minutes and Senator BROWN for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas.

#### AMERICA'S MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I speak for the first time from the Senate floor with a simple message: The world is growing ever more dangerous and our defense spending is wholly inadequate to confront the danger. To be exact:

During the last four or five years the world has grown gravely darker. . . . We have steadily disarmed, partly with a sincere desire to give a lead to other countries, and partly through the severe financial pressure of the time. But a change must now be made. We must not continue longer on a course in which we alone are growing weaker while every other nation is growing stronger.

I wish I could take credit for those eloquent and ominous words, but I cannot. Winston Churchill sounded that warning in 1933, as Adolph Hitler had taken power in Germany.

Tragically, Great Britain and the West did not heed this warning when they might have strangled that monster in his crib.

Rather than let the locusts continue to eat away at the common defense, the Axis Powers were stronger and the West weaker, conciliating with and appeasing them, hoping their appetite for conquest and death might be sated. As we all know, however, that appetite only grew until it launched the most terrible war in human history.

Today, perhaps more tragically because we ought to benefit from those lessons of history, the United States is again engaged in something of a grand experiment of the kind we saw in the 1930s. As then, military strength is seen in many quarters as a cause of military adventurism. Strength and confidence in the defense of our interests, alliances, and liberties is not seen to deter aggression but to provoke it.

Rather than confront our adversaries, our President apologizes for our supposed transgressions. The administration is harsh and unyielding to our friends, soothing and suffocating to our enemies. The President minimizes the threat we confront, in the face of territory seized, weapons of mass destruction used and proliferated, and innocents murdered.

The concrete expression of this experiment is our collapsing defense

budget. For years, we have systematically underfunded our military, marrying this philosophy of retreat with a misplaced understanding of our larger budgetary burdens. We have strained our fighting forces today to the breaking point, even as we have eaten away at our investments in future forces, creating our own "locust years," as Churchill would have put it. Meanwhile, our long-term debt crisis looks hardly any better, even as we ask our troops to shoulder the burden of deficit reduction, rather than shoulder the arms necessary to keep the peace.

The results of this experiment, it should come as no surprise, are little different from the results from the same experiment in the 1930s. American weakness and leading from behind have produced nothing but a more dangerous world. When we take stock of that world and our position in it, there can be no doubt a change must now be made.

An alarm should be sounding in our ears. Our enemies, sensing weakness and hence opportunity, have become steadily more aggressive. Our allies, uncertain of our commitment and capability, have begun to conclude that they must look out for themselves, even where it is unhelpful to stability and order. Our military, suffering from years of neglect, has seen its relative strength decline to historic levels.

Let's start with the enemy who attacked us on September 11: radical Islamists. During his last campaign, the President was fond of saying Al Qaeda was "on the run." In a fashion, I suppose this was true. Al Qaeda was and is running wild around the world, now in control of more territory than ever before. This global network of Islamic jihadists continues to plot attacks against America and the West. They sow the seeds of conflict in failed states and maintain active affiliates throughout Africa, the Arabian Peninsula, the Greater Middle East, and South Asia.

Further, Al Qaeda in Iraq was let off the mat when the President disregarded its commanders' best military judgment and withdrew all troops from Iraq in 2011. Given a chance to regroup, it morphed into the Islamic State, which now controls much of Syria and Iraq. The Islamic State cuts the heads off of Americans, burns alive hostages from allied countries, executes Christians, and enslaves women and girls. The Islamic State aspires and actively plots to attack us here at home, whether by foreign plots or by recruiting a lone wolf in our midst.

The President's suggestions, in other words, that the war on terror is over or ending, are far from true. Indeed, the Director of National Intelligence recently testified that "when the final accounting is done, 2014 will have been the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has

been compiled." Yet the President will not even speak our enemy's name.

The threat of radical Islamic terrorism brings us to Iran, the world's worst state sponsor of terrorism. My objections to the ongoing nuclear negotiations are well known and need not be rehearsed at length here. I will simply note that the deal foreshadowed by the President, allowing Iran to have uranium enrichment capabilities and accepting an expiration date on any agreement—to quote Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu—"doesn't block Iran's path to the bomb; it paves Iran's path to the bomb." If you think, as I do, the Islamic State is dangerous, a nuclear-armed Islamic Republic is even more so.

Recall, after all, what Iran already does without the bomb. Iran is an outlaw regime that has been killing Americans for 35 years, from Lebanon to Saudi Arabia, to Iraq. Unsurprisingly, Iran is only growing bolder and more aggressive as America retreats from the Middle East. Ayatollah Khamenei continues to call for Israel's elimination. Iranian-backed Shiite militias now control much of Iraq, led by Qassem Suleimani, the commander of the Quds Force, a man with the blood of hundreds of American soldiers on his hands.

Iran continues to prop up Bashar al-Assad's outlaw regime in Syria. Iranian-aligned Shiite militants recently seized Sana'a, the capital of Yemen. Hezbollah remains Iran's cat's paw in Lebanon. Put simply, Iran dominates or controls five capitals in its drive for regional hegemony. Moreover, Iran has rapidly increased the size and capability of its ballistic missile arsenal, recently launching a new satellite. Just 2 weeks ago, Iran blew up a mock U.S. aircraft carrier in naval exercises and publicized it with great fanfare.

Iran does all of these things without the bomb. Just imagine what it will do with the bomb. Imagine the United States further down the road of appeasement, largely defenseless against this tyranny.

You do not have to imagine much, though; simply look to North Korea. Because of a naive and failed nuclear agreement, that outlaw state acquired nuclear weapons. Now America is largely handcuffed, watching as this rogue regime builds more bombs and missiles capable of striking the U.S. homeland and endangering our allies.

But perhaps an even more obvious result of this experiment with retreat is the resurgence of Russia. The President aspired for a reset with Russia and made one-sided concessions such as withdrawing ballistic missile defenses from Poland and the Czech Republic. So Vladimir Putin saw these concessions as weakness and continues to violate the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. The West refused to assist the new Ukrainian President, so

Putin invaded and stole Crimea. The Western response was modest sanctions. So Russian-supplied rebels shot a civilian airliner out of the sky in the heart of Europe. The President dithers in providing defensive weapons to Ukraine, so Putin reignites the war, takes Debaltsevo, and stages outside Mariupol. When bombs and bullets were called for, blankets were rushed to the frontline.

That is just in Ukraine. Putin is also testing NATO's resolve. Russia has tested a ballistic missile with multiple warheads, designed to threaten our European allies in direct violation of the INF treaty. Russian bombers recently flew over the English Channel, disrupting British civil aviation. Estonia asserts that Russia kidnapped an Estonian security officer on its Russian border. And Russia continues to intimidate and harass other NATO partners such as Sweden, Moldova, and Georgia.

Finally, Russia's ability to continue its aggression will only grow because its defense spending has more than quadrupled over the last 15 years. Moreover, the Russian military today is qualitatively better than the old Soviet military, despite its smaller size, as Admiral Bill Gortney, Commander of NORAD testified just last week.

Some say that falling oil prices will restrain Putin. In fact, Russia's Finance Minister recently announced 10 percent across-the-board budget cuts to all departments of their government—except defense. This should give us some insights into Putin's intentions and ambitions.

Among major nation-state competitors, Russia's military buildup is exceeded only by China's. Over the same period of the last 15 years, China's military spending has increased by 600 percent. Moreover, the bulk of the spending is directed quite clearly against the United States as China pursues its anti-access and area denial strategy. This strategy is designed to keep American forces outside the so-called first island chain and give China regional hegemony from the Korean Peninsula to the Indonesian archipelago. Thus, China is on a spending spree for more submarines, aircraft carriers, antiship ballistic missiles, and other air and naval systems.

The impact of China's rapid military expansion is clear. China has challenged Japan's control of the Senkaku Islands and purported to establish an exclusive air defense zone over the East China Sea. By expanding its activities in the Spratlys, China is precipitating a confrontation with the Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia, and Taiwan. Further, China's repressive actions against protesters in Hong Kong only serve to undermine Taiwanese support of reunification, which itself could spark further Chinese aggression. All of this is to say nothing of China's cyber theft

and economic espionage against American interests or its atrocious record on human rights.

While America has retreated, not only have our enemies been on the march, our allies, anxious for years about American resolve, now worry increasingly about American capabilities. With the enemy on their borders, many have begun to conclude they have no choice but to take matters into their own hands, sometimes in ways unhelpful to our interests.

Even our core NATO allies appear unsettled by our recent experiment with retreat. The French intervened in Mali to confront Islamic insurgents, but without adequate advance coordination, they quickly found themselves in need of emergency logistical support from our Air Force.

Turkey just announced a new missile defense system that will not be interoperable with NATO systems. Greece has a new governing coalition that is hinting at greater cooperation with Russia.

The picture is no better outside NATO. Japan has significantly increased its defense budget because of a rising China and may feel compelled to reinterpret its post-war constitutional ban on overseas "collective self-defense." Saudi Arabia just entered a nuclear pact with South Korea, likely a response to Iran's nuclear program. Similarly, the Persian Gulf States have increased defense spending by 44 percent in the last 2 years. While we should encourage our partners to carry their share of the defense load, the Sunni states are building up their defenses, not to help us, but because they fear we won't help them against Iran.

We should never take our allies for granted, but we also shouldn't take for granted the vast influence our security guarantees give us with our allies' behavior. Germany and Japan are not nuclear powers today because of our nuclear umbrella. Israel didn't retaliate against Hussein's Scud missile attacks in the gulf war, and thus we preserved the war coalition because we asked them for restraint and committed significant resources to hunting down Scud launchers. This kind of influence has been essential for American security throughout the postwar period, yet it has begun to wane as our allies doubt our commitment and our capabilities.

Make no mistake, our military capabilities have declined. In recent years, we have dramatically underfunded our military to the detriment of our security. To fully understand the military aspect of our experiment with retreat, some historical perspective is needed.

Defense spending reached its peak in 2008, when the base budget and wartime spending combined was \$760 billion. Incredibly, the total defense budget plummeted by \$200 billion in the last year.

Today, defense spending is only 16 percent of all Federal spending, a historic low rivaled only by the post-Cold War period. To give some context, during the Cold War, defense spending regularly accounted for 60 percent of Federal spending. But if we don't end the experiment of retreat, this President will leave office with a mere 12 percent of all Federal dollars spent on defense.

The picture is no prettier when cast in the light of our economy. In the early Cold War, defense spending was approximately 9 percent of gross domestic product. Today, it sits at a paltry 3.5 percent. But our defense budget isn't just about numbers and arithmetic. It is about our ability to accomplish the mission of defending our country from all threats.

The consequences of these cuts are real, concrete, and immediate. As former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta explained, these cuts to defense spending have put us on the path to the smallest Army since before World War II, the smallest Navy since World War, and the smallest Air Force ever. Let's look more closely at each service.

Our Army has shrunk by nearly 100,000 troops. The Army has lost 13 combat brigades, and only a third of the remaining brigades are fully ready to meet America's threats. Further, investments in modernization have fallen by 25 percent. If we continue on the current path, the Army will lose another 70,000 soldiers, and every modernization program designed to preserve the Army's technological advantage will be eviscerated.

The Navy, meanwhile, has had to cancel five ship deployments and significantly delay the deployment of a carrier strike group. The Navy's mission requires it to keep three carrier strike groups and amphibious readiness groups prepared to respond to a major crisis within 30 years, but the Navy can only fulfill a third of its mission because of cuts to maintenance and training.

Similarly, the Air Force is less than one-third of its size 25 years ago. Moreover, the Air Force depends upon modernization to preserve its technological edge, perhaps more than any other service, but current funding levels could require cancellation of airborne-refueling tankers and surveillance aircraft, set back fighter and nuclear weapons modernization, and shorten the life of tactical airlift and weapons recovery programs.

Nor are these impacts just immediate; they will be felt long into the future. Key programs, once divested, will be difficult to restart. Manufacturing competencies will be lost, the skilled-labor pool will shrink, and the defense manufacturing base will atrophy. Today's weapons systems and equipment will begin to age and break down. Our troops won't be able to train, and their weapons and equipment won't be ready

to fight. In short, we will have a hollow force incapable of defending our national security.

What is to be done then? Our experiment with retreat must end. This Congress must again recognize that our national security is the first priority of this government. Our national security strategy must drive our military budget rather than the budget setting our strategy. The military budget must reflect the threats we face rather than the budget defining those threats.

In the face of these threats and after years of improvident defense cuts, we must significantly increase our defense spending. After hundreds of billions of dollars of these cuts, the base defense budget next year is set to be only \$498 billion. That is wholly inadequate. Secretary of Defense Ash Carter recently testified: "I want to be clear about this—parts of our nation's defense strategy cannot be executed under sequestration." All four of the military service chiefs, in addition, have testified that these cuts put American lives at risk.

The President has proposed a modest increase to \$534 billion, which is better than nothing. Senators JOHN MCCAIN and JACK REED have called for the full repeal of sequestration, which would raise the base defense budget to \$577 billion. I applaud and thank these veterans of both the Senate and our military for this correct and clear-eyed recommendation.

Yet I also want to highlight their support for the recommendation of the National Defense Panel, which estimated that base defense spending for fiscal year 2016 should be \$611 billion at a minimum.

The National Defense Panel was a bipartisan group of eminent national security experts convened by Congress to analyze the Quadrennial Defense Review. They unanimously concluded that then-Secretary of Defense Bob Gates' fiscal year 2012 budget was the proper starting point to analyze our current defense needs—for at least two reasons.

First, Secretary Gates had already initiated significant defense cuts and reforms totaling \$478 billion. It is hard to say, given those efforts, that his 2012 budget had left much fat in the Department of Defense.

Second, Secretary Gates and the Department assembled and submitted this budget in late January 2010 and early 2011, or just months before the Budget Control Act with its draconian defense cuts became law. That budget, therefore, was the last time the Defense Department was able to submit a threat- and strategy-based budget, instead of the budget-based strategies we have seen over the last 4 years.

This logic is compelling, even unsailable. Thus, I agree we should spend not merely \$611 billion on the base defense budget next year but substan-

tially more than that. After all, as we have seen earlier, and as the National Defense Panel has noted, the world has become much more dangerous since 2011. Islamic terrorism, Iranian aggression, Russian revisionism, and Chinese interventionism have all worsened—to say nothing of other challenges. The \$611 billion is necessary, but it is not sufficient.

What then should our defense budget be next year? I will readily admit we cannot be sure how much is needed above \$611 billion. As the National Defense Panel explained, "because of the highly constrained and unstable budget environment under which the Department has been working," the Quadrennial Review "is not adequate as a comprehensive long-term planning document." Thus, the panel recommends that Congress "should ask the Department for such a plan, which should be developed without undue emphasis on current budgetary restraints."

I endorse this recommendation. In the meantime, though, even if we can't specify a precise dollar amount, we can identify the critical needs on which to spend the additional money.

First, our military faces a readiness crisis from budget cuts and a decade of war. Our young soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are the greatest weapons systems our country could ever have, but they need training—live-fire exercises, flight time, and so forth. Their weapons, equipment, and vehicles need maintenance and reset. If we faced a major crisis today, our troops would no doubt suffer more casualties and greater likelihood of mission failure. Of course, they know all of this, and morale suffers because of it.

Second and related, our military is shrinking rapidly to historically small levels. This decline must be reversed. Our Navy probably needs 350-plus ships, not a budget-dictated 260 ships. The Army needs to maintain its pre-9/11 end strength of 490,000 Active-Duty soldiers, as the Marine Corps needs 182,000 marines. The Air Force needs more aircraft of virtually every type—bomber, fighter, airlift, and surveillance. It is the deepest folly to reduce our military below its 1990s size as the world has grown considerably more dangerous since that quiet decade.

Third, we should increase research, development, and procurement funds to ensure our military retains its historic technological advantage, particularly as our adversaries gain more access to advanced, low-cost technologies. This should start with the essential tools of command and control: cyber space, space, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. The Air Force needs to modernize its bomber and mobility aircraft, in particular. The Navy needs to continue to improve its surface-ship and especially its submarine capabilities.

These critical priorities will no doubt be expensive, probably tens of billions

of dollars more than the \$611 billion baseline suggested by the National Defense Panel. Because the massive cuts to our defense budget resulted in part from record deficits, the question arises, however: Can we afford all of this?

The answer is yes—without question and without doubt, yes. The facts here, as we have seen, are indisputable. The defense budget has been slashed by hundreds of billions of dollars over the last 6 years. The defense budget is only 16 percent of all Federal spending, a historic low and heading much lower if we don't act. And using the broadest measure of affordability and national priorities, defense spending as a percentage of our economy, last year we spent only 3.5 percent of our national income on defense, which is approaching historic lows and may surpass them by 2019.

Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that our military needs \$700 billion in the coming year, an immediate increase of \$200 billion. To some, that may sound staggering and unrealistic, yet it would still be barely 4 percent of our economy—a full 1 percent lower than the 5 percent from which President Reagan started his buildup. If we increased spending merely to that level—which both President Reagan and a Democratic House considered dangerously low—we would spend \$885 billion on defense next year.

Furthermore, trying to balance the budget through defense cuts is both counterproductive and impossible. First, the threats we face will eventually catch up with us, as they did on September 11, and we will have no choice but to increase our defense budget. When we do, it will cost more to achieve the same end state of readiness and modernization than it would have without the intervening cuts. This was the lesson we learned in the 1980s after the severe cuts to defense in the 1970s.

Second, we need a healthy, growing economy to generate the government revenue necessary to fund our military and balance the budget. In our globalized world, our domestic prosperity depends heavily on the world economy, which, of course, requires stability and order. Who provides that stability and order? The U.S. military.

Finally, in the short term, ephemeral gains in deficit reduction from defense cuts merely mask the genuine driver of our long-term debt crisis: retirement and health care programs. The Budget Control Act ultimately failed to control these programs—a failure not only of promises made to our citizens but also because the deficit-reduction default became annual discretionary funding, particularly the defense budget. In the 4 years since, relative deficits have declined, alleviating the imperative to reform these programs yet doing nothing to solve their long-term insolvency and our debt crisis.

A better question to ask is: Can we afford to continue our experiment in retreat? I suggest we cannot. Imagine a world in which we continue our current trajectory, where America remains in retreat and our military loses even more of its edge. What would such a world look like?

It is not a pretty picture. Russia might soon possess the entire north shore of the Black Sea. An emboldened Putin, sensing Western weakness for what it is, could be tempted to replay his Ukrainian playbook in Estonia or Latvia, forcing NATO into war or obsolescence.

China could escalate its island conflicts in the East and South China Seas. Without an adequate American response—or worse, with China denying American forces access to those seas—countries as diverse as South Korea, Japan, Taiwan, and the Philippines would feel compelled to conciliate or confront regional stability.

While North Korea already possesses nuclear weapons, Iran appears to be on the path to a nuclear bomb, whether it breaks or upholds a potential nuclear agreement. Not only might Iran use its weapon, but its nuclear umbrella would also embolden its drive for regional hegemony. Moreover, Iran could provide its terrorist proxies with nuclear materials.

And does anyone doubt that Saudi Arabia and other Sunni states will follow Iran down this path? Nuclear tripwires may soon ring the world's most volatile region, increasing the risk of nuclear war, as well as the possibility that Islamist insurgents might seize nuclear materials if they can topple the right government.

Islamic terrorists, meanwhile, will continue to rampage throughout Syria and Iraq, aspiring always for more attacks in Europe and on American soil. Emboldened by America's retreat and by their own battlefield successes, they will continue to attract thousands of hateful fighters from around the world, all eager for the chance to kill Americans.

All these are nightmare scenarios, but sadly not unrealistic ones. The alternative, however, is not war. No leader—whether a President, a general or platoon leader—wishes to put his troops in harm's way. War is an awful thing, and it takes an unimaginable toll on the men and women who fight it and their families.

But the best way to avoid war is to be willing and prepared to fight a war in the first place. That is the alternative: military strength and moral confidence in the defense of America's national security. Our enemies and allies alike must know that aggressors will pay an unspeakable price for challenging the United States.

The best way to impose that price is global military dominance. When it comes to war, narrow margins are not

enough, for they are nothing more than an invitation to war. We must have such hegemonic strength that no sane adversary would ever imagine challenging the United States. "Good enough" is not and will never be good enough.

We can look to a very recent historic example to prove this point. Just 25 years ago, a dominant American military ended the Cold War without firing a shot. If we return to the dominance of that era, aggressive despots such as Vladimir Putin, rising powers such as China, and state sponsors of terrorism such as Iran's Ayatollahs will think long and hard before crossing us. And while we may not deter terrorist groups such as the Islamic State, Al Qaeda, and Hezbollah, we will kill their adherents more effectively, while also sending a needed lesson to their sympathizers: Join and you too will die.

Bringing about this future by being prepared for war will no doubt take a lot of money. But what could be a higher priority than a safe and prosperous America, leading a stable and orderly world? What better use of precious taxpayer dollars? What more lessons from history do we need?

I began with Churchill's prescient words from 1933. Alas, the West did not take his advice, did not rearm and prepare to deter Nazi Germany. The predictable result was the German remilitarization of the Rhineland and the long march to war. Now let me close with his regretful words from 1936:

The era of procrastination, of half-measures, of soothing and baffling expedients, of delays, is coming to its close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences.

Churchill later called World War II the unnecessary war because it could have been stopped so easily with Western strength and confidence in the 1930s. I know many of you in this Chamber stand with me, and I humbly urge you all—Democrat and Republican alike—to join in rebuilding our common defense, so that we will not face our own unnecessary war, our own period of consequences.

I will now yield the floor, but I will never yield in the defense of America's national security on any front or at any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### CONGRATULATING SENATOR COTTON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we just had an opportunity to hear from our new colleague from Arkansas, who has laid out the national security requirements of our country quite effectively. As someone who has served in the military himself in recent conflicts, he speaks with extra authority. I want to congratulate the junior Senator from Arkansas for an extraordinary initial speech and look forward

to his leadership on all of these issues in the coming years.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, time is running out for us to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program, a program that began almost 20 years ago in this body and the other body and that right now is taking care of 10 million children—the children of parents who in most cases have full-time jobs that don't offer insurance and full-time jobs that don't pay enough so these families can buy insurance for their children.

We know that CHIP works. It works for parents, and it works for children. We know that if we don't act now, States will start rolling back the CHIP programs. Legislatures are adjourning almost as we speak. We need to provide States with certainty so they can budget for CHIP now and 4 years into the future.

Unfortunately, the deal currently being floated in the House would not fund CHIP for a full 4 years. Instead, if reports are true, it would permanently repeal the sustainable growth rate—the so-called doctors fix—while failing to provide much needed certainty to children's health care. I want to take care of doctors. I want to make sure this is done right because it affects doctors. It affects doctors' ability to deliver care. It affects those patients whom doctors serve. But how do we leave here taking care of the doctors permanently and shortchanging children, only giving them 2 years of health insurance? It is past time we fix SGR.

In 2001, when I was a member of the House, Congressman BILIRAKIS as the Republican chair of the Health Subcommittee of the Energy and Commerce Committee and I as the Democratic ranking member wrote the first SGR fix, so I have been fixing the SGR for a long time. But we shouldn't be focused in this body and that body on paying doctors at the cost of shortchanging our children. Our priority must be passing a full 4-year, clean extension of the current CHIP program, on which 130,000 children in my State depend—again, sons and daughters of working Oklahoma families and working Ohio families who are working in jobs where they simply don't get insurance and don't get paid enough that

they can buy insurance. These 10 million children in our Nation depend on this.

A 4-year extension of CHIP will provide Congress, the administration, and our States with the necessary time to collect relevant data and information to fully analyze and prepare for the future of kids covered. Doing only 2 years is not just shortchanging these children and creating anxiety in their families, it is also truncating our ability, compromising our ability to really understand how to fully integrate CHIP into a health care system overall in the future. We should be providing certainty and stability for these families, not the cliché of kicking the can down the road in favor of a short-term fix. A 4-year extension provides that certainty and will make a difference into the next decade on how, in fact, we take care of low-income children.

In Ohio alone, CHIP provides insurance to 130,000 children. Enrollment is expected to grow over the next couple of years. I have traveled across Ohio in the last few weeks and have met with parents and children, doctors and nurses, to discuss CHIP. I have been to Cincinnati Children's Hospital and Toledo Children's Hospital, Columbus's Nationwide Children's Hospital and Cleveland's Rainbow Children's Hospital. This morning, I was in Mahoning Valley in Boardman, a suburb of Youngstown, at the Akron Children's Hospital. More than 6,000 children in Mahoning Valley rely on CHIP for care.

I met with Ericka Flaherty, a Youngstown parent whose children could lose comprehensive coverage if we don't extend CHIP now. Her son Chase was born prematurely, born at 27 weeks. He was immediately diagnosed with a number of chronic conditions, including a heart defect, chronic lung disease, and asthma. Chase spent more than 4 months in neonatal care, and, thanks to outstanding doctors at Akron Children's Hospital, he is alive and growing today. But he needs many routine medical visits—visits his family simply can't afford. His parents work, but they simply can't afford to treat his conditions, including visits to lung specialists, neurologists, an eye specialist, and the regular hospital checkup every 2 months. Without CHIP, Ericka would face significant financial hurdles in getting Chase the care he needs.

I also met with Jessica Miller of Lisbon, a community just south of Mahoning County, during this roundtable. Her youngest son, Payton, was diagnosed with a serious respiratory condition. He had to be life-flighted to Akron Children's Hospital to receive care when he couldn't breathe. He has been diagnosed with type 1 juvenile diabetes. His grandmother joined us. Jessica told me that she is so thankful for CHIP, that she gets Payton all the care he needs to treat these conditions—

care she and her husband Justin would have a hard time affording otherwise. Justin is working as a paramedic. He was called out and couldn't be at our meeting today. Justin is full time in nursing school. They are making something of their lives. I don't want them to be anxious about the health care of their children.

Throughout Ohio, I hear the same thing: Providing health insurance to children like Chase and Payton isn't just the right thing to do, it is the smart thing to do. It means children do better in school. They feel better when they are in school. They miss fewer days in school because they get preventive care because their health care needs are taken care of.

CHIP has been around 18, almost 20 years. It has always been bipartisan. If we follow these children later in life, we see they have higher rates of going to college and higher earnings than non-CHIP kids who don't have insurance. By all kinds of very quantifiable measurements, CHIP is not just good for those families, it is not just the right thing to do to continue to fund CHIP over 4 years, it is also the smart thing to do for our country.

Together with more than 40 of my colleagues, I introduced the Protecting & Retaining Our Children's Health Insurance Program—PRO-CHIP—Act, which is a clean 4-year extension of funding for CHIP. PRO-CHIP would protect the Pediatric Quality Measures Program and provide funding to sustain this program through 2019.

It would also extend the Performance Incentive Program, which provides bonus payments to States that help increase Medicaid enrollment among children, because if we provide insurance for low-income children, they are going to do better, and society is going to do better. They are less likely to end up in the emergency room for something much more serious. For instance, for a child without insurance who has an earache, the mother and father think that it is going to cost a lot of money to go to the doctor and that maybe it will just get better, they wait a week. Into the second week, the pain is worse. The child can't sleep. The child cries. They eventually go to the emergency room, which costs a lot more money than going to the doctor's office, with the possibility that the child has had hearing loss. That is just one example of why we want to provide insurance and get them into the doctor early rather than waiting until later.

PRO-CHIP has been endorsed by every children's hospital in Ohio, the Association of Children's Hospitals, virtually every children's hospital, I believe, in the country, and other national groups—the March of Dimes, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Children's Hospital Association, and Families USA, all of which want a clean CHIP. All of them want a 4-year

extension for all the reasons we talked about.

More than 1,500 organizations from across the country—including more than 75 groups from Ohio and a number from Oklahoma, the Presiding Officer's State—have written to Congress asking us to “take action as soon as possible to provide a four-year funding extension for CHIP.”

Groups, including the Urban Institute, the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, and the Bipartisan Policy Center, have all noted the importance of the current CHIP program.

The Urban Institute estimated that an additional 1.1 million children will become uninsured if separate CHIP coverage were eliminated. Again, these are sons and daughters of parents who have jobs—jobs that don't provide insurance and jobs that don't pay enough that they can afford insurance. This would be a 40-percent increase, if this were to happen, in the number of uninsured children in the United States relative to the number projected under the ACA with the continuation of CHIP.

The Bipartisan Policy Center has called for extending CHIP for more than just the 2 years, but note what they say when calling for a CHIP extension: “Two years does not provide sufficient time for state and federal elected officials and agencies to address major programmatic changes sought by policymakers on both sides of the aisle and at both levels of government.”

Support for CHIP has always been bipartisan. Senator HATCH, Republican from Utah; Senator Kennedy, Democrat from Massachusetts; a number of us on the Energy and Commerce Committee in the House of Representatives back in 1997, Republicans and Democrats alike; and Chairman BILIRAKIS and I and others helped to write this legislation which has been successful at bringing the uninsured rate for children down by more than 50 percent. I am encouraged that Members of both

parties have shown a willingness to come together. Senate Democrats will have a hard time supporting any plan that doesn't extend CHIP for a full 4 years.

I want to support the sustainable growth rate. I helped write the original one. I have supported it for 20 years. We shouldn't be doing it like this on a temporary 1- or 2-year basis. This is finally going to get done right, but we don't do that and then leave out the children by only providing 2 years.

Parents like Ericka and Jessica face enough uncertainty with their children's health. Most of us in this body are parents, and a number of us are grandparents. Most of us, because we dress like this and we are Senators and have good insurance provided by taxpayers—we may have anxiety about our children and our grandchildren's health, but we don't have anxiety about their insurance and their ability to go to hospitals and doctors and specialists to get care. Certainly, we are anxious about our children and all the things that could happen, but our anxiety doesn't reach into the whole sphere of worrying about how to provide insurance for children.

Ericka and Jessica can't be anything but anxious when they hear that CHIP could end, and they understand that it should be 4 years. CHIP gives parents like them peace of mind that they will be able to get their children the care they need without bankrupting those families. We need to make sure these parents continue to have that peace of mind with a 4-year extension. The PRO-CHIP legislation we have introduced in the Senate with almost four dozen cosponsors makes sure those kids don't lose critical coverage by saying no to any deal that doesn't fund CHIP for the full 4 years.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

PATRICIA M. LOUI-SCHMICKER, OF HAWAII, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

IAN C. KELLY, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GEORGIA.

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### *To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. ARNOLD W. BUNCH, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### *To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. STEPHEN W. WILSON

##### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### *To be vice admiral*

VICE ADM. JAMES F. CALDWELL, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### *To be vice admiral*

REAR ADM. MICHAEL T. FRANKEN

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 2015:

##### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CARLOS A. MONJE, JR., OF LOUISIANA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION.

##### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MANSON K. BROWN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 16, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 16, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TOM EMMER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

### CHRISTIAN PERSECUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the sobering but extremely consequential topic of Christian persecution.

Last week, I had the honor of visiting with more than 100 parishioners of St. Alphonsus Liguori Catholic Church in Zionsville, Indiana, including many interested high school students who shared with me their passionate concerns about the senseless persecution of their Christian brethren.

Through the church's Social Action Committee, they wanted to know how a small, faithful community could make a difference in bringing attention to this commonly overlooked matter. However, they wondered if their cries for mercy were falling on deaf ears in Washington. They felt helpless in bringing to light the barbarity, torture, and living conditions that Christians in places like Iran endure.

The parishioners at St. Alphonsus felt that too often horrendous massacres are met with isolationism and arguments that it is not America's job

to promote human rights beyond our shores.

Today I want to let the people of St. Alphonsus and all those who seek to give a voice to the silenced victims of religious persecution know I hear you, and others in Washington, D.C., do as well.

I believe that America must re-assume its leadership role in protecting those most destitute and downtrodden, that American leadership in the world should advance not only our national interests but also the interests of those who yearn for freedom across the globe, that Christians who have to shield their faith for fear of crucifixion or beheading have an ally in America, an ally who will fight for the dignity of all mankind.

Incidents of persecution of Christians more than doubled in 2014 alone. I wish I could say I was surprised by this increase, but I am not. I think this is part of the larger trend around the globe.

The world we live in is remarkably unstable right now. People lack security. Too many regions of our world are fending off the rise of groups that espouse extremely radical ideologies, groups that hate this Nation, groups that often hate all other religions, groups that feed off of destruction and poverty, groups that value violence over peace, groups that are clearly not a true or worthy representation of the religions they claim as their own.

The parishioners at St. Alphonsus Church asked me: What can we do?

I told them America first needs a smart and decisive plan because the threat Christians face is significant, and it is not going away.

The United States must work with free nations across the globe to reaffirm a simple but important message: human rights are not negotiable. Countries don't get to pick and choose which rights they allow and which ones they deny. We also need to work more locally to raise awareness of the specific issue of Christian persecution. There must be a strong grassroots element to this effort.

Each month, approximately 180 Christians are killed across the globe because of their faith. That is a startling number. In America, a country where it is so easy to take our freedoms for granted, it is easy not to notice the pain and suffering of others, but we must. And I know we are a truly generous and kind people.

When Japanese communities were torn apart by a massive tsunami in

2009, Americans mobilized to donate more than \$700 million in charitable relief.

Americans always answer the call when people are suffering. Well, today there is clearly a tsunami of hatred sweeping parts of the world, and there are people who need our help. So churches and other groups with a concern for their fellow Christians and all global citizens need to take a stand.

Like those at St. Alphonsus have, Christians and people of all faiths across this Nation need to reach out to their elected officials and let them know of the tragic persecution of Christians and that it deserves attention, that religious freedom is a value we must defend and promote. Only then will everyone in this body know what was foretold in Matthew, that blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven. Let us now work to bring that kingdom of Heaven closer to Earth.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM) at 2 p.m.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. In this Chamber where the people's House gathers, we pause to offer You gratitude for the gift of this good land on which we live and for this great Nation which You have inspired in developing over so many years. Continue to inspire the American people that, through the difficulties of these days, we might keep liberty and justice alive in our Nation and in the world.

A week after many Members of this assembly traveled to Selma to remember historic and heroic actions 50 years ago, may the House be energized to guarantee the very rights so many suffered to obtain back then and which

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



still elude so many of their American descendants today.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KILDEE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANOTHER OBAMACARE DEBACLE

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last month, the Obama administration admitted that it sent inaccurate tax forms to 820,000 Americans who receive health insurance through ObamaCare. Individuals who received subsidies must fill out the 1095-A form to document what they have received for the past year.

The government is advising people not to file their tax returns until they have the correct forms, but just last week Kevin Counihan, the man responsible and accountable for leading healthcare.gov, declined to say when ObamaCare participants will get the correct tax forms and if all of the new forms have been created.

Since its implementation, the President's health care law has proved to be a hindrance, not a help, to the health care market. This debacle is yet another example of why we must continue to work towards repealing this ill-conceived law and replacing it with policies that empower patients and promote access to affordable health care options.

### JOBS

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I just got back from spending a week at home in Michigan talking with the people that I work for and meeting with small business owners. I heard a lot of frustration—frustration about the priorities of the Republican leadership in the House and of Congress in general.

Instead of legislation to create jobs here in America to make it easier for hardworking families to buy their own home, to afford to send their kids to school, and to save for retirement, this Congress has bounced from one manufactured political crisis to the next and has not taken on the big challenges that the people sent us here to take on.

Let's put away this dysfunction and this paralysis. Let's get back to the work of the American people.

As we now are set to consider our Nation's budget, let's make sure that the priorities of the American people—good paying jobs, affordable college, homeownership, and the ability to save for a decent retirement—that those priorities are the priorities that we include in this important budget document. This is what the American people expect of us, and this is what we should take on.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 16, 2015 at 10:38 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 7.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,  
*Deputy Clerk.*

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1530

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the

vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

### IMPROVING REGULATORY TRANSPARENCY FOR NEW MEDICAL THERAPIES ACT

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 639) to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 639

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act".

#### SEC. 2. SCHEDULING OF SUBSTANCES INCLUDED IN NEW FDA-APPROVED DRUGS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPROVAL.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE OF DRUG APPROVAL.—Section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(X) DATE OF APPROVAL IN THE CASE OF RECOMMENDED CONTROLS UNDER THE CSA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an application under subsection (b) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

"(2) DATE OF APPROVAL.—For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in paragraph (1), the term 'date of approval' shall mean the later of—

"(A) the date an application under subsection (b) is approved under subsection (c); or

"(B) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPROVAL OF BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS.—Section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(n) DATE OF APPROVAL IN THE CASE OF RECOMMENDED CONTROLS UNDER THE CSA.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an application under subsection (a) with respect to a biological product for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule controlling the biological product is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

"(2) DATE OF APPROVAL.—For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in paragraph (1), references to the date of approval of such application, or licensure of the product subject to such application, shall mean the later of—

"(A) the date an application is approved under subsection (a); or

“(B) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the biological product.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE OF APPROVAL OF ANIMAL DRUGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 512 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) DATE OF APPROVAL IN THE CASE OF RECOMMENDED CONTROLS UNDER THE CSA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an application under subsection (b) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

“(2) DATE OF APPROVAL.—For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in paragraph (1), the term ‘date of approval’ shall mean the later of—

“(A) the date an application under subsection (b) is approved under subsection (c); or

“(B) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug.”.

(B) CONDITIONAL APPROVAL.—Section 571(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4)(A) In the case of an application under subsection (a) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the sponsor that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, conditional approval of such application shall not take effect until the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.

“(B) For purposes of this section, with respect to an application described in subparagraph (A), the term ‘date of approval’ shall mean the later of—

“(i) the date an application under subsection (a) is conditionally approved under subsection (b); or

“(ii) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug.”.

(C) INDEXING OF LEGALLY MARKETED UNAPPROVED NEW ANIMAL DRUGS.—Section 572 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc-1) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) In the case of a request under subsection (d) to add a drug to the index under subsection (a) with respect to a drug for which the Secretary provides notice to the person filing the request that the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, a determination to grant the request to add such drug to the index shall not take effect, and the Secretary shall not list the drug on such index, until the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.”.

(4) DATE OF APPROVAL FOR DESIGNATED NEW ANIMAL DRUGS.—Section 573(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360ccc-2(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) For purposes of determining the 7-year period of exclusivity under paragraph (1) for a drug for which the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, the drug shall not be considered approved or conditionally approved until the date that the interim final rule controlling the drug is issued in accordance

with section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.”.

(b) SCHEDULING OF NEWLY APPROVED DRUGS.—Section 201 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 811) is amended by inserting after subsection (i) the following:

“(j)(1) With respect to a drug referred to in subsection (f), if the Secretary of Health and Human Services recommends that the Attorney General add the drug to schedule II, III, IV, or V pursuant to subsections (a) and (b), the Attorney General shall, not later than 90 days after the date described in paragraph (2), issue an interim final rule controlling the drug in accordance with such subsections and section 202(b) using the procedures described in paragraph (3).

“(2) The date described in this paragraph shall be the later of—

“(A) the date on which the Attorney General receives the scientific and medical evaluation and recommendations from the Secretary of Health and Human Services in accordance with subsection (b); or

“(B) the date on which the Attorney General receives notification from the Secretary of Health and Human Services that the Secretary has approved an application under section 505(c), 512, 571, or 572 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the drug described in paragraph (1).

“(3) A rule issued by the Attorney General under paragraph (1) shall be in accordance with the procedures provided in subsection (a), except that the rule shall become immediately effective as an interim final rule without requiring the Attorney General to demonstrate good cause therefor. After publication of the interim final rule, the Attorney General shall issue a final rule in accordance with the procedures provided in subsection (a).”.

(c) EXTENSION OF PATENT TERM.—Section 156 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting “; or in the case of a drug product described in subsection (i) within the sixty-day period beginning on the covered date (as defined in subsection (i))” after “marketing or use”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(i)(1) For purposes of this section, if the Secretary of Health and Human Services provides notice to the sponsor of an application or request for approval, conditional approval, or indexing of a drug product for which the Secretary intends to recommend controls under the Controlled Substances Act, beginning on the covered date, the drug product shall be considered to—

“(A) have been approved under the relevant provision of the Public Health Service Act or Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and

“(B) have permission for commercial marketing or use.

“(2) In this subsection, the term ‘covered date’ means the later of—

“(A) the date an application is approved—

“(i) under section 351(a)(2)(C) of the Public Health Service Act; or

“(ii) under section 505(b) or 512(c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

“(B) the date an application is conditionally approved under section 571(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act;

“(C) the date a request for indexing is granted under section 572(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; or

“(D) the date of issuance of the interim final rule controlling the drug under section 201(j) of the Controlled Substances Act.”.

### SEC. 3. ENHANCING NEW DRUG DEVELOPMENT.

Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i)(1) For purposes of registration to manufacture a controlled substance under subsection (d) for use only in a clinical trial, the Attorney General shall register the applicant, or serve an order to show cause upon the applicant in accordance with section 304(c), not later than 180 days after the date on which the application is accepted for filing.

“(2) For purposes of registration to manufacture a controlled substance under subsection (a) for use only in a clinical trial, the Attorney General shall, in accordance with the regulations issued by the Attorney General, issue a notice of application not later than 90 days after the application is accepted for filing. Not later than 90 days after the date on which the period for comment pursuant to such notice ends, the Attorney General shall register the applicant, or serve an order to show cause upon the applicant in accordance with section 304(c), unless the Attorney General has granted a hearing on the application under section 1008(i) of the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will include an exchange of letters between the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 639 seeks to improve the transparency and consistency of the Drug Enforcement Administration's first scheduling of new FDA-approved drugs under the Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, and, secondly, its registration process for the manufacture of controlled substances for use in clinical trials. Ultimately, this will allow new and innovative treatments to get to patients who desperately need them.

Due to the cost and uncertainty of the drug development process, there is broad agreement that a predictable timeline for approval decisions is a necessary component to successful drug development.

Industry, the FDA, and Congress have taken steps to provide more transparency and consistency in the drug approval process through the negotiation and authorization of the Prescription Drug User Fee program and a commitment to review goals embedded in the PDUFA agreements.

However, drugs that contain substances that have not been previously marketed in the U.S. and that have abuse potential must also be scheduled under the Controlled Substances Act, the CSA, by the DEA before they can reach patients.

Under the CSA, there is no deadline for the DEA to make a scheduling decision, and the delays in DEA decisions have increased significantly. Between 1997 and 1999 and 2009 and 2013, the average time between FDA approval and DEA's final scheduling increased from an average of 49.3 days to an average of 237.6 days. Recently, a company had to wait over 13 months after FDA approval to receive a final scheduling recommendation from the DEA.

The lack of predictability in the timing of DEA scheduling decisions leads to unnecessary uncertainty in the drug development process and needless delays in patient access to new therapies.

Section 2 of H.R. 639, as amended by the full committee, would require DEA to issue an interim final rule, scheduling the new drug no later than 90 days after it is approved or when it receives the FDA's scheduling recommendation, whichever comes later. After receiving the FDA's recommendation, the DEA would continue to conduct its own analysis prior to scheduling the drug, but patients would now have peace of mind in knowing this will no longer be an open-ended process. Of note: since 1996, the DEA has not made any scheduling decision for a new drug that was contrary to the FDA recommendation.

Further, section 3 of this bill would bring much-needed certainty to another open-ended DEA process. Manufacturers of controlled substances are required to be registered with the DEA. The requirement to register extends to manufacturers of controlled substances intended to be used in clinical trials for products not yet approved by the FDA. There is no timetable for the DEA to grant approval of registration applications, and there is not a process for the applicant to determine the reasons for delay in the application. The lack of transparency, predictability, and timeliness in the registration process leaves companies unable to properly plan clinical trial schedules for prospective new therapies.

For registration applications related to schedule III, IV, and V drugs that will only be used in clinical trials, section 3, as amended by the full committee, would require the DEA to register the applicant or serve an order to show cause on why the applicant shall not be registered within 180 days of the filing of the application.

For drugs in schedule I and II that will only be used in a clinical trial, the DEA would be required to issue a notice of application not later than 90 days after an application is accepted

for filing. Ninety days after the end of the comment period, pursuant to the notice, the DEA would be required to register the applicant or serve an order to show cause on why the registrant should not be registered.

Such a solution does not force the DEA to make a particular decision but will provide transparency to the process so companies can better plan when regulatory decisions will be made.

I would urge all Members to support this critical piece of legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
March 16, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,*  
*Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-*  
*ington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN UPTON: I am writing with respect to H.R. 639, the "Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 639 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree to discharge our Committee from further consideration of this bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 639 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and asks that you support any such request.

I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 639, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration of H.R. 639.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,  
*Chairman.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,  
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Ray-*  
*burn House Office Building Washington,*  
*DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 639, the "Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act." As you noted, there are provisions of the bill that fall within the Committee on the Judiciary's Rule X jurisdiction.

I appreciate your willingness to forgo action on H.R. 639, and I agree that your decision is not a waiver of any of the Committee on the Judiciary's jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that the Committee will be consulted appropriately and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward. In addition, I understand the Committee reserves the right to seek the appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-

Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, for which you will have my support.

I will include a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 639 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman.*

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 639, the Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act. This legislation was introduced by the chair of our Health Subcommittee, JOE PITTS of Pennsylvania; the ranking member of the full committee, FRANK PALLONE of New Jersey; and myself to provide a solution to delays experienced by patients in need.

Currently, new drugs and substances that previously have not been marketed in the United States and that have abuse potential must be scheduled by the Drug Enforcement Administration prior to being marketed.

The amount of time the DEA has taken before acting on FDA recommendations has significantly lengthened in recent years, which delays the availability of new therapies.

This legislation will improve patient access by bringing clarity and transparency to the process of scheduling a new FDA-approved therapy.

I was pleased to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) in supporting this legislation to continue the great work they started last Congress. I thank them and their staff for working on this important access issue.

I want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON and the work of the committee's minority and majority staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee. I support this bipartisan bill and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office for H.R. 639.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 2015.

Hon. FRED UPTON,  
*Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,*  
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 639, the Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Julia Christensen.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF.

Enclosure.

AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE ON FEBRUARY 12, 2015

H.R. 639 would modify the administrative procedures followed by the Department of Justice in regulating new drugs that are already approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and in authorizing drugs to be used in clinical trials. The legislation would aim to streamline the current review and approval process. CBO estimates that implementing the bill would have no significant effect on spending subject to appropriation. Enacting the legislation would affect direct spending and revenues related to federal health care costs; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. CBO estimates that that those effects would also not be significant over the 2015–2025 period.

The legislation would change the effective date of FDA approval for certain new drugs that undergo review by the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) to determine if the drug should be marketed with restrictions as a controlled substance. Such a change could extend certain regulatory periods during which FDA will not accept marketing applications or permit another manufacturer to market a version of an affected drug and could also result in the extension of patent terms for certain products. Extending such periods of marketing exclusivity could delay the entry of lower-priced generic drugs on the market, and such a delay would increase the average cost for prescription drugs. Any increase in health care costs resulting from delaying the market entry of generic drugs would affect direct spending and revenues by increasing the cost of prescription drugs for federal health programs and private health insurance.

CBO expects that the bill's provisions would apply to a limited number of drugs subject to DEA classification after enactment. Because most drugs generally retain patent protections after FDA approval for more than 10 years, CBO anticipates that the likelihood that drugs affected by the bill will face generic competition before 2025 under current law would be small. As a result, we estimate that enacting the bill would not significantly affect direct spending or revenues over the 2015–2025 period. Beyond 2025, however, the potential for the legislation to delay the market entry of generic drugs would be greater, and the effect on direct spending and revenues would increase in later years.

H.R. 639 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments. The bill would impose a private-sector mandate, as defined under UMRA, on manufacturers of generic drugs by delaying the entry of those products in the market. The cost of the mandate would be the net loss of income, which could be significant depending on the drug. Based on information from industry sources, CBO estimates that the cost of the mandate would probably fall below the annual threshold established in UMRA for private-sector mandates (\$154 million in 2015, adjusted annually for inflation).

The CBO staff contacts for this estimate are Julia Christensen and Mark Grabowicz (for federal costs) and Amy Petz (for private sector costs). The estimate was approved by Theresa Gullo, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lend my support to H.R. 639, the Improving

Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act. This important public health bill aims to bring better reliability and transparency to medical therapies, while continuing to ensure that they reach patients in need quickly, but most importantly safely and effectively.

When a new drug is approved by the FDA, a company can begin marketing the product upon its approval. However, for a subset of drugs, FDA recommends to the DEA they be included in the Controlled Substance Act—or “scheduled,” if there is abuse potential. Until DEA makes a final decision, a drug cannot be released to the public.

Unfortunately, there is no deadline for the DEA to make a decision. As a result, the process has lengthened over time, in some instances lasting years before a decision is made. So even if a drug is considered safe and effective, patients and physicians are being forced to wait to access these therapies. This bill would continue to allow DEA to conduct its own analysis, but would remove much of the uncertainty from the process. It also would speed up the DEA registration process allowing the manufacture and distribution of controlled substances for use only in clinical trials.

I want to thank Chairman PITTS for working with me on this bill last Congress, and committing to move forward early this Congress. Thank you to Mr. GREEN as well for joining us on this important bill.

I am glad that we have been able to work with both DEA and FDA, our Senate counterparts and the bill sponsors, to ensure that the goals of this bill is met.

I urge members to support H.R. 639 and I look forward to its swift passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 639, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ACCESS TO LIFE-SAVING TRAUMA CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 647) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 647

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act”.

#### SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF TRAUMA AND EMERGENCY CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) TRAUMA CENTER CARE GRANTS.—Section 1245 of the Public Health Service Act (42

U.S.C. 300d-45) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by striking “2009, and such” and inserting “2009, such”; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: “, and \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020”.

(b) TRAUMA SERVICE AVAILABILITY GRANTS.—Section 1282 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-82) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

#### SEC. 3. ALIGNMENT OF PROGRAMS UNDER ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.

Section 2811(c)(2)(F) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300hh-10(c)(2)(F)) is amended by striking “trauma care under parts A through C of title XII” and inserting “trauma care under parts A through D of title XII and part H of such title”.

#### SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS RELATING TO TRAUMA CENTER GRANTS.

(a) CLARIFICATION ON ELIGIBLE TRAUMA CENTERS.—Section 1241(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-41(a)) is amended by striking “qualified public, nonprofit Indian Health Service, Indian tribal, and urban Indian trauma centers” and inserting “qualified public trauma centers, qualified nonprofit trauma centers, and qualified Indian Health Service, Indian tribal, and urban Indian trauma centers”.

(b) TRAUMA CENTER GRANTS QUALIFICATIONS FOR SUBSTANTIAL UNCOMPENSATED CARE COSTS.—Section 1241(b)(3)(B) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-41(b)(3)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “35” and inserting “30”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “50” and inserting “40”.

(c) CLARIFICATION RELATING TO TRAUMA CENTER GRANTS.—The heading for part D of title XII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-41 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

#### “PART D—TRAUMA CENTERS”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House today will consider two bills relating to Federal support for trauma care. These bills have both passed the Energy and Commerce Committee at the subcommittee and full committee levels on voice votes.

Trauma is the leading cause of death under the age of 65. It is expensive, costing over \$400 billion per year, third only to heart disease and cancer. It affects individuals of all ages—35 million

Americans annually, or one person every 15 minutes.

Over many years, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) and I have worked closely on this issue to update the law and ensure the reauthorization of crucial trauma grant programs occurs. As a result of this coordination, today we will be voting on two bills that continue our long bipartisan record of support for efforts to shore up the Nation's trauma systems and centers.

The Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act, H.R. 647, will authorize two grant programs, which will expire this year, that provide critically needed Federal funding to help cover uncompensated costs in trauma centers, support core mission trauma services, provide emergency funding to trauma centers, and address trauma center physician shortages in order to ensure the future availability of trauma care for all our citizens.

Trauma can happen at any time to anyone. It can happen to a family in a highway crash or a gunshot victim or a construction worker who is injured at the worksite. Trauma centers must be available for all victims of traumatic injury. Getting a trauma victim to a trauma center right away is the first step in saving that person's life.

These bills draw support from the American Association of Neurological Surgeons, the American Association of Orthopedic Surgeons, the American Burn Association, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the American College of Surgeons, the American Trauma Society, the Congress of Neurological Surgeons, the Association of Critical Care Transport, the American Heart Association, the American Stroke Association, Emergency Nurses Association, Society of Trauma Nurses, the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma, Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma, National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians, the Orthopedic Trauma Association, and the Trauma Center Association of America.

I strongly urge the House to support both of these bills.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 647, the Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act. My colleague and fellow Texan, Dr. MIKE BURGESS, and I have introduced this legislation. I thank him for his leadership and partnership on this issue.

The bill would reauthorize vital programs to prevent more trauma center closures and improve access to trauma care.

The trauma center care grants were created to prevent trauma center closures by supporting their core mis-

sions, covering a portion of the losses from uncompensated care, and providing emergency awards to centers at risk of closing.

The trauma service availability grants are awarded through the States to address shortfalls in trauma services and improve access and availability of trauma care in underserved areas.

□ 1545

Despite our best prevention efforts, trauma injury will continue to occur. Unfortunately, access to trauma care is threatened by losses associated with the high cost of treating severely injured patients, including those unable to pay for their care, and a growing shortage of trauma-related physicians.

The public expects that appropriate trauma care will always be available to them wherever they reside or travel, yet this is not a reality. Profound challenges face our Nation's trauma centers, trauma systems, and the physicians who treat the most vulnerable patients. Thus, I urge swift passage of this important legislation.

Again, I want to thank Representative BURGESS for championing this effort with me, and his staff, J.P. Paluskiewicz, for their hard work. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member PALLONE and the work of the committee's staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

I support this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out the gentleman's name is J.P. Paluskiewicz, and we do, indeed, thank him for his efforts on the bill.

I have no more speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out many people nowadays are familiar with what is called the golden hour, that first hour that occurs after a traumatic injury where the ability to save life and limb is vastly increased if a person can be delivered to a center within that golden hour's time. It is imperative to reauthorize these programs. They are critically needed for our citizens. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote on the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 647.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### TRAUMA SYSTEMS AND REGIONALIZATION OF EMERGENCY CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 648) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 648

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act".

#### SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN TRAUMA CARE PROGRAMS.

Section 1232(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-32(a)) is amended by striking "2014" and inserting "2020".

#### SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS AND CLARIFICATIONS TO CERTAIN TRAUMA CARE PROGRAMS.

(a) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR REGIONALIZED SYSTEMS FOR EMERGENCY CARE RESPONSE.—Section 1232(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-31(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015, not more than 50 percent of such amounts remaining for such fiscal year after application of paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be allocated for the purpose of carrying out section 1204."

(b) CLARIFICATIONS UNDER TRAUMA SYSTEMS FORMULA GRANTS REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE AMERICAN BURN ASSOCIATION.—Section 1213 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-13) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by inserting "and (for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015) contains national standards and requirements of the American Burn Association for the designation of verified burn centers," after "such entity,";

(2) in subsection (b)(3)(A), by striking "and the American Academy of Pediatrics," and inserting "the American Academy of Pediatrics, and (for a fiscal year after fiscal year 2015) the American Burn Association,"; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting "and not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act" after "Act of 2007"; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and the American Academy of Pediatrics" and inserting "the American Academy of Pediatrics, and (with respect to the update pursuant to the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act) the American Burn Association".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Part B of title XII of the Public Health Service Act is amended—

(1) in section 1218(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 300d-18(c)(2)), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “1232(b)(3)” and inserting “section 1232(b)”;

(2) in section 1222 (42 U.S.C. 300d-22), by striking “October 1, 2008” and inserting “October 1, 2017”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, H.R. 648, is identical to H.R. 4080 that passed the House last year unanimously. This legislation has also passed both the subcommittee and the full committee. This support extends back to 1990 when the grant was created and authorized.

This reauthorization allows funding for trauma systems development and the regionalization of emergency care. These programs are designed to improve patient outcomes, and they are designed to save lives and cut costs, objectives where I believe there is bipartisan agreement.

Trauma systems are organized efforts in a defined geographic area that deliver the full range of care to injured patients. Many members of the subcommittee have trauma systems in their districts or ones nearby that are able to serve their constituents.

Regionalizing emergency care allows States to coordinate their resources and helps first responders act faster, leading to lower costs and better outcomes. A study released last year found that patients living near a recently closed trauma facility were 20 percent more likely to die from their injuries. Two years after closure, the likelihood of death increased to 29 percent, emphasizing the importance of these grants.

This legislation is broadly supported by medicine, sharing the list of supporting organizations that I previously read on H.R. 647. It is bipartisan. I would stress it has gone through regular order.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON and Chairman PITTS, as well as Ranking Member PALLONE and Ranking Member GREEN, for their help and support on this legislation. I want to thank the Energy and Commerce staff on both

sides of the dais: Clay Alspach, Katie Novaria, as well as Hannah Green, and a special thanks to Adrianna Simonelli, who championed both of these bills as my legislative fellow and who is now working on the committee.

Mr. GREEN and I have worked on these issues literally for years, and I appreciate his continued partnership on this bill. I want to thank his staff, Kristen O'Neill. Finally, I do want to thank J.P. Paluskiewicz, who shepherded this bill through the entire process.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 648, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act. I am proud to be the lead sponsor of this bill, along with my colleague, Dr. BURGESS, and I want to thank him for his leadership and commitment to this issue.

The bill reauthorizes the programs that provide grants to States for planning, implementing, and developing trauma care systems and establishing pilot projects to design innovative models of emergency care systems.

Ideally, trauma and emergency care systems respond quickly and efficiently to ensure that seriously injured individuals receive the care they need within the golden hour, the time period in which medical intervention is most effective at saving lives. However, unintentional injury remains the leading cause of death for Americans ages 44 years and younger, and access to trauma centers is inconsistent throughout the country. In fact, 45 million Americans lack access to a trauma center within the first hour after injury.

Emergency departments and trauma centers are overcrowded. The emergency care system is splintered, and surgical specialists are often unavailable to patients when they need them. This legislation helps establish a system that saves lives and improves the functioning of our trauma care systems.

Again, I want to thank Representative BURGESS for championing this effort with me and his staff for their efforts. I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, Ranking Member PALLONE, and the work of the committee's staff in advancing this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bipartisan bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by strongly urging all Members of the House to vote in favor of this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 648.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker, The Capitol,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write today to resign from the House Small Business Committee. While I appreciate the honor of being appointed, in order to best serve the constituent of Texas' 23rd congressional district, I believe I must focus on my existing committee assignments.

With my background in the intelligence community, cybersecurity, and representing the district with the largest length of U.S.-Mexico Border, my ability to focus on my Information Technology Subcommittee Chairmanship and Border and Maritime Subcommittee Vice-Chairmanship is where I believe I can be of most value to my constituents and colleagues in the House.

I appreciate your timely consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

WILL HURD,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1630

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.



# NOTICE OF OBSERVATION TREATMENT AND IMPLICATION FOR CARE ELIGIBILITY ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 876) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 876

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

## SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act” or the “NOTICE Act”.

## SEC. 2. MEDICARE REQUIREMENT FOR HOSPITAL NOTIFICATIONS OF OBSERVATION STATUS.

Section 1866(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395cc(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (V), by striking at the end “and”;

(2) in the first subparagraph (W), by striking at the end the period and inserting a comma;

(3) in the second subparagraph (W)—

(A) by redesignating such subparagraph as subparagraph (X); and

(B) by striking at the end the period and inserting “, and”;

(4) by inserting after such subparagraph (X) the following new subparagraph:

“(Y) beginning 12 months after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, in the case of a hospital or critical access hospital, with respect to each individual who receives observation services as an outpatient at such hospital or critical access hospital for more than 24 hours, to provide to such individual not later than 36 hours after the time such individual begins receiving such services (or, if sooner, upon release)—

“(i) such oral explanation of the written notification described in clause (ii), and such documentation of the provision of such explanation, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

“(ii) a written notification (as specified by the Secretary pursuant to rulemaking and containing such language as the Secretary prescribes consistent with this paragraph) which—

“(I) explains the status of the individual as an outpatient receiving observation services and not as an inpatient of the hospital or critical access hospital and the reasons for such status of such individual;

“(II) explains the implications of such status on services furnished by the hospital or critical access hospital (including services furnished on an inpatient basis), such as implications for cost-sharing requirements under this title and for subsequent eligibility for coverage under this title for services furnished by a skilled nursing facility;

“(III) includes such additional information as the Secretary determines appropriate;

“(IV) either—

“(aa) is signed by such individual or a person acting on such individual’s behalf to acknowledge receipt of such notification; or

“(bb) if such individual or person refuses to provide the signature described in item (aa), is signed by the staff member of the hospital or critical access hospital who presented the

written notification and includes the name and title of such staff member, a certification that the notification was presented, and the date and time the notification was presented; and

“(V) is written and formatted using plain language and is made available in appropriate languages as determined by the Secretary.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 876, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this is commonsense legislation dealing with the Medicare program that is bipartisan that the Committee on Ways and Means marked up a couple of weeks ago.

I want to just commend my colleagues Congressman YOUNG from Indiana and Congressman DOGGETT from Texas for their work on this.

This is common sense. This tells patients what the rules are so that they know what is going to happen when they are in the hospital, so they know what kind of billing they are going to have.

I yield whatever time he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the coauthor of this legislation, for the purpose of describing this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for taking up this important piece of legislation today. I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) for his leadership on this issue.

When seniors require a hospital stay, they are rightfully more concerned with their recovery than with understanding how the hospital classifies their status as a patient; but when that classification can impact future coverage of health care services related to their recovery, they deserve to be made aware of the potential ramifications.

This act, the NOTICE Act, would require hospitals to provide meaningful written and oral notification to patients who are in the hospital under observation for more than 24 hours. This notice would alert the beneficiary or person acting on their behalf of the Medicare patient’s admission status and the financial implications of that classification so he or she can advocate on their own behalf while in the hospital.

No one should be caught off guard by a large medical bill just because they weren’t aware of the status codes or the billing procedures. In a time of sickness and stress, families should focus on the recovery of their loved ones instead of dealing with the hidden costs due to lack of notice.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill and yield myself such time as I might consume.

The NOTICE Act, as the name suggests, is about giving notice. In this case, it gives notice to patients when they are about to be billed personally, perhaps for many thousands of dollars, because they were characterized as under observation rather than regular inpatient status without them even knowing.

I am pleased to have worked on this legislation since last summer with Mr. YOUNG when we originally filed the bill, and I am appreciative of Chairman RYAN’s prompt consideration of it in our committee.

This is a consumer protection bill designed to provide at least limited protection to health care consumers. Currently, a hospital may either admit a patient as an inpatient or keep them under observation. This categorization might apply to heart murmur, irregular heartbeat, indigestion, or other symptoms that would cause a senior or an individual with a disability who is covered by Medicare to go into the hospital.

It probably makes little or no difference in the way the hospital treats the physical condition, but it can make a very big difference in terms of how the patient’s pocketbook is cared for. Indeed, the effect of being under observation is that the patient gets stuck with the bill for any skilled nursing home care that is required for rehabilitative services after the stay at the hospital.

Medicare will pay for that needed care if a Medicare recipient patient is hospitalized for more than 3 days as an inpatient, but Medicare will not pay for skilled nursing home care if someone is simply under observation. Since Medicare has paid nothing, there is also no gap to be covered by Medigap; and instead of being in a gap, folks like this are really left in just a giant black hole. A Medicare patient that is sucked into this hole will be billed for the entire cost of rehabilitation at the nursing home, which can run into tens of thousands of dollars.

This practice is happening more and more across America, though it is largely unknown to most people until they get caught up in it. In 2012, Medicare patients had more than 600,000 observation stays that lasted 3 days or more. According to one study, over a 6-year span, the number of stays under observation has increased by 88 percent. Many Medicare patients are being put under observation for a length of



time that exceeds the guidelines that have been set by Medicare.

Last year on the NBC Nightly News, Kate Snow profiled Ms. Kelley-Nelum, who discovered that this costly classification had a big impact on her hospitalized husband. After repeated questioning and demanding to know why her husband was under observation, she got the hospital to reclassify him. She later learned that had that not occurred, had she not been persistent in standing up for her ill husband, that they would have faced about \$22,000 in out-of-pocket rehabilitation bills.

Last year, with so many patients facing insurmountable out-of-pocket costs for skilled nursing care after unknowingly being placed under observation, The New York Times actually ran a piece that was designed to provide guidance to health care consumers about how to get out of this observation category. The first step is knowing you are in it, and this bill provides for that meaningful disclosure.

This legislation is endorsed by AARP, by the Alliance for Retired Americans, the Center for Medicare Advocacy, the National Association of Professional Geriatric Care Managers, LeadingAge, American Health Care Association, and the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare.

I include in the RECORD letters from two of those groups in support of the legislation.

AARP,  
February 24, 2015.

Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,  
Rayburn Office Building,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.  
Hon. TODD YOUNG,  
Longworth Office Building,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DOGGETT AND REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG: On behalf of the nearly 38 million AARP members and the millions more Americans with Medicare, we are pleased to endorse the Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility (NOTICE) Act of 2015 (H.R. 876). Thank you for working together to address the growing problem of Medicare beneficiaries paying high out-of-pocket costs due to hospital stays in which they were classified as an outpatient, rather than being formally admitted as an inpatient.

As you know, the use of "observation status" has become more prevalent in recent years, and the duration of observation stays has grown longer. While there may be several reasons for these trends, it is clear that Medicare beneficiaries are spending more and more time in the hospital without being formally admitted. Admission as an inpatient activates Medicare Part A cost-sharing and a three-day stay requirement for skilled nursing facility (SNF) coverage; in contrast, observation status is billed under Part B, and can expose beneficiaries to unexpectedly high out-of-pocket costs amounting to thousands of dollars.

Beneficiaries must be informed and made aware of how any changes to their status will affect them. This legislation would require hospitals to provide meaningful written and oral notification to patients who are

in the hospital "under observation" for more than 24 hours. While this does not solve all the problems regarding cost-sharing and access to SNF coverage, it is an important step to ensuring Medicare beneficiaries have access to information about their care. Clearly understanding their admission status will help patients, and their caregivers, better plan treatment options with their health care providers.

Again, thank you for your continued work to protect Medicare beneficiaries. If you have any questions, please contact me, or have your staff contact Ariel Gonzalez, Director of Federal Health and Family.

Sincerely,

JOYCE A. ROGERS,  
Senior Vice President,  
Government Affairs.

AMERICAN HEALTH CARE ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, February 11, 2015.  
Hon. LLOYD DOGGETT,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

CONGRESSMAN DOGGETT: I serve as the president and chief executive officer of AHCA/NCAL, the nation's largest association of long term and post-acute care providers. The association advocates for quality care and services for the frail, elderly, and individuals with disabilities. Our members provide essential care to millions of individuals in more than 12,000 not for profit and for profit member facilities.

AHCA/NCAL, its affiliates, and member providers advocate for the continuing vitality of the long term care provider community. We are committed to developing and advocating for public policies that support quality care and quality of life for our nation's most vulnerable. Therefore, we are in support of the legislation, Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility (NOTICE) Act, that you and Congressman Todd Young (R-IN-9) have introduced again this Congress.

The NOTICE Act requires hospitals to give formal notice to patients within a period of time after classifying them as an inpatient or as an outpatient under observation. More specifically, the legislation works to ensure that hospitals notify patients entitled to Medicare part A coverage of their outpatient status within 36 hours after the time of their classification or, if sooner, upon discharge.

Often times, patients have no idea what their status is in a hospital or the importance of it. This can lead to thousands of dollars in out-of-pocket medical expenses should they need skilled nursing center care following their hospital stay. The observation stays issue is a financial burden on seniors and their families. It can cause unnecessary spend-down, accelerating the time frame in which seniors will have to turn to programs such as Medicaid to pay for their care.

This legislation is a positive step forward, and raises attention to a complex and critical issue hurting the nation's seniors. AHCA/NCAL applauds Congressmen Doggett and Young for serving as champions for seniors and those individuals who need our services the most.

Sincerely,

MARK PARKINSON,  
AHCA/NCAL President & CEO.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I also appreciate the help we have received from the Center for Medicare Advocacy. They have had reports, again, from people all over the country being placed in this situation.

The hospitals may act in the best interests of a patient's health but not always in the best interest of the patient's pocketbook. The NOTICE Act will equip patients and their loved ones with the knowledge that they need to be effective advocates and avoid crippling financial repercussions.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman from Texas if they have any other speakers? We are prepared to close.

Mr. DOGGETT. I have one speaker on the way. If you are prepared to close and he is not arriving, then we will close.

Do you have any other speakers?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I will just say a few things. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Mr. Speaker.

This is basically common sense. What is happening is people on Medicare are going to the hospital. They don't know what their status is, whether they are considered inpatient or outpatient. As far as they are concerned, it is the same thing. The problem is they are being declared one or the other, unbeknownst to them, and that has a huge difference in the billing that they receive.

So what this bill simply says is you will know your status so that you can make an informed decision as a patient in a hospital, because there are huge financial implications to that status. This is very simple. It is good government.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds and will welcome my colleague, JOE COURTNEY, who has long sought to respond legislatively to protect health care consumers from the financial pain of this observation status.

While the passage of the NOTICE Act is an important step, Representative COURTNEY has an Improving Access to Medicare Coverage Act that would treat observation stays the same as inpatient stays. I support his legislation as he has supported, from the beginning, this initiative, and I appreciate his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, salute Congressman DOGGETT for his effort in terms of bringing this legislation forward. As the chairman of the committee said, this is really about giving patients a fighting chance to challenge this coding, a change that happens while people are in the hospital and have absolutely no idea that they are not being treated as full part A inpatient patients at hospital facilities.

The impact of being coded as observation versus inpatient may sound extremely arcane, but what that means is that at time of discharge, if a patient

is medically prescribed to go to a nursing home for rehab care for a broken bone or for home health services for a heart condition, they are not covered by Medicare if they are in the observation bucket as opposed to the inpatient bucket.

The inspector general's office for Medicare issued a report in 2012 that 600,000 patients across the country with long-stay hospital visits over 3 days fell into this black hole, this no man's land where, again, their doctors are telling them that they need to have rehab services so that people can walk again and deal with activities of daily living; but the price for doing that, because you are in observation status, can be tens of thousands of dollars, which is where long-term care facilities, nursing home coverage for private-pay patients, out-of-pocket patients, exist today.

This bill at least gives patients the opportunity to challenge that decision. But the fact of the matter is, what we need to do is to restore the 3-day rule, which is in statute. It has been there since 1965. Observation status is something new within the last 10 years, and what we need to do as a Congress is to restore that 3-day rule, which says to a patient: If you are coded observation or if you are coded inpatient, it should not interfere with your medically prescribed course of treatment at the time that you are discharged from the hospital.

That, unfortunately, is not going to be fixed as a result of this legislation. We should build on this legislation and again restore Medicare's promise, which, again, from day one, has said that medically prescribed care will be covered by the system at time of discharge from a hospital for longer than 3 days.

The horror stories of people who in some instances were in hospital for 9 days with broken bones, broken hips, who, again, are staring at a 10 to \$15,000 fee to be admitted to a nursing home—again, 600,000 cases in 2012.

So again, we need to build on this legislation, but fundamentally, we need to restore the 3-day rule which has been in statute since 1965. We will be introducing that legislation later this week. It will be a bipartisan bill. We think we can withstand the test of any pay-fors to make sure that it allows the Medicare system's finances to stay in a stable condition. In the meantime, we should pass this legislation today.

Again, I want to salute the Member from Texas for his leadership on this issue.

□ 1645

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the gentleman from Connecticut.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I agree, Mr. Speaker.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 876, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### MEDICARE DMEPOS COMPETITIVE BIDDING IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 284) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 284

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Medicare DMEPOS Competitive Bidding Improvement Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. REQUIRING BID SURETY BONDS AND STATE LICENSURE FOR ENTITIES SUBMITTING BIDS UNDER THE MEDICARE DMEPOS COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION PROGRAM.

(a) BID SURETY BONDS.—Section 1847(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(G) REQUIRING BID BONDS FOR BIDDING ENTITIES.—With respect to rounds of competitions beginning under this subsection for contracts beginning not earlier than January 1, 2017, and not later than January 1, 2019, an entity may not submit a bid for a competitive acquisition area unless, as of the deadline for bid submission, the entity has obtained (and provided the Secretary with proof of having obtained) a bid surety bond (in this paragraph referred to as a ‘bid bond’) in a form specified by the Secretary consistent with subparagraph (H) and in an amount that is not less than \$50,000 and not more than \$100,000 for each competitive acquisition area in which the entity submits the bid.

“(H) TREATMENT OF BID BONDS SUBMITTED.—

“(i) FOR BIDDERS THAT SUBMIT BIDS AT OR BELOW THE MEDIAN AND ARE OFFERED BUT DO NOT ACCEPT THE CONTRACT.—In the case of a bidding entity that is offered a contract for any product category for a competitive acquisition area, if—

“(I) the entity's composite bid for such product category and area was at or below the median composite bid rate for all bidding entities included in the calculation of the

single payment amounts for such product category and area; and

“(II) the entity does not accept the contract offered for such product category and area,

the bid bond submitted by such entity for such area shall be forfeited by the entity and the Secretary shall collect on it.

“(ii) TREATMENT OF OTHER BIDDERS.—In the case of a bidding entity for any product category for a competitive acquisition area, if the entity does not meet the bid forfeiture conditions in subclauses (I) and (II) of clause (i) for any product category for such area, the bid bond submitted by such entity for such area shall be returned within 90 days of the public announcement of the contract suppliers for such area.”.

(b) STATE LICENSURE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1847(b)(2)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3(b)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) The entity meets applicable State licensure requirements.”.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in the amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to require State licensure of an entity under the Medicare competitive acquisition program under section 1847 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3) before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) GAO REPORT ON BID BOND IMPACT ON SMALL SUPPLIERS.—

(1) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study that evaluates the effect of the bid surety bond requirement under the amendment made by subsection (a) on the participation of small suppliers in the Medicare DMEPOS competitive acquisition program under section 1847 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3).

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date contracts are first awarded subject to such bid surety bond requirement, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under paragraph (1). Such report shall include recommendations for changes in such requirement in order to ensure robust participation by legitimate small suppliers in the Medicare DMEPOS competition acquisition program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 284, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I simply want to, again, commend our committee, Republicans and Democrats, for working on a bipartisan basis

to fix a problem in the Medicare Program that needs fixing.

I want to specifically highlight Mr. TIBERI, a senior member of our committee from Ohio, along with Mr. LARSON, a senior member of the committee from the Democratic side of the aisle, for working together to fix a very deep flaw in a competitive bidding system which needs a lot of work to be improved.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) for the purpose of describing and explaining the need for this legislation.

Mr. TIBERI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your support of H.R. 284, the Medicare Competitive Bidding Improvement Act which, as you said, I introduced with my friend and colleague from Connecticut, Mr. JOHN LARSON.

The bill does fix a fundamental flaw in the Medicare durable medical equipment Competitive Bidding Program by simply requiring that bids be binding. It will promote fairer competition. More importantly, it protects our seniors and supports small businesses.

DME includes items like home oxygen, blood sugar monitors, and walkers for seniors. The Competitive Bidding Program was intended to reduce out-of-pocket costs for these seniors.

However, over the last several years, it has become very clear, Mr. Speaker, that the bidding process is extremely flawed, in large part because the bids are not binding. This encourages low-ball bidding—or suicide bidding—which artificially drives down prices and will eventually lead to market failure because there is no performance on many of these bids, meaning seniors don't get their equipment.

I have heard from seniors, beneficiaries, and small business suppliers in my State of Ohio that the program is impeding access to needed items for seniors, like the ones I just described, ultimately harming their health and making costs more expensive for our seniors and the program itself. This is absolutely unacceptable.

The goal of the bill is to reduce the number of bad actors who are now participating in the program by simply imposing a penalty if the supplier who wins the bid doesn't accept the contract to the bid they won.

The bill will help ensure that these suppliers submit bids in good faith, creating more certainty for those suppliers, and, most importantly, making sure that seniors get the supplies and the equipment that they need and qualify for, increasing access to more quality products and services at the end of the process.

If this bill is signed into law, seniors across the country will no longer have to worry about whether the company in their area will provide the information and, more importantly, the equipment to which they bid on and actually

be able to provide that wheelchair, walker, or oxygen tank that that senior so desperately needs.

As the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee mentioned, the bill has bipartisan support. It is a commonsense bill that actually passed the Ways and Means Committee unanimously. It was scored by the Congressional Budget Office to actually save taxpayer dollars over the next 10 years.

I encourage my colleagues to support the bill, and I thank Mr. LARSON for his partnership.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know that this legislation has been in the works by Representatives TIBERI and my good friend Mr. LARSON from the State of Connecticut. Unfortunately, he could not be here to speak on his own bill due to unforeseen circumstances, so I am but a poor fill-in for Mr. LARSON.

The bill is a commonsense bill that will save a lot of money. The durable medical equipment Competitive Bidding Program has reduced well-documented overpayments to DME providers.

It is estimated that it would result in \$42 billion in savings over a 10-year period, with \$26 billion in savings for the Federal Government and more than \$17 billion in out-of-pocket savings for beneficiaries themselves.

This legislation, as I mentioned, was introduced in the Ways and Means Committee by Representatives TIBERI and LARSON. What they are essentially trying to get at is the issue of low-ball bidders, and what this legislation would do is require bonds for companies who wish to participate in the program.

The Ways and Means Committee did pass this bill out of the committee on a unanimous voice vote, and I, as well, support its passage. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 284 as a commonsense solution that will save money in the long run.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to say the gentlewoman understates the point. She is a perfectly fine fill-in for Mr. LARSON.

I congratulate my colleagues on the committee for seeing a problem and rushing to fix this problem. This is what we are supposed to do here.

We are legislating a solution to make sure that senior citizens have access to the highest quality, lowest price durable medical equipment. There is a flaw in the law in how that is being done, and this bill rectifies that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 284, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1191

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act".

### SEC. 2. EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND CERTAIN NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4980H(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY SERVICES, GOVERNMENT, AND NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

"(A) EMERGENCY SERVICES VOLUNTEERS.—Qualified services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to an eligible employer shall not be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the terms 'qualified services', 'bona fide volunteer', and 'eligible employer' shall have the respective meanings given such terms under section 457(e).

"(B) CERTAIN OTHER GOVERNMENT AND NONPROFIT VOLUNTEERS.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—Services rendered as a bona fide volunteer to a specified employer shall not be taken into account under this section as service provided by an employee.

"(ii) BONA FIDE VOLUNTEER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'bona fide volunteer' means an employee of a specified employer whose only compensation from such employer is in the form of—

"(I) reimbursement for (or reasonable allowance for) reasonable expenses incurred in the performance of services by volunteers, or

"(II) reasonable benefits (including length of service awards), and nominal fees, customarily paid by similar entities in connection with the performance of services by volunteers.

"(iii) SPECIFIED EMPLOYER.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'specified employer' means—

"(I) any government entity, and

"(II) any organization described in section 501(c) and exempt from tax under section 501(a).

"(iv) COORDINATION WITH SUBPARAGRAPH (A).—This subparagraph shall not fail to

apply with respect to services merely because such services are qualified services (as defined in section 457(e)(11)(C)).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after December 31, 2013.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1191, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a very commonsense bill aimed at protecting our volunteer firefighters across America. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for bringing this issue to our attention. It is something that he, as a former mayor, is very familiar with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) for the purpose of explaining his bill.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 1191, the Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act.

I had hoped by now that we would not have to be on the floor of this body talking about my legislation once again. This is the third time I have brought this bill to the floor of the House.

It is intended to protect volunteer firefighters and emergency services personnel from ObamaCare. The first two times I introduced it, it passed the House by a combined vote of 811-0.

I know that there are very few pieces of legislation that attract such amazing bipartisan support, and for that, I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Today, I come asking for your support again.

Let me tell you why this bill is necessary. In 2013, a firefighter from back home named Bob Timko approached me at a parade in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. He told me about a serious problem regarding volunteer firefighters and the Affordable Care Act, or ACA.

Because the Internal Revenue Service specifically considered volunteer firefighters employees for Federal tax purposes, there was the fear that they would fall under the employer mandate of the ACA. If volunteer fire companies

were subject to the employer mandate, they could be liable for crippling new health care costs, causing many to have to close their doors.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the threshold for the employer mandate is 50 employees. That raised the question of how volunteer firefighters would be counted. Would they be counted as employees just under the fire company, or would they be counted as municipal employees?

If that were the case, many volunteer fire companies could easily achieve 50 employees. If they did, these companies could be forced to pay health insurance costs for their volunteers or pay a fine.

This is very important in my home State of Pennsylvania. Ninety-seven percent of our fire companies depend either mostly or entirely on volunteers. Across the country, 87 percent of fire companies depend on volunteers.

As a former mayor, I can tell you that volunteer firefighters are part of the essential fabric of our communities. These are people who risk their lives every day to protect their friends, families, and people they don't even know. I can tell you that no one becomes a volunteer firefighter because they want health insurance. While they are on duty, they are, of course, covered by workman's compensation insurance.

Our volunteer firefighters have a hard enough time raising money needed for basic equipment. They cannot afford to pay for health insurance—or pay a fine—on top of it.

Last year, the IRS finally decided—after months of pressure from Members of the House, from firefighters, and from the media—that they will not consider volunteer firefighters “employees” for Federal tax purposes, but I don't think we should leave something as important as public safety in the hands of unelected bureaucrats at the IRS. Our brave volunteer emergency personnel deserve certainty.

As I said, this is the third time we have had this bill before this body. The first time, in 2014, it passed the House of Representatives 410-0. When it got to the Senate, they used it to attach unrelated language about emergency unemployment insurance. The bill died.

The second time, just earlier this year, it passed the House of Representatives 401-0. This time, the Senate stripped all of my language out of the bill. It got turned into a 1-week funding measure for the Department of Homeland Security.

This is a bill that deserves to become law. This legislation has the strong support of the National Volunteer Fire Council, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the Congressional Fire Services Institute.

I appreciate their support and the work of all the men and women they represent who protect us every day in

our hometowns. We all agree that public safety is too important of an issue to play politics with.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this bill, and I ask all Members to vote “yes.”

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartened that my Republican colleagues are acting on legislation to improve the Affordable Care Act, rather than to simply repeal it.

Technical corrections have long been part of the legislative process for such fundamental pieces of legislation, and this bill does the same.

Volunteer first responders are absolutely critical to the safety and security of communities across the country. Seventy percent of all firefighters across the country are volunteers. For the communities aided by volunteer first responders, the services donated annually by these volunteers are estimated to be worth more than \$140 billion.

This legislation allows communities to continue to benefit for the time and commitment of our firefighters and other first responders.

□ 1700

Treasury has responded to the concerns that Mr. BARLETTA and many other Members raised through their final regulations. But this legislation makes permanent the reasonable solution that the administration put forward.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a letter from the Department of the Treasury specifically outlining the regulations that address those concerns.

This bill is bipartisan, and it is non-controversial. It, as I said, codifies a regulation that has already been issued by the administration.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, DC, January 10, 2014.

Hon. STEVE ISRAEL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ISRAEL: I am writing regarding your interest in how the employer shared responsibility provisions of the Affordable Care Act will apply to volunteer firefighters and volunteer emergency medical personnel. In particular, you have urged the Treasury Department to consider not requiring the volunteer hours of these personnel to be counted in determining an employer's full-time employees or full-time equivalent employees for purposes of the employer shared responsibility rules. We appreciate your efforts and leadership on behalf of the volunteer emergency responder community, and want to assure you that we share your concern that emergency volunteer service be accorded appropriate treatment.

Treasury and the IRS issued proposed regulations providing guidance on the employer shared responsibility provisions under section 4980H of the Internal Revenue Code

(Code) in December 2012 and invited public comments. Numerous comments were received from individuals and local fire and EMS departments that rely on volunteers, from the International Association of Fire Chiefs (IAFC), and from Members of Congress. The comments generally suggested that the final employer responsibility rules not count volunteer hours of nominally compensated volunteer firefighters and emergency medical personnel in determining an employer's full-time employees or full-time equivalent employees.

Treasury and the IRS carefully reviewed those comments and spoke with IAFC representatives to gain a better understanding of the specific issues presented by volunteer firefighters and volunteer emergency personnel under the employer responsibility provisions. Treasury and the IRS also reviewed pertinent rules that apply to such volunteer personnel under other laws. These include the statutory provisions applicable to bona fide volunteers for different purposes under Code section 457(e)(11) (relating to deferred compensation plans of state and local governments and tax-exempt organizations) and rules governing the treatment of volunteers for purposes of the wage and hour laws. As a result of that review and further analysis concerning the appropriate treatment of volunteer firefighters and volunteer emergency personnel under section 4980H, the forthcoming final regulations generally will not require volunteer hours of bona fide volunteer firefighters and volunteer emergency medical personnel at governmental entities or tax-exempt organizations to be counted when determining an employer's full-time employees or full-time equivalent employees.

The forthcoming final regulations, which we expect to be issued very shortly, should provide timely guidance for the volunteer emergency responder community. Under the transition relief announced by Treasury in July of 2013, no employer shared responsibility payments will be assessed for 2014; such payments will be assessed only for 2015 and subsequent years (see IRS Notice 2013-45).

I hope this information is helpful. And thank you for the important insights you have provided with this issue. If you have any questions, please contact me, or ask a member of your staff to contact Sandra Salstrom at 202-622-1900.

Sincerely,

ALASTAIR M. FITZPAYNE,

*Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs.*

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank Mr. BARLETTA for bringing this to our attention. This is a problem with the law and, therefore, the law needs to change. It is insufficient that we have some regulatory forbearance from the administrative branch because the law has to be changed, and that is why this legislation is necessary.

Again, I just wanted to thank Mr. BARLETTA for his leadership on this issue. We need to do right by our volunteer firefighters, and this does that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 284. I have heard from many stakeholders in eastern Connecticut about this issue, and believe that this bill is a commonsense approach to making needed

improvements to the competitive bidding process for durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies.

Requiring bidding entities to meet state licensure requirements in product category areas and obtaining reasonable bid surety bonds for each area are sensible prerequisites to improving the competitive acquisition program. Requiring vendor bidders to be licensed, means that they have attained basic standards of education and training, which patients can rely on. These reforms will ensure that the competitive DME bidding process produces a more stable supply chain of life saving equipment for Medicare patients.

I am proud to support this legislation, and urge bipartisan support for this bill today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1191, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. EMMER of Minnesota) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 647, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 648, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 876, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## ACCESS TO LIFE-SAVING TRAUMA CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the mo-

tion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 647) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 389, nays 10, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—389

Abraham	Costello (PA)	Guthrie
Adams	Courtney	Hahn
Aderholt	Cramer	Hanna
Aguilar	Crawford	Hardy
Allen	Crenshaw	Harper
Amodeli	Crowley	Harris
Ashford	Cuellar	Hartzler
Babin	Culberson	Hastings
Barletta	Cummings	Heck (NV)
Barr	Curbelo (FL)	Heck (WA)
Barton	Davis (CA)	Hensarling
Bass	Davis, Danny	Herrera Beutler
Beatty	Davis, Rodney	Hice, Jody B.
Benishek	DeGette	Higgins
Bera	Delaney	Hill
Beyer	DeLauro	Himes
Bilirakis	DelBene	Honda
Bishop (GA)	Denham	Hoyer
Bishop (MI)	Dent	Hudson
Bishop (UT)	DeSantis	Huffman
Black	DeSaulnier	Huizenga (MI)
Blackburn	DesJarlais	Hultgren
Blum	Deutch	Hunter
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart	Hurd (TX)
Bonamici	Dingell	Hurt (VA)
Bost	Doggett	Israel
Boustany	Dold	Issa
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Jackson Lee
F.	F.	Jenkins (KS)
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Jenkins (WV)
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Johnson (GA)
Brat	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, E. B.
Brooks (AL)	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (IN)	Ellison	Jolly
Brown (FL)	Ellmers (NC)	Jordan
Brownley (CA)	Emmer (MN)	Joyce
Buchanan	Engel	Katko
Buck	Eshoo	Keating
Bucshon	Esty	Kelly (IL)
Burgess	Farenthold	Kelly (PA)
Bustos	Farr	Kennedy
Butterfield	Fattah	Kildee
Byrne	Fitzpatrick	Kilmer
Calvert	Fleischmann	Kind
Capps	Fleming	King (IA)
Cárdenas	Flores	King (NY)
Carson (IN)	Forbes	Kinzing (IL)
Carter (GA)	Fortenberry	Kirkpatrick
Carter (TX)	Foster	Kline
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Knight
Castor (FL)	Franks (AZ)	Kuster
Castro (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Labrador
Chabot	Fudge	Lamborn
Chaffetz	Gabbard	Lance
Chu, Judy	Gallego	Langevin
Cicilline	Garamendi	Larsen (WA)
Clark (MA)	Garrett	Larson (CT)
Clawson (FL)	Gibbs	Latta
Clay	Gibson	Lawrence
Cleaver	Gohmert	Lee
Clyburn	Goodlatte	Levin
Coffman	Gosar	Lewis
Cohen	Gowdy	Lieu, Ted
Cole	Graham	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	Loebsack
Collins (NY)	Graves (LA)	Lofgren
Comstock	Grayson	Long
Conaway	Green, Al	Loudermilk
Connolly	Green, Gene	Love
Cook	Griffith	Lowenthal
Cooper	Grothman	Lowe
Costa	Guinta	Lucas

Luetkemeyer Peterson  
Lujan Grisham Pingree  
(NM) Pittenger  
Luján, Ben Ray Pitts  
(NM) Pocan  
Lynch Poe (TX)  
MacArthur Poliquin  
Maloney, Carolyn Polis  
Maloney, Sean Pompeo  
Marchant Price (NC)  
Marino Price, Tom  
Matsui Quigley  
McCarthy Rangel  
McCaul Ratcliffe  
McCollum Reed  
McDermott Reichert  
McGovern Renacci  
McHenry Ribble  
McKinley Rice (NY)  
McMorris Rice (SC)  
Rodgers Richmond  
McNerney Rigell  
Sally Roby  
Meadows Roe (TN)  
Meehan Rogers (AL)  
Meeks Rogers (KY)  
Meng Rokita  
Messer Rooney (FL)  
Mica Ros-Lehtinen  
Miller (FL) Ross  
Miller (MI) Rothfus  
Moolenaar Rouzer  
Mooney (WV) Roybal-Allard  
Moore Royce  
Moulton Ruiz  
Mullin Ruppertsberger  
Murphy (FL) Russell  
Murphy (PA) Ryan (WI)  
Nadler Salmon  
Napolitano Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Neal Sarbanes  
Neugebauer Scalise  
Newhouse Schakowsky  
Noem Schiff  
Nolan Schock  
Norcross Schrader  
Nugent Schweikert  
Nunes Scott (VA)  
O'Rourke Scott, David  
Olson Serrano  
Palazzo Sessions  
Pallone Sewell (AL)  
Palmer Sherman  
Paulsen Shimkus  
Pearce Shuster  
Pelosi Simpson  
Perlmutter Tiberi  
Perry Titus  
Peters Torres

## NAYS—10

Amash LaMalfa  
Foxy Massie  
Huelskamp McClintock  
Jones Sanford

## NOT VOTING—33

Becerra Hinojosa  
Capuano Holding  
Carney Jeffries  
Clarke (NY) Kaptur  
Conyers Lipinski  
DeFazio Lummis  
Fincher Mulvaney  
Granger Pascrell  
Graves (MO) Payne  
Grijalva Posey  
Gutiérrez Rohrabacher

## □ 1855

Mr. LAMALFA changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CULBERSON changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Sensenbrenner  
Westmoreland

Roskam  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Scott, Austin  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Turner  
Waters, Maxine  
Wilson (SC)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was hosting French Ambassador Gérard Araud in South Carolina where we visited French business investments across the Second Congressional District creating thousands of jobs. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on H.R. 647—Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act.

### TRAUMA SYSTEMS AND REGIONALIZATION OF EMERGENCY CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 648) to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 15, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—382

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguiar  
Allen  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Benishok  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boustany  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capps  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clawson (FL)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Duffy

Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Knight  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern

McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Price (NC)  
Price, Tom  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Ruppertsberger  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon

## NAYS—15

Amash  
Foxy  
Garrett  
Huelskamp  
Hunter

Jones  
Marchant  
Massie  
McClintock  
Ribble

## NOT VOTING—35

Becerra  
Capuano  
Carney  
Clarke (NY)  
Conyers  
DeFazio  
Fincher  
Fortenberry

Granger  
Graves (MO)  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hinojosa  
Holding  
Jeffries  
Kaptur

Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Roskam Scott, Austin Turner  
Rush Smith (NJ) Waters, Maxine  
Ryan (OH) Smith (WA) Wilson (SC)  
Sanchez, Loretta Speier

□ 1903

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was hosting French Ambassador Gérard Araud in South Carolina where we visited French business investments across the Second Congressional District creating thousands of jobs. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 648—Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act.

#### NOTICE OF OBSERVATION TREATMENT AND IMPLICATION FOR CARE ELIGIBILITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 876) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 395, nays 0, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 115]

YEAS—395

Abraham	Brady (PA)	Clay
Adams	Brady (TX)	Cleaver
Aderholt	Brat	Clyburn
Aguilar	Bridenstine	Coffman
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Cohen
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Amodei	Brown (FL)	Collins (GA)
Ashford	Brownley (CA)	Collins (NY)
Babin	Buchanan	Comstock
Barletta	Buck	Conaway
Barr	Bucshon	Connolly
Barton	Burgess	Cook
Bass	Bustos	Cooper
Beatty	Butterfield	Costa
Benishkek	Byrne	Costello (PA)
Bera	Calvert	Courtney
Beyer	Capps	Cramer
Bilirakis	Cárdenas	Crawford
Bishop (GA)	Carson (IN)	Crenshaw
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Crowley
Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)	Cuellar
Black	Cartwright	Culberson
Blackburn	Castor (FL)	Cummings
Blum	Castro (TX)	Curbelo (FL)
Blumenauer	Chabot	Davis (CA)
Bonamici	Chaffetz	Davis, Danny
Bost	Chu, Judy	Davis, Rodney
Boustany	Cicilline	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan	Clark (MA)	Delaney
F.	Clawson (FL)	DeLauro

DelBene	Keating	Peters
Denham	Kelly (IL)	Peterson
Dent	Kelly (PA)	Pingree
DeSantis	Kennedy	Pittenger
DeSaulnier	Kildee	Pitts
DesJarlais	Kilmer	Pocan
Deutch	Kind	Poe (TX)
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Poliquin
Dingell	King (NY)	Polis
Doggett	Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo
Dold	Kirkpatrick	Price (NC)
Doyle, Michael	Kline	Price, Tom
F.	Knight	Quigley
Duckworth	Kuster	Rangel
Duffy	Labrador	Ratcliffe
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Reed
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Reichert
Ellison	Lance	Renacci
Elmiers (NC)	Langevin	Ribble
Emmer (MN)	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Engel	Larson (CT)	Rice (SC)
Eshoo	Latta	Richmond
Esty	Lawrence	Rigell
Farenthold	Lee	Roby
Farr	Levin	Roe (TN)
Fattah	Lewis	Rogers (AL)
Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted	Rogers (KY)
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Rokita
Fleming	Loeb sack	Rooney (FL)
Flores	Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen
Forbes	Long	Ross
Foster	Loudermilk	Rothfus
Fox	Love	Rouzer
Frankel (FL)	Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard
Franks (AZ)	Lowe	Royce
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Ruiz
Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Ruppersberger
Gabbard	Lujan Grisham	Russell
Gallego	(NM)	Ryan (WI)
Garamendi	Luján, Ben Ray	Salmon
Garrett	(NM)	Sánchez, Linda
Gibbs	Lynch	T.
Gibson	MacArthur	Sanford
Gohmert	Maloney,	Sarbanes
Goodlatte	Carolyn	Scalise
Gosar	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Gowdy	Marchant	Schiff
Graham	Marino	Schock
Graves (GA)	Massie	Schrader
Graves (LA)	Matsui	Schweikert
Grayson	McCarthy	Scott (VA)
Green, Al	McCaul	Sensenbrenner
Green, Gene	McClintock	Serrano
Griffith	McCollum	Sessions
Grothman	McDermott	Sewell (AL)
Guinta	McGovern	Sherman
Guthrie	McHenry	Shimkus
Hahn	McKinley	Shuster
Hanna	McMorris	Simpson
Hardy	Rodgers	Sinema
Harper	McNerney	Sires
Harris	McSally	Slaughter
Hartzler	Meehan	Smith (MO)
Hastings	Meeks	Smith (NE)
Heck (NV)	Meng	Smith (TX)
Heck (WA)	Messer	Stefanik
Hensarling	Mica	Stewart
Herrera Beutler	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Hice, Jody B.	Miller (MI)	Stutzman
Higgins	Moolenaar	Swalwell (CA)
Hill	Mooney (WV)	Takai
Himes	Moore	Takano
Honda	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Mullin	Thompson (MS)
Hudson	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (PA)
Huelskamp	Murphy (PA)	Thornberry
Huffman	Nadler	Tiberi
Huizenga (MI)	Napolitano	Tipton
Hultgren	Neal	Titus
Hunter	Neugebauer	Tonko
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Torres
Hurt (VA)	Noem	Trott
Israel	Nolan	Tsongas
Issa	Norcross	Upton
Jackson Lee	Nugent	Valadao
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Van Hollen
Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke	Vargas
Johnson (GA)	Olson	Veasey
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Vela
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Velázquez
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Visclosky
Jolly	Paulsen	Wagner
Jones	Pearce	Walberg
Jordan	Pelosi	Walden
Joyce	Perlmutter	Walker
Katko	Perry	Walorski

Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup

Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth

Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

NOT VOTING—37

Becerra	Hinojosa	Rush
Capuano	Holding	Ryan (OH)
Carney	Jeffries	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Scott, Austin
Conyers	Lipinski	Scott, David
DeFazio	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
Edwards	Meadows	Smith (WA)
Fincher	Mulvaney	Speier
Fortenberry	Pascarell	Turner
Granger	Payne	Waters, Maxine
Graves (MO)	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Grijalva	Rohrabacher	
Gutiérrez	Roskam	

□ 1910

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was hosting French Ambassador Gérard Araud in South Carolina where we visited French business investments across the Second Congressional District creating thousands of jobs. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on H.R. 876—Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act, as amended.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 113 on the Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act, H.R. 647, I am not recorded because of prior commitments in the Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 114 on the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, H.R. 648, I am not recorded because of prior commitments in the Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 115 on the Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act, H.R. 876, I am not recorded because of prior commitments in the Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, on today, March 16, 2015, I was unavoidably detained in my district and missed the three rollcall votes of the day. Had I been present I would have voted:

"aye"—rollcall vote No. 113—H.R. 647—Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act;

"aye"—rollcall vote No. 114—H.R. 648—Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act;

"aye"—rollcall vote No. 115—H.R. 876—Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 2015 I was unable to be present and missed the following votes:



On rollcall vote No. 113, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 647, the Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act, I would have voted "aye";

On rollcall vote No. 114, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 648, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, I would have voted "aye";

On rollcall vote No. 115, on Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 876, the Notice of Observation Treatment and Implication for Care Eligibility Act, I would have voted "aye."

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, from the Committee on House Administration, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-44) on the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO WORLD WAR II MEMBERS OF THE DOOLITTLE TOKYO RAIDERS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table (S. Con. Res. 7) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HILL). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 7

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL FOR CEREMONY TO PRESENT CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO WORLD WAR II MEMBERS OF DOOLITTLE TOKYO RAIDERS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center is authorized to be used on April 15, 2015, for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders, collectively, in recognition of the military service and exemplary record of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders during World War II.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the ceremony described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1102

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) from H.R. 1102, the Police Accountability Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1041

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1041.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

□ 1915

#### RECOGNIZING DR. ERICK HUECK OF MIAMI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an outstanding educator in my south Florida Congressional District, Dr. Erick Hueck, a chemistry teacher at Miami Senior High School. Dr. Hueck has been an accomplished teacher for more than 25 years, and he has the awards to prove it, including the Miami-Dade Teacher of the Year Award and the Governor's Teacher of the Year Award, among many others.

But more than these accolades, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Hueck is known to his students as a mentor and a role model, someone to whom they can come for both academic and life wisdom and who is making learning and science fun.

Dr. Hueck is a positive influence, giving his students the knowledge, the confidence, and the opportunity to follow their dreams.

Thank you, Dr. Hueck. We are all so very proud of you.

Go Stingarees.

#### BIPARTISANSHIP

(Ms. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, American families expect us to work hard to keep them safe. It is our job to work together in addressing their national security concerns, not to diminish our government's standing for political sport.

In 2 short months, this Congress has allowed party extremists to push us to the brink of having no Homeland Security funding, and now we must deal with the dynamic created by misguided Senators whose attempts to undermine the President on Iran have set a dangerous precedent that compromises the authority of future Presidents to negotiate on matters of foreign and national security policy.

I ask my colleagues: What are we doing? We can't cater to political extremes here at home and protect American families from real extremist threats abroad. Let's move beyond the politics that divide us and commit to working with the President to ensure that Iran does not obtain a nuclear weapon. The Illinois families I represent deserve it, and the American people demand it.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF JEFFREY BUCK, LAWRENCE TOWNSHIP VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTER

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of 18-year-old Lawrence Township volunteer firefighter Jeffrey Buck.

On March 3, Jeff was battling a house fire in Clearfield, Pennsylvania, when the porch roof collapsed on him and two fellow firefighters. For the next 6 days, Jeff was in critical condition, on and off sedation, and on March 9, Jeff succumbed to his injuries.

Mr. Speaker, it is tragedies like this that remind us how selflessly these brave volunteers act in order to protect their neighbors and our communities.

This is a sad time for Clearfield and the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. On Friday afternoon, I attended the memorial service for Mr. Buck in Clearfield, and it was truly remarkable to see the entire community come together and unite in the wake of this terrible tragedy.

I ask my colleagues to join me in offering their prayers and deepest sympathies to Jeff's family, friends, and fellow first responders.

#### HONORING MALCOLM JAMES "JIMMY" KEEP, VETERAN OF WORLD WAR II

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Malcolm James "Jimmy" Keep, a lifelong Memphian and a veteran of World War II who fought bravely against Japanese forces in Guam, Saipan, and Iwo Jima. Keep, now 88 years of age, served with the 4th Marine Division after joining the Marines at age 17 in 1943.

Tomorrow, Mr. Keep and his son, Mickey, will travel to Iwo Jima, with the help of a Memphis-based nonprofit organization called Forever Young Senior Veterans, to join 70 other Marine veterans for a 70th anniversary gathering.

Jimmy Keep was assigned to reconnaissance duty early in his career and recalls fighting on Saipan as the bloodiest thing he had ever seen. He came under enemy fire from all sides on Iwo Jima when his amphibious tank was disabled, causing him and his partner, Charlie, to evacuate on foot. The two escaped unharmed, earning them the nickname "rain-walkers." If they could survive that kind of heavy fire, they could surely walk through rain without getting wet.

On Iwo Jima, Keep cleared out huge tunnels that were used by the enemy to launch attacks on the Marines, and he helped carry a fellow marine who was injured back to the beach. He told him: "You're getting off this rock. I'll trade places with you."

Jimmy Keep is a true hero. I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Malcolm James "Jimmy" Keep for his service and bravery as a marine with the 4th Marine Division during the Pacific campaigns in World War II. He will have the Memphis Grizzlies flag when he gets there at Iwo Jima, and that will be part of his contribution to Memphis.

#### CONGRATULATING THE OAK GROVE MIDDLE SCHOOL ROBOTICS TEAM

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the robotics team at Bloomington's Oak Grove Middle School, the Typhoons, for taking first place in the Minnesota First Tech Challenge State Championships last month. This is the first year that the Oak Grove team had the opportunity to compete in State competition, but they still managed to beat out 47 other teams for first place. The team is now qualified to compete in the upcoming North Super Regional Championships coming up in Des Moines.

Mr. Speaker, as our economy continues to be driven by advancements in new technologies, it is important that our youth and young people have the opportunity to learn and explore in the science, math, technology, and engineering fields.

Robotics clubs and competitions bring out the best of students' imagination, ingenuity, and skill. They inspire students to pursue educational opportunities that will help them compete for the jobs of tomorrow. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the teachers, the staff, and the mentors

that have made STEM a priority at Oak Grove, and also congratulations to all the students on a job well done.

#### 2016 BUDGET PRIORITIES

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, our Vice President, JOE BIDEN, once said: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget, and I'll tell you what you value."

This body's routine budgeting practices have faded away in the last 4 years only to be replaced by partisan bickering that uses austere budgets as messaging tools. These budgets invariably go nowhere, while the most vulnerable individuals and families in our communities see their needs grow larger and their potential to make their own success grow smaller.

Our national priorities should be simple enough: public investment in quality education accessible by every student, infrastructure, job training programs, research, and a national energy policy that encourages innovation and new jobs. The strategy we have seen of cutting our way to prosperity simply does not work. The more we do it, the more we cut ourselves down while more nations pass us by.

As we work our way through the 2016 budgeting process, instead of telling our constituents our values, let's show them what we value by producing an ambitious budget that creates opportunity for our American middle class and those struggling to enter it or to stay in it.

#### THE DEPLORABLE ACTIONS OF THE MADURO REGIME

(Mr. CURBELO of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Maduro regime in Venezuela has moved to expel opposition leaders from the National Assembly, arrested the mayor of Caracas on charges of conspiracy to commit violent acts, and has detained opposition leader Leopoldo Lopez for treason. The government issued a policy allowing police to use deadly force to control protests, which has resulted in the death of a 14-year-old student on his way to school. Over the weekend, Maduro's cronies in the legislature gave him dictatorial powers to more harshly crack down on internal dissent. Venezuela is sadly teetering closer towards a Cuba-style dictatorship.

I condemn these acts of repression which are a desperate attempt by Maduro and his henchmen to cling to power, despite policy failures that have led to shortages of food and medical

supplies, long lines at shops, and soaring inflation.

These sanctions announced last week are a long overdue first step to holding the Maduro regime accountable for its grotesque disregard for human rights. But more must be done to ensure that these thugs answer for their crimes.

I stand in solidarity with the peaceful, democratic Venezuelan opposition there and in the U.S. that oppose thuggish rule. They have been instrumental in spreading information about Maduro's deplorable actions.

#### LAW ENFORCEMENT LEADERSHIP

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, maybe even a few months ago, I had the privilege of listening partly to the testimony of Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch, a brilliant expression of a seasoned and competent, qualified and wise attorney that has served this Nation for many, many years. Formerly, as the U.S. attorney in Brooklyn, New York, she has been one who has received accolades from all over the Nation.

Now, unfortunately, the Senate, the other body, chooses to create a constitutional crisis. As she lingers waiting for a confirmation vote, already approved by the Judiciary Committee with a bipartisan vote, it begs the question: Why we are having this kind of treatment of the appointees of President Obama?

So I ask the other body if they would do what is right for the American people as we look for law enforcement leadership, as we continue to look for direction on antitrust issues, voting rights issues, women's rights issues, human rights issues, and many issues dealing with terrorism that fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Justice. It is time, and now, for this confirmation to be done and approved and for this former U.S. attorney to be sworn in as the United States Attorney General in the Department of Justice.

#### THANKING TIM BUTLER, REPRESENTATIVE OF THE 87TH HOUSE DISTRICT IN THE ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank a former staffer for his service to this House, my office, and to the people of Illinois. Tim Butler, who most recently served as my district chief of staff, left my office recently to represent the people of the 87th House District in the Illinois General Assembly.

Tim was an asset to my team from day one, as we set out to make sure every constituent in the Thirteenth District knew we were there to serve them by getting answers from Federal departments like the VA, listening and acting on legislative ideas, and much more. Under Tim's leadership, we opened five district offices, helped more than 1,500 constituents through casework, and launched 10 advisory boards, just to name a few of our team's accomplishments during my first term.

Tim began his service in the House in 1991 with the Committee on Education and Labor, and after leaving the committee, he worked for then-Congressman Ray LaHood for 14 years. It was during his time with Congressman LaHood and my time as projects director for Congressman SHIMKUS that Tim and I met and became friends. With his dedication and record of success helping constituents in Congressman LaHood's office, I knew he would be a perfect fit for mine.

Tim's leadership in my office will be missed, but I know he will provide the same level of exemplary constituent services representing the people of the 87th District in the Illinois General Assembly.

I thank Tim for his service to this House, and I congratulate him on his new opportunity to serve the people of Illinois.

#### THE BATTLE WAGES ON: SECURING EQUAL VOTING RIGHTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to be before you this evening on the heels of our Nation's recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Selma marchers which tore down many obstructive barriers to voting for African Americans and which led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

We have grown as a nation since the night Jimmie Lee Jackson was murdered peacefully marching for voting rights in Alabama, and we are not the America we were when Mamie Till made the world see what had been done to her baby. But we are still living in dynamic times for our democracy. Selma has changed, but the issues of Ferguson, Missouri, remain.

Nearly 60 years after Emmett Till was buried, Black mothers still worry about the value of their son's lives when they leave home. We are reminded of this every time we look into the eyes of Trayvon Martin's mother. We are better today than we were then, and the changes we made to our laws paved our path to prosperity. The President spoke of this in Selma, and Republicans and Democrats alike were united in our feeling that we must uphold the promise of the Nation we inherited because of Selma.

□ 1930

The U.S. Senate should vote to confirm very qualified and exceptional U.S. Attorney Loretta Lynch as the next Attorney General. The CBC devoted an hour of floor testimony last month in defense of her confirmation, but in her role as Attorney General, Loretta Lynch will be tasked with defending the Federal laws that protect the right to vote, and that brings us to our topic this evening.

Tonight's Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour is entitled: "The Battle Wages On: Securing Equal Voting Rights in the United States." This topic is truly timely. This conversation needs to take place now. Work remains to secure equal voting rights in the United States.

Actions like the Supreme Court's decision to gut the Voting Rights Act remind us that the equality that should exist at the ballot is still lacking and why I dream of a day when the Voting Rights Act is no longer necessary. The truth is that voter discrimination and suppression remain as tragic legacies of our past.

In the past few years, many States have introduced restrictive legislation that diminishes an individual's access to the voting booth. The Justice Department may have the tools to fix this problem and go after places that are discriminating against certain voters.

In some places, getting a voter ID that you can use to vote can cost up to \$150, and that can be a burden for someone who is on a fixed income and not driving anymore and doesn't have a license.

Discriminatory laws and policies that hamper access to the ballot box are reasons that the protections and the Voting Rights Act are necessary. The VRA must remain intact as its principles are powerful democratic agents that make our Union more perfect.

With that, I would like to kick off this Special Order hour by yielding to my colleague and anchor, a man who has dedicated his life to the issues of justice in America—a lawyer, judge, and statesman who has defended voting rights—the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, the Honorable G.K. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Thank you very much, Congresswoman KELLY. Thank

you for your leadership, and thank you for what you mean to the Congressional Black Caucus.

The Congressional Black Caucus is now the largest caucus in our history. We are very proud to announce that we have 46 members now in CBC, representing more than 30 million people from 23 States, in addition to the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, so I am delighted that you have taken this responsibility each week, Ms. KELLY, to come to the floor and manage this time.

Typically, Congressman DONALD PAYNE would be joining Congresswoman KELLY tonight, but Mr. PAYNE is not able to come to the floor tonight to help with this Special Order due to, what I am told, is complications from foot surgery, so we wish Congressman PAYNE a very speedy recovery.

Ms. KELLY, I wanted to particularly thank you for selecting this subject this evening. This is a very timely conversation that we must have in this Congress, and that is the whole subject of the Voting Rights Act. The topic that you have chosen, "The Battle Wages On: Securing Equal Voting Rights in the United States," is so very appropriate; and, hopefully, in the next 2 or 3 minutes, I want to tell you why.

Let me just start by explaining the whole voting rights story. Some of my colleagues may not fully appreciate it and understand that when we talk about voting rights, we just don't talk about 1965.

In order to fully appreciate the voting rights history in this country, we must go back to the end of slavery when 4 million slaves became free. They did not have the right to vote. Once the 15th Amendment was added to the Constitution, then all of the former slave men got and obtained the right to vote.

They got engaged. They got involved in the political process. From 1870 until 1900, a period of some 30 years, African American males, particularly in the South, were fully engaged in the political process.

But do you know what? In 1900, Mr. Speaker, in 1900, that right to vote came to an end. It came to an end because of Southern States like South Carolina, North Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and the like, all of these Southern States passed disfranchisement laws, particularly a literacy test.

This literacy test had the practical effect of denying the former slaves and their descendants the right to vote. Not only did you have to read and write in order to be able to register to vote, you had to convince the registrar that you were literate.

The practical effect of that was that the whole voting rights movement during those days came to an abrupt end in 1901 when Congressman George H. White, who was one of my predecessors

in North Carolina, stood on this House floor on March 3, 1901, and made a very profound welfare speech to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, that is the first era of voting rights in this country.

The next era, I would say, would be from 1901 to 1965, when African Americans, for the most part, were not allowed to register to vote because of the literacy test and were not meaningfully involved.

The next and final phase would be from 1965 until the present. In 1965, this Congress passed a historic 1965 Voting Rights Act, and it was a bipartisan bill. Democrats and Republicans promoted the bill all the way to the finish line with the help of then President Lyndon B. Johnson.

The 1965 voting rights, Mr. Speaker, did many great things, but the three things that I will highlight tonight are: Number one, it eliminated the literacy test; number two, it gave a right of action, it gave to African American communities all across the United States the right to bring legal action to file civil lawsuits in Federal court to challenge discriminatory election laws or practices or procedures; the third part of the Voting Rights Act was what we now refer to as section 5.

The Congress in 1965 set aside certain States in the country and certain subdivisions within a State to require them to get preclearance before election laws when new election laws went into effect.

Many of our Southern States did not like section 5, but it was put on the books for a purpose because, if given the opportunity, these States were going to pass discriminatory election laws that made it very difficult for African Americans to vote.

Section 5 has now been on the books since 1965. It has been strongly enforced by the Attorney General. Section 2 has been strongly enforced in courts all across the country. Now, we have 46 African Americans serving in Congress, we have thousands elected at State and local levels all across the country, and it was because of the Voting Rights Act in many respects.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we received a great surprise on June 25 of 2013. The U.S. Supreme Court declared that section 5 could not be enforced because the formula that gives life to section 5, which is section 4, the court said that section 4 needed to be updated and called on this Congress to amend section 4 to make it more contemporary in its application.

This Congress has failed to act. Now, this is the spring of 2015, and we have failed to act. Our voting rights are under continuous assault with more and more States and counties enacting voting laws that, on their face, appear to not be an impediment to voting. Many of these new laws are discriminatory, I want you to know. Some are in-

tended to be. Others, though not intentional, will have a discriminatory result.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am just unable to understand why my Republican colleagues refuse to support an amendment to section 5 to make this provision compliant with the Supreme Court decision.

Through the years, this Congress has been called upon to extend section 5, and it has done so in a bipartisan way. In 2006, as section 5 was about to expire then, there was a bipartisan bill passed by this Congress, signed by President George W. Bush. There were 192 Republicans who voted for the bill.

I want to say that to you again, my colleagues: 192 Republicans voted to extend section 5 just a few years ago. I saluted them then; I salute them now. Sixty-six of those Republicans continue to serve in the House today, including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mr. Speaker, we must fix section 5 to comply with the Supreme Court's decision to update the formula. If we continue down this path and if we do nothing, the practical effect will be that jurisdictions will pass election laws or implement election practices or procedures that will discriminate, and we know it, and we must prevent it from happening.

The only remedy African American communities have to obtain redress from discriminatory practices will be to file very expensive litigation. In the meantime, the law, the new law goes into effect.

If section 5 was in place, there wouldn't be the need for expensive litigation. The jurisdiction would simply be required to make a showing to the Department of Justice, and the Attorney General would determine the effect of the change on minority voting strength. That is the way we have done it for the last 50 years.

I call on my Republican colleagues to please join with us in a bipartisan, bicameral effort to fix the formula so that section 5 can be enforced in our country.

Thank you, Ms. KELLY.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, Congressman BUTTERFIELD.

It is now my honor to yield to the gentlewoman from Alabama, one that was our gracious host last weekend, and we appreciate everything she did, TERRI SEWELL.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 2015, nearly 100 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle went to Selma to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday and the 1965 march from Selma to Montgomery. I was humbled to welcome so many of my colleagues in Congress to my hometown of Selma, Alabama.

It meant a lot to me and the State of Alabama to also welcome President

and Mrs. Obama and their daughters, as well as President and Mrs. George W. Bush to Selma to commemorate the significant events in American history. The Selma movement for voting rights was a uniquely American story of how ordinary Americans working together achieved extraordinary social change.

I want to thank all of the Members and everyone who participated in the Faith & Politics pilgrimage to Alabama this year. I especially want to thank my Alabama colleagues—Senator SESSIONS, Representative MARTHA ROBY, Representative ROBERT ADERHOLT, Representative BRADLEY BYRNE, and Representative GARY PALMER—for their participation in the delegation. A special thanks to Congressman JOHN LEWIS and the Faith & Politics Institute for a job well done.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to walk in the footsteps of JOHN LEWIS with JOHN LEWIS is an unforgettable experience that is truly transformative. The bipartisan participation by Republicans and Democrats alike was truly something to behold, especially given the hyperpartisanship of Washington.

It was something to see us gather together in Selma, Alabama, to honor the sacrifices of the foot soldiers who dared to fight for voter equality 50 years ago. I tried not to have any expectation from this bipartisan showing, but I must admit my hope was that all of us would be motivated by the experience of traveling with JOHN LEWIS, in his footsteps with him, to honestly look at modern-day threats to voting rights today.

Now that the spotlight is no longer on Selma, we must move beyond the bridge and see that there is still a need to fight to ensure that all Americans can participate equally in the political process.

New barriers to voting rights have been legitimized in State legislatures across this country. Photo ID laws and efforts nationwide to get rid of early voting or weekend voting are modern-day efforts that have had the profound effect of restricting access to voting.

Any effort that restricts or decreases the likelihood of citizens to vote is a threat to the voting rights of all Americans. There is no denying that modern-day laws imposed to ostensibly prevent voter fraud has had the "unintended consequence" of making it much harder for certain sectors of the population to vote.

My father is a perfect example of an individual who has found it harder to vote because of these modern-day laws. Prior to the State of Alabama imposing a photo ID law to vote, my father, Andrew, a stroke victim who has been wheelchair bound for the last 10 years, had been voting by using his federally issued Social Security card, which does not have a photo; but once the law was imposed, my father—who no longer

drives, who no longer works, is retired—had no way of getting a photo ID.

After the Alabama law changed, my mother and I made sure that my father would get a photo ID to vote. The effort was tremendous. We transported my father in a special wheelchair access van and got him into the old Dallas County courthouse, which was grandfathered in from having ADA laws and, therefore, no wheelchair ramp. Once inside the courthouse, the elevator to the registrar's office was being serviced, and we had to wait an hour in order to use it.

Once we finally got to the office of the board of registrars, there was only one person waiting on 25 people in line. My mother and father persevered. They persevered to make sure that my father got a photo ID that day because he was resolved in voting because his daughter was on the ballot for reelection.

□ 1945

Just think of all of the seniors or disabled citizens who do not have a relative or a person to take them to get a photo ID. This photo requirement definitely reduces the number of and the ability of certain segments of the society to exercise their right to vote.

In the Supreme Court ruling which invalidated the preclearance provisions of the VRA, the Court said that the formula used by Congress to determine the covered States was outdated, and it implied that there was no need for the Voting Rights Act today since, after all, there was an African American elected as President. Oh, how shortsighted the Supreme Court was. As long as there are vulnerable communities that face barriers to voting, there is still a need for Federal protection.

Just last year, after the Supreme Court ruling, the city of Evergreen, Alabama, came under Federal scrutiny for unfairly excluding African Americans from the voting rolls and for attempting to further dilute their voting power with a redistricting plan that would pack its majority Black population into only two of the five municipal districts. Incidences like this in Evergreen, Alabama, remind us that progress is always illusive and that the injustice suffered on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 50 years ago has not been fully vindicated.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the bridge, there are still laws that explicitly or unintentionally limit the access of Americans to vote. Now that we have commemorated the movement that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, what are we going to do to protect the progress that has been made and to expand access to the sacred right to vote?

On March 7, 2015, while en route to Selma, President Obama signed H.R.

431, the bill that awarded a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers of the Selma to Montgomery march of 1965. Finally, this Nation is acknowledging the bravery of these foot soldiers, who dared to make this Nation live up to its ideals of justice and equality for all. While a great honor, a medal is not adequate repayment for their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the greatest tribute that we as Members of Congress can give is to work honestly and earnestly on a bipartisan bill to restore Federal voting protections to vulnerable communities under the Voting Rights Act. While I applaud bipartisan efforts made in the Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2015, which creates a new formula that would determine which jurisdictions require Federal preclearance, this new formula that is in the current VRA Amendment Act omits key States, key States like North Carolina, South Carolina, and Alabama. I can't imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the very State—Alabama—that prompted the Voting Rights Act that was signed into law 50 years ago would now not be afforded the protection of Federal oversight. The fight for voting rights was born in Alabama, and on my watch, it will not die there.

Voting rights advocates and everyday citizens must remain vigilant and do all that they can to safeguard against efforts to constrict democracy in State and local governments. Our democracy requires it. We can all pay a debt of gratitude to those foot soldiers by voting in every election—local, State, and Federal. We all have our part to play, and we in Congress can play a vital role.

To echo the President's call to action, President Obama said on that day:

Selma shows us that America is not the project of any one person. The single most powerful word in our democracy is the word "we." We the people are tasked with strengthening and safeguarding our democracy. We the people are responsible for ensuring our Nation lives up to its very principles.

On the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act and the historic march from Selma to Montgomery, I urge my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to recommit ourselves to the work that was done by our predecessors, to work together to restore the Voting Rights Act for all Americans. That is the least we can do on this, the 50th anniversary. I look forward to this august body taking up a voting rights amendment act that fully restores Federal protection to all vulnerable communities so that all Americans can definitely exercise that sacred right to vote.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlewoman from Alabama. Thank you for sharing the challenges citizens like your dad can have in complying with the new Voting Rights Act law. Thank you for standing up.

At this time, I would like to yield to the fierce and gentle woman from the District of Columbia, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend, Representative ROBIN KELLY from Illinois, for her leadership on this night, this first night back.

For Members back from Selma, I appreciate that our chair of the Congressional Black Caucus has been here to give us very important background and history. I particularly appreciate that we have just heard from a Member from Alabama, itself, Representative TERRI SEWELL, and all of that seems to me to be the appropriate prelude for what we are doing here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, yes, this is the first day we are back from this historic trip and are back from the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act. There is no place for the almost 100 Members who went to Selma to be but on this floor this evening. I want to thank Attorney General Holder for taking the crippled Voting Rights Act and continuing to enforce it. The trip to Selma essentially set the stage for Members to come back and to regard our trip as a call to action and get down to work to revitalize the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

My thanks to Representative JIM SENSENBRENNER and to Representative JOHN CONYERS for cosponsoring a revised version of the act. My thanks to JOHN LEWIS, who has kept Selma and the Voting Rights Act alive by his annual trips with Members and others to Selma. I am appreciative of the almost 100 Members from both parties who went to Selma on the 6th and 7th.

What was the purpose of going?

It could not have been a celebration. You can celebrate the 1964 Civil Rights Act. It has not been dismembered. You can celebrate the 1968 fair housing law. It still is on the books. But you go to Selma to try to bring back to its full glory the Voting Rights Act of 1965, where setback with section 5 has rendered the act virtually obsolete for most of its original purposes.

I stress that the Supreme Court did not invalidate the 1965 Voting Rights Act. It invited the 100 Members who went to Selma and the others in this body to modernize the act. We may differ on how to do that. I do not think there can be any doubt that it has to be revised and that we have to meet the challenge that the Supreme Court has given us. After all, the Voting Rights Act has prevented, literally, hundreds of discriminatory voting practices, and there were countless practices that it simply deterred. I must say that I was disappointed that, early on in this session, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative GOODLATTE, indicated that he did not believe that the act was necessary, and he talked about the 11 Southern States that had been under the act.

The fact is that the preclearance Voting Rights Act requirements went

far beyond those States. At the time of the Supreme Court decision in 2013, Arizona and Alaska were covered. Parts of California, New York, South Dakota, and Michigan were covered. In the past, parts of Hawaii, Colorado, New Hampshire, Idaho, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Wyoming, Maine, New Mexico, and Oklahoma have been covered. It is true that at the heart of the coverage were the 11 Southern States, but that is where the heart of the violations were, in fact, tracked. That is where the poll taxes were. That is where the violations were.

There has been a compromise bill that has been put forward by Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. CONYERS. In the very act of going to Selma, there was put upon us an obligation to come back and respond to that trip. The bill before us has tried to meet some of the objections that were raised. There is a rolling preclearance formula, for example, that does not require congressional reauthorization. There is a bail-in section of the act to reach those who had not been covered. There are a minimum number of violations over a period of time that have to be recorded in order for a state to come under the act.

As my good friend from Alabama, TERRI SEWELL, says, the act is not what all of us wanted, but it does mean that in the spirit of compromise and because of the necessity of this act, this act which democratized the South and is necessary now—perhaps not as necessary as it was 50 years ago—but no one can doubt, as a Supreme Court Justice himself said when he said he didn't doubt that there was still discrimination in voting practices, but he said it was up to the Congress to modernize the bill.

I don't see how almost 100 Republican and Democratic Members can have gone to Selma on the 50th anniversary without coming back to revise the act. We went emptyhanded. We went without a bill. I hope that what we got in Selma was the gumption to come back and to put forward a bill. Yes, the act has been dismembered by the Supreme Court, but the Court asked us to reshape it. It asked us to restore it. It was one thing to go without a bill. It is quite another to come back and do nothing about a bill.

The President did not hesitate to say where the responsibility, in fact, lies, and I am quoting from his speech in Selma:

One hundred Members of Congress have come here today to honor people who were willing to die for the right it protects. If we want to honor this day, let these 100 go back to Washington and gather 400 more and, together, pledge to make it their mission to restore the law this year.

That is our mission. The trip to Selma, where we went in the name of the entire Congress, demands that we act before the end of this Congress.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you so much to the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C.

At this time, I would like to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, our leader, JAMES CLYBURN.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I often refer to this Hall as America's classroom. I do that because I do believe that, as we conduct ourselves here on this floor, it is to set an example for all citizens, especially our young citizens, who look in on our proceedings and get some idea about how they ought to conduct themselves as Americans going forward. One of those things, I think, that we ought to be very careful of is how we address the rights and responsibilities that we all have as citizens.

□ 2000

We teach our children in our classrooms and in our homes that the right to vote is basic to this democracy of ours. I know that all of us are aware that in our past it is a right that has not always been practiced, but in its wisdom this body, acting collectively, decided back in 1965 that it would do something about making right the wrongs that have been heaped upon citizens for decades when it comes to voting. And so we did.

A formula was adopted that was based upon the 1964 results of the Presidential election. We have renewed time and time again that law, always updating under that formula; but several months ago the United States Supreme Court looked at the formula and decided that the formula had outlived its usefulness, but the Voting Rights Act was still needed. They invited the Congress to take a look at the formula and update it, as the chair said, and to make it more contemporary. We have worked for months.

I want to thank Mr. SENSENBRENNER of Wisconsin and Mr. CONYERS of Michigan for the work they have done to put together some amendments that would update that formula.

This time we decided to look back just a few years and to see, within the last 10 or 12 years, what jurisdictions have still continued to violate people's rights and who have been found guilty of doing so. Rather than apply the formula to everybody, what we will do is come up with a series of wrongs, put some numerical qualification on it, and make a new formula.

Now, that formula is not going to cover South Carolina today, but under the formula, any jurisdiction, any State that permits these kinds of atrocities and is found to have done so, they will be brought under the formula. So the formula applies to every jurisdiction in the country. I think that it is time for us to be honest that everybody will not do right, but we should have something in place so when a jurisdiction fails to do right, we will have a mechanism to address those ills.

Now, let me hasten to add—and I want all that are listening in to under-

stand—this part of the Voting Rights Act is a preventive measure. It says that it allows for the Justice Department to move to prevent any kind of implementation of a change in the voting laws so that we won't have expensive litigation if something in it is not quite right. I believe that it is incumbent upon us to do what we can to employ methods that will not require citizens and the jurisdiction, their States, their cities and counties, to go to the expense of litigation when we can have an administrative procedure in place to take a look at what has been done and make a decision as to whether or not there is any possibility that someone's voting rights could be taken away. That is all this formula does. That is all section 5 is about.

I would hope that those of us who traveled to Selma last week to renew our commitment to making this country of ours a more perfect Union will sit down in the near future, and before we get to the 50th anniversary of the signing of that 1965 Voting Rights Act, which comes on August 6 of this year, sometime between now and August 6, let's put in place the kind of amendments that would allow the Voting Rights Act to maintain the life that it has given to so many communities for so many years.

I want to thank Ms. KELLY for putting together this Special Order.

Let me close by saying: The longer I live, the more I get in touch with those old adages that we grew up with, one of which was "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." I believe that these amendments that we are proposing are preventive measures, and it is much more valuable than for us to come back looking for a cure that could be very, very expensive.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for your important insight and your important comments.

Now it is my honor to yield to the gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my colleagues and thank Congresswoman KELLY and Chairman BUTTERFIELD for the opportunity to carry forward the spirit of the 50th commemoration of the march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Let me also begin by thanking our colleague Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL and all of the Alabama delegation for their hospitality and their spirit of unity.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am so moved by that experience that I frankly believe that now is the time to move the bill that is bipartisan that is a response to the United States Supreme Court to the floor of the House, to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the floor of the House.

Leader CLYBURN was very apt in describing a very significant point that really answers the question of the Supreme Court. If I had my way, coming



from the State of Texas, I frankly believe that the reauthorization that we did through the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, and which I was very much engaged in in 2006 and 2007, was a thorough expose of the value of the Voting Rights Act. We did 15,000 pages of testimony, and witness after witness from different perspectives indicated that the formula that we were using at that time on the preclearance was an effective formula. Of course, the Supreme Court challenged the data, and I would only argue that it is appropriate to update the data. I welcome that.

But we have gone even further. As has been articulated by the bill that has just been introduced by a number of us, we have crafted a formula that says it is an even playing field, an even playing field for a State to opt in because they have voting rights abuses for all people or to opt out because they have a smooth, evenhanded process for citizens in their State to vote.

So I believe it is important that the message get out of what the Voting Rights Act stands for and what it meant for those foot soldiers to cross that bridge. They crossed that bridge, and they were willing—and were bloodied, frankly—to do something non-violent, and that is to petition their leaders at the voting box.

I can't imagine that there is any Member here in this place, in this august Congress, that would not want to go to their constituents, whether they live in South Dakota or Utah or Mississippi or New York or Texas, as I do, that there is an unfettered right to vote.

I will soon be introducing a Voting Rights Act that establishes the date that we signed the Voting Rights Act by the President that came from Texas, Lyndon Baines Johnson, with the leaders of Martin Luther King and JOHN LEWIS and many others standing at his side, to introduce that as being Voting Rights Act Day, to reinforce the value to Americans of the importance of voting.

Who would want to oppose the idea that voting is not important?

So I am looking forward to having Members join on the simple premise that it is important to vote in America and that it is important to commemorate the signing of the Voting Rights Act and make it Voting Rights Day. That inspiration came as we saw the thousands that were marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Let me just clarify for a moment, under section 5, the submitting jurisdiction under the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and H.R. 885, Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2015, has to prove that the proposed changes are not retrogressive, that they do not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color. We have

expanded that, again, to go by acts, by occurrences that would keep someone from voting.

So I believed that this past weekend, or the weekend of Bloody Sunday, was a moving moment that would draw us together, that would allow us to understand H.R. 885. And might I say this: I know that many of us will be willing to have teach-ins to ensure that our colleagues understand the importance of this legislation and that we do it in a bipartisan manner.

Let me conclude my remarks by saying, earlier today I stood on the floor and asked for a bipartisan approach to the approval of the Attorney General nominee by the other body. I say that from the spirit of recognition of the three branches of government. A President has nominated a very well-qualified, distinguished member of the bar, Loretta Lynch, to be the next Attorney General of the United States of America.

We understand differences of opinion with legislation. I have no quarrel with those differences. I happen to support the human trafficking bill and recognize that there is a disagreement on language that I agree with the disagreement, but that disagreement can be worked out through ongoing talks and however they want to approach it or a vote on the floor. But Loretta Lynch, the Attorney General nominee, should not be held up captive to disagreements on legislation and moving toward a constitutional crisis.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, is wrapped up together. The Department of Justice enforces the Voting Rights Act, enforces the voting rights of Americans. As we look to the future, as we formulate the understanding of the three branches of government, to avoid a constitutional crisis of not having the leadership that is timely for the work that has to be done, I would hope the Senate would move forward, and I would hope that all of us would honor the Voting Rights Act and the message of Selma that we stand together under this wonderful flag and stand for voting rights for all.

Since its passage in 1965, and through four reauthorizations signed by Republican presidents (1970, 1975, 1982, 2006), more Americans, especially those in the communities we represent, have been empowered by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 than any other single piece of legislation.

Section 5 of the Act requires covered jurisdictions to submit proposed changes to any voting law or procedure to the Department of Justice or the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C. for pre-approval, hence the term “pre-clearance.”

Under Section 5, the submitting jurisdiction has the burden of proving that the proposed change(s) are not retrogressive, i.e. that they do not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

In announcing his support for the 1982 extension of the Voting Rights Act, President

Reagan said, “the right to vote is the crown jewel of American liberties.”

And Section is the “crown jewel” of the Voting Rights Act.

But a terrible blow was dealt to the Voting Rights Act on June 25, 2013, when the Supreme Court handed down the decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 537 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b), the provision of the law determining which jurisdictions would be subject to Section 5 “pre-clearance.”

FACTS OF *SHELBY COUNTY V. HOLDER*

In 2006, the City of Calera, which lies within Shelby County, enacted a discriminatory redistricting plan without complying with Section 5, leading to the loss of the city's sole African-American councilman, Ernest Montgomery. In compliance with Section 5, however, Calera was required to draw a nondiscriminatory redistricting plan and conduct another election in which Mr. Montgomery regained his seat.

According to the Supreme Court majority, the reason for striking down Section 4(b): “Times change.”

Now, the Court was right; times have changed. But what the Court did not fully appreciate is that the positive changes it cited are due almost entirely to the existence and vigorous enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

And that is why the Voting Rights Act is still needed.

Let me put it this way: in the same way that the vaccine invented by Dr. Jonas Salk in 1953 eradicated the crippling effects but did not eliminate the cause of polio, the Voting Rights Act succeeded in stymying the practices that resulted in the wholesale disenfranchisement of African Americans and language minorities but did eliminate them entirely.

Before the Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965, the right to vote did not exist in practice for most African Americans.

And until 1975, most American citizens who were not proficient in English faced significant obstacles to voting, because they could not understand the ballot.

Asian Americans and Asian immigrants also suffered systematic exclusion from the political process.

In 1964, the year before the Voting Rights Act became law, there were approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress.

Few, if any, black elected officials were elected anywhere in the South.

Because of the Voting Rights Act, there are now more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 43 members of Congress, the largest number ever.

The Voting Rights Act opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Latino public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including 263 at the state or federal level, 27 of whom serve in Congress.

Now to be sure, the Supreme Court did not invalidate the preclearance provisions of Section 5; it only invalidated Section 4(b).

But that is like leaving the car undamaged but destroying the key that unlocks the doors and starts the engine.

According to the Court, the coverage formula in Section 4(b) had to be struck down because the data upon which it was based—registration rates and turn-out gaps—was too old and outdated.



But my colleagues in Congress and I refuse to let the Voting Rights Act die.

And so we went to work, crafting and drafting the legislation that would repair the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court decision and capable of winning majorities in the House and Senate and the signature of the President.

After months of hard work, consultation, negotiation, and collaboration, we produced and have reintroduced in the 114th Congress, a bill, H.R. 885, "Voting Rights Amendments Act of 2015" that can achieve these goals.

To be sure, this legislation is not perfect, no bill ever is.

But—and this is important—the bill represents an important step forward because it: 1. is responsive to the concern expressed by the Supreme Court; and 2. establishes a new coverage formula that is carefully tailored but sufficiently potent to protect the voting rights of all Americans.

First, H.R. 885 specifies a new coverage formula that is based on current problems in voting and therefore directly responds to the Court's concern that the previous formula was outdated.

The importance of this feature is hard to overestimate. Legislators and litigators understand that the likelihood of the Court upholding an amended statute that fails to correct the provision previously found to be defective is very low and indeed.

H.R. 885 replaces the old "static" coverage formula with a new dynamic coverage formula, or "rolling trigger," which works as follows: 1. for states, it requires at least one finding of discrimination at the state level and at least four adverse findings by its sub-jurisdictions within the previous 15 years; 2. for political subdivisions, it requires at least three adverse findings within the previous 15 years; but 3. political subdivisions with "persistent and extremely low minority voter turnout," can also be covered if they have a single adverse finding of discrimination.

The effect of the "rolling trigger" mechanism effectively gives the legislation nationwide reach because any state and any jurisdiction in any state potentially is subject to being covered if the requisite number of violations are found to have been committed.

Prior to *Shelby County v. Holder*, the Voting Rights Act covered 16 states in whole or in part, including most of the states in the Deep South.

The rolling trigger contained in H.R. 885, unfortunately, does not; at least not initially. The only states that would be covered initially under the new bill are: 1. Texas 2. North Carolina 3. Louisiana 4. Florida 5. South Carolina.

To compensate for the fact that fewer jurisdictions are covered, our bill also includes several key provisions that are consistent with the needs created by a narrower Section 5 trigger.

For example, H.R. 885: 1. Expands judicial "bail-in" authority under Section 3 so that it applies to voting changes that result in discrimination (not just intentional discrimination); 2. Requires nationwide transparency of "late breaking" voting changes; allocation of poll place resources; and changes within the boundaries of voting districts; 3. Clarifies and

expands the ability of plaintiffs to seek a preliminary injunction against voting discrimination; and 4. Clarifies and expands Attorney General's authority to send election observers to protect against voting discrimination.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 is no ordinary piece of legislation.

For millions of Americans, and many of us in Congress, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is a sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

ABOUT TEXAS NAACP V. BERRY

(TEXAS PHOTO ID CASE; CONSOLIDATED WITH VEASEY V. PERRY)

1. The suit alleges that the State of Texas' photo ID requirement for in-person voting, enacted in 2011, was adopted for discriminatory reasons, in violation of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and has a discriminatory "result" in violation of Section 2. The case is consolidated with similar suits filed by the United States and other private plaintiffs.

2. Trial was held from September 2 to September 11, 2014, and closing arguments were presented on September 22, 2014.

3. On October 9, 2014, U.S. District Judge Nelva Gonzales Ramos issued a 147-page opinion in which she ruled that the Texas photo ID requirement violates both the U.S. Constitution and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

4. Judge Ramos found that the law was enacted for the purpose of discriminating against African-American and Latino voters, and that it denies minority voters an equal opportunity to participate in the political process in violation of the Section 2 results standard.

5. Judge Ramos also found that the photo ID law unconstitutionally burdens the right to vote, and functions as an unconstitutional poll tax.

6. On October 14, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit granted Texas' motion to stay the district court's permanent injunction until Texas' appeal is briefed, argued and decided.

7. On October 15, 2014, the Lawyers' Committee and co-counsel filed an emergency application with the Supreme Court to reinstate the district court's injunction.

8. On October 18, 2014, the Supreme Court denied the application to vacate the stay; Justice Ginsburg filed a dissent, joined by Justices Sotomayor and Kagan.

9. Oral argument before the 5th Circuit is scheduled to take place during the last week in April.

10. Previously, in a lawsuit litigated under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, a three-judge district court in *Texas v. Holder*, 888 F. Supp. 2d 113 (D.D.C. 2012), ruled that Texas' photo ID law did not satisfy the nondiscrimination requirements of Section 5.

11. However, the district court ruling was vacated by the Supreme Court, 133 S. Ct. 2886 (2013), following the Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 133 S. Ct. 2612 (2013), that the geographic coverage formula for Section 5 is unconstitutional.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlelady from Texas for her remarks. Now it is my honor to yield to the gen-

tlelady from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Congresswoman GWEN MOORE.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged just recently to stand hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder in Selma, Alabama, with 100 Members of Congress, with civil rights leaders, friends of the movement of all races from every State in the United States, with civil rights luminaries such as Mrs. Abernathy, Dorothy Cotton, Amelia Boynton—113 years old—Doris Crenshaw, and, of course, our very own colleague, JOHN LEWIS, who helped lead a march for a better life and more equality for all of America.

But it was very, very hard to celebrate. There was a very sober mood in the crowd as we realized that the voting rights of Americans, particularly African Americans, were under threat 50 years after the Voting Rights Act was signed. As the President said in his remarks:

Right now, in 2015, 50 years after Selma, there are laws across the country designed to make it harder for people to vote.

□ 2015

As we speak, more of such laws are being proposed. Meanwhile, the Voting Rights Act, the culmination of so much blood, so much sweat and tears, the product of so much sacrifice in the face of wanton violence, the Voting Rights Act stands weakened, its future subject to political rancor.

As we think of those martyrs like Viola Liuzzo, James Earl Chaney, Andy Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, it is very, very difficult to deal with the reality that States such as the one that I hail from, Wisconsin, is one of the States who has joined the map of shame and passed one of the strictest voter ID laws in the country.

In the following years since 2011, Wisconsin has been a battleground in fighting this pernicious law. In 2014, a Federal judge ruled that our voter ID law was unconstitutional and violated section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. It found that 300,000 Wisconsinites lacked the proper ID needed under the law and that the law would have a disparate impact on Blacks and Latinos.

Despite that powerful finding, the Federal district court was recklessly overturned by a three-judge panel in the Seventh Circuit. Right before our 2014 election, the United States Supreme Court stepped in and enjoined this law in an emergency stay to prevent them from implementing the voter ID law only 6 weeks before the 2014 election. Recently, members of the Congressional Black Caucus have sent an amicus brief, and I am optimistic that justice will prevail.

I know that there have been many African Americans and people of other races who have marched across that Edmund Pettus Bridge. As a woman, I know that the brave suffragettes fought equal treatment for over 70

years while they faced humiliation and shame from society.

History has made it so very, very clear that voting rights are so fundamental. The 14th Amendment to the Constitution protects voting rights; the 15th Amendment provided that males, even former slaves and males of any race, could vote; women's suffrage; with the 24th Amendment, poll taxes supposedly were eliminated, and the 26th Amendment allowed 18-year-olds to vote.

Of course, we have the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I think it is very, very clear, when you look at the history of this protection, that it is one of the most constitutionally protected rights that there is.

I would urge my colleagues here in this body to do more than hold hands and sing, "We Shall Overcome," but to really pass laws to strengthen the Voting Rights Act.

We have all heard the adage that history repeats itself, and we have seen a race across the country for Republican legislatures and Governors to pass these voter ID laws, but I think we also have the power to shape our future by drawing from the lessons of the past: our civil rights movement, our march in Selma, where we stood hand in hand, arm in arm, and fought back against this tide of oppression.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from Wisconsin. Thank you for sharing your thoughts.

Now, it is my honor to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida, FREDERICA WILSON.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. In Miami-Dade County, I have a program called the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project. It is a program of Black and Hispanic boys who are trying to grow up into good men.

The Friday before Bloody Sunday, over 500 12th graders—graduating seniors—from that program went to a movie to watch a private screening of the movie "Selma."

I want to give a special shout-out to Nancy Sewell, who is the mother of TERRI SEWELL. As I watched the two of them on C-SPAN, MSNBC, and CNN, I was so proud of them.

These boys were prepared by men who experienced the civil rights battles and know the bitter history and violent battles we had to endure. I wish I had the resources to take all 500 of them to Selma.

During the movie, we planned a Twitter war. Thousands participated all across the Nation. Movie stars, rappers, sports legends, and the White House joined in the Twitter war. These boys will never be the same. They were visibly moved; and their applause, tears, hugs, and tweets proved their transformation.

The next day, on that Saturday, when the President spoke, the Twitter war continued. It was based at my

home. So many of them watched and marveled at Representative JOHN LEWIS, a card-carrying, sworn-in member of the 5000 Role Models of Excellence Project. They watched so proudly as he introduced the first Black President of the United States. In fact, he is the only President that they know. They are beyond proud.

Why did I do this? I wanted as many students as possible to experience the importance of voting, and I am not finished. All 8,000 of them will see the movie as soon as it is released for distribution. This generation of children needs to know the importance of voting. They need to know what their forefathers had to endure so that they could vote.

When I was on the Miami-Dade County School Board in 1996, we set up a process in partnership with the department of elections. Every eligible student is registered to vote in the 11th grade, and when they graduate and turn 18, their voter registration card is mailed to their homes. This is a policy that all school districts all across America should adopt.

While they repair the damage to the Voting Rights Act through legislation, graduating seniors in Miami-Dade public schools—Black, White, and Hispanic—will still have the opportunity to vote. Every single one of them will vote. I hope that other school districts will adopt this policy so that children will know and understand the importance of voting. It is their voice.

God of our weary years, God of our silent tears, let us as a people march on until victory is won.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the gentlewoman from Florida. Thank you for sharing your success stories. Hopefully, those can be duplicated.

At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS.

Ms. ADAMS. Thank you, Congresswoman KELLY, for your leadership. I appreciate what you are doing very much. Certainly, it is something that we need to do, and we must do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to stress the importance of equal voting rights for everyone. Just over a week ago, I traveled to Selma with several of my colleagues to retrace the steps of those who shed blood as they tried, again, to gain equal access to the ballot box.

As a professor for 40 years at Bennett College in North Carolina, I made sure that the students that passed through my classroom and our campus knew just how important it was to have their voices heard, and to this day, students know: "Bennett Belles are voting belles."

In 2013, the Supreme Court struck down a major provision of the Voting Rights Act limiting Federal oversight over State voting laws. Sadly, my home State of North Carolina quickly implemented voting laws that dis-

enfranchise voters by making cuts to early voting, reenforcing strict ID requirements, and ending some preregistration programs which did not allow young high school students to be able to register to vote.

As I think about those who risked their lives in order to exercise their right to vote, I cannot believe that 50 years later, in 2015, that simple freedom given to us in the Constitution is still under attack.

It is time for all of us, Mr. Speaker, to come together to restore the Voting Rights Act, to ensure that every voter—no matter their race, no matter their class or creed—can make their voice heard and elect the leaders of their choice.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, again, for her insight and comments.

Here we are, 50 years removed from Selma, 50 years after Americans—young and old, Black, White, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, Jewish—made a decision to stand up for what they knew was right. They stood up for democracy and demanded fair and unobstructed access to the ballot.

As you have heard this hour, the evolution to the America we are today has been a long and challenging journey. The Voting Rights Act has done much to make our Union more perfect, but the strength of the Voting Rights Act has been diminished. With new, discriminatory laws on the books, this Congress must act. This Congress can pass a bipartisan bill that extends section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

As was the case in Selma, the law is not equal for all. We must unite, as we did then. I urge my colleagues to take up this important issue and strengthen the Voting Rights Act.

I would like to take this time to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and all my colleagues who took the time to speak to us this evening.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues Congressmen PAYNE and KELLY for leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order Hour.

Mr. Speaker, fifty years ago 600 men and women began a peaceful march in Selma, Alabama to demand their full and equal right to participate in our democracy. Their quest for equal voting rights was met with physical violence and racial hatred on what has become known as "Bloody Sunday."

The marchers were turned back that day, but they remained steadfast. With unwavering determination, residents of Selma, civil rights activists, and inspired people from across the nation completed the march from Selma to Montgomery. Their heroism was instrumental in the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; a watershed bipartisan action of the U.S. Congress.

Fifty years later, on the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, I stood with President Obama and my House and Senate colleagues to

honor the legacy of those brave foot soldiers for justice. But unfortunately, the battle wages on. There is still much to be done to ensure the sacrifice of those marchers was not in vain.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* to strike down Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act left many Americans more vulnerable to voting discrimination. In the absence of this historic safeguard, numerous states have attempted to suppress voting through restrictive voter ID laws and limits on early voting. My home state of Ohio is one of them.

Congress must act to restore Section 4 of the Voting Rights Act and update critical voter protections. In 2015, no eligible citizen should be disenfranchised. No eligible citizen should be denied full participation in our democracy. Let us recommit to rejecting intolerance and injustice in all forms, and continue the fight for equal voting rights for all Americans.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this year, we celebrate the 50th Anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It is an historic piece of legislation that was signed with the pride, humility and blood of brave men and women whose courage has watered the soil of our nation's democracy. For decades, it has been revered as a pillar of America's transformative society. It represented the promise of our forefathers.

Yet, fifty years after its passage, the laws' promises are unfulfilled. And, reflective of the nation's climate during the civil rights era, we are witnessing divisive political forces rally to resurrect the abhorrent practices of racial discrimination and disenfranchisement.

Fifty years after the passage of the Voting Rights Act, minorities across the country are fighting against state voter i.d. laws for the right to vote. Despite the Supreme Court's erroneous holding that "[o]ur country has changed," and there is no longer a need for federal preclearance for changes in voting laws, minorities are facing increased barriers to the ballot box.

While there have certainly been great progress, we still have a long way to go. In the 1960's, our nation was marked by moments of crises, war, poverty and mass social injustices. Fifty years later, our nation bears the same markings. We met the challenges then. It is time we rise to that challenge once more. Despite the current climate, when it appears that we are fighting a lost cause, we must remember that it is our patriotic duty to continue to fight. We must fight to honor the legacy of those who fought for us. Not only is it our duty to vote—it is also our constitutional right: one that should be protected and restored by Congress.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY for hosting this important Special Order. I appreciate your leadership in organizing today's important discussion.

Last weekend, I had the honor of joining more than one hundred members of Congress, faith leaders and activists, to honor Bloody Sunday and the march from Selma to Montgomery.

We gathered in Selma to celebrate and honor the courage of ordinary Americans willing to face tear gas, billy clubs, and risk their lives to ensure equal treatment under the law.

The march from Selma to Montgomery helped change the course of history. They faced extreme opposition and their actions that day on Edmund Pettus bridge proved that non-violent change is possible.

Ten days after the march from Selma to Montgomery, President Lyndon Johnson sent to Congress the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a cornerstone of our democracy.

In the 50 years since Bloody Sunday, our nation has made significant progress. To deny this progress, as the President mentioned in his speech in Selma, is to rob us of our own agency, our own capacity, and what we can do to make America better.

As we pause to mark this important anniversary and reflect on its effect on history, we know that the battle for full voting rights wages on.

When the Supreme Court struck down the pre-clearance formula, states can change their election laws without prior federal approval—the ruling gutted the heart of the Voting Rights Act.

The Voting Rights Act pre-clearance requirement afforded millions of voters confidence that roadblocks will not be thrown in their way as they try to exercise their fundamental right to vote.

It provided voters with the knowledge that the federal government can be a backstop against oppressive laws and prevent voter discrimination before it happened.

Now voter suppression is once again rearing its ugly head in the form of registration restrictions, voter ID laws, decreased access to early voting and racially-motivated redistricting that is stopping people from their right to vote.

Now, I was born and raised in Texas and I vividly remember the days of Jim Crow, segregation, and poll taxes.

The tactics being used today may be more subtle; but they serve the same purpose: to prevent Americans from exercising their fundamental right to vote.

Mr. Speaker—Enough is enough.

As the heirs of the civil rights movement, we cannot allow these assaults to stand.

We must be defiant.

We must stand up to those that want to turn back the clock and restrict our right to vote. We have come too far to go back now.

Sadly, voting rights is not the only place that inequality exists.

More than 45 million Americans are still living in poverty. African Americans have a poverty rate that is nearly three times the poverty rate of white Americans.

The 10.4 percent unemployment rate among African Americans is nearly twice the national average.

Discrimination and racial bias remains endemic in our justice system.

We can start to address these issues this year—by working to restore the Voting Rights Act. One hundred members of Congress visited Selma to commemorate Bloody Sunday and as President Obama eloquently stated, we must go back to Washington and gather four hundred more.

We can restore this law by passing a bipartisan bill, H.R. 855, The Voting Rights Amendment Act, which I am a proud cosponsor.

This bill will help undo some of the damage done by the Supreme Court's decision.

Just as Congress acted 50 years ago after the stirring events in Selma, Congress must act today to address the issues facing our nation.

Mr. Speaker—We cannot afford to backslide on the progress we have made.

We cannot afford to lose the prize that our forefathers and mothers fought, bled and died to obtain and preserve.

We must stand together—stronger than ever—to raise our voices, march in the streets, and cast our ballots to demand change.

I am reminded of Dr. King's "Two Americas" speech on April 14th, 1967 at Stanford University, when he said:

We must come to see that social progress never rolls in on the wheels of inevitability. It comes through the tireless efforts and the persistent work of dedicated individuals.

We must rededicate ourselves to persistently working for progress, equality and justice.

The American dream of equality, freedom, liberty, justice and life for all can and should be more than just words.

It should be a promise to all Americans, regardless of the color of their skin or where they were born.

---

#### APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY AND INTEGRITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1011c, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for a term of 6 years:

Upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader:

Dr. George T. French, Fairfield, Alabama

Dr. Kathleen Sullivan Alioto, New York, New York

Mr. Ralph A. Wolff, Oakland, California

---

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a function in the district.

Mr. ROSKAM (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the passing of his father.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of business in the district.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 639. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing; with an amendment (Rept. 114-41, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 647. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 648. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 132. Resolution providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress. (Rept. 114-44). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 639 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. McHENRY:

H.R. 1365. A bill to prevent the reclassification of certain ammunition as armor piercing ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 1366. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to set the retirement benefits age for today's eight-year-olds at age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN (for herself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 1367. A bill to amend the Expedited Funds Availability Act to clarify the application of that Act to American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PERRY, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1368. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent foreign diplomats from being eligible to receive health insurance premium tax credits and health insurance cost-sharing reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 1369. A bill to modify the treatment of agreements entered into by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish nursing home care, adult day health care, or other extended care services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1370. A bill to direct the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers to revise certain authorized purposes described in the Missouri River Mainstem Reservoir System Master Water Control Manual; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1371. A bill to improve the Compliance, Safety, Accountability initiative of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 1372. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1373. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to consider, within the annual rulemaking processes, the effect of regulatory changes to certain Medicare payment systems on provider consolidation; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. CLEAVER, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1374. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for counterfeiting or selling Presidential inauguration tickets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1375. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1376. A bill to amend chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to permit provisional approval of fast track products; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1377. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for tax preferred savings accounts for dependent youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. DAVID

SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1378. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues related to recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1379. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Board of Veterans' Appeals to develop evidence in appeal cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1380. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for a medallion furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to signify the veteran status of a deceased individual; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. QUIGLEY (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995, and the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 to improve access to information in the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, House Administration, the Judiciary, Ethics, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss RICE of NEW YORK (for herself, Mr. COOK, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ABRAHAM, Ms. KUSTER, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 1382. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in awarding a contract for the procurement of goods or services, to give a preference to offerors that employ veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of certified adult day services under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALZ (for himself, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. JONES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. STEWART, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 1384. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CASTOR of Florida:

H. Res. 150. A resolution expressing support for designation of July as National Sarcoma Awareness Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H. Res. 151. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of March 15, 2015, through March 21, 2015, as National Young Audiences Arts for Learning Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MCHENRY:

H.R. 1365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the explicit power of Amendment II of the United States Constitution: A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed.

Additionally, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause, of the United States Constitution: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 1366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—The Congress shall have Power. . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 1368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 1369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which states "Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

The management of the Missouri River by the Army Corps of Engineers directly impacts commerce. The river is a source of barge traffic carrying a variety of goods.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 1374.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 3, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States;"

Article I, Section 3, Clause 6: "To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;"

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 1375.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 1376.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 1377.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: The Commerce Clause

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1378.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1379.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1380.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H.R. 1381.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 1382.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1383.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALZ:

H.R. 1384.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 93: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 131: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 140: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 167: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 169: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 173: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 213: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 232: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 235: Mr. TIPTON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. JOLLY, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 249: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. DENHAM.

H.R. 250: Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 310: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 317: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 353: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 358: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SIRE, Mr. JONES, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 381: Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 386: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 402: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. BUCHON.

H.R. 407: Ms. MOORE, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.  
H.R. 444: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 451: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 453: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 465: Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 472: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.  
H.R. 500: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 509: Mr. GALLEGOS.  
H.R. 513: Mr. COSTA and Mr. PEARCE.  
H.R. 528: Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 531: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 540: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 546: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 570: Ms. LEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 572: Ms. MENG.  
H.R. 578: Mr. NUGENT, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 586: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 592: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 594: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. RATCLIFFE.  
H.R. 595: Mr. CHAFFETZ.  
H.R. 598: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 601: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 610: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 612: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. CHAFFETZ, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 616: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 617: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 628: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 631: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 638: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.  
H.R. 639: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 647: Mr. HARPER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 648: Mr. HARPER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 650: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUM, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 654: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 662: Mr. JONES, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. PITTENGER.

H.R. 663: Mr. KING of Iowa and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 685: Mr. FORBES, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 702: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 706: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 707: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 721: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 722: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 742: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 751: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 756: Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 767: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 775: Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 784: Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 793: Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 802: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 805: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 815: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 816: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. BLUM, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 822: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 825: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 842: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 845: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. ASHFORD, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 849: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 852: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 855: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 863: Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 869: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 879: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 884: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 885: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DOLD, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 903: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 909: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 919: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 920: Mr. NADLER, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 923: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 924: Mr. HURT of Virginia and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 928: Mr. BABIN, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MCHENRY, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. ISSA, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 931: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 932: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 969: Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 970: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 973: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. ESTY, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 976: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 977: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 978: Mr. KILMER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 993: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 997: Mr. BENISHEK and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1000: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1019: Mr. COOPER, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1058: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BLUM, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1059: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BLUM, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1062: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1063: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1078: Mr. FARR, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1086: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BARR, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 1090: Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1095: Mr. WELCH and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1100: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1104: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1114: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JONES, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1125: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1128: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1129: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 1130: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1131: Ms. SPEER, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1135: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1142: Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1153: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1162: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ESTY, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1174: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1178: Mr. OLSON, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1180: Mrs. BLACK, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1190: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 1191: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DENT, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. BOST, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. HUELSKAMP, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1192: Mr. POLIS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOHMERT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1195: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1206: Mr. BABIN, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1210: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. WALBERG, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1218: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1232: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1233: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 1234: Mr. ROKITA and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1248: Mr. TURNER and Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.

H.R. 1249: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. BABIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 1258: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 1267: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1284: Mr. NADLER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK OF MASSACHUSETTS, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 1301: Mr. WELCH, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HARPER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1309: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1319: Ms. GABBARD, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1320: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 1323: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1339: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 1341: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1343: Ms. MENG, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TIPPON, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 1358: Mr. BEYER.

H.J. Res. 29: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MESSER, Mr. ROKITA and Ms. FOXX.

H.J. Res. 33: Mr. BARR.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. WALZ, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. NEAL and Mr. RIBBLE.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. PITTS.

H. Res. 11: Mr. MULVANEY.

H. Res. 12: Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H. Res. 14: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H. Res. 26: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. NEAL.

H. Res. 45: Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 54: Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LANCE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WALZ, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Res. 92: Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. BEYER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. FARR, and Mrs. TORRES.

H. Res. 106: Mr. MEEKS.

H. Res. 111: Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H. Res. 137: Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 139: Mr. TROTT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. ROKITA.

H. Res. 140: Mr. COLE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COOK, Mr. SALMON, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. DESANTIS.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1041: Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1102: Mr. PERLMUTTER.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE  
OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S RICH-  
ARD W. "DICK" JONES, JR.

**HON. JEFF MILLER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a good friend, Mr. Richard W. "Dick" Jones, Jr. I am saddened by his passing, but fortunate to have experienced his friendship, kind-hearted nature, selfless character, and unwavering loyalty.

Dick was a native Northwest Floridian, born and raised on the beautiful Emerald Coast. He was born in Pensacola, Florida on May 7, 1930, to Richard W. Jones, Sr. and Agnes Curry Jones. Dick was a standout athlete, and, following his high school graduation, he attended the University of Florida, where he played on the school's varsity tennis team. Dick's passion for both tennis and the Florida Gators were constants throughout his life, and he was known as a top tennis player in Northwest Florida and an avid Gator fan.

Dick was also a true patriot, who answered the call of duty and served our Nation with honor and distinction as a member of the United States Air Force. Following his Air Force service, Dick began a successful career in the petroleum industry, while he and his loving wife, Sally, raised their two children.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize the life of Dick Jones. As with so many great Americans, Dick's impact cannot be truly captured in words. To all those who had the pleasure of knowing him, his legacy will forever live on in cherished memories, and he will long be remembered as a loving and devoted husband, father, grandfather, great-grandfather, and friend. My wife Vicki and I extend our prayers and deepest condolences to his wife, Sally; son, John R. (Rusty) Jones and wife Becky; son, Richard W. (Rick) Jones, III and wife Tonya; four grandchildren, Jessica Jones and husband Jonathan, Katherine Ann Jones, Grace Ellen Jones, and Richard W. (Will) Jones, IV; one great-grandchild, Mason Jones; brother, Robert C. (Bert) Jones and wife Dolores; sister, Dixie Jones Beal and husband Burnell; aunt, Mary Ann Curry and her family; dear friends and brother-in-law, John C. Green and John's daughter, Sherry Herring and family; and the entire Jones family.

CONGRESSIONAL TEACHER AWARD

**HON. VERN BUCHANAN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of outstanding public school

teachers in Florida's 16th Congressional District.

I was once told that children are 25 percent of the population, but they are 100 percent of the future.

And it's true. The education of a child is an investment, not only in that student, but in the future of our country.

Therefore, I established the Congressional Teacher Awards to honor educators for their ability to teach and inspire students.

An independent panel has chosen Amanda Rojas from Haile Middle School in Bradenton for Florida's 16th District 2015 Congressional Teacher Award for her accomplishments as a middle school social studies teacher.

The following teachers were also nominated and chosen for recognition:

Edward Hashey from Wilkinson Elementary School in Sarasota for his accomplishments as a Fifth Grade teacher.

Christi McDowell-Cameron from Brookside Middle School for her accomplishments as the International Baccalaureate Coordinator.

Russell Finger from Suncoast Polytechnical High, for his accomplishments as a high school science teacher.

Michelle Carpenter from Team Success School, for her accomplishments as a first grade teacher.

On behalf of the people of Florida's 16th District I congratulate each of these outstanding teachers and offer my sincere appreciation for their service and dedication.

MOWEAQUA CENTRAL A&M GIRLS  
BASKETBALL TEAM

**HON. JOHN SHIMKUS**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, Congressman RODNEY DAVIS and I rise today to acknowledge the outstanding victory of the Moweaqua Central A&M Girls Basketball Team as State Champions.

The Raiders won the Class 1A State Championship in a 51-41 victory. We would like to congratulate Coach Tom Dooley, Assistant Coaches Todd Rork and Mike Garner, the Athletic Director Jess Lehman and Athletic Trainer Timothy Berger who have worked hard to help the Central A&M High School Raiders achieve this victory.

Members of the state championship team include: Ryan Dooley, Taylor Jordan, Kaylee Collins, Kaylee Hennings, Kaylan Schinzler, Kayla Gibson, Jorji Sparrgrove, Olivia Jordan, Mikah Maples, Shelby Dailey, Gabby Cole, Katie Conlin, Taryn Sams, Morgan Damery, and Abigail Hilton.

Congressman DAVIS and I both look forward to the continued success of the Moweaqua Central A&M Raiders and we extend our best

wishes for another outstanding season next year.

TRIBUTE TO WADSWORTH, OHIO

**HON. JAMES B. RENACCI**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a city I am proud to call home: Wadsworth, Ohio.

This past year, Wadsworth celebrated its bicentennial. It was an opportunity to reflect on how far our city has come and how much we can achieve in the years ahead.

Founded in 1814, the city was named after Elijah Wadsworth, a Revolutionary War hero. Though he never lived in Wadsworth, he was an active member of his community and served as the postmaster, sheriff, and the commander of the 4th Division State Militia. He led by example and showed us just how important it is to give back to a community that has given you so much.

Wadsworth is important to me not only because it's where I have called home for more than 30 years, it's also where I raised my three children. That is why over a span of 18 years I served the city in capacities as a volunteer firefighter, a member of the Board of Zoning appeals, a member of the Planning Commission, president of the city council, and as mayor.

Now, as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I am working on behalf of the people of Wadsworth and Ohio's 16th District to encourage economic growth in our region and solutions that hold the promise of a brighter future.

President Lincoln once said, "The best way to predict the future is to create it." I came to Washington to fight to pass on a better America with more opportunities to our children and grandchildren, and each day I work toward that goal.

RECOGNIZING CHRIST TEMPLE  
CHURCH OF CHRIST (HOLINESS)

**HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and admiration that I congratulate Christ Temple Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. of Gary, Indiana, as its congregation and church leaders join together in celebration of the church's 90th anniversary. The congregation, along with the church's pastor, Bishop Dr. Dale L. Cudjoe, the Executive Board, and the Board of Deacons, commemorated this momentous occasion on Sunday, March 15, 2015, at the church.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Christ Temple Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. was organized by Sister Ella Bradley and Elder William A. Nolley when the two met and shared a common goal of starting a church in Gary, Indiana, that reflected the faith they had both known growing up in Mississippi and Missouri. Sister Bradley opened her home in Gary for the very first meeting, and the church was founded on November 25, 1925. Soon after, a lot of land was purchased on Pierce Street for the construction of the church building. Finally, in 1933, under the direction of Elder Johnny James Peterson, the first church was built. Years later, the church's pastor, Elder L. M. Relf, helped to ensure that remodeling work was completed on the church. Due to the growing congregation, a larger place of worship was needed and, in 1980, under the leadership of Elder James K. Mitchell Jr., a bigger church was purchased at its current location on Washington Street in Gary. Bishop O.W. McInnis became the interim pastor in 1988 and worked to pay off the church's mortgage. Bishop McInnis appointed Elder Dale L. Cudjoe as the next pastor of the church in 1989, and he became the full-time pastor in 1993. In 2010, Pastor Cudjoe was elected to the bishopric and became the presiding prelate of the Northern Diocese Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A., which includes Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio.

Led by Bishop Cudjoe, Christ Temple Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. continues to be a source of hope and charity for the community of Gary. Every week, members of the church organize a clothing and toy giveaway for those in need within the community. Through the church's youth ministry, children of the community can participate in the Youth Choir, Sunday School, and the Gym Ministry. In addition, the Brotherhood Ministry and the Temple Music Ministry programs are successful in building a spirit of unity throughout the church and the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in honoring and congratulating Christ Temple Church of Christ (Holiness) U.S.A. in Gary, Indiana, on its 90th anniversary. For their commitment to service, and for touching the lives of countless individuals, the church leaders, parishioners, and board members are worthy of the blessings that have been bestowed upon them.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SEDA KHOJAYAN— 28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

#### HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Seda Khojayan of Glendale, California.

Seda Khojayan immigrated to the United States from Iraq in 1976. Currently, she is a

member of the Soroptimist International of Glendale, serves as a Commissioner on the City of Glendale Commission on the Status of Women, and on the Board of Directors of the YWCA of Glendale. Mrs. Khojayan has been a dedicated member of the Armenian Relief Society of Western U.S.A., Inc. (ARS) for over three decades, serving on its Regional Executive Board for two terms and in the capacities of Chair, Treasurer and Advisor for the ARS Segan Chapter in Glendale.

Seda uses her professional experience as a Programmer/Data Security Analyst for a major car manufacturer and education in Economics and Public Administration, to help plan and implement fundraising efforts, including grant writing, to help Armenian organizations such as the ARS secure funding for various philanthropic, educational and social projects for low income families and for the needy. She also served as a fundraising committee member of Homenetmen Glendale "Ararat" Chapter, Homenetmen Navasartian Games & Festival, Armenian Cultural Foundation (ACF), and for the City of Glendale, including the Unity Fest, Man's Inhumanity to Man, and Relay For Life.

Throughout the years, Seda has received numerous awards, including the City of Glendale Commission on the Status of Women's Jewels of Glendale Women of Courage Award in 2008, the ACF's Community Service Award in 2013, and the Armenian American Chamber of Commerce's Woman in Community Service Award in 2014. Mrs. Khojayan and her husband, Shirak, have two sons, Shaun, a federal criminal defense attorney, and Dikran, an industrial engineer, and one granddaughter, Lillian.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Seda Khojayan.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO SAMUEL WANG

#### HON. THOMAS MACARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding young man from my district, Samuel Wang. Samuel was selected as a member of the 2015 National Youth Orchestra of the United States of America, which is a great accomplishment.

The National Youth Orchestra, hosted by Carnegie Hall, is a competitive opportunity for 16 through 19 year old musicians from across the country. Samuel is a young violinist from Medford, New Jersey, who stood out among his peers and earned the high honor of being chosen to participate in this year's orchestra. The young men and women selected will perform at Carnegie Hall this summer, then tour seven cities in China. On their trip, they will have the opportunity to serve as cultural representatives of our country, share in the exchange of art and music, and collaborate and gather with young Chinese musicians.

I am honored to represent bright young people in South Jersey like Samuel, and I am excited to hear from him when he returns from his trip this summer. Best of luck, Samuel, and congratulations.

#### RECOGNIZING WORLD DOWN SYNDROME DAY

#### HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, to mark World Down Syndrome Day on March 21st, 2015, the San Diego Congressional Delegation honors individuals challenged by Down syndrome.

World Down Syndrome Day was established by the United Nations in 2011 and is marked each year on the 21st of March to raise awareness for those affected by this condition. Down syndrome is the most common genetic condition in the U.S., affecting approximately 400,000 Americans. Each year nearly 6,000 babies are born in the United States with Down syndrome. Over the years, research and improved therapy options have led to great advances in the health and quality of life for those affected by Down syndrome. And Congress needs to continue to build upon those efforts.

We applaud the efforts of Special Heroes and their San Diego Down Syndrome chapter for their mission to serve individuals diagnosed with Down syndrome and their families in the San Diego community—improving their daily lives by providing opportunities for success while promoting community education and engagement is paramount.

Special Heroes has partnered with The Arc of San Diego to be a valuable foundation and resource of support to many families in the San Diego Community. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Congressional Delegation stands to recognize World Down Syndrome Day.

#### HONORING THE SAN ANTONIO MUSIC TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

#### HON. LAMAR SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the San Antonio Music Teachers Association (SAMTA) in San Antonio, Texas. SAMTA has provided education and performance opportunities for music teachers and their students, including recitals, auditions, competitions and lecture series. SAMTA provides scholarships necessary to many students who need financial assistance to continue with their music education. Members of SAMTA serve on the faculty of schools, colleges and universities. Members also perform on the concert stage and in houses of worship. SAMTA has elevated the level of professional standards and musicianship in San Antonio and the surrounding area. We are very grateful for the service they provide to aspiring musicians in our local community.

HONORING GORDON MICHAEL  
HENDRIX

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Gordon Michael Hendrix. Gordon is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Gordon has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Gordon has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Gordon has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Gordon Michael Hendrix for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

“SHARK LADY” OF MOTE PASSES  
AWAY AFTER NEARLY 75 YEARS  
OF MARINE RESEARCH

**HON. VERN BUCHANAN**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize one of America's great ocean research pioneers, Dr. Eugenie Clark.

“Genie” Clark—known as the “Shark Lady”—founded Mote Marine Laboratory in Southwest Florida. She died at age 92 on Feb. 25 at her home in Sarasota.

Genie visited the New York Aquarium in 1922 at age nine and was fascinated by the sharks and other fish of many shapes and colors. She began sharing what she learned about the fish with others.

After carrying out a distinguished career spanning almost 75 years, raising four children and inspiring students and others, Clark will be remembered for her amazing discoveries.

Her legacy is impressive: blazing trails for women in science; inspiring generations of people from ocean experts to school children; swimming with sharks to learn about them; and founding a world-class marine laboratory that turned 60 this year.

Clark was a world authority on fish—particularly sharks and tropical sand fish. A courageous diver and explorer, Clark conducted 72 submersible dives as deep as 12,000 feet and led over 200 field research expeditions to the Red Sea and Gulf of Aqaba, Caribbean, Mexico, Japan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, Thailand, Indonesia and Borneo to study sand fish, whale sharks, deep sea sharks and spotted oceanic triggerfish. She wrote three books and more than 175 articles, including research publications in leading peer-reviewed journals such as Science

and a dozen popular stories in National Geographic magazine.

In 1955, Clark started the one-room Cape Haze Marine Laboratory in Placida, Fla., with her fisherman assistant and with philanthropic support and encouragement from the Vanderbilt family. The Lab thrived in partnership with its community and became Mote Marine Laboratory in 1967 to honor major benefactor William R. Mote. Today the Lab is based on City Island, Sarasota, and it hosts 24 diverse marine research and conservation programs, education programs for all ages and a major public Aquarium. The Lab has six campuses in Florida and more than 200 staff, including scientists who work in oceans surrounding all seven continents.

Clark joined the Zoology faculty at the University of Maryland in 1968, and she officially retired in 1992. She returned to Mote in 2000 as Senior Scientist and Director Emerita and later became a Trustee. There, she continued to build upon and champion the groundbreaking research that she started 60 years ago.

Clark dove as recently as June 2014, when she brought a team of volunteer research divers to study deep water triggerfish in the Solomon Islands. The divers had been searching for nests and monitoring how the fish behaved.

Clark is the recipient of three honorary degrees and numerous awards including The Explorers Club Medal; the Medal of Excellence from the American Society of Oceanographers; The NOGI award in Arts from Underwater Society of America; the Dugan Award in Aquatic Sciences from the American Littoral Society; a Gold Medal from the Society of Women Geographers; the Distinguished Fellow Award from the American Elasmobranch Society; and the Franklin L. Burr Award from the National Geographic Society. Several fish species have been named in her honor: *Callogobius clarki* (Goren), *Sticharium clarkae* (George and Springer), *Enneapterygius clarkae* (Holleman), and *Atrubucca geniae* (Ben-Tuvia and Trewavas).

Clark is survived by her four children: Hera, Aya, Tak and Niki Konstantinou, and her grandson, Eli Weiss.

A TRIBUTE TO TRACY A. STONE—  
28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT  
WOMAN OF THE YEAR

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Tracy Stone, of Elysian Valley, a unique neighborhood in Los Angeles, California.

Tracy Stone received a Bachelor's Degree in Art History from Cornell University in New York, a Master's Degree in Architecture from

The University of Texas at Austin, and in 1989, was licensed as an Architect by the State of California. In 1991, Ms. Stone opened her own firm, Tracy A. Stone Architect. The office has completed a variety of projects, including a 'green' teahouse, an animal shelter and a children's dance studio.

Ms. Stone and members of her firm created and organized the annual “Frogtown Artwalk” in Elysian Valley, which started in 2006, as a small event showcasing the artists and artisans inhabiting the small commercial/industrial buildings along the Los Angeles River in Elysian Valley. It has grown into a full-scale community event that engages musicians from the surrounding areas, community organizations, local residents, as well as artists and artisans. The event has also featured various activities geared to parents and youth. The Frogtown Artwalk has traditionally celebrated the relationship between the Elysian Valley and the adjacent Los Angeles River, helping to bring interest as well as attention to a long forgotten resource. In 2008, Tracy Stone and Allen Anderson established a non-profit organization, the Elysian Valley Arts Collective, which manages and funds the annual artwalk, and which has allowed the event to grow in complexity and size.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Tracy A. Stone.

CELEBRATING MS. MAXINE  
MILNER'S 100TH BIRTHDAY

**HON. JACKIE WALORSKI**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Ms. Maxine Milner, who is turning 100 years old March 23rd, 2015. She embodies the American dream as someone who has worked every day to improve the lives of her family and loved ones.

As we celebrate Ms. Milner's birth we can look back on a century filled with family and hard work. She was born in Kokomo, Indiana, and has remained a lifelong Hoosier who has never strayed far from home. In 1932, she married Edward V. Brown, and they were married for 74 years before he passed away in 2008. Shortly after marrying Edward, Maxine began working in 1935 at Crosley Radio. Crosley was eventually bought by Delco Radio where she continued to work for 39 years. Maxine was blessed with three children, four grandchildren, and is also a proud great grandmother of two. Since her retirement in 1974 she has been living out her retirement on Grissom Air Force base in Peru, Indiana.

It is an honor to wish Ms. Maxine Milner a very happy birthday and to celebrate a century of achievement. On behalf of Indiana's Second District, I am proud to recognize Maxine's birthday and wish her good health and many more birthdays.

## TRIBUTE TO TODD JACOBSON

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Mr. Todd Jacobson, a history teacher at Creston High School. Mr. Jacobson received the 2014–2015 VFW High School Teacher of the Year Award.

Mr. Jacobson received this award after being nominated by fellow teacher and 2009 award recipient, Lesa Downing. Mr. Jacobson served overseas during the Gulf War, and now says that he believes that there are no two greater professions, no more honorable professions than to have been a soldier and a teacher. He feels fortunate to have been able to do both. Todd plans to use his monetary award to provide a seating area at Creston's Freedom Rock in honor of his late father-in-law, Wilbur Chubick, who served in the Navy during the early 1950s.

I applaud and congratulate Todd Jacobson for his award, for providing the youth in Iowa's 3rd congressional district the education that they will need to be successful in the future and for serving our country during the Gulf War. I am proud to represent him, his family and his fellow teachers and students in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating Todd Jacobson and wishing him well and continued success in the future.

## HONORING JOHN EVANS

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to have local leaders in the business community who are civic-minded, and work hard to better the neighborhood. John Evans, the friendly face the community knows so well from Brown's Jewelers on Riverdale Avenue, has been one of those community-minded business leaders for many years.

John was born and bred in the Bronx. The grandson of a Greenwich Village artisan jeweler, he and a partner started in the jewelry business in 1967, building a successful business in the East Bronx. At age 30, John was ready for a new challenge, and took his talents to Fuji Film. For 20 years John rose through the ranks of the company, becoming upper-level management in Fuji's bio-medical engineering division.

As successful as his tenure at Fuji Film was, John decided to return to jewelry, this time at Brown's in Riverdale. For 18 years as owner, John has become a pillar of the Riverdale community. He has selflessly provided both financial and moral support to organizations throughout the entire area, including the Riverdale Jewish Community Relations Council (RJCRC), the South Riverdale Little League, the children's basketball program at the Riverdale Y, Rising Stars program at the Riverdale Y, and the Conservative Synagogue

Adath Israel of Riverdale. John's warmth and positive nature are evident in everything he does, and the Riverdale community has benefited greatly from all of his efforts.

This year, the RJCRC is honoring John with the Community Business Award at their annual Legislative Breakfast on March 15th. I want to congratulate my good friend John on this wonderful honor, and thank him for everything he has done on behalf of the Riverdale community. No one deserves this recognition or honor more than him.

## HONORING CADET MAXWELL ROSE

**HON. JASON SMITH**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cadet Maxwell Rose of Missouri for his achievement and commitment to serving our country.

Cadet Rose has reached the second milestone of the Civil Air Patrol Cadet Program, and is being promoted to the rank of Cadet 2nd Lieutenant. To complete the program and achieve this milestone, Cadet Rose had to excel in different trainings and leadership classes. He then went before a Promotion Review Board of his peers who acknowledged his achievements and awarded him this recognition. This is quite an honor as only a few distinguished cadets nationwide achieve this status.

At a young age Cadet Rose has shown an admirable commitment to serve our country, and I am very thankful for patriots like him who will lead the future generation of airmen. It is my pleasure to recognize his efforts and achievements before the House of Representatives.

A TRIBUTE TO CHERYL ORTEGA—  
28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT  
WOMAN OF THE YEAR**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Cheryl Ortega of Echo Park, a unique neighborhood in Los Angeles, California.

Born in Los Feliz and raised in the Echo Park area of Los Angeles, California, Ms. Ortega's father's family arrived in Echo Park from Massachusetts in 1917, hoping to be part of the early movie industry. Ms. Ortega attended Los Feliz Elementary School, Our Mother of Good Counsel School, Immaculate Heart High School and Immaculate Heart College. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in French and a Bilingual Teaching Credential in Spanish.

Cheryl has been passionate about education from a very young age. She has been a teacher for nearly half a century, and has been teaching in Echo Park at Logan Span School for over two decades. Ms. Ortega's close association with the immigrant community has led her to actively advocate for people whose children she has taught in bilingual early education programs for almost 50 years. Along with her professional career, Cheryl is active and engaged in volunteering for the community and its schools. Currently, she serves on the Board of Directors of United Teachers Los Angeles, representing English Learner students and their teachers. She also serves as the Co-Chair of the Schools, Libraries, and Community Organizations of the Greater Echo Park Elysian Neighborhood Council, and has been a member of the Council through several different administrations.

Cheryl and her husband, John, have three children, John, Kristina and Sara, and five grandchildren, Danny, Jake, Amanda, Ben and Caleb.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Cheryl Ortega.

IN HONOR OF MR. MIKE  
MOYNIHAN**HON. DONALD NORCROSS**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the works of Mr. Mike Moynihan whose achievements, contributions and service to the people of New Jersey as an advocate and leader, have not gone unnoticed.

Mr. Moynihan recently retired after eighteen years with the United Way of Camden County and the United Way of Greater Philadelphia and Southern New Jersey. Mr. Moynihan has also served across the nation with the United Way for nearly thirty years.

Mike was an effective and valuable member of the United Way of Camden County as its President and CEO. He was an advocate for the needs of the whole community, assisting in the merger that created a powerful and effective United Way in our area. I know Mike as a vital member of the community, and I enjoyed our time working together.

In addition to his work with the United Way, Mike also serves on the executive committee of the Senator Walter Rand Institute for Public Affairs at Rutgers University, the Camden County Government Ethics Board, and has also been involved in a variety of community service organizations.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Moynihan is a great man who demonstrates for us all the good that can be accomplished by pairing true leadership and great compassion. I join with my community and all of New Jersey in honoring the achievements of this truly exceptional man.

## HONORING BRYSON DEAN GRAU

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Bryson Dean Grau. Bryson is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Bryson has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Bryson has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Bryson has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Bryson Dean Grau for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

REMEMBERING JIM "LIBBY"  
LIBERATORE**HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great man in my district, Jim "Libby" Liberatore, who passed away this month at the age of 60. Mr. Liberatore was a former Burlington Township fire chief, and dedicated his life to emergency services and caring for his community.

It is not often that we come across public servants who not only embody the spirit of service, but who approach that service with passion and excitement. Libby was truly one of those men—he began his career as a volunteer firefighter in 1971 and went on to fill countless positions and duties over the next 43 years. He spent six years as fire chief and received the State Firefighter of the Year Award in 1992.

His friends and colleagues describe him as the key individual responsible for bringing people together. Mr. Liberatore organized educational trips to conventions, encouraged a spirit of healthy competition, and led fundraisers for the fire station. His devotion to those around him never went unnoticed, and the South Jersey community is greatly improved because of his life and work.

It is my sincere hope that Libby will continue be an inspiration to those who knew him, and that we can all strive to reflect the same values of service, love, and dedication he personified. May he rest in peace.

## TRIBUTE TO MAX MEKUS

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Max Mekus for his many years of service on the Ringgold County Board of Health.

For the past 26 years, Dr. Mekus has served as a faithful servant to his county. All members of this board are volunteers and have jurisdiction over public health matters in the county.

I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress join me in commending Dr. Max Mekus for his service to Ringgold County and wish him the best in his retirement from his duties. I consider it an honor to represent him in Congress, and I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

COLUMBUS NORTH GIRLS  
BASKETBALL TEAM**HON. LUKE MESSER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of the Columbus North girls basketball team.

The Columbus North girls' basketball team recently captured the team's first state championship. The Bulldogs won the Indiana High School Athletic Association Class 4A State Final 62–56 over Homestead High School.

The team embodied the best of Hoosier sportsmanship with their dedication, grit, and execution shown not only in the championship game but throughout the entire season. For the leadership and support of this championship team, congratulations and accolades go to Superintendent Dr. John Quick, Principal David Clark, Athletic Director Jeff Hester, Coach Pat McKee, the assistant coaches, all other support staff, and the 27 young women who worked so hard to achieve their championship goal.

I ask the entire 6th Congressional District to join me in congratulating the Columbus North Bulldogs for their impressive victory. I look forward to seeing what each of these talented young women will achieve in the future.

A TRIBUTE TO JEAN MALUCCIO—  
28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT  
WOMAN OF THE YEAR**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my

Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Jean Maluccio of La Crescenta, California.

Jean is a savvy businesswoman who helps oversee the Maluccio Company, a local investment firm, but is best known for her unparalleled volunteerism that benefits the entire Crescenta Valley. Jean served as the Executive Director of the Crescenta Valley Chamber of Commerce for more than 18 years, without pay, and continues to have an active role with the chamber as an advisor, and helps ensure the smooth operation of chamber events that include the Taste of the Foothills and Home-town Country Fair. She served as President of the Crescenta Valley Chamber of Commerce in 1994, 1995, 2009 and 2010. Jean was also one of the founders of the Crescenta Valley Fireworks Association, a nonprofit which organizes an annual 4th of July fireworks display, and works countless hours each year arranging for the carnival entertainment, handling site permits, working with security for the event and selling tickets.

Ms. Maluccio has also been actively involved with Prom Plus, where she was on hand to secure donations of food and serve food to guests at the organization's 20th anniversary gala. She also gives of her time with Relay For Life, an annual 24-hour event held at Clark Magnet High School, where hundreds of people walk on the school field to raise funds to fight cancer. Jean not only obtains the donated food to feed the participants, but also stays for most of the 24 hours to ensure that the food is ready when needed. In addition, Jean also volunteers for the Glendale Police Department, working at the Montrose COPPS substation representing the department in many capacities and answering questions from the public.

A strong supporter of our nation's military, Jean was a driving force in raising awareness and helped organize fundraisers for the refurbishment of the war memorial at Two Strike Park in La Crescenta.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Jean Maluccio.

## HONORING YAEL LEVY

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my district is blessed to have an incredible array of natural beauty, and community members that work to highlight and preserve this beauty do a wonderful service for the neighborhood. When it comes to Yael Levy, who founded Riverdale Riverfest, the commitment to highlighting the need for expanded access to our scenic Hudson waterway has turned a simple passion into a community calling.

Yael founded Riverdale Riverfest in June, 2010 in hopes of advancing the timetable for construction of the Hudson River Greenway Link, a waterfront park that would connect the Manhattan Hudson River Greenway to the old Croton Aqueduct Trail in Westchester County. The festival has become an annual tradition

for many, bringing people from all over the Northwest Bronx to the campus of the College of Mount Saint Vincent, which sits on the Hudson's shores. The festival is a great time for the entire family, and offers everything from stage performances and local vendors to boat rides. By giving the community a taste of how wonderful year round public access to the waterfront would be, the festival has gone a long way toward building the public support necessary to make the Greenway Link a reality.

When Yael is not working to expand river access, she is serving as Deputy Chief of the Appeals Bureau at the Nassau County District Attorney's Office, and teaching New York Criminal Practice at St. John's University School of Law.

A proud mother of three, Yael has loved raising her family in Riverdale, and hopes to someday be able to cycle with them along the Hudson without having to start by leaving the Bronx.

This year, The Riverdale Jewish Community Relations Council is honoring Yael with the Community Builder Award at their annual Legislative Breakfast. I want to congratulate Yael on this wonderful honor, and thank her for all she has done to enhance and promote our beautiful community.

H.R. 648, THE TRAUMA SYSTEMS AND REGIONALIZATION OF EMERGENCY CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT AND H.R. 647, THE ACCESS TO LIFE-SAVING TRAUMA CARE FOR ALL AMERICANS ACT

### HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged that today the House will consider two important public health bills that deal with traumatic injury. These two bills would reauthorize a number of important trauma programs to help equip states to deliver these critical medical services.

Traumatic injury is the leading cause of death for children and adults under the age of 45. After an accident, the care received in the first hour presents the highest likelihood that the patient will survive rapid intervention after a traumatic injury. Without that immediate care, their survival rates decrease by 25 percent. Trauma systems not only provide rapid intervention at the time of injury but also include supporting equipment and personnel, and a continuum of care, including pre-hospital, hospital, and rehabilitation services.

The first bill, H.R. 648, the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act, which passed the House last year, allows for planning and implementing trauma care systems in the States. The bill would also establish pilot projects for innovative models of regionalized trauma care.

The second bill, H.R. 647, the Access to Life-Saving Trauma Care for All Americans Act, reauthorizes two additional trauma programs that will increase the availability of trauma services. Trauma centers should be avail-

able for all victims of traumatic injury. Unfortunately, many trauma centers are at serious risk of closure and financial insolvency. In fact, nearly thirty trauma centers have closed in the past fifteen years.

The programs included in this bill will provide critically needed federal funding to help cover uncompensated costs in trauma centers, support core mission trauma services, provide emergency finding to trauma centers, and address trauma center physician shortages in order to ensure the future availability of trauma care for all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, none of these programs have received funding during the appropriations process in recent years. I hope that our consideration of these measures signals the importance of these programs to Members of Congress. I would like to thank Mr. GREEN and Mr. BURGESS, who are both leaders on trauma care, for their work on these bills.

I urge Members to support H.R. 647 and H.R. 648.

### HONORING BRET MARCKX

#### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Bret Marckx. Bret is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Bret has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Bret has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Bret has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Bret Marckx for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

### TRIBUTE TO RICHARD "BUTCH" MILLER

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Richard "Butch" Miller, of Creston, Iowa for being inducted into the Iowa High School Officials Hall of Fame.

Over his 27 year career as a sports official, Butch officiated in hundreds of football games, 10 years of football playoffs and one championship football contest. In basketball, he officiated sectional, district and substate game for 17 years, and many girls and boys regular season games. Mr. Miller also officiated softball games and numerous junior college contests.

In addition to these many responsibilities, Butch Miller spent the early 1980s, working with the Harlem Globe Trotters as an official. He traveled to the Far East, South America, Australia and all 50 states. He worked at Madison Square Garden and all the big venues throughout the country.

I am honored to represent Butch Miller and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me in congratulating him on this latest honor and wish him the best of luck in the future.

### IN HONOR OF THE DILLARD HIGH SCHOOL LADY PANTHERS BASKETBALL TEAM

#### HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Dillard High School "Lady Panthers" Basketball team for winning the Class 5A Florida State Championship on February 21, 2015. With their 51-35 victory over the Jacksonville Paxon School for Advanced Studies the Lady Panthers brought home their 9th state championship for Hall of Fame coach Marcia Pinder.

Coach Pinder now has the most girls basketball state titles of any coach in state history, and is the winningest coach in Florida high school basketball—boys or girls—history. I would like to take this opportunity to personally congratulate all of the outstanding players and coaches for this amazing achievement:

#3 Jamesha Paul, #4 Destiny Frazier, #10 Tiera Wilks, #11 Tyler Wilks, #12 Jacaira Allen, #20 Jade Alexander, #21 Dominique Fields, #25 Jade Wyatt, #30 Ragene Grier, #31 Amber Lee, #32 Courtney Parson, #33 Harmony Adams, #35 Daymia Ware, #40 Katrina Savage, #44 Linsey Francois.

Head Coach: Marcia Pinder, Asst. Coach: George Adams, Asst. Coach: Brandon Adams, Asst. Coach: Tania Miller, Asst. Coach: Enewetok Ramsey, Asst. Coach: Chanell Washington.

The Lady Panthers displayed hard work, perseverance, and dominance on their road to winning the state championship, losing only one game all season and winning their six previous postseason games by an average of nearly 30 points. This state championship is the Lady Panthers' fifth in the last six years—a truly remarkable feat that has made South Florida very proud. I commend the players and coaching staff for their dedication to excellence, and I wish them continued success in the future. Go Lady Panthers!

### A TRIBUTE TO LYNN WHITE-SHELBY—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

#### HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year,

we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Lynn White-Shelby of Burbank, California.

Lynn graduated from Ohio Wesleyan University with a major in physical education and science, and began her teaching career at Franklin High School in the Highland Park area of Los Angeles, California. Ms. White-Shelby's business career began in the Public Relations Department at the Los Angeles College of Chiropractic, where she was promptly promoted to Secretary to the President, and later as Assistant to the President and Assistant Director of the Postgraduate Department, developing the first Chiropractic Assistants program. Lynn then went on to work at ACCO Engineered Systems in Glendale, California, as Secretary to the President, which soon led to a management position as their Corporate Insurance and Safety Administrator.

Ms. White-Shelby is a dedicated volunteer. Upon retirement, she jumped right into volunteering at the learning center at the Boys & Girls Club of Burbank and Greater East Valley, tutoring at the Main Club, and co-teaching a storytelling/acting class at Burbank's Roosevelt Elementary School. She is also a devoted and giving member of the La Providencia Guild of Children's Hospital Los Angeles, serving on numerous committees, working at the Thrift Shop and is currently the First Vice President/President Elect. Lynn also served five terms as President of the Verdugo-Glen Chapter of the American Business Women's Association (ABWA), where she has been a member for over three decades, and currently serves as the Education Chair, which awards scholarships to women students. In addition, Lynn serves as Vice Chairman on the City of Burbank's Senior Citizen Board, and as Secretary on the Boys & Girls Club of Burbank and Greater East Valley's Board of Directors.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Lynn White-Shelby.

#### HONORING AMELIA BOYNTON ROBINSON

#### HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Amelia Boynton Robinson, a woman who made vast contributions to the civil rights movement.

Amelia Boynton was born on August 18, 1911 in Savannah, Georgia, and was first exposed to the fight for equal rights at the age of 9, when she joined her mother in the women's suffrage movement. She learned four principles of life that she still carries on today: daily praying, always helping and showing compassion for others, standing up for the morally right, and becoming economically independent.

After graduating from Tuskegee University, she also studied at Tennessee State, Virginia

State, and Temple University. She became a registered voter in 1932, and was one of the first people to pass tests used as a barrier to prevent Southern blacks from being able to vote.

In 1930, Amelia met Dallas County extension agent Samuel Boynton. The two shared the desire to improve the lives of African-Americans in their community. As a result, the Boynton's became co-founders of the Dallas County Voters League in 1933. In 1936, Amelia and Samuel married and had two sons, Bill, Jr. and Bruce Carver. After losing her husband in 1963, Amelia was not deterred from her commitment to improve the lives of African Americans.

On February 29, 1964, Amelia Boynton ran on the Democratic ticket for a seat in Congress representing the state of Alabama, becoming the first African-American woman to run as a Democratic candidate as well as the first woman to run in the state's history.

On March 7, 1965, at the age of 53, Amelia joined fellow civil rights activist Martin Luther King, Jr. in organizing the marches from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama. On that fateful day, 600 peaceful protestors tried to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge and were met with the violence known as "Bloody Sunday." Forever immortalized by photograph, the nation saw Amelia Boynton beaten unconscious and left for dead on this tragic day.

"Bloody Sunday" prompted swift action by Congress and resulted in President Lyndon B. Johnson signing the Voting Rights Act on August 6, 1965. President Johnson invited Amelia as a guest of honor during the signing of this important civil rights legislation.

After the signing of the Voting Rights Act, Amelia continued her leadership across the nation as a writer, speaker, and social change ambassador.

In 1990, Boynton was awarded the Martin Luther King, Jr. Medal of Freedom. She continued to tour the United States on behalf of the Schiller Institute, which continues to defend the human and moral rights of all.

And on March 7, 2015, I was proud to have walked alongside Amelia Boynton during the 50th Anniversary of the March in Selma, Alabama. I ask my colleagues who also traced the very footsteps that Amelia took to pledge to go beyond just remembering those who sacrificed for us and resolve to carry on their legacy with action.

#### HONORING GWEN MCCLAIN

#### HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gwen McClain of Steeleville, Missouri, for her outstanding achievement of receiving the Patriot's Pen Award. The National Patriot's Pen Essay Contest is an annual competition sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. While over 200 essays were submitted in the state of Missouri, Gwen's stood out above the rest.

The theme of the 2015 National Patriot's Pen Contest was "Why I appreciate America's

Veterans." Students were encouraged to examine America's history, along with their own experiences in modern American society. As a recipient of this award, Gwen has shown remarkable creativity and maturity.

It is my pleasure to congratulate Gwen McClain on her great accomplishment before the U.S. House of Representatives.

#### HONORING BRANDAN SCOTT FITZGERALD

#### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Brandan Scott Fitzgerald. Brandan is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Brandan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Brandan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Brandan has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Brandan Scott Fitzgerald for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

#### OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

#### HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,457,339,107.97. We've added \$7,525,580,290,194.89 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

#### A TRIBUTE TO ANN NEILSON—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

#### HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding



women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Ann Neilson of La Cañada Flintridge, California.

Born in Los Angeles and raised in Manhattan Beach, Ms. Neilson and her husband, Bob, have lived in La Cañada Flintridge for over fifty years. Well-regarded as a straightforward, tireless community leader, Ann is involved in numerous charitable organizations in La Cañada Flintridge. She has been a Docent at the Lanterman House for over two decades, and is a past and present Board member. She is active in the Assistance League of Flintridge (ALF), a nonprofit service organization of volunteers committed to serving the needs of the community through philanthropic programs developed and administered by its members. Ms. Neilson was Chair of the College Application Essay Committee, Chair of the Retired Service Volunteer Committee, a volunteer at the Bargain Box Thrift Shop, and a member of the Budget Committee. Ann's current project with ALF is Chair of their impressive Summer School program for La Cañada Flintridge children grades one through eight, a project that the league subsidizes.

Another organization that is near and dear to her heart, Ann has been active in the Girl Scouts of America for nearly forty-six years. She served as a Leader, was President of the Mt. Wilson/Vista Girl Scout Council for six years, Director and Co-Director of two Girl Scout Day Camps in La Cañada Flintridge, and Co-Organizer of the 100th Anniversary Girl Scout Float for the 2012 Pasadena Tournament of Roses Parade. Ms. Neilson is also very involved in the La Cañada Flintridge Tournament of Roses Association, established in 1979, where she is a Founding Member. The association has produced volunteer-made floats for the Pasadena Tournament of Roses Parades for nearly four decades, winning awards in the majority of the parades. She served as President for three years and now serves as Past President.

Married for nearly sixty years, Ann and Bob have four children, Beth, Karen, Nancy and Jim, and one grandchild, Emily.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Ann Neilson.

#### TRIBUTE TO DORIS DIDDY

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Doris Diddy for her many years of service at the bank in Menlo, Iowa.

For the past 55 years, Ms. Diddy has served the people of Menlo as an outstanding and dedicated employee, offering reliable and friendly service. Her first day of employment was January 15, 1960, and since that time she has seen four company changes, but she has stayed at her post at the bank, serving her fellow community members. Great service goes a long way, and I am honored to see fellow Iowans like Doris providing service second to none.

I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress join me in commending Doris Diddy for her service to Menlo and Rolling Hills Band and Trust as she faithfully defended their vault for 55 years. I consider it an honor to represent her in Congress, and I wish her the best in her future endeavors.

#### RECOGNIZING STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA VFW DEPARTMENT PRESIDENT BRENDA JOHNSON

#### HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States was established to serve our nation's veterans and their families. This organization honors military service and ensures that the history of America's veterans is preserved for future generations. With the help of its 500,000 members, the organization serves those who have been called to the highest honor by maintaining veterans' memorials, sharing veterans' history with the community, volunteering at veterans' hospitals, and providing scholarships to students recognizing patriotism through art and volunteerism. One very special member, who I would like to recognize today, President Brenda Johnson, rallies the theme "LOVE FOR OUR VETERANS" in my home state of Pennsylvania. President Johnson, a resident of Falls Township, is a Life Auxiliary member of the VFW#6495 located on Haines Road in Levittown, Bucks County, PA, one of seven auxiliaries in my home district. I would like to thank President Johnson and the Ladies Auxiliary for their continued support and dedication and wish them continued success as they serve our veterans and their families.

#### IN HONOR OF LOUIS F. CAPPELLI, SR.

#### HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Louis F. Cappelli, Sr. for his achievements, contributions and service to the people of New Jersey as an educator, advocate and leader. Mr. Cappelli passed away at the age of eighty this year and will truly be missed.

Mr. Cappelli graduated with a bachelor's degree from Trenton State College and a Master's degree from Temple University both in education. Particularly valuing his work with young athletes, Mr. Cappelli was a physical education teacher as well as a football and track coach. Over his many years in education Mr. Cappelli served as a vice-principal at Triton High School for ten years and as its principal for another twenty-four years.

Mr. Cappelli also served the people of New Jersey in a number of civic posts. He honored his heritage through his leadership with Order

of the Sons of Italy, serving as the president for his local Lodge 494 and the Grand Lodge of the State of New Jersey. Serving on the board of directors for the Cerebral Palsy School & Treatment Center of Camden County, Mr. Cappelli never shied away from being a part of a good movement.

He was an effective and beloved member of the Collingswood Board of Education, and was known as advocate for the needs of the students, even when those positions were unpopular. He was also a valued member of the Camden County College board of trustees. I knew Mr. Cappelli as a vital member of the community, who couldn't have been more proud of his family.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Cappelli, Sr. was a great man who exemplified the true meaning of community leader and family-man. I join with my community and all of New Jersey in honoring the achievements of this truly exceptional man.

#### A TRIBUTE TO RENAE PLANT—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

#### HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Renae Plant of Los Feliz, a unique neighborhood in Los Angeles, California.

Born in Eumundi, Queensland, Australia, Renae moved to the United States in 1994 with dreams of becoming an actor. After living in New York for six years, where she was a model and actor, she moved to Los Angeles in 2000, and established a management company, Nebula Management. Shortly after, she began a second business, a maternity tee shirt line. In 2007, Renae and her husband, Livinio, rescued the local preschool their daughter attended, Camelot Kids, located in the Silver Lake area of Los Angeles, which had been on the verge of permanent closure. After three months of meetings, the preschool was able to re-open its doors. Now eight years later, with Ms. Plant as the Director, the preschool is known for its warm, nurturing environment that encourages a natural love of learning, and is an award-winning school with a long waiting list.

An accomplished organizer, Renae has recently given her time and talent to the Thomas Starr King Middle School, where her daughter, Ilan attends the Environmental Magnet program. In 2014, she joined the Executive Board as Treasurer of Friends of King, a parent support and fundraising group for the school, and that same year, was instrumental in raising substantial funds that will be used to paint the entire school. She launched the "I Keep King Clean" project with a group of parents who clean the school and carry out other beautification tasks, and was ultimately successful in

obtaining a professional cleaning service for the school. In addition, Ms. Plant has been a key force with upcoming efforts to decorate the perimeter fences at the school, the "Chain Link Art Gallery" project, and the upcoming renovation of the library and the gym.

Married for eleven years, Renae and her husband, Livinio, have three children, Ilan, Mateo and Deklan.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Renae Plant.

#### HONORING POTS

#### HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as the Congressional Representative for New York's 16th District, I am always amazed by some of the work our great civic organizations do to better the community. Part of the Solution, better known as POTS, is one of those fantastic organizations that has done so much for so very many throughout the Bronx.

POTS is a 501(c)(3) organization that serves as a "one-stop shop" for individuals living in poverty. The goal of the organization is to help those in need on their journeys from crisis to stability and, ultimately, self-sufficiency. By nourishing the basic needs and hunger of those who come through their doors, the organization seeks to create a positive, loving, and caring community in the Bronx. POTS offers a wide variety of services that were designed to work in concert to address diverse and complex issues. From clothing and food pantry programs to comprehensive legal services, POTS does it all. Even in instances where POTS does not provide directly needed service, their staff will link incoming clients with other groups or organizations that can help them. Simply put, anyone who comes to POTS for help gets it.

Since the very first meal in 1982, POTS has served hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers, and this year will help more than 20,000 individuals, including 6,000 children. They have been an absolute godsend to the Bronx and continue to do more and more every year to help those in trying times.

The Riverdale Jewish Community Relations Council is honoring POTS with the Community Organization Award at their annual Legislative Breakfast. They have chosen a wonderful organization to honor. My sincere congratulations go out to the entire Board and staff of POTS on receiving this well deserved recognition and award.

#### TRIBUTE TO JACLYN EASTER

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Jaclyn Easter, a middle school science

teacher at Bergman Academy School in Des Moines. Jaclyn received the Maitland P. Simmons Memorial Award for New Science Teachers.

This award, from the National Science Teaching Association, is given to only 25 outstanding teachers from around the country and provides mentorship, tracking and continuing opportunities for meaningful involvement with NSTA, and Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics (STEM) professional development.

I applaud and congratulate Jaclyn for her award and for providing the youth in Iowa's 3rd Congressional District the education that they will need to be successful in the future. I am proud to represent her, her fellow teachers and students in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating Jaclyn Easter and wishing her well and continued success in the future.

#### RECOGNIZING ROBERT WILLIAMS' SERVICE TO CARTHAGE WATER & ELECTRIC PLANT

#### HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Robert Williams on his upcoming retirement this April as general manager of Carthage Water & Electric Plant and thank him for his service to the community.

Robert joined Carthage Water & Electric Plant in January 1998 and has been the general manager since 1999. The utility provides and distributes energy and water to residents, businesses and industrial facilities; also the company now provides fiber and wireless Internet services.

Robert's invaluable skills and expertise in the field of energy were acquired over years of experience. When he joined the U.S. Army in 1972, he was trained as a power generation technician. He was assigned to a special nuclear power program where he ran nuclear power generators in an air defense unit. After his time in the Army, Robert worked with Springfield's City Utilities, as well as utilities in Higginsville, Missouri, and Miami, Oklahoma. He graduated from Missouri State University.

During his career Robert chaired numerous utility-related organizations on a regional, state and national level. He served on the executive committee of American Public Power Association, Southwestern Power Resources Association, Missouri Public Utility Association, Tri-State Water Coalition and Southwest Missouri Joint Municipal Water Utility Commission.

I again am honored to recognize Robert Williams and congratulate him on his retirement after 40 years of dedicated work in the utility industry.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SUSAN B. STEWART—28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

#### HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Susan B. Stewart of Sunland, California.

Born and raised in Vermont, Susan Bishop moved to the Sunland-Tujunga area in the late 1990's, and in 2010, she married Richard Stewart. Well-regarded in her community, Susan is involved in numerous organizations where she puts her superior organizing skills to good use. Ms. Stewart is on the Sunland-Tujunga Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and the chamber's Spring Carnival Committee, and has served on the Nomination Committee, By-Laws Committee and Marketing and Membership Committee. Susan is a Founding Board member and current Board member of the Sunland-Tujunga-Shadow Hills Community Fund whose mission is to support student programs at Verdugo Hills High School and the local newspaper, Voice of the Village, and is on the fund's Fireworks Festival Committee. In addition, she is an active member of the Sunland-Tujunga Rotary Club, has served as President and Secretary, and continues to help with many of their annual events, including Winterfest and the Fourth of July Parade. Past President and Past Secretary of Renaissance Speakers Toastmasters Club, Past Secretary of District 52 of Toastmasters International, she is currently an Ambassador for the organization.

With a long career as a management consultant, specializing in the areas of ethics, expansion and establishment, Susan assists with the management of her husband's painting contracting business in Sunland. Ms. Stewart is an avid horsewoman, and has taught horseback riding for many years, and one of her greatest joys is riding on the trails in the beautiful Sunland-Tujunga foothills.

Between Susan and Richard, they have four children: Moriah, Thoreau, Jake and Justin, and two grandchildren: River Jane and Elliot.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Susan B. Stewart.

#### PALM BEACH LAKES HIGH SCHOOL STATE CHAMPIONSHIP WIN

#### HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the girls basketball team of Palm Beach Lakes High School located in West Palm Beach, Florida.

On Saturday, February 21, 2015, the Lady Rams soundly defeated last year's state champions, Apopka-Wekiva, 58–40 for the team's first state championship win. Their 28–2 record and convincing win in the title game are two things for which the Palm Beach County community should be very proud of.

I want to congratulate Coach Cassandra Rahming, herself a former star at Palm Beach Lakes, and the entire team for a job very well done. I especially want to praise star guard Kayla Thigpen, who scored nine points in the second quarter, and power forward Jackie Johnson, who recorded six points, nine rebounds, three blocks and four steals in the first half.

Mr. Speaker, the Palm Beach Lakes High School Lady Rams are fine examples of young women who have excelled at athletics and academics. By working hard and focusing on the tasks at hand, they have reached the pinnacle of their sport. I wish the entire team much success and look forward to Palm Beach Lakes High School winning more championships for years to come.

#### RECOGNIZING THE VARSITY FOOTBALL TEAM OF CHERRY CREEK HIGH SCHOOL

#### HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the varsity football team of Cherry Creek High School in Greenwood Village, Colorado on winning the 2014 Colorado 5A Football State Championship game on November 29, 2014.

A crowd of more than 13,000 watched the Bruins in their stunning 25–24 win over Valor Christian High School. Late in the fourth quarter Cherry Creek scored a touchdown to bring the game to 23–24. Rather than kicking a field goal, the Bruins made a bold move opting for a two point conversion to win the game.

In this extremely close game, the young men of Cherry Creek High School's football team proved that hard work, dedication, and a little courage is a recipe for greatness. These football players were led to the championship title through the tireless leadership of their head football coach, Dave Logan, and his commendable staff.

Additionally, I recognize senior running back and star player, Milo Hall, for his superior performance in the game rushing 214 yards and scoring two touchdowns.

It is with great pride that I join with the citizens of Greenwood Village, as well as the entire Sixth Congressional District of Colorado, in congratulating the Cherry Creek Bruins on their ninth State Championship. This outstanding accomplishment is now preserved in the United States CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will endure forever.

#### A TRIBUTE TO NADIA SUTTON— 28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

#### HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Nadia Sutton of West Hollywood, California.

Born in Brussels, Belgium, Nadia has led an interesting life both as an actress and an activist. She has traveled extensively and lived all over the world, including residing in Israel, France, Spain, England and the United States, where she moved in 1979. As an actress, Ms. Sutton has worked in theater, radio, television and film. Passionate about civil rights, she began her activism career by supporting the Algerian independence cause while in France, and in England by helping create an alternative radio station and working against the censure of a Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgender (LGBT) magazine.

Ms. Sutton has been involved in numerous organizations in the Los Angeles area with a primary focus on LGBT, women's rights, and animal issues. For many years, she has organized protests, lobbied legislatively and fought against LGBT discrimination, and for marriage equality. Nadia served on the West Hollywood Lesbian and Gay Advisory Board for twelve years, and is a Founding Board member of The Lavender Effect, a virtual museum dedicated to educating the public about the historical contributions of LGBT people, especially those from the Southern California area. She sits on the West Hollywood Women's Advisory Board, on the Board of Directors of the West Hollywood Chamber of Commerce, and is active with C.I.T.Y. x1 (Community Intervention Through Youth), an organization dedicated to organizing free social events for LGBT youth. A devoted animal lover, she co-founded PAWS LA (Pets Are Wonderful Support), an organization dedicated to helping people living with AIDS keep their beloved animal companions, where she is currently serving as a Board member, and is a volunteer with Catnippers, an association that helps spay and neuter feral cats and kittens. Nadia resides in West Hollywood with her cat, Barnaby.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Nadia Sutton.

#### HONORING ANDREW NEIL DANNER

#### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Andrew Neil Dan-

ner. Andrew is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 314, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Andrew has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Andrew has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Andrew has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Andrew Neil Danner for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. KEVIN V. DE REGNIER

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Kevin de Regnier for being inducted as the 62nd President of the American College of Osteopathic Family Physicians (ACOF). He is an Iowa native and I'm proud to recognize him today for his great achievement.

Dr. de Regnier earned a B.A. in chemistry with a biology minor from the University of Northern Iowa before going on to receive his osteopathy degree from the University of Osteopathic Medicine and Health Sciences (Now Des Moines University). He completed his residency in family practice at Des Moines General Hospital shortly after. He also received his certification from the National Board of Examiners for Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons.

Dr. de Regnier has served on the ACOFP Board of Governors since 2006, and has been an active leader in the Osteopathic medicine community for years. He has also been appointed by the Governor to serve on the Iowa Health Systems and Plans Committee of Iowa Health Regulation Task Force and continues to serve as an adjunct professor of family medicine at Des Moines University.

Dr. de Regnier is an Iowan who has made our state proud. He has dedicated his life to helping and serving others and it is with great honor that I recognize him today. I know that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring his accomplishments. I thank him for his service and wish him and his family all the best moving forward.

## HONORING BRAD SILVER

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there are few things more noble than a life dedicated to public service. The work my good friend Brad Silver has done as part of the Bronx Jewish Community Council (BJCC), an organization that represents the combined community relations and anti-poverty efforts of all the local Jewish community councils in the Bronx, has left an indelible mark on the lives of countless individuals in the area.

Brad began his professional career in 1971 as an Outreach Worker for Teens at the Bronx House, a local Jewish community center. While serving as Teen Program Director and finally Co-op City Program Director at Bronx House, he somehow found time to pursue and receive his Masters Degree in Social Work at Yeshiva University. In 1978 Brad began working at the Hawthorne Cedar Knolls School, a residential treatment center for adolescents of the Jewish Board of Family and Children's Services.

Following six successful years at Cedar Knolls, Brad moved onto the BJCC, where he began serving as the Director of Social Services in 1984. As his role and responsibilities grew, Brad began moving up the BJCC ladder, becoming the Executive Vice President of the Council in 1999. In his time with the BJCC, the organization has achieved a remarkable reputation as a pillar of community betterment. With a budget now exceeding \$17 million annually, the BJCC serves over 10,000 people annually with everything from home attendant services to neighborhood resource centers. Their success is a tremendous testament to Brad's work.

In addition to his professional accomplishments, Brad is also an accomplished family man. He continues to reside in the community he was raised in, the Amalgamated Houses in the Bronx, with his wife, and lives just a block away from his mother.

This year the Riverdale Jewish Community Relations Council is honoring Brad with the Community Service Award at their Legislative Breakfast. In working with him personally, I know no one is more deserving of this honor.

A TRIBUTE TO KELLYE  
NAKAHARA WALLETT—28TH CON-  
GRESSIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN  
OF THE YEAR

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recog-

nize a remarkable woman, Kellye Nakahara Wallett of Pasadena, California.

Born and raised in Oahu, Hawaii, Ms. Nakahara moved to San Francisco in the 1960's to establish herself as a professional artist, selling her watercolors of the San Francisco waterfront. In 1968, she married David Wallett and they moved to Los Angeles, where she began her career as an actress. Halfway through the first season of the popular television series "M\*A\*S\*H", she landed the role of "Nurse Kellye." A renowned and award-winning artist who generously donates her artwork to many charitable organizations, Kellye's artwork has been displayed in Pasadena City Hall, the California State Capitol, and in the White House, where at Congressman SCHIFF's invitation, she painted a Christmas ornament for the official White House Christmas Tree in 2008.

Well-regarded as an enthusiastic and energetic community leader, Ms. Nakahara Wallett's past volunteer service includes eight years on Pasadena's Arts and Culture Commission, serving as an Ambassador for the Southern California Cherry Blossom Festival, and an Honorary Committee member and volunteer for the Latino Heritage Parade in Pasadena. She was also active in the American Diabetes Foundation, Neighborhood USA Conference, and the American Red Cross. Currently, she is a twenty-three year volunteer with The Sunshine Kids, a non-profit organization dedicated to children with cancer, and a frequent guest speaker for various Japanese reparations organizations. Kellye is the Artistic Director and Artist-in-Residence for the Towne Singers, sings with the California Philharmonic, and has been a long-time volunteer judge for Representative SCHIFF's 28th Congressional District Art Competition Forum & Exhibit.

Long-time Pasadena residents, Kellye and her husband David, have two children, daughter Nalani, son William, and four grandchildren, David, William, Max and Grayson.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Kellye Nakahara Wallett.

RARE DISEASE MONTH, HONORING  
DR. ABRAHAM ABUCHOWSKI

**HON. LEONARD LANCE**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 16, 2015*

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Abraham Abuchowski, a constituent from Warren, NJ, for his contributions to the rare disease community, his important role in bringing innovative orphan therapies to market and his support of the biotechnology industry in New Jersey.

Last month Dr. Abuchowski was presented with the Dr. Sol J. Barer Award for Vision, Innovation and Leadership. This award recognizes outstanding research and business leaders who have made and who continue to make significant contributions to the growth and prosperity of the biosciences industry in New Jersey and throughout the world.

After receiving his doctorate from Rutgers University, Dr. Abuchowski went on to develop PEGylation, the most widely used protein drug delivery system in the world. He founded Enzon to commercialize the technology and it later became the first biotechnology company in New Jersey to obtain Food and Drug Administration approval of a product.

Three decades later, New Jersey has become a leader in the biotechnology industry and our companies have secured more than thirty drug and medical device approvals in 2014 alone. Dr. Abuchowski is continuing his work to improve health outcomes for individuals affected by rare diseases and the company he currently leads, Prolong Pharmaceuticals, recently received an orphan drug designation from the Food and Drug Administration for a therapy he has been working on to treat sickle cell disease.

I am proud of the contributions that Dr. Abuchowski has made to advance medical research and to develop innovative treatments for rare diseases in New Jersey and around the world. I ask my colleagues to continue to support rare disease research and treatment development to ensure affected individuals have access to innovative therapies and improved health outcomes.

## SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 17, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED  
MARCH 18

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy shipbuilding programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

Committee on Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to examine S. 697, to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act.

SD-406

10 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Forest Service.  
SD-124

Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Transportation.  
SD-562

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the impact of patent litigation practices on the American economy.  
SD-226

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine the legislative presentation from multiple veterans service organizations.  
SD-G50

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of Defense  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Missile Defense Agency.  
SD-192

2 p.m.

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe  
To hold hearings to examine Northern Ireland, focusing on Stormont, collusion, and the Finucane inquiry, including other issues of accountability for past government collusion in paramilitary crimes.  
RHOB-2175

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services  
To hold hearings to examine the postures of the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SD-106

Committee on the Budget

Business meeting to markup the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.  
SD-608

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Communications Commission.  
SR-253

Committee on Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 35, to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, S. 438, to provide for the repair, replacement, and maintenance of certain Indian irrigation projects, S. 465, to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the

Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe, and the nomination of Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine an original bill, entitled "the Reauthorization of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act of 2015".  
SD-628

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the Economic Report of the President 2015.  
SD-562

## MARCH 19

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Strategic Command, U.S. Transportation Command, and U.S. Cyber Command in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SD-G50

Committee on Finance

To hold hearings to examine the Affordable Care Act at five years.  
SD-215

Committee on Foreign Relations

Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy  
To hold hearings to examine the United States-Africa leaders summit seven months later, focusing on progress and setbacks.  
SD-419

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine the regulatory regime for regional banks.  
SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security  
To hold hearings to examine the evolving cyber insurance marketplace.  
SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine U.S. crude oil export policy.  
SD-366

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management  
To hold hearings to examine Federal rulemaking challenges and areas of improvement within the existing regulatory process.  
SD-342

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine patent reform, focusing on protecting innovation and entrepreneurship.  
SR-428A

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for

fiscal years 2016 and 2017 for the Veterans Benefits Administration.  
SD-124

2 p.m.

Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the United States Secret Service.  
SD-138

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Airland

To hold hearings to examine Air Force force structure and modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-222

Select Committee on Intelligence

To hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.  
SH-219

3:30 p.m.

Committee on the Judiciary  
Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts

To hold hearings to examine reining in amnesty, focusing on *Texas v. United States* and its implications.  
SD-226

## MARCH 24

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine waters of the United States, focusing on stakeholder perspectives on the impacts of the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed rule.  
SD-106

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine management reforms to improve forest health and socioeconomic opportunities on the nation's forest system.  
SD-366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine continuing America's leadership, focusing on advancing research and development for patients.  
SD-430

## MARCH 25

9 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Defense Health Program.  
SD-192

Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-222

2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support  
To hold hearings to examine the current state of readiness of U.S. forces in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-232A  
  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces  
To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of

the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-222  
  
MARCH 26  
  
9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine the Administration's Quadrennial Energy Review.  
SD-366

2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Airland  
To hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-222

## SENATE—Tuesday, March 17, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

We praise You, our God and King. You rule generation after generation. You are so high that the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain You. Yet You dwell with those who possess a contrite spirit. Thank You for Your kindness and mercy, for showering compassion on all creation.

Bless our Senators. Give them words that will illuminate and refresh. Help them to accept timely advice and valid criticism as a measure of progress. Lord, infuse them with patience and truth as they practice self-control.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

### TRIBUTE TO RUBY PAONE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate's doorkeeper, Ruby Paone, will mark her 40th year of service to the Senate.

Ruby has seen the Senate from a lot of different angles. She has had a lot of unique titles—everything from card desk assistant to Reception Room attendant—as she climbed the ladder to her current post.

I am sure that Ruby will tell you that a lot has changed since her first day here back in 1975. I am sure she will tell you a lot has stayed the same. One thing that won't change is the Senate's gratitude to its many dedicated employees. That is why the Senate community extends its congratulations to Ruby Paone this morning and why we thank her for her many years of service.

### HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in about an hour the Democratic Party

will confront a momentous choice. Will Democrats launch a historic filibuster against helping oppressed victims of modern slavery because leftwing lobbyists appear to demand it? Will they do that at the behest of these leftwing lobbyists?

Democrats filibustering help for terrified children and abused women would represent a new low in the Senate. Filibustering help for terrified children and abused women certainly represents a new low for the Senate, and the American people will not soon forget it—nor should they. It is hard to even keep straight anymore why Democrats would filibuster this human rights bill.

The bill Democrats apparently now oppose was introduced months ago by a Democrat and a Republican. The bill Democrats now oppose was originally cosponsored by 13 of our Democratic friends. Thirteen of them cosponsored it. The bill Democrats now oppose was approved by every Democrat on the Judiciary Committee. Every single Democrat on the Judiciary Committee supported the bill.

The bill Democrats now oppose was brought to the floor last Monday after Democrats agreed unanimously to do that. But that was Monday. By Tuesday, Democrats were threatening to launch a historic filibuster against helping the abused and the enslaved—launching a filibuster against the abused and the enslaved.

Democrats' supposed rationale was that they had not bothered to read the very bill they introduced, cosponsored, and voted for. That in itself is a stunning admission. But as embarrassing as this admission might be for Democrats, it doesn't tell the full story. It is obviously absurd to believe that not a single one of the 13 Democrats who originally cosponsored this bill and not a single member of any of these Democrats' well-educated staff would have read this bill before agreeing to support it. It is really hard to believe; isn't it?

The bipartisan Hyde language Democrats now cite as the basis for their human rights filibuster would not have been hard to find. It was sitting right there on page 4.

Democrats would have recognized the bipartisan Hyde provision easily because so many Democrats voted to support the same bipartisan provision just 3 months ago in December. It was in the CROMNIBUS that most of our Democratic friends voted for in December—the very same language. So they surely would have recognized it sitting right there on page 4.

The top Democrat on the Judiciary Committee certainly would have noticed the Hyde provision he supported in December. He actually offered an unrelated amendment to the very same page as the provision he now objects to.

The bipartisan Hyde language is supported by about 7 in 10 Americans. How do the American people feel about the Hyde language? The Hyde language is supported by 7 out of 10 Americans as a policy principle and has been part and parcel of the legislating process for decades. It appears in just about every funding bill we consider, and it appears in numerous authorizing bills that have received bipartisan support.

Not surprisingly, the leadership of the House of Representatives said last night that “any House-Senate agreement on a trafficking bill that includes a victims fund will” have to contain “the Hyde Amendment, as we have done for nearly 40 years.” So the House of Representatives says that any bill that passes the House will also include this language.

What about that great bastion of conservatism—the Washington Post? The Washington Post recently noted in an editorial that “the Hyde Act has been in force for four decades,” and pointedly asked whether the inclusion of this bipartisan provision “justifies the defeat of this important legislation.” Given the long legislative history of this bipartisan provision and the overwhelmingly popular support for what it does, the answer, obviously, is no. No, most of our colleagues on the other side voted for this very same provision 3 months ago.

Let's remember what this debate should really be about. It should not be about what leftwing lobbyists want. It should be about helping the victims of modern slavery—victims such as Melissa, whom my colleague Senator CORNYN has spoken about before. She was sold into the sex trade when she was just 12 years old. She was beaten regularly and chained to a bed in a warehouse. She was even set on fire by those who enslaved her. That is Melissa's story. She said she just wanted to die.

When Melissa finally escaped the grasp of her tormenters, she was not treated like a victim. Melissa was treated like a criminal by our justice system. It is stories such as Melissa's that should motivate every Member of this Chamber to act.

The victims who suffer in dark warehouses may not have the same clout as the lobbyists who appear to oppose this bill, but these victims need our help,



and they need it now. So if there truly are Senators who are concerned with removing a bipartisan provision they have supported so many times in the past, they should offer an amendment to strike it and then stop blocking this human rights bill. I offered them a chance to do just that last week.

Let's have a vote—a simple majority vote—on a measure they now belatedly find they object to, having supported it in the past, and then, as an official with the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women put it: “Win or lose and move on.” But as it stands now, in her words, “Senate Democrats are choosing a phantom problem over real victims.” That is the spokesman for the Coalition Against Trafficking in Women.

The White House needs to get involved here too. So far the White House has barely lifted a finger to help us pass this legislation, and that needs to change. I think the White House should do this because it is the right thing to do. But if that is not enough, they should also consider the consequences of Democrats making a historic mistake.

If Democrats actually vote to filibuster help for oppressed victims of modern slavery, I cannot imagine that the American people will forget it.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### TRIBUTE TO RUBY PAONE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the longest serving Member of this body is the President pro tempore emeritus of the Senate, PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont. He came to this body in January of 1975, 40 years and 2 months ago. But nipping at his heels is an individual well-known in this Chamber, Ruby Paone. Ruby came to the Senate right out of college and has worked in the Reception Room and other places in the Senate for decades—four decades, in fact.

Today marks Ruby's 40th anniversary of working in the Senate. To put that in perspective, she has worked through 7 different Presidential administrations, 16 different Sergeants at Arms, and has seen 383 Senators serve in this Chamber during her time.

After working with 383 different Senators, one would think that maybe she could not remember these names and faces, but that is not Ruby. She knows everyone and remembers everything during her time here in the Senate.

During these 40 years in the Senate, a lot has happened, not the least of which is meeting her husband, whom we all know, Marty. Marty also worked in the Senate for many, many years, eventually serving as the secretary of the majority, and we all depended on him so much.

In fact, Ruby and Marty were both here in the Capitol working on their wedding day. The Senate was in session until 12 p.m. that day. Marty and Ruby decided to get married 3 hours later, and they did.

Ruby and Marty have three wonderful children. I can remember their careers in soccer and working their way through school. Their children are Alexander, Stephanie, and Tommy. Ruby and Marty are rightly very proud of these three fine young people, one girl, Stephanie, and the two boys.

No words can adequately sum up the 40 years of service to our country, but Adlai Stevenson came close when he said: “Patriotism is not a short and frenzied outburst of emotion but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime.”

I appreciate very much Ruby's steadfast dedication. I admire her continued support of this institution that is very dear to so many of us. Thank you, Ruby, for your 40 years of faithful service, and we look forward to many more.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article that appeared and was posted last night at 7:14 p.m. in the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 2015]

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT ADDS 16.4 MILLION TO HEALTH INSURANCE ROLLS

(By Lenny Bernstein)

About 16.4 million adults have been added to health insurance rolls under the Affordable Care Act, which provided especially robust gains in coverage for minorities and states that expanded their Medicaid programs, administration officials announced Monday.

The total includes 14.1 million adults who joined the insurance rolls since October 2013 and 2.3 million younger adults ages 19 to 25 who were able to remain on their parents' health insurance plans since October 2010, when that provision of Obamacare went into effect.

Richard Frank, the assistant secretary for planning and evaluation at the Department of Health and Human Services, called the gains “historic,” comparing the impact to the creation of Medicare and Medicaid in the mid-1960s.

HHS Secretary Sylvia Mathews Burwell said she was “pleased” with the numbers but added that the government still can enroll greater numbers of African Americans and Latinos.

“African American, Latino [rates] are not exactly where you want to be, because the [uninsured] numbers are still high,” Burwell said. “I believe we can do more.”

The Latino uninsured rate dropped by 12.3 percentage points between the first quarter of 2014 and the same period in 2015 as 4.2 million adults gained coverage. That ethnic group, however, continues to have the lowest rate of insurance coverage.

About 2.3 million African Americans enrolled, dropping that group's uninsured rate

by 9.2 percentage points, and 6.6 million whites obtained coverage, a decline of 5.3 percentage points.

The data are based on surveys conducted for HHS. The totals do not show whether an individual obtained coverage through the new insurance marketplaces, a private employer or some other method. No numbers on children were included.

States that decided to expand their Medicaid insurance programs for the poor recorded bigger gains than those that didn't, reducing their uninsured rate by 7.4 percentage points as compared with 6.9 points for states that declined to expand.

Meena Seshamani, director of HHS's Office of Health Reform, said the 16.4 million newly covered adults no longer need to put off health care “because they can't afford it” or “worry about going broke” if they face a serious illness.

“Today's news is good for the health and financial security of millions of Americans,” she said.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, referring to this article just printed in the RECORD: The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services released some very good news, further proof that ObamaCare is working and insuring millions of Americans—16.4 million to be exact.

Reading from the Washington Post report that is now part of this RECORD, I state:

About 16.4 million adults have been added to health insurance rolls under the Affordable Care Act, which provided especially robust gains in coverage for minorities—

And everyone, in fact—

and states that expanded their Medicaid programs, administration officials announced Monday.

The total includes 14.1 million adults who joined the insurance rolls since October 2013 and 2.3 million younger adults ages 19 to 25 who were able to remain on their parents' health insurance plans since October 2010, when that provision of Obamacare went into effect.

As if that weren't enough good news, the Department of Health and Human Services also reported that uninsured rates for minorities are plunging.

Quote:

The Latino uninsured rate dropped by 12.3 percentage points between the first quarter of 2014 and the same period in 2015 as 4.2 million adults gained coverage. . . .

About 2.3 million African Americans enrolled, dropping that group's uninsured rate by 9.2 percentage points, and 6.6 million whites obtained coverage, a decline of 5.3 percentage points.

So it is clear that the Affordable Care Act is working just as Congress intended.

Not only are record numbers of Americans gaining health coverage, but historically underinsured communities are now getting access to quality health care.

At some point, my Republican colleagues need to face reality. ObamaCare is helping their constituents.

# HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION AND LORETTA LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to speak a little bit about human trafficking and Loretta Lynch.

The Republican leader is right. In an hour or so the Senate will vote to end debate on the human trafficking and child pornography legislation. That vote is going to fail. The Republican leader knows it is going to fail, just as I do. It is going to fail because Republicans have chosen to manufacture a political fight that has nothing to do with human trafficking.

Abortion legislation has no place in human trafficking legislation. The Republican Congressman who drafted this version of the human trafficking bill in the House said as much. Congressman ERIK PAULSEN said: "There is no reason it should be included in these bills. This issue is far too important to tie it up with an unrelated fight with politics as usual."

We have a long piece out of the New York Times. My friend quoted partially from the Washington Post. But let's be realistic. There has been a sleight of hand here to get the abortion language in this bill.

As this article indicates:

This legislation, which sailed through committee in February, stalled last week when Democrats noticed a provision that would prohibit money in the fund from being used to pay for abortions. The original Senate bill, introduced in the last Congress, made no reference to abortion. Nor did the House's version of the bill, introduced by Representative Erik Paulsen. Paulsen said, "there is no reason it should be." He said last week, "This issue is far too important to tie it up with an unrelated fight with politics as usual."

Republicans say they routinely add the abortion language to bills, but Democrats say Republicans operated in bad faith—not to mention in violation of Senate norms—by misrepresenting the bill's contents.

This dispute has nothing to do with the needs of the Justice Department. It is beyond irresponsible to strand the Department without a leader, sowing instability and uncertainty in an important executive agency.

The chief law enforcement officer of our country is being detained because of this fight between us, Democrats and Republicans, over whether abortion should be in this bill. We believe it shouldn't be; Republicans believe it should be.

This is a good person who deserves our immediate attention. The Loretta Lynch nomination should be done immediately. There is no reason we can't do this now, today.

Would the Presiding Officer tell us the business of the day?

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

## JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

Portman amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking.

Portman amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth.

Vitter amendment No. 284 (to amendment No. 271), to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, at 11 a.m. this morning we will be having a very important vote on human trafficking in an important piece of legislation, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I am glad this issue is finally getting the kind of attention it deserves, but I would be lying to you if I said I wasn't disappointed in the way this bill has become a political football for people who want to cause the Senate to cease to function entirely or to relitigate issues that have been resolved 40 years ago such as the Hyde amendment.

We in the Senate have an opportunity to do a great deal of good for thousands of people, including children who are victims of sex trafficking, many of whom are young girls not even of high school age. On average the typical victim of human trafficking is between the age of 12 and 14.

But instead of voting to pass this bill last week, as I had originally hoped, the minority leader, the Democratic leader, blocked the vote, and he has consistently taken the position that they are not going to allow us to progress with this legislation. The majority leader offered to give the other side a vote to strip out the language which they find offensive, but that was

declined; and instead, the obstruction and the blocking of this legislation continues.

I would like to come back to the question that I have asked myself privately and I have asked here publicly repeatedly, and that is, Why are so many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle objecting to language they have repeatedly voted for time and time and time again? Why do they want to make this an issue on this piece of legislation, which is one of the rare islands of bipartisan comity, cooperation, and collaboration we have seen in recent times? Most importantly, why are Democrats going to the wall to block a bill that would help thousands of innocent victims of sex trafficking across the country who are crying out for our help? It truly baffles me, but that is what is going on.

Of course, we know human trafficking is a problem all across the country, including my home in Texas. I was recently reminded of a couple of Texas stories about how important it is that we pass this legislation, including a recent story out of Waco, TX, involving the Border Patrol, where it was reported that over the last 5 months the Border Patrol has apprehended 144 known sex offenders trying to sneak back into the United States illegally. So reportedly 100,000 people are trafficked each year, according to the Washington Post. They say an estimated 100,000 children are trafficked each year for sex. Why in the world can't we find some way to set these differences aside, to fight them another day, and to move on doing some good where we can by passing this legislation?

It has, unfortunately, become clear that this obstruction is about politics, plain and simple, because you know there is actually a whole lot of agreement about the importance of this legislation. For example, we have 12 Democratic cosponsors to this legislation. This bogus story you have heard about language being slipped in the bill that they didn't know was there is just that, completely bogus. Each of these Democrats has highly skilled professional staff, and they themselves weren't born last night, didn't fall off the turnip truck. They know what the legislation included, and it had language in it they had voted in favor of repeatedly in previous pieces of legislation.

Then there is the fact that all 20 Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee voted in favor of this legislation, including 9 Democrats, all Members of the Judiciary Committee. Then when it came to the floor last week, all 100 Senators basically consented to bring this legislation forward. So why is it that after so much bipartisan cooperation and trying to work together to solve a real problem and help the victims of human trafficking—particularly those 100,000 children trafficked

for sex—how is it this legislation became a political football to relitigate the Hyde amendment? Well, unfortunately, we know the abortion lobby has been working very hard to derail this legislation. Why? Because they care about these victims of human trafficking? Absolutely not, because everyone knows the Hyde amendment language contains an exception for rape and the health of the mother. So under this act, these limitations on spending wouldn't have anything to do with the services available to help those victims of human trafficking.

I know that Members of the Senate on the Democratic side care deeply about this issue. I know the ranking member, the former chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator LEAHY, cares deeply about this issue. I believe all 12 Democratic cosponsors of this legislation care deeply about this issue, and all Members of the Senate Judiciary Committee—all 20 of us who voted in favor of the legislation—care deeply about this issue. But there is one person who appears not to care one bit about this issue, and that is the senior Senator from Nevada, the Democratic leader. He apparently doesn't care at all about the victims of human trafficking. If he did, then I think he would find a way to work with us to pass this legislation.

Unfortunately, we are going to have a vote here at 11:00 which is going to be very telling. I hold out some hope that our Democratic colleagues who cosponsored this legislation or who previously voted for legislation that includes this same type of language or the members of the Judiciary Committee who voted to support this bill at the committee markup will find a way to vote for cloture to allow us to progress to final passage of this legislation.

There is going to be a very important choice. The choice is simply between the victims or party and lobbyists and outside groups who are trying to blow this piece of legislation up in order to relitigate the settled law of the land for the last 40 years.

In fact, the Washington Post editorial yesterday I think stated the issue very well. They said, at the conclusion of their editorial, "the question is whether the Senators who want to accomplish something can overcome the advocacy groups and politicians who would rather use this controversy as one more opportunity to raise funds and to sharpen divisions."

That is absolutely pathetic, that someone would use the plight of these victims of human trafficking to raise funds and to drive divisions between Americans.

So we will find out what the choice is and what Democrats choose. Will they follow the lead of the Democratic leader who apparently does not care about the consequences of this obstruction, and will they find a way in their heart

to do what they know is right? Because they voted for this legislation previously, they have agreed to cosponsor it, and, of course, as I said, they voted for previous language that is identical to that contained in this bill.

I will quote from a Texas newspaper, the Corpus Christi Caller-Times, which published an editorial with the headline "Anti-Trafficking bill is nothing to bicker about." That should be obvious, but unfortunately, the obvious has to be said, apparently time and time again.

The editorial closes with this line, which I find to be poignant. It says:

This fight is supposed to be against human trafficking. Distracting attention from that fight is shameful.

It is shameful.

Scripture reminds us that it does not profit a person to gain the whole world and lose your soul, and I worry that the Senate is losing its soul and its unique role as an institution where we can actually work out our differences, we can have debate, and we can have votes, and we can actually make some discernible progress forward on behalf of the people we represent.

This is an important time of choosing for Members of the Senate. At 11 o'clock when we have this vote, we will need a handful of brave and courageous Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle who will say to their leader: This is a bridge too far. We are not going to march in lockstep with the leader and take what could be legislation that will help these victims of human trafficking and turn it into a failure.

This is a time for choosing. I know there are Senate Democrats who care deeply about the victims of human trafficking. Unfortunately, not everybody does, or else we would not be having this obstruction. So I hope that our colleagues, in thinking about this vote today—or perhaps during a sleepless moment last night as they were contemplating this very important time of choosing—I hope that they will examine their conscience and that they will reflect on the reason why they came to the Senate in the first place. Was it to play these kinds of partisan political games to advance the fundraising interests of the abortion lobby or some other group who wants us to derail this legislation or to relitigate issues that were settled 40 years ago? That is not the reason why I believe the overwhelming number of the Senators came to the Senate. They came here because they wanted to do something good, something positive, something that would help the most vulnerable among us.

We will have that opportunity here today with this vote at 11 o'clock. Shame on us if we cannot rise to the occasion, if we cannot transcend this sort of partisan division and the tug at our sleeves by the outside groups who

want to derail this important piece of legislation. Shame on us.

There is going to be a time of choosing. Everybody who votes will make a record. That record will be part of their permanent legacy in this body. History will reflect whom they chose in this fight—the 100,000 children who are trafficked for sex in America who might benefit from this legislation or the abortion lobby that wants us to relitigate this issue based on language that every single Democrat has voted for in one fashion or another time and time again.

This is a phony fight and a phony issue. We ought to do what is right. We ought to pass this legislation as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I hope we will do what is right, but I hope we will step back from either partisan name-calling or ascribing motives to people. Even though my dear friend from Texas voted against the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, I am never going to say he is for violence against women or for human trafficking, even though that bill had the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act as an amendment in it.

While he and the distinguished majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, Senator HATCH, Senator GRASSLEY, and others voted against the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, I would not ascribe to them a motive that they believe in violence against women or in human trafficking. Even though that legislation had a strong anti-human trafficking amendment in it, I do not ascribe their vote against the bill as admitting they are for violence against women or human trafficking.

One of the lessons that I have learned in my time as a Senator is that if you listen to the people you serve, really listen to them, you will almost always do the right thing. This morning, as some Senators are trying to shut off debate and end our efforts to provide a comprehensive, victim-centered response to the horrible crime of human trafficking, I ask that we stop and listen. Listen to the voices of the survivors. What they are saying is clear: Stop playing politics with our lives.

Holly Austin Smith, a survivor, a girl who ran away at the age of 14, who was bought and sold for sex, put it this way:

Politics should not govern the options available to victims of sex trafficking, especially when such victims often have had their basic human rights taken away by criminals who had only their own agendas in mind.

We ought to stand with these survivors and put aside our agendas. The survivors are asking us to vote against this bill because it includes unnecessary and destructive, partisan language.

A letter signed by the Alliance To End Slavery & Trafficking, Rights4Girls, Shared Hope International, and nearly 100 other anti-trafficking groups says this:

We urge all members of the Senate to turn away from this divisive debate and find a bipartisan approach to this new initiative to protect and serve the needs of survivors.

Two years ago the Senate came together and passed an expansive new authorization of the Violence Against Women Act. I realize some in this body who now say we must vote for this bill voted against the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. But I worked for months with the remarkable people of the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, a coalition of thousands of organizations representing millions of victims of domestic and sexual violence.

They spent hours upon hours explaining what we needed to do to ensure that we protected all victims—and we listened. Together, we crafted a bill that responded to those needs. I trust these advocates. They have dedicated their lives to making sure survivors have a voice.

And here is what they are telling us:

We write today to express our deep concern about the controversy of inserting the Hyde provision into the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. The House passed a version of that Act that did not include this new Hyde provision and we ask the Senate to do the same.

They are right. The highly partisan House passed a version of the very bill we are debating today that does not contain this unnecessary and destructive provision. That deeply divided body came together and they passed this bill with a unanimous vote just a few weeks ago, without this divisive language that Senator CORNYN has insisted be in the Senate bill. I am confident that if we did the same, we could also pass it easily.

I want to make clear to everyone who is paying attention to this vote, the partisan provision embedded in the Senate version of this bill is not something the survivors of human trafficking are asking for. It is not something the experts in the field who work with them every day are asking for. In fact, those who are closest to the damage wreaked by this terrible crime are asking us to take the provision out.

We are not talking about taxpayer money; we are talking about money collected from the various offenders who have already controlled too much of the lives of these women and girls. These survivors deserve more options, not fewer. It is in response to the request of these human trafficking survivors that I am opposing cloture on this version of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I support the rest of this bill, and that is why I included it in the comprehensive substitute amendment I filed last week.

Also included in my substitute is a vital component to prevent human trafficking by focusing on runaway and homeless youth. These children are exceptionally vulnerable to human traffickers and we must not turn our backs on them.

If we are serious about helping to end this heinous crime, we must stop playing politics and start listening. Let's listen to the people who suffer from the trafficking. Let's listen to the victims. Let's listen to the experts who have always stood with us on this. They say: Take this provision out. Let's do so. The Republican-controlled House came together and they passed the House version of this legislation unanimously without this divisive language. Shouldn't we do the same thing? This is not a question of whether you are for or against trafficking. I do not think there is anybody who is for it. Those who, like me, actually prosecuted these cases know how important it is. So listen to the victims. They say: Take out this language and let's move forward. I will vote no on cloture so that we can move forward and return to the bipartisan path that we have always walked on this issue.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor with a simple message for our Republican colleagues: Enough is enough. The bill we are debating today, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, should without question be bipartisan because the bill about combating trafficking is no place for politics. That means it is no place for harmful, partisan measures that restrict women's respective health options. So it is deeply disappointing that over the last week, Republicans have insisted on including such a provision in this Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. Then, instead of working with us to take this provision out, get this bill done, and move on to other important work, they have dug in their heels.

Democrats want to work with Republicans on this legislation and get it back on track. We put forward a substitute that takes out the politics and focuses on what matters in this debate, which is helping the survivors of trafficking get the justice they deserve. It would be shocking if Senate Republicans refused to support this alternative just because it does not include an expansion of the so-called Hyde amendment that restricts women's access to health services—especially, by the way, since the House has already passed this bill without this harmful women's health provision, just as the Senate did last year. So we know Republicans can support an antitrafficking bill that does not hurt women. There is no reason why we should not be able to shift this back to something that both sides can support.

What makes all of this even worse is that the majority leader is now insisting on even more gridlock and dysfunction. He has said that in efforts to continue a political attack on women's health, he will not only hold up the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act but also the confirmation of a highly qualified nominee for Attorney General. That is indefensible. Loretta Lynch deserves a vote. She has been waiting longer than any of the last five nominees for Attorney General. She has been confirmed by the Senate twice already for her position for previous roles. She deserves to be able to get to work.

The majority leader has said the Senate will not move to her nomination until we finish the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I would like to note that we voted last night on two other nominations, so it seems pretty absurd to say that we cannot work on both at the same time.

The bottom line is that Senate Republicans have a choice today—politics as usual or working with us to get this done. They can continue to hold up important work, to draw out a political fight we have had again and again, or they can work with us to get our nominee for Attorney General on the job, pass the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, and move on to tackle the many other challenges our country faces today. I really hope they will choose to work with Democrats, fight human trafficking, and help women across the country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, James Lankford, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton, Ron Johnson, Richard Burr, Daniel Coats, Roy Blunt, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Pat Roberts, Bill Cassidy, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

#### YEAS—55

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Casey	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeben	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Donnelly	Moran	
Enzi	Murkowski	

#### NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Kaine	Reid
Blumenthal	King	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Schatz
Boxer	Leahy	Schumer
Brown	Markey	Shaheen
Cantwell	McCaskill	Stabenow
Cardin	McConnell	Tester
Carper	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	
Heinrich	Peters	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Cruz Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 43.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, James Lankford, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton, Ron Johnson, Richard Burr, Daniel Coats, Roy Blunt, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Pat Roberts, Bill Cassidy, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Leg.]

#### YEAS—55

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Casey	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeben	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Vitter
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Donnelly	Moran	
Enzi	Murkowski	

#### NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Kaine	Reid
Blumenthal	King	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Schatz
Boxer	Leahy	Schumer
Brown	Markey	Shaheen
Cantwell	McCaskill	Stabenow
Cardin	McConnell	Tester
Carper	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Nelson	
Heinrich	Peters	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Cruz Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 43.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The Senate majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this morning was a sad day for the Senate, when a straightforward bill designed to help the 100,000 or so children who are sex trafficked in America goes down

because of the advocacy of a group that wants to turn this into an abortion debate and to change the settled law of the last 39 years.

As I said before the vote, I really feel as if this is a time when the very soul of the Senate is being tested. Are we going actually to break out of these shackles that we seem to be bound by, which say that we are going to turn every issue—no matter how sensitive or how much good could be done—into a political issue that divides us? I would have thought of all the topics where there would be bipartisan consensus, it would be combating the crime of human trafficking.

Indeed, everything that went on before today seemed to give me hope that we would be able to do that. For example, there is the fact that there were 12 Democratic cosponsors of the underlying legislation. In the Senate Judiciary Committee, there were 20 votes, a unanimous vote including 9 Democrats, in favor of the bill in committee, and it came to the floor of the Senate.

As the Presiding Officer knows, ordinarily we would have to jump through some procedural hoops. But thanks to the consent of 100 Senators, we did not have to do that so we could get on the bill and begin the open amendment process without having to jump through those hoops. At least that is what I thought. Then somehow, somewhere, somebody decided they wanted to pick a fight on something that has been the settled law for 39 years; and that is the Hyde amendment.

The Hyde amendment basically says that no taxpayer funds can be used to fund abortion except in the case of rape and in the case of the health of the mother being in jeopardy, as certified by a physician. So one might wonder why people want to fight over the Hyde amendment when the Hyde amendment itself has an exception for sexual assault, which obviously would be the major concern on behalf of any of these victims of human trafficking. That is why this has been called a phantom issue. I would use another word. I would say it is a phony issue. It is a fake fight in order to derail legislation which would demonstrate that we, on a bipartisan basis, can work together and try to solve a real problem and make progress.

I suspect the Presiding Officer had the same experience I did during this last election. Back in Texas, people would say: Can't you guys and gals get anything done in Washington, DC? Why is it so broken and so dysfunctional? Why can't you find common cause on something and make some progress and deal with real problems that confront the people of Texas or the people of Oklahoma or the people of the United States of America?

Now, that doesn't mean we come up here and leave our principles behind. It is just the opposite. I am not suggesting for a minute, in the interest of

compromise, that we leave our principles behind, but there is a lot we can do, consistent with our principles, to help pass legislation which will have a very positive impact on the American people.

The President mentioned issues such as trade as something we can work on together. But little did I imagine that the powers that be would pick on an anti-human trafficking bill in order to try to divide the Senate—in order to peel off the 12 Democratic cosponsors who didn't even vote. Many of them didn't even vote for the bill.

In other words, they were for the bill—enough to cosponsor it—and then this morning they did not vote to see the bill progress to final passage. I don't know how they can explain that or, frankly, how they can reconcile that in their own conscience, recognizing that this legislation was designed to help vulnerable children, by and large, who are victims of what we call modern day slavery—sexual, economic bondage.

This legislation was designed not only to rescue them but to help them heal and begin a path toward a better, more productive life. That is why this morning I said I really felt this was a vote for the soul of the Senate.

I cannot imagine any Senator who does everything they have to do to be elected to get to serve here—the hardship for your family, raising money, and all the stuff you have to do to get here—and then to squander it by refusing to take a step to help the most vulnerable people who exist in our country. It is just beyond my imagination.

But I am afraid this is more than about a piece of legislation. There is an idea here in the Democratic leadership that they really don't want the Senate to be able to function. They don't really want us to be able to pass legislation or solve problems. What they want to do is to have the talking point that after the last election nothing has really changed in the Senate—that it is just as dysfunctional as it was when they were in charge.

I am happy to say I am optimistic—despite this morning's vote—that we will begin to make some progress as soon as next week, when we will, I think, take the first step to pass a budget. It will be the first time a budget has been passed since 2009.

I am grateful to the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, for saying that we are going to come back and vote again and again and again on this human trafficking bill until it passes. He is not going to schedule the nomination confirmation vote on the next Attorney General until such time as we get this passed.

Unfortunately, that is what this place has degenerated into—everybody looking for leverage to try to get a little bit more of what they want, and in the process, the very people we are sup-

posed to be trying to work for and trying to help get lost.

I am very disappointed. This is not why I came to the Senate. This is not the kind of Senate I want to serve in. This is not what my constituents—the 26.9 million people I work for in Texas—sent me here to do. They expect more of us. They deserve more of us. I hope, now that this initial vote has been cast—thank goodness for the four Democrats who broke ranks with their leadership on that side of the aisle and decided to vote to advance this legislation, but we still need two more. We still need two more brave Democratic Senators who are going to defy their leadership and not simply follow them off the cliff.

This is what, from a practical political standpoint, I don't understand. One reason why Republicans are in the majority now is because, frankly, the President's policies were repudiated in the last election and the people who ran for reelection as incumbent Senators didn't have a record of accomplishment they could point to. So what they were left with was a referendum on the President's record which they followed down the line, and they had nothing else they could point to that they actually had done on the Senate floor because the Senate had been locked down and no amendments, no good ideas, no votes occurred. We literally had a U.S. Senator from Alaska, for example, who was running for reelection after serving in the Senate for 6 years who could not point to a single bill or amendment that bore his name that had been passed. So when people wondered, What are the issues in this election, they were left with the President of the United States saying: My policies are on the ballot, even though my name is not. Then we had the incumbent U.S. Senator with no record of accomplishments separate and apart from that referendum on the President's policies, and that referendum—the President's policies—lost and the people who enabled them and supported them.

Frankly, I really don't understand the calculation of our colleagues on the other side who have now slavishly voted according to the dictates of their party leadership and said no to the victims of human trafficking who would have benefited from that legislation. I don't know how they reconcile that in their minds. I don't know whether they have had sleepless nights worrying about it or whether their hearts have become so hardened, whether they have become so accustomed to this sort of mindless partisanship that they don't even think about it anymore.

Thanks to the majority leader, we are going to have another opportunity for them to rectify their “no” vote. All we need is two additional Senators who will vote to progress this legislation given the next opportunity. So I hope our colleagues will reconsider.

## RECESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:04 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

## JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Thank you, Mr. President.

First, let me say Happy St. Patrick's Day to all my friends and family and colleagues in the Senate.

(The remarks of Ms. STABENOW pertaining to the introduction of S. 758 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

Ms. STABENOW. I yield the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE FUTURE OF COLORADO AND AMERICA

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, in 1893 Katharine Lee Bates made her way up the slopes of Pikes Peak and first wrote the words to one of America's greatest patriotic hymns, poeticizing “purple mountain majesties” and “amber waves of grain.”

One hundred years ago, Enos Mills helped preserve “mountain scenes of exceptional beauty and grandeur,” giving to the country the crown jewel of American splendor, Rocky Mountain National Park.

For over a century, visionaries such as John Liff helped to settle the high plains of Colorado, described by Ian Frazier as a “heroic place,” an expanse of splendid isolation with unparalleled sense of space and generations of pioneers.

This is Colorado. From west to east and north to south, the beauty, heritage, and vitality of Colorado calls and beckons across our Nation and the world to those looking and longing for a place to call home, to live and work, to visit and vacation.

Our love for Colorado drives us to be better stewards of the land, to reach for solutions to great challenges, and to find optimism in every vale and valley. For generations, we have challenged our sons and daughters to always look up—look up to that great Rocky Mountain horizon—as our ever-

young State and our ever-hopeful attitude live peak to peak—the honor of living in the west, a land of opportunity and new beginnings.

It is this constant drive for a better future for our great State and Nation that leads me to the floor of the Senate to speak for the first time, where my duties as Colorado's newest Senator begin, walking in the footsteps of Colorado's first Senators, Jerome Chaffee and Henry Teller, and alongside my colleague Senator MICHAEL BENNET. It is an incredible and heavy obligation to fulfill to well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office, defending our Constitution with faith and allegiance to the rights we cherish, but an obligation and duty every person in Colorado expects us not just to fulfill but to excel at—from Beecher Island to the Book Cliffs, from Fisher's Peak to the Pawnee. Somewhere in between is my hometown of Yuma, home to hardy pioneers that have seen the high plains through great success and record harvests, depression and dust bowls, drought and tragedy. Yet through it all, the good times and challenges, it is still called home by generations who would live nowhere else.

It is here in this little eastern plains town, weatherworn and always thirsty, that Jaime and I are raising our children, Alyson, Thatcher, and Caitlyn, in a home that once belonged to their great-great-grandparents and are surrounded in town by family, Lala and Papa, great-grandparents, and more.

No matter where across Colorado's four corners you live or across this great Nation, we all hope for the same thing for our children—to live in a loving community that values every citizen, where they learn the value of hard work and perseverance, where hard work is met with merited reward, and that they find a Nation of liberty and freedom that they help make a little more free and a little more perfect to carry on the tradition of our Founding Fathers, always endeavoring to be better tomorrow than they are today.

Our Nation has always understood that this endeavor is not something that is just passed on, hoping someone else does the work for us. It is something we ourselves have to fight for today. We are responsible for the starting point we hand to the next generation, and we have a moral obligation to make it the best point possible, always advancing.

To accomplish this I have laid out a Four Corners plan representing all areas of Colorado and those issues that matter most to the people of this country: growing our economy and getting this Nation back to work in the kinds of jobs with the kind of salary that allows people to achieve their dreams, to develop North American energy security while enhancing the protection and appreciation of our environment, and making sure that we give our chil-

dren the tools they need to succeed in a world growing both in its complexity and its interconnectedness.

In rural America we must work not only to keep the generations of families who grew up there on the farm and ranch but to find new ways to bring new families back to the farms, ranches, and small towns throughout our great State. We must revitalize Main Streets that are slowly losing their place as the heart and soul of the community—boarded up and forgotten. To do this I will introduce legislation that will help provide ways to infuse new investments and life into our rural communities, called the Rural Philanthropy Act. It will help struggling businesses to find new private sector partners to serve their community, whether it is a smalltown newspaper or a local clothing store. It will help grow jobs and create more opportunities for startups and innovation.

We must look to reimagine burdensome rules and regulations that tie the hands of people who want to start a business by revitalizing Main Street and breathing new life into a tired city block. Doing good things shouldn't be so difficult, and we need a government that recognizes this.

Colorado's economy will also benefit from value-added trade opportunities with the passage of new trade agreements opening up new markets and eliminating barriers to growing markets. I will work to ensure that small businesses have the resources they need to participate in trade, making sure the benefit of new markets doesn't just stop at the biggest corporations.

Through my First in Space Initiative, we will focus on policies that promote and grow Colorado's leading aerospace economies, launching new jobs in space, engineering, and aeronautics.

A healthy economy means that everyone benefits—not just those who already have found success. That is why I will work to expand the earned-income tax credit. By eliminating the waste, fraud, and abuse all too common within the EITC, we can save billions of dollars and then use that money to expand the credit, making a program that has already lifted millions of people out of poverty to do even more good for people throughout Colorado and in our urban centers. Measuring a successful economy shouldn't simply be a matter of looking to see whether the haves have more but about what policies we have put in place to actually help the poor lift themselves out of poverty.

We are living in a veneered economy. While the numbers on Wall Street look good and profits are looking up, scratch the surface and too many people continue to suffer, endlessly searching for jobs they desperately need and earning the kinds of salary they need to help achieve their family's goals. While parts of Colorado may be suc-

ceeding, others are struggling. True success means that every part of our State's economy flourishes.

Thanks to our State's energy economy, parts of the State that seem to have been left behind are now thriving. A national policy geared towards North American energy independence will not only boost jobs and provide abundant and affordable energy upon which our economy relies, but it will boost our national security by providing to our allies abroad the energy partner they need that presents an alternative to nations such as Russia and Iran.

I look forward to continuing my push for an expedited export process for LNG, allowing Mesa and La Plata County energy producers the opportunity to play a leading role in national security while creating jobs at home.

Commonsense Colorado energy solutions also means focusing on renewable energy as well. Harnessing the winds in Weld, the sun in San Luis, and the power of water in the West, we can lessen pollution and help clean up the air. Working across the aisle with Senator CHRIS COONS from Delaware, I will focus on energy-savings performance contracts, an often overlooked private sector tool that has the potential to create thousands of jobs and save the taxpayer billions of dollars while helping to reduce pollution.

Reducing pollution and protecting our environment is a cornerstone of Colorado. I look forward to working with Congressman SCOTT TIPTON on legislation to help preserve and restore our great forest lands and to protect Colorado landscapes. Whether it is healthy forest legislation, reducing the maintenance backlog in our national parks or finding collaborative solutions to challenging land conflicts, we owe it to future generations of Coloradans to pass on an environment that is cleaner when they receive it than the one which we inherited.

Future generations of Coloradans also deserve the opportunity to receive an education. Whether that is fighting to restore local control to States, school districts, and parents or working to make the dream of a college degree a reality, our future depends on our ability to provide the skills and training for the next generation of leaders and entrepreneurs.

I will continue work on my legislation called the Making College Affordable Act. This will help families save for college and meet expenses in primary and secondary education. I look forward to promoting STEM education opportunities and transforming our immigration system from one that sends the best and brightest students back home to compete against us to one that allows them the opportunity to stay here in the United States to create jobs and innovation that we will continue to benefit from.



There is no doubt in the next 6 years many issues will arise that fall outside these Four Corner issues, and I look forward to meeting every single one of these challenges by finding new opportunities that will help make Colorado a better place.

I look forward to working with Congressman MIKE COFFMAN to finish the VA hospital in Aurora, a hospital earned through sacrifice but tarnished by delay. When it is completed, it will give veterans a far better place for the care they deserve. That always must be our focus, making Colorado and the United States a better place, giving the people of this country the confidence that we can work together to achieve common goals, to strive for brighter horizons, to deliver to the American people a government they can be proud of again. I will work with Senator BENNET and anyone who is committed to these common goals.

Too many people believe that government can no longer address the great challenges of our time—an \$18 trillion debt, mounting entitlement costs, a health care crisis that continues into the next century, and seemingly overwhelming policy challenges. Some leaders would have us believe they can't do anything about it, that a managed decline is better than a rapid decline.

The American people know better. They don't have to—and indeed, they will not—accept second best. A government that we can be proud of is one that solves the greatest challenges of our time, balances our budget, and puts in place solutions that rise above the rhetoric. A government we can be proud of again means an America that is always advancing and never in retreat.

Our search for solutions, our search for a government we can be proud of comes from the common bond—regardless of color, gender or creed, and, yes, even party—that we as Americans all hold: the shared story of our lives, the unrelenting American spirit. This is the American story.

We owe our Nation to the sacrifices made by millions of men and women for freedom for each other, to countless generations in the past and present who have worn a uniform in the defense of our Nation—a nation made exceptional by pioneering people, a nation of innovation and opportunity, a nation that imagines and inspires, a nation that rises above to be better tomorrow than we are today.

I grew up working at the family implement dealership, a family business that was started by my great-grandfather 100 years ago. Sweeping the floors and cleaning the bathrooms, I learned what it takes to make a business work. I learned about the employees who made the business function and how we succeed as a business when our employees succeed—the hard-work-

ing men and women who hope their aspirations will be fulfilled.

I learned from my grandma, the real life Rosie the Riveter who welded liberty ships in World War II alongside her husband, my grandpa. They gave up everything, moving their family and all they had in life to be part of the effort to win the war and to provide their four children with the opportunity to succeed and to build their own futures for their own families in a free world.

A few weeks ago, when going through some old boxes—a random collection of endless material, pictures—I discovered a stack of letters that were written by my grandfather to his parents and to my grandmother during World War II. The letters were written in near perfect cursive. Others were typed on an old hammer-strike typewriter they undoubtedly used to the last days of the implement dealership. He talked about the loneliness for home, new friends he had made during the war, questions about his young son, and the new countries he was visiting in France and beyond.

I would like to share parts of one of those letters today because it shares part of our American story. It was written on August 15, 1945.

Dear Folks,

Aha, that day, 14 August, is indeed a history making day, and last night at twelve o'clock when at last all the rumors were confirmed that the world was at peace I said a silent prayer and know that it won't be long until we are all together again. If you pull those reins hard enough, maybe I will be home for Xmas, mother, certainly have a good chance of making it now, although anything can still happen and there are thousands of miles to cover, but one can't help but be optimistic.

It must have been an incredible feeling to know that the war you had been fighting, the war that had consumed the world and taken our Nation's young men and women thousands of miles away from home was over, to have received word that "the rumors were confirmed that the world was at peace." And after years of battle and weariness and a silent prayer, the optimism of one soldier and that soldier's Nation persevered.

There are countless families across this country who share a similar story. One of their aunts or uncles, parents or siblings are people who share the honor and the obligation of wearing a uniform for the United States of America with all of the responsibility that comes along with it.

They are people whom we will most likely never meet, nor will we ever be able to fully thank them, but they still fought for all of us. Through the words of one simple letter, we recognize the power of peace over conflict, of love for family and country. A silent prayer, no doubt of thanks, thanks for answering so many other silent prayers, silent prayers for a day of peace and homecoming. What it must have been like to

know that the great darkness of war which threatened freedom not for some but for all had finally come to an end. Just like that, you will be home as if nothing ever happened.

Somewhere in that silent prayer, under the new calm of a war-torn horizon was the thanksgiving of a soldier for his victorious nation, a soldier looking to go home a civilian to live out his dreams far away from harm, in the arms of his family.

While we may disagree on the details of policy and the tactics of direction, let us make no mistake in our charge—to ensure that we have a nation that is worthy of the sacrifice so many have made; to refuse to pass on to future generations a nation in retreat or decline; to make sure ours is a nation that is always worth fighting for. This is Colorado. This is the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING EDWARD WILLIAM BROOKE III

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on January 3, the Nation lost a courageous public servant—actually, an icon of the 20th century: Massachusetts Senator Edward William Brooke III. He was 95 years old.

I have had the privilege of serving with more than 350 Senators since Vermonters first elected me to represent them in this Chamber. There is a very special list of those with whom I have served, and it is a privilege to count among those on that special list Senator Edward Brooke. We were both elected representatives of Northeastern States, even though we came from different political parties.

Senator Brooke and I forged a relationship that lasted long after he left Congress. We actually shared a similar start to our careers. As a former State's Attorney, I admired and respected Senator Brooke's legacy as a fearless prosecutor. As Attorney General for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Senator Brooke exposed and fought against political corruption.

He was no stranger to breaking barriers, and he ultimately became the first African American elected in Massachusetts to serve in the United States Senate—a post he held for 12 years.

Senator Brooke was a problem-solver. He wanted to spend his time in the Senate making a difference, not just making pronouncements. He invested his considerable abilities in bridging

racial, economic, and political divides to solve the challenges facing the Nation. He was a key, and sometimes crucial, voice along the difficult path toward enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1968. He spearheaded equal opportunity legislative initiatives from housing, to education, to employment. I think there was no bridge Senator Brooke was unwilling to cross to make lives better.

Senator Brooke is one of the few Senators to receive the Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom. He was also the recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal. His service in World War II was recognized with a Bronze Star.

This lifelong public servant dedicated his life to defending the bedrock principles of this country. His legacy of fighting for justice and equality is as important today as ever before. It is a legacy that will always deserve to be remembered and honored.

Marcelle and I feel privileged to have known him and I send my condolences to his wife, Anne, his children, and his grandchildren.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. President, the New York Times ran an editorial this morning aptly entitled "The Loretta Lynch Confirmation Mess." The editorial writers note:

Of course, as Mr. McConnell readily acknowledged, the delay [of the vote on Loretta Lynch's nomination] is not simply about trafficking legislation but a redirection of Republicans' fury at what they consider Mr. Obama's lawless actions.

If Republicans are serious about law enforcement, serious about implementing the legislation I hope will pass to combat and prevent human trafficking, they will stop their partisan attacks and allow a vote on Loretta Lynch's nomination. After all, she has a very good record of prosecuting people who are involved in trafficking. You can't say you are in favor of stopping trafficking and then block an Attorney General who has a record of enforcing the trafficking laws.

It has been 19 days since the bipartisan majority in the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably reported her nomination. She has been waiting longer for a floor vote than the five most recent attorneys general combined. She has been waiting for a vote for 19 days. If you took Attorneys General Reno, Ashcroft, Gonzales, Mukasey, and Holder, all of them together were 18 days. For Loretta Lynch it is 19 days.

It has certainly been much longer than for the three men nominated during the last Republican administration or for the incumbent Attorney General nominated by this administration. She has now waited, as I said, longer than the previous five Attorneys General combined.

If we don't vote on her this week, her nomination will have waited on the

Senate floor longer than the most recent seven Attorneys General combined. I hope it doesn't come to that. That would show a real disdain for the Department of Justice in its efforts to enforce our laws, to stop trafficking, and to go after terrorists, but it is also beneath the Senate.

Certainly when I was chairman, I did not do that for President Bush's Attorney General nominee when he was in his last 2 years as President. As chairman I moved Judge Mukasey through in a fraction of the time we have taken on Loretta Lynch. I did this even though his nomination was not something I supported and I ultimately voted against it. I moved him forward quickly even though Judge Mukasey was unwilling to state how he felt about President Bush's position on torture and did not seem to have a position on the politicization of his predecessor, or his work with U.S. attorneys, things that set back law enforcement for years. In fact, even though he had no position on most of the issues President Bush was involved in, either through Executive orders or otherwise, he was still moved through in a tiny fraction of the time Loretta Lynch has been pending so far.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the New York Times article I mentioned earlier.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, March 17, 2015]

#### THE LORETTA LYNCH CONFIRMATION MESS

(By the Editorial Board)

What does the abortion issue have to do with the prevention of human trafficking? Nothing.

What do either of those things have to do with Loretta Lynch, whom President Obama nominated more than four months ago to succeed Eric Holder Jr. as attorney general of the United States? Even less.

Yet Ms. Lynch's confirmation as the nation's top law enforcement officer—which seemed like a sure thing only a few weeks ago—is being held hostage to last-minute political mischief.

Ms. Lynch, a supremely well-qualified prosecutor, has waited far too long to be confirmed. Senate Republicans said as recently as last week that they would schedule Ms. Lynch's confirmation vote for this week, but, on Sunday, the majority leader, Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, said that won't happen until the Senate moves forward on a bipartisan trafficking bill, which would, among other things, establish a fund for victims through a fine paid by those convicted of trafficking crimes.

The legislation, which sailed through committee in February, stalled last week when Democrats noticed a provision that would prohibit money in the fund from being used to pay for abortions. The original Senate bill, introduced in the last Congress, made no reference to abortion. Nor did the House's version of the bill, introduced by Representative Erik Paulsen, a Republican of Minnesota. "There is no reason it should be included in these bills," Mr. Paulsen said last week of the abortion language. "This issue is

far too important to tie it up with an unrelated fight with politics as usual."

Republicans say they routinely add the abortion language into many bills and that Democrats should have read more carefully. Democrats say Republicans operated in bad faith—not to mention in violation of Senate norms—by misrepresenting the bill's contents.

This dispute has nothing to do with the needs of the Justice Department. It is beyond irresponsible to strand the department without a leader, sowing instability and uncertainty in an important executive agency.

Mr. Holder announced his retirement in September, to the evident delight of Republicans who have opposed him from the start. One would have thought they would be eager to see him go, yet almost six months later he remains in office because a replacement has not been confirmed. No one disputes Ms. Lynch's experience or accomplishments. She currently leads the federal prosecutor's office in the Eastern District of New York, and she has received the support of senators of both parties. The only objection anyone could come up with was that she might not stand up against President Obama's policies, an odd criticism to aim at a prospective cabinet member.

Of course, as Mr. McConnell readily acknowledged, the delay is not simply about trafficking legislation but a redirection of Republicans' fury at what they consider Mr. Obama's lawless actions. Ms. Lynch is "suffering from the president's actions," he said Sunday, referring to Mr. Obama's move on immigration policy last November.

This is not the way for Republicans to reassure the country of their ability to govern now that they control both houses of Congress. Instead, they could start by ending the delay on what should be a straightforward floor vote and do the job Americans elected them to do.

Mr. LEAHY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, next Tuesday, March 24, we will reach the deadline for the deal with Iran for its illicit nuclear program. That is the date by which the Obama administration said it would have a framework for a final agreement with Iran. So far, it seems as though the administration is willing to make a deal at any cost. America cannot afford that and Congress should not allow it. An overwhelming majority of Americans believe we should not accept a bad deal with the Iranians. In one poll earlier this month, 84 percent of Americans said it is a bad idea to accept the kinds of concessions this administration seems to be making.

The Obama administration started negotiating with Iran more than 5 years ago. It has mishandled these talks from the very beginning by conceding Iran's right to enrich uranium. This deal was supposed to be about stopping Iran's nuclear program as a pathway to a bomb. Negotiators started off by insisting that Iran should have no more than 1,500 centrifuges to produce nuclear materials. That number has steadily grown during the negotiations. According to David Ignatius

in the Washington Post on February 24, the number is now four times the level where we started. His article is entitled "A compelling argument on Iran." It says, "The deal taking shape would likely allow Iran about 6,000" centrifuges. So we have gone from 1,500 to 4,000 to now 6,000. The author of the article says one administration official told him that even 9,000 centrifuges would be okay.

Remember, Iran is not supposed to have a uranium enrichment program. The United Nations Security Council has demanded the program be suspended. So why is the Obama administration negotiating on this point at all? When did this change from being an attempt to stop Iran's nuclear program to become an attempt to delay or to manage Iran's nuclear program? If this deal makes too many of these kinds of concessions to the Iranians, it would be just one more example of the failed foreign relations of this Obama Presidency.

Go back and look at what happened with the Russian reset. It was the reset button Secretary of State Clinton launched in March of 2009—6 years ago this month. Look at her comments in which she said that Syrian President Assad was "a reformer." President Obama talked about a redline with Syria—a redline that Syria could not cross by using chemical weapons against his own people. Assad crossed that line more than 2 years ago.

Remember when the President called ISIS a JV team?

This is all part of a pattern of the Obama administration underestimating our enemies and being outmaneuvered by them. This administration has a terrible record of being wrong about Iran as well.

When Congress was debating increased sanctions against Iran, the White House opposed those sanctions. Congress had to force sanctions authority on the President. It was those sanctions—the ones Congress imposed upon the President—that brought Iran to the negotiating table. Now the administration says it opposes congressional participation once again. Well, I don't believe the White House gets to be the sole decider on this important issue.

The administration claims it understands it would be better to have no deal at all than to have a bad deal, and I agree. That is why we need oversight—oversight by Congress—to make sure this is not a bad deal. The negotiators don't get to decide for themselves if it is a good deal or a bad deal. The American people get a say, and Congress, as the elected representatives of the people, is the right place for the people to have their voices heard.

So what does the Obama administration have to say about all this? The President's Chief of Staff sent a letter over the weekend, Saturday night—the

Saturday night surprise—and he said Congress will get to be involved only after the administration signs a deal. Congress gets to be involved only after people get to find out what is in it, after President Obama signs a deal. It is kind of like NANCY PELOSI when she said of the health care law, first you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it.

So why is it the Chief of Staff of the President is acting this way? Why is the Obama administration telling Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, to sit down and be quiet? Let's be clear about what is at stake here. If the Obama administration allows Iran to continue with its illicit nuclear program, the world will be less safe, less stable, and less secure. Any agreement must be accountable, must be enforceable, and must be verifiable. If that is not the case, then it is a bad deal.

We need to make sure this deal is about protecting Americans, not protecting the President's diplomatic legacy. If the Obama administration is so confident it can negotiate a good deal, why not let Congress participate?

We have bipartisan legislation here that Senator CORKER has written with Democrats and Republicans as cosponsors. That bipartisan legislation would make sure that congressional sanctions currently in place stay in place, and they stay in place long enough for Congress to hold hearings and to take whatever action is needed. That bill being proposed will be before the Committee on Foreign Relations next week. That bill will guarantee the President keeps an eye on Iran's compliance with any agreement. If the Iranians try to break the deal, we would know about it so that Congress would reimpose sanctions, reinstate sanctions.

The American people need to be involved in this process. Getting onboard and getting the approval of Congress only strengthens the agreement the administration negotiates. It will validate, give more legitimacy to it, and more credibility. Congress should and must be involved. It will make clear to both our allies and our enemies that America stands united in our commitment to ending Iran's nuclear program. It also makes it far more likely this agreement will outlast the Obama administration.

When President Obama and Vice President BIDEN were Senators, they favored this kind of involvement by Congress. They both actually cosponsored legislation requiring Congress to approve any long-term security commitment President Bush was to make with Iraq. Well, a long agreement with Iran over its nuclear program to me is even more important.

In one policy after another, President Obama has disregarded the views of the American people. This is a huge con-

cern. He has ignored Congress. He acted on his own even when he had no authority to act. He has done it on the domestic side, he has done it on the foreign relations side, and it looks to me as if the administration is planning once again to ignore Congress and the American people in pursuit of an inadequate deal with Iran. It is time for Congress to step in and to stand up for the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post story of February 24 by David Ignatius entitled "A compelling argument on Iran."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 2015]

A COMPELLING ARGUMENT ON IRAN

(By David Ignatius)

Prussian King Frederick the Great offered this rebuke to those who refused to allow any concessions: "If you try to hold everything, you hold nothing."

President Obama might make a similar retort to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's attack on the alleged "bad deal" the United States is contemplating with Iran. Netanyahu rejects any concessions that allow Iran to enrich uranium; he thinks the U.S. goal of a one-year "break-out" period before Iran could build a bomb isn't enough.

To which several leading administration officials respond: Okay, then, what's a better practical idea for controlling Iran's nuclear program? They see in Netanyahu's maximalist goals an air of unreality—of fantasy, even. They grant that their solution isn't perfect. But they argue that it's far better for Israel and the West than any other plausible scenario.

The Iran nuclear talks, arguably the most important diplomatic negotiations of the last several decades, will come to a head next month. Netanyahu will take his case against the agreement to Congress on March 3 in an unusual speech organized by the Republican House speaker. His own political leadership will be tested in Israeli elections on March 17. The Iran negotiations will reach a March 24 deadline for the framework of a final comprehensive accord.

Israel's Minister of Intelligence Yuval Steinitz made the case against the Iran agreement in an interview with me last week. "From the very beginning, we made it clear we had reservations about the goal of the negotiations," he explained. He said Obama's effort to limit the Iranian nuclear program for a decade or so, in the expectation that a future generation of leaders wouldn't seek a bomb, was "too speculative."

The administration's response is that the agreement is better than any realistic alternative. Officials argue it would put the Iranian program in a box, with constraints on all the pathways to making a bomb. Perhaps more important, it would provide strict monitoring and allow intrusive inspection of Iranian facilities—not just its centrifuges but its uranium mines, mills and manufacturing facilities. If Iran seeks a covert path to building a bomb, the deal offers the best hope of detecting it.

If the current talks collapsed, all these safeguards would disappear. The Iranians could resume enrichment and other currently prohibited activities. In such a situation, the United States and Israel would face

a stark choice over whether to attack Iranian facilities—with no guarantee that such an attack would set Tehran back more than a few years.

The deal taking shape would likely allow Iran about 6,000 IR-1 centrifuges at Natanz. The Iranians apparently wouldn't install IR-2s, which operate twice as fast, and they would limit research on future models, up to IR-8s, that are on the drawing board. How these research limits would be monitored and enforced is a key bargaining issue. Another critical variable is the size of the stockpile Iran could maintain; U.S. officials want a very low number, with additional enriched material shipped out of Iran.

One official argues that the United States would be better off with 9,000 IR-1s and a small stockpile than with 1,000 IR-2s and a large stockpile. Netanyahu probably won't address this issue in his speech to Congress, since he insists the only acceptable number of centrifuges is zero.

Another key technical issue is how non-permitted centrifuges would be dismantled. There is a range of options, from simply unplugging the equipment to pulverizing it altogether. The United States wants a formula that would require at least a year for the Iranians to restart the shelved equipment. As for the planned Iranian plutonium reactor at Arak, negotiators seem to have agreed on a compromise that will halt construction well before Arak becomes "hot" with potential bomb fuel.

The length of the agreement is a crucial variable. U.S. officials have always spoken of a "double-digit" duration period, somewhere between 10 and 15 years. Negotiators are also exploring the possibility of different phases of the timeline, with inspection provisions having a longer life span than, say, limits on the number of centrifuges.

The deal-breaker for the administration is if Iran balks at U.S. insistence that sanctions will only be removed step by step, as Iran demonstrates that it's serious about abiding by the agreement. In the U.S. view, Iran has to earn its way back to global acceptance.

The Iran deal is imperfect. As Count Metternich observed in 1807 about negotiations with the rising powers of his day, "Peace does not exist with a revolutionary system." But U.S. officials make a compelling case that this agreement is a start toward a safer Middle East.

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. Thank you, Mr. President. I rise to speak on S. 178, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, and the Toomey-Manchin amendment No. 291 to that bill.

First of all, I wish to thank Senator CORNYN for bringing this bill to the Senate floor. It is a bipartisan bill. It is an extremely important bill. It has been awfully frustrating that we can't even get onto this bill. It is especially hard to understand because of the fact

that this is a bipartisan bill which has 10 Democratic cosponsors and another 3 Democrats who voted for it in the Senate Judiciary Committee. This shouldn't even be controversial.

It is particularly disturbing because when you think about what we are trying to address with Senator CORNYN's bill, it is awfully important. I mean, what can be more despicable than what we are trying to go after here—trafficking human beings? This is a form of modern-day slavery, is what it is, and some of the most despicable people in the world take the most vulnerable people in our society and they turn them into essentially slaves in the sex industry. I mean, as appalling as that is, it happens, and it happens in every State.

What this bill does is it provides more tools for law enforcement to better be able to crack down on this appalling practice and provides harsher penalties, as well it should, and it provides more resources for folks who do the important work of helping victims to heal, which is a very long, very difficult, very painful process. It is unimaginable what some of these folks go through. Children are forced into slavery, brutalized, beaten, and raped. It is dehumanizing—an atrocious situation. We have a bill which is bipartisan and which would actually do something constructive about it, and our Democratic colleagues will not even allow us to begin the debate, much less move on in the process.

I understand there is a provision in the bill they don't like. I get that. But we have offered repeatedly that they would be allowed to offer any amendment they like. They can offer an amendment to strike the language to which they object, and that is the way the Senate is supposed to work. You put a bill on the floor. If somebody doesn't like something that is in it, you try to change it. It is pretty basic, pretty fundamental, and that is what we ought to be doing. But we haven't been able to persuade enough of our Democratic colleagues to allow us to proceed to this bill yet. I hope we will soon.

One of the reasons I hope so goes beyond the substance of this bill, and that is the amendment Senator MANCHIN and I will introduce as soon as we are able to do that. This is an amendment which will allow us to amend the underlying trafficking bill with a bill Senator MANCHIN and I have introduced designed to protect kids from sexual abuse. It is amendment No. 291, and it is based on a bill we have called the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act. The goal is to protect kids from pedophiles in schools. That is what it comes down to. There is overwhelming bipartisan support for our legislation, the bill I introduced with Senator MANCHIN. It passed the House unanimously.

I rose last week to ask unanimous consent to bring up this amendment and make it pending so we could debate and we could vote on it, and one of our friends from the other side of the aisle objected to that as well. So there is no progress on this yet, but I am convinced that this isn't going to stand. I am convinced that enough Democratic Senators are going to come to their senses and they are going to join us in voting on this bill and that we are going to be able to somehow proceed with this and proceed with the various amendments I and others intend to offer.

I want to speak a little bit about my amendment because I think we are going to get to it. As I mentioned, it is about protecting kids at school from violent and sexual predators. Let me start with an observation that should go without saying, but I will say it anyway.

We all know that the overwhelming majority of school authorities, teachers and nonteachers alike, are very good and decent people and that it would never occur to them to abuse the children in their care. They are motivated in their desire to help kids succeed in the various ways they help guide these kids. I am completely convinced that the overwhelming majority of teachers and school employees don't want a pedophile anywhere near their school. They don't want them in the classroom next to them. They don't want them coaching their kids. They don't want them in any way involved because most teachers have good sense and decency. That is the way they are. But the reality is that schools are, in fact, where the kids are, and pedophiles know this. So we have a problem. The problem is that some of these predators are finding ways into the schools.

Stated very clearly, last year alone, 459 school employees—some teachers, some not teachers—459 adult school employees were arrested across America for sexual misconduct with the kids they are supposed to be looking after; 459 that we knew enough about what they were doing and the prosecutors felt they had a strong enough case that they could actually go ahead and make the arrest. How many more are under investigation? How many more where there are suspicions but no evidence with which to pursue a case? Probably a lot more. But we know for sure there are 459 appalling cases, and so far this year, we are on track to have similar numbers. We are 76 days into the school year, and over 90 school employees have already been arrested this year across the country.

This is absolutely a real problem. Some of these predators are finding ways to slip through the cracks of the system that is meant to keep them out, and Senator MANCHIN and I want to do something about it.

Here is our suggestion. We have a bill that does two simple things. It says to

the State: If you are going to collect the millions of dollars in Federal funding that go to primary and secondary education, then you have to do a proper background check and you have to make sure you are not hiring a pedophile. You have to check the Federal and State databases to make sure you are doing a thorough background check. And the second requirement is you can't engage or permit anybody to engage in this appalling practice that is known as passing the trash. It is shocking that this could even exist, but it does.

I will tell you the story that actually inspired this legislation, which is a case in point of passing the trash. The story begins with a teacher teaching in Delaware County, PA. This teacher was a pedophile who was molesting boys who were in his care. The school district figured out what was going on. There was never enough evidence to actually prosecute him, but they knew something was very wrong. The school district decided it would be better if this teacher became someone else's problem, so, as appalling as it is, what they did was they wrote a letter of recommendation to recommend this teacher for another job provided that he leave. Well, he leaves. He goes across the State border into West Virginia, applies for and, in part on the strength of the letter of recommendation he had, he gets hired at a school in West Virginia. He works as a teacher. He resumes what these people do—abusing children. Eventually, he becomes principal, and while principal at the school, he rapes and murders a 12-year-old boy named Jeremy Bell.

So the practice of sending a letter of recommendation along with a monster such as this is known as passing the trash. As appalling as that is, it happens enough that it has its own name. As a matter of fact, just Friday, I was in Pittsburgh and I was visiting a wonderful group of people—Pittsburgh Action Against Rape—a great group of professionals who do wonderful work, mostly helping victims cope with the aftermath of their assaults. One of the people I met there and heard from is the president of the board of directors. Her name is Beth Docherty. She told her story. Her story began when she was 15 years old. She was in the band at her school when the band instructor began to rape her. When she came forward and told the authorities what was happening, the school promised the teacher they wouldn't conduct any investigation if he would just quietly resign. Then the school wrote a glowing letter of recommendation for this guy, which he took with him, went to Florida, and found a teaching job there.

Fortunately, the prosecutors in the case in Pennsylvania felt confident that they had a strong enough case, and in time they were actually able to get him back from Florida. They pros-

ecuted him and they locked him up, and he is in jail today, where he belongs and might be for the rest of his life.

The point of this is, as appalling and shocking as it is to our conscience that anyone would do this, I am here to say it happens. It happens, and we need to do something about it for the sake of Jeremy Bell and for the sake of Beth Docherty and who knows how many other children.

Our legislation simply requires that the State have a provision in its law that makes it illegal to knowingly recommend for hire someone who is attacking kids. This, too, strikes me as a bill that should not be controversial. It passed the House unanimously. But there are people who are trying to kill this bill. We have some of our friends on the other side of the aisle, and outside organizations from the left have argued against this.

I want to quote from a letter that was sent to all of us explaining why a number of those groups are opposing the legislation. Here is the quote. This is what they say in their letter:

"Individuals who have been convicted of crimes and have completed their sentences should not be unnecessarily subjected to additional punishments because of these convictions."

Well, wait a minute. Think about the logic of that position. By that logic, an admitted convicted child molester who serves a 10-year prison sentence for his crime should be able to walk out of the jail, walk down the street, apply for and get a job teaching elementary schoolkids. How ridiculous is that? It is completely ridiculous.

Our kids should not be involuntary members of a social experiment where we are trying to see which convicted child molesters are going to be recidivists. Frankly, most of them are. I am not willing to take the risk that our kids should be left alone with people like that. We have a National Sex Offender Registry for a reason. It is because we recognize those people pose a danger that extends past the time of their incarceration. Parents need to know about that. That is why we have this national registry. Schools need to avoid the danger.

To be clear, I am not suggesting a convicted child molester can never work again anywhere, but I am saying they should not work in a school. I think that is completely reasonable. I am shocked, frankly, that these organizations would come out against this commonsense legislation.

But the objection, in fairness—some objection comes from our side of the aisle as well. I have a colleague for whom I have all the respect in the world. The senior Senator from Tennessee is a wonderful Senator. I agree with him on far more than I disagree. But I have to say, I strongly disagree with his view of this particular view.

He has been here on the Senate floor. He has been very upfront with me about his opposition to our bill. The basis of his opposition to my bill is he believes that passing the legislation Senator MANCHIN and I are proposing, requiring background checks and forbidding the passing of trash, constitutes the equivalent of a national school board, that it is an unreasonable infringement on schools.

Well, I could not disagree more. Now the idea of a national school board is a terrible idea. I have no interest in that. You will never hear me arguing that the Federal Government should impose on States and school districts things such as appropriate class size, or whether you should teach geometry before algebra in middle school, or what grade should students read "The Grapes of Wrath." Any of those kinds of curriculum issues or testing issues should be left to local school boards and States. But that is not what we are trying to do here.

What I am saying with my legislation with Senator MANCHIN is if a State takes billions and billions of Federal tax dollars each year, then you cannot use that money to pay the salary of a convicted child abuser. I think that is totally different. That is nothing like a national school board.

Furthermore, we all voted in favor of the substance of these background check requirements when we all passed the child care development block grant bill, which, by the way, passed this Chamber with one dissenting vote. It was 98 to 1. There was one "no" vote, which had nothing to do with the background check provisions, by the way. The senior Senator from Tennessee was an original cosponsor of that legislation.

By the way, that also passed the House unanimously. It is virtually identical. It holds that children in these daycare centers should have the protection that comes with knowing the employees have gone through this background check system.

So do we have a national daycare board? I do not think so. If it is okay to protect the youngest of kids, which it certainly is and should be, why cannot we also extend that protection to kids who are a little bit older? We are insisting on a standard that is appropriate and rigorous for kids who are toddlers. Then when they go to kindergarten, we are not going to have the same standard to protect them? That makes no sense to me at all.

Then another point I would make regarding this idea of a national school board is this practice of passing the trash. When a school district sends a letter of recommendation for a known offender, and he takes that letter with him and goes across State lines, what can a single State do about that? The case I described of Jeremy Bell, the little boy who was killed by the teacher

in West Virginia who originated in Pennsylvania—what could West Virginia do to forbid Pennsylvanians from sending a letter of recommendation for that teacher? Absolutely nothing is the answer. Because West Virginia's legislative authority does not reach into Pennsylvania. This happens across State lines. In fact, it is a very conscious decision on the part of many of these predators, because they want to put as much distance between their criminal activities as they can. When they move, they move far sometimes. So this demands a Federal response. There is nothing a State can do to solve this problem. That is why we address it in our bill.

The other point I would make is, look, this is not the first time we have had the Federal Government establish some employment standards. We have Federal laws that, for instance, ban discrimination in schools. Schools are not permitted, under Federal law—you cannot discriminate in your hiring on the basis of sex or race or age or religion or pregnancy. Does that mean we have a national school board? Does that mean we have a national school board? Does this mean we have to repeal all of these laws? I do not think so. I think it is perfectly reasonable to have employment standards.

Finally, I would say do we not have some responsibility of oversight of how Federal tax dollars get spent by the States? I mean, do we send the money and say: Hey, here is a pile of cash, do whatever you like with it? I do not think that is a very reasonable standard. What could be more reasonable than simply saying you cannot use Federal tax dollars we are responsible for if you are going to use it to pay the salaries of convicted child abusers. I think that is pretty straightforward.

I will say there may be alternative amendments here. There has been some discussion that some of our colleagues may offer alternatives to the legislation Senator MANCHIN and I have. I am still willing to work with anyone on our side or the other side of the aisle. If we can constructively work—if the goal is to actually get something passed that is going to be helpful, that is going to be constructive, then I will work with anybody to get there. But there are a few things I will not agree to. I will not agree to a provision that, under the guise of privacy, requires a school to stay silent while a known child molester seeks a new teaching job. That is not reasonable. I will not agree to a bill that does nothing to change the status quo, a bill that does nothing to provide additional protections for our kids.

Unfortunately, in my view, the amendment that is offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee fits into this latter category. He has got an amendment that I think provides absolutely no additional protections. It

says all States have to have a background check system. But guess what. All States already do. The problem is, many of them are inadequate. As I said before, there is nothing a State can do about passing the trash across State lines. So it does nothing to stop passing the trash. It does nothing to stop schools from hiring a convicted child rapist. It does not say anything about the standards of the background check. The bill is so loose that if a State simply decided to do a Google search, that would meet the criteria of the bill. It is completely unacceptable. It does not change the status quo. It does nothing to protect the kids. You could make the argument that this bill is arguably worse than doing nothing, because it could undermine the effort to do this right, create the illusion of having done something at the national level when, in fact, it has not done so.

I will conclude by simply saying I am not prepared to settle for the status quo. I am not satisfied when we have a situation where 459 school employees are arrested in a single year—arrested for sexual misconduct with the kids they are supposed to be taking care of. Obviously we have a problem here. I am not going to settle for a pretend piece of legislation that accomplishes nothing.

What comes home to me is my own three kids. I have three young children. When one of my children gets on a schoolbus in the morning, I have every right to expect the school that child is going to—the school my child is going to—is as safe an environment for him or her as it can possibly be. Every other parent in Pennsylvania and every parent in America deserves to have peace of mind. Every child deserves to have that security. So that is why I am not going to give up on this.

I am confident at some point our Democratic friends are going to realize it is a huge mistake for them to continue their filibuster of the trafficking bill. When they do, they will agree to let us proceed to it. When that happens, I will be back. Senator MANCHIN and I will offer our legislation as an amendment. We are going to have a debate about it. We are going to have a vote about it. I certainly hope we win this vote. This, again, is legislation that passed the House unanimously. If it passes the Senate, it is sure to become law. If it does not pass for some reason, then I am going to come back again and again until it does.

I hope we will take this up sooner rather than later. I hope we get on this bill still this week. There is still time. I know we will have an open amendment process when we do. I look forward to offering this amendment.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, yesterday, I, along with a number of my colleagues, filed an amendment to the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. This amendment, based on the Rape

Survivor Child Custody Act which we filed as a stand-alone bill last Congress, would provide grants to States that have laws on the books that allow women to petition for the termination of parental rights based on clear and convincing evidence that a child was conceived through rape. The goal is to encourage more States to adopt such laws.

The amendment as drafted gives broad discretion to the Attorney General to determine which States are eligible for grants and which are not. For that reason, I would like to say a few words regarding our intention in drafting this amendment.

Under the Rape Survivor Child Custody Act, the Attorney General is empowered to make grants to "States that have in place a law that allows the mother of any child that was conceived through rape to seek court-order termination of the parental rights of her rapist with regard to that child, which the court is authorized to grant upon clear and convincing evidence of rape." Termination is defined as "a complete and final termination of the parent's right to custody of, guardianship of, visitation with, access to, and inheritance from a child."

There are a number of States that have such a law on the books but which also state that parental rights can be reinstated if extenuating circumstances occur. And while the bill states that a determination must be final, the bill was drafted with the idea that there is a difference between a "final" determination and an "unmodifiable" one. And States with such laws on the books should still qualify because the amendment does not say the determination has to be unmodifiable, just final.

The intention as currently drafted is that 10 States would be eligible under their current laws. These 10 States are Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Wisconsin. Once this amendment is hopefully adopted as part of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking and passed into law, I am confident that the Department of Justice will concur in this assessment.

In addition to this amendment, I have two other amendments which I filed yesterday. The first amendment would provide help support local law enforcement in their efforts to track down homeless and runaway youth by providing funding for retired Federal agents who assist the local law enforcement in these investigations.

In September of 2013, a group of retired FBI agents in Northwest Ohio came to my office and asked for help in creating a pilot program that would allow retired agents to assist local law enforcement in finding runaway children and teens. Generally, Northwest Ohio children who become involved in trafficking do so within about 2 weeks



of running away from home, so finding them quickly is critical. Overall, about one-third of runaways become victims of trafficking.

Toledo has just one detective working on missing person's cases, both adults and children. These retired FBI agents want to help law-enforcement officials investigate the 18,000 runaways in Ohio every year, but they need resources. Police don't have the manpower to track these children, but every city has retired agents who could assist the "overworked" departments.

The second amendment mirrors Congressman MALONEY's Human Trafficking Prevention Act. This legislation comes in response to a State Department inspector general report recommended the changes made by this amendment. It would train Foreign Service officers working at U.S. Embassies overseas to help stem the demand for trafficking and spot victims before they are trafficked into the United States. It passed the House in January on a voice vote, and I am confident that it would find similar broad support in the Senate.

Mr. TOOMEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYTOTE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### VOTING RIGHTS ACT ANNIVERSARY

Mr. COONS. Madam President, today is the 50th anniversary of the introduction of the bipartisan Voting Rights Act of 1965, a day we are reminded of what is possible when we come together across party lines.

It was 50 years ago today that Republican minority leader Senator Everett Dirksen and Democratic majority leader Senator Mike Mansfield came together on this floor to introduce landmark legislation that sought to fulfill the promise of the 15th Amendment to the Constitution and ensure that no person would be denied the right to vote because of the color of his or her skin.

I was reminded of the power of their example just 2 weeks ago when I gathered with Republicans and Democrats from the House and Senate in Selma, AL, to honor the Americans who came from across our country 50 years ago to march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma and demand equal voting rights. Their example was one of unity, as was the example of Members from both sides of the aisle who came together to introduce and eventually pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

So I am concerned as I come to the floor this afternoon about our troubling inability to come together in this Chamber on issues where there clearly

should be broad agreement as well. I have with me a photographic reminder that the last time the Voting Rights Act was signed into law—was reauthorized—it was signed by Republican President George Bush, with the support of both Democrats and Republicans in the then Congress.

Those of us who gathered 2 weeks ago at the bridge at Selma were treated both to a stirring speech by our current President, and the cheering presence of President Bush, when a challenge was issued to those Members of Congress present that we should come together, fix the Voting Rights Act, and reintroduce it in this Chamber.

When it comes to voting rights, it surely is true that today's America is not the America of half a century ago, just as today's hurdles to the ballot box are not the same as in the time of Jim Crow. Yet it is also true that in too many cities, towns, States, and counties across our country, new roadblocks are being built to make it more difficult for Americans to vote.

It is clear that, as President Obama said to us on the Edmund Pettus Bridge 2 weeks ago, "our march is not yet finished."

In the coming weeks, as Senator LEAHY, I, and others work to bring to the Senate a new voting rights act that reflects today's challenges, it is my sincere hope and my prayer that Republican colleagues will partner with us to continue the work that remains undone.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Madam President, this was also to be the week that we would take up, consider, and vote on the nomination of Loretta Lynch to serve as Attorney General. I must say that the Senate's proceedings this week do not portend well, because we find ourselves, yet again, stuck in regrettable partisan gridlock.

For the past 129 days, we have had before us an incredibly qualified and talented nominee for Attorney General. Loretta Lynch was first nominated by President Obama in November. She has now waited for a vote longer than any Attorney General nominee in 30 years.

As of today, her confirmation has waited longer on the floor than the last five Attorneys General combined.

That is unacceptable, and I frankly haven't heard a single good reason from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for why Ms. Lynch's nomination deserves such a delay. Instead, her nomination is being used by many to continue their fight with the President over his immigration policy, and this is after nearly shutting down the Department of Homeland Security because of those same disagreements.

While we do need to have a focused and functional debate in this Congress about immigration, it is simply irresponsible to hold up a highly qualified

nominee for Attorney General because some don't like that she agrees with the very President who nominated her.

I take very seriously the Senate's role to advise and consent on Presidential nominations. So let's just take a minute and look at Loretta Lynch's experience, her background.

She is a graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School. She spent 8 years in private practice at a prestigious law firm, then known as Hogan & Hartson. She served on the United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda.

She has served the public and previously been unanimously confirmed by this body—twice, I should add—to be the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. That is a job where she has prosecuted drug crimes, violent crimes, and where she has taken on corrupt politicians.

At her nomination hearing in the Judiciary Committee, on which I serve, our chairman called an outside witness panel of nine witnesses. When asked, not one of them said they opposed Ms. Lynch's confirmation to be Attorney General on the basis of her skills or experience. The committee was, in fact, unable to produce one shred of testimony in opposition to her nomination.

Yet we stand today in the middle of March and the first African-American woman ever to be nominated Attorney General of the United States, our Nation's top law enforcement official, has foundered on this floor longer than the five prior nominees combined. I think this is unacceptable and sets an unfortunate, even dangerous precedent. We should not play political games with the Department of Justice, an executive branch agency with 125,000 employees and a \$28 billion departmental budget that is charged with all sorts of different law enforcement functions, from running the Federal prisons to enforcing the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act, to making sure we fight human trafficking and money laundering.

Frustratingly, we find ourselves this week also considering a bill to combat human trafficking, which we don't seem to be able to move forward. It is important legislation that includes broad bipartisan support, except for a simple, partisan, political provision that has now turned it into a divisive issue.

The Republican leader this week has argued that once we finished work on this human trafficking bill, we could then move on to Loretta Lynch's nomination vote. But I am forced to wonder when the delay tactics here will end.

Not only is it seemingly untrue that we can't do human trafficking legislation and this nomination at the same time—because if my memory serves, we just confirmed two other executive branch nominees last night—but the Republican leader knows well that if he



truly wanted to move this bill forward, Democrats would be ready to partner with him with just a minor revision to the bill.

There is, in fact, a bitter irony that, as was reported last night, Loretta Lynch's confirmation is being held up over an issue—human trafficking—which she herself said she would prioritize if confirmed.

I ask my Republican colleagues: Let's find a way to move forward on all of these issues—on combatting human trafficking and confirming Loretta Lynch to serve as Attorney General and on reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act, which is such an important linchpin of civil rights in this country.

We agree that we need to combat human trafficking. So let's work together on the broad areas where we are, in fact, united. Let's confirm an Attorney General nominee who is qualified, smart, and will give the fight against human trafficking the dedication it deserves. Ms. Lynch would make a superb Attorney General.

As someone who has herself served in law enforcement and served in that role at the State level, I think the Presiding Officer appreciates the importance of having a confirmed Attorney General to lead our Federal Department of Justice.

Loretta Lynch has demonstrated—throughout her confirmation process and through her many years of service to her country—that she is well and amply prepared and qualified to take on this vital and important role.

I urge my colleagues to end the delays and give Loretta Lynch the vote our country deserves.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BRINGING MONTANA SOLUTIONS TO WASHINGTON

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, it is an incredible honor to represent Montana in the Senate. More than 150 years ago, a young Norwegian woman named Karine Dyrud immigrated to this country. She came in search of freedom and opportunity. She came to a nation where government served the people and not the other way around. After her husband passed away, this tough widow and mother of seven headed West to Montana and settled with her children about an hour north of Great Falls.

Karine Dyrud was my great-great-grandmother and the beginning of my Montana story. Her perseverance is the reason why my family has called Montana home for five generations. It is why Cindy and I have been able to pass

along the legacy of faith and freedom, of personal responsibility, to our four children.

We are blessed to live in the greatest Nation on Earth, and it is a solemn responsibility of the Senate to do everything in its power to keep it that way.

Before I was elected to Congress, I spent 28 years in the private sector growing companies and creating jobs. In fact, I am the only chemical engineer in Congress. In the private sector, we understand the importance of hard work, of innovation, accountability, and not spending more than you take in.

The freedom of ideas and trade, private property and opportunity, are the fundamental elements of liberty and of prosperity. These are the elements that helped RightNow Technologies—a Montana-based cloud computing business that I served as vice president of for 12 years—grow from a small startup into a publicly traded company and a global leader in cloud computing. We created over 1,000 high-paying jobs—jobs that support a vibrant community with good schools and quality of life for Montana families.

Unfortunately, Washington, DC, under the guise of equality, is encroaching upon these freedoms, replacing the constitutional rule of law through elected officials with bureaucratic rule that is unaccountable, inefficient, ineffective, and far too costly. Washington is more concerned with its own self-interest and self-gain than the well-being of the American people.

As we begin consideration of the Federal budget this week, we must hold government accountable to the people. Last year, the New York Times did an assessment of the health and wealth of every county in the Nation. You might expect folks in Silicon Valley to be doing fairly well or perhaps in the suburbs of New York City. What shocked me was seeing that six of the Nation's top 10 wealthiest counties surround Washington, DC. That sends a pretty clear message about where Washington priorities are.

During the recession, while millions of Americans were struggling to make ends meet amidst layoffs and economic instability, Washington, DC, thrived. The Federal Government poured millions of dollars into new buildings, and salaries kept growing and growing.

It is time for Washington to be held accountable to the American people, and that is why the first bill I introduced in the Senate was the Balanced Budget Accountability Act. It simply requires Congress to balance the budget or Members won't get paid. It is not that complicated. It is easy to measure. It is very simple. No balanced budget, no paycheck.

Washington is out of touch with the day-to-day struggles that American farmers, ranchers, union workers, and tribal members face every day. Look

no farther than President Obama's recent veto of the Keystone XL Pipeline. Instead of working toward North American energy independence, President Obama continues to play politics with good-paying American jobs. Instead of advancing economic opportunity for hard-working Montana families, President Obama is instead perpetuating his war on energy and standing in the way of affordable made-in-Montana and made-in-America energy.

While serving in the House, I invited Crow tribal chairman Darrin Old Coyote to testify before the Natural Resources Committee. The Crow Reservation in Montana is home to some of the richest energy reserves in our country, but the President's senseless agenda is preventing them from developing their resources. What Chairman Old Coyote said has stuck with me. He said, "A war on coal is a war on the Crow people."

President Obama and the EPA's regulatory overreach is a direct threat to thousands of jobs and our Nation's economic future. We shouldn't be hitting pause on American energy production. We need to encourage it. More made-in-America energy doesn't just mean more money in the pockets of hard-working families. It also means more jobs. It means energy independence.

Our energy security, though, isn't just about jobs and low energy prices. It is tied directly to our national security. I am happy to report the United States will become the largest oil and gas producer in the world this year, surpassing both Russia and Saudi Arabia. As we see the growing threat of ISIS and a nuclear Iran, one thing is clear: We need more made-in-America energy, not more made-in-the-Middle East oil.

We have tremendous opportunities to develop our Nation's energy resources and create new jobs across the entire Nation, but we must allow the States to take the lead. Rather than moving forward with commonsense, job-creating solutions, such as the Keystone Pipeline, Washington continues to put barrier after barrier up to prevent job creation and the responsible management of our resources.

We see that in our national forests and our public lands. Our public lands out West are a tremendous asset to our tourism economy and our way of life. It is one of the many reasons people come to Montana in the first place. But the Federal Government's perpetual failure to properly manage our national forests has led many of Montana's forested counties into economic despair. Like many Western States, Montana once boasted a robust timber industry. Now timber harvests in our national forests have declined 82 percent. In fact, I had dinner one evening with a couple from Eureka, MT, up in the northwest corner of our State, in

Lincoln County. They said: STEVE, basically we describe this area now as poverty with a view.

We must implement meaningful forest management reforms that get our timber industry up and running again. It improves the health of our forests and it ensures our rural counties aren't dependent on the whims of the Federal Government's annual budget. But we must ensure that States have primacy in these decisions. We must ensure the hard-working farmers, the ranchers, the loggers, and the sportsmen who live, work, and recreate on these lands every day have their voices heard, and that those closest to the land are guiding management practices, not bureaucrats in Washington, DC, or lawyers in San Francisco, who would be hard pressed to find Montana on a map.

But Washington's overreach doesn't just affect our natural resources. We are seeing it in our technology sector and the Internet. I worked in the technology sector for more than 12 years. I know firsthand how the Internet has removed geography as a constraint for countless businesses in Montana and across our Nation.

I know technology has created jobs and economic opportunities in communities where little previously existed. We must encourage the growth of these high-tech jobs in Montana and across our country. These are good-paying jobs that will help us grow economically and allow us to remain globally competitive.

The Internet is a laboratory of innovation, yet DC wants to tie our entrepreneurs' hands by placing more regulations on the Internet. The FCC recently approved a 300-plus-page plan to regulate Americans' Internet access as a title II utility, in short, a government takeover of the Internet. That is like putting a buggy whip manufacturer in charge of Tesla.

The Internet is unconstrained innovation. That is why I will stand strong against DC's attempts to tax the Internet, to regulate the Internet, and to stifle innovation. If we want to remain the greatest Nation in the world, we need to remain globally competitive, and technology plays a key role in that.

We also must implement meaningful tax reforms that encourage American businesses, incentivize American businesses to grow and create jobs here at home, not overseas. During my time at our software company, in the last 5 years I managed Asia Pacific, and I had offices in Tokyo and Sidney, but headquartered in Bozeman, MT, as we were growing and competing against some of the world's best technology companies.

We must expand our trade opportunities, certainly for our farmers and ranchers across our country. So it is important that innovation and entrepreneurship are encouraged, not hin-

dered. Unfortunately, Washington, DC, is more interested in issuing press releases and headlines than getting results.

As an engineer, I was trained to solve problems, find solutions, and get results. It is time for Washington to look to the States for these solutions—to adhere to the principles of federalism and States rights, as clearly found in our Constitution—and empowering local communities, State legislatures, Governors, and tribes to manage their resources, to grow economic opportunity, and to find and determine their own destiny.

In fact, it is time for Washington to listen to the States and it is time for Washington, DC, to listen to Montana.

I have always said one of the best decisions I ever made in my life was when I picked my great-great-grandmother. She got her family out to Montana, and she is buried in a small country cemetery just east of a small town called Conrad, MT. On her headstone, in this very remote small country cemetery, reads three simple words: "saved by grace." She placed her ultimate faith in her God, not in her government.

It is an honor to stand here today on the Senate floor to serve as Montana's voice in Washington. I will continue working to bring more Montana solutions to Washington and get it working again for all Montanans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### CONGRATULATING SENATOR DAINES

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I want to congratulate our freshman colleague from Montana on his initial speech, and particularly to second his observations about the devastation in the coalfields of America. We have a depression in the eastern part of my State as a direct result of this administration and the EPA, and I know it has affected the great State of Montana as well. So among the many insightful observations the Senator from Montana made, I particularly appreciate his thoughts about energy.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the committee-reported amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, David Vitter, Richard Burr, Chuck Grassley, Joni

Ernst, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Daniel Coats, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Mark Kirk, Cory Gardner, Thom Tillis.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, David Vitter, Richard Burr, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Daniel Coats, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Mark Kirk, Cory Gardner, Thom Tillis.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived with respect to these cloture motions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I rise today to speak on two topics. The first topic is to urge my colleagues to bring up the vote on Loretta Lynch right away. The delay on her nomination to be Attorney General has gone on long enough, and there are no longer any legitimate excuses. She is by all accounts an excellent candidate. She is highly qualified, and she has bipartisan support in the Committee on the Judiciary. No one has questioned her stellar credentials. Her nomination has been held up for too long. In fact,

Republicans have held up her nomination longer than the five most recent Attorney General nominees combined. But now her nomination has been tied to a piece of legislation that Republicans themselves have poisoned. Why are they putting poison pills in their own legislation? They took a perfectly good bipartisan bill and ensured it would go nowhere. Then they took a perfectly qualified Attorney General nominee and tied her vote to their poisoned legislation.

The majority party is getting in its own way when it comes to the major responsibilities of governing. It is time for the Republicans to act like the majority and govern. This is the difference between being in the majority and being in the minority. Putting poison pills in legislative vehicles may be an odious practice, but it is normally reserved for the minority party—the party that is not in charge. Generally speaking, you do not poison your own piece of legislation.

The American people have given the keys to the car to the Republican Party, and now they need to drive the car. This is the difference between being in the minority and the majority. Governing includes giving advice and consent on nominations. This is a particularly important nomination. The Attorney General is the top law enforcement official in the country. He or she is responsible for enforcing our Nation's laws, protecting national security, and upholding our constitutional rights.

This last role is vital at a time when the DOJ is investigating violations of constitutional rights by local law enforcement agencies. Just last week, DOJ released a scathing report on the deep and pervasive racism in the Ferguson, MO, police force. In that report, the Department described shocking practices: systematic targeting of African-Americans and an abuse of power to collect enormous amounts in fees. In a city with a population of 21,000 people, 16,000 people have outstanding arrest warrants—16,000 people. That is three-quarters of Ferguson's population. Those arrest warrants are overwhelmingly issued to Ferguson's African-American population—92 percent, to be exact. Emails and other documents DOJ collected prove the Ferguson police force acted with racial animus.

If confirmed, Ms. Lynch would continue DOJ's task of investigating unconstitutional policing across the country. She faces weighty issues—the over-militarization of our police, our policing practices, and reforming our sentencing guidelines, just to name a few.

As the first African-American woman to serve as Attorney General, this would be a historic nomination and a crucial one.

At a time when the public's trust in law enforcement is badly eroded, we

need to confirm Ms. Lynch as our Attorney General and let her get to work on fighting for our civil rights.

#### THE HOUSE BUDGET

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, today the House released its budget proposal. It is a proposal divorced from reality that seeks to balance the budget on the backs of those in the country who can least afford it. It takes from the middle class and gives to the ultrawealthy.

Without a doubt, my colleagues and I will have much more to say about the Republican budget in the coming weeks and months, but today I want to discuss a section of the budget that seeks to deny the very real and very current threat of climate change to our public health and military readiness.

The Department of Defense is responsible for protecting the security of the United States, and that requires taking into consideration every threat and every threat multiplier that affects the global security environment and our national interests, including climate change. That is why the military spends considerable time assessing the effects climate change could have on its facilities, capabilities, and missions, and how those effects could undermine its ability to protect our national security. It is unfortunate that today in their budget proposal House Republicans said that this planning is wasteful spending. I am as against wasteful spending as anyone, but preparing for threats to our national security planning and operations is the opposite of wasteful. It is prudent.

Today, I want to talk about how a climate change prohibition would tie the hands of our national defense strategy.

Climate change affects our national security in two major ways.

First, the DOD has warned that climate change is likely to impact the military's facilities and capabilities. In particular, America's military bases may be particularly vulnerable to climate change.

According to a 2008 National Intelligence Council finding, "more than 30 U.S. military installations were already facing elevated levels of risk from rising sea levels." In my home State of Hawaii, for example, Navy and Marine Corps installations such as Pearl Harbor and Marine Corps base Kaneohe Bay are literally on the water's edge.

According to the Department of Defense, the combination of decreasing sea ice, rising sea levels, and thawing permafrost along the coast of Alaska has increased coastal erosion at several Air Force radar early warning and communication installations. This coastal erosion has already damaged roads, seawalls, and runways at our bases.

Second, climate change exacerbates the drivers of global instability, including drought, food shortages, water scarcity, and pandemic disease.

ADM Sam Locklear III, commander of the USPACOM, said that the biggest long-term security threat in the region is climate change because "it is probably the most likely thing that is going to happen . . . that will cripple the security environment."

I would like to make a point here. The Department of Defense is in no position to get caught up in our partisan or ideological battles. The Department of Defense has to deal with what is. The Department of Defense has to prepare for and contend with reality. And we should have debates on the Senate floor. We should talk about whether the President's clean powerplant is the right approach. We should talk about how we should approach international agreements coming into the Paris Accords. Let's have that debate about whether a carbon fee is the most prudent approach. But what we should not do is make it impossible for the Department of Defense to do its planning and preparation. That is what the House budget does.

In its 2014 QDR, the Department of Defense warned that the effects of climate change "are threat multipliers that will aggravate stressors abroad such as poverty, environmental degradation, political instability, and social tensions—conditions that can enable terrorist activity and other forms of violence." The stresses could break the backs of weak governments and institutions in countries around the world where the United States has enduring interests. In particular, the National Intelligence Council stated in its "Global Trends 2030" report that climate change will pose stiff challenges to governance in places such as Afghanistan and Pakistan.

That is why I find it ironic that many of my Republican colleagues who are so committed to slowing the pace of our withdrawal from Afghanistan on the premise that doing so will preserve our security gains and keep Afghanistan stable are now tying the hands of the national security community so that they are unable to study the security effects of climate change on Afghanistan and the region. Again, I don't think we should tell them how to study it, what conclusions to draw, what preparations to make, except to say that we should stay out of their way as they do their security planning, as they do their security preparation. I am not suggesting that they take my view on climate change; I am suggesting that they be allowed to deal with what is and that they not be sucked into a partisan ideological battle over climate change. They don't have the luxury of getting sucked into a partisan ideological battle when it comes to climate change. They have to

deal with what is because they are responsible for our national defense.

Fortunately, while some in Congress play politics, our military leaders are clear-eyed about the current and present threats posed by climate change, and they are making the necessary investments in knowledge of impacts to their readiness and to regional and global conflicts. We need to back them up and make sure that climate deniers do not tie one hand behind their back while they work to understand the threats to defend our country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with the senior Senator from Illinois and the junior Senator from New Jersey, as well as the junior Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SMARTER SENTENCING ACT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, we rise today to speak in favor of the Smarter Sentencing Act, a bipartisan piece of legislation that would make targeted reforms to mandatory minimum sentences for nonviolent drug offenders.

I was proud to join my distinguished colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, in introducing this legislation. He and I wish to thank our cosponsors, Senators JEFF FLAKE, CORY BOOKER, TED CRUZ, PAT LEAHY, RAND PAUL, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, JOHNNY ISAKSON, and CHRIS COONS.

I also wish to thank the lead sponsors of the House version of the Smarter Sentencing Act, Congressmen RAÚL LABRADOR and BOBBY SCOTT.

It is not often that you see a political coalition such as this one on Capitol Hill. It reflects the importance of an issue whose time has come—reforming our Federal sentencing laws. We come to the floor today to explain what the Smarter Sentencing Act does and to address some common misconceptions about our bill that have been expressed on the Senate floor.

I ask my friend and colleague Senator DURBIN: What problems does the Smarter Sentencing Act seek to address?

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Utah not only for his leadership on this issue but for the fact that we have been able to work together on an issue that is not considered to be simple in nature. It is chal-

lenging, complex, and controversial in some respects. As the Senator mentioned at the outset, we have done it on a bipartisan basis. If one looks at the cosponsors of the Smarter Sentencing Act, they span the political spectrum.

I was standing at our press conference—as the Senator from Utah was speaking—next to Senator TED CRUZ. Some said: DURBIN and CRUZ are on the same bill? As the saying goes around here, obviously one of us has not read it. The fact is that we both read it, and we both understand the importance of this undertaking.

Our criminal justice system in America is in crisis. The United States of America holds more prisoners, by far, than any other country in the world. The Federal prison population has grown by 750 percent since 1980 and our Federal prisons are approximately 30 percent over capacity.

Over the past 30 years, spending on Federal incarceration has increased more than 1,100 percent. Our exploding prison population now consumes a quarter of the Justice Department's discretionary budget. These runaway expenditures are undermining other law enforcement efforts. The U.S. attorney's office and the Drug Enforcement Administration have already lost hundreds of positions, and resources for State and local law enforcement have decreased dramatically.

The biggest drivers of growth in the Federal prison population are drug sentences. There are almost 50,000 more drug offenders in Federal prisons now than 20 years ago—50,000. This problem is made even worse by mandatory minimum sentences which have grown by 155 percent over the past 15 years. One-third of all Federal prisoners are now subject to mandatory minimums and 50 percent of those are drug offenders.

These mandatory penalties don't allow our courts to distinguish between the big-time career offenders, who ought to be the focus of our effort, and lower-level offenders. Now, that just is not very smart, and it is not effective when it comes to holding offenders accountable and protecting public safety.

We are expected to be joined at any minute by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. BOOKER, and I thank my friend for joining us in this effort to spotlight this important issue of criminal justice reform.

I will turn the floor over for my colleague and the lead sponsor of this bill, Senator LEE, to respond to the question of the importance of this undertaking.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, we have new research that shows there are two big problems we face as a result of these mandatory minimum sentences within our Federal system. First, they are not needed to ensure public safety in many instances, and second, they are having a very negative impact on certain disadvantaged communities.

Last year, the National Research Council of the National Academies issued a major study of incarceration in the United States. One of their main conclusions is that mandatory sentencing and excessively long sentences generally do not have a significant deterrent effect and are ineffective unless targeted at offenders with a very high rate of recidivism or extremely dangerous offenders.

The National Research Council concluded: “[We] have reviewed the research literature on the deterrent effect of such laws and have concluded that the evidence is insufficient to justify the conclusion that these harsher punishments yield measurable public safety benefits.”

And recent data from the U.S. Sentencing Commission, an independent and bipartisan Federal agency, shows that shorter sentences can accomplish the same goals without compromising public safety.

Our communities have paid a high cost for the stiff sentences that mandatory minimums require. The National Research Council found that high incarceration rates are concentrated in poor, minority neighborhoods, and that the incarceration of significant numbers of residents in these neighborhoods actually compounded existing social and economic problems such as unemployment, poverty, family disruption, poor health, and drug addiction.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, if I could ask the Senator from Utah if he would yield for a moment.

Mr. LEE. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. Senator BOOKER has joined us, and we are happy to have his cosponsorship on this legislation. I hope he might be able to make some of his own observations on the very issue the Senator from Utah has been discussing.

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I wish to pick up where my friend left off. I thank, from the bottom of my heart, the leadership of Senator LEE and Senator DURBIN on what is an extraordinary piece of legislation in terms of its impact.

My colleagues have made it clear time and again—in the last Congress and in this Congress—that the application of mandatory minimum sentences, especially in drug cases, feeds the perception of pervasive unfairness in our criminal justice system just for the points that Senator LEE was making. This perception is based in that reality.

When I was mayor, I used to always say, “In God we trust,” but everyone else, “Bring me data.” The data is clear from the U.S. Sentencing Commission, which shows that mandatory minimums have a disparate impact on minority communities.

Let's be clear. The majority of illegal drug users and dealers in our country are white, but three-quarters of all the

people incarcerated for drug offenses are Black and Latino, and the large majority of individuals subject to Federal mandatory minimum penalties are African American and Hispanic. That perception is fed by this reality: African Americans are granted relief from mandatory minimum penalties as are other citizens under the so-called safety valve, but Blacks get the safety valve far less than other groups.

For example, the data shows that in 2010, 63.7 percent of White offenders received the safety valve relief while only 39.4 percent of Black offenders received that benefit.

In 2012, Blacks were 26.3 percent of all drug offenders, but they were 35.2 percent of the drug offenders who received no safety valves whatsoever—no relief from the mandatory minimum penalties.

I will now yield back for Senator LEE, again, the lead sponsor of this bipartisan legislation, and I ask the Senator: What does this legislation do, specifically, to address mandatory minimums?

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for this question, which really cuts to the heart of many of the most important reasons why we feel this bill needs to become law.

First, the Smarter Sentencing Act would reduce Federal mandatory minimum penalties for drug offenses in a very targeted way. Our bill would allow Federal judges to determine—on a case-by-case basis—when the harshest penalties should apply. We don't repeal any mandatory minimum sentences, and we do not lower any maximum sentences. This approach maintains a floor below which no offenders can be sentenced, but it gives judges the discretion to determine when the very harshest penalties should apply in a particular case.

These changes in mandatory minimum sentences do not apply to violent offenses, and they do not apply to offenders who import drugs into the United States unless, of course, the offender's role is limited solely to transporting or storing drugs or money.

Second, the Smarter Sentencing Act would modestly expand the Federal safety valve, which allows Federal judges to sentence a limited number of nonviolent drug offenders at levels below the mandatory minimum sentence. Our bill would expand the safety valve to nonviolent offenders with only a minor criminal history. Individuals who use weapons or play a leadership role in the offense in question would be ineligible for the safety valve in those circumstances.

I ask the senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, to explain other important provisions of our bill.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Utah.

When I was a Member of the House of Representatives many years ago, we

were told there were some dramatic changes when it came to the use of narcotics in America. In fact, they came to us and said: We are worried. There is a new form of cocaine called crack cocaine. It is dirt cheap. It is \$5 for a hit. It is deadly addictive, and if a woman is addicted to it and happens to be pregnant, it could seriously damage the baby she is carrying.

We did something at the time which seemed like the right thing to do. What we did was to establish a sentencing standard for crack cocaine dramatically larger than powder cocaine—100 times larger. I voted for it, and the belief was that we were sending a clear message to anyone in America: If you get caught with crack cocaine, we are going to throw the book at you. That is what we voted for.

I remember that the rollcall in the House of Representatives was bipartisan. We felt—all across the spectrum: Let's get the message out and get it out now before crack cocaine causes its damage.

Under the law at the time, it took 100 times more powdered cocaine than crack to trigger the same mandatory minimum sentences—100 times. For example, possessing 5 grams of crack carried the same 5-year mandatory minimum sentence as selling 500 grams of powdered cocaine. That was the 100-to-1 crack-powder sentencing disparity. The crack-powder disparity disproportionately affected African Americans, who made up more than 80 percent of those convicted of Federal crack offenses.

At a hearing I held in 2009, former Bush administration DEA head Asa Hutchison, known to many of us as a former colleague in the House, testified: "Under the current disparity, the credibility of our entire drug enforcement system is weakened."

What was happening? African Americans were noting what was going on here. They were being sent, as Senator BOOKER said, over to the prison system and put away for years and years for the use of a tiny amount of crack cocaine because of the sentencing guidelines that we established in the House of Representatives. The Smarter Sentencing Act addresses this issue.

I might add that in 2010, I joined with Senator JEFF SESSIONS, a Republican from Alabama, in sponsoring the Fair Sentencing Act. We decided that we would address this issue of the 100-to-1 disparity and try to make sense out of it. I support 1 to 1. I think that is what the science backs. But we reached a political agreement—that is the nature of the Senate and the House. The bill unanimously passed the Senate and the House and was signed into law by the President. The Fair Sentencing Act reduced the sentencing disparity between crack and powdered cocaine.

The Smarter Sentencing Act—the bill we are considering today—address-

es this again. It would allow some inmates who were sentenced before the Fair Sentencing Act to petition for the sentence reductions that this law put in place in 2010. This provision would not automatically reduce a single sentence of anyone serving under the old 100-to-1 standard, but it would allow Federal judges and prosecutors to conduct a case-by-case, singular, individual review as to whether the individual should have their sentence reduced. Responding to our decreased reliance on prisons, the Smarter Sentencing Act would direct the Justice Department to report to Congress on how the cost savings from our bill would be used to reduce crime and prevent recidivism.

Let's respond to a few misstatements that have been made about the Smarter Sentencing Act. One of our colleagues said: "We are not sending huge numbers of nonviolent drug offenders to Federal prison under lengthy mandatory minimum sentences."

I ask the Senator from New Jersey how he would respond to that comment?

(Mr. GARDNER assumed the Chair.)

Mr. BOOKER. I appreciate that, and I hope we all in the Senate can deal with the same set of facts. We are entitled to different opinions and different conclusions regarding the facts, but we should not be debating facts when we have them here before us.

So let's take a look at those facts. In 2011, the sentencing commission issued a comprehensive study about mandatory minimum sentences. The study found that almost 55,000 people were in Federal prisons serving mandatory minimum sentences for a drug crime. That was more than 50 percent of all Federal drug offenders and more than a quarter—25 percent—of all Federal prisoners, period.

Second, the great majority of Federal drug offenders do not use violence. Let me say that one more time because it is very important. We are talking about in this bill nonviolent offenders, and the great majority do not use violence. The sentencing commission's most recent data shows that less than 1 percent of offenders used or threatened violence in committing their crime, and no weapons—no weapons—were involved in more than 80 percent of drug cases.

Third, many of those serving mandatory minimum drug sentences are low-level offenders. It is true that certain low-level offenders such as the couriers don't often receive mandatory minimums. But other low-level offenders frequently are sentenced to mandatory minimums.

For example, among those who are most likely to receive a mandatory minimum sentence are street-level dealers—those who sell less than 1 ounce of a drug. Almost 45 percent of street-level dealers are serving mandatory minimums in Federal prison.

Finally, these mandatory minimum sentences are lengthy. They are costly. They drain taxpayer resources. A recent sentencing commission study shows that the average sentence for mandatory minimums was 132 months—11 years in Federal prison without parole.

Some claim also that mandatory minimum prison sentences are not a major factor in the massive increase in the Federal prison population and overcrowding in Federal prisons. Remember, in the last 30 years, we have had an explosion in our Federal prison population—800 percent. Some people say that mandatory minimums have had nothing to do with that. I look to my colleague from Utah to respond. Is that true?

Mr. LEE. It is not true. It is simply inaccurate. So those who insist that our exploding Federal prison population somehow has nothing to do with the explosive use of mandatory minimum prison sentences within our Federal system are simply wrong.

In its 2011 report, the U.S. Sentencing Commission concluded that mandatory minimums have had “a significant impact on the Federal prison population.”

From 1995 through 2010, the number of Federal prisoners serving a mandatory minimum sentence grew from 29,603 to 75,579. That is a 155-percent increase. It represents over one-third of all Federal prisoners.

As of December 2014, over 59 percent of the 210,567 Federal inmates—125,000 inmates over all—had been convicted of an offense carrying a mandatory minimum. Of these, 74.3 percent, which represents 91,806 inmates, were required to serve that mandatory minimum sentence or more.

In 2013, 62.1 percent of all drug offenders were convicted of an offense carrying a mandatory minimum. Over 60 percent of them received no safety valve relief and 70 percent of them did not receive relief for cooperating with authorities.

Some have argued that those serving sentences for nonviolent drug offenses have long and violent criminal histories, but sentencing commission data shows this is inaccurate. In 2013, 49.6 percent of drug offenders had little or no criminal history, and only 7 percent of drug offenders were sentenced under the “career offender” sentencing guideline, which requires two prior convictions for a drug offense or a crime of violence.

But here is the important point: The Smarter Sentencing Act reduces certain mandatory minimum sentences for nonviolent drug offenses, but we do not lower the maximum sentence. That means a judge can sentence offenders all the way up to the statutory maximum if she determines it is appropriate under the circumstances.

Some have raised concerns about how reducing mandatory minimum sen-

tences might impact serious problems such as the heroin epidemic or narcoterrorism. Can the Senator from Illinois address that?

Mr. DURBIN. I want to address that because it is a problem in my State and across the United States. We are finding that high school students are turning to heroin. It is affordable, sadly. It is affordable, and they are using it as an alternative to other drugs. We certainly know the peril and dangers from narcoterrorism. The Smarter Sentencing Act which we are cosponsoring only reduces mandatory minimum sentences for nonviolent drug offenses. There is a separate mandatory minimum of 20 years that applies when the drugs have resulted in death or serious bodily injury. Any dealer who sells drugs that killed or hurt someone, such as an accidental overdose, will still be subject to the same mandatory minimum of 20 years. Our bill does not touch that provision of the law.

As for narcoterrorism, a special Federal sentencing guideline applies. The truth is charges under that statute are very rare. Between 2008 and 2012, only three cases—three—out of almost 200,000 were sentenced under that guideline. But the Smarter Sentencing Act does not change the sentencing guideline enhancement for narcoterrorism or any of the enhancements for terrorism. We don't cut corners when it comes to that serious crime.

In fact, our bill directs the sentencing commission to ensure that severe sentences for “violent, repeat, and serious drug traffickers who present public safety risks remain in place.” Also, there will continue to be dozens of statutory penalties and sentencing enhancements in the sentencing guidelines allowing judges to impose heightened sentences for violent and repeat offenders.

The Smarter Sentencing Act which we are describing doesn't automatically reduce a single sentence and it doesn't eliminate any mandatory minimum or reduce any maximum sentence at all. Our bill simply restores the traditional authority of a Federal judge to impose a sentence that fits the crime and the criminal, based on the circumstances of the case, while maintaining a floor below which no one person can be sentenced.

Can the Senator from New Jersey discuss the impact the Smarter Sentencing Act will have on communities that have been most negatively impacted by the crisis in our Federal justice system?

Mr. BOOKER. I appreciate that question. This is one of the reasons I am so passionate about the legislation originally introduced by Senator LEE and the Senator from Illinois, because the mandatory minimums are patently unfair to people all across America. Whether one is White or Black, to have a disproportionate sentence unneces-

sary to punish a person and prevent a person from doing a future nonviolent crime is bad enough, but when we are talking about, as the Senator from Illinois was before, so negatively concentrated in certain urban areas, it creates an invasive belief that begins to undermine faith in our criminal justice system alone. As we said earlier, the overwhelming majority of drug users and sellers are White, but the overwhelming number of people incarcerated and arrested for it are Black, as well as those receiving mandatory minimums.

But what people have to understand is that this has a punishing effect on us all. No. 1, it is hurting families. A friend of mine brought to my attention a “Sesame Street” clip where even the educators in public broadcasting are seeing that certain communities have so many of their men—nonviolent offenders—being sucked into the prison system for these long sentences that we have created a generation of children growing up without their parents. That has a difficult impact when it comes to the poverty of that family, when it comes to the challenges of having a provider pull away. So the Smarter Sentencing Act is a tool to help to relieve that problem, as well as the costs to us all.

What is wonderful—at a time when we have debt, when we need to invest in infrastructure and many other needs, the current system is costing us hundreds of billions of dollars annually. This legislation I have signed on to as a cosponsor offers a savings that can be redirected to community efforts that prevent crime in the first place—evidence-based programs that undermine crimes in the first place—as well as to helping people coming out of prison stay out of prison. We can save money and still protect public safety with lower rates of incarceration and a greater reliance on community revision and treatment.

The wonderful thing about this is that what I am saying is not speculation. It is the facts we are experiencing in States that have already embraced reducing mandatory minimums. In fact, many of these States—and it is wonderful that this is bipartisan legislation—many States are red States. We are seeing this path of reducing crime, reducing prison populations, creating savings, being shown to us in State after State model that the Federal Government should follow—models seen in Texas and in Georgia.

Senator FLAKE encouraged us to pay attention to overcriminalization in the Federal system. He too is a champion of reforming the system and making it better. I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona: How does the Smarter Sentencing Act address the problem of overcriminalization?

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Senator from New Jersey, and I thank Senator

DURBIN and Senator LEE. It is great to be a part of this bipartisan effort, the Smarter Sentencing Act.

This is important because this section requires the Attorney General and the heads of certain Federal agencies to each submit a public report that identifies all criminal offenses that are established by statute or regulation that each agency enforces. These reports must provide information on the elements of each offense, the potential penalty and the required intent for each offense, and the number of prosecutions for each offense for the last 15 years. This is valuable information.

This section also requires the Attorney General and the relevant agencies to establish a publicly accessible index for these offenses. This information is an important step toward understanding the scope of the overcriminalization problem. When we have this information, we will have a better idea of why these sentences are being imposed and we can make better recommendations moving ahead.

There are some who argue that long mandatory prison sentences encourage defendants to plead guilty and to cooperate with prosecutors. They claim that by reducing mandatory minimum sentences, our bill will reduce the incentive for defendants to plead guilty and thus cooperate.

How would the Senator from Utah respond to that complaint?

Mr. LEE. Those who make that argument—those who suggest that by passing this bill we would reduce the bargaining power of prosecutors—are mistaken.

The sentencing commission data on this point shows that the longer a mandatory minimum sentence is, the more likely a defendant is not to plead guilty and to cooperate and instead to insist on going to trial.

Sentencing commission data also showed that rates of cooperation for crimes that have no mandatory minimum sentence are the same and even higher for drugs that do have rigid mandatory minimum sentences.

The reality is that defendants are most likely to cooperate when they have information to give. That is why high-level drug offenders receive relief of mandatory minimum sentences at much higher rates than lower offenders. Defendants who organize or manage a drug trafficking enterprise have the most information with which to bargain as they enter into discussions with prosecutors. Low-level offenders who have less responsibility and less knowledge often don't have much information to offer, no matter how long a mandatory minimum sentence they might face in a particular case.

Judge William Wilkins, who was appointed to the bench by President Reagan and served as the first chair of the U.S. Sentencing Commission, said the following:

There are few Federal judges engaged in criminal sentencing who have not had the disheartening experience of seeing major players in crimes before them immunize themselves from the mandatory minimum sentences by blowing the whistle on their minions, while the low-level offenders find themselves sentenced to the mandatory minimum prison term so skillfully avoided by the kingpins.

Some of them claim the Smarter Sentencing Act will add up to \$1 billion in Federal spending.

Senator FLAKE, is that true?

Mr. FLAKE. That is creative accounting, to put it mildly. Here is the reality. The Congressional Budget Office has taken a look at this and has analyzed the impact of passing the Smarter Sentencing Act. It is true there will be costs incurred mainly because of benefits that are paid to people who are not in prison for so long, but the CBO estimated that in the first 10 years alone, our bill would save approximately \$4 billion, for a net savings of about \$3 billion. Those savings can be redirected to efforts to reduce and prevent crime in the first place.

Senator BOOKER, I think it is partly because of this reason, the cost savings, that we have such broad support of the bill. Would the Senator discuss some of the groups that are supporting this legislation?

Mr. BOOKER. This incredible convergence of people from all different stripes in our country, all different backgrounds, races, religions, and political philosophy—let's just start with the bipartisan U.S. Sentencing Commission and the Judicial Conference have both urged Congress to reduce mandatory minimum penalties and both have stated their support for this legislation, the Smarter Sentencing Act.

It is supported by faith leaders such as the Justice Fellowship and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. It is supported by advocacy groups across the political spectrum and has been endorsed by conservative leaders such as Grover Norquist and Americans for Tax Reform, Eli Lehrer and the R Street Institute, Pat Nolan, former president of the Justice Fellowship, Marc Levin of the Texas Public Policy Institute, and Freedom Works.

It is supported by law enforcement leaders, including the Major Cities Chiefs Association and the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, which represents many of the largest district attorney's offices in the country—big cities. They represent county, Federal, State, and local prosecutors—prosecutors at every level.

The bill is supported by the Council of Prison Locals, which represents more than 28,000 correctional workers in the Federal Bureau of Prisons. The bill is also supported by crime victims themselves, including the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence, a coalition of more than

1,000 different organizations that advocate on behalf of victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. As they explain, mandatory minimum drug sentences are draining the resources needed for victims. Women who are victims of domestic violence sometimes end up serving long sentences that the Congress intended for kingpins and other drug organization leaders. All of that unity in this country supports this act.

I wonder, is there anything else Senator LEE would like to say about this bipartisan, widely supported by both the data and the advocates across the quantum spectrum—is there anything else the Senator would like to add?

Mr. LEE. Yes, and I would like to conclude my remarks in a moment by wrapping up. Before I do that, though, I notice on the floor with us is my friend Senator WHITEHOUSE, who happens to be another supporter and cosponsor of this bill and who is also the ranking member on the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I would ask Senator WHITEHOUSE to say a few words about this bill.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you, Senator LEE. I am glad to be a part of this conversation. I share the concern that we all have for a Federal prison system that is 30 percent over capacity and costs \$6 billion a year already. We have to add, if we are going to take care of the 30 percent over capacity—that is \$6 billion under the present circumstances, and that \$6 billion comes out of law enforcement budgets and community support budgets that could be making our streets safer.

At the beginning of every sentence, a judge imposes the duration of the sentence, and at the end of every sentence, a prisoner makes a decision about how he or she is going to engage with the public upon their release. There is a bill that deals with the latter part, helping prisoners make better decisions and be better prepared to re-engage with the public once they are released. I hope very much the bill Senator CORNYN and I are leading in the Senate Judiciary Committee can, as this moves forward, be connected because the two are linked thematically, and it makes a big difference.

The reason we care about how people at the end get back into regular society is because if they reoffend they go back to prison again and add to the prison population and add to the costs. If they are in longer than they should be, then we are not getting any public safety benefit out of all of this.

So I look very forward to working with all my colleagues to try to see if we can get together in the Senate a comprehensive piece of sentencing reform legislation. Having been a prosecutor myself, having used mandatory minimums, I appreciate that they can, in certain circumstances, have value, but I think if one looks at the big picture, this sentencing reform legislation



is important and will serve the public interest in a great variety of respects, including safer communities. So that is why I am cosponsoring it and that is why I am an ardent supporter of it.

In closing, let me thank Senator DURBIN and Senator LEE for their leadership as the lead coauthors of this legislation and Senator FLAKE and Senator BOOKER for their efforts on behalf of this as fellow cosponsors.

Mr. LEE. I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE.

Mr. President, I would like to conclude by thanking my colleagues for their help. First of all, thanks to Senator DURBIN for working with this Senator over the last couple of years in developing this legislation. I thank my other cosponsors as well. I thank Senator BOOKER, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator FLAKE, who have joined us today.

This is truly a bipartisan, bicameral effort that brings support from across the political spectrum. Excessive mandatory minimums do not make us safer. The last 30 years have shown us that they are applied unevenly and they leave a gaping hole in the communities they impact most heavily. Now we as a society have to pick up the tab. We must decide if we will continue to pay the high fiscal and social costs that mandatory minimums impose. It is important for us to remember these costs do have many manifestations.

Sometimes in this body we focus only on the fiscal pricetag that can be expressed in raw numbers, but doing that allows us to ignore too often the high human costs—the families and the communities that have lost brothers, sons, fathers, uncles, and nephews, people who could be back in their communities contributing meaningfully to their success, who are instead sent away for sometimes far too long of a prison sentence. We can continue down this current path or if we could try something smarter, that perhaps would be better.

The Smarter Sentencing Act gives us an opportunity to do precisely that—to do something smarter, to rely less on prison, and to do more with scarce resources. Instead of just paying for prisons, it would allow us to work smarter in pursuit of justice.

I hope all my colleagues will join us in supporting the Smarter Sentencing Act.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, to change the subject from sentencing reform to climate change, I come to the floor today for the 93rd consecutive week that the Senate has been in session to urge that my colleagues wake up to the urgent threat of what results

from our levels of carbon pollution. It is an opportune time now to consider a step-up in American corporate responsibility on climate change. Call it corporate climate responsibility 2.0.

Americans can celebrate and applaud the fact that America's corporate leaders have taken so many important steps on climate change. Companies such as Walmart and Coca-Cola, to pick just two, see the problem clearly and have done great things. Walmart, for instance, has taken exemplary responsibility for its carbon footprint not only within its facilities but out beyond its corporate walls into its international supply chain. Walmart has led the move for consumers away from incandescent bulbs and into high-efficiency lighting. If you have ever used that machine where you have to crank electricity in order to light up an incandescent bulb and then do the same thing for a high efficiency bulb, you have an unforgettable experience of how much more efficient those modern bulbs are. Walmart has strong and responsible carbon policies and Walmart has made a successful business model of saving money by reducing carbon emissions. Walmart even has an internal price on carbon so it can properly evaluate its internal processes in its own facilities against its climate standards.

This is not new for Walmart. A decade ago, Walmart's then-CEO Lee Scott said:

The science is in, and it is overwhelming. We believe every company has a responsibility to reduce greenhouse gases as quickly as it can.

Coca-Cola, the other company I mentioned, has exemplary carbon policies too. Coca-Cola knows how disruptive climate change can be on the water supply that is Coca-Cola's most basic need in its bottling facilities. They, too, have found the sweet spot of saving money by reducing their carbon output.

As the Arctic melts, Coca-Cola even put a polar bear on its iconic Coke can. Muhtar Kent, Coca-Cola's CEO, has said:

It is absolutely imperative that our commitment to a low-carbon future be fully understood. We're here to lend a Coca-Cola voice to the public and political debate on getting to a fair framework, an inclusive framework, and an effective framework so that we can achieve climate protection.

Many other major corporations have too. There is Google and Apple, apparel giant VF Corporation and Nike, Mars, Nestle, and Cargill, General Motors and the Ford Motor Company, UPS and Federal Express, Unilever and Starbucks. All are in different ways clear-eyed and responsible climate champions.

So there is a lot to celebrate from America's corporate leaders, but there is also more to be done. We are right now at a societal and political tipping

point on climate change, where corporations that are already good on climate change—corporations that are sensible and responsible on climate change—can make a big difference by taking it up one more step and putting their politics where their policies already are.

So what is putting your politics where your policies are? First, it is making climate change an issue, something we talk about when we come to Congress. I don't know whether Walmart has ever spoken to Senator BOOZMAN or Senator COTTON, from their home State of Arkansas, about climate change. I know they never spoke to Senator Pryor when he was in the Senate because he told me so. I don't know whether Coca-Cola has ever spoken about climate change to Senators ISAKSON or PERDUE from Coca-Cola's home State of Georgia.

It is not just them. I pick out Walmart and Coca-Cola because they are two of the best companies on carbon reduction. I actually don't know of one major American corporation that makes climate change a priority when it comes here to Washington and lobbies Congress, not one.

America's corporate leaders have great carbon reduction policies, but when they come to Congress, that is not on the agenda of their politics. If it were, it would make a difference. I know it is not easy. Senior corporate leaders in major American companies have told me and others that they fear retribution if they lobby Congress on climate change; that they will be punished on tax or trade or liability or regulatory or other issues they have in Congress.

That is how ugly and rough the fossil fuel lobby plays around here. But there is an answer: group up. The fossil fuel industry and its allies in Congress cannot punish everyone. They cannot punish Coke and Pepsi and Walmart and Target and VF Corporation and Nike and Apple and Google and Ford and GM and Mars and Nestle and Unilever. They cannot punish them all.

So, please, I ask our corporate leaders: Make an agreement with one another that you will not abandon your climate principles when you come to Congress. If good corporations will not speak up, the only corporate force lobbying and politicking Congress on climate change is the fossil fuel industry. You will get exactly what you have now: a Congress in which Members fear to take action on climate because they know one side, the fossil fuel boys, will punish them. They do not know any other side that will help them.

So the first part of corporate climate responsibility 2.0 is: Do not abandon hope all ye who enter here. Do not check your principles at the door. A second part of corporate climate responsibility 2.0 would be to stand by

your principles with those who advocate for you. The best corporate citizens push their good climate policies out beyond their corporate walls into their supply chains. They insist that their suppliers comply with those climate principles. They will not do business with suppliers that do not abide by their climate principles.

So it would be consistent to push their good climate policies out into their advocacy organizations, too, and insist that their advocates comply with those same climate principles, just like their suppliers must.

They ought not to do business with advocacy groups that will not abide by their climate principles. What am I talking about? I have described how good Coca-Cola has been on climate issues. It is terrific on climate issues. Coca-Cola and its bottlers are also important vital members of the American Beverage Association, which sits on the board of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is one of the worst climate denial organizations and which is a persistent obstacle to any responsible action on carbon emissions.

Similarly, Verizon, 3M, and Ford, all with good climate policies, all sit on the board of this organization with opposite policies. If they would not put up with it from their suppliers, if their suppliers flouted their principles, why put up with it from a corporate mouthpiece they support but that flouts their principles?

If corporate climate change policies are important enough to push beyond the corporate walls and into the supply chain, they should be important enough to push beyond the corporate walls and into the corporation's advocacy organizations. It does not make sense for corporations to speak out of one side of their mouths on climate change and then contradict themselves, through their corporate mouthpieces, their advocacy organizations.

Some do not. Nike resigned from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce board of directors over the chamber's horrible climate policies. Apple left the chamber altogether. So have big electric utilities such as Exelon and PG&E and so have many local chambers of commerce. Google left the American Legislative Exchange Council, known as ALEC. When Google left ALEC last year because of that group's bad climate position, Google CEO Eric Schmidt said of the group: "They are literally lying" about climate change. You do not need to support an organization that is "literally lying" about climate change—not under corporate climate responsibility 2.0. It is not necessary to have your own trade association or legislative organization arguing against you.

The same should be true of opinion outlets. For decades, the Wall Street Journal editorial page has been an important and respected voice of the busi-

ness community. But now on climate change, the Wall Street Journal editorial page never reflects the views on climate change of most of America's corporate leaders, only its fossil fuel corporate leaders.

That page has become exclusively the voice of the fossil fuel industry, and of their climate denial front organizations. In fact, in some ways we could say the Wall Street Journal editorial page has actually become a climate denial front organization. The fossil fuel companies have co-opted the Wall Street Journal editorial page. Where is the objection from American corporations, big well-known American corporations that have spent millions and millions of dollars addressing their carbon emissions, that have spent enormous corporate effort, all the way up to the CEO level, dedicated to a carbon solution and that have developed great policies on climate change? Why be silent when the voice of the business community is saying the exact opposite of what you have worked so hard for and care so much about?

Under corporate climate responsibility 2.0, companies such as that could stand up for their own well-established climate principles and against the opposition to their own corporate principles from the Wall Street Journal editorial page. I feel we are so close to getting something done, something big done on climate change. Our corporate sector has shown so much leadership. The great American corporate leadership on climate change aligns exactly with what America's science leadership is also saying.

The great American corporate leadership on climate change aligns exactly with what America's military and national security leaders are also saying. The great American corporate leadership on climate change aligns exactly with what so many of our religious leaders are saying all the way up to Pope Francis. Of course, American corporate leadership on climate change aligns with what Americans, the customers of these corporations, want and expect.

So let's take it up a step. Let's ask our corporate leaders to step it up to corporate climate responsibility 2.0 and take their existing good policies and line them up with their politics, take what they demand of their suppliers and demand the same of their advocates. That would be a big way for America's corporate leaders to help this body wake up.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REMEMBERING SAM SMITH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the life of Sam Smith from Las Vegas, NV. Mr. Smith passed away last month.

Mr. Smith was a retired firefighter and the founder of the bookstore and treasured community establishment, Native Son. Native Son operated in West Las Vegas for 17 years, and throughout that time Mr. Smith was its heart and soul. Mr. Smith offered free math and reading classes and helped many students prepare for fire department entrance exams. He had a saying, "People who study calculus don't go to jail." Mr. Smith cared about the people in his community, and he worked to improve their lives.

Mr. Smith helped people like Trina Jiles become the first Black woman in the Clark County Fire Department. When she came into Native Son in 1995 he told her there were no Black women firefighters and asked how many push-ups she could do. When she did 20, he told her she would be all right and began teaching her in his free math and reading classes. Soon after, she passed all of her tests and became Clark County's first Black female firefighter. She went on to work her way up the department to become an arson investigator.

Through his years of service, Sam Smith was a fixture in the West Las Vegas community. I appreciate all he has done, and I celebrate his life.

#### CONSERVING LA MOSQUITIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to briefly draw the Senate's attention to a recent announcement made by Honduran President Juan Orlando Hernández concerning his government's efforts to secure and preserve a newly discovered archaeological site in the eastern part of his country. The area is part of La Mosquitia, a large swath of tropical rain forest along the Mosquito Coast in eastern Honduras, which also extends into northeastern Nicaragua.

Reaching the remote forest is accomplished primarily by air or water, and it was airborne sensing technology in 2012 that first uncovered the ancient site, now revealed to be as much as 1,000 years old. The site is believed by some to be the location of the mythic White City, a safe haven where indigenous populations took refuge from Spanish conquistadores. However, archaeologists Christopher Fisher of Colorado State University and Oscar Neil Cruz of the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History and ethno-botanist Mark Plotkin of the Amazon Conservation Team who reached the site earlier this month believe the discovery could be even more significant as just one of many sites that may reveal an entire lost civilization.

La Mosquitia is also the home of the Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve, a

World Heritage Site that has twice been placed on UNESCO's world heritage in danger list, most recently in 2011. The designation was the result of an investigation that revealed rampant deforestation, primarily by cattle herders seeking to meet the demand for beef in the United States, in addition to illegal hunting and fishing. Perhaps one of the most significant aspects of the Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve's designation is that it is representative of the threats to all of La Mosquitia.

That is why President Hernández's announcement is so important. La Mosquitia is not just a treasure of the Honduran people; it has preserved centuries of cultural artifacts and is now home to a multitude of plant and animal life that has remained largely undisturbed by the outside world.

President Hernández's commitment to preserve these archeological sites from looters and other criminal activity and to protect the broader forest area by replanting the jungle and countering deforestation deserves our support. I look forward to working with the Government of Honduras on how the United States may be able to assist its conservation efforts.

#### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks at the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

We're here today to review the president's fiscal year 2016 budget request for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the independent federal agency responsible for regulating the safety of our nation's commercial nuclear power plants and other nuclear materials.

This is the first time in many years that the subcommittee has held a hearing to examine the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's budget.

It is also the first of several hearings that the subcommittee will hold this year on nuclear power. These hearings are important because nuclear power provides about 20 percent of our nation's electricity and more than 60 percent of our carbon-free electricity.

I plan to focus my questions today on four main areas:

1. Licensing nuclear waste repositories;
2. Avoiding excessive regulations;
3. Licensing for new and existing reactors; and
4. Making sure the agency is running effectively

First, we must solve the 25-year-old stalemate about what to do with used fuel from our nuclear reactors to ensure that nuclear power has a strong future in this country.

Later this year, I will reintroduce bipartisan legislation with Senators Feinstein, Murkowski and perhaps others, to create

both temporary and permanent storage sites for nuclear waste. Also, Senator Feinstein and I plan to include a pilot program for nuclear waste storage in the Energy and Water appropriations bill, as we have for the past three years.

The new sites we'd seek to establish through the legislation Senator Feinstein and I are reintroducing this year would not take the place of Yucca Mountain—we have more than enough waste to fill Yucca Mountain to its legal capacity—but rather would complement it.

This legislation is consistent with the president's Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.

But let me be clear: Yucca Mountain can and should be part of the solution. Federal law designates Yucca Mountain as the nation's repository for used nuclear fuel.

The Nuclear Waste Fund, which is money that utilities have paid the government to dispose of their used nuclear fuel, has a balance of about \$36 billion and there are still several steps to go in the licensing process for Yucca Mountain.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has a balance of unspent funding that you are supposed to use to continue the licensing process. But more resources will be required, so I think it's fair to ask the question:

Knowing that there are additional steps and they will cost money, why would you not request additional funds in your budget?

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission recently completed the Safety Evaluation Report that said Yucca Mountain met all of the safety requirements through "the period of geologic stability."

The commission and the Environmental Protection Agency define the "period of geologic stability" as one million years. To continue to oppose Yucca Mountain because of radiation concerns is to ignore science—as well as the law.

The next steps on Yucca Mountain include completing a supplemental environmental impact statement and restarting the hearings before the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, which were suspended in September 2011.

Money is available for these activities, and I want to hear why there is no request to use it.

Federal law requires that nuclear power plants be built safely, but the law doesn't say it should be so hard and expensive to build and operate reactors that you can't do it.

A 2013 report by the Center for Strategic and International Studies found that up to 25 of our 99 nuclear reactors could close by 2020.

The decision to close a reactor could be due to a number of factors, including the low price of natural gas, and the wasteful wind production tax credit, which is so generous that in some markets wind producers can literally give their electricity away and still make a profit.

But the decision to close a reactor can also have to do with excessive and unnecessary regulations. I want to work with the commission to address this.

Over the next several decades, most of our 99 nuclear reactors will go through the commission's license renewal process to extend their licenses, which is critical to the future of nuclear power. I want to make sure that the commission is prepared for this additional work.

I also want to make sure the commission has devoted the appropriate resources to the licensing process to keep new reactors—like Watts Bar 2 in Tennessee—on time and on budget.

I have proposed that we build 100 new reactors, which may seem excessive, but not if about 20 percent of our current capacity from coal goes offline by 2020 as projected by the Energy Information Administration. If this capacity were replaced entirely by nuclear power it would require building another 48 new, 1,250-megawatt reactors—which, by the way, would reduce our carbon emissions from electricity by another 14 percent. Add the reactors we may need to replace in the coming decades due to aging and other factors, and my proposal for 100 may not seem so high.

Additionally, the commission needs to move forward with new small modular reactors.

This subcommittee has provided funding to help small modular reactors get through the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's licensing process. I'd like to get your views on what you need to continue your efforts.

One of the challenges for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is to ensure that the agency is running effectively and focusing staff on the right goals.

In fiscal year 2000, Congress appropriated about \$470 million for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The budget request this year is more than \$1 billion.

Much of the increase was due to the significant number of new reactor licenses that were anticipated—however most were never actually submitted. So, it is fair to ask whether this additional funding is being used for unnecessary regulation.

The best way to understand the importance of nuclear power is to look at the stories of three countries: Japan, Germany and the United Arab Emirates.

Japan and Germany have recently experienced what happens when a major manufacturing country loses its nuclear capacity. In Japan, the cost of generating electricity has increased 56 percent and Germany has among the highest household electricity rates in the European Union—both because they moved away from nuclear power.

The United Arab Emirates has shown what a country can do when a country decides to take advantage of nuclear power. By 2020, the Emirates will have completed four reactors that will provide nearly 25 percent of its annual electricity.

It will take building more nuclear reactors to avoid the path of Japan and Germany, and today's hearing is an important step to making sure the United States does what it must to unleash nuclear power.

I look forward to working with the commission and our Ranking Member, Senator Feinstein, who I will now recognize for an opening statement.

#### CUBA'S CULTURE OF POVERTY CONUNDRUM

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article regarding the early years of the Castro regime, the policies of which created a culture of poverty in Cuba, and converted a previously developing country into an underdeveloped, closed society.

The author, Professor Roland Alum, is a Garden State constituent, a longtime participant in civic activities, and has been a personal friend for three decades. He is a respected anthropologist and author whose writings have appeared in both major newspapers and academic journals.

This article, which appeared in *Panoramas*, an electronic journal at the University of Pittsburgh, touches upon sensitive topics apropos to the current U.S.-Cuba relationship.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *Panoramas*, Feb. 14, 2015]

THE CUBAN CULTURE OF POVERTY CONUNDRUM  
(By Roland Armando Alum)

INTRODUCTION

I propose here to re-examine certain aspects of life in "Socialist Cuba," principally the so-called culture of poverty, as gauged relatively early in the Castro brothers regime by two U.S. socio-cultural anthropologists, the legendary Oscar Lewis and his protégée/associate Douglas Butterworth, whose research project 4.5 decades ago was surrounded by controversy and enigmas.

Unquestionably, the Fidel and Raúl Castro "Revolutionary Government" enjoyed an extraordinary initial popularity in 1959. Yet, the enthusiasm vanished as the duo hijacked the liberal-inspired anti-Batista rebellion that had been largely advanced by the then expanding middle-classes. Instead of delivering the promised "pan con libertad" (bread with liberty), the Castro siblings converted Cuba into a socio-spiritually and fiscally bankrupt, Marxist-Stalinist dystopia in which both, bread and liberty are scarce (Botín, 2010; Horowitz, 2008; Moore, 2008).

Cuba was the last Ibero-American colony to attain independence (1902); yet, by the 1950s, the island-nation was a leader in the Americas in numerous quality-of-life indicators. This record was reached notwithstanding instability and governmental corruption during the republican era (1902-58), including the 1952-58 bloody authoritarian dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista. However, under the (now anachronistic octogenarian) Castros, Cuba became an impoverished, Orwellian closed society beleaguered by unproductivity, rampant corruption, humiliating rationing, human rights abuses, and—understandably—unprecedented mass emigration (Díaz-Briquets & Pérez-López, 2006; Horowitz, 2008).

CUBA'S CULTURE OF POVERTY CONUNDRUM

The Lewis and Butterworth project in 1969-70 is still, oddly, among the little known accounts of the early effects of the Castro family's regimentation. Supported by a Ford Foundation's nearly \$300,000 grant, the professors intended to test Lewis's theory of the "culture of poverty" (or rather, sub-culture of poverty). They had innocently hypothesized that a culture of poverty (hereafter CoP) would not exist in a Marxist-oriented society, as they presupposed that the socially alienating conditions that engender it could develop among the poor solely in capitalist economies. Influenced by Marxism, Lewis in particular had cleverly problematized the commonalities of the poor's elusive quandary in well-known prior studies across different societies, notably among Mexicans and Puerto Ricans.

While poverty is defined in relative terms, the CoP was conceptualized as an amorphous corpus of socially transmitted self-defeating beliefs and interrelated values, such as: abandonment, alcoholism, authoritarianism, deficient work ethic, domestic abuse, fatalism, homophobia/machismo, hopelessness, illegitimacy, instant, gratification/present-

time orientation, low social-civic consciousness, mother-centered families, sexism/misogyny, suspicion of authorities while holding expectations on government dependency, and so forth.

This "psychology of the . . . oppressed . . . poor" is considered a key obstacle to achieving vertical socio-economic mobility even in fluid social-class, more open societies, such as the U.S. Not all poor individuals develop a CoP, but being poor is a *sine qua non* condition.

Ever since its early stages as a separate discipline in the mid-1800s, anthropology's cornerstone has been the concept of "culture." A century later, the notion drifted to everyday language; to wit, statements such as "a culture of corruption" became common in the media in reference to mindsets in government and corporations. I prefer the interpretation of culture by my own Pitt co-mentor, "Jack" Roberts (1964): "a system for storing and retrieving information," which fits with the Lewis-Butterworth approach.

With initial high-level governmental welcome, one of the Lewis-Butterworth investigations entailed comprehensive interviews of former Havana slum-dwellers resettled in new buildings. In the research project's fourth book, *The People of Buena Ventura*, Butterworth (1980) admitted with disenchantment that his research project found sufficient social symptoms that met the CoP criteria, thus disproving the initial hypothesis expecting an absence of the CoP under socialism.

THE PROJECT'S SIGNIFICANCE

The Lewis-Butterworth ethnographic (descriptive, qualitative) work has various additional implications. It shed light for an evaluation of the Guevarist "New Socialist Man" archetype. Similarly, it informed an understanding of the dynamics that led to the spectacular 1980 Mariel boat exodus, when over 120,000 Cubans (some 1.2% of Cuba's population) "voted with their feet." Ironically, the regime and its insensitive fans abroad still refer to the raggedy refugees with disdainful discourse as "escoria" (scum) and with the Marxist slur "lumpen proletariat." Significantly, most Marielistas were born and/or enculturated under socialism, i.e., they personified the presumed "New Man." Many of them, moreover, had been military conscripts, and/or had served time in the infamous gulag-type "U.M.A.P." forced-labor camps created for political dissidents (particularly intellectuals and artists), Beatles' fans, gays, the unemployed, long-haired bohemians/hippies, Trotskyites, would-be emigrants (considered "traitors"), and religious people (including Jehovah's Witnesses and Afro-Cuban folk-cults' practitioners), etc. (Núñez-Cedeño, et al., 1985). In fact, the Marielistas encompassed also an over-representation of Afro-Cubans, the demographic sector traditionally viewed as most vulnerable, and thus, among the expected prime beneficiaries of socialist redistribution.

Certainly, there were always poor Cubans—of all phenotypes—and conceivably, some version of the CoP existed pre-1959; but in my exchanges with Butterworth, he reconfirmed another remarkable finding. While acknowledging the social shortcomings of pre-revolutionary times, he could not document (for ex., through the collection of oral life-histories), a case for a pervasive, pre-revolutionary Lewisian CoP.

This in situ scrutiny of daily life fairly early in the Castros era corroborates previous and subsequent accounts by many Cubanologists and the much vilified and ever-expanding exile community. There ex-

ists a widespread CoP in Socialist Cuba, though not necessarily as a survivor of the ancien régime, but—as Butterworth deduced—a consequence of the nouveau régime. The authorities must have suspected, or ascertained through surveillance, about the prospective conclusions, given that the anthropologists were suddenly expelled from the country. They were accused of being U.S. spies, most of their research material was confiscated, and some "informants" (interviewees) were arrested and/or harassed. Additionally, their Cuban statistician, Alvaro Insua, was imprisoned.

Comfortably from abroad, academic and media enthusiasts of the Castros' "dynasty" customarily replicate party-line clichés in their penchant to "launder" the dictatorship's excesses and the centralized economy's dysfunctions by blaming external factors. Topping the excuses is the ending of the defunct COMECON's subsidies circa 1990. Some apologists—notably a few anthropology colleagues—even absurdly refer to the 1959-90 epoch as a "utopia," while the government labeled the current calamitous post-1990 years the "Special Period."

Yet, the undertaking by Lewis & Butterworth, who were initially eagerly sympathetic to the Castros, provided remarkable revelations that regime's defenders conveniently still continue to overlook. It showed that life for average Cubans toward the end of the regime's first decade—long before the Special Period—was already beset with corruption, consumer scarcities, and time-wasting food-lines. All this is characteristic of what is branded "economies of shortage," standard for Soviet-modeled societies (Eberstadt, 1988; Ghodsee, 2011; Halperin, 1981; Verdery 1996).

Likewise, Butterworth portrayed how ordinary Cubans—"los de a pie" (those on foot)—were by then engaging in what nowadays we call "everyday forms of resistance," a social weapon of subjugated people anywhere. As also depicted by other observers and Cuban former participant-resisters (now exiled, my own informants or "cultural consultants"), Butterworth reported how Cubans were already undermining the hegemonic police-state through taboo actions, such as absenteeism, black-marketeering, bribes, pilfering, and even vandalism. Apparently, this project remains the only conventional testing of the CoP in a totalitarian socialist country, although numerous researchers have chronicled the pitiable quality of life under such socio-political systems (Eberstadt, 1988; Halperin, 1981).

Indeed, the Cuban reality of widespread misery—except for the privileged top one-percent (now an elitist gerontocracy)—as well as of indignities and hushed quotidian defiance, evokes narratives about similar, though faraway communist "experiments" that collapsed a quarter-century ago. Among these comparable accounts are ethnologist Verdery's (1996) descriptions of despot Ceausescu's Romania and Ghodsee's (2011) Bulgarian ethnographic vignettes.

EPILOGUE

A number of experts have been reporting about certain kinds of behavioral traits among Cubans, both islanders and recent émigrés, which may reflect CoP patterns (Botín, 2010; Horowitz, 2008). This is not surprising, as the CoP worsened with time as impoverishment augmented (Hirschfeld, 2008).

One can surmise that, despite its human and material toll, the Castros regime not only failed to solve traditional social problems, but exacerbated at least some of them,

and moreover created new ones (Díaz-Briquets & Pérez-López, 2006; Eberstadt, 1988). Much of this was already manifested in the 1960s (Edwards, 1973; Halperin, 1981), as reflected in the Lewis-Butterworth venture.

Lewis died, heart-broken, at age 56 in December 1970 upon his repatriation. Butterworth also took ill—especially emotionally—dying in 1986 (at 56 too). The Insuas were abandoned in Cuba to their own lot. Alvaro languished in jail for six years; in 1980 he was “allowed” to leave for Costa Rica with wife Greta (who had also worked for the project), and son Manolo. They reached the U.S. soon thereafter, coinciding with the arrival of the Mariel expatriates and Butterworth’s book publication. After a brief staying in northern New Jersey, where I assisted them, they settled in Miami.

In assessing the legacy of the Lewis-Butterworth project on Cuba’s culture of poverty, there remain several intriguing puzzles pending exploration. Hopefully, someday Alvaro and Greta will write their own elucidating memoirs.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO BILL BREWER

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Bill Brewer on his retirement after serving the great State of Nevada for over 30 years. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of hard work and dedication to enhancing the lives of many across rural Nevada.

Mr. Brewer stands as a shining example of someone who has devoted his life to serving his State and his local community. After earning his degree from Oklahoma State University, Mr. Brewer started working in the housing industry for the Farmers Home Administration, FmHA. In 1994, he became the first housing program director for the new Nevada State office of FmHA. This was later named the State office of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, Rural Development. During his tenure as program director for the USDA, Mr. Brewer invested more than \$1 billion in rural Nevada, assisting hundreds of families and seniors in home ownership and affordable rental housing. Mr. Brewer will continue his work in public service as leader of the senior management team of Nevada Rural Housing Authority, working to make goals of the organization a reality. His positive legacy in the rural Nevada housing industry will be felt for years to come.

His unwavering commitment to the State is noble and has not gone without notice. Mr. Brewer was appointed to the Nevada Housing Division Advisory Committee and the Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee as a result of his accomplishments. His hard work earned him the County Supervisor of the Year for Nevada and the State Director’s Going the Extra Mile Award in 2011. His accolades are well deserved.

It is not only Mr. Brewer’s commitment to his local community in the

housing sector that places him amongst the most notable in his community but also his devotion to charitable service. Mr. Brewer has served on the board of directors for the Nevada Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America for 10 years and is a longtime member of the organization. In 2004, he received the Boy Scouts Silver Beaver Award in recognition of his service and was awarded the President’s Volunteer Service Award in 2009.

I am grateful for his dedication to the people of Nevada. He exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and community service and should be proud of his long and meaningful career. Today, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Mr. Brewer on his retirement, and I give my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Nevada a better place. I offer him my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award the Congressional Gold Medal to the World War II members of the Doolittle Tokyo Raiders.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 284. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 639. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing.

H.R. 647. An act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 648. An act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 876. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 803(a) of the Congressional Recognition for Excellence in Arts Education Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)), the Minority Leader appoints the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Con-

gressional Award Board: Mr. Romero Brown of Acworth, Georgia.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1011c, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity for a term of six years: Upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader: Dr. George T. French of Fairfield, Alabama, Dr. Kathleen Sullivan Alioto of New York, New York, and Mr. Ralph A. Wolff of Oakland, California.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 284. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 639. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 647. An act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 648. An act to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 876. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COATS, from the Joint Economic Committee:

Special Report entitled “2015 Economic Report of the President” (Rept. No. 114-5).

By Mr. BURR, from the Select Committee on Intelligence, without amendment:

S. 754. An original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 749. A bill to require dynamic scoring of major legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 750. A bill to achieve border security on certain Federal lands along the Southern border; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 751. A bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CORKER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. VITTER, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 752. A bill to establish a scorekeeping rule to ensure that increases in guarantee fees of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac shall not be used to offset provisions that increase the deficit; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. COONS):

S. 753. A bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURR:

S. 754. An original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; from the Select Committee on Intelligence; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. CORKER):

S. 755. A bill to designate as wilderness certain public land in the Cherokee National Forest in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 756. A bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 757. A bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 758. A bill to establish an Interagency Trade Enforcement Center in the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 759. A bill to establish procedures for the expedited consideration by Congress of the recommendations set forth in the Cuts, Consolidations, and Savings report prepared by the Office of Management and Budget; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 760. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize a bipartisan

majority of Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission to hold non-public collaborative discussions; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 761. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to designate certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs as health professional shortage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 762. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish an innovation in surface transportation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 763. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 764. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 765. A bill to appropriately determine the budgetary effects of energy savings performance contracts and utility energy service contracts; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 766. A bill to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 767. A bill to eliminate the payroll tax for individuals who have attained retirement age, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 102. A resolution requiring authorizing committees to hold annual hearings on Government Accountability Office investigative reports on the identification, consolidation, and elimination of duplicative Government programs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Con. Res. 10. A concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the year of 2015 as the "International Year of Soils" and supporting locally led soil conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 15

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 15, a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to recognize the authority of States to regulate oil and gas operations and promote American energy security, development, and job creation, and for other purposes.

S. 142

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 142, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 257

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 257, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services.

S. 269

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 269, a bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.



S. 308

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 308, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 388

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to require humane treatment of animals by Federal Government facilities.

S. 418

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 418, a bill to support and encourage the health and well-being of elementary school and secondary school students by enhancing school physical education and health education.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 430

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 430, a bill to prohibit the marketing of electronic cigarettes to children, and for other purposes.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 483

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 483, a bill to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 502, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 526

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 526, a bill to sunset the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force after three years.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 577

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 577, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate the corn ethanol mandate for renewable fuel.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic

diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 615

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) were added as cosponsors of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 626

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 626, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 634

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to prohibit the Federal Emergency Management Agency from recouping certain assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 667

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 667, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 674

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to expand programs with respect to women's health.

S. 683

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California



(Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 683, a bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 297

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 297 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

AMENDMENT NO. 300

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 300 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 758. A bill to establish an Interagency Trade Enforcement Center in the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to discuss the importance of international trade and the enforcement of international trade agreements.

We talk a lot about international trade in this Chamber and frame it in terms of opening new markets with new trade agreements. But as the distinguished Presiding Officer understands, while it is important to ensure future agreements are fair for businesses and workers, we should also be devoting more time to the 290 trade agreements we already have and ask ourselves; are we doing all we can to ensure we are enforcing these trade agreements on behalf of American businesses and workers who are affected by trade agreements, on behalf of communities that are affected by trade agreements?

I do not think we are, despite strong efforts by the Obama administration. I say that because this particular report—which I have in my hand, which is very heavy—is a report from the U.S. Trade Representative that has 384 pages detailing all of the trade barriers we face around the globe. Those are 384 reasons why we need to do more to fight for our manufacturers, our farmers, our innovators, our workers—everyone employed in all of the indus-

tries that are affected by trade barriers.

So today, Senator GRAHAM and I are introducing the Trade Enforcement Act, which would make permanent the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center at the USTR.

The Center was created in 2012 by Executive order. I appreciate that very much. Senator GRAHAM and I have been working for a number of years to get a trade enforcement office, and I appreciate that President Obama put in place by Executive order this new Center with responsibilities to coordinate the enforcement powers of multiple Federal agencies.

It has already demonstrated its value in helping our Nation win major trade enforcement cases. We just need to make it permanent.

Around the same time as the Center's creation, China began imposing illegal duties on American cars and SUVs in defiance of World Trade Organization rules. These duties threatened the jobs of America's 850,000 automobile workers and had a direct impact on more than \$5 billion of U.S. auto exports.

With the help of the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center, the U.S. Trade Representative challenged this practice by China at the WTO. The WTO agreed with the United States that China's duties breached numerous international trade rules, and last June the duties were terminated. They ended.

Another case, Argentina was restricting imports of U.S. goods—blocking energy products, electronics and machinery, pharmaceuticals, medical devices, cars and parts—billions of dollars in potential sales. The Center helped to challenge that practice by Argentina, and, again, the WTO ruled in favor of the United States.

The Center helped to challenge China's practice of imposing duties on exports of rare Earth materials—so important, again, to our basic technology and manufacturing. In fact, in that case, the United States won. The Center helped to challenge India's ban on U.S. agricultural products, and we won again.

So what we are learning is that when the U.S. Trade Representative works with the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center—with an entity that is laser-focused on enforcing trade laws—to challenge unfair trade practices around the world, the United States wins.

We can continue winning if only we devote more time and more attention to enforcing the rules in our existing trade agreements. Again, we have a lot of work that needs to be done with all the trade barriers stopping us from having the opportunities to the markets that would allow us to export our goods.

For example, the USTR's report on nontariff trade barriers highlights how

China provides export subsidies to its auto parts manufacturers so they can sell their parts to other countries at below market value and still turn a profit. This makes it impossible for our parts manufacturers—many of them small businesses—to compete in those markets.

In a letter I wrote to the President—which I was pleased to have 188 Members of Congress sign—I asked the administration to take action. I was very pleased when the USTR announced later that year that the United States was formally challenging China's illegal practices on autos and auto parts. Without the investigation and the technical work done by the Interagency Trade Enforcement Center, that challenge would not have been possible.

We have a free-trade agreement with Korea. Yet that nation continues to erect new trade barriers that make it more difficult for U.S. automakers to do business there. Even today, despite best efforts to open things up, Korea is one of the most closed auto markets in the world.

Our legislation is based on the fact that our enforcement needs to go further and faster, and we need to support it. We need to give the USTR the resources it needs to take swift, decisive action to crack down on unfair trade practices. I very much appreciate the work that is being done by that Center, and they are showing what happens when we are focused, when we as a country are focused on those things that our businesses and workers need in terms of eliminating unfair trade practices.

But I think it is very important that this Interagency Trade Enforcement Center become permanent, and that is what the bill that Senator GRAHAM and I are introducing would do.

Our bill would also establish a Chief Trade Enforcement Officer to lead the Center so we have one person being held accountable on enforcement who would be accountable to the Senate and to the American people.

We also do something that I think is very important that will help manufacturing. Right now we have at the USTR a Chief Agricultural Negotiator. I support that. They are somebody helping to lead our efforts in agricultural policy. But we know to have a strong economy, it is about making things and growing things, and the making things part of it does not have a chief negotiator. That is why we in our bill create a Chief Manufacturing Negotiator to focus squarely on the interests of manufacturers in our country. That will clearly send a message that when we talk about growing the middle class, growing the economy, we are going to be laser-focused on manufacturing, as well as on agriculture.

We know that for every \$1 billion in goods we export, we support 5,800

American jobs. By passing the Trade Enforcement Act, we will remove more trade barriers, meaning we will export more goods and create more American jobs, and we all want to create jobs and grow the economy.

So I am looking forward to working with my colleagues in the months ahead to ensure that in this global marketplace where we find ourselves, there is, in fact, a level playing field and we have an agency and individuals who are laser-focused on making sure we have fair trade.

In the end, our goal should be to export our products, not our jobs. That is what Senator GRAHAM's and my bill would do.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 763. A bill to amend title XII of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain trauma care programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act with Senator MURRAY. Timely and effective trauma care is critical to ensuring lifesaving interventions for those who have serious injuries.

Nationally, trauma is the leading cause of death in the United States for individuals aged 44 and younger. According to the National Trauma Institute, trauma accounts for 41 million emergency room visits and 2.3 million hospital admissions across the country each year. The nation's trauma and emergency medical systems are designed to respond quickly and efficiently to get seriously injured individuals to the appropriate trauma center hospital within the "golden hour," the time period when medical intervention is most effective in saving lives and preserving function. Achieving this standard of access requires maintenance and careful coordination between organized systems of trauma care.

The Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act builds on my previous efforts to improve trauma care, which is an essential component of our care system. Last year, the President signed into law legislation I introduced, the Improving Trauma Care Act, which includes burn injuries in the definition of trauma care. Previously, the statutory definitions of trauma were inconsistent and outdated. Most notably, the law defined trauma in a way that excluded burn injuries, preventing burn centers from being able to apply for funding made available under trauma and emergency care programs. The Improving Trauma Care Act updated the Federal definition of trauma to include burns, a change that more appro-

priately reflects the relationship between burns and other traumatic injuries.

This was an important step, but more must be done. The legislation we are introducing today would reauthorize two important grant programs: Trauma Care Systems Planning Grants, which support State and rural development of trauma systems, and Regionalization of Emergency Care Systems Pilot Projects, which provide funds to design, implement, and evaluate innovative models of regionalized emergency care. The bill would also direct States to update their model trauma care plan with the input of relevant stakeholders. These critical programs support emergency care in communities across the country.

I urge our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in cosponsoring this legislation and working toward its expeditious passage.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 102—REQUIRING AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES TO HOLD ANNUAL HEARINGS ON GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE INVESTIGATIVE REPORTS ON THE IDENTIFICATION, CONSOLIDATION, AND ELIMINATION OF DUPLICATIVE GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 102

*Resolved,*

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the "Congressional Oversight to Start Taxpayer Savings Resolution" or the "COST Savings Resolution".

##### SEC. 2. REQUIRING COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE REPORTS.

(a) **DUPLICATION REPORTS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Comptroller General of the United States transmits each annual report to Congress identifying programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives with duplicative goals and activities within the Government under section 21 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution increasing the statutory limit on the public debt" (Public Law 111-139; 31 U.S.C. 712 note), each standing committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) with jurisdiction over any such program, agency, office, or initiative covered by that report shall conduct hearings on the recommendations for consolidation and elimination of such program, agency, office, or initiative.

(b) **HIGH RISK LIST.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Comptroller General of the United States publishes a High Risk List, or any successor thereto, each standing committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) with jurisdiction over any agency or program area on the High Risk List shall conduct hearings

on the vulnerabilities to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement, or need for transformation, of the agency or program area.

(c) **JOINT HEARINGS.**—For any program, agency, office, initiative, or program area over which more than 1 standing committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) has jurisdiction, to the extent determined beneficial and appropriate by the Chairmen of the committees, the committees may hold joint hearings under subsection (a) or (b).

##### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 10—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE YEAR OF 2015 AS THE "INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF SOILS" AND SUPPORTING LOCALLY LED SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

S. CON. RES. 10

Whereas many of the international partners of the United States are designating 2015 as the "International Year of Soils";

Whereas soil is vitally important for food security and essential ecosystem functions;

Whereas soil conservation efforts in the United States are often locally led;

Whereas 2015 also marks the 80th anniversary of the signing of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act (16 U.S.C. 590a et seq.) on April 27, 1935;

Whereas soils, as the foundation for agricultural production, essential ecosystem functions, and food security, are key to sustaining life on Earth;

Whereas soils and the science of soils contribute to improved water quality, food safety and security, healthy ecosystems, and human health; and

Whereas soil, plant, animal, and human health are intricately linked; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—*

(1) supports the designation of 2015 as the "International Year of Soils";

(2) encourages the public to participate in activities that celebrate the importance of soils to the current and future well-being of the United States; and

(3) supports conservation of the soils of the United States, through—

(A) partnership with local soil and water conservation districts; and

(B) landowner participation in—

(i) the conservation reserve program established under subchapter B of chapter 1 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831 et seq.);

(ii) the environmental quality incentives program established under chapter 4 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3839aa et seq.);

(iii) the conservation stewardship program established under subchapter B of chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3838D et seq.);

(iv) the agricultural conservation easement program established under subtitle H of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3865 et seq.);

(v) the regional conservation partnership program established under subtitle I of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3871 et seq.); and

(vi) the small watershed rehabilitation program established under section 14 of the

Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1012).

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 317. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 307 submitted by Mr. TILLIS and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 318. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 291 submitted by Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 178, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 317. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 307 submitted by Mr. TILLIS and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 1, strike line 5, and all that follows through page 2, line 6, and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a covered alien is convicted of human trafficking or any conspiracy related to human trafficking, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) revoke any immigration benefit granted to the covered alien or relief from removal provided pursuant to policies implemented under, or substantially similar to policies implemented under, an Executive action set out under subsection (c); and

(2) place the covered alien in expedited proceedings for removal from the United States after the covered alien completes any term of imprisonment for such a conviction.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED ALIEN.—The term “covered alien”—

(A) means an alien present in the United States; and

(B) does not include an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(2) LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—The term “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

SA 318. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 291 submitted by Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) and intended to be proposed to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike the period and insert “or the ‘Jeremy Bell Act’.”.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled “TSA Oversight and Examination of the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Building a Competitive U.S. International Tax System.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “America’s Health IT Transformation: Translating the Promise of Electronic Health Records Into Better Care.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Securing the Southwest Border: Perspectives from Beyond the Beltway.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing enti-

itled “Immigration Reforms Needed to Protect Skilled American Workers.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WILDLIFE, AND WATER

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Deepening Political and Economic Crisis in Venezuela: Implications for U.S. Interests and the Western Hemisphere.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Benji McMurray, a detailee to the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, be granted floor privileges for the duration of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to grant floor privileges to a member of my staff, Derek Brown, through the end of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 2015

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 18; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the time

be equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the second half; finally, following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent

that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:33 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 18, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 17, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 17, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### FUNDING AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today the House Budget Committee will reveal the budget for fiscal year 2016. That budget will contain more money for Afghanistan, which is why I am speaking on the floor today. Afghanistan is an absolute waste of taxpayer money. It is a true graveyard of empires.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 years ago, I was speaking on the floor about a New York Times article titled, "Karzai Says He Was Assured CIA Would Continue Delivering Bags of Cash." I will quote from that article again today: "The CIA money, Mr. Karzai told reporters, was 'an easy source of petty cash,' and some of it was used to pay off members of the political elite and a group dominated by warlords."

This past Sunday, an article was published in a Raleigh, North Carolina, paper titled, "CIA Cash Helped to Refill Al Qaeda Coffers." According to the article: "The CIA contribution to al Qaeda's bottom line was just another in a long list of examples of how the

United States, largely because of poor oversight and loose financial controls, has sometimes inadvertently financed the very militants" who have been killing American soldiers. Finally, the article stated: "The cash flow has slowed since a new Afghan president, Mr. Ghani, assumed office in September, Afghan officials said, but they added that cash was still coming in."

For at least 5 years, it has been reported that cash from the United States has been funneled to the Afghan Government through the CIA as a sort of slush fund, and some of that money has made its way to al Qaeda. This is only one example of the waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan, yet the current administration has obligated the American taxpayer and soldier to 9 more years in Afghanistan, without even a debate on the floor of the House.

Let me remind the House: Al Qaeda is our enemy. Congress owes the American people and the soldiers a debate to end this failed policy.

Mr. Speaker, after over \$685 billion in taxpayer dollars, blood, and limbs lost in Afghanistan, it is time to stop the waste, fraud, and abuse of American taxpayer money there and to start reallocating that money right here in America to help our veterans, to help the infrastructure of America, and to help our children, America's future. Why are we spending this kind of money in Afghanistan that is abused and wasted and used to kill American soldiers? I do not understand it, Mr. Speaker.

Our debt is over \$18 trillion. When President Clinton left office in the year 2000, our debt was \$5.6 trillion. Today, it is over \$18 trillion in debt, and we are going to continue with 9 more years of waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan. We, in Congress, owe the American people a debate.

With that, Mr. Speaker, before closing, I will ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform. God, please bless the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq. And I will ask God to please bless the President and the House and the Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today and God's people tomorrow.

### HONORING TED FOWLER ON HIS RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Ted Fowler, who recently retired from a storied career at one of North Carolina's and, indeed, one of America's famous dining establishments, Golden Corral.

An inspirational leader, Ted retired after nearly 40 years at the helm of Golden Corral. A humble yet enthusiastic man, Ted is a relentless competitor who achieved great success by demonstrating tireless commitment to his company, employees, and customers.

Ted joined the Golden Corral family not long after its first restaurant opened in 1973. He oversaw the expansion of the franchise from a one-family steakhouse in Fayetteville, North Carolina, to over 500 restaurants nationwide. This includes operations in 41 States with over 9,000 employees and revenues upward of \$195 million. Mr. Speaker, that is no small feat.

Ted steered the company through its brand transition, which was a difficult undertaking in today's restaurant industry. He worked hard to ensure the upward mobility of his employees so that every employee had a chance to achieve a better life. For example, Mr. Speaker, he initiated a company program that helped entry-level employees become managers within a year; and within 5 years, they could run their own franchise.

Mr. Fowler is more than just a respected leader in the restaurant industry. He truly cared about the people who worked and dined at Golden Corral. For instance, since 2001, Golden Corral has served more than 4 million free meals to active and retired military personnel on Veterans Day. He also oversaw Camp Corral, a free, one-of-a-kind summer camp for children of wounded and disabled or fallen military servicemembers. Since its founding, Camp Corral has grown to 20 camps in 16 States and has served over 4,000 children. It is because of big-hearted causes like these that I am proud to call Ted Fowler a friend.

Encouragement and leadership exemplified through many of his company programs are some of the reasons why Mr. Fowler is a past recipient of the North Carolina Restaurateur of the Year Award, the Foodservice Operator of the Year, and the Gold Plate Award.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize and congratulate a proven job creator and an even better man. Ted Fowler embodies all the qualities of a noble, compassionate businessman. I wish him good health and happiness in his retirement.

## PRESERVING SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an impending crisis that is going to be coming upon us in 2016. Mr. Speaker, not too many people know or realize that our Social Security disability trust fund is going to be insolvent, bankrupt, underfunded—whatever term you want to use—by the middle of 2016. Mr. Speaker, what that means is that our fellow Americans—approximately 11 million of them—who receive Social Security disability checks are going to be looking at a 20 percent reduction in their benefit come the middle of 2016 if we do not step up to the plate and reform this critical program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Ways and Means Committee here in Washington, D.C., and 2 years ago, I questioned our Treasury Secretary from the White House. I said: Mr. Lew, where is the White House's proposal to deal with this issue? Nothing in the budget from the White House, nothing in the Treasury Secretary's testimony addressed this canary in the coal mine that is coming down upon us in 2016.

This year I asked the same question, and essentially what I got was the proposal that they are going to take from Social Security retirees the contributions they make to Social Security retirement and transfer them into the disability trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, in my private practice, my private life as a businessman before I came to Washington, D.C., that was essentially robbing Peter to pay Paul. That is not acceptable.

We need to protect Social Security retirees. We also, Mr. Speaker, need to protect our fellow Americans who suffer from disabilities. We need to do better than robbing Peter to pay Paul. That is why I am looking for input from colleagues on the other side of the aisle, for people across the Nation to say, How can we reform the Social Security disability trust fund so that it meets its obligations and it stands with the disabled community in a way that says, You know what? If you want to return to work, you can.

Because right now, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, the Social Security disability trust fund penalizes those who suffer from disabilities if they return to work because then they lose their benefit. That doesn't make sense.

I support the work ethic of America, and that is why I support reforms that are going to take care of the disability trust fund, that make sure that our fellow Americans receive the benefits that they need and rely upon. But we are also going to stand with our disability community and make sure if they want to return to work and have a capacity to return to work, we in

Washington, D.C., will stand with them and reward that work ethic.

Bottom line: I am going to protect our Social Security retirees because to put them in further harm's way, as we know the impending Social Security crisis that is going to come to a head in 2033, just around the corner, will do—to take from that retirement fund is further weakening our Social Security system. We can do better. We must do better.

I care about those retirees. I care about those disabled fellow Americans. That is why I say today that we are not going to maintain the status quo of robbing Peter to pay Paul, but we are actually going to get to the business of reform. We are going to protect retirees and take care of our fellow Americans who are disabled.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) at noon.

## PRAYER

Reverend Jon Randles, Victory Life Church, Lubbock, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Holy and most high God, we come before You, grateful for Your gift of life. All good things come from You. We acknowledge that powerful truth.

I pray for these leaders who serve in this Congress today the wisdom to make choices that are righteous, just, and good for all Americans and beyond. I pray those leaders the humility to remember that if they seek Your ways, You will guide their journey to those choices that are always best. I pray that all of us, as Americans, strive to know who we are, to know Whom and what we serve, and to know where we are going.

Bless them as they lead us, and may we all seek with our lives to leave a shadow that makes a difference for freedom, truth, goodness, and always with encouragement.

Acknowledging You, we pray.  
Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## WELCOMING REVEREND JON RANGLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome to the House of Representatives today's guest chaplain and my fellow Lubbock, Texas, native, Jon Randles. Jon is joined here today by his wife, Kelly; his two sons, Zack and Sam; and their wives, Autumn and Jennifer; his daughter, Hayley; and her husband, Chance; as well as their grandchildren. Also here are 70 members of his congregation.

Jon has been engaged in two career paths: he has served as both a pastor and a nationwide motivational speaker. He began pastoring the first of his four churches as a college sophomore at Hardin-Simmons University in Abilene, Texas. He has a master of divinity degree from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary and did doctorate studies in ancient Roman history at Texas Tech University.

He served as Director of Evangelism at the Baptist General Convention of Texas. In 2010, as a contractor for the U.S. Air Force, he crafted a program for senior officers to mentor members of the junior force.

In 2013, after 20 years as an evangelist and a motivational speaker, he returned to pastoring and is currently the senior pastor at Victory Life Baptist Church in Lubbock, Texas.

In all of his endeavors, Jon has encouraged excellence and character. But most of all, Jon has impacted countless lives by his witness and testimony of Jesus Christ.

Jon has the heart of a lion and a tremendous amount of faith. As he battles pancreatic cancer, he is an amazing example to all of us how to run the race God has set out for each of us.

May God bless Jon Randles, and may He continue to bless the United States of America.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests

for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of National Agriculture Week.

If you look around this great building, you will find countless references to our early economy, which depended largely on our Nation's abundant farmland. This vital industry impacts every person in this country, from the food we place before our family to the businesses that keep our citizens gainfully employed.

My home State of Minnesota is the fourth largest agricultural exporter in the country, and Stearns County, which is in my district, is the largest dairy producing county in Minnesota. We are the Land of 10,000 Lakes and 80,000 farms.

As a member of the Agriculture Committee, I am proud to work on behalf of both farmers and consumers to ensure this vibrant industry continues to thrive. Please join me this week in thanking a farmer.

#### THE GOP'S "WORK HARDER FOR LESS" BUDGET

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget that has been released today should be called "Work Harder for Less." It squeezes hardworking Americans, making it harder for them to buy a home, harder to send their kids to college, and harder to enjoy a secure retirement.

How does it do these things, Mr. Speaker?

If you want to buy a home, it makes it harder because it continues to stagnate paychecks. If you want to send your kids to college, it makes it harder by slashing tuition assistance and student loans. If you want to save some money for a secure and enjoyable retirement, it privatizes Medicare—again—after all these years of attempts.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican budget takes the tools of opportunity away from hardworking Americans all in order to provide bigger and deeper tax cuts for the superwealthy. It is the same old-same old spiced up with another repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and the American people will understand what the Republican priorities are versus ours.

#### AMBASSADOR GERARD ARAUD VISITS SOUTH CAROLINA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as cochairman of the French Caucus, I had the opportunity to escort French Ambassador Gerard Araud across South Carolina, where he met enthusiastic citizens of French heritage along with business leaders who appreciate our valued alliance.

South Carolina's association with France was highlighted by the arrival of the Marquis de Lafayette at Georgetown to support the American Revolution. His portrait is one of only two here in the House Chamber.

Today, French investments are extraordinary with the joint Michelin plants in Lexington, providing over 2,000 jobs at a nearly 2-million-square-foot facility. At the Savannah River site in Aiken, the Ambassador toured the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication facility using AREVA advanced technology to convert weapons-grade plutonium into green fuel. These investments produce jobs for Americans and profits for France.

In between tours, the Ambassador was honored to speak to the Columbia Rotary Club, South Carolina's largest civic organization, led by President John Johnston, with introduction by French Huguenot, Rusty DePass.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### THE GOP'S "WORK HARDER FOR LESS" BUDGET

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, well, today the Republicans are unveiling yet another Republican budget that would ensure hardworking Americans have to continue to work harder and get less.

Our country deserves a budget that puts these hardworking families first, not this damaging budget that guts middle class priorities making it harder to buy a home, harder to send your kids to college, and harder to have a secure retirement. It is all at the expense of handouts to special interests.

This "work harder, get less" budget continues to squeeze the middle class by keeping wages stagnant, cutting student loans, and privatizing Medicare. House Democrats stand ready to pass a budget that invests in our families so that they can take home bigger paychecks, send their kids to school, and save for retirement.

The Republican budget takes the tools that build the American Dream away from hardworking Americans to give bigger tax cuts and bigger tax breaks to the superwealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my Republican colleagues will work with us in a

bipartisan fashion to fashion a budget that works for all Americans.

#### CELEBRATING THE ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE IN SAVANNAH, GEORGIA

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the 191st occasion of the St. Patrick's Day Parade in Savannah, Georgia. Among the largest Irish celebrations in the Nation, the St. Patrick's Day Parade is held in the downtown historic district and is always a meaningful occasion for the citizens of Chatham County and the State of Georgia.

In 1824, the Hibernian Society of Savannah, which was formed to aid the early Irish immigrants, began what would become the second largest St. Patrick's Day Parade in the Nation. Peak years have estimated up to 400,000 visitors to the area for St. Patrick's Day festivities. Georgia is proud to welcome visitors from all across the Nation, and it continues to be successful due to the hard work and dedication of those working in Savannah, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize and honor the members of the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee, including Chairman Kevin Halligan and the Grand Marshal, Mr. Hugh Coleman, for their tireless efforts and outstanding commitment in organizing this year's parade. Thank you all for all you do in our community and the State of Georgia. I wish you much success in today's event.

#### A STRONG MIDDLE CLASS IS A STRONG AMERICA

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget released today would deny working families the opportunity to earn a fair living that used to ensure a strong middle class in this country.

Their budget would hurt seniors, as Republicans have proposed four times before, by ending Medicare as we know it. It would place the burden of balancing the budget on the poor and keep arbitrary spending caps that hurt young and old alike by decimating Head Start and denying homebound seniors access to meals. It would cut Pell grants, hurting students seeking higher education, and it would leave our military lacking the critical resources we need to defend our country.

Mr. Speaker, our Democratic budget will honor our promises to seniors and will give someone who worked hard the opportunity to earn a fair wage so that they can raise their family. It will keep health care affordable and help students seeking to better themselves attain an affordable education, and it



will invest in our future by repairing our crumbling roads and bridges that are vital to a growing economy.

Our budget stands for protecting Medicare, earning a fair wage, and rebuilding our infrastructure, because a strong middle class is a strong America.

#### THE JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to express my outrage that Senate Democrats have refused to allow consideration of desperately needed sex trafficking legislation.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act would strengthen punishments for perpetrators and increase Federal funding for the victims of human trafficking. But instead of supporting this vitally important legislation, Senate Democrats are playing political games. They have refused to support the legislation despite its having a bipartisan group of cosponsors and unanimous approval from the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, trafficking is a real problem in every State in the United States of America. Right now, almost 300,000 American children are at risk of commercial sexual exploitation. Children are being sold into sexual slavery right now while some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been holding up this critical legislation for 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Senate Democrats to drop their protests, support the thousands of vulnerable women and children this legislation would protect, and join Republicans in the fight against human trafficking.

#### THERE THEY GO AGAIN

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would be quoting Ronald Reagan but, "There you go again," another Republican budget that kicks the poor, the hungry, and the disabled to the curb, that strangles the middle class and deserts hardworking families.

"There you go again," another Republican budget that stymies research and development, abandons essential infrastructure, and stifles access to education.

"There you go again," another Republican budget that robs senior citizens, degrades the environment, and devastates our cultural institutions.

"There you go again," another so-called Republican path to prosperity that is really a road map for distress and decline for all but big corporations and the megawealthy.

So I urge folks, call those Republican Representatives and tell them that the American people don't want to and don't deserve to go that way again.

□ 1215

#### HONORING CONESTOGA HIGH SCHOOL MUSIC DEPARTMENT

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Conestoga High School Music Department and their great success in this year's music festivals.

In 2015, Conestoga High School sent an impressive 32 students to the district chorus, band, and orchestra festivals; 19 students to the region chorus, band, and orchestra festivals; six students to the all-State chorus, band, and orchestra festivals; one student to All-Eastern Orchestra; and one student to All-National Orchestra.

In addition, sophomore Jason Bassiliou's music composition has been selected as the winner at the high school level in the 2015 Pennsylvania Music Educators Association Composition Program.

Under the dedicated leadership of department head Sue Dickinger, Conestoga High School Music Department represents among the best of Pennsylvania's Sixth District in the musical arts.

Music is, in fact, an integral part of a student's curriculum, and I commend the students, their teachers, and Conestoga High School on an exceptional year in music.

#### 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARCH IN SELMA

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, what an occasion and privilege it was to mark the 50th anniversary of the march in Selma. As my friend and hero Congressman JOHN LEWIS said: "Selma is more than a place, it is the realization of an idea."

Selma showed us that true empowerment begins with voting rights. After 50 years of progress, the Supreme Court has rolled back the Voting Rights Act, one of the most effective laws ever passed. Now, House leadership is saying parts of the VRA are "not necessary." Literacy tests may be relics of the past but only because of the VRA.

Some States have replaced old overt forms of voter disenfranchisement with more subtle forms of voter suppression through registration, through restricting, and voting itself. States need to stop holding people back from voting, and Congress must hold States accountable. The Court may not have

done the right thing, but surely Congress can.

Let's restore the VRA and better the voting process for all voters.

#### NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT RULE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I, along with 15 fellow House colleagues, called upon the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to provide flexibility with the agency's proposal to list the northern long-eared bat under the Endangered Species Act.

Back in December, the Fish and Wildlife Service proposed listing the northern long-eared bat as threatened under the Endangered Species Act through a special 4(d) rule, which would provide exemptions for certain activities if they met prescribed conservation activities.

Apart from forest management, the initial rule did not specify which activities would be granted exemptions. Because this species of bat can be found in 38 States, including all of Pennsylvania, a broad Endangered Species Act listing would have far-reaching impacts upon the States and permissible land uses.

Mr. Speaker, listing the northern long-eared bat as endangered has never been warranted. Since day one, the Fish and Wildlife Service has repeatedly acknowledged the underlying cause of population decline is a disease—white-nose syndrome—not habitat loss through human activity.

Rather than limiting commerce and land use activities—impacting jobs and local economies—the Fish and Wildlife Service should focus their efforts on combating white-nose syndrome.

#### HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the Republican budget plan.

Budgets are not just numbers on a piece of paper; they are moral documents, moral documents that demonstrate our Nation's values, ideals, and our priorities.

The House Republican budget of "work harder and get less" is not where it is at. Their budget makes it harder for American families to pay for a home, to send their kids to college, and keeps paychecks in this country stagnant; and it is something that we should not tolerate.

Instead, Republicans should work with Democrats to end the sequestration so we can make it easier to send

our kids to college, fix our roads that are crumbling every day, and also to make sure that we can keep good-paying jobs here in our country. That is the American Dream; that is the land of opportunity.

I urge the Republicans to work with us, not against us, so we can fix this problem for the American people.

#### HALABJA ATTACKS

(Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this week marks the 27th anniversary of the Halabja chemical attacks against the Kurdish people in Iraq.

On March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime created one of modern history's most barbaric crimes. He ordered his forces to drop chemical weapons, including mustard and sarin gas, on the Kurdish town of Halabja.

The brutal attack, which can only be described as a crime against humanity, resulted in painful, agonizing deaths of at least 5,000 innocent men, women, and children, while leaving thousands more maimed, blinded, and otherwise permanently debilitated.

More than two and a half decades later, the aftermath of this horrific atrocity is still apparent with the victims, many of whom have suffered long-term illnesses, paralysis, neurological effects, cancers, and even congenital malformations in children to this day.

Since these atrocities, the Kurds have done a remarkable job of rebuilding. Today, the Kurds are one of America's most steadfast allies. Peshmerga forces continue to shoulder immense burdens while seeking to defeat and destroy our mutual enemy ISIS.

As a uniquely democratic and stable haven amidst a region more often marked by instability and authoritarian rule, Kurdistan also hosts almost 1.6 million Internally Displaced Persons and refugees, including Christians, Yazidis, and other religious minorities.

Today, we remember the unconscionable attack on Halabja, but we also celebrate the achievements and will of the Kurdish people to move forward.

#### STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of policies that will help more students and families afford college.

The cost of obtaining a college degree has increased more than 1,000 percent over the last three decades, and many more students need Federal loans to cover the costs.

After racking up a mountain of debt, graduates struggle to put money into

savings, buy a house, or start a business, but many people are shocked to find out that the Federal Government is making billions of dollars in profits off these students by charging higher interest rates than necessary. This is not fair or right.

We should be rewarding our students for pursuing an education, not taxing them for it. Students should get the same low interest rates that the Federal Reserve gives the big banks on Wall Street.

I hope we can find bipartisan support in Congress for commonsense policies to make college more affordable.

#### NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate National Women's History Month.

Many famous women have shaped the course of our country's fate; however, there are also women of note in our local communities that have made a real impact. I would like to highlight a constituent of mine, Paula O'Neil, Ph.D.

Dr. O'Neil was elected as the first woman to serve as clerk of the circuit court and county comptroller in Pasco County's history. A true role model, Dr. O'Neil has a long history of exemplary public service in government and serves as a professor at Saint Leo College, now Saint Leo University.

She has also been a courageous voice for others as she bravely battles cancer, stressing the importance of early detection.

This National Women's History Month, I am happy to honor Dr. Paula O'Neil and recognize all women making a positive impact in our communities.

#### WE CANNOT AFFORD TO BALANCE AMERICA'S CHECKBOOK ON THE BACK OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, we saw encouraging news about our economy continuing to move back from the debilitating recession that we faced only a few years ago. While we still have a ways to go, we are certainly moving in the right direction.

However, if the GOP budget revealed today should come to pass, it would have devastating effects on America's middle class and undo the progress that we have made. This budget will force middle class families to work harder and get less.

The GOP has presented us with legislation that will keep paychecks stagnant, making it harder to buy a home;

it would cut student loans, making it difficult for kids to afford college, and it would strip away the secure retirement by privatizing Medicare.

We cannot afford to balance America's checkbook on the backs of the middle class. In the district where I come from—California's Inland Empire—families are struggling from the recession and are fighting to catch up with the rest of the Nation.

I cannot and will not ask them to bear this burden because the GOP can't pass a budget.

#### CONFIRMATION OF LORETTA LYNCH

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it has been 126 days since the President named Loretta Lynch as his nominee for the U.S. Attorney General position. It has been 46 days since the hearings began, and as we thought that there would soon be a full vote in the Senate, we are now facing another delay as Senate Republicans continue to drag their feet.

This is unprecedented. Loretta Lynch rightfully deserves to be the next Attorney General for the United States. She is a proven litigator who is well qualified. She has a reputation as an accomplished, knowledgeable attorney.

If confirmed, she will be the first African American woman to hold the position. This is a serious position, and it shouldn't fall victim to partisan gridlock.

There is no argument that Loretta Lynch is more than qualified; yet she has been scrutinized more than any other male that has come before her vying for the U.S. Attorney General role: 900 questions, 9 hours of testimony.

A fellow North Carolinian, Ms. Lynch is from a family of clergymen and civil rights community leaders. Throughout her career, she has served twice as U.S. attorney general for New York.

I stand today in full support of Loretta Lynch as our next U.S. Attorney General. Let's confirm her as our next Attorney General, and let's make history.

#### TWO VISIONS FOR OUR NATION'S FUTURE

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, Americans have a choice of two contrasting visions for our Nation's future.

One vision features higher taxes, more debt, and greater burdens on hardworking families. The administration's budget would drown our Nation \$27 trillion in debt. It would never ever balance.

Its proponents pat themselves on the back for running these annual deficits, saying they have and could be worse. Only in D.C. is a half-trillion dollar deficit greeted with a pat on the back.

Further, if Congress had accepted the administration's previous budget proposals, the Federal Government would be 20 percent larger today, more bloated, and less efficient.

The other vision put forth by Congress leads to a balanced budget at the end of the decade, and it stops devastating tax increases. The congressional budget reduces spending by over \$5.5 trillion and calls for a fairer and simpler Tax Code so small businesses can create jobs and provide the better-paying jobs Americans are desperate for.

Mr. Speaker, Congress' proposal actually invests in the future and places our Nation on a path towards paying off our debt—rather than adding to it—by making government more efficient, effective, and accountable.

Now is the time for the parties to work together to implement a vision that keeps our Nation on the path to prosperity, that keeps debt off the backs of working families, and that balances our Federal budget.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 17, 2015 at 9:19 a.m.:

Appointments:  
Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference.  
Senate Delegation to the Canada-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference.  
Senate Delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Conference.  
U.S.-China Interparliamentary Group Conference.

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

□ 1230

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1029, EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1030, SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I

call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 138

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1029) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-10. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. At any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1030) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Tech-

nology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-11. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 138 provides for the consideration of two important pieces of legislation to create a more transparent and accountable Environmental Protection Agency, one that works in an open manner for all of America. The rule provides for 1 hour of debate for each of the bills contained within the rule. Further, amendments were made in order for each bill, for a total of six amendments from Members of both parties.

Mr. Speaker, the first bill contained in this rule, H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015, brings greater accountability and oversight to the Board of appointed advisers which the EPA uses to review the

scientific basis for its official actions. Created in the late 1970s, the Science Advisory Board was intended to be a check on the EPA in order to ensure that the Agency's math and statistics were all in order before it promulgated rules or regulations.

In fact, the original authorization for the Board made clear that the Science Advisory Board was to report to both the Environmental Protection Agency and to Congress on its findings. However, over the course of the past several decades since its inception, the Science Advisory Board has become little more than a rubberstamp for whatever the EPA Administrator wishes to accomplish. With the Board members being handpicked by the Administrator, they are likely being chosen primarily on the basis that they hold the same view of the environmental world as whoever the head of the EPA is at any given time.

The bill before us would provide for a more balanced representation on the Science Advisory Board, setting out parameters regarding whom the Administrator can choose and ensuring that State and local governments have representation on the Board so the Board is not comprised solely of environmental activists, as has been the case for some time now. Indeed, current regulations exclude industry experts from serving on the Science Advisory Board but not officials from environmental advocacy groups—in other words, special interests. These new regulations are necessary to ensure against any appearance of impropriety on the Science Advisory Board.

This legislation becomes even more critical when one considers that the numerous regulations currently being considered by the Environmental Protection Agency could have enormous impacts on the Nation's economy. From proposed carbon regulations to the ratcheting down of ozone regulations, the Science Advisory Board has been tasked with reviewing the science that will back up some of the most expensive rules in the history of the Environmental Protection Agency. It is critical that the American people have confidence that the Federal Government is doing what is justified. The fear is that, absent significant reforms to the Environmental Protection Agency's process, this simply will not be the case.

The second bill contained in this rule, H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act, is also intended to make the Environmental Protection Agency's rulemaking process more transparent. This was at one time a goal of the current administration's. We seem to have lost that somewhere along the way. The legislation states that the Environmental Protection Agency may take official action on an environmental regulation only if it has identified all of the scientific and technical

information upon which it has based its decision, and these must be publicly available studies that can be independently peer reviewed. This would bring the EPA's process in line with how many scientific journals operate when they publish peer-reviewed studies.

Further, the bill is prospective, and it will not interfere with any enacted rules or regulations by the Environmental Protection Agency. To address concerns expressed during the Science Committee's consideration of the bill, the legislation spells out that nothing in these requirements would jeopardize any privacy concerns with scientific studies. The CDC successfully makes its studies available. It redacts personal information, and it does not expose any test subject's personal information. The EPA should have no problem similarly complying with these requirements.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are waking up to how much of the United States economy the EPA is attempting to regulate—from carbon dioxide to ozone—and people are rightly anxious over how these new and, in some cases, unprecedented rules will affect some consumers' wallets. It is reasonable and expeditious to ensure that the science that the EPA relies upon to craft its regulations simply be transparent and simply be available for all to see and not for just that select group of industry insiders that the EPA deems worthy to see its work products.

Even the congressional committees that are charged with the legitimate oversight of the Environmental Protection Agency's actions have had difficulty in obtaining basic scientific justifications for the actions taken by the EPA over the last few years. The bills before us today will begin the process of making the Environmental Protection Agency accountable to the very constituency that it claims to protect—the American people.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the rule and "yes" on the underlying bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Texas, Dr. BURGESS, for yielding the customary 30 minutes. I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate to have put the most recent Republican manufactured crisis of funding the Department of Homeland Security behind us. This was not the first crisis caused by the extreme rightwing in this body, and I am certain that it won't be the last. In looking ahead to the balance of the year, I am sure that my Republican colleagues are preparing themselves to continue with the same trend.

For example, the current suspension of the debt limit, which expired on March 15, is a crisis. By the end of this

month, Congress has to act on the so-called "doc fix" or else—crisis. The highway trust fund is set to run out of money in about 3 months. There is another crisis. At the end of June, the Export-Import Bank will have to be reauthorized—crisis. That takes us all the way to the end of the fiscal year, in September, when we push reset and have to do it all again from the beginning. This is no way to govern, and it is not what Americans who are struggling to put food on the table want or deserve.

I haven't mentioned the two bills in question today. That is not by accident. It is because they are typical go nowhere, do-nothing pet projects. Mr. Speaker, having served on the Rules Committee for as long as I have and having made the prediction, as my colleagues on the Democratic side of the Rules Committee have repeated, that the legislation is going nowhere, I think that we have been confirmed virtually every time.

These two measures are attempts by corporate interests to compromise the Environmental Protection Agency's integrity and stock its scientific review board with sympathizers. Neither will become law. "Secret science" might sound scary, but the rhetoric has outpaced the reality. Furthermore, this bill will not improve the EPA's science or make it more transparent. In fact, the bill's impossible standards and mechanisms will actually force the Environmental Protection Agency to ignore major and consequential studies.

De-identifying the data is not so simple. Firstly, just because the data is de-identified doesn't mean that it will stay de-identified. We are all familiar with how much personal information is readily available. Only a few pieces of information are required to reconnect the de-identified dots across the Internet and social media. Moreover, de-identifying the data means removing critical information that often renders the results not reproducible, which, under the regime created by this bill, would then force the EPA to ignore legitimate and, possibly, important studies.

□ 1245

Dr. BURGESS pointed out that it would protect the wallets of some. I am equally concerned about the bodies of all.

The other measure we are considering today, H.R. 1029, will give private industry substantial influence over the EPA. As we should have learned from the economic collapse, stuffing the regulatory agency with industry-affiliated experts is like leaving the wolves to mind the flock.

Mr. Speaker, I find it most unfortunate that my Republican colleagues continue to bring up do-nothing bills that will go nowhere and then spend the rest of their time doing everything

in their power to oppose the President of the United States. Quite frankly, the American people deserve better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of response.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the body that there was an election held in November of last year, and the results of that election are now part of history. Prior to that election, it is true, there were bills passed in the House of Representatives that were submitted to the Senate for action, and basically nothing happened. The then-Senate majority leader had made a decision that he was going to prevent any legislation from passing, he was going to prevent his Members from having to take a vote that might be construed as difficult, and he was certainly going to prevent the President from being in a position of having to veto any legislation.

I would just remind people that the process is the House and Senate each pass their bills; they agree in a conference committee to any differences. If that conference report is passed by both Houses, indeed, it is submitted to the White House for action, and that action may, indeed, be a veto. But you know what, Mr. Speaker? That veto is actually an important part of the process.

Right now people are unaware of where the President is on several issues because he has simply never had to render a decision; it has always been a full stop over at the Senate majority leader's desk. The American people spoke loudly last November that they did not want that process to continue.

Now, one may successfully argue that in 2012 the American people voted for divided government, but in 2014 they said: You know, that is not working out so well for us, and we are willing to give the Senate, to return a voice to the Senate.

We are now giving the Senate an opportunity. These bills were both passed last year. The gentleman from Florida knows that very well. We had this very same argument on the floor of the House last fall. Both bills essentially died in the Senate. It is my hope now that we will give the Senate yet another opportunity. It is a new day, new Senators, new majority leader. Let them have a chance to act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURGESS. I yield myself an additional 2 minutes just to speak briefly on the substance of H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act. This is a bill that requires the Environmental Protection Agency to base its regulations on science, not only on science, but science that is available to the public and subject to independent verification. Who could be against that?

That is part of the scientific process. That is part of scientific inquiry. You

balance things, propose a theory; someone proposes an alternate; you get the data, collect the evidence, do the studies, do the experiments, make that generally available, and come to a conclusion.

This is a transparency bill. The administration ran on the concept of transparency. We are simply trying to help them fulfill that obligation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the March 3, 2014, statements of the administration on the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act and Secret Science Reform Act.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1029—EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2015

(Rep. Lucas, R-OK and 24 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1029, which would affect the ability of EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) to form panels and perform its essential functions. The SAB, along with other functions, reviews the quality and adequacy of certain scientific and technical information used by EPA or proposed as the basis for EPA regulations. Therefore, it is imperative that the SAB be composed of the most knowledgeable scientific and technical experts available. The Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), which governs Federal advisory committees such as the SAB, provides for balanced panels and subcommittees that include experts with diverse backgrounds who represent wide-ranging perspectives.

H.R. 1029 would negatively affect the appointment of experts and would weaken the scientific independence and integrity of the SAB. For example, the bill would impose a hiring quota for SAB members based on employment by a State, local, or tribal government as opposed to scientific expertise. The bill would also place limitations on SAB members' participation in "advisory activities that directly or indirectly involve review and evaluation of their own work." Determining the practical meaning of "indirect" involvement will be difficult and consequently problematic to implement. The provisions on appointment of experts to the SAB and various other requirements could also preclude the nomination of scientists with significant expertise in their fields.

In addition, H.R. 1029 would add burdensome requirements on the SAB with respect to solicitation of and response to public comments, above and beyond those imposed by FACA. These new requirements would saddle the SAB with workload that would impair its ability to carry out its mandate. Further, H.R. 1029 would add an unnecessary, burdensome, and costly layer of requirements for hazard and risk assessments without defining the scope of these requirements and absent recognition that many high profile assessments already are reviewed by the SAB.

If the President were presented with H.R. 1029, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

#### STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1030—SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2015

(Rep. Smith, R-TX and 28 cosponsors)

The Administration strongly supports regulatory transparency, but strongly opposes H.R. 1030. The bill would impose arbitrary, unnecessary, and expensive requirements that would seriously impede the Environ-

mental Protection Agency's (EPA's) ability to use science to protect public health and the environment, as required under an array of environmental laws, while increasing uncertainty for businesses and States.

H.R. 1030 could be used to prevent EPA from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating any "covered action" until legal challenges about the legitimate withholding of certain scientific and technical information are resolved. Provisions of the bill could be interpreted to prevent EPA from taking important, and possibly legally required, actions, where supporting data is not publicly available, and legal challenges could delay important environmental and health protections. For example, the data underlying some scientifically-important studies is not made broadly available in order to protect the privacy of test subjects, and modeling that EPA uses for a variety of purposes are not EPA property and therefore cannot be publicly released. H.R. 1030 could interfere with EPA's ability to take actions based on such data. In short, the bill would undermine EPA's ability to protect the health of Americans, would impose expensive new mandates on EPA, and could impose substantial litigation costs on the Federal government. It also could impede EPA's reliance on the best available science.

Instead of an overly broad bill that would tie EPA's hands, the Administration urges the Congress to support the Administration's efforts to make scientific and technical information more accessible and regulations more transparent. A bill consistent with the principles expressed in the Administration's Executive Order 13563 "Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review" and the December 2010 Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) Memorandum on Scientific Integrity, as well as implementation of the Administration's recent open data and public access initiatives (e.g., OSTP's February 2013 policy memorandum on Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research) would greatly benefit the American people. EPA also has embarked on several initiatives that enhance access to and transparency of data and science used to inform policy and regulatory decisions.

If the President were presented with H.R. 1030, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. I would urge that my colleague who made the comment that we don't know where the President is, well, there is where the President is.

I would also ask rhetorically, if it is that all these things that we passed that I said were going nowhere last year, why is it that we haven't had anything go anywhere this year with both a Republican Senate and a Republican House, and neither of these measures is going to go anywhere nor are they going to go to conference, and I believe people know that.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, we are going to offer an amendment to the rule that would allow the House to consider the Promoting U.S. Jobs Through Exports Act. This bill would renew the Export-Import Bank's charter for an additional 7 years, ensuring certainty for U.S. exporters and businesses through 2022.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services and my good friend.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for his leadership on this important issue. I applaud him, Leader PELOSI, and Whip HOYER for their efforts to ensure we support policies that create American jobs and keep U.S. businesses competitive.

I find the contrast with the bills we consider this week particularly striking as the out-of-touch Republican leadership wastes our time with measures that deny science and strip workers of critical rights.

Mr. Speaker, I am in disbelief that we are still debating the future of the Export-Import Bank, which we know supports hundreds of thousands of jobs and levels the playing field so that American businesses, large and small, can compete globally. The facts underscore what is at stake.

In fiscal year 2014, Ex-Im Bank approved more than 3,400 transactions with a total estimated export value of \$27.5 billion. This support is estimated to have sustained 164,000 export-related U.S. jobs. Over the past 5 years, it is estimated that the Bank has created or sustained more than 1.2 million private sector jobs. Moreover, all this was accomplished as the Bank returned over \$674 million back to the American taxpayers just last year.

Over the past two decades, the Bank has generated a surplus of \$6.9 billion for U.S. taxpayers, but for months a handful of extremists in this Chamber have refused to accept the numerous and widespread benefits provided by the Export-Import Bank to our economy. They have ignored these numbers as well as the diverse array of interests who support the Bank, such as the United States Chamber of Commerce; the National Small Business Association; the National Association of Manufacturers; labor unions, such as the AFL-CIO; and many others.

Instead, they have decided to follow the talking points of extremist groups like Heritage Action and the Club for Growth. I find it ironic that Republicans are actively working to ensure this important engine of job creation closes its doors while also waging war with President Obama over the Keystone XL pipeline, which even the most inflated estimates say would create far fewer jobs than Ex-Im.

However, I have been heartened to see a number of frustrated Republicans, some of them even Tea Partiers themselves, say enough is enough and have chosen to stand up for real workers and businesses rather than a handful of ideologues dictating policy from a Washington think tank. I applaud the 58 Republicans who courageously have

come out against their leadership in favor of renewing the Export-Import Bank's charter.

As we take an important vote that will bring Export-Import Bank legislation to the floor today, I ask those Republicans to once again show their courage, show their leadership, and show your constituents who rely on the Export-Import Bank for jobs and economic growth that you are willing to do what is best for them and not what is politically expedient.

Democrats want to provide certainty for the businesses and workers who rely on the Bank, and that is why I, along with Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Whip HOYER of Maryland, recently introduced legislation to reauthorize, reform, and reenergize the Export-Import Bank. The measure takes a sensible approach to renewing the Bank, extending its charter for 7 years, increasing its lending authority to meet the needs of U.S. exporters, and modernizing the Bank's programs to better serve small- and medium-sized businesses.

I couldn't be prouder of my democratic colleagues, 189 of whom joined as cosponsors just a few days after being introduced. Such widespread support sends a strong message to America's manufacturers, businesses, and workers that Democrats are united in preserving an institution that for decades has helped this Nation create jobs and grow the economy; and it makes clear that if those supportive Republicans were to join us, this Congress could pass an extension of the Export-Import Bank's charter today.

Mr. Speaker and Members, this is the right thing to do for our workers and for our businesses and for our Nation. Let's stand up for what is right.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of a response.

I appreciate the comments on the Export-Import Bank. I would point out to the body that today's rule has under consideration bills dealing with regulating the Environmental Protection Agency. The House did pass an extension of the Export-Import Bank charter last December that follows through until June of this year. There will be ample opportunity for us to have this debate and engage in debate as, indeed, people of this country want us to do. Today is not the time for that debate. Today is the day for deciding whether or not this body will further regulate the EPA.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would think the time to create American jobs is anytime, and sooner rather than later.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HASTINGS for yielding to me.

I, too, rise in support of H.R. 1031, the Promoting U.S. Jobs Through Exports Act of 2014, which reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank long term. I am so proud to have been able to introduce this legislation, along with our ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, Ms. WATERS, and Representatives HECK and HOYER.

The bill has 189 Democratic cosponsors. You add that number to the 57 Republicans that are supportive of Representative FINCHER's legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and just do the math there: 189 and 57, far and above any kind of majority needed to reauthorize this important jobs creation, jobs engine, and I would hope that this body would move forward on reauthorizing this legislation.

My district of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, has a very strong manufacturing and industrial base. I believe that we are maybe second in the country that really depends on a strong manufacturing and industrial base for our basic economic activity, and the small manufacturers in Milwaukee utilize the Export-Import Bank to export goods and services to places like China and India.

One of the narratives, the untrue narratives about the Export-Import Bank is that it is a utility for big companies like Boeing, it is the Bank of Boeing. Well, not so much. There is an endless supply chain, like the ones that I have visited recently.

I just recently went to a shop in Milwaukee that employs 30 people—30 people—yet they export U.S. goods to work on the Panama Canal.

□ 1300

The president of that company just flat out stated that he doesn't exist without the Export-Import Bank. Folks, it is just that simple.

I have heard many debates and arguments about the importance of passing stuff like Keystone, which is debatable as a job creator, and where it does create jobs, it is in a very small geographic area—whereas the Export-Import Bank creates hundreds of thousands of jobs in all of our districts.

Folks, it is just really that simple. The Export-Import Bank is a necessary part of our discussion about creating jobs.

Until we get past the political arguments that are being made about hanging the Export-Import Bank out there as low-hanging fruit to demonstrate our willingness to cut off so-called corporate welfare so that we can then get at cutting off entitlement programs to people, until we get past that cynical debate, I don't think that we are going to see very much in the way of improving our job creation performance in the United States.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of a response.



Talking about job creation is well and good, but we should also concern ourselves about job erosion and job loss. I don't know if the EPA is the number one Federal agency involved in job erosion and job loss, but it is right up there.

If you talk to anyone at home in your district about what is the Federal agency that is responsible for more job destruction, the EPA, if not at the top of the list, is right behind some of the others.

What we are about today is to regulate the regulator. It is not even to regulate the regulator, just have the regulator disclose to us what information upon which they are relying to make those regulations.

Why does the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act matter? Because the Science Advisory Board plays a critical role in reviewing the scientific information that forms the foundation of costly EPA regulations. What is the cost of those EPA regulations, Mr. Speaker? The cost is jobs.

The work we are doing today is important. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule and in favor of the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at this time to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), my good friend and a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the previous question in order that I might support Mr. HASTINGS' effort to offer the amendment to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Here is why. The Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine. Over the last 5 years, it has created—by good and scientifically-based estimates—about 1.2 million well-paying jobs, good-paying jobs, the kind of jobs that you can have and buy a home and send your kids to college and that touch every congressional district in the State. The Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine.

The Export-Import Bank is also a deficit-reducing machine. Not one red penny in the last generation has been used to subsidize it. In fact, \$7 billion has been transferred to the Treasury to reduce the deficit. It was \$1 billion 2 years ago, \$675 million last year, and a projected \$8 million this year. The Export-Import Bank is a deficit-reducing machine.

In addition to that, it is a superperformer, by any private sector measure. I come from the private sector. How they conduct their business is the envy of the financial services sector.

It has a default rate of less than—you are hearing this correctly—.175 percent and a collection rate over 50 percent. It

is a superperformer; yet the Export-Import Bank goes away in exactly 105 days—poof, gone, vanished.

The gentleman from Texas asked a very good question, a fair question: Why now? Well, the answer is: The clock is ticking, tick tock, tick tock. There are 105 days to go; yet the committee of jurisdiction has not had a hearing, has not scheduled a markup, and has issued no notice for either.

In fact, when we had the committee oversight plan before us, what did the committee chair do? He opposed a neutrally worded amendment that said, Let's take up the Export-Import Bank and subject it to regular order. That is all. Let's go through regular order.

There is no intent to take up the Export-Import Bank—no hearing, no markup, a rejection of regular order. That is why now.

It has been said, erroneously, that the Export-Import Bank primarily benefits Big Business—principally, aerospace. That is so wrong on so many levels, I cannot exaggerate it.

To begin with, 90 percent of the transactions of the Export-Import Bank go to small business, but it also fails to understand something, this argument coming from people who are supposed to understand the private sector.

Take a company like Boeing, a pride of America. Please remember, ladies and gentlemen, there are only two companies on the face of the planet that produce large airplanes, and America has but one of them. Do you know what they rely on? 12,000 businesses in their supply chain, many of which are small.

Here is the fact. Last week, I was home in a town called Puyallup, which most people can't even pronounce. It is a beautiful community of 38,000 people. It is not anywhere near Renton or Everett, where the airplanes are manufactured.

Do you know how many small businesses there are in the confines of the city limits of Puyallup that supply the aerospace industry and benefit from the Export-Import Bank? Seventeen, small businesses everywhere, but it is also stand-alone small businesses.

Another in my district is called Pexco. They produce traffic cones and the like that they sell internationally. Ex-Im financed \$2.3 million of their product last year.

I had a couple in my office just a few weeks ago from eastern Washington. I don't even represent them. They have agricultural products, mint extract and mint oil. Before they began working with the Export-Import Bank, one-third of their gross revenues were in exports. They began working with them, and their domestic side has grown. Now, it is two-thirds.

I had another agricultural interest in the office. They said that 5 years ago, 5 percent of their business was export.

They did not use the Export-Import Bank. They began using it, and it is now 50 percent.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, let us remember that there are 60 developed nations on the face of the Earth, and if we allow our Export-Import Bank to expire, we will be the only one on the face of the planet without an export credit authority.

Let me tell you, China is rubbing their hands in anticipation because, in addition to Airbus—remember, we are 2 to 8 years away from China manufacturing a wide-body airplane. They can't wait for the Export-Import Bank to expire so they can capture market share.

Why in the world would we unilaterally disarm? Remember this: We are only 5 percent of the world's population.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HECK of Washington. If we want to keep and grow our middle class, we need to learn how to sell into the growing middle class of the rest of the world, and that requires the Export-Import Bank.

The Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine, a deficit-reducing machine, and a superperformer. The votes are here. It is 190, by the way—not 189—and 58 on that side of the aisle.

There is a part of me, a voice in me that wants to shout: Let my people go. The votes are here. It is not scheduled for a hearing. Let Mr. HASTINGS offer his amendment. Let's reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind Members we are talking about the EPA today, a job-destroying agency.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I appreciate my friend and colleague from the Rules Committee yielding me time to speak on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak on the rule for H.R. 1030 and H.R. 1029 because I think, frankly, it fits into what I have just been hearing, but I think it fits in sort of maybe a perverse way, but also a very good way, because it emphasizes exactly what we need to be talking about here, and that is jobs, that is the economy, that is good growth, that is good government, that is the things that we are supposed to be doing and working on that and finding out why certain things don't get done.

Anybody watching over the last little bit would actually have a concern as to what we are doing, and I think it goes back to a simple understanding that there is a very clear understanding of why and who is offering what amendments and what bills up here. The Republican majority is offering a vision



in which people are empowered in government, not taking the incentives away.

I think it was summed up very well in a statement just the other day from the administration that actually said that their definition, if you will, of a burdensome regulation was something that burdened the employees of a government agency.

I think it is very clear from our perspective that what is a burdensome regulation is something that burdens American businesses and burdens the scientific communities and burdens those in which government is putting its finger on and stifling. There is a big difference here. All you have to do is watch what is said and watch what is done, and you will begin to see that.

I will not be supporting, as we go back to these bills, all the amendments made in order under this rule. I am still pleased that we, as a House, are considering them as we come to the floor and also that the House will ultimately work its will.

One of the key differences highlighted is in how we as conservatives and others in this body look at H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle in the committee markup of this legislation argued that "this marks a radical departure from longstanding practices."

I hope this is the case, for these acclaimed "longstanding practices" have favored interest group agendas over scientific integrity, back rooms over public participation, and sacrificed transparency and openness at the altar of political expediency.

Conservatives in this body believe that Congress should not tolerate an administration who refuses to make public the scientific data behind numerous EPA regulations, regulations that are crippling the ability of businesses to survive in this economic climate created and sustained by the failed policies of this administration.

This administration issued a statement of opposition, as I just talked about a moment ago, saying that underlying measures in these bills would be "burdensome" on the government. I think if our Founders were hearing this today, they would stand up and say: That is not what we intended.

Read the document. The document said a limited, structured government that supports the people, that supports our welfare, and supports the cause of the United States of America, not in a form in which government is the problem in finding out these problems and keeping from areas in a scientific community, in the business community.

There is a clear, distinct difference here. What is burdensome on government is what then turns around and becomes burdensome on the American people. You see, conservatives in Congress try to streamline and reform our

regulatory system, ensure that cost and benefits of regulations are analyzed before it is implemented, and we are told that that is burdensome.

While the conservatives are being criticized for burdensome reforms, they are also, at the same time, pushing through \$181.5 billion in regulations just last year.

Apparently, the administration has redefined burdensome to mean something that most do not. It is just another example of a disconnect.

Now, what is often said at this point is that conservatives and Republicans don't want clean water. They want to destroy the environmental integrity. They want bad air and poor traffic control and maybe everything else in the world that you want to say because there is a belief that government will fix all that.

There is a proper role for government, but in this environment, let's have transparency, let's have openness, let's have public participation. Let's not keep stuff away from the American people. That is what they are asking for. That is what they expect from their government.

Instead of marginalizing the honest debate about science and being about scientific enterprise, instead of saying that they are for something that nobody is for, let's be honest about the legislation.

If you don't really want to talk about the legislation, let's talk about everything else in the world. That is a good way to distract. We don't want to talk about a process that is broken. We will talk about something else.

No, it is not going to happen this time. I agree with the previous speaker. Let my people go. Let my people go. Let the government be open. Let the government be transparent.

Let the government be limited so that the American people are not limited, the American people have all they need, and that is the purpose of these bills.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am always fascinated when our colleagues come to the floor of this great deliberative body and argue against government. The last time I looked, all 435 plus 6 of us and the 100 United States Senators sought public office to be involved in making government better.

□ 1315

The government is the people of the United States. And it is not only the respective agencies; it is also our counties, our parishes, our districts, our cities that are the government. When we say that, it makes it sound as if the government is bad, and defense is the only entity that all of us agree is our responsibility.

But yes, clean water is our responsibility, and, yes, emissions that cause

harm to the environment and to individuals are our mission. Those are responsibilities of government.

Yes, air traffic control is a responsibility of government. Yes, the way our roads are undertaken, or the repair of bridges, yes, that is the government.

So I have a lot of trouble with an antigovernment attitude when, in fact, we are just being anti-ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, we know that science is the formation of conclusions upon a foundation of testable observation. Sometimes mistakes are made, and they can be construed as valuable because you learn what not to do the next time.

Government, for example, operated NASA and still has some role in that, and many of the experiments that were failed experiments led to us understanding how to develop the microwave and how to develop scientific heart devices that have benefited the American people. Yes, that was the government.

But this Republican-caused crisis was resolved in the same way it was a few weeks back, the same way it was resolved the last time the Republicans shut down the government. It was resolved on the backs of Democrats.

When the other party decides to work with the Democratic Party, the American people benefit from its government, and we saw evidence of that in the Homeland Security financing measure.

Given how often we find ourselves in similar situations, I can't help but wonder what hypothesis my friends are trying to test. I do not think that seeing how far our security and economic stability can bend before breaking is what is meant by "the great American experiment."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule that is going nowhere fast, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

First off, I want to bring us back to the issue at hand today; that, is the rule for consideration of H.R. 1029 and H.R. 1030.

H.R. 1029 protects jobs by helping to ensure that important scientific advice is balanced and unbiased. The bill promotes public participation and encourages the Science Advisory Board to draw on State and private sector expertise, fairly simple concepts.

H.R. 1030 is a transparency bill that simply asks the EPA to show its work

before implementing regulations that cost billions of dollars and destroy jobs. Transparency and reproducibility are basic tenets of science. Costly environmental regulations should only be based on data that are available to independent scientists and to the public.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, if the EPA has nothing to hide, then there is no good reason to keep this data from the American people.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of the two important bills to provide for an open and transparent rulemaking at the Environmental Protection Agency. I certainly thank the authors for their thoughtful legislation. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 138 OFFERED BY  
MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R.1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that

"the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution, if ordered, and suspending the rules and passing H.R. 1191.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 181, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 116]

#### YEAS—232

Abraham	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Aderholt	Griffith	Pearce
Allen	Grothman	Perry
Amash	Guinta	Pittenger
Amodei	Guthrie	Pitts
Babin	Hanna	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hardy	Poliquin
Barr	Harper	Pompeo
Barton	Harris	Posey
Benishek	Hartzler	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Blackburn	Hill	Ribble
Blum	Holding	Rice (SC)
Bost	Huelskamp	Rigell
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brat	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney (FL)
Buck	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Burgess	Jolly	Rothfus
Byrne	Jones	Rouzer
Calvert	Jordan	Royce
Carter (GA)	Joyce	Russell
Carter (TX)	Katko	Ryan (WI)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Scalise
Clawson (FL)	King (NY)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kinzinger (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kline	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Knight	Shimkus
Comstock	Labrador	Shuster
Conaway	LaMalfa	Simpson
Cook	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Costello (PA)	Lance	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Long	Stefanik
Culberson	Loudermilk	Stewart
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Stutzman
Denham	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Dent	MacArthur	Thornberry
DeSantis	Marchant	Tiberi
DesJarlais	Marino	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Trott
Dold	McCarthy	Turner
Duffy	McCauley	Upton
Duncan (SC)	McClintock	Valadao
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Wagner
Ellmers (NC)	McMorris	Walberg
Emmer (MN)	Rodgers	Walden
Farenthold	McSally	Walker
Fincher	Meadows	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Walters, Mimi
Fleischmann	Messer	Weber (TX)
Fleming	Mica	Webster (FL)
Flores	Miller (FL)	Wenstrup
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Westerman
Fortenberry	Moolenaar	Westmoreland
Fox	Mooney (WV)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Mulvaney	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Gibbs	Neugebauer	Womack
Gibson	Newhouse	Woodall
Gohmert	Noem	Yoder
Goodlatte	Nugent	Yoho
Gosar	Nunes	Young (IA)
Gowdy	Olson	Young (IN)
Granger	Palazzo	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Palmer	

#### NAYS—181

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Bustos
Aguilar	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Ashford	Bonamici	Capps
Bass	Boyle, Brendan	Capuano
Beatty	F.	Cardenas
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Carney
Bera	Brown (FL)	Carson (IN)
Beyer	Brownley (CA)	Cartwright

Castro (FL) Honda  
 Castro (TX) Hoyer  
 Chu, Judy Huffman  
 Cicilline Israel  
 Clark (MA) Jackson Lee  
 Clarke (NY) Jeffries  
 Clay Johnson (GA)  
 Cleaver Johnson, E. B.  
 Clyburn Kaptur  
 Cohen Keating  
 Connolly Kelly (IL)  
 Cooper Kennedy  
 Costa Kildee  
 Courtney Kilmer  
 Crowley Kind  
 Cuellar Kirkpatrick  
 Cummings Kuster  
 Davis (CA) Langevin  
 Davis, Danny Larsen (WA)  
 DeFazio Larson (CT)  
 DeGette Lawrence  
 Delaney Lee  
 DeLauro Levin  
 DelBene Lieu, Ted  
 DeSaulnier Lipinski  
 Deutch Loeb sack  
 Dingell Lofgren  
 Doggett Lowenthal  
 Doyle, Michael Lowey  
 F. Lujan Grisham  
 Duckworth (NM)  
 Edwards Luján, Ben Ray  
 Ellison (NM)  
 Engel Lynch  
 Eshoo Maloney,  
 Esty Carolyn  
 Farr Maloney, Sean  
 Fattah Matsui  
 Foster McCollum  
 Frankel (FL) McDermott  
 Fudge McGovern  
 Gabbard McNeerney  
 Gallego Meeks  
 Garamendi Meng  
 Graham Moore  
 Grayson Moulton  
 Green, Al Murphy (FL)  
 Green, Gene Nadler  
 Grijalva Napolitano  
 Gutiérrez Neal  
 Hahn Nolan  
 Hastings Norcross  
 Heck (WA) O'Rourke  
 Higgins Pallone  
 Himes Pascrell

## NOT VOTING—19

Collins (GA) Lummis  
 Conyers McKinley  
 Graves (MO) Payne  
 Hinojosa Roskam  
 Hudson Rush  
 Hurt (VA) Sanford  
 Lewis Schock

□ 1348

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. DEGETTE, ESTY, and CLARKE of New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 116 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. HURT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote No. 116, ordering the Previous Question on H. Res. 138. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 180, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 117]

## AYES—236

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Ashford  
 Babin  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Benishek  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Buchson  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Clawson (FL)  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Crenshaw  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dold  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers (NC)  
 Emmer (MN)  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Garrett  
 Gibbs  
 Gibson  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger

Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd (TX)  
 Hurt (VA)  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jolly  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Joyce  
 Katko  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 Knight  
 Labrador  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latta  
 LoBiondo  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 MacArthur  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo

Adams  
 Aguilar  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Becerra  
 Bera  
 Beyer  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cárdenas  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 DeSaulnier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Duckworth  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge

## NOT VOTING—16

Coffman  
 Conyers  
 Graves (MO)  
 Hinojosa  
 Hudson  
 Lummis

□ 1355

So the resolution was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 117, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

## PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIRE-FIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). The unfinished business is the

vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 118]

YEAS—415

Abraham	Coffman	Fudge
Adams	Cohen	Gabbard
Aderholt	Cole	Gallego
Aguilar	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Allen	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Amash	Comstock	Gibbs
Amodei	Conaway	Gibson
Ashford	Connolly	Gohmert
Babin	Cook	Goodlatte
Barletta	Cooper	Gosar
Barr	Costa	Gowdy
Barton	Costello (PA)	Graham
Bass	Courtney	Granger
Beatty	Cramer	Graves (GA)
Becerra	Crawford	Graves (LA)
Benishek	Crenshaw	Grayson
Bera	Crowley	Green, Al
Beyer	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Bilirakis	Culberson	Griffith
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Grijalva
Bishop (MI)	Curbelo (FL)	Grothman
Bishop (UT)	Davis (CA)	Guinta
Black	Davis, Danny	Guthrie
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Gutiérrez
Blum	DeFazio	Hahn
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hanna
Bonamici	Delaney	Hardy
Bost	DeLauro	Harper
Boustany	DelBene	Harris
Boyle, Brendan	Denham	Hartzler
F.	Dent	Heck (NV)
Brady (PA)	DeSantis	Heck (WA)
Brady (TX)	DeSaulnier	Hensarling
Brat	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Bridenstine	Deutch	Hice, Jody B.
Brooks (AL)	Diaz-Balart	Higgins
Brooks (IN)	Dingell	Hill
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Himes
Brownley (CA)	Dold	Holding
Buchanan	Doyle, Michael	Honda
Buck	F.	Hoyer
Bucshon	Duckworth	Huelskamp
Burgess	Duffy	Huffman
Bustos	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Butterfield	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Byrne	Edwards	Hunter
Calvert	Ellison	Hurd (TX)
Capps	Ellmers (NC)	Hurt (VA)
Capuano	Emmer (MN)	Israel
Cárdenas	Engel	Issa
Carney	Eshoo	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	Esty	Jeffries
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (TX)	Farr	Jenkins (WV)
Cartwright	Fattah	Johnson (GA)
Castor (FL)	Fincher	Johnson (OH)
Castro (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, E. B.
Chabot	Fleischmann	Johnson, Sam
Chaffetz	Fleming	Jolly
Chu, Judy	Flores	Jones
Cicilline	Forbes	Jordan
Clark (MA)	Fortenberry	Joyce
Clarke (NY)	Foster	Kaptur
Clawson (FL)	Foxo	Katko
Clay	Frankel (FL)	Keating
Cleaver	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (IL)
Clyburn	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)

Kennedy	Nadler	Scott, David
Kildee	Napolitano	Sensenbrenner
Kilmer	Neal	Serrano
Kind	Neugebauer	Sessions
King (IA)	Newhouse	Sewell (AL)
King (NY)	Noem	Sherman
Kinziger (IL)	Nolan	Shimkus
Kirkpatrick	Norcross	Shuster
Kline	Nugent	Simpson
Knight	Nunes	Sinema
Kuster	O'Rourke	Sires
Labrador	Olson	Slaughter
LaMalfa	Palazzo	Smith (MO)
Lamborn	Pallone	Smith (NE)
Lance	Palmer	Smith (NJ)
Langevin	Pascrell	Smith (TX)
Larsen (WA)	Paulsen	Speier
Larson (CT)	Pearce	Stefanik
Latta	Pelosi	Stewart
Lawrence	Perlmutter	Stivers
Lee	Perry	Stutzman
Levin	Peters	Swalwell (CA)
Lewis	Peterson	Takai
Lieu, Ted	Pingree	Takano
Lipinski	Pittenger	Thompson (CA)
LoBiondo	Pitts	Thompson (MS)
Loeback	Pocan	Thompson (PA)
Lofgren	Poe (TX)	Thornberry
Long	Poliquin	Tiberi
Loudermilk	Polis	Tipton
Love	Pompeo	Titus
Lowenthal	Posey	Tonko
Lowey	Price (NC)	Torres
Lucas	Price, Tom	Trott
Luetkemeyer	Quigley	Tsongas
Lujan Grisham	Rangel	Turner
(NM)	Ratcliffe	Upton
Luján, Ben Ray	Reed	Valadao
(NM)	Reichert	Van Hollen
Lynch	Renacci	Vargas
MacArthur	Ribble	Veasey
Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Velázquez
Carolyn	Rice (SC)	Visclosky
Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Wagner
Marchant	Rigell	Walberg
Marino	Roby	Walden
Massie	Roe (TN)	Walker
Matsui	Rogers (AL)	Walorski
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Walters, Mimi
McCaul	Rohrabacher	Walz
McClintock	Rokita	Wasserman
McCollum	Rooney (FL)	Schultz
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters, Maxine
McGovern	Ross	Watson Coleman
McHenry	Rothfus	Weber (TX)
McMorris	Rouzer	Webster (FL)
Rodgers	Roybal-Allard	Welch
McNerney	Royce	Wenstrup
McSally	Ruiz	Westerman
Meadows	Ruppersberger	Westmoreland
Meehan	Russell	Whitfield
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Williams
Meng	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (FL)
Messer	Salmon	Wilson (SC)
Mica	Sánchez, Linda	Wittman
Miller (FL)	T.	Womack
Miller (MI)	Sanchez, Loretta	Woodall
Moolenaar	Sarbanes	Yarmuth
Mooney (WV)	Scalise	Yoder
Moore	Schakowsky	Yoho
Moulton	Schiff	Young (IA)
Mullin	Schrader	Young (IN)
Murphy (FL)	Schweikert	Zeldin
Murphy (PA)	Scott (VA)	Zinke

NOT VOTING—17

Conyers	McKinley	Schock
Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Scott, Austin
Hastings	Payne	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	Roskam	Vela
Hudson	Rush	Young (AK)
Lummis	Sanford	

□ 1402

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on the final vote results for rollcall vote No. 118 that took place on March 17, 2015, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1191.

#### EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD REFORM ACT OF 2015

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1029.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 138 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1029.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1404

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1029) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Chairman SMITH and former Environment Subcommittee Chairs Harris, Stewart, and Schweikert for their hard work on this important piece of legislation. I also want to thank my friend Representative PETERSON for making this bill a bipartisan effort. I appreciate his willingness to sponsor this bill with me.

This is a good government bill. It reflects the values we should uphold, regardless of which side of the political aisle we are on.

In western Oklahoma, we are no strangers to regulatory overreach from the Environmental Protection Agency. Farmers, ranchers, and small businesses often find themselves the target of burdensome and simply inefficient regulations.

These regulations range from something as specific as farm fuel tank requirements to vastly prohibitive restrictions on electric power plants that power our homes.

Government intrusion into America's energy and agricultural sectors reverberate into our everyday lives in the form of higher food prices or higher monthly energy bills. Stagnant wages and underemployment have only exacerbated the problem for families trying to make ends meet.

The science behind EPA regulations is as important as the money they siphon from our economy. Science and data are invaluable tools in helping us navigate complex policy issues, and when the economic cost of these regulations reaches into tens of millions of dollars, we need to get it right.

H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, ensures that the best experts are free to undertake a balanced and open review of regulatory science.

The Board was established to provide scientific advice to the EPA, to Congress, and to review the quality and relevance of the science that EPA uses for regulations, but in recent years, shortcomings from the process, unfortunately, have arisen.

Opportunities for public participation are limited, an imbalance of viewpoints has been allowed to grow, potential conflicts of interest have gone unchecked, and the ability of the Board to speak independently seemingly has been curtailed. If the EPA undermines the Board's independence or prevents it from providing advice to Congress, the valuable advice these experts can provide is wasted.

Despite the existing requirement that EPA's advisory panels be "fairly balanced in terms of point of view represented," the Science Committee has identified a number of problems that we fear undermine the panel's credibility and work product.

These include:

A number of advisory members have received money from the EPA. This could create an appearance of a conflict of interest.

Some of the panelists have taken public and even political positions on issues they are advising the Board about. For example, a lead reviewer of the EPA's hydraulic fracturing study published an antifracturing article entitled: "Regulate, Baby, Regulate." Now, clearly, this is not an objective point of view and should be publicly disclosed.

Public participation is limited during most Board meetings; interested parties have almost no ability to comment on the scope of the work, and meeting records are often incomplete and hard to obtain.

The EPA routinely excludes State, local, and tribal experts while stacking the review panels with individuals who will give the EPA the answer it wants.

This bill is both proscience and pro-sound science. This bill is founded upon recommendations for reform outlined in the National Academy of Sciences and the EPA's Peer Review Handbook. This bill ensures that the Board is balanced, transparent, and independent, all of which will help prevent the SAB from being manipulated by any group.

H.R. 1029 liberates the Board from EPA—some would say tyranny, but I would prefer to think it empowers the Board to listen to outside expertise. This viewpoint is consistent with the basic ideals of our democracy.

Subject areas such as risk and hazardous assessments often involve the examination and evaluation of some of the most complicated scientific and technical information. These assessments are precisely where the Board's expertise is most needed. The decision to review remains in the hands of the Board, and the EPA must respect the independence of the Board's opportunity to review.

Perhaps, most importantly, this bill seeks to increase public participation that benefits all stakeholders. Currently, valuable opportunities for diverse perspectives are limited. The Federal Government does not have a monopoly on the truth.

The public has important expertise that we can't afford to ignore in a democracy. State, local, tribal, and private sectors have a long history of qualified scientific experts. Their contributions should be taken seriously.

Unfortunately, the history of the SAB shows that private sector representation is often lacking or nonexistent; instead, the EPA picks the Board—ignoring the knowledge, expertise, and contributions of these experts.

This bill ensures that qualified experts are not excluded simply due to their affiliation. This will add value and credibility to future Board reviews.

Mr. PETERSON and I recognize the important role that science should play in our policy debates and provides safeguards to give the public confidence in science. It restores the independent Science Advisory Board as a defender of scientific integrity and will help restore credibility and trust in a Federal agency that has lost much of it.

Disagreements on scientific conclusions shouldn't occur on the House floor, and this legislation will help ensure that the best experts are free to undertake an open review of the EPA's regulatory science.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act.

I want to start by thanking my colleagues, Mr. LUCAS and Chairman

SMITH, for their intention to improve the EPA's Science Advisory Board, and I especially want to thank Chairman SMITH for working with me on other legislation that passed the Science Committee and the House on a bipartisan basis.

Members and staff on both sides of the aisle worked tirelessly last week and, in fact, since the last Congress toward a bipartisan bill about the Science Advisory Board that accommodated much, if not all, of the fundamental principles shared by both Democrats and Republicans.

Unfortunately, we were not able to reach agreement on some very critical provisions by this date. Accordingly, I will be urging my colleagues to vote "no" on the underlying bill before us today.

This bill has not changed meaningfully since we considered it last year, and I stand here today with the same concerns I raised last Congress. My colleagues who support H.R. 1029 may describe this bill as an attempt to strengthen public participation in EPA's scientific review process, improve the process for selecting expert advisers, expand transparency requirements, and limit nonscientific policy advice within the EPA's Science Advisory Board.

All of these are good government principles that I agree with, and if this bill or the bill we considered last year achieved these goals, I would be here ready to support it, but H.R. 1029 would not achieve these good government goals.

Instead of improving the Science Advisory Board structure or operation, the bill will limit the quality of scientific advice the EPA receives and allow seemingly endless delays in EPA's regulatory process.

H.R. 1029 would make it easier for industry representatives to serve on the Board, even if they have a financial conflict of interest. To be clear, I am not opposed to industry experts participating on the Science Advisory Board or in the peer review process at the EPA. Their insight into processes and industry conduct can provide valuable guidance to an advisory body.

That being said, Congress should not be endorsing legislation that undermines longstanding ethics requirements and practices with the end result being an overrepresentation of industry voices on EPA's Science Advisory Board, and this is likely to be the result of the adoption of this bill.

□ 1415

This bill conflates bias with financial conflicts of interest, and it assumes that a simple disclosure will prevent a material interest in an outcome from coloring the judgment and actions of a Board member. Congress should not be supporting legislation that undermines longstanding ethics requirements and

practices that have worked well to ensure fairness and the balance of views on all Federal advisory committees.

Another troubling element of H.R. 1029 is that it would significantly delay the work of the Science Advisory Board. The Board should absolutely seek public comment on the science it is reviewing, and, if necessary, it should extend the duration of the public comment period to ensure that interested parties have ample opportunity to submit their views. With this, we agree.

However, H.R. 1029 takes this process to the extreme by creating unnecessary burdens, including a loophole that could keep the Board from ending the public comment period and that could require that the Board provide written responses to a significant number of comments it receives. H.R. 1029 distorts the important public participation process to create what amounts to an endless appeals process that will provide those who disagree with the EPA an effective tool to halt, derail, or slow the Agency's rulemaking.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD several letters from organizations that have similar concerns with H.R. 1029, including the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Environmental Defense Fund, the National Center for Health Research, the Center for Medical Consumers, the National Physicians Alliance, and others.

MARCH 16, 2015.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015, and H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015. Our organizations are dedicated to saving lives and improving public health.

Science is the bedrock of sound regulatory decision making. The best science underscores everything our organizations do to improve health. We strongly believe in a transparent and open regulatory process. A vital element of research is patient confidentiality. Physicians and researchers have earned the trust of their patients by steadfastly maintaining patient confidentiality. Patient confidentiality is a clear legal and ethical obligation.

The Secret Science Reform Act of 2015 will compel the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to either ignore the best science by prohibiting the agency from considering peer-reviewed research that is based on confidential patient information or force EPA to publicly release confidential patient information, which would violate federal law. This is an untenable outcome that would completely undermine the ability of the EPA to perform its responsibilities under the Clean Air Act and myriad other federal laws. The legislation will not improve EPA's actions; rather, it will stifle public health protections.

The kind of information disclosure envisioned in this legislation exceeds that required by peer-reviewed journals. We believe much of the intent of this legislation is already achieved through the current peer-review process required by all academic journals. The vast majority of peer-reviewed

journals require manuscript authors to register any trial using human subjects with [clinicaltrials.gov](http://clinicaltrials.gov). This public registry collects key information on the study population, research goals and methods that allow outside reviewers and scientists to either challenge or attempt to reproduce study results. Additionally, the peer-review process and publication of results invites the broader scientific community to debate study findings. Trial registry and manuscript publications are only part of the process by which scientific endeavors operate in a transparent environment.

Private organizations, public charities, research universities, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, corporations and many other entities conduct medical research. Many of these organizations compile large longitudinal data sets that track patients over a period of time. These data serve as the basis of many studies that permit epidemiologists to track disease and risk factor information for large patient populations.

The published peer-reviewed information from such data often inform regulatory decision making at the EPA and other federal agencies as well as future research. Not only do these data inform regulatory action, they help inform efforts to educate the public about the magnitude of a disease, risk factors and steps individuals can take to improve their health. In order for EPA to set the most appropriate standards, it must be informed by the best information.

Understanding the impact of air pollution on human health and the magnitude of harm caused by pollution at specific levels helps the agency meet its obligations under the Clean Air Act. Absent these data, it is unclear upon what basis the agency could make sound decisions.

H.R. 1029, The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 will also undermine the scientific basis for EPA policy, specifically by compromising the integrity of the panel that reviews that science. EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) is composed of independent scientific and technical experts who are tasked with evaluating the science and providing advice that EPA uses to inform its decision making. The current law provides for balanced panels and experts with diverse backgrounds.

This legislation would impose a hiring quota on the SAB that would require ten percent of members to be selected for qualifications other than their scientific expertise. This bill will compromise not only the scientific integrity of the SAB, but also its independence, as the quota would open the door for representatives of the regulated industries to serve on the board.

Further, the bill will also, in some cases, prohibit SAB members from participating when their own research is involved—even indirectly. This requirement could block participation of the “best and the brightest” researchers in a particular field at the very time their expertise is needed to accurately inform the regulatory process.

Finally, the SAB is currently governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act and already has a public comment system in place. H.R. 1029 would add on the burdensome requirement that the SAB respond to individual comments in writing, a requirement that could be so time-consuming as to render the board unable to carry out its function.

We urge the U.S. House of Representatives to stand up for sound science and public

health protections, and vote NO on both H.R. 1030 and H.R. 1029.

Sincerely,

HAROLD WIMMER,  
National President &  
CEO, American  
Lung Association,

GEORGES C. BENJAMIN, MD,  
Executive Director,  
American Public  
Health Association,

JEFFREY LEVI, PhD,  
Executive Director,  
Trust for America's  
Health,

STEPHEN C. CRANE, PhD,  
MPH,  
Executive Director,  
American Thoracic  
Society,

TONYA WINDERS,  
President & CEO, Al-  
lergy & Asthma Net-  
work.

MARCH 16, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters we strongly urge you to oppose the “Secret Science Reform Act of 2015” (HR), the “EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015”. Collectively, these misleadingly named bills would radically diminish EPA's ability to protect public health. Under these bills, EPA would be required to ignore significant science; the Scientific Advisory Board would be required to ignore conflicts of interest; and enforcement officials would be required to ignore pollution emitted in violation of the law. These bills are broadly written and would have damaging impacts far in excess of what their sponsors will admit.

The “Secret Science Reform Act is based on a faulty premise. Its notion of “secret science,” based on claims about studies of fine soot pollution conducted almost two decades ago, is unfounded despite lengthy congressional inquiries. The bill would deny EPA the ability to rely upon peer-reviewed medical studies that involve commitments to patient confidentiality, when the agency carries out its statutory responsibilities to safeguard public health and the environment. Further, this bill would effectively amend numerous environmental statutes by forbidding EPA to use certain kinds of studies in setting health standards. It would also make it impossible for EPA to use many kinds of economic models it routinely relies on because those models are proprietary. This marks a radical departure from longstanding practices. Its end result would be to make it much more difficult to protect the public by forcing EPA to ignore key scientific studies.

Science Advisory Board bill would attack EPA's scientific process in a different way. The worst provision would mandate allowing the participation of scientists with financial conflicts of interest, as long as those conflicts are disclosed. This is inconsistent with a set of nearly universally accepted scientific principles to eliminate or limit financial conflicts. This bill would significantly weaken the content and credibility of the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) reviews—a textbook example of making a government program function poorly to the benefit of polluting industries and at the expense of public health and independent science. The bill will add unnecessary new burdens on the SAB, distorting its mission and altering its process with no benefit to EPA or the public. The bill also significantly broadens the scope of the SAB and creates a comment process

that will add needless delay to the Board's work. The result would be further stalling and undermining of important public health, safety, and environmental protections.

This legislation will obstruct the implementation and enforcement of critical environmental statutes, undermine the EPA's ability to consider and use science, and jeopardize public health. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose these bills.

Sincerely,

BlueGreen Alliance; Center for Effective Government; Clean Water Action; Defenders of Wildlife; Earthjustice; Environmental Defense Fund; Friends of the Earth; Greenpeace; League of Conservation Voters; Natural Resources Defense Council; Physicians for Social Responsibility; Sierra Club; Union of Concerned Scientists.

MARCH 2, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned individuals and organizations working on public health and science-informed regulation strongly oppose the H.R. 1029 the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 and H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015, to be considered by the House of Representatives this week.

Both bills would severely undermine the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to use the best available scientific evidence when making decisions regarding the protection of public health and safety and the environment.

When very similar bills were up for a vote in the House last November, the Administration issued veto threats for both bills. The Administration stated that the Secret Science Reform Act would "greatly impede the EPA's ability to use science to protect public health and the environment," and warned that the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would "weaken the scientific independence and integrity of the SAB."

The erroneously named Secret Science Reform Act would tie the EPA's hands by restricting the information it can use to develop protective regulations. The EPA could only regulate based on publicly available scientific data. This restriction would block the agency's use of many different types of public health data, such as those for which public release would violate privacy protections, or data from corporations that are designated as confidential business information. It also would restrict the use of scientific data that is not "reproducible." This provision seems to adopt a very narrow view of scientific information solely based on laboratory experiments. As major scientific societies including the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) have noted, such a restriction would eliminate the use of most epidemiological and public health data, such as those regarding the public health impacts of air pollution, because these data are collected in long-term studies following individuals longitudinally.

Not only do privacy concerns arise, but such studies are not inherently reproduced in the way a laboratory experiment or a clinical trial may be. It would be unethical to deliberately expose adults or children to air pollution merely to determine whether the increased rates of asthma and heart attacks caused by such exposures can be duplicated, or to encourage teenagers to smoke to re-assess the toxic effects of tobacco.

The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would greatly weaken the EPA's advisory process, making it far more likely that

recommendations from its independent Science Advisory Board (SAB) will be dominated by corporate special interests. This bill opens the door to increased corporate influence on the Board, by encouraging the EPA to accept more SAB panelists with corporate ties.

The bill's overly broad restriction on SAB members with subject-matter expertise is equally counterproductive, and goes far beyond the common-sense limits imposed by the National Academies. Unlike the 2014 bill, the 2015 bill does appear to permit SAB experts with published, peer-reviewed research, to address those topics on which they have credentials, provided that their expertise is publicly disclosed. But the language in the bill is so vague that it raises many questions. Generally, experts have developed their knowledge base over time, and not purely through peer-reviewed publications. How is an expert supposed to make that distinction? What happens if a scientist relies on expertise that is not specifically permitted in the bill? Will there be legal ramifications? Clearly, scientific experts will think twice before joining the SAB if it means they will have to consult their lawyers before they give advice.

Even worse, the bill requires the SAB to remain in an endless loop soliciting public comment about the "state of the science" touching on every major advisory activity it undertakes and responding to nearly every comment before moving forward, without being limited by any time constraints. At best, the SAB will be reduced to busy work. At worst, the SAB's assessments will address the concerns of corporations, not the desires of citizens for science-informed regulation that protects public health.

These bills together will greatly impede the ability of EPA, and potentially other agencies, to utilize the best available science, independently reviewed, to inform regulations crucial to public health and the environment.

We strongly urge you to vote No on The Secret Science Reform Act and the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act.

Sincerely,

Center for Science and Democracy at the Union of Concerned Scientists; Annie Appleseed Project; Breast Cancer Action; Center for Medical Consumers; Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies; Jacobs Institute of Women's Health; National Center for Health Research; National Physicians Alliance; Our Bodies Ourselves; Public Citizen; Woodymatters; John H. Powers, MD, Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine; The George Washington University School of Medicine; University of Maryland School of Medicine.

UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS,

March 2, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Union of Concerned Scientists strongly opposes H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015, set to be voted on by the House of Representatives this week. This bill would greatly impede the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to protect public health informed by the best available science.

Last November, when a similar bill was up before the House, the Administration threatened a veto. The Administration noted that the 2014 bill "would negatively affect the appointment of experts and would weaken the scientific independence and integrity of the SAB." That observation continues to hold true for the 2015 version.

This proposal would make it nearly impossible for the Board to do the crucial independent evaluations of EPA scientific analyses that enable the agency to protect public health. This bill opens the door for more corporate influence on the Board, because the bill directly stipulates that experts with financial ties to corporations affected by SAB assessments are "not excluded." This signal likely will increase the number of conflicted SAB panelists empowering companies to delay the SAB's work for years, if not decades. It strikes at the heart of the whole concept of independent reviews, and at a time when the ability of corporations to influence policy is already high.

At the same time this bill encourages corporate experts to join the SAB, it creates roadblocks for academic experts to meaningfully participate by banning experts' participation in "advisory activities that directly or indirectly involve review and evaluation of their own work." This effectively turns the idea of conflict of interest on its head, with the bizarre presumption that corporate experts with direct financial interests are not conflicted while academics who work on these issues are.

The notion that a member of the SAB cannot fully participate in a discussion that cites the member's own work is counterproductive and goes far beyond the common-sense limits imposed by the National Academies.

Unlike the 2014 bill, the 2015 bill does appear to permit SAB experts with published, peer-reviewed research, to address those topics on which they have credentials, provided that their expertise is publicly disclosed. But the language in the bill is so vague that it raises many questions. Generally, experts have developed their knowledge base over time, and not purely through peer-reviewed publications. How is an academic scientist supposed to make that distinction? What happens if a scientist relies on expertise that is not specifically permitted in the bill? Will there be legal ramifications? Clearly, scientific experts will think twice before joining the SAB if it means they will have to consult their lawyers before they give advice.

While hamstringing experts, the bill offers almost limitless opportunities for "public comment," opportunities that only benefit moneyed special interests. For example, for each major advisory activity, the Board must convene a public information-gathering session "to discuss the state of the science" related to that activity.

It is possible, under this requirement, that the Board may find itself repeatedly reexamining "the state of the science" on climate change or the harmful effects of certain toxins—each time it made an assessment that touched on either climate change impacts or reducing air pollution.

In addition, both the EPA, before it asks for the Board's advice, and the Board itself, would be required to "accept, consider, and address" public comments on the agency's questions to the Board. As the SAB deliberates, it must also encourage public comments "that shall not be limited by an insufficient or arbitrary time restriction." In effect, these provisions turn a scientific evaluation into a public hearing, even though EPA must already accept public input on all its regulations.

The Board is required to respond in writing to each "significant" comment. In practice, it is difficult to see how the Board could impose any deadlines on accepting comment. Nor is it a reasonable expectation on the Board's membership of pro bono experts.



Last year, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that implementing the law's mandates would cost the EPA about \$2 million over a four-year period. These are funds that could be put to much better use by a cash-strapped agency.

This bill would not improve the work of the Board, and would make it more difficult for the EPA to receive the independent science advice it needs to do its work. We strongly urge your opposition.

Sincerely,

ANDREW A. ROSENBERG, PH.D.,  
*Director, Center for Science and  
Democracy,  
Union of Concerned Scientists.*

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, our government's ability to protect public health is at stake when we consider legislation like the bill before us today. Unfortunately, we do not have to look far to see the impacts of these kinds of delay tactics. Articles published last year by the Center for Public Integrity chronicle efforts to slow down and to undermine the EPA's efforts to keep arsenic out of drinking water and benzene out of American workplaces. When we prevent the EPA from taking timely action to protect the public from known poisons and cancer-causing agents, we are putting lives at risk.

The EPA's science is tied to its mission—to protect public health and the environment through rational regulation. Scientific research, knowledge, and technical expertise are fundamental to the EPA's mission and inform its regulatory functions. The need for that expertise is why Congress created advisory bodies such as the Science Advisory Board in the first place—to provide independent advice on the science underpinning regulation, which, in turn, allows the EPA Administrator to make sound regulatory decisions. Instead of undermining the scientific advice the EPA receives, we should be giving the Agency the tools it needs to strengthen and improve the regulatory process with sound science.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me, once again, in opposing this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD letters from the American Farm Bureau, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and from other entities that are in support of H.R. 1029.

MARCH 2, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH, CHAIRMAN,  
*House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), the nation's largest general farm organization, I am writing in support of H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015. AFBF strongly supports this legislation and is committed to working with you in pressing for its swift consideration.

The Science Advisory Board (SAB) is intended to review the scientific basis for EPA

regulatory decisions, but shortcomings have become clear including limited public participation, EPA interference with expert advice, and potential conflicts of interest.

H.R. 1029 reforms the SAB process by strengthening public participation, improving the process of selecting expert advisors, reducing conflicts of interest and enhancing transparency. The legislation draws from EPA's own Peer Review Handbook and recommendations from the Bipartisan Policy Center to urge sensible reforms. H.R. 1029 would make the SAB a more robust tool that in the future would impact the development of flawed EPA action such as the recent WOWS proposed rule.

American Farm Bureau Federation supports H.R. 1029 because farmers and ranchers deserve good governance and regulations based on meaningful scientific review.

This legislation deserves strong, bipartisan support. We applaud your leadership in this effort and will continue to work with you to ensure passage of H.R. 1029.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,  
*President.*

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*Washington, DC, February 26, 2015.*

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, supports H.R. 1029, the "EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015," and H.R. 1030, the "Secret Science Reform Act of 2015."

H.R. 1029 would help ensure that the Science Advisory Board (SAB), which directly counsels the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on scientific and technical issues, is unbiased and transparent in performing its duties. This bill would establish requirements that SAB members are qualified experts, that conflicts of interest and sources of bias are disclosed, that the views of members—including dissenting members—are available to the public, and that the public has the opportunity to participate in the advisory activities of the Board and view EPA's responses. Because EPA relies on SAB reviews and studies to support new regulations, standards, guidance, assessments of risk, and other actions, the actions of the SAB must be transparent and accountable. This is a critical safeguard to assure the public that the data federal agencies rely on is scientifically sound and unbiased.

H.R. 1030 would improve the transparency and reliability of scientific and technical information that federal agencies rely heavily upon by to support new regulatory actions. This bill is designed to ensure that the studies and data federal agencies cite when they write new regulations, standards, guidance, assessments of risk—or take other regulatory action—are clearly identified and made available for public review. Additionally, information must be sufficiently transparent to allow study findings to be reproduced and validated. This is a critical safeguard to assure the public that the data federal agencies rely on is scientifically sound and unbiased.

These bills would improve the transparency and trustworthiness of scientific and technical information agencies rely on to

justify regulatory actions that can significantly affect society. The American public must have confidence that the scientific and technical data driving regulatory action can be trusted. Accordingly, the Chamber supports H.R. 1029 and H.R. 1030.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN,  
*Executive Vice President Government Affairs.*

THE CENTER FOR  
REGULATORY SOLUTIONS,  
*Feb. 25, 2015.*

[Press Release]

CRS WELCOMES BIPARTISAN EFFORTS TO  
MAKE EPA SCIENCE MORE TRANSPARENT

WASHINGTON, DC.—Yesterday, Congressional leaders from both parties announced bold steps to rein in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which has been imposing costs and red tape on American small businesses, all while refusing to disclose the science the agency uses to justify their mandates. The Center for Regulatory Solutions (CRS) applauded two bills that were introduced on February 24, which specifically target EPA's long standing failure to be transparent regarding the science behind the agency's ozone regulation. The House Science, Space and Technology Committee has scheduled votes on both bills for this afternoon.

"Today I applaud Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress for introducing legislation designed to ensure EPA is transparent with the American public when it comes to their justification for imposing costly regulations," CRS President Karen Kerrigan stated. "The ozone rule could be EPA's most expensive rule in history. Given the enormity of the costs and impact of this regulation, why shouldn't the EPA be transparent with Congress and the American people about the science used to justify their decisions? Sadly, it appears that small businesses and their workforce may be picking up the tab for the Obama EPA's costly, secret, and political agenda."

#### BACKGROUND

The timing of these bills could not be better as EPA is hard at work crafting the most expensive regulation ever promulgated by the agency, the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for Ozone, to be issued in late 2015. EPA itself estimated Ozone NAAQS would cost the economy as much as \$90 billion annually, but other estimates put the price tag closer to \$270 billion annually and as much as \$3.4 trillion from 2017 to 2040. The proposed regulation is so far-reaching in its impact that President Obama put the rule on hold in 2011 out of fear it would hurt his reelection chances and the economy.

The Administration contends the health benefits would far outweigh the costs—but here's the catch—EPA calculates the benefits based on hidden science. If enacted, the legislation would stop EPA from relying on secret science to justify new job killing regulations and would allow independent scientists the opportunity to examine EPA's claims.

The first bill, the "Secret Science Reform Act" was introduced by Senator John Barasso (R-Wyo.) and House Science, Space, and Technology Committee Chairman Lamar Smith (R-Texas). The bill is necessary because EPA has repeatedly refused to comply with Congressional requests to publicly disclose the data from two important health studies. These aren't just any studies. They are the taxpayer-funded "Harvard Six Cities

Study” and the “Cancer Prevention Study” (including recent updates), which relied on data that remains inaccessible to the public. This means other scientists, independent from the EPA, are unable to verify the studies’ conclusions. Accordingly—we are left to simply trust EPA that its benefits claims are based on reality.

In addition, Senator John Boozman (R-Ark.) and Joe Manchin (D-W.V.) introduced bipartisan legislation called the “Science Advisory Board Reform Act” to promote fairness, transparency, and independence within EPA’s science advisory boards so that EPA relies only on unbiased scientific advice. This is important because as CRS previously pointed out the Clean Air Science Advisory Committee (CASAC) recommended EPA set more burdensome standards for ozone, while ignoring the legal requirement to report on the costs of implementing stricter standards. Ignoring a \$90 billion annual price tag is no mere oversight. Rather it clearly demonstrates CASAC’s pro regulatory bias.

CRS strongly supports both legislative efforts, which would allow needed insight into the science behind costly regulations that have a real impact on the daily lives of Americans across the country, and the survivability and competitiveness of small businesses. As a survey conducted by CRS found last year, 72 percent of Americans believe that regulations are created “in a closed, secretive process.” Moving forward with this important legislation would be a significant step toward addressing that disconnect and promoting transparency.

AMERICAN COMPOSITES MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,

Arlington, VA, February 27, 2015.

Re Please support H.R. 1029, The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the approximately 3,000 small and medium-sized U.S. companies that manufacture composite products such as wind turbine blades, pollution control equipment, auto and truck components, rebar for highway bridges, and recreational boats, I write in support of H.R. 1029, The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015.

EPA’s reviews of the environmental and health effects possibly associated with exposure to industrial chemicals, including the substances used by composites manufacturers, can help manufacturers protect the health of employees and plant communities. But if EPA’s chemical health risk assessments are not based on careful and thorough reviews of quality scientific data, the viability of manufacturers can be compromised without providing any public health benefit.

H.R. 1029 will make several changes to improve the effectiveness of the Science Advisory Board (SAB) as it assesses and provides feedback to EPA on the quality of its chemical health reviews. The legislation will increase the ability of informed stakeholders to provide information to the SAB, and allow what may be the minority views of individual SAB members to be considered by EPA as it revises draft chemical assessments.

These and the other reforms required under H.R. 1029 will improve both the scientific quality of EPA reviews and the public’s confidence in EPA’s chemical assessment process. These improvements will in turn improve the ability of our industry’s small business owners and plant managers to rely on EPA assessments to guide the adoption of health-protective measures for workers and plant neighbors.

Thank you for your support of good science and the composites industry.

Sincerely,

TOM DOBBINS,  
President,

AMERICAN FUEL & PETROCHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS,

Washington, DC, March 16, 2015.

Re Letter in Support of H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 and H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
Minority Leader, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: The American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers (AFPM), a national trade association representing more than 400 companies, including a majority of all U.S. refiners and petrochemical manufacturers, would like to express its support for the passage of H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 and H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015. These two measures would provide more clarity on how decisions are reached by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and bring more transparency to the science that supports EPA regulations.

The United States is on the verge of a manufacturing renaissance due to a surge in oil and natural gas production that will strengthen U.S. energy security, create jobs and grow the economy. However, the manufacturing renaissance is being threatened by overly burdensome regulations from the EPA. While AFPM supports commonsense regulations, there is a severe lack of transparency in EPA’s science and advisory panels, which serve as the basis for new regulations. This lack of transparency is making it more difficult for manufacturers to capitalize on America’s abundance of economical and reliable energy.

EPA’s Science Advisory Board (SAB) is charged with reviewing the scientific foundation of EPA regulatory decisions and advising EPA on science and technology related matters. Currently, SAB’s practice of determining panels is conducted behind closed doors by EPA SAB staff. This practice has created a conflict of interest, which has resulted in the panel embedding their own policy views in their science recommendations, as well as peer reviewing their own work. The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act brings much needed reform to the SAB by strengthening public participation and public comment opportunities, improving the make-up of the SAB, requiring opportunities for dissenting panelists to express their opinions, and limiting non-scientific policy advice and recommendations.

Moreover, the research and data used by EPA to support new regulations is currently not available to the public. Congress and outside groups should be able to review health benefit claims by the EPA for new Clean Air Act regulations in order to determine if the science supports the high cost of many of these new regulations. The Secret Science Reform Act looks to bring greater transparency to EPA’s research and data. EPA would be prohibited from issuing regulations unless all scientific and technical information relied upon is specifically identified, and would be required to make information publicly available for independent analysis.

We believe it is imperative that EPA use high quality science and provide more clar-

ity and transparency on how decisions are made. This will only strengthen EPA’s value and utility for ensuring public safety, and credibility among manufacturers. Improving the scientific quality and sharing of information, as well as the composition of the SAB is critical to fostering a regulatory environment that will allow manufacturers to develop safe and cost-effective products on which Americans depend for everyday life.

Therefore, AFPM supports and urges immediate passage of H.R. 1029 and H.R. 1030. It is critical that Congress pass legislation that brings more transparency to the science and advisory panels that supports EPA regulations.

Sincerely,

CHARLES T. DREVNA,  
President.

PORTLAND CEMENT ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, March 2, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH, Chairman,  
Committee on Science, Space and Technology,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: The Portland Cement Association (PCA) appreciates your leadership in promoting public policies that encourage transparency and the use of sound science in the federal regulatory process. PCA represents 27 U.S. cement companies operating 82 manufacturing plants in 35 states. Collectively, these companies account for approximately 80% of domestic cement-making capacity, with distribution centers in all 50 states.

America’s cement manufacturers comply with a broad spectrum of federal and state environmental rules. Policies that promote an open, predictable and credible regulatory process help balance goals that we all share: a clean environment and a healthy economy. To that end, PCA supports the passage of H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015, and H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015.

H.R. 1030 would ensure that EPA bases its rules on publicly available, verifiable information. H.R. 1029 would strengthen the transparency and public participation requirements for the scientific panels that review EPA’s regulatory science. These two bills provide a common sense framework for greater transparency, accountability and integrity in the science that supports EPA’s rules.

PCA looks forward to working with you and members of the Committee to move these important bills forward. If you have questions or need more information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. TOSCAS,  
President and Chief Executive Officer.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON), the ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. PETERSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 1029, the Science Advisory Board Reform Act, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

The Science Advisory Board’s work is important in making sure that the EPA considers all scientific information when writing regulations that will impact American farmers, families, and small businesses. Unfortunately,

concerns have been raised about the current review process.

In listening to the debate, people need to understand that this is merely an advisory board, that these folks are not the ones who are making the decisions. I would argue that, if there is one thing that the EPA needs, it is sound advice, and they wouldn't get themselves into all of this trouble that they continue to get themselves into over water in the U.S. and every other thing that you can name. We have got a business in my district that has complied with everything they have asked. It did a 90 percent reduction in emissions from its outside wood furnaces, and now the EPA has come with a regulation that will put them out of business and cost 250 jobs in my district, and it is just on and on.

I think that it would be good for the EPA to get advice from people whom, maybe, they aren't listening to. Under the current process, it is just not working. They are, I think, only hearing from one side of these arguments. I don't know what people are afraid of, as you are going to have advice coming from people who actually know what is going on with some of these issues, and I think that is a good thing.

This legislation addresses those concerns, and it builds on the work that we did in the 2014 farm bill. I think this bill is necessary, as I said, to make sure that there is the right kind of input in the EPA. I don't know if it is going to solve all of the problems, but it will help ensure a more balanced and independent Science Advisory Board, and it will help alleviate some of the unintended consequences that are surrounding current EPA regulations, so I encourage my colleagues' support.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015, which is the same one we spoke against last year, because it benefits no one but the industry, and it harms public health.

Last year, Dallas-Fort Worth received an "F" for air quality from the American Lung Association. Now, more than ever, the American people need a strong EPA to protect their right to clean air and water, and the public supports that. This includes an effective Science Advisory Board, a group whose job it is to provide the EPA with independent scientific analysis and advice.

As written, H.R. 1029 "reforms" EPA's Science Advisory Board for the worse. The hypothetical intent of this bill is to improve the balance of the members serving on the Board; but, in

reality, the bill would make it easier for industry-affiliated representatives with a conflict of interest to serve on the Board. Experts with industry associations are far more likely to find that the science they are asked to review will have a financial impact on their employers. Academic scientists do not have such financial conflicts of interest with the Board's advice or with the EPA's actions.

However, my Republican colleagues seem to have a fundamental distrust of scientists from our Nation's universities because H.R. 1029 puts in place a number of requirements that will likely dissuade academic scientists from serving on the Board. It is difficult to understand how anyone could object to the most knowledgeable academic scientists offering their advice and expertise to the EPA. Who would know better whether the EPA had mischaracterized the science on an issue than the people who are leaders in their respective fields?

To be clear, I am not arguing that industry should not have representation on the EPA's Science Advisory Board, as their insight is valuable also, but I do not support weakening conflict of interest practices so more industry representatives can serve on the Board.

The bill also favors industry by tying the Board up with procedural burdens so unlimited that it is unlikely any Science Advisory Board panel could ever render an opinion in a useful period of time. I assume that that is really the point of H.R. 1029. Endless delays leave plenty of time to manufacture doubt in the science and to delay the formulation of public health regulations by the EPA. Unfortunately, that also means that the health and safety of our families, friends, and constituents will be needlessly put at risk. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1029.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, the vice chairman of the Science Committee, for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, Americans expect the review of regulatory science to be balanced and transparent. H.R. 1029, the Science Advisory Board Reform Act, ensures scientists get the opportunity to provide unbiased, independent advice to the Environmental Protection Agency and to Congress.

I thank Congressman LUCAS and the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, COLLIN PETERSON, for their initiative on this issue.

This bill strengthens the EPA Science Advisory Board's independence so that the administration cannot manipulate science to further its political agenda.

Hardworking American families are hit hard by costly regulations, whether it is through lost jobs or higher electric bills and gasoline prices, and the EPA has been known to twist science to justify its actions. Behind the scenes, however, there is a review process that was intended to provide a critical check on the EPA's conclusions. The EPA Science Advisory Board was created to provide a meaningful, balanced, and independent assessment of the science that supports the EPA's regulations. Unfortunately, this goal is not being realized.

The EPA frequently undermines the SAB's independence and prevents it from being able to provide advice to Congress. As a result, the valuable advice these experts can provide is wasted, and the truth is silenced. The public's right to know must be protected in a democracy. As the EPA now seeks to pursue the most aggressive regulatory agenda in its 44-year history, it is critical that the SAB be able to give unbiased advice. The more regulations the EPA creates, the more we need the involvement of an open and transparent Science Advisory Board. This bill simply gives independent experts an opportunity to review the science and provide advice.

We all know that the Federal Government doesn't have a monopoly on the truth, so it is important to get the public's take on regulations. The bill does not create an unlimited public comment period, but the public does have a right to know what the Federal Government is doing to them. H.R. 1029 expands transparency requirements, improves the process for selecting expert advisers, and strengthens public participation requirements.

This bipartisan legislation restores the independent Board as an important defender of scientific integrity. Its commonsense reforms will help make the EPA's decisions more credible and more balanced.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) for their leadership on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I mentioned the letters that were entered into the RECORD. Frequently, here in Congress, we talk about government efficiency and getting things to work better, and I just want to read what the Center for Medical Consumers said about H.R. 1029:

The bill requires the Science Advisory Board to remain in an endless loop of soliciting public comment about the state of the science, touching on every major advisory activity it undertakes and responding to nearly every comment before moving forward, without being limited by any time constraints.

Also, the National Physicians Alliance noted:

This bill's overly broad restriction on Science Advisory Board members with subject matter expertise is equally counterproductive and goes far beyond the common-sense limits imposed by the National Academies, and the language in the bill is so vague that it raises many questions.

Mr. Chairman, we can do better than this. We need to get back to the table and work together so that we have a bill that actually improves the Science Advisory Board.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to another outstanding gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak in strong support of H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015.

The Science Advisory Board was established by Congress to review the science behind the EPA's decisions and to advise Congress and the EPA on scientific and technical matters. Unfortunately, the SAB is no longer functioning as designed as it is without the impartiality and expertise needed to be an effective arbiter of the EPA's use of science and its regulations. For example, the membership of the SAB has excluded individuals from State or local governments. Yet these are the folks who are often the closest to the impacts that the regulations have on job creators across America.

As the EPA continues its regulatory assault on America's economy, it is critically important that Congress act to improve the quality of the EPA's use of science in its decisions. This legislation will do just that. It will improve the quality of the SAB's membership, increase public participation in its scientific reviews, allow for dissenting opinions among members, and it requires that the SAB communicate uncertainties in its findings and conclusions.

□ 1430

Mr. Chair, I am an air-conditioning contractor. As such, we are licensed by the TDLR in Texas. Mr. Chair, I want someone on that board that understands the air-conditioning business, that has business background.

It is sad, Mr. Chair, we are supposed to be a country that has a government, not a government that has a country. Opponents of this bill act like business people cannot be trusted to help their own government. They say they have a conflict of interest. That just gets all over me.

Business folks, whom I call the salt of the earth, they invest money in businesses; they create jobs; they take risks; they build families and communities—and they can't be trusted? They can use their expertise to serve our community and our country. I would even offer that they are a form of a renewable resource.

Mr. Chair, it is high time for this bill to pass and put some common sense and transparency in the process.

I thank Congressman LUCAS and Chairman SMITH for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I also want to point out that the National Center for Health Research is concerned. They ask: What happens if a scientist relies on expertise that is not specifically permitted in the bill? Will there be legal ramifications? Clearly, scientific experts will think twice before joining the Science Advisory Board if it means they will have to consult their lawyers before they give advice.

Mr. Chairman, there is some ambiguous language in this. We can do a better job making sure that the Science Advisory Board functions in an efficient way that actually helps inform their decisions. I suggest that we get back to the table, rather than pass this bill today, and find strong legislation that improves the Science Advisory Board.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire about the time remaining between the two sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma has 16½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Oregon has 19½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. I would note to the gentlelady, at the present time I do not have any additional speakers, so whenever you are prepared to close, I believe I have the right to close ultimately.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, the bill before us today does undertake the laudable goal of improving transparency at the Environmental Protection Agency; however, as I stated previously, the bill, as written, does not accomplish this goal. I worked on this bill in the last Congress; and there were a lot of recommendations that were made, when we had hearings on this bill in the last Congress, where we could all agree—recommendations that the industry supports, that academia supports, and that scientists support. We should be taking those recommendations and adding them to this bill, working together to find a bill that will improve the Science Advisory Board.

I want to clarify to my colleagues, we have no objection with industry representation on the Science Advisory Board. That is not the point. What happens under this bill, however, is that financial conflict of interest is conflated with bias, and we could have industry representation with a significant financial interest. That is not the direction we should be going in. Of course, industry people have expertise, as do scientists who work in academia.

Again, we can and should work together to improve the EPA's approach to reviewing the science underpinning regulations, but this legislation is not the answer. This bill will only damage and delay the process, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I would apologize to the gentlelady. I was just informed that the majority floor leader would like to speak for 1 minute.

I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority floor leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his work.

Mr. Chair, there is a wise saying that one of the best assets of a good leader is a good adviser. Nobody can know everything, and advisers step in to give opinions and provide different perspectives for those who have to make decisions.

History is filled with people or groups that failed because they never had their assumptions challenged. Unfortunately, the same failure can be seen in our own government.

Back in 1978, Congress created the EPA Science Advisory Board to provide independent scientific advice to the administration. Sadly, the independence has been compromised. Over the years, the Science Advisory Board has silenced voices of dissent, limited public participation in its decisions, and has shown potential conflict of interest. In fact, over half of the Board members have taken grant money from the EPA, the very Agency they are supposed to provide impartial analysis to. This isn't chump change.

Since 2000, Board members have received roughly \$140 million in taxpayer money from the EPA grants according to the Congressional Research Service, and the research they are reviewing is often directly related to the money they received. This isn't transparent; this isn't accountable, and this isn't right.

Today we will consider a bill to set things right. We aren't telling the Science Advisory Board what to say; we aren't telling the EPA what to do, but we are demanding that the Board be transparent and independent, as it was originally intended.

True science demands clarity and impartiality. The Science Advisory Board lacks both, and that needs to change.

I thank the gentleman for his work, bringing transparency, accountability, and efficiency back to the Science Advisory Board.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to several points of view on different perspectives today. I think the majority floor leader and the chairman of the

committee and a number of my colleagues did an outstanding job of explaining why this bill is necessary, why it is appropriate.

I will acknowledge to my colleague from Oregon that this is a work in progress, that clearly there are still things that need to be examined, addressed, looked at, and perfected over the course of the legislative session before, ultimately, this is signed into law.

But the underlying principles, an entity like the Environmental Protection Agency, which has such tremendous influence and control over our everyday lives—whether you are a farmer, rancher, business person, just a citizen, such tremendous control through their authority and their rulemaking process over our lives—it is important, and it is the very reason that Congress established the Scientific Advisory Board in 1978, it is important to have a knowledgeable group look over their shoulder to verify their facts, to understand the process they are going through in order that, ultimately, that rulemaking process is something that is based on sound science and is something that is appropriate.

Now, in the bill we simply say that, in effect, anyone with knowledge and expertise should be able to participate. We ask for full disclosure. If you have an economic interest, whether it is doing scientific research or in any related business, fully disclose your background. That presently is not going on. So that is an improvement. That is an enhancement.

We explicitly ask that public input be allowed, that it be encouraged. There is nothing wrong with that. There are a lot of really bright people around this country who have great understanding of the issues that affect their day-to-day lives and should be able to share that.

Can the Board stop the Environmental Protection Agency from doing something? It is an advisory board. Their power is not in being able to stop an action of the EPA, but their power is making them justify the action that they are proposing to take, to justify the science that leads to that action. There is nothing wrong with that. There is absolutely nothing wrong with that.

I suppose the bottom line is this: We live in an extremely cynical time. Surprisingly, there is distrust even of the United States Congress and all Federal institutions, I am afraid. This bill is an effort to take a step in the direction of restoring that faith and confidence. Call it enhanced transparency if you want; call it openness if you want; call it just making sure we all know where the money is going and where the money is coming from. Whatever you want to call it, this is a bill that tries to move us in the direction of not only better regulations when we must have

regulations, but better science to justify those regulations and the confidence of all of our fellow citizens.

I simply ask, Mr. Chairman, when the opportunity avails—I know we will have several good amendments to discuss shortly—that my colleagues support H.R. 1029, and we move this process forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-10. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1029

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

*This Act may be cited as the “EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015”.*

#### **SEC. 2. SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD.**

(a) **INDEPENDENT ADVICE.**—Section 8(a) of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365(a)) is amended by inserting “independently” after “Advisory Board which shall”.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—Section 8(b) of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) The Board shall be composed of at least nine members, one of whom shall be designated Chairman, and shall meet at such times and places as may be designated by the Chairman.

“(2) Each member of the Board shall be qualified by education, training, and experience to evaluate scientific and technical information on matters referred to the Board under this section. The Administrator shall ensure that—

“(A) the scientific and technical points of view represented on and the functions to be performed by the Board are fairly balanced among the members of the Board;

“(B) at least ten percent of the membership of the Board are from State, local, or tribal governments;

“(C) persons with substantial and relevant expertise are not excluded from the Board due to affiliation with or representation of entities that may have a potential interest in the Board’s advisory activities, so long as that interest is fully disclosed to the Administrator and the public and appointment to the Board complies with section 208 of title 18, United States Code;

“(D) in the case of a Board advisory activity on a particular matter involving a specific party, no Board member having an interest in the specific party shall participate in that activity;

“(E) Board members may not participate in advisory activities that directly or indirectly in-

volve review or evaluation of their own work, unless fully disclosed to the public and the work has been externally peer-reviewed;

“(F) Board members shall be designated as special Government employees; and

“(G) no registered lobbyist is appointed to the Board.

“(3) The Administrator shall—

“(A) solicit public nominations for the Board by publishing a notification in the Federal Register;

“(B) solicit nominations from relevant Federal agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Energy, the Interior, and Health and Human Services;

“(C) make public the list of nominees, including the identity of the entities that nominated each, and shall accept public comment on the nominees;

“(D) require that, upon their provisional nomination, nominees shall file a written report disclosing financial relationships and interests, including Environmental Protection Agency grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, or other financial assistance, that are relevant to the Board’s advisory activities for the three-year period prior to the date of their nomination, and relevant professional activities and public statements for the five-year period prior to the date of their nomination; and

“(E) make such reports public, with the exception of specific dollar amounts, for each member of the Board upon such member’s selection.

“(4) Disclosure of relevant professional activities under paragraph (3)(D) shall include all representational work, expert testimony, and contract work as well as identifying the party for which the work was done.

“(5) Except when specifically prohibited by law, the Agency shall make all conflict of interest waivers granted to members of the Board, member committees, or investigative panels publicly available.

“(6) Any recusal agreement made by a member of the Board, a member committee, or an investigative panel, or any recusal known to the Agency that occurs during the course of a meeting or other work of the Board, member committee, or investigative panel shall promptly be made public by the Administrator.

“(7) The terms of the members of the Board shall be three years and shall be staggered so that the terms of no more than one-third of the total membership of the Board shall expire within a single fiscal year. No member shall serve more than two terms over a ten-year period.”.

(c) **RECORD.**—Section 8(c) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by inserting “or draft risk or hazard assessment,” after “at the time any proposed”;

(B) by striking “formal”; and

(C) by inserting “or draft risk or hazard assessment,” after “to the Board such proposed”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting “or draft risk or hazard assessment,” after “the scientific and technical basis of the proposed”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The Board’s advice and comments, including dissenting views of Board members, and the response of the Administrator shall be included in the record with respect to any proposed risk or hazard assessment, criteria document, standard, limitation, or regulation and published in the Federal Register.”.

(d) **MEMBER COMMITTEES AND INVESTIGATIVE PANELS.**—Section 8(e)(1)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365(e)(1)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “These member committees and investigative panels—

“(i) shall be constituted and operate in accordance with the provisions set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b), in subsection (h), and in subsection (i);

“(ii) do not have authority to make decisions on behalf of the Board; and

“(iii) may not report directly to the Environmental Protection Agency.”.

(e) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—Section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365) is amended by amending subsection (h) to read as follows:

“(h)(1) To facilitate public participation in the advisory activities of the Board, the Administrator and the Board shall make public all reports and relevant scientific information and shall provide materials to the public at the same time as received by members of the Board.

“(2) Prior to conducting major advisory activities, the Board shall hold a public information-gathering session to discuss the state of the science related to the advisory activity.

“(3) Prior to convening a member committee or investigative panel under subsection (e) or requesting scientific advice from the Board, the Administrator shall accept, consider, and address public comments on questions to be asked of the Board. The Board, member committees, and investigative panels shall accept, consider, and address public comments on such questions and shall not accept a question that unduly narrows the scope of an advisory activity.

“(4) The Administrator and the Board shall encourage public comments, including oral comments and discussion during the proceedings, that shall not be limited by an insufficient or arbitrary time restriction. Public comments shall be provided to the Board when received. The Board’s reports shall include written responses to significant comments offered by members of the public to the Board.

“(5) Following Board meetings, the public shall be given 15 calendar days to provide additional comments for consideration by the Board.”.

(f) **OPERATIONS.**—Section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365) is further amended by amending subsection (i) to read as follows:

“(i)(1) In carrying out its advisory activities, the Board shall strive to avoid making policy determinations or recommendations, and, in the event the Board feels compelled to offer policy advice, shall explicitly distinguish between scientific determinations and policy advice.

“(2) The Board shall clearly communicate uncertainties associated with the scientific advice provided to the Administrator or Congress.

“(3) The Board shall ensure that advice and comments reflect the views of the members and shall encourage dissenting members to make their views known to the public, the Administrator, and Congress.

“(4) The Board shall conduct periodic reviews to ensure that its advisory activities are addressing the most important scientific issues affecting the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(5) The Board shall be fully and timely responsive to Congress.”.

### SEC. 3. RELATION TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as supplanting the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

### SEC. 4. RELATION TO THE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as supplanting the requirements of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

The CHAIR. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part A of House Report 114-37. Each such amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be

considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 114-37.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 22, insert “, or for which the Board has evidence that it may involve,” after “involving”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to enhance some of the good government language that already exists in this bill. Page 2 of this bill, beginning on line 21, details the instances in which a Board member must recuse himself from an EPA Science Advisory Board advisory activity. As currently written, a Board member must recuse himself only when he has an interest in a specific party that is involved in the matter being addressed by the advisory activity. I feel that this language must be broadened. I thank the chairman for working with me toward this end.

Let’s say that the Chemical Assessment Advisory Standing Committee wishes to engage in an advisory activity on a specific chemical compound. Now let’s say that only one university in the country, perhaps the University of Florida, performs research on this compound and receives a sizable amount of Federal funds to do so. Under the current language, any representative from that university that serves on the committee should recuse himself from participating in the advisory activity.

The amendment that I am offering would broaden the category of persons who must recuse themselves. My amendment would require persons for whom the Board has received evidence that an advisory activity may involve them to recuse themselves. Under my proposed amendment language, a drug company like Pfizer, seeking to produce drugs utilizing the chemical compound subject to an advisory committee activity, could be excluded from participating as well.

I think it would be highly unfair that an entity such as the University of Florida could be excluded from an advisory activity and not a corporation like Pfizer if there is reason to believe that it would be directly engaged in ac-

tivities utilizing the science upon which the Board seeks to advise.

Clearly, we should encourage the most qualified persons in various scientific fields to participate on the committees that compose the EPA’s Science Advisory Board. What we should not do, however, is to allow persons to participate in advisory actions that may directly impact their own bottom lines.

Existing language in this bill, I believe, partially addresses our goal of preventing conflicts of interest, but accepting this Grayson amendment would go much further toward accomplishing our common joint goal of preventing conflicts of interest. To that end, I urge support for my amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his amendment that would clarify the bill’s safeguards against conflicts of interest. I appreciate his attention to detail, continued engagement with this bill, and look forward to his support.

H.R. 1029 seeks balance and transparency in the makeup and composition of the Science Advisory Board. Financial conflicts of interest are specifically prohibited, and that would clarify the intent.

In addition to language already in the bill preventing conflicted individuals from participating, the bill requires disclosure. Although disclosure itself may not prevent all bias, the consumers of the Science Advisory Board’s product—the EPA, and the American people—will be better informed if they have all the facts.

I want to thank my colleague from Florida for his constructive amendment to this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part A of House Report 114-37.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 7, strike “and” at the end of subparagraph (F).



Page 3, line 9, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 3, after line 9, insert the following new subparagraph:

“(H) a Board member shall have no current grants or contracts from the Environmental Protection Agency and shall not apply for a grant or contract for 3 years following the end of that member’s service on the Board.”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It ensures that members of the Science Advisory Board do not receive grants from the EPA or enter into contracts with the EPA. Additionally, this amendment prohibits Science Advisory Board members from receiving EPA funds for 3 years after the individual is no longer a Board member.

This amendment—and this bill—is about fairness and transparency. Members of the Science Advisory Board should be independent and impartial. They should not be swayed by the possibility of receiving funds from the EPA for their work.

Just as Members of Congress are banned from lobbying for a period of time after leaving office, members of the Science Advisory Board should be barred from receiving grants after they leave the board. Board members should not make a decision based on a promise from the EPA that he or she will benefit financially after they leave the Board.

The role of the Science Advisory Board should be to provide independent scientific advice to the Agency. This amendment will ensure the Board is truly independent. American families who bear the impact of the EPA’s regulations deserve to know that the regulations are based on sound science, not on any other agenda.

I encourage all my colleagues to support fairness and transparency by supporting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would have a negative effect on the participation of the Nation’s best scientists, punishing them for providing invaluable expert advice to the EPA.

This amendment would penalize scientists who have received any grant from the EPA by precluding them from serving on the EPA’s Science Advisory Board, a Board that is charged with providing the most sound and reliable scientific advice to the EPA; yet it is those very scientists who have received EPA grants who are often the very best in their field.

Why would we pass an amendment that limits our Nation’s most qualified experts from reviewing EPA actions?

By precluding these scientists from serving on the Board, it could greatly diminish the pool of eligible, qualified experts who can serve on the Science Advisory Board and, more importantly, serve the Nation. This amendment essentially guarantees that the EPA will not receive the best advice from the best scientists. I can’t fathom why we would do that.

Of additional concern is a draconian provision in the amendment that prohibits a Board member from applying for an EPA grant or contract for 3 years after serving on the Board.

I don’t understand how or why we can legislate against someone applying for a grant. Three years without the ability to apply for a grant from one of our Federal research agencies can arrest the careers of our Nation’s best and brightest minds.

Furthermore, the amendment isn’t even clear on how limited people are from applying and where they can apply. Why would we agree to an amendment that is constraining our Nation’s ability to develop and foster scientific knowledge?

This kind of ban is punitive, and it would force researchers to choose between public service and their own research. It makes no sense in any other area of government, and it makes no sense here.

We want and need the best and brightest Americans serving our national interests everywhere, and we should never entertain the idea of punishing experts for providing valuable and needed public service.

I cannot support or recommend support for any amendment that has a punitive effect on the best and brightest scientific minds in the country, and I cannot support an amendment that would limit the Environmental Protection Agency from considering the full and complete spectrum of expertise for membership to their Science Advisory Board.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

I, too, want the best and brightest. That is why the core principle of the bill is on disclosure, make sure we know where the money goes. Mr. MCKINLEY is taking this to the next point in this focus on following the money. I appreciate where he is coming from.

I said earlier to my colleague from Oregon that this is a work in progress. We will see, ultimately, what the final version is; but if you believe that the money should be followed, if you be-

lieve we should know where the dollars are and if that impacts the science, then, clearly, Mr. MCKINLEY is on the right path.

I am voting with him. It is a work in progress.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, again, this amendment would cause the EPA to be precluded from getting some of the best science. The amendment says that a Board member shall have no current grants or contracts from the Environmental Protection Agency and shall not apply for a grant or a contract for 3 years following the end of that member’s service on the Board.

Mr. Chairman, that would cause serious problems. It is a vaguely worded amendment. I would be concerned about inhibiting people from even applying for grants. We need to do everything we can to support our bright scientists. This would preclude them from serving.

We should vote against this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part A of House Report 114-37.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 17, through page 4, line 5, redesignate subparagraphs (C) through (E) as subparagraphs (D) through (F), respectively.

Page 3, after line 16, insert the following new subparagraph:

“(C) solicit nominations from—

“(i) institutions of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a))); and

“(ii) scientific and research institutions based in work relevant to that of the Board; Page 4, line 9, strike “paragraph (3)(D)” and insert “paragraph (3)(E)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that I believe really strikes at the heart of the issues that were raised by the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act, and that is the need for sound, objective, and transparent decisionmaking by our Federal agencies.



I think we all recognize how important it is to bring in outside experts to inform Agency policies and protocols. Not only does this allow the engagement of Americans who are practicing in their fields into a process that will impact their livelihoods, it also ensures that the Federal Government can reach out to access the very best scientific knowledge, including experts with a depth and variety of knowledge that we wouldn't have access to through our own internal resources.

With the EPA's Science Advisory Board in particular, that means an independent review of technical information that is used to ground Agency proposals and regulations. The efforts of this bill to seek relevant expertise outside the Agency, however, without this amendment, are limited by its failure to include academics, science, and research-based institutions in its solicitations for Board membership.

That is what this amendment corrects. Not to specifically solicit Board membership in these fields, as we do in others, would be a huge mistake on our part.

Institutions within my district alone house some leading global experts in public and environmental health. Joe Ryan—a current member of the EPA's Science Advisory Board and a professor of environment, engineering, and applied sciences at CU Boulder—leads his field in the study of ecological, health, economic, and sociologic impacts of natural gas development on surrounding communities.

Professor Ryan's work is data driven, thorough, strongly objective, and would be of great help to policymakers, as is the work of James White, an institution at CU Boulder since he started the INSTAAR Stable Isotope Lab back in 1989.

Since its opening, Professor White and the INSTAAR Stable Isotope Lab have produced groundbreaking evidence regarding the rapidity of shifts in climate change and their origins in internal planetary adjustments.

Without the work of professors like Joe Ryan and James White, we would be decades behind in our understanding of environmental science and public health priorities, and the work of the EPA would suffer as a result.

In April of last year, Colorado State University professor Diana Wall was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a prestigious group of global thinkers. Professor Wall pioneered our understanding of soil biodiversity. As a result, it drew global praise for its unprecedented findings.

Professor George Wittemyer, also at CSU, recently produced the first verifiable estimation of the impacts of the ongoing ivory crisis on Africa's elephant populations. His findings, subsequently distributed and utilized globally, amount to significant breakthroughs in the field.

These professors, like these and many others, are critical to progress not only within the realm of their academic interests, but throughout the daily lives of American families in helping to prevent the eroding of our public health and our global environment. That is what the amendment I offer today is all about.

By soliciting the input of academics and research scientists who base their work on independent and transparent aims, we advance the expertise of the EPA and ensure that a variety of decisionmaking information is available.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for his amendment that would complement the provisions in the bill ensuring a public nomination process and seeking greater balance. I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to improve this bipartisan bill and look forward to its support as we move forward.

I am proud of our Nation's institutions of higher learning that house some of the greatest minds in the world. Students, professors, and researchers circle the globe to come join our coveted academic community. It is important that the EPA reach out to universities and research institutions to find a balanced and diverse set of experts to serve on the Board.

I want to thank my colleague from Colorado for his constructive amendment to this bipartisan bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the wealth of support that has been shown for this amendment, and I hope that we are able to accomplish this amendment. I am thrilled to have the support of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

To the extent that it is within our power, it is this body's responsibility to ensure our Federal partners are receiving the very best available objective information. My amendment will allow information that has its repository in our institutions of higher education to be able to serve as advisers for the EPA.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MS. BONAMICI

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 114-37.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "EPA Science Advisory Board Improvement Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 8(b) of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4365(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The Board, as established in subsection (a), shall be composed of at least 9 members, 1 of whom shall be designated Chair, and shall meet at such times and places as may be designated by the Chair of the Board, in consultation with the Administrator.

"(2) Each member of the Board shall be qualified by education, training, and experience to evaluate scientific and technical information on matters referred to the Board under this section. The Administrator shall ensure that—

"(A) the Board is fairly balanced in its membership in terms of the points of view represented and the functions to be performed;

"(B) no Board member shall participate in an advisory activity of the Board involving a particular matter or specific party which the Board member has a direct or predictable financial interest;

"(C) no Board member is a registered lobbyist, or has served as a registered lobbyist within a 4-year period prior to nomination to the Board; and

"(D) Board members shall be designated as special Government employees.

"(3) The Administrator shall—

"(A) solicit public nominations for the Board by publishing a notification in the Federal Register;

"(B) make public the list of nominees, including—

"(i) the identity of the entities that nominated each nominee; and

"(ii) the professional credentials of each nominee, including relevant expertise and experience, as well as the sources of research funding and professional activities such as representational work, expert testimony, and contract work dating back 2 years;

"(C) solicit public comment on the nominees;

"(D) develop, and make publically available, a formal memorandum describing each advisory activity to be undertaken by the Board which shall include—

"(i) the charge to the Board, including an explanation of the scope of issues to be addressed by the Board and the formal statement of questions posed to the Board;

"(ii) the ethics rules, if applicable, that would apply to Board members; and

"(iii) other information relied on to support the selection of panel members; and

"(E) require that, upon their provisional nomination, nominees shall be required to complete a written form disclosing information related to financial relationships and interests that may, or could be predicted to, be relevant to the Board's advisory activities, and relevant professional activities and public statements, for the 2-year period prior to the date of their nomination, in a manner sufficient for the Administrator to assess the independence and points of view of the candidates."

(b) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND TRANSPARENCY.—Section 8(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365(h)) is amended to read as follows:

“(h)(1) The Board shall make every effort, consistent with applicable law, including section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Freedom of Information Act’) and section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Privacy Act’), to maximize public participation and transparency, including making the scientific and technical advice of the Board and any committees or investigative panels of the Board publicly available in electronic form on the website of the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(2) The Administrator and the Board shall encourage and solicit public comments on the advisory activities of Board, including written and oral comments, especially comments that provide specific scientific or technical information or analysis for the Board to consider, or comments related to the clarity or accuracy of the recommendations being considered by the Board.

“(3) The Administrator shall specify the areas of expertise being sought and make every effort to solicit candidate recommendations from the public, and solicit public comments on candidates selected.”.

(c) OPERATIONS.—Section 8 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 4365) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j)(1) In carrying out its advisory activities, the Board shall strive to avoid making policy determinations or recommendations, and, in the event the Board determines that it would be appropriate or useful to offer policy advice, shall explicitly distinguish between scientific determinations and policy advice.

“(2) While recognizing that consensus recommendations and conclusions are the most useful to the Administrator and Congress, the Board shall ensure the views of all Board members, including dissenting views, are adequately incorporated into reports and recommendations from the Board.”.

### SEC. 3. RELATION TO THE FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as supplanting the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

### SEC. 4. RELATION TO THE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as supplanting the requirements of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I mentioned during general debate on H.R. 1029, I am not opposed to—in fact, I support legislation that will improve the EPA’s Science Advisory Board. It is something I have been committed to since we had hearings in the last Congress, something we haven’t had in this Congress. We didn’t even have a markup on this bill.

For the most part, I agree with the goals of H.R. 1029 and recognize the need to increase transparency in the

selection of Board members and to promote public participation in the Board’s review process.

That being said, not all of the provisions included in H.R. 1029 will actually improve the Science Advisory Board. In fact, some of the provisions in the bill distort common practices for eliminating or limiting financial conflicts of interest.

Another provision turns the valuable and necessary process of soliciting public comments into a tool for the endless delay of public health protections.

Over the past week, my staff has worked tirelessly with majority staff in an attempt to find common ground and move forward with a bill that is worthy of broad bipartisan support.

Unfortunately, a compromise could not be reached on some of the key problem areas of this bill. However, because I agree with the goals of H.R. 1029—but not with the execution of those goals in the text of this bill—I am offering an amendment that will truly improve the Science Advisory Board.

This amendment draws on non-partisan recommendations from the Bipartisan Policy Center, the Keystone Policy Center, and the Government Accountability Office that will lead to greater transparency in the selection of Board members and restore confidence in the scientific advice offered by the Board.

My substitute amendment would require EPA to release a formal memorandum detailing—among other things—the charge to the Board, including the specific questions the Board is tasked with addressing.

It would require the EPA to make available online the professional credentials of each person nominated to the Board, including any source of research funding dating back 2 years. It also outlines the disclosure requirements for every nominee.

Finally, my amendment requires the EPA to solicit public comment on the nominees, the candidates selected, and the advisory activities of the Board, including specific scientific or technical information for the Board to consider.

□ 1500

These changes encompass the core principles that both Republicans and Democrats have agreed should be followed in EPA’s Science Advisory Board.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, based on nonpartisan recommendations of experts, and move forward with a bill that makes positive changes to the EPA’s Science Advisory Board. My amendment will improve transparency in membership balance, promote public participation without endlessly delaying EPA action or skewing the membership of the board toward conflicted parties.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have said it numerous times, and I will repeat once again, this is a work in progress. This is a bill that is so important to the future of the country, so important to how we address the scientific issues of our day, that this must proceed forward.

In the markup the other day, I think we had something like four amendments. We have had and accepted several amendments today. I would assume that if ultimately our friends in that other body are able to take action, that we will wind up, once again, working on the differences between the two bills. So there are a number of opportunities to refine and improve even this piece of legislation.

But that said, the fundamental principles are still there. We need to pass a bill to continue the process on H.R. 1029 that addresses transparency, that opens the process up to the public, that opens the process up to all individuals who have the scientific knowledge, the ability to contribute to this oversight group.

That is why I prefer the disclosure route. Let us all know who makes what off of what, and then we will base their objectivity on that.

Again, the Science Advisory Board looks over the shoulder of the EPA. They can’t stop the EPA from doing anything. But the power of their analysis, which is only as good as the information that EPA shares with them, their ability to review that will determine just how much support there will be across the country, whatever the ultimate rule is.

I know my colleague from Oregon works in good faith, and I respect that greatly. And just as she and her staff have worked with the committee and the committee staff, I suspect we will continue to work together.

Ultimately, can we come up with a document that we can all agree with?

I am a person of great optimism, and I think we should try. But on this day, an amendment that basically, from my perspective, takes away virtually all of the key points that the bill attempts to achieve, on this day, at this moment, I cannot support that, and I have to, respectfully, ask my colleagues to turn down this amendment, to hopefully then advance the bill so that we can ultimately get to that final document.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I want to first correct a misstatement that I made. I meant to say we did not have a subcommittee markup. We did have a full committee markup. However, we did not have any hearings this Congress on this very important issue.

I want to just add to what my good colleague, Mr. LUCAS, said a couple of times about how this is a work in progress. If it is a work in progress, Mr. Chairman, I submit that we shouldn't be here quite yet today. We should continue to work together on this because there are a lot of goals that we agree on.

If it is a work in progress, why are we on the floor voting today?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this substitute amendment does more to improve the transparency to get to the goals that everyone agrees we need on the Science Advisory Board. I submit that it is a better approach. However, I would prefer that we continue to work, and then bring the bill up for a vote.

I am an optimist too, Mr. LUCAS, and I could get it done.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), a very senior and knowledgeable member of the House Science Committee.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, let me just note that there has been some laudable cooperation in the Science Committee this year, which I deeply appreciate. And the gentlelady and I have actually cosponsored some very needed legislation.

I think this particular bill does demonstrate, however, that as much as we can try to work together, that there are some fundamental differences between the two parties here in Congress dealing with scientific issues.

It is much to the chagrin of many of us to see—I have been a Member of Congress now since 1989—that the integrity of America's, and especially our Federal Government's, science programs has been brought into question by what appears to be a very cynical manipulation of the sciences by various elements in our government and within the political system who would like to manipulate science for their own benefit.

Let me just say that we need to take the steps to ensure to the American people that integrity is being restored to the scientific process, especially those scientific processes in which the Federal Government is involved.

This amendment, the reason why I would be opposed to it, it goes in the opposite direction than what this bill was intended to do. The bill was intended to try to create a higher level of trust, that there is an integrity within the science situation here with the EPA Science Advisory Board.

This amendment would allow individuals to peer-review their own work, for example, and without any disclosure requirements. That means an individual could be paid by the EPA to write a chapter for a science project and then also serve as a reviewer for that project.

The amendment does not require, for example, disclosure of conflict of interest waivers and recusal agreements. So we need to make sure that these types of activities are well documented and that we know exactly what needs to be done so the public can feel confident that when you have an advisory board for the EPA which actually passes regulations and controls over our lives, that the science behind those proclamations and those mandates by the EPA are made on solid science, rather than on people who perhaps have conflicts of interest and other such problems in coming to a scientifically-based decision, rather than a decision and a recommendation that serves special interests or serves someone's own personal interests.

So I would ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment. But like the chairman states, this is a work in progress. Maybe we can come up with some language that both sides will appreciate. Thank you very much.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from California for working with me on other legislation.

I do want to point out that if there is something that isn't in the amendment, as my colleague noted, we have to keep in mind that the Science Advisory Boards are already covered by the Federal Advisory Committee Act that governs Federal advisory committees just like the Science Advisory Board and helps provide for balanced panels and subcommittees that include experts with diverse backgrounds who represent wide-ranging perspectives. So we need to look at this policy in conjunction with the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

I do want to point out that the underlying bill, H.R. 1029, makes it harder for qualified scientists to serve but makes it easier for industry representatives to serve, even when they have a financial conflict of interest.

My amendment in the nature of a substitute levels the playing field and is a better approach.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, just to mention to the gentlelady, I have no additional speakers, and I believe I have the right to close.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to note that I think we have had a very good discussion today. I think we have raised a lot of relevant points. We have covered a lot of ground and some good amendments. We have worked our way through this process. This is a step in the great legislative effort that ultimately leads to good legislation.

Some of my freshman colleagues might not be aware of this, but recently I was involved in a process that

took 2½ years to ultimately come up with a bill. I hope that not every piece of legislation requires 2½ years to accomplish, but I would say this: regular order, respecting the input of all Members, both sides of the aisle, both ends of the Chamber, ultimately leads to a better legislative product to the benefit of everyone.

And I think we are once again embarking on that effort, so I respectfully ask my colleagues to reject this amendment and pass the underlying bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 175, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 119]

#### AYES—242

Abraham	Costello (PA)	Guthrie
Aderholt	Cramer	Hanna
Allen	Crawford	Hardy
Amash	Crenshaw	Harper
Amodei	Culberson	Harris
Ashford	Curbelo (FL)	Hartzler
Babin	Davis, Rodney	Heck (NV)
Barletta	Denham	Hensarling
Barr	Dent	Herrera Beutler
Barton	DeSantis	Hice, Jody B.
Benishek	DesJarlais	Hill
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Holding
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Huelskamp
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Huizenga (MI)
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hultgren
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Hunter
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Hurd (TX)
Bost	Farenthold	Hurt (VA)
Boustany	Fincher	Issa
Brady (TX)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (KS)
Brat	Fleischmann	Jenkins (WV)
Bridenstine	Fleming	Johnson (GA)
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Fortenberry	Jolly
Buck	Fox	Jones
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Joyce
Byrne	Garrett	Katko
Calvert	Gibbs	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	Gohmert	King (IA)
Carter (TX)	Goodlatte	King (NY)
Chabot	Gosar	Kinzinger (IL)
Chaffetz	Gowdy	Kline
Clawson (FL)	Graham	Knight
Coffman	Graves (GA)	Labrador
Cole	Graves (LA)	LaMalfa
Collins (GA)	Grayson	Lamborn
Collins (NY)	Green, Gene	Lance
Comstock	Griffith	Latta
Conaway	Grothman	LoBiondo
Cook	Guinta	Long

Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce

## NOES—175

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleave  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Doyle, Michael  
F.

Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Scalise  
Schradner  
Schweikert  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson

Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres

Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky

Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—15

Cartwright  
Graves (MO)  
Hinojosa  
Hudson  
Lummis

Payne  
Roskam  
Rush  
Sanford  
Schock

Scott, Austin  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Welch  
Young (AK)

## □ 1538

Messrs. CAPUANO and ROGERS of Alabama changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. GENE GREEN of Texas and STEWART changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REED) having assumed the chair, Mr. YODER, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1029) to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 138, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. PETERS. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Peters moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1029 to the Committee on Science, Space, and

Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

**SEC. 5. PROTECTING TAXPAYERS FROM SCIENCE PROMOTED BY POLLUTING COMPANIES.**

No person shall be a member of the Science Advisory Board if—

(1) such person is the CEO of a corporation convicted of major environmental crimes, including the release of toxic pollutants into safe drinking water, refusal to clean up Superfund waste sites, or violations from the release of air pollutants that endanger human health and safety; or

(2) the primary source of research funds for such person comes from corporations or individuals convicted of major environmental crimes, including the release of toxic pollutants into safe drinking water, refusal to clean up Superfund waste sites, or violations from the release of air pollutants that endanger human health and safety.

Mr. PETERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, let's make this simple. The fundamental role of the Environmental Protection Agency is to protect our Nation's environment and to ensure that we have healthy communities for children and families across the country. The Science Advisory Board is the body that ensures that EPA uses the best scientific research available to protect the environment and public health. To support this mission, we in Congress should be working together to ensure that the best and brightest scientists are on this Board. Instead, today's bill would muddy the waters when they should be crystal clear.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill moves EPA away from scientific integrity and weakens the independence of the Science Advisory Board. First, the bill requires that all scientific and technical points be balanced among members of the Board.

What does the term “balanced” mean?

Politicians should not be mandating scientific results. Science should be determined by the experts—scientists and scientific researchers—not by those of us in this Chamber.

Second, the bill imposes a non-science-based hiring quota for Advisory Board members based on employment by a State, local, or tribal government without regard to scientific expertise.

Finally, the open public comment period in the bill would allow regulatory opponents an endless amount of time to halt, derail, discredit, and slow EPA actions that go against their interests.

So instead of limiting review time and providing businesses with more certainty of how EPA regulations will affect their projects, the underlying bill would increase delay and decrease certainty—not what we have been trying to achieve with regulatory reform in this body up until now. Regulatory reform isn't done through obstructing every potential new rule. It is done, in part, by requiring agencies to render their decisions on a schedule so that the market can move forward. This bill would do the opposite.

□ 1545

My amendment will not cure all of these defects in the underlying bill, but it makes two obvious and significant changes to promote scientific integrity. It states simply that anyone working for a corporation that has been convicted of a major environmental crime should be prohibited from serving on the Science Advisory Board.

It secondly states that any person whose primary source of research comes from these criminal corporate actors should be prohibited from serving on the Science Advisory Board.

Mr. Speaker, for too long, we have heard that we have to choose between supporting economic prosperity and a clean environment. The implication is that we can't have both, but that is a false choice and one we can't afford to make. Americans know that we deserve nothing less than both: economic opportunity and clean air and clean water for future generations.

My State of California added 498,000 jobs in the last year while, at the same time, we continue to be a global leader in environmental reforms that have provided cleaner air than at any time in the last 50 years.

I am from San Diego where scientific research, economic growth, and environmental stewardship are not in conflict, but rather are the subject of ongoing, sustained, bipartisan collaboration.

It should be clear to everyone that CEOs from major corporations that are convicted of major environmental crimes have no place serving on the Science Advisory Board and neither should biased scientists.

Vote "yes" on the motion, and stand with me to maintain the integrity of the independence of the Science Advisory Board.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. LUCAS. I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, at one point today, one of the upperclassman walked by and said, "You again," referencing my working on a piece of legislation on this floor.

For the freshmen, you might not understand the relevance of that, but in the last session and the session before, I and Mr. PETERSON—my colleague on this bill—and the members of the Ag Committee worked for 2½ years to pass a piece of legislation that should have taken 6 months.

Now, why is that relevant in our discussion about H.R. 1029? It is relevant because when I give you my word as the primary author of the bill that I will work with both sides of the Chamber, that I will work with all perspectives, that this is a work in progress, you can take that for exactly what it means.

Now, why H.R. 1029 in the very first place? One of the classic problems that we all face in our town meetings, that we face in our interaction with citizens across this country, is a mistrust of the Federal Government, of Congress, of the other body, of the administration, of the institutions.

Now, how do you overcome mistrust when it is engrained as deeply as it is right now? You increase transparency, you open the process up, you make sure that everyone understands every part of the process.

That is what the Science Advisory Board was all about when it was created in 1978—have someone look over the shoulder of the people who are picking the scientists, who put the science together. That is the justification for all these rules.

The majority floor leader noted in recent times \$140 million spent on this research, real money. Some might argue it is done in a closed show; some might argue it is done without the input of everyone.

H.R. 1029 is an effort to open that up. H.R. 1029 is an effort to increase the transparency, to restore confidence to the process. The EPA needs that just as badly as this institution does.

Now, to the motion to recommit, in particular, it is pretty good, pretty impressive, pretty crafty, but remember, the director of the EPA appoints the Board members. Surely, the director, especially with the additional disclosure requirements in the bill, will show the kind of judgment and prudence that is necessary—surely, surely.

That said, my friends, this is a work in progress, but it is an effort to turn around a problem that is greater than just one science board, one agency. It is an effort to address a problem that faces the entire Federal Government.

With that, my friends, I ask you turn down this motion to recommit. You

pass the underlying bill, you let us continue to work and try and do something for the benefit of everyone.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 237, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]

#### AYES—179

Adams	Esty	McCollum
Aguilar	Farr	McDermott
Ashford	Fattah	McGovern
Bass	Foster	McNerney
Beatty	Frankel (FL)	Meeks
Becerra	Fudge	Meng
Bera	Gabbard	Moore
Beyer	Gallego	Moulton
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	Nadler
Blumenauer	Graham	Napolitano
Bonamici	Grayson	Neal
Boyle, Brendan	Green, Al	Nolan
F.	Green, Gene	Norcross
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Brownley (CA)	Hahn	Pascarella
Bustos	Hastings	Pelosi
Butterfield	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Capps	Higgins	Peters
Capuano	Himes	Pingree
Cárdenas	Honda	Pocan
Carney	Hoyer	Polis
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Castor (FL)	Israel	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY)	Kaptur	Ruiz
Clay	Keating	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clyburn	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Cohen	Kildee	T.
Connolly	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Conyers	Kind	Sarbanes
Cooper	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Costa	Kuster	Schiff
Courtney	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Cummings	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Lee	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Levin	Sinema
DeFazio	Lewis	Sires
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Delaney	Lipinski	Speier
DeLauro	Loebach	Swalwell (CA)
DelBene	Lofgren	Takai
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Takano
Deutch	Lowe	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Lujan Grisham	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	(NM)	Titus
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
F.	(NM)	Torres
Duckworth	Lynch	Tsongas
Edwards	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Ellison	Carolyn	Vargas
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Eshoo	Matsui	Vela

Velázquez  
Viscosky  
Walz

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

□ 1557

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BOUSTANY was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE  
LOUISIANA NATIONAL GUARD CRASH VICTIMS

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to commemorate the loss of 11 outstanding servicemen, including four members of the Louisiana National Guard, as a result of a helicopter training accident off the coast of Florida.

From the Louisiana National Guard's 1st Assault Helicopter Battalion, 244th Aviation Regiment based in Hammond, Louisiana, we lost Chief Warrant Officer George Wayne Griffin, Jr.; Chief Warrant Officer George David Strother; Staff Sergeant Lance Bergeron; and Staff Sergeant Thomas Florich.

From the United States Marines, based at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, we lost Captain Stanford Henry Shaw, III; Master Sergeant Thomas Saunders; Staff Sergeant Marcus S. Bawol; Staff Sergeant Trevor P. Blaylock; Staff Sergeant Liam A. Flynn; Staff Sergeant Kerry Michael Kemp; and Staff Sergeant Andrew C. Seif.

Mr. Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join us in a moment of silence on behalf of these servicemen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 181, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

AYES—236

NOES—237

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)

Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Knott  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Palm  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen

Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Scalise  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Cartwright  
Graves (MO)  
Hinojosa  
Hudson  
Lummis  
Murphy (FL)  
Payne  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Rush  
Sanford  
Schock  
Scott, Austin  
Smith (WA)  
Welch  
Young (AK)

Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzer  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador

LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby

NOES—181

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hastings  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)

Lawrence	Neal	Serrano
Lee	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Levin	Norcross	Sherman
Lewis	O'Rourke	Sinema
Lieu, Ted	Pallone	Sires
Lipinski	Pascarell	Slaughter
Loeback	Pelosi	Speier
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Lowenthal	Peters	Takai
Lowey	Pingree	Takano
Lujan Grisham	Pocan	Thompson (CA)
(NM)	Polis	Thompson (MS)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Price (NC)	Titus
(NM)	Quigley	Tonko
Lynch	Rangel	Torres
Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Tsongas
Carolyn	Richmond	Van Hollen
Maloney, Sean	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
Matsui	Ruiz	Veasey
McCollum	Ruppersberger	Vela
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
McGovern	Sánchez, Linda	Visclosky
McNerney	T.	Walz
Meeks	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Meng	Sarbanes	Schultz
Moore	Schakowsky	Waters, Maxine
Moulton	Schiff	Watson Coleman
Murphy (FL)	Schradler	Wilson (FL)
Nadler	Scott (VA)	Yarmuth
Napolitano	Scott, David	

## NOT VOTING—15

Cartwright	Lummis	Schock
Duffy	Payne	Scott, Austin
Graves (MO)	Roskam	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	Rush	Welch
Hudson	Sanford	Young (AK)

□ 1607

Mr. COHEN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes on Tuesday, March 17, 2015, due to the attendance of a funeral for a close friend. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: rollcall No. 116: Previous Question on H. Res. 138—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1029—EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 and consideration of H.R. 1030—Secret Science Reform Act of 2015: "yea;" rollcall No. 117: Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1029—EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 and consideration of H.R. 1030—Secret Science Reform Act of 2015: "yea;" rollcall No. 118: H.R. 1191—Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act: "yea;" rollcall No. 119: McKinley Amendment: "yea;" rollcall No. 120: Motion to recommit H.R. 1029 with instructions: "nay;" rollcall No. 121: H.R. 1029—EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015: "yea."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote Nos. 116, 117, 118, 119, and 121, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes." On rollcall vote No. 120, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 132, PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 8, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-45) on the resolution (H. Res. 152) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 296

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 296.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HURD of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

## BILL BADGER, A HERO

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, last week, Arizona and our country lost a hero with the passing of Bill Badger, one of the people responsible for subduing the gunman of the January 8, 2011, shootings in Tucson, Arizona.

Bill served for 37 years in the Army, where he flew helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft. After moving to Arizona in 1985 with his wife, Sallie, Bill established and later served as the first commander of the Western Army National Guard Aviation Training Site in Marana. He retired from the military as a colonel.

After the shooting, Bill was credited with saying, "Once you're in the military, you never retire. You're always there to help the community and the people who are in danger," and that is exactly what he did that day.

Despite being wounded, Bill put himself in the line of fire to take down the gunman, saving many lives through his bravery and his quick actions. Like many others that day, Bill showed us

that, even in the darkest of times, courage and compassion can shine forth.

He was a hero in the truest sense of the word—one of southern Arizona's own—and he will be deeply missed by our community.

## CYBER ABUSE

(Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, right now, millions of American women and girls are online, navigating their personal and professional lives. Sadly, many will be threatened online or will be subjected to terrifying harassment.

Journalists, academics, and other professionals who dare to express an opinion, especially a feminist one, are routinely attacked with graphic threats of rape and murder. Women are targeted with sexually explicit messages and threats 27 times more than men, and for women of color and LGBT women, the rate is even higher. As a result, young women are deciding not to pursue certain jobs in order to avoid the crosshairs of men who think they don't belong. Others are being driven offline, sacrificing their freedom of expression for personal safety.

A decade ago, Congress made online threats of death or serious injury illegal, but these cases are rarely prosecuted. That is why I am asking my colleagues to join me in calling on the Department of Justice to intensify the investigation and prosecution of the most extreme cases of online threats.

Ensuring the stronger enforcement of laws that protect women from violent online threats is one commonsense thing Congress can do to ensure that the Internet and the 21st century economy is open to everyone.

## CELEBRATING BRAIN SCIENCE AWARENESS WEEK AND NATIONAL BRAIN INJURY AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, March is National Brain Injury Awareness Month, and this week also marks Brain Science Awareness Week, and I am very proud of the amazing advances in neuroscience research that are taking place in my district of south Florida.

The Miami Project to Cure Paralysis, working in concert with the University of Miami's Miller School of Medicine, is at the forefront of understanding traumatic brain and spinal cord injuries and how they can best be treated. Project investigators are now beginning to experiment with transplanting



patients' own nerve cells to enhance recovery following paralysis. This brave work has never been more important, especially for our patriots, our military men and women, as they return home from combat and support missions abroad.

Thanks to the brain research happening in Miami and elsewhere, we have never been closer to a cure.

□ 1615

#### NANCIE ATWELL IS A TRULY REMARKABLE EDUCATOR

(Ms. PINGREE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about a truly remarkable educator from my State of Maine. This week in Dubai, Nancie Atwell won the very first Global Teacher Prize. It is called the "Nobel Prize for Education," and over 5,000 teachers worldwide were nominated for the award.

Twenty-five years ago Nancie started the Center for Teaching and Learning in Edgecomb, Maine. Nancy and the staff at the school have educated thousands of students and hundreds of teachers, teachers who come every year to serve as interns at the school and learn about the cutting-edge teaching methods that have been developed there.

Nancie has dedicated her heart and soul to the school, to the teachers, and to the students. Just one example of the selflessness is the \$1 million prize that Nancie won with this award. She didn't hesitate for even a moment before announcing she is going to give every penny of it to the school she founded and loves.

Nancie Atwell is a shining example of how teachers make the world a better place. Maine is lucky to have her, and she is an inspiration to us all.

#### HONORING THE LOUISIANA NATIONAL GUARDSMEN TRAG- ICALLY KILLED LAST WEEK

(Mr. ABRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the lives of the four Louisiana National Guardsmen and seven marines who so tragically died in a helicopter accident off the coast of Florida. My family and I and all of the Louisiana delegation, I am sure, with the rest of the Congress will continue to keep their families in our prayers.

As a helicopter pilot myself, I feel a certain kinship to the two guardsmen in my district, George Griffin, Jr., and George Strother. Both of them served our district, our State, and our country most honorably.

Chief Warrant Officer George Griffin was originally from Delhi, which is

only about 10 minutes from my house. He had more than 6,000 flight hours, including 1,000 or more combat hours, and was a very decorated veteran.

Chief Warrant Officer George Strother, of Alexandria, was a seasoned combat veteran who also served distinguishedly and was decorated, and he also served us in our trying times of Katrina.

These men, these two plus the others who died in the Black Hawk accident, served our Nation and our country most honorably, admirably, and stood in harm's way when we didn't have to. We will never forget them; we honor them; and again, our prayers are with their families.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNI- VERSARY OF BLOODY SUNDAY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join many Members of this House in Birmingham, Selma, and Montgomery, Alabama, from March 6 to 8 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday, which led inexorably to the signing of the Voting Rights Act in August of that same year, 1965.

It was my 10th visit to Selma to mark the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, and each one is more powerful than the last. The visit was organized by The Faith & Politics Institute and was led by JOHN LEWIS, our colleague, such a giant in our history and in this body.

While there, Members heard powerful and moving remarks from President Obama, who made history as the first African American to hold the highest office in our land. We also heard, Mr. Speaker, from the late Governor Wallace's daughter, Peggy Wallace Kennedy, who spoke eloquently and movingly about living in the shadow of her father's actions 50 years ago. Governor Wallace later recanted his support for segregation and asked forgiveness from the African American community, and his daughter has worked hard to build bridges and promote dialogue and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I include the remarks of the President into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members can read them and be inspired and uplifted, as I was in hearing them delivered.

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT OBAMA AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SELMA TO MONTGOMERY MARCHES EDMUND PETTUS BRIDGE—SELMA, ALABAMA

It is a rare honor in this life to follow one of your heroes. And John Lewis is one of my heroes.

Now, I have to imagine that when a younger John Lewis woke up that morning 50 years ago and made his way to Brown Chapel, heroics were not on his mind. A day like this was not on his mind. Young folks with bed-

rolls and backpacks were milling about. Veterans of the movement trained newcomers in the tactics of nonviolence; the right way to protect yourself when attacked. A doctor described what tear gas does to the body, while marchers scribbled down instructions for contacting their loved ones. The air was thick with doubt, anticipation and fear. And they comforted themselves with the final verse of the final hymn they sung:

"No matter what may be the test, God will take care of you; Lean, weary one, upon His breast, God will take care of you."

And then, his knapsack stocked with an apple, a toothbrush, and a book on government—all you need for a night behind bars—John Lewis led them out of the church on a mission to change America.

President and Mrs. Bush, Governor Bentley, Mayor Evans, Sewell, Reverend Strong, members of Congress, elected officials, foot soldiers, friends, fellow Americans:

As John noted, there are places and moments in America where this nation's destiny has been decided. Many are sites of war—Concord and Lexington, Appomattox, Gettysburg. Others are sites that symbolize the daring of America's character—Independence Hall and Seneca Falls, Kitty Hawk and Cape Canaveral.

Selma is such a place. In one afternoon 50 years ago, so much of our turbulent history—the stain of slavery and anguish of civil war; the yoke of segregation and tyranny of Jim Crow; the death of four little girls in Birmingham; and the dream of a Baptist preacher—all that history met on this bridge.

It was not a clash of armies, but a clash of wills; a contest to determine the true meaning of America. And because of men and women like John Lewis, Joseph Lowery, Hosea Williams, Amelia Boynton, Diane Nash, Ralph Abernathy, C.T. Vivian, Andrew Young, Fred Shuttlesworth, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and so many others, the idea of a just America and a fair America, an inclusive America, and a generous America—that idea ultimately triumphed.

As is true across the landscape of American history, we cannot examine this moment in isolation. The march on Selma was part of a broader campaign that spanned generations; the leaders that day part of a long line of heroes.

We gather here to celebrate them. We gather here to honor the courage of ordinary Americans willing to endure billy clubs and the chastening rod; tear gas and the trampling hoof; men and women who despite the gush of blood and splintered bone would stay true to their North Star and keep marching towards justice.

They did as Scripture instructed: "Rejoice in hope, be patient in tribulation, be constant in prayer." And in the days to come, they went back again and again. When the trumpet call sounded for more to join, the people came—black and white, young and old, Christian and Jew, waving the American flag and singing the same anthems full of faith and hope. A white newsman, Bill Plante, who covered the marches then and who is with us here today, quipped that the growing number of white people lowered the quality of the singing. To those who marched, though, those old gospel songs must have never sounded so sweet.

In time, their chorus would well up and reach President Johnson. And he would send them protection, and speak to the nation, echoing their call for America and the world to hear: "We shall overcome." What enormous faith these men and women had. Faith in God, but also faith in America.

The Americans who crossed this bridge, they were not physically imposing. But they gave courage to millions. They held no elected office. But they led a nation. They marched as Americans who had endured hundreds of years of brutal violence, countless daily indignities—but they didn't seek special treatment, just the equal treatment promised to them almost a century before.

What they did here will reverberate through the ages. Not because the change they won was preordained; not because their victory was complete; but because they proved that nonviolent change is possible, that love and hope can conquer hate.

As we commemorate their achievement, we are well-served to remember that at the time of the marches, many in power condemned rather than praised them. Back then, they were called Communists, or half-breeds, or outside agitators, sexual and moral degenerates, and worse—they were called everything but the name their parents gave them. Their faith was questioned. Their lives were threatened. Their patriotism challenged.

And yet, what could be more American than what happened in this place? What could more profoundly vindicate the idea of America than plain and humble people—unsung, the downtrodden, the dreamers not of high station, not born to wealth or privilege, not of one religious tradition but many, coming together to shape their country's course?

What greater expression of faith in the American experiment than this, what greater form of patriotism is there than the belief that America is not yet finished, that we are strong enough to be self-critical, that each successive generation can look upon our imperfections and decide that it is in our power to remake this nation to more closely align with our highest ideals?

That's why Selma is not some outlier in the American experience. That's why it's not a museum or a static monument to behold from a distance. It is instead the manifestation of a creed written into our founding documents: "We the People . . . in order to form a more perfect union." "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

These are not just words. They're a living thing, a call to action, a roadmap for citizenship and an insistence in the capacity of free men and women to shape our own destiny. For founders like Franklin and Jefferson, for leaders like Lincoln and FDR, the success of our experiment in self-government rested on engaging all of our citizens in this work. And that's what we celebrate here in Selma. That's what this movement was all about, one leg in our long journey toward freedom.

The American instinct that led these young men and women to pick up the torch and cross this bridge, that's the same instinct that moved patriots to choose revolution over tyranny. It's the same instinct that drew immigrants from across oceans and the Rio Grande; the same instinct that led women to reach for the ballot, workers to organize against an unjust status quo; the same instinct that led us to plant a flag at Iwo Jima and on the surface of the Moon.

It's the idea held by generations of citizens who believed that America is a constant work in progress; who believed that loving this country requires more than singing its praises or avoiding uncomfortable truths. It requires the occasional disruption, the willingness to speak out for what is right, to shake up the status quo. That's America.

That's what makes us unique. That's what cements our reputation as a beacon of oppor-

tunity. Young people behind the Iron Curtain would see Selma and eventually tear down that wall. Young people in Soweto would hear Bobby Kennedy talk about ripples of hope and eventually banish the scourge of apartheid. Young people in Burma went to prison rather than submit to military rule. They saw what John Lewis had done. From the streets of Tunis to the Maidan in Ukraine, this generation of young people can draw strength from this place, where the powerless could change the world's greatest power and push their leaders to expand the boundaries of freedom.

They saw that idea made real right here in Selma, Alabama. They saw that idea manifest itself here in America.

Because of campaigns like this, a Voting Rights Act was passed. Political and economic and social barriers came down. And the change these men and women wrought is visible here today in the presence of African Americans who run boardrooms, who sit on the bench, who serve in elected office from small towns to big cities; from the Congressional Black Caucus all the way to the Oval Office.

Because of what they did, the doors of opportunity swung open not just for black folks, but for every American. Women marched through those doors. Latinos marched through those doors. Asian Americans, gay Americans, Americans with disabilities—they all came through those doors. Their endeavors gave the entire South the chance to rise again, not by reasserting the past, but by transcending the past.

What a glorious thing, Dr. King might say. And what a solemn debt we owe. Which leads us to ask, just how might we repay that debt?

First and foremost, we have to recognize that one day's commemoration, no matter how special, is not enough. If Selma taught us anything, it's that our work is never done. The American experiment in self-government gives work and purpose to each generation.

Selma teaches us, as well, that action requires that we shed our cynicism. For when it comes to the pursuit of justice, we can afford neither complacency nor despair.

Just this week, I was asked whether I thought the Department of Justice's Ferguson report shows that, with respect to race, little has changed in this country. And I understood the question; the report's narrative was sadly familiar. It evoked the kind of abuse and disregard for citizens that spawned the Civil Rights Movement. But I rejected the notion that nothing's changed. What happened in Ferguson may not be unique, but it's no longer endemic. It's no longer sanctioned by law or by custom. And before the Civil Rights Movement, it most surely was.

We do a disservice to the cause of justice by intimating that bias and discrimination are immutable, that racial division is inherent to America. If you think nothing's changed in the past 50 years, ask somebody who lived through the Selma or Chicago or Los Angeles of the 1950s. Ask the female CEO who once might have been assigned to the secretarial pool if nothing's changed. Ask your gay friend if it's easier to be out and proud in America now than it was thirty years ago. To deny this progress, this hard-won progress—our progress—would be to rob us of our own agency, our own capacity, our responsibility to do what we can to make America better.

Of course, a more common mistake is to suggest that Ferguson is an isolated inci-

dent; that racism is banished; that the work that drew men and women to Selma is now complete, and that whatever racial tensions remain are a consequence of those seeking to play the 'race card' for their own purposes. We don't need the Ferguson report to know that's not true. We just need to open our eyes, and our ears, and our hearts to know that this nation's racial history still casts its long shadow upon us.

We know the march is not yet over. We know the race is not yet won. We know that reaching that blessed destination where we are judged, all of us, by the content of our character requires admitting as much, facing up to the truth. "We are capable of bearing a great burden," James Baldwin once wrote, "once we discover that the burden is reality and arrive where reality is."

There's nothing America can't handle if we actually look squarely at the problem. And this is work for all Americans, not just some. Not just whites. Not just blacks. If we want to honor the courage of those who marched that day, then all of us are called to possess their moral imagination. All of us will need to feel as they did the fierce urgency of now. All of us need to recognize as they did that change depends on our actions, on our attitudes, the things we teach our children. And if we make such an effort, no matter how hard it may sometimes seem, laws can be passed, and consciences can be stirred, and consensus can be built.

With such an effort, we can make sure our criminal justice system serves all and not just some. Together, we can raise the level of mutual trust that policing is built on—the idea that police officers are members of the community they risk their lives to protect, and citizens in Ferguson and New York and Cleveland, they just want the same thing young people here marched for 50 years ago—the protection of the law. Together, we can address unfair sentencing and overcrowded prisons, and the stunted circumstances that rob too many boys of the chance to become men, and rob the nation of too many men who could be good dads, and good workers, and good neighbors.

With effort, we can roll back poverty and the roadblocks to opportunity. Americans don't accept a free ride for anybody, nor do we believe in equality of outcomes. But we do expect equal opportunity. And if we really mean it, if we're not just giving lip service to it, but if we really mean it and are willing to sacrifice for it, then, yes, we can make sure every child gets an education suitable to this new century, one that expands imaginations and lifts sights and gives those children the skills they need. We can make sure every person willing to work has the dignity of a job, and a fair wage, and a real voice, and sturdier rungs on that ladder into the middle class.

And with effort, we can protect the foundation stone of our democracy for which so many marched across this bridge—and that is the right to vote. Right now, in 2015, 50 years after Selma, there are laws across this country designed to make it harder for people to vote. As we speak, more of such laws are being proposed. Meanwhile, the Voting Rights Act, the culmination of so much blood, so much sweat and tears, the product of so much sacrifice in the face of wanton violence, the Voting Rights Act stands weakened, its future subject to political rancor.

How can that be? The Voting Rights Act was one of the crowning achievements of our democracy, the result of Republican and Democratic efforts. President Reagan signed its renewal when he was in office. President

George W. Bush signed its renewal when he was in office. One hundred members of Congress have come here today to honor people who were willing to die for the right to protect it. If we want to honor this day, let that hundred go back to Washington and gather four hundred more, and together, pledge to make it their mission to restore that law this year. That's how we honor those on this bridge.

Of course, our democracy is not the task of Congress alone, or the courts alone, or even the President alone. If every new voter-suppression law was struck down today, we would still have, here in America, one of the lowest voting rates among free peoples. Fifty years ago, registering to vote here in Selma and much of the South meant guessing the number of jellybeans in a jar, the number of bubbles on a bar of soap. It meant risking your dignity, and sometimes, your life.

What's our excuse today for not voting? How do we so casually discard the right for which so many fought? How do we so fully give away our power, our voice, in shaping America's future? Why are we pointing to somebody else when we could take the time just to go to the polling places? We give away our power.

Fellow marchers, so much has changed in 50 years. We have endured war and we've fashioned peace. We've seen technological wonders that touch every aspect of our lives. We take for granted conveniences that our parents could have scarcely imagined. But what has not changed is the imperative of citizenship; that willingness of a 26-year-old deacon, or a Unitarian minister, or a young mother of five to decide they loved this country so much that they'd risk everything to realize its promise.

That's what it means to love America. That's what it means to believe in America. That's what it means when we say America is exceptional.

For we were born of change. We broke the old aristocracies, declaring ourselves entitled not by bloodline, but endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights. We secure our rights and responsibilities through a system of self-government, of and by and for the people. That's why we argue and fight with so much passion and conviction—because we know our efforts matter. We know America is what we make of it.

Look at our history. We are Lewis and Clark and Sacajawea, pioneers who braved the unfamiliar, followed by a stampede of farmers and miners, and entrepreneurs and hucksters. That's our spirit. That's who we are.

We are Sojourner Truth and Fannie Lou Hamer, women who could do as much as any man and then some. And we're Susan B. Anthony, who shook the system until the law reflected that truth. That is our character.

We're the immigrants who stowed away on ships to reach these shores, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free—Holocaust survivors, Soviet defectors, the Lost Boys of Sudan. We're the hopeful strivers who cross the Rio Grande because we want our kids to know a better life. That's how we came to be.

We're the slaves who built the White House and the economy of the South. We're the ranch hands and cowboys who opened up the West, and countless laborers who laid rail, and raised skyscrapers, and organized for workers' rights.

We're the fresh-faced GIs who fought to liberate a continent. And we're the Tuskegee Airmen, and the Navajo code-talkers, and the Japanese Americans who

fought for this country even as their own liberty had been denied.

We're the firefighters who rushed into those buildings on 9/11, the volunteers who signed up to fight in Afghanistan and Iraq. We're the gay Americans whose blood ran in the streets of San Francisco and New York, just as blood ran down this bridge.

We are storytellers, writers, poets, artists who abhor unfairness, and despise hypocrisy, and give voice to the voiceless, and tell truths that need to be told.

We're the inventors of gospel and jazz and blues, bluegrass and country, and hip-hop and rock and roll, and our very own sound with all the sweet sorrow and reckless joy of freedom.

We are Jackie Robinson, enduring scorn and spiked cleats and pitches coming straight to his head, and stealing home in the World Series anyway.

We are the people Langston Hughes wrote of who "build our temples for tomorrow, strong as we know how." We are the people Emerson wrote of, "who for truth and honor's sake stand fast and suffer long;" who are "never tired, so long as we can see far enough."

That's what America is. Not stock photos or airbrushed history, or feeble attempts to define some of us as more American than others. We respect the past, but we don't pine for the past. We don't fear the future; we grab for it. America is not some fragile thing. We are large, in the words of Whitman, containing multitudes. We are boisterous and diverse and full of energy, perpetually young in spirit. That's why someone like John Lewis at the ripe old age of 25 could lead a mighty march.

And that's what the young people here today and listening all across the country must take away from this day. You are America. Unconstrained by habit and convention. Unencumbered by what is, because you're ready to seize what ought to be.

For everywhere in this country, there are first steps to be taken, there's new ground to cover, there are more bridges to be crossed. And it is you, the young and fearless at heart, the most diverse and educated generation in our history, who the nation is waiting to follow.

Because Selma shows us that America is not the project of any one person. Because the single-most powerful word in our democracy is the word "We." "We The People." "We Shall Overcome." "Yes We Can." That word is owned by no one. It belongs to everyone. Oh, what a glorious task we are given, to continually try to improve this great nation of ours.

Fifty years from Bloody Sunday, our march is not yet finished, but we're getting closer. Two hundred and thirty-nine years after this nation's founding our union is not yet perfect, but we are getting closer. Our job's easier because somebody already got us through that first mile. Somebody already got us over that bridge. When it feels the road is too hard, when the torch we've been passed feels too heavy, we will remember these early travelers, and draw strength from their example, and hold firmly the words of the prophet Isaiah: "Those who hope in the Lord will renew their strength. They will soar on [the] wings like eagles. They will run and not grow weary. They will walk and not be faint."

We honor those who walked so we could run. We must run so our children soar. And we will not grow weary. For we believe in the power of an awesome God, and we believe in this country's sacred promise.

May He bless those warriors of justice no longer with us, and bless the United States of America. Thank you, everybody.

### THE GOP BUDGET

(Ms. BONAMICI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, America has always been the country of opportunity. For those struggling, our country works to prevent families from becoming destitute and provides critical supports to help them out of difficult circumstances so they can earn a living and support their families. This support serves as a statement of our values, that you don't have to be born lucky to overcome hardship and succeed.

But the budget released today by my colleagues in the majority does not reflect these values. Instead of strengthening vital services like food assistance or investing in K-12 education, it slashes them. It reinforces the idea that your circumstances are your destiny.

We should be investing in American workers and creating an economy that will help everyone get ahead. Unfortunately, the priorities expressed today do not reflect this vision, and I hope we can work together toward a budget that does.

### A BALANCED BUDGET FOR A STRONGER AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about the Republican budget that was just announced today, and I do that with a great amount of pride and excitement as vice chairman of that committee.

I also look forward to working with the gentlelady who just spoke during the 1-minute speeches, not only to create a sustainable budget and priorities for America, but to debunk many of the things that she just said.

I am pleased to be joined by several members of the Committee on the Budget to help me do this.

Before we get into the details, I feel it appropriate, Mr. Speaker, and absolutely necessary to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip of the House of Representatives, a friend of mine, to discuss some of the things that have happened to the great citizens in Louisiana.

#### HONORING THE LOUISIANA GUARDSMEN WHO PERISHED LAST WEEK

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Indiana for yielding.

As we observed a moment of silence on the House floor just a little while ago, I rise today in honor of the 11 brave American servicemen involved in last week's tragic helicopter crash off the coast of Florida. It is heart-breaking events like this, Mr. Speaker, which remind us that freedom is not free.

Four of those heroes were members of the Louisiana National Guard stationed within the 1st of the 244th Assault Helicopter Battalion out of Hammond, Louisiana, which is located in my district.

Our hearts are heavy, Mr. Speaker, as our Nation joins the battalion in mourning the loss of Chief Warrant Officer George Wayne Griffin, Jr., Chief Warrant Officer George David Strother, Staff Sergeant Lance Bergeron, and Staff Sergeant Thomas Florich. Their names will forever be engraved in our hearts and in our minds. They were described by their fellow soldiers as extraordinary and amazing aviators.

Colonel Patrick Bossetta, the commander of the State Aviation Command, who I spoke with over the weekend, said this, Mr. Speaker:

"This crew was made up of the larger-than-life men who have had a passion for Army aviation that was so evident in the dedication that they had towards their profession. I know this, as I have personally flown with each one of them. They were driven by their intense desire to selflessly serve their country, fellow soldiers, and marines."

I want to talk about what some of their other colleagues said about them.

Lieutenant Colonel John L. Bonnette II, who is the commander of the 244th said:

"When I say they were heroes, I mean it many times over. They risked their lives under difficult conditions, flying in combat and during national emergencies, to ensure our security and help save thousands of people. I don't have the words to sum up their lives in a few sentences. You just can't. Our whole aviation family is reeling from this loss. The hole that is left is enormous. They were part of the fabric of this unit. The difference they made with everyone they served with will be a lasting legacy. Personally, flying with all of them was a privilege and an honor. I am a better person for having known them."

These heroes, Mr. Speaker, were husbands, fathers, and sons. We reflect upon the countless sacrifices they made for our great Nation, the selfless call they answered to defend our freedoms. They died doing what they loved.

I want to take a few moments now to let the American people know about these four members of the Louisiana National Guard who died in this tragic accident.

First is Chief Warrant Officer 4 George Wayne Griffin, Jr., who was 37 years old. Chief Warrant Officer Griffin

was from Delhi, Louisiana, and joined the Louisiana National Guard in 1994 and was commissioned as a warrant officer in 1999 before going on to become the battalion standardization pilot with over 6,000 flight hours, including more than 1,000 combat hours. He later deployed to Iraq in 2004 to 2005 and again was redeployed in 2008 and 2009. He also served during State deployments in the aftermath of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Isaac, as well as in support of Operations River Guardian and Deepwater Horizon.

"G. Wayne Griffin was born to be an Army Aviator," said Chief Warrant Officer 5 Reggie Lane, commander of Detachment 38, Operational Support Airlift Command. "As one of the most talented and respected warrant officers in the Louisiana National Guard, he had a tremendous passion for flying and a God-given natural ability to fly both helicopters and airplanes and to teach others to be the best aviators and crewmembers they could be. He was a great friend and brother to all. With his loss, there will be a void that may never be filled."

Griffin is survived by his wife, Becky, four children, and his father.

Now, Chief Warrant Officer 4 George David Strother was 44 years old. Chief Warrant Officer Strother was from Alexandria and served in the Louisiana National Guard from 1988 to 2007 and again from 2009 until his death last week. He deployed to Iraq in 2004 and 2005, to Afghanistan in 2011, and Kosovo in 2014. He also served during State deployments for Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Isaac. Strother commissioned as a warrant officer in 1994 before going on to become an instructor pilot, with over 2,400 flight hours, including more than 700 combat hours.

"To describe Dave Strother as a big personality would not be accurate. He was more like a force of nature that could best be observed and marveled at, never opposed or altered," said Major Andre Jeansonne, commander, F Company, 2nd Battalion, 135th Aviation Regiment. "His huge heart touched the lives of all men he met."

Strother is survived by his wife, Melissa, his son and a stepdaughter, and his mother.

Staff Sergeant Lance Bergeron, 40 years old. Staff Sergeant Lance Bergeron of Thibodaux, Louisiana, enlisted into the U.S. Marine Corps in 1998 before joining the Louisiana National Guard in 2001 as a Black Hawk repairman. His extensive experience as a qualified enlisted flight instructor, graduate of the aircraft crewmember standardization instructor course, aircraft maintainer force, and warrior leader course made Bergeron a crew chief others aspired to be, according to members of his own unit. The combat veteran deployed to Iraq twice, in 2004 to 2005, and again in 2008 to 2009. Bergeron also served during State de-

ploymments for Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Isaac, and Operation River Guardian. Bergeron is survived by his wife, Monique, two children, and his mother and father.

Finally, Staff Sergeant Thomas Florich, 26 years old. Staff Sergeant Florich, of Fairfax County, Virginia, enlisted in the Louisiana National Guard in 2007 as a Black Hawk repairer. He was posthumously promoted from sergeant to staff sergeant. Staff Sergeant Florich served during State deployment for Operation Deepwater Horizon and Hurricane Isaac. He earned more than 125 flight hours and was a graduate of the warrior leader course.

"Tom was full of life, and his personality could light the room," said Marquez. "He was family with this unit and felt at home working with his brothers in Alpha Company. His dedication to duty and loyalty was without equal, always ready to accept any mission and extra duty in order to help the unit meet the mission. He will be greatly missed by the unit and the flight facility."

Florich is survived by his wife, Meghan, who is expecting their first child, as well as his father and step-mother.

□ 1630

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, these four men served their country and the people of Louisiana with great honor. They deployed to war zones and served during times of great emergency for our State. They represent the very best of what our military stands for.

On behalf of my family, the Louisiana congressional delegation, and the entire House of Representatives, I want to say thank you to these four men and their families for the sacrifices they have made and for their service to our country. Their service and sacrifice will not be forgotten. They will remain in our prayers.

God bless these heroes, and God bless America.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for those eulogies and for being all too appropriate in the honor that we should give these fallen Americans, as great as they have been.

Today, after votes for the day, Mr. Speaker, I want to recap some of the things that happened earlier in the day.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor to say that at about 10:45 this morning, the Republican members of the Budget Committee held a press conference where we explained to the American people our vision for our priorities and for the priorities of America to get us back on track. "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America," is our theme.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased and proud to say that this theme isn't altogether new for the United States House of Representatives Republicans. In fact, in large part, this is the fifth year

in a row that we have proposed these kinds of ideas so that we can live responsibly in the here and now to produce and afford a better tomorrow for our children and grandchildren.

Isn't that, Mr. Speaker, what we are here to be about? Hasn't it always been the history of these great United States that we would leave the next generation better off than the current generation has had it?

As you know, Mr. Speaker, and as my colleagues will help me point out here over the next hour, we stand here as actually the first generation in American history that is poised to leave the next one worse off by any objective measure.

That is why the budgets that we produce, the spending that we promulgate here in the United States Congress really needs to be scrutinized, really needs to be prioritized.

It is going to take people with a great degree of personal responsibility and leadership, Mr. Speaker, to have a great, truthful conversation with the American people to, number one, tell them what the situation really is, but just as important, number two, to let them know that there are solutions, that we can fix it if we just show them what they are.

Let me quickly go through some of the points of our budget that we will mark up in committee tomorrow and expect to be on the floor next week for a vote.

Again, the first point, this plan will balance the budget in less than 10 years. That is faster than any of the recent House Republican budgets. Mr. Speaker, it is in stark contrast to the President's budget, which never balances, ever.

How can we pay off this \$18 trillion-plus in debt that we have right now, plus the hundred trillion that is on the way over the next several decades, if we never first get it to balance? This Republican budget does that. We do it in less than 10 years.

Now, many American families are saying, 10 years? I wish I had 10 years to balance our budget. I have to balance it immediately in our households, some might say. For a government that spends over \$3 trillion a year, it takes a while to turn that big aircraft carrier, so to speak, around.

That is why I use the word "responsible," Mr. Speaker. We are being responsible in these reforms, in these priority changes, so that people have time to adapt, so that we can get the economy going again to produce more revenue to make perhaps that 10 years even go by quicker, but this is a responsible way to do it.

All we have to do is show the rest of the world that we have a pathway to prosperity and we will continue to be the best place in the world to invest, to grow a business, to grow a family for the next several decades, as we have been for the last several hundred years.

The other thing our budget does, Mr. Speaker, is it repeals ObamaCare, saving nearly \$2 trillion in the process. This is government-controlled health care. It has never worked in the past. It is not going to work now.

We get rid of it, encouraging us to start over with health care reforms in a way that Americans feel comfortable in keeping their doctor, for example, in ways that respect free market principles of supply and demand, in ways that naturally stop us from overconsuming. That is the baseline from which we should have a health care reform debate and policy, not from a government-controlled perspective.

Our budget also proudly relies on a fairer and simpler Tax Code. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Congressional Budget Office, those that are tasked with keeping track of our economic indicators and scoring the different bills that come through Congress, has indicated that our GDP—our gross domestic product in this country—will be assumed to be about 2.3 percent over the next several years.

Now, that is new information, Mr. Speaker. Never before has our GDP growth been calculated to be that low; yet it is because of our current policies over the last several years that they must calculate our GDP growth to be that low. We call for changing that formula.

A fairer, simpler Tax Code allows for job creators to create those jobs, to create more investment, and to invest more in their people and businesses. That creates a net economic positive effect that creates economic value that ultimately, Mr. Speaker, will allow more tax revenue into the government's coffers to help balance the budget and then begin to pay off our debt.

Mr. Speaker, our budget also proudly provides for a strong national defense. As we have heard now for the last several weeks, months, and years, the global war on terror is very much alive, very much real, very much a serious threat, and it would be irresponsible of us to continue cutting our military at a time when these threats exist. Our budget recognizes that.

Our budget calls for more spending in our military than President Obama, the Commander in Chief, has said he needs; and I think it reflects the reality of the situation around the world today, Mr. Speaker. You will see the Republicans stand strong for our military men and women and the defense budget that they need.

This budget also, Mr. Speaker, gives power back to the States. In legislative parlance and philosophical parlance, that is called federalism. Really what this budget is and recognizes is that those individuals and the States are much better at governing the affairs of their respective lives and their respective people than a prescriptive, one-size-fits-all recipe from Washington.

Our budget calls for flexibility, giving the property of individuals and States, i.e., their tax dollars, back to them so they can run social programs that they think are important, that fit the needs of their constituencies and their communities, and that gets Washington out of the way.

Our Medicaid reform proposals, for example, are a great example of this concept, where we send the States' and the individuals' property back to them—their tax dollars, in terms of Medicaid—and say: You know what, you are better at determining who is really poor in your communities and your States and what kind and what amounts of health care those people need.

Then, finally, the third leg to that is what the delivery system for those services would look like.

Who says that we have the answers to all this? It is no one-size-fits-all, prescriptive policy. The States are where it is at. The individuals and their communities know better than we do how to serve those most in need.

That gets right to the heart of Ms. BONAMICI's allegations during her 1-minute speech. Throwing money at something—into a system that is broken, that doesn't work—is no way to fix a problem. It only grows our debt and makes people more dependent on broken programs.

Let's trust our fellow citizens. Let's trust our local elected officials to know their communities and their constituencies best. That is how you get people out of dependency.

Our goal with the Republican budget is to get people off these programs, not to make them lifetime dependents. There is no freedom, there is no liberty, there is no personal responsibility in that.

The Republican budget also recognizes and focuses on the dignity that comes with a job, the dignity that comes with work. That is altogether important and, Mr. Speaker, altogether lost in so many ways in so many places in this city and in this Congress—the dignity of work, earning the success, the happiness that comes with that. This Republican budget reflects all of that.

I am pleased at this time to yield the floor to several members of the Budget Committee, all of whom have helped put this document together, all of whom have worked diligently and seriously on behalf of the American people—and especially their constituents—to make this document not only bold, but accurate, in terms of its numbers and philosophically correct.

First, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, a new Member to this body, Congressman ALEX MOONEY. He lives in Charles Town in Jefferson County in West Virginia and has three children. He is the son of a Cuban refugee and Vietnam veteran.

Alex grew up with a deep sense of appreciation for the American ideals of individual freedom and personal responsibility. That, Mr. Speaker, is what makes him a great member of the House Budget Committee.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, thank you to Congressman TODD ROKITA for arranging this Special Order to talk about the House budget released today titled: "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America."

As a freshman member of the House Budget Committee and the Representative of West Virginia on the committee, I worked to deliver on West Virginia priorities in the House budget.

The first of these priorities is to balance the Federal budget. It is totally unacceptable for West Virginia—and all Americans—to live within their means while the Federal Government allows spending and debt to run rampant. While the House budget released today is not perfect, it balances, unlike the President's budget.

As you can see right here, it is a 10-year budget cycle. Our budget balances in year nine. Not only does the President's budget not balance, it creates more debt and deficit each and every year as you go along. We don't have a partner to work with at the administrative level in the President's office to balance the budget.

We had to do this on our own because the American people demand and deserve a balanced budget. It is the right thing to do, and that is a bipartisan statement. As I traveled my State and my district last year, I heard from everybody, Republican and Democrat, that they wanted a balanced budget. This puts us on the path to do so.

I also successfully led three budget proposals through the committee process, and each are now included in the final House budget released today. The first two will stop the President's war on coal in its tracks, and the third cuts unnecessary Federal spending.

The first proposal stops the administration's efforts to close coal-fired power plants. We simply did this by eliminating any funding for the development and implementation of new ozone standard regulations by the Environmental Protection Agency, or the EPA.

The coal industry has already spent billions of dollars over the last few years coming into compliance with previous ozone standard rules, but the President's EPA is expected to release new ozone standards anyway, designed intentionally to shutter coal plants.

The President and his radical environmentalist allies fail to recognize that many States still rely on coal to provide energy at affordable household prices.

Over 90 percent of West Virginia households rely on coal for affordable, reliable energy. Recent estimates say implementation of the President's new

rule would cost over 10,000 jobs in West Virginia.

The second proposal I secured in the House budget to stop the President's war on coal was to prevent funding for a new stream buffer rule from the Department of the Interior.

The administration has already spent over \$7 million writing this rule, which is designed to allow the administration to claim regulatory jurisdiction within 100 feet of anything they deem to be a stream.

□ 1645

That dubious proposition would allow Federal regulators to shut down surface mining operations in almost every region of West Virginia with the stroke of a pen. That is not how we make laws.

Some studies estimate that Federal and State governments will lose \$4 billion to \$5 billion in tax revenue if it is enacted, and the coal industry would lose \$14 billion to \$20 billion in revenue and as many as 85,000 jobs in our region.

Stopping the War on Coal is good policy for hardworking West Virginia taxpayers and good policy for our Nation. We must continue to pursue an all-of-the-above energy approach to secure energy independence and grow our economy.

I am proud of this budget's rejection of discrimination against certain forms of energy production, such as coal, which the President deems to not be politically correct.

To cut Federal waste, my third proposal defunds the Legal Services Corporation, an agency which operates far outside its original mandate after decades absent of any congressional oversight.

Defunding the Legal Services Corporation is a proposal supported by both the Congressional Budget Office and The Heritage Foundation. Instead of providing legal services to the poor, as is its mandate, the organization has been used to advance pro-abortion and politically ideological policies, as well as increase spending on welfare.

Defunding this organization would remove a Federal agency operating outside of its mandate and would also save taxpayers millions of dollars.

I am proud these proposals were included in the House budget to stop the President's assault on energy jobs and cut waste from the Federal Government. I look forward to continuing to fight for West Virginia priorities as the budget process continues. With real solutions, we can restore fiscal conservatism to Washington and foster economic prosperity for our Nation.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman. If the gentleman would stay, I would like to engage him in a question if he could.

I am very interested in what you are saying. You come from an area of this

country, like so many areas of this country, that understand the meaning of the fact that when you pull something out of the ground and you process it, you have just created wealth. You have just created jobs for people.

That is not a dirty thing. And, in fact, the coal industry and the fossil fuel industry today, they are the cleanest they have ever been and have done so much good work. They have been chided and bullied for so many years now.

But I want you to tell us about how the electricity that comes from coal eventually not just is less dirty than it was before, but that it produces the electricity that gives people clean water, and not just in West Virginia or in Indiana, but in Africa. It raises people altogether out of poverty.

Could you talk more about what happens in West Virginia and the good it brings to people there and around the world?

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Sure. We burn clean coal and we see the use of coal. As I mentioned, 90 percent of our State uses coal for their energy. It is the cheapest, most affordable type of energy, electricity, that can be created, so it is a blessing to have that in our State and other States that have it as well.

We already burn it clean. The coal industry has dealt with regulations under previous administrations for many years. We are burning it clean.

It is not an accident. It is an intention of this administration because they stated it when they said they want a war on coal. They stated they are going to make it—the President himself said he is going to make it so expensive that it would bankrupt the coal production companies and shut down coal that way. So it is their goal to make standards that aren't just reasonable, but that are intended to stop an agency from producing.

I would like to also point out, we ship coal to other countries. We ship coal to China, for example. Well, guess what?

There is no EPA in China. They burn the coal there much, much dirtier than we do in this country. So it is cleaner to burn it here anyway than to ship it to other countries and have them burn it. So it makes no sense.

In fact, they are harming the environment. These very policies that are intended to help the environment are actually harming the environment. It makes no sense. It is harming every taxpayer, every family who wants this affordable form of energy.

Mr. ROKITA. Right. Reclaiming my time, I would say that every person we employ in West Virginia, in Indiana, and anywhere else in the country, gets a paycheck for sure. That is a great thing.

The government, both at the State and Federal levels and maybe even the



local level, gets a cut of that, right? And that eventually gets here to Washington, D.C.

Sir, does it not make sense then that that would help pay down—excuse me, let's look at your chart—pay down the deficits, eventually getting us to balance, as we stated, in less than 10 years, and then allowing us to begin to work on our surplus over the next several decades?

So we certainly have to cut spending, and that is the main driver of our debt, and reform the social entitlement programs that are driving the debt. But every little bit of economic growth, economic activity that comes with a job, that comes with a paycheck, allows us, if we wanted to, like we do in this budget, to pay down those deficits in the debt.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Yes. Thank you for yielding.

I would say tens and really hundreds of thousands of jobs are on the line with these coal policies that prevent people from having good-paying jobs and feeding their families. And both parties can agree—it is a bipartisan proposal—the best way to help the poor or to help anybody not get on government assistance is to get a good-paying job, and that is what we are trying to provide here, good-paying jobs, the dignity that you mentioned, Congressman, in your earlier remarks about the dignity of having a good-paying job.

Folks in my State and, I am sure, others, want those good-paying jobs because they want that dignity. They want to work. They don't want to have to be relying on government programs.

So the assault on the coal industry and the energy industry in general is something that is particularly harmful to our State. And anyone listening across this country, I would be careful, because if they can discriminate against one form of energy, which is coal, what is next?

There is an agenda here that exists to discriminate against various types of energy production. Look, we just want to be fair. We want an all-of-the-above energy policy. We want these jobs here at home that are going to happen anyway because they are doing it in other countries, so we want these jobs here at home. They are good-paying jobs.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman.

Reclaiming my time, I thank Congressman MOONEY for his expertise in this area, coming from the State of West Virginia.

Again, I would say he is an excellent member of the Budget Committee and takes his job seriously, and I welcome him to continue with our discussion here.

Mr. Speaker, if I can inquire how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn our attention now to another hard-charging member of the Budget Committee, someone else who is new to Congress and who is bringing that energy, along with great ideas, to the discussion. A lot of his ideas are found in this budget.

Congressman JOHN MOOLENAAR of Michigan was a chemist, or perhaps is still a chemist. He worked in the private sector prior to joining us here. He is an example of a team that created the jobs that better our economy, that allow us to crawl out of this deficit and debt that we are facing because of our overspending, and his experience will allow us to be part—allow the conversation to illustrate the solutions that come with raising our GDP level back to where it used to be not just a few years ago so that we can have a better economy now and a better future for our children.

Before serving in Congress, JOHN MOOLENAAR served on the Midland City Council and in the State legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR).

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Thank you very much. I want to thank my colleague from Indiana for his leadership organizing this presentation today.

Mr. Speaker, as it is clear from the charts and the discussion we have already had today, Washington has a spending problem.

In January, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office estimated that the Federal Government would collect \$3.4 trillion in revenue in fiscal year 2016.

The week after that, the Obama administration released a \$4 trillion spending plan that raises taxes and never balances, a refusal to live within the government's means.

Out-of-control Federal spending has exploded the national debt. In 2014, revenue to the Federal Government was 49 percent higher than in 2000. Yet, spending for 2014 was 95 percent higher than 2000.

As part of the economy, the debt is at its highest point since the 1950s. Much of the problem is spending required by unsustainable government programs. This spending has increased dramatically and crowded out funding for national security and other priorities.

Mandatory spending alone in 2014 cost \$2.3 trillion, more than was spent funding the entire government in 2004.

As a member of the House Budget Committee, I have worked with our colleagues to craft a budget that addresses our country's fiscal challenges. The House Republican budget balances within 10 years and does not raise taxes.

It reforms unsustainable government programs while keeping the promises that have been made to our seniors. It grants flexibility to the States on Medicaid, allowing them to craft their own

health care programs for those in need. This change brings Medicaid closer to the American people it was meant to serve.

I hope that Members of both parties, in both the Senate and the House, will be able to come together and address the budget in a responsible way, without raising taxes on hardworking families who have seen their wages stagnate during this historically slow economic recovery.

The House Republican budget puts our country on a path toward a more stable and responsible fiscal future.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. MOOLENAAR points out some of the obvious and perhaps maybe not so obvious problems the budget faces and what we face as a Congress.

Really quickly, before introducing a veteran member of the committee, I want to illustrate a little bit what, Mr. Speaker, Mr. MOOLENAAR was discussing.

Here you see, in a pie graph form, what our Federal Government, what your Federal Government spends its money on. I have taken the liberty of dissecting or pushing out two pieces of that pie to show you, really, from a year-to-year perspective situation, what we get to vote on as Members of Congress.

It is defense discretionary, as we call it, and there is nondefense discretionary. In terms of the fund centers and the lines in the budget, we can dial those up or dial those amounts down year to year, Budget Control Act deals and all that notwithstanding.

But it is the rest of this pie that Mr. MOOLENAAR indicates that is so alarming, because the rest of this pie, I can't, Mr. Speaker, you can't, Mr. MOOLENAAR can't dial up the spending or dial it down year to year by our vote on the budget or our vote on appropriations bills because the funding formula for those programs is found in the underlying law.

So Congressman ROKITA doesn't get to decide how much Social Security an eligible citizen receives year to year, or what the Medicare services are going to be, or what the costs or payouts for them are going to be, or determine right now what the one-size-fits-all Medicaid program looks like. That is all determined by the underlying law.

This spending, until we reform these programs, is on autopilot. It just goes on and on and on and on, and that is why these programs too need to be reformed.

So we have taken the extra step in our House Republican budget and outlined solutions for the other committees, for Members of Congress, for the American people, that would work to not only pay down the deficits but then our debt over time after we come into balance, recognizing, being honest with the American people about what is causing our debt.



If you see from this pie graph, it is only about 40 percent of our budget year to year that we can dial up or down simply by a vote on the budget.

□ 1700

Over 60 percent is on autopilot.

So you can't possibly pay off our deficits and our debt until you address the underlying cause—what is driving our debt—and that is these entitlement programs of Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, the interest we owe ourselves and other countries for this debt we are racking up, and a smorgasbord of other mandatory spending, mostly welfare programs.

The Republican budget not only recognizes that, not only tells the American people the truth, but then offers solutions of what could solve the situation over a reasonable amount of time.

A fellow who has been integral to making sure that these good ideas have stayed in our budget now for the fifth time in the last several years is a gentleman I have come to know as a good friend, a trusted confidant, a fellow whom I have said from this microphone before represents the people in his district in Georgia so very, very well, and not only that but represents America so well because of his excellent oratory, his good ideas, and his intense work ethic, which we need more of, frankly, around here, Mr. Speaker.

I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia, Mr. ROBERT WOODALL.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend, the vice chairman for yielding.

I know the vice chairman won't brag about himself, Mr. Speaker. So let me brag about him just for a second.

He got elected when I got elected 4 years ago. But when you think about what the American people have asked for from this Congress in terms of solving the problems that affect their lives, in terms of dealing with the issues that threaten economic prosperity, in terms of doing the heavy lifting that is required, they have cleared out more than half of this institution.

Well, if you got elected in the class that the vice chairman and I were elected in 4 years ago, you are already in the top 50 percent of seniority in this institution.

We talk about how folks come to Congress and stay forever. America has been turning people out on their ear left and right over these last 4 years, which has allowed folks like the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA) to rise to these levels where they can lead on these issues.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the vice chairman didn't come from a legislative background. He came from a background as a shot-caller. He was the secretary of State in Indiana. He didn't have somebody else to blame when things went wrong. The buck stopped on his desk. Every single day, the buck

stopped on his desk, exactly like it does for every father and every mother and every employer anywhere across this country. And when you now have filled this institution with folks who were shot-callers yesterday and now have been asked to find agreement among 435 of their colleagues, you get exciting results, exciting results.

I am going to keep the chart that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) had up here, Mr. Speaker.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR) is a freshman. He sold himself short when he talked about the hard work to get this budget done, and you need look no further than this chart to see it.

Mr. Speaker, I don't fault the President's work ethic. I think the President works hard to do what he thinks is best for this country. But there is not one family in America that believes you can borrow as much as you want to borrow, spend as much as you want to spend, and your family's economic future will be secure. They all know that is a path to disaster.

This blue line represents the budget deficits in the President's budget, the budget that he just sent to Congress. It is his legal responsibility to do it. He did it. This is the plan that he laid out for America—deficits as far as the eye can see, borrowing not just for the next year or the next 10 years or the next 20 years or the next 30 years, but forever.

The work that Mr. MOOLENAAR and Mr. ROKITA have done isn't easy. It is unpleasant work. I don't know why you took the job, I will say to my friend from Indiana. It is an awful job to be vice chairman of the Budget Committee because your job is to do the things that haven't gotten done before. Your job is to do the things that were too hard for everybody else to do, and you have stepped into the breach to do it.

This red line, Mr. Speaker, represents deficits under the budget that Mr. ROKITA and Chairman TOM PRICE of Georgia are bringing to a markup in the Budget Committee tomorrow. They couldn't balance the budget in day one. There is a lot of sweat equity in this chart. They could not balance the budget in day one because the red ink is just too thick. You have got to do it in a responsible way. They made the tough decisions to cut deficits in half by year two, in half by year two and on out to budget surpluses by the time you get to the end of the 10-year window, a balanced budget for America.

You can't see the sweat stains on this chart, Mr. Speaker. But there is sweat equity in this chart. We are not talking about, are you going to spend an extra million dollars here, an extra million dollars there. We are not talking about, are you going to prioritize environmental spending or national park spending. We are not talking about, are you going to prioritize transportation

spending via roads or transportation spending via air.

We are talking about, are you going to balance the budget ever. Or are you going to borrow from your children and your grandchildren as far as the eye can see?

And I have news, Mr. Speaker. Every single one of these dollars and deficits you see in the President's budget represents a dollar of future tax increases or future benefit cuts. I want you to think about that.

What Mr. ROKITA and the Budget Committee have done is to put together a courageous package that says, We should pay for the bills today that we are incurring today. We should not sacrifice tomorrow's prosperity for today's indulgence. We should do the tough things when we can so that our children don't have to labor under those burdens.

Every single one of these dollars that the President borrows and spends—and, I should add, this is with a \$1 trillion tax increase; even with \$1 trillion in new taxes, the President still is running these kinds of deficits—represents either a tax increase for your children and your grandchildren or a benefit cut for your children and your grandchildren. Those are the only two ways to get a dollar in this country.

We should have the courage, if we want to spend money, to go find the money to spend. We should have the courage that if we want to cut benefits, to cut those benefits today, not 100 years from today. We should have the courage to do the difficult things that need to be done. And I am just grateful to the gentleman from Indiana and his leadership on the committee. What we are going to mark up—it will probably be a 12-hour markup tomorrow. I am so excited about it. I am so excited about it. What we are going to mark up is a budget that every Member of this Chamber can be proud of.

And I will tell you a secret, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to let the cat out of the bag. I don't think it is too soon to break the news. But I have seen some patterns in the 4 years I have been here. My expectation is that, as hard as the Budget Committee has worked on this document, as much sweat equity has gone into doing the difficult things that need to be done, my guess is that they are going to allow any Member of this Chamber who wants to write a budget to offer their ideas and get a vote on those ideas too. We have seen it year after year after year. I suspect we are going to see it again.

This isn't about trying to shut folks out of the process, Mr. Speaker. This is about trying to bring folks into the process. The kind of collaborative process the vice chairman of the committee has driven, along with Chairman TOM PRICE, is the difference between taking the responsibility on our shoulders, as

parents, grandparents, legislators, citizens, or kicking that can down the road to the next generation.

I just couldn't be more proud of the effort and the work product that my friend from Indiana has created.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. As much as I appreciate his comments about the work we have all done on the Budget Committee, they are certainly undeserved with regards to me. It was a team effort from the beginning. It continues to be a team effort.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Georgia is exactly right, though, that every Member of this Chamber—and that is Republican or Democrat—can be proud of this budget. This honestly and accurately solves this country's Federal Government fiscal problems. And they should also be proud of the fact that, as the gentleman mentions, other ideas are going to be accepted in regular order and be voted on. And it really doesn't get more American than that. That will be an honor that has continued to be our tradition, and I see no reason that that won't continue.

If the gentleman would, I would like to hear his thoughts on the Medicare part of our budget.

The gentleman heard me reference the fact that the autopilot spending, these social programs need to be reformed. And I want to be very clear not only with my colleagues, with the gentleman from Georgia, but also with the American people, Mr. Speaker, that we are not cutting, we are not slashing, we are not ending Medicare or these other programs, as I know perhaps there will be some scare tactic language presented. I hope that is not the case. I continue to hope. But the fact of the matter is, we save and we strengthen Medicare.

I yield to the gentleman for his comments in that regard.

Mr. WOODALL. Well, I appreciate my friend for yielding.

I know my friend is well known in this body for his work on Medicaid and the effort to save that important health care program as well, and I thank him for that.

Medicare is a great example. It is a great example. There is not a Member in this institution, Mr. Speaker, who believes that we have the money or could even find the money to pay for Medicare as it is structured today.

It is not a question of, is it going to go bankrupt; it is a question of when is it going to go bankrupt. And that is not a Budget Committee member from the State of Georgia talking. Those are the Medicare trustees talking. The folks who are in charge of looking after the program year after year after year tell us that it is going to go under.

What people in my district ask for, I will say to my friend from Indiana, is not a leg up, not something for noth-

ing, not a free lunch. They just want to know what the rules are. And if you tell them what the rules are, they will rise to the occasion.

I am in my forties. I know Medicare is not going to be there for me the way it is for my parents. I worry it won't be there at all for folks in my age bracket.

What the Budget Committee has done in this budget is absolutely to protect Medicare. It has gone from something that might not be there for me—and certainly wouldn't be there for me in the way that my parents have known it—to a commitment that I can count on. Not I, the United States Congressman; I, as a 45-year-old citizen in America for whom payroll taxes—those taxes that pay for Medicare—have been the largest tax burden that 80 percent of American families have paid all of their lives.

These dollars that you see here represent dollars that the President, in many cases, is frittering away on today's consumption but that we are re-investing in Medicare to ensure that it survives for another day.

And what it does, Mr. Speaker—I don't know how deeply you have dug into the Budget Committee Medicare proposal—it anticipates providing choice in the Medicare system the likes of which Medicare has never seen.

I mean, America has seen that wildly successful Medicare Advantage program. Have you seen that, Mr. Speaker? I mean, it has been the source of attempts to slash over and over and over again by this administration for reasons that I cannot imagine because it is the most popular Medicare program in America, Medicare Advantage, which for the first time allowed taxpayers to make choices about how they were going to receive their Medicare benefits.

What the gentleman from Indiana and our entire committee has put together in this budget is a pathway through that premium support program to let every Medicare beneficiary going forward, folks—even young people like me at 45, folks at 18—know that when they get to Medicare, not only will it still be there for them, but they will have a choice of plans to choose the one that works best for them.

Mr. ROKITA. That is so very important and critical to understanding our reform efforts because of the fact that our proposed changes don't even have to affect anyone who is on these programs or near to being on them.

Our modeling, our reform, our ideas would start in 2024. So the younger guys—men and women, of course—in America, those of the age group that the gentleman from Georgia referenced, would have time to prepare.

And it is not like these changes would be draconian. They would just reflect how we live now and how long

we live in the 21st century. Again, the main part of our reform is giving people choice.

We believe and we know from data and from experiences in the States—those laboratories of democracy that I referenced earlier, the notion of Federalism, where the best government comes from those that govern closest to the people—that if you give people a choice, no matter their socioeconomic background, now matter how old or young they are or how smart or simple some may think they are, they can make the best choices for themselves in all facets of their lives. And that includes health care. Once we do that, once we have folks invested in the decision-making process, you will see costs naturally go down.

□ 1715

That is a large part of our plan. Let people choose what works best for them, what works best for that time in their lives, and you will see them take an ownership interest just like they would an ownership interest in any other thing that they have a vested interest in, whether it is repairing their automobile, buying an automobile, or even their health care. It will work the same way. That is a good portion of our plan.

Again, anyone who is on these programs or near to be on them can take the promises that were offered, the deal that was given, and can continue on with their lives and planning for their future.

The gentleman from Georgia, I, members of the Budget Committee, and previous Congresses now for 4 years in a row have talked to the American people about this idea of down the road let's change the system, not so it goes away, but so that it can be strengthened and saved so that it can be around for those in the future. I think what every parent and every grandparent ultimately wants is a better life for their children and grandchildren.

Now, if we contrast that for a minute with the President's idea, you see a much different picture. First of all, in order to fund his government-controlled health care plan, Mr. Speaker, he basically takes from Medicare. The President's health care law makes drastic cuts to the Medicare program without improving the long-term solvency of that program. In addition to the reductions already proposed in the law, ObamaCare created the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a Board of 15 unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats who will cut Medicare in ways that would deny care to current seniors. That is not the way forward. That doesn't save and strengthen these popular programs. That is what will end up destroying them for future generations.

Some may ask—I know the gentleman from Georgia has heard this

question—well, didn't the President's health care law improve Medicare's solvency? No. It absolutely did not. The President's health care law raided Medicare to fund ObamaCare. Advocates of the President's health care law claimed that the law both improved Medicare solvency and paid for the new entitlement at the same time, but this claim is contradictory. Medicare's chief actuary testified before the House Budget Committee that the Medicare savings had been double counted.

The House Republican budget stops the raid on Medicare and ensures that any current law Medicare savings are devoted to saving Medicare. So that is what I mean when I say and when the gentleman from Georgia says that this is an honest budget. It is truth telling to and for the American people, but it also offers the solutions that can honestly and responsibly get us out of this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. What my friend says about people being able to rely on this budget, about the honesty and integrity in the budget, it really is contrasted with these deficit numbers that you see coming out of the White House, because there is not an honest broker in this room who would not tell you that if you continue to run these deficits, eventually you are going to hit the wall. You are going to have to pull the rug out from under current beneficiaries. That is what bankruptcy means.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we mean when we say "bankruptcy." We don't mean that Social Security goes away and Medicare goes away and you get zero. We mean you are still stuck on the program, but we are slashing your benefits in half overnight. That is immoral. It is immoral to make promises to people and not keep them.

I don't want the gentleman from Indiana's job, Mr. Speaker. I don't want it. Being vice chairman of the Budget Committee is hard because you have to make tough decisions. And the decision that the Budget Committee made was we can be honest with folks who have not yet attained Medicare age that the program will not be there for them as it was for their parents if we make no changes. We can keep our commitment to older seniors—those folks on the program—to say, if we promise it to you, you are going to get it. Then we can bring in this new element of choice, again, for folks in my age bracket, to say, when you get to Medicare, we will have protected it, and you will have some personal decision-making in terms of how do you get the benefit package that best serves you, best serves your spouse, and best serves your family.

I am so appreciative in a town where people dodge responsibility like it is the plague that the Budget Committee

has said that we are either going to break promises tomorrow when we run out of money or we are going to be honest with people today about the state of the affairs that we are in: \$400 billion deficits, \$600 billion deficits, trillion-dollar deficits in the President's budget. And if you saw the chart that the vice chairman held up earlier, that pie chart of where America spends its money, interest that we are paying today dwarfs education spending, transportation spending, environmental spending, and the like.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the gentleman from Georgia again. He is not only a blessing to his State, he is a blessing to this Congress and to this country for his integrity, his hard work, and for his oratory. Thank you, sir, very, very much.

Mr. Speaker and Members of this body, please pay attention to the House Budget Committee tomorrow as we mark up this bill, hopefully not for 12 hours, but maybe so. We will be there for as long as it takes. And be ready—be ready and be proud—to vote on the floor of this House next week for a budget that offers honesty, real solutions, a balanced budget for a stronger America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### MIDDLE CLASS ECONOMICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to speak. I hadn't intended to talk on Medicare, although I think that the ultimate reaction to what we just heard is that the Medicare guarantee that has been the bedrock, foundation, for seniors really will terminate if this budget proposal that we just heard discussed for so long continues because it will basically give seniors an option not to have Medicare. I don't think we want to do that. This has been an extremely important program for more than 40 years now, and I want to look really, really hard at the proposal that is being put forth by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

What I came to talk about today is something that the President actually spoke to us about here in the Chamber in January, and it was middle class economics—middle class economics. How is it that we can grow the middle class which has been stagnant in its economic growth for the last almost 25 years now, not seen a pay increase, husband and wife or a single parent struggling to make ends meet here in America? The President came here and

he brought to us this middle class economics.

Why is it important? Well, basically, if the middle class is healthy, if the middle class paycheck is growing, the economy grows. It is an economy that is based upon the consumer, and the consumer really is the middle class. So it becomes absolutely important that we look at how we are going to grow the middle class in America.

There are many different ways to do that. Obviously, we need to strengthen the wages that the middle class have. We have seen very little wage growth in the last two decades. We need to really make sure that the men and women that are out there working day in and day out have the increase in their paycheck. We have seen little tiny bumps now as we look across the Nation, and as more and more people become employed and the labor market becomes somewhat tighter, we would hope to see this. But an important element of this paycheck is the minimum wage. So we advocate for \$10.10 minimum wage all across this Nation. We hope to get it.

But what we really want to spend time on today is the infrastructure and how to really see the infrastructure—the foundation for economic growth—really be put in place in America. We now have until mid-May, May 15, to put in place a new version of the highway bill. Can we do it? We have to do it. If we don't put in place and extend the Surface Transportation Act, we are going to see contractors all across America shut down their work, new contracts for highways and bridges not go into effect but, rather, be delayed. So Congress has an enormous task at its hand, and that is to reauthorize the Surface Transportation Act.

The current one? We kicked it down the road last fall. Well, the stop sign is right in front of us, so we need to get with it. We are going to talk about some of the elements in that. We know that if we put in a robust, full Surface Transportation Act, we are going to see the American middle class go back to work.

Let me just show you some of the elements that are in that Surface Transportation Act. Here they are. Last year, the President proposed the GROW AMERICA Act. I am going to call this the GROW AMERICA Act II. So we are looking now at how we can do that. The President came out with a full, 6-year program, a very robust increase in the amount of money available for surface transportation—fully paid for without increasing the excise tax on gasoline and diesel. No, you are not going to see an increase in the pump because of this program. Now, the oil companies may stick you, but not the government.

And so the President's plan, which we call the GROW AMERICA Act 2, has all of these elements in it: rail, a full

rail program that is a freight program; how you connect the rail system, the highway system, and the port system; buses; light rail and the intercity transportation systems that are so important for our urbanization. We are seeing a major need for these buses, for the light rail, the metro systems across the Nation. Ports: 90 percent of the commerce comes through our ports, and so the ports—Los Angeles, Long Beach, in California, Oakland, San Francisco, and Sacramento in my district—are critically important. So there are all of these elements.

We know we need to repair the bridges. We have a nice picture of the Golden Gate Bridge here. We probably should put the new Bay Bridge, or maybe we could actually put up this bridge. This actually happened about 3 years ago. This is Interstate 5 from the Canadian border to the Mexican border down the west coast, Interstate 5. Well, for about a month and a half you weren't going to get very far on Interstate 5 because this bridge is right near the Canadian border, and it collapsed. So bridges across the United States are in desperate need of rebuilding. Many of them are decades old, some more than 100 years old; and, finally, highways.

So this is the GROW AMERICA Act Surface Transportation Program that the President has proposed, about \$160-some billion over a 6-year period of time. It is a large program. It provides a lot of money for all of the things we need to do: freight, intercity travel, buses, light rail, metro systems, ports, bridges, and highways. It is all there. There is a separate bill dealing with our airports. This is our program. This is what we need to do. When we do this, we are going to put America back to work.

Now, one of my colleagues from California, the former speaker of the California Assembly, is here to talk about an element in this program. I welcome KAREN BASS to this 1-hour discussion.

Ms. BASS, if you would like to tell us what is going on in California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BASS).

Ms. BASS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, last year, Congress took an important first step. The CR/Omnibus allowed transit agencies to pursue local hiring. It didn't require them to adopt local hire policies, but it put hiring decisions in the hands of local government officials. I think my good friend and colleague from California is making the point that transportation is the backbone of this country, and certainly we have been the world's leader in infrastructure, in projects like has been described by my colleague, but we need to do more of that.

Every now and then, Congress does something in a bipartisan manner, and because of this action, the Department

of Transportation established pilot programs that will permit L.A. Metro to prioritize local hiring on over \$2 billion in transit and highway projects. Not just L.A. Metro, but around the country, local hire is now a policy. This investment will translate into tens of thousands of well-paying jobs for Angelenos putting these tax dollars back into the communities that paid for the projects.

□ 1730

Los Angeles is in the midst of a multibillion dollar investment in transit projects that will reduce congestion on our streets and reduce air pollution. Two major projects, I am fortunate to say, are in my district.

One is the Crenshaw line, which is an 8½ mile light rail line between the Expo line on Exposition Boulevard and the green line. It will serve the Crenshaw District, Inglewood, Westchester, Los Angeles International Airport, and surrounding communities.

Another project is the purple line that will provide a high-capacity, high-speed, dependable alternative for those traveling between communities, such as Miracle Mile, Beverly Hills, Century City, and Westwood. Angelenos have repeatedly voted to raise local taxes to help build these local transportation projects, but LA metro had not been allowed to prioritize hiring local workers.

In LA, it is crucial that we adopt local hiring policies. Los Angeles unemployment remains higher than the national average, and people living in south Los Angeles, who are directly impacted by the transit projects I mention, are facing some of the highest unemployment rates in the State.

Their tax dollars are paying a vast majority of these projects. Their businesses and homes are being the most impacted by the construction, but they don't benefit from the thousands of jobs that these transit projects will create.

While I was back in my district last week, I heard numerous commercials on how Crenshaw Boulevard, a major thoroughfare through south Los Angeles, will be closed for several days because of the light rail construction. This closure is directly impacting businesses trying every day to provide goods and services to the people who live there, as well as the residents who call south Los Angeles home.

This closure is difficult, but ensuring that these transit dollars will bring well-paying jobs is one way to alleviate the temporary pain from construction. We have done the right thing and allowed transit agencies to have control over local hiring practices. This will bring high-quality jobs to the areas most impacted by the disruption of transit construction.

Democrats and Republicans can often disagree, but on this area, we are on

the same page. More local control to transit agencies will mean they can build light rail and subway projects that will last for generations while ensuring that people who need jobs today will be the first in line for the jobs these projects create today.

This is an example of bipartisanship. My colleagues that are here today talking about the Grow America Act, this is a first step; it is positive, but we obviously need to do so much more. The example of the projects that you have given is where we need to go next.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. BASS. I really appreciate your support. You have been a leader in California for many years, despite your youth. We look forward to this.

I am very familiar with the extensions that you are talking about in southern California. As Lieutenant Governor, we were working on many of those projects, and I really like that local hire. That is so critically important.

We have this issue not just on big transit programs like yours, but we also have it on our military bases, two of which I represent. All too often, people are imported from other States to do work in our local communities, and I am going: No, no, no, hire local, hire local, buy local.

Let me put one more thing up here, and then I am going to yield to my friend from New York because this is really his turf. Make It In America, Buy America. So when you are going to build these projects, let's do it with American-made products.

I think this one, Ms. BASS, this is, I don't know, a problem that occurred in San Francisco. When they decided to rebuild the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, they decided to use Chinese steel.

Some 6,000 jobs went off to China. The steel came back. It turns out that the steel had all kinds of problems: welding problems, structural problems. They are still dealing with this. This is really the "San Francisco Made in China Bay Bridge"

On the other hand, my good friend here from New York, PAUL TONKO, the Tappan Zee Bridge, across the Hudson River, both of them about \$6 billion to \$7 billion. This bridge made in America, with American workers, and American steel—and it is coming in on budget—not Chinese steel.

I don't know, Ms. BASS, but when you talk about making it local, hire local, we ought to have Buy America, Make It In America, and then we can really see the jobs, not just the local jobs in the construction, but all of the other parts that go with it.

Where is that train being made? It could be made in Sacramento by Siemens with American workers, made in America, our tax dollars hiring local workers and American-made products. It can be exciting. We can really build

this economy. We can grow America, and we can rebuild the American middle class in the process.

Mr. TONKO, congratulations on your Tappan Zee Bridge made in America with, as Ms. BASS would say, locally hired workers.

Mr. TONKO. We are proud of any Make It In America provisions.

Let me thank you, first and foremost, for bringing together Representatives like Congresswoman BASS and you always at the helm to lead us into discussions at the soundness of investment, in infrastructure, that is required for a modern-day society, for commerce to function, for economic recovery sake. We need to include infrastructure as a bit of the formula that takes us to the maximum outcome for producing jobs.

I think any of us comprehends how investment and infrastructure equates to job creation. It is an easy exercise to relate to the skilled set of labor that is required to build these bits of infrastructure, but it is in the millions that we can strike in terms of added jobs and certainly a bolstering of our regional economies and certainly our national economy.

This one is a no-brainer. It makes sense across the board to invest in what is crumbling infrastructure, improving those deficit-rated bridges, deficient bridges, and to be able to provide for the sort of vision that we as a nation require, this Nation requires, in order to move forward on a path of soundness.

The siloing that needs to take place—or can take place, perhaps better said—is a frightening thing. We need to look at this infrastructure improvement through that silo, through certainly the opportunities for economic recovery, the environmental policies, the energy policies.

If we can move forward with these investments, encourage American-made manufactured goods and products for these projects, and then also see the soundness of putting together multimodal concepts where we bring together, through a sense of planning, all of the modes of transportation so that they are put into a hub concept where we are putting together the best energy outcome and that constantly working in that silo mentality that doesn't produce the results that will be most beneficial to all of us and for generations that will follow.

I think that we need to understand that we improve our bridges, we structure new where it is required; we don't continue to build to capacity without the element of rail opportunity that can remove some of those cars from the highway.

Energy efficiency is a common factor with rail transportation. It is the most energy-efficient mode of travel. If we can invest in rail and then incorporate that with soundness of transportation

and infrastructure so that we are not building where it is not essential, where it can be avoided by multimodal concepts, we will then have the best product.

All of this is focused on the needs of a modern-day society. When we have seen the crumbling of infrastructure, where we have put on the back burner maintenance and repair and improvements, it begins to catch up with the budgetary thinking here, and we develop crises that require huge outlays of money.

It is important for us to move now as urgent as we can, as quickly as we can, to invest in our infrastructure, in our roads, and our bridges.

I have looked at the needs within my district. They are there; they are very heavy. The impact on consumers with faulty roads, with less than acceptable infrastructure, is costly to the individual motorists.

That is in terms of repair and maintenance of your vehicle; it is in terms of idle time where there are traffic jams related to, again, a need for infrastructure that is soundly developed through a sense of planning where we look at all modes of transportation.

We have seen other nations begin to leapfrog past where we are at. We have instructed developing nations on how best to build their infrastructure, not just transportation roads and bridges and the traditional transportation infrastructure, but with utilities, with communications wiring, with all sorts of opportunities in water and sewer.

We can advise, but we need to take our own advice as a nation and begin the investment in what is soundly a strengthener of commerce, public safety, and quality of life issue for all of us, individuals and families in this country.

This is a golden opportunity. This is a way to put people to work. It is a way to purchase American-made goods that are, again, producing jobs in their manufacturing centers. It is a way to embrace sound planning. It is a way to be a better steward of the environment. It is a way to be energy smart in the outcome.

All of this can be taken care of if we do this incorporated sense of thinking, a collaborative model that doesn't silo us to the tomorrows of our society, but builds on a pathway to soundest investment, to most efficient and effective use of taxpayer dollars.

People want safe roads. They want safe bridges. They want the modern convenience of utility infrastructure and communication infrastructure. They want the soundness of thinking that a company's water, drinking water, and water and sewer infrastructure are sound.

Representative GARAMENDI, you are on the west coast. I am the country span away on the east coast.

Mr. GARAMENDI. 2,800 miles.

Mr. TONKO. We are sitting on very aged infrastructure, and it is important for us to recognize that fact. There is a life expectancy that, when met, begins a huge crumbling of the infrastructure.

We need to acknowledge that fact. We need to acknowledge the fact that the soundness of workers skilled, trained, prepared, ready to do this work can be put into meaningful work opportunities, and we can get, again, the pathway to soundness of commerce and quality of life addressed in a very reasonable fashion.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much. You are always passionate about growing the American economy, making the jobs. Often, you talk about research and the important role of research and, today, the important role of infrastructure of all kinds.

Earlier, as I was going through some numbers about the GROW AMERICA Act II—this is this year's version of the President's infrastructure bill—I misstated. I said it was about a \$167 billion program. Actually, it is a \$478 billion program over 6 years.

It happens to be \$176 billion more than we are currently spending at the same rate, so it is really a terrific boost in the infrastructure. It does cover all of these things: rails, buses, ports, bridges, highways.

That is not all that we need to do. The American Society of Civil Engineers laid it out. If you look at our airports, they are getting a D; bridges, a C-plus—you go down through the list—drinking water, a D; energy, a D—just all through the list, all of the infrastructure—sanitation systems, D; water systems, D.

Many of our communities, New York City and others in your area, are communities that are two centuries old, and some of the infrastructure is also two centuries old. We have this enormous need to rebuild our economy. If we do so, we are going to create a lot of jobs.

One of my favorite publications that came across my desk recently is this one: "Infrastructure Investment Creates American Jobs," Duke University. This isn't something put out by the Democratic Party; it is put out by Duke University.

They say for every billion dollars that we invest, we not only get the infrastructure—the roads, the ports, the airports—but we also get 21,671 jobs. The economic impact is not just \$1 billion or \$1; it is actually \$3.54.

You are getting this boost in the economy. You are getting that thrust growing the American economy and, as the President said, "growing the middle class" because these are middle class jobs.

I am sure you see this in your area.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely.

Again, the aged infrastructure is one factor; the new development, innovation, cutting-edge, high-tech opportunities that are not embraced, not incorporated into the infrastructure that we currently require—these are two major driving factors as to why we should be aggressive in our pursuit of infrastructure resources.

□ 1745

There are those, ourselves included, who embrace an infrastructure bank bill, making certain that we can get more for the dollar, that we can leverage and stretch the commitments that we make to reach more projects.

You talked about water infrastructure. I am seated on the Energy and Commerce Committee and am ranker on the Environment and the Economy Subcommittee, so it is an appropriate place to review and to further inspect the state of our drinking water infrastructure.

In the last district work period just completed, I began with my crew at home the initial steps, with tours, of reviewing the water infrastructure that serves the communities that I represent. In Schenectady, New York, which is a town of about 60,000 individuals, we have some 240 miles of pipe in one community. That pipe may be as old as 100-plus years. The main feeds are 36-inch and 24-inch pipes.

When you look at all of this infrastructure, knowing that the replacement factor is going to come, isn't it a better thing to plan how we are going to share those resources with communities?

This is understanding that when we have a water main break—and we witnessed many of those during the very harsh winter that the Northeast of the country faced this year, and a number of the frost heaves are now busting this infrastructure. When we have some of these major breaks and when you see the water flowing from that location, it is not just water that is flowing by; it is dollars and it is electrons, because it took immense amounts of electricity, energy supplies, to treat that water. It took tons of taxpayer dollars to make certain that it is acceptable in its form for consumption, drinking water, and, of course, it is the water wasted.

So we need to see this as a way to save water, to save dollars, to save energy, and why not incorporate into this discussion all of those elements that speak to drinking water needs in this country?

You have seen too many opportunities or impacts on communities where they have had this "boil water" provision for days, if not weeks. You see it around the country. People are getting impacted, again, with this infrastructure that is so old, and it is in need of repair. We are sitting on not only pipes in the ground but well systems, the in-

frastructure, the computers, the workforce that is required.

Are we training the appropriate workforce to pick up in these areas who have high levels of certification? The know-how is immense, and the responsibility is awesome. There is the human infrastructure. There is the training. There is the planning that is required and, certainly, the outstanding need for the soundness of all of the system that brings you from that aquifer, that water source, into the business place or the home place.

This is something that we are going to further explore because we know there is an inordinate need, and we want to put together a sound plan that is thoughtful and reaches to the expected—the projected—needs and offers the assistance to local governments, which is so essential.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, you are talking about water. In just looking through the report card from the American Society of Civil Engineers, they have down here "water systems," with drinking water, D; energy, D-plus; sanitation is another D; and wastewater, D.

Just across the Nation, in terms of a modern water infrastructure, both drinking water—potable water—as well as the sanitation systems, we rank them a D. In other words, we are polluting. We have contaminated water to drink, and we have contaminated water going out the other end of the sewer plant.

Let me just take a second to talk to you about a place where there is not enough water—California. We are in the fourth year of a major drought in California, Mr. TONKO, and you are talking about all of those water problems you have in New York. Perhaps you could put it on one of those tank cars and send it out to California, because we are in desperate need of water in California. Fortunately, last November, the people of California took note of this problem, and they passed a \$7.5 billion bond to build the water systems of California.

There are many parts to this—rebuilding the community water systems for small communities like you described. We have problems in California because communities are out of water. They don't have any water at all. That is part of it. There is another part in dealing with conservation so that we would conserve our water. There is another piece of it that deals with recycling. In fact, the fifth-biggest river on the west coast of the Western Hemisphere—from Alaska all the way to Chile—is the sanitation plants in southern California.

You take, for example, water coming from northern California—500 miles, 5,000 feet in the air. You take it into southern California. You bring it in from the Colorado River—200 miles, 2,000 feet. You bring it into southern

California. You clean it. You use it once. Then you clean the water to a higher standard than the day it arrives in southern California, and you dump it in the ocean. Hello. Anybody thinking? So the people of California said, Let's recycle, so recycling programs are going to be part of California's future.

We need to build reservoirs. We need to take care of the underground aquifers, which are rapidly being depleted. Unlike in New York, we are depleting them in California, not only in California, but in Nevada, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Georgia, Florida, and Oregon. All of these States are seeing a depletion in their aquifers. In California, we need to get with this.

In doing so, what I would like to see us do here in Washington is to take our Federal water programs, which are several. We have a recycling program and a conservation program—title VI is the Central Valley Improvement Act—available to the entire Nation. We have the EPA with its water programs, the Department of Agriculture, obviously the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Corps of Engineers.

For those programs that are California's, we ought to put them right underneath that water bond and augment, supplement, and drive forward that water bond that the people of California already voted for. We have our task in major infrastructure, in putting people to work, and in guaranteeing the future for California water supplies.

Mr. TONKO. I couldn't agree more. I think what we can do to supplement efforts in individual States is so critical right now because the need is so in demand.

When I talk about this, I hear from your counterparts in California about the huge loss of water they had with some of the water main breaks. Again, it is the water; it is the dollars; it is the electrons that are flowing right by us. I have heard from Representatives from Texas, from those in Maryland, from those in the Northeast—New England and the Northeast—all saying it is about time. We need to do something here. My gosh. We have wooden pipes serving some communities. It is out of sight, out of mind. It is beneath that surface, and we are just believing that the water supply will be there and that the pipes will last forever. We know that the acidic quality of soils will wear the pipes from the outside and that the velocity will wear the pipes from the inside. They will not last forever.

It is important for us to make certain that we communicate well, establish that dialogue with the water maintenance crews at all levels in our home States and have them instruct us as the first line of that service delivery system and say, Hey, this is the situation. These are the conditions. These

are the needs. And let us go forward with this infrastructure discussion that fully incorporates all of the elements of infrastructure—from the safety of our roads and bridges to the advanced investment in ports and rail, to communications to utilities. We have monopoly designed settings now wheeling electrons from region to region, State to State, nation to nation, nations to the U.S. All of this needs to be broadened in terms of the dialogue that we share and develop.

We need to understand that we are at a cutting edge where, in this century now, we need to upgrade because of new opportunities or upgrade because of aged infrastructure. It begins with the soundness of planning, and it is why I enjoy these discussions with you where we can ignite, so to speak, that thinking at home and, certainly, amongst our colleagues here in the House and down the hall in the Senate to make certain that we are just avidly supportive of going forward with a progressive order of policies that will speak to these infrastructure needs and where we allocate the resources that are going to respond effectively to the given situation at hand.

It is within our grasp. The bottom line is it produces jobs—millions of jobs—all while addressing safety and quality of life and commerce opportunity.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much. You keep bringing these issues so clearly to all of us.

There are some among the 435 Members of this House who believe that the Federal Government should not have a role in these kinds of projects, and I think they are doing two things as they advocate that the Federal Government ought to get out of this business.

First of all, they are ignoring the Constitution, which specifically says Congress is supposed to take care of postal roads. They are also ignoring the Founding Fathers. Washington asked his Treasury Secretary, Hamilton, to develop a program on advancing the American economy, and he came back with a program to build ports, postal roads, and canals. So this has been a long history of America from the beginning—that the Federal Government has a role in all of these.

This morning, we had a hearing in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee about the highway bill, about the surface transportation bill. We note that the President put forward what I call the GROW AMERICA Act II—this is this year's version of last year's bill—that is for \$478 billion, a 6-year program, \$176 billion more than proposed last year, and fully paid for.

I notice that the ranking member of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee has joined us. Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON of Washington, D.C., is with us now.

This is her turf as ranking member of that committee.

Thank you so very much for joining us, Ms. NORTON. Share with us your thoughts on how we can grow America—grow the middle class, increase the paychecks for Americans, and build our infrastructure.

Ms. NORTON. I thank both of my good friends.

I certainly thank you, my good friend from California, Mr. GARAMENDI, for the consistency with which you have taken on these Special Orders. You don't need my support, but I thought I would come down and offer my support, not only because of how comprehensive have been your comments to remind the American people of how important our bill is, the surface transportation bill; but I would like to just take a few minutes to relate to what I have heard both of you say. Indeed, I have heard you mention jobs and the economy in one form or fashion, but I want to take this moment to indicate the link between jobs and the surface transportation bill. What makes me want to do this is the Gallup Poll.

We have always known that the surface transportation bill and, indeed, that infrastructure has been an engine of the economy, and one reason is that it throws off jobs. It starts, of course, in construction, but then, more than any other sector, it stimulates jobs all the way up, jobs that support all the way up. That is what the GROW AMERICA Act will do. Of course, if you want to do that, you need stable funding. When I looked at what the American people want, I saw immediately the link between that and this Special Order hour today. If you look at the most important problems in American life, it is amazing what they are. The Gallup Poll asked, What is the most important issue for the American people?

□ 1800

There were eight issues. Of those eight issues, seven out of eight have to do with the economy.

Number one was economic problems, divided into the economy and unemployment and jobs. Federal deficit and Federal debt were there, but everything else was about jobs and the economy.

There are gaps between the rich and the poor, lack of money—that is how the American people put—wage issues, and the high cost of living. There you have it. What is the best way to do what Americans want.

I agree with my good friend from California, we had a good hearing this morning, but I wonder if both of you weren't surprised that there was not more talk in this very bipartisan hearing that we had about jobs and the relationship to the surface transportation bill. I think there is a reason for

that. That is that we can't yet pass the first hurdle: How are we going to pay for it? It costs money.

Your chart there—rail, buses, ports, bridges, highways—are not free. We are so hung up on trying to do the impossible, fund all of those without money, that we can't get to what the money will do. We are approaching the absolute deadline, May 31. The construction season is already here. It is 65 degrees in Washington, D.C., today.

I wonder, Congress knows that that very first bill, that Eisenhower bill in 1956, had a 13-year authorization because the Republicans in the 1950s were attuned to how long it takes to do exactly the kinds of things, Mr. GARAMENDI, that your chart points to, and you need an authorization more than a few months or even a few years to get that done—a 13-year authorization. No wonder that those post-World War II years were the very best years for the American economy.

The States simply cannot make capital improvements. That is what your chart speaks to. Every last one of those is a capital improvement. You can't do it without capital funds that come in bulk. The States, of course, have thrown up their hands. How many of them have just said, "We have got to do it if Congress won't do anything; we just can't go on like this"? Of course, they are forgoing the projects they most need because no State has that kind of funds. Eleven States don't even have the option of putting up their own funds, they depend so heavily on Federal funds.

But to show the link that I came to the floor to make to jobs, the occupations with the largest growth today would make the American people cry. Number one is personal care aides. Heaven knows we need them. We are having a big rally here in the District tomorrow because of the low pay of these workers. But at the bottom is construction laborers. The personal care aides make median \$19,000, almost \$20,000. The construction laborers make almost \$30,000. That is a difference between a higher-wage job and those are the kind of jobs you are talking about, Mr. GARAMENDI—and a low-wage job. We are making only low-wage jobs because we are not, in fact, funding bills that would not only deal with rail, buses, ports, bridges, and highways, but the other parts of our transportation and infrastructure that my good friend has also mentioned.

Of the fastest growing occupations, the top 10, only two have to do with what would grow America—insulation workers and brick and stone masons. Those are only two of the top 10.

In my own district, the District of Columbia, I would hate to ask you to guess what is the occupation with the largest job growth—security guards. We need security guards and we welcome security guards, but I want my



two friends at the podiums to know that not one job, not one truly high-paid job, except registered nurses and lawyers—God forgive us—is on this list.

So I come to the floor to thank both of my good friends for the conversation you have been having, to join it, and to link it to what worries the American people. They can think about nothing these days. They don't even think about ISIL. They hardly even thought about the Department of Homeland Security bill that we just passed here only last week. They can't think about anything except that as we say, rightly, there is a growth in jobs, and yet their wages stagnate because the growth is not where the wages would grow.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Ms. NORTON, you hit right on with your closing sentence. It is about the middle class; it is about middle class jobs; it is about growing the economy and laying the foundation for present and future economic growth. We could do that. The President's plan last year, which he called the GROW AMERICA Act—and I am saying this year we call it the GROW AMERICA Act II—is \$478 billion. That is a lot of money, and we put that into the surface transportation.

I was thinking about as you were talking about the surface transportation, Mr. TONKO, over there, and about the new Amtrak bill that just passed out of our committee. It will be on the floor pretty soon. It calls for a lot of investment for Amtrak on the Northeast corridor so that you can go from Washington, D.C., to your home up on the Hudson River. I think there is a rail line that goes up there.

Mr. TONKO. There certainly is.

Mr. GARAMENDI. They call for a big investment there. One of the things we think ought to be in this bill—in fact, it is in the bill—is a very strong Buy America provision. This is a locomotive, electric locomotive for the Amtrak line here on the Northeast corridor from Washington, D.C., to Boston, and this locomotive is 100 percent American made. It is made in Sacramento, California, of all places, by a German company, Siemens, who looked at the American Recovery Act, and there was \$700 million in there to build these locomotives, and they said 100 percent American made. And Siemens looked at that and goes: \$700 million, make it in America, we can do that, and they are doing it. These are now being deployed on the east coast line.

But the next phase is a high-speed line between Washington and Boston, and that high-speed line calls for a new kind of train, high-speed train, and out of our committee we said that it is going to be built in America.

Now, Mr. TONKO, here is where I turn this over to you. It turns out that one of the foreign companies, Alstom, which is a French company, has a man-

ufacturing plant in upstate New York, maybe near your district. If so, you are going to have those middle class manufacturing jobs when this bill passes with a 100 percent Buy America provision.

Mr. TONKO. Well, interestingly, when I was on a recent trip south of D.C., into the southeast of the U.S., I got to tour a brand-new car that is a luggage car, storage car, includes racks for bikes, all sorts of storage done on that car itself, and proudly they wanted to share with me it is made in Elmira, New York, in upstate New York, state-of-the-art design, brand new vehicle, just put on, I believe, that week that I was on the train. So, you are right, this translates into jobs of all orders, from manufacturing of these cars, these train cars, to innovation and research that is required, for instance, in our electric utility infrastructure.

But, you know, I think Delegate HOLMES NORTON struck something that should speak to our senses, and that is history dictating to us when we were at our best. When we had this dip in our economy, when we were in post-Depression, when we needed to recover, we invested in jobs; we invested in infrastructure. My gosh, you look at the buildings that came through those late 1920s and 1930s that are still standing, not only solid as a rock, but tremendously designed and great bits of architecture that speak to a great bit of cityscape in our communities that really added to the look of the community.

And we can take it back even before that in the history of our time when, as we have talked on this floor before, the Erie Canal, barge canal, was constructed. It was done at a time when Governor DeWitt Clinton had this goal—and the economy was in tough shape, too—and so he drove this idea through tough times when people said we can't afford it. And elements in history, chapters in history repeatedly remind us, you know, we are replete with these anecdotal bits of evidence that tell us, when things were really tough, when the economy was really, really weak, we went and pulled ourselves out of those pits, those financial downfalls, and did it through investment in infrastructure.

Here we not only have an opportunity to pull us up and have a stronger economic response, but it is also enabling us to utilize the intellectual capacity of this great country that grows innovation, grows ideas, new concepts, research on lighter weight materials that can make our renewable energy supplies all the greater, where the bang for the buck is all the stronger.

So there are elements galore that speak to an effective bit of planning that can take us through these tough economic times, respond to this crumbling nature of infrastructure or the need to build the new state-of-the-art

elements into our Nation, be it communication, utility, transportation-wise or water and sewer-wise. There are golden opportunities to add to the workforce and then utilize the best opportunities out there, technologically, that have been developed through the soundness of American know-how, American ingenuity. So this gives birth. This gives—it coaxes from us the strength that we have as a nation to rely on that creative pioneer spirit that builds America in the truest form and fashion.

So coaxing that kind of activity, America needs to be coaxed by that, pushed to embrace the pioneer spirit. Go forward with these opportunities to make us a strong, strong voice that will resonate with all communities across this country because they know that need for infrastructure is strong. It is really beckoning our leadership to go forward and commit to the soundness of that infrastructure investment, and we see it in so many aspects of the work done here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We know that one of the key opportunities that presents itself to Congress in the next 3 months is the surface transportation bill. We know that we have to have it out of here, renew it by the end of May. We know that if we do that, the construction season—while being a little bit rocky because we are late in getting this done—will be able to move forward through the summer and then on into the fall.

One of the tasks that our Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON has is to push that out, and if in that piece of legislation we maintain the Buy America provisions, it is not just the construction jobs, it is going to be the manufacturing jobs, and men and women that will build the light rail, that will build the buses, that will build the Metro systems, will put together the pieces of the port, the bridges, wherever they may be, and of course the highways.

Ms. NORTON, you have got a task out ahead of you. I know you are up to it. If you would like to share some additional thoughts, we would be delighted to hear from you.

Ms. NORTON. Well, my additional thoughts are really stimulated by the comments that both of you have made. You spoke about manufacturing. One of the reasons, one of the first things that occurred that got out of this recession was that manufacturing began to come back in America; and now, of course, corporations are finding good reasons to manufacture in America, and particularly at this time.

Mr. TONKO, in essence, you were talking about stimulating the economy, and the best way to do it is to build something. You mentioned the buildings in Washington. If you look at the cornerstone of virtually all the public buildings downtown, the buildings that

people come to see, the Federal buildings, they all have a 1930s cornerstone, because that is when we stimulated ourselves out of the Depression.

Mr. GARAMENDI mentioned Amtrak. Well, this is the hub of Amtrak, my own district. I must tell you, when I think about high-speed rail, speaking of Amtrak—and we haven't put the first high-speed rail on line, not the first, which puts us behind not only all of our allies, but even some developing countries.

□ 1815

It makes me almost ashamed to be on this committee, we are so behind. If we really wanted to get the economy going, we would give ourselves a deadline for high-speed rail. We would understand that if you want to move your economy quickly, you do not do something like cut taxes. You build things. You build America.

I don't know how much time you have left, but I just want to thank you for the leadership. Mr. GARAMENDI, that you have taken and to say to you that I am with you as we continue to remind this Congress that this should be one of its foremost tasks this year: our surface transportation bill.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Your leadership on the Subcommittee on Highways and Transit is exceedingly important. All of us look forward to your success and the success of all of us in building America's infrastructure.

We have about a little less than 5 minutes left. If you would like to take a few minutes, then I can, and we will call it an evening in which we have come, once again, to talk about building America, rebuilding the American middle class.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you. Certainly, it is an honor to join with you and our colleagues this evening, as so many have come to the floor to speak to the soundness of infrastructure.

We have talked about the present moment. We have talked about being inspired by the past, but let's look to the future. Not only do we owe it to the present moment to embark upon some of the newest options, alternatives, and innovative concepts, but what about the impact on future generations?

If we don't do what is required of us in this present moment, we are saying that we are willing to survive on that fat of the land, that we take all of that thoughtfulness and all of the sense of progress and the pioneer attitude of generations before us who said: We are going to leave a sound bit of infrastructure, and we are going to know that we did the most we could in our moment so that generations to follow will be able to live—and live strongly—and be able to prosper from that and perhaps further stretch the thinking of America.

Well, we haven't done that. We have taken that opportunity and utilized it

in a way that serves our present-moment needs. The neglect here, I think the sinfulness of this outcome, the moral compass that should guide us is that you leave a better world for those to come.

The payment mechanism isn't going to get cheaper. We know that. The need is inordinately high. The sense of vision that we need to share as leaders of a nation that is so great as the U.S. needs to provide for a soundness of planning and cutting-edge opportunities and an infrastructure that is strong and vibrant that allows for job creation, for commerce and its needs, for public safety, for individuals and families across this country.

Representative GARAMENDI, this has been a very sound way to share with people across the country what the thinking is of the Democrats in the House. The Democrats believe in the soundness of infrastructure. They believe in investing in jobs. They believe in investing in a better tomorrow, investing where you rightly anticipate lucrative dividends—lucrative dividends.

It is not spending foolishly. It is investing soundly in a way that speaks to documented need and then encourages and inspires us to speak in bold terms that will take us to cutting-edge opportunities that we will leverage in the present moment so that generations to follow will say: They got it, they tackled the problem, they responded to the challenge, they were bold in their attempt.

Let's leave that as our message. Let's leave that as our legacy.

I thank you for the opportunity here this evening.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. TONKO, thank you so very much for joining us tonight and your leadership on this whole range of issues.

It is about tomorrow. Tomorrow will be solid for America if we build a solid foundation, and that foundation is the infrastructure. It is the research facilities, the sanitation, the water facilities, the highway and rail facilities.

The President has made a proposal. It is up to us to respond to that. Six years, fully paid for, no increase in the gasoline and diesel tax, it is all there. All we need to do is grab it and grab the future in the process. I am happy for the opportunity to share this evening on building tomorrow's future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### IRAN NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting these days to hear our cur-

rent Secretary of State, someone who as a Congressman went to Central America and basically was negotiating a deal with a communist leader—corrupt—at the same time the Reagan administration was conducting negotiations.

I am very proud of my Senate friends down at the other end of the Capitol who sent a letter to Iran, since the former constitutional law instructor—not professor, but instructor—from Chicago doesn't seem to realize he needs the Senate advice and consent in order to create a binding treaty with another country, especially one that actually has a major impact on the ability to continue to exist for Israel and the United States.

If this President and Secretary of State get the deal that includes everything that we would want that this administration has not already taken off the table overtly, then it means nuclear proliferation in the Middle East.

Our allies in the Middle East, so-called Saudi Arabia; Qatar; UAE; Egypt; and, in fact, most of the nations in the Middle East—Jordan, perhaps—are all going to need nuclear weapons to protect themselves.

If this administration continues to persist with anything that does not require dismantling and stoppage of the spinning of the centrifuges in Iran that continue to develop nuclear material for bombs, then the whole world is going to be in trouble.

In fact, the negotiations have become so desperate on the part of our own administration that then-Congressman John Kerry would try to sit down and negotiate with a communist criminal leader in Central America and undermine the efforts of the Reagan administration.

Our friends down the hall—47 Senators—were completely aboveboard. They said nothing inappropriate. There was no crime, no treason. They were just advising people to the negotiations that here is what the U.S. Constitution says.

Apparently, they had not been so advised by our constitutional law instructor Commander in Chief, so it is important that somebody did, and I am pleased that my colleague and friend Tom CORRON did just that.

But here we are. I think this article from townhall.com by Katie Pavlich illustrates very clearly just how desperate this administration has gotten to get any kind of deal, just any kind of deal so they can say they got a deal.

Yes, okay, Iran has an agreement that will allow Iran to continue to cheat, as they have been found to have done a number of times, so it doesn't actually allow them to have not just a nuke in 10 years, they could covertly develop a nuke within the year if they so wished.

My friends DANA ROHRBACHER and STEVE KING met with IAEA representatives who had been inspecting Iran, and

it left me extremely concerned about how quickly, easily, and covertly Iran could go ahead and move to the next step, even beyond 5 or 20 percent enrichment, as Iran has gotten.

Here is this article from Katie Pavlich from March 16. In part, she says:

According to a report in *The Times of Israel*, the National Intelligence Agency delivered a report to Congress that scraps Iran and Hezbollah from the terrorism list, citing the country's work against ISIS as one of the reasons why.

Mr. Speaker, if this administration is scrapping—taking—Iran and Hezbollah off the terrorist list, then the last thing we need this administration doing is negotiating with these terrorists—this terrorist regime—trying to work out a deal because anybody that would say Iran and Hezbollah are not a terrorist country and terrorist organization should not be negotiating anything for the United States of America, where the vast bulk—thank God—of the American people do not want to support, lend credence to, or in any way help terrorist countries or a terrorist organization like Hezbollah.

It goes ahead and quotes from the National Intelligence Agency report from *The Times of Israel* and then has Ms. Pavlich's question:

Is ISIS a threat? Absolutely. Should we align ourselves with or appease Iran because of their work against ISIS? Absolutely not.

As a reminder, Hezbollah, funded by Iran, is the largest terror organization in the world. Before 9/11, Hezbollah, not al Qaeda, was responsible for the majority of U.S. terrorism deaths, including the 1983 bombings of U.S. Marine barracks and U.S. Embassy in Beirut, in addition to a series of attacks in the 1980s.

Hezbollah is also responsible for countless attacks on Israel. In 1992, Hezbollah, with help from Iran, bombed the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires. In 1994, they bombed the Jewish community center in the same South American city.

Those are just a handful of examples that don't even account for the thousands of rockets Hezbollah has launched into Israel throughout the years.

So what's going on here? Why strip Hezbollah and its funding parent Iran from the terrorism label? Especially now? It all points back to getting President Obama his deal with Iran at all costs.

This reclassification of Iran and Hezbollah without the terrorism label is a certain warning sign the deal the White House is working on to appease the rogue regime does not have the best interests of the United States as a top priority.

Since, apparently, this administration is not aware, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, our colleagues here in Congress would want to be aware of what the administration isn't. Maybe that comes from not reading the intelligence reports, but you don't even have to get an intelligence report from an intelligence agency.

This, for example, comes from the Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America, and it is a timeline for Hezbollah violence.

1982, Israel invades Lebanon to drive out the PLO's terrorist army, which had frequently attacked Israel from its informal "state within a state" in southern Lebanon.

Hezbollah, a Shiite group inspired by the teachings and revolution of Iran's Ayatollah Khomeini, is created with the assistance of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps.

The group is called Hezbollah, or "party of God" after initially taking responsibility for attacks under the name "Islamic jihad."

Some thought that was the Republican Party, but actually it is Hezbollah that is the party of God.

□ 1830

In July of 1982, the president of American University in Beirut, Davis S. Dodge, is kidnapped. Hezbollah is believed to be behind this and most of the other 30 Westerners kidnapped over the next 10 years.

April 18, 1983, Hezbollah attacks the U.S. Embassy in Beirut with a car bomb, killing 63 people, 17 of whom were American citizens.

October 23, 1983, the group attacks a U.S. Marine barracks with a truck bomb, killing 241 American military personnel stationed in Beirut as part of the peacekeeping force. A separate attack against the French military compound in Beirut kills 58.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that, to the Obama administration, the killing of all these marines, the killing of all these American citizens in Beirut, and the kidnapping of Americans and other diplomats by Hezbollah would be considered workplace violence. I get that. But to most people in America, they understand these are acts of sheer terrorism, and they need to be called what they are.

September of 1984, the group attacks the U.S. Embassy annex in Beirut with a car bomb, killing two Americans and 22 others.

More workplace violence.

March of 1984, William F. Buckley, a CIA operative working at the U.S. Embassy in Beirut, is kidnapped and later murdered.

April of 1984, Hezbollah attacks a restaurant near the U.S. Air Force Base in Spain. The bombing kills 18 U.S. servicemen, injuries 83.

December of '84, Hezbollah terrorists hijack a Kuwait Airlines plane. Four passengers are murdered, including two Americans.

I don't see how this administration would be able to classify that hijacking and murders as workplace violence, but you never know.

February 1985, Hezbollah publicizes its manifesto. It notes that the group's struggle will continue until Israel is destroyed and rejects any cease-fire or peace treaty with Israel. The document also attacks the U.S. and France.

June 1985, Hezbollah terrorists attack TWA Flight 847. The hijackers severely beat passenger Robert Stethem, a U.S. Navy diver, before killing him and dumping his body onto the tarmac at the Beirut airport. Other passengers are held hostage before being released on June 30.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that many Americans will remember these events and know how strongly we felt about the terrorism being carried out by Hezbollah, that this administration

would like to call a peace-seeking organization. Yeah, it is a peace-seeking organization, just like a heat-seeking missile is a peacekeeping missile. They will blow up anything that they can get ahold of that is American.

December '86, under the alias of Organization of Oppressed on Earth, Hezbollah announces it had kidnapped and murdered three Lebanese Jews. The organization previously had taken responsibility for killing four other Jews since 1984.

February of '88, Hezbollah kidnaps Colonel William Higgins, a U.S. Marine serving with a U.N. truce-monitoring group in Lebanon, and murders him.

October of '89, members of the dissolved Lebanese Parliament ratify the Taif Agreement. Although the agreement calls for the disbanding of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias, Hezbollah remains active.

February '92, Sayyed Hassan Nasrallah takes over Hezbollah after Israel kills the group's leader, Abbas Musawi.

March of '92, with the help of Iranian intelligence, Hezbollah bombs the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires, killing 29, injuring over 200.

July 1994, Hezbollah bombs the Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, again with Iranian help, killing 86 and injuring over 200.

November 1995, Hezbollah bombards towns in northern Israel with volleys of Katyusha rockets in one of the group's numerous attacks on Israeli civilians.

March '96, Hezbollah fires 28 Katyusha rockets into northern Israeli towns. A week later, the group fires 16 rockets, injuring 36 Israelis. Israel responds with a major offensive known as the "Grapes of Wrath" operation to stop Hezbollah rocket fire.

August 1997, Hezbollah opened fire on northern Israel with dozens of rockets in one of the group's numerous attacks on Israeli civilians.

October of '97, the United States lists Hezbollah as a terrorist organization.

And parenthetically, we might insert, this is October of 1997. This is the Clinton administration. This is the Clinton administration that heard cries of Muslims in other parts of the world, and it seemed that, despite the fact that the Clinton administration rushed, sent military to assist Muslims in other parts of the world, all the while, Islamic terrorists were plotting to blow up the World Trade Centers by sending planes crashing into them.

Now, it would seem, if these were peace-seeking organizations, like Hezbollah, like the Nation of Iran, the administration of that nation, at least they would take note that, gee, the Clinton administration is reaching out every way they can to help Muslims in the world, and we should take note of that and ease up.

But that was not happening, not by a terrorist group like Hezbollah. In fact, in May of 1999, Hezbollah opens fire on northern Israel with dozens of rockets in one of the group's numerous attacks on Israeli civilians.

June of '99, Hezbollah opens fire on northern Israel, killing two.

May of 2000, Israel withdraws troops from Lebanon after 18 years of patrolling the "security zone," a strip of land in the south of

the country. The security zone was set up to prevent attacks on northern Israel.

June of 2000, U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan certifies Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon. Shortly thereafter, the U.N. Security Council endorses Annan's report. Hezbollah, nonetheless, alleges Israel occupies Lebanon, claiming the small Shebaa Farms area Israel captured from Syria during the 1967 war as Lebanese territory.

It seems Hezbollah was so intent on being a terrorist organization, even when Israel handed over land that it was claiming, they still were not content. They wanted terrorism; and, actually, they want Israel and the United States eliminated.

October of 2000, Hezbollah attacks Israel military posts and raids Israel, kidnapping three Israeli soldiers.

March 2001, the British Government adds Hezbollah's "military wing" to its list of outlawed terrorist organizations.

April 2002, Hezbollah launches Katyushas into northern Israeli town, and the assault comes amidst almost daily Hezbollah attacks against Israeli troops in Shebaa Farms.

December 2002, Canada lists Hezbollah as a terrorist organization.

August 2003, Hezbollah shells and kills 16-year-old Israeli boy, wounds others.

June 2003, Australia lists Hezbollah's "military wing" as a terrorist organization.

September 2004, U.N. Security Council Resolution 1559 calls for the "disbanding and disarmament of all Lebanese and non-Lebanese militias," a reference to Hezbollah.

December 2004, both the United States and France bans Hezbollah's satellite television network, Al-Manar. A U.S. State Department spokesman notes the channel "preaches violence and hatred."

March 2005, the European Parliament overwhelmingly passes a resolution stating: "Parliament considers that clear evidence exists of terrorist activities by Hezbollah. The European Union Council should take all necessary steps to curtail them." The European Union, nonetheless, refrains from placing the group on its list of terrorist organizations.

July of 2006, Hezbollah attacks Israel with Katyushas, crosses the border, kidnaps two Israeli soldiers. Three Israeli soldiers are killed in the initial attack. Five more soldiers are killed as Israel launches an operation to rescue the soldiers and push Hezbollah from its border. And during the ensuing war, Hezbollah launches rockets at civilian targets.

August 2006, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopts Resolution 1701, which calls for a cessation of hostilities, the deployment of Lebanese and U.N. forces into southern Lebanon, and the disarmament of armed groups in Lebanon.

So anybody in this administration here in the U.S. or elsewhere who thinks that Hezbollah is not a terrorist organization then clearly thinks that every place that Hezbollah has killed innocent people is just another workplace where violence occurred, a random act of violence or violence in the workplace, because it is insane to think that Iran is not a sponsor of terrorism, that Iran has not killed more Americans than any other country in the last 15 years. It is incredible. That is outside of 9/11, the killing of approxi-

mately 3,000 Americans on 9/11 between the Pentagon and New York City.

But as far as American servicemembers fighting in Iraq, it was Iran who was behind the killing of most of those American servicemembers. Iran has fought vehemently to eliminate the United States' presence from Iraq.

I think if we could get to the bottom of why there was not a status of forces agreement, you would find that it is because the Ayatollah Khomeini, Ahmadinejad, President at the time, said they believed that the twelfth imam, the Mahdi, would come, would arise back to power, would come to power amidst chaos.

As I understand their beliefs and their beliefs in prophecy, he would first come to reign from the town of Kufa, which the way the lines were drawn in the 20th century put Kufa in Iraq.

Unfortunately, the State Department, the Justice Department, the intelligence agencies under the Obama administration have had their training materials regarding the beliefs of radical Islamists purged, so they are not allowed to learn exactly what our enemy believes and what they have believed, and so it is hard for them to anticipate what our enemies want to do. And perhaps all the purging has helped lead this administration to the idea that if we purge all the educational material about what radical Islamists believe, then maybe it won't be actual and factual.

□ 1845

Yet the New York Post says: "ISIS Accepts Boko Haram's Pledge of Allegiance."

We had an article in the last recent weeks where a Catholic bishop from Nigeria had indicated that the Obama administration basically was indicating that if Nigeria did not amend their marriage laws to go against the laws of nature and nature's god, as Christians believe and as the Bible teaches, then the Obama administration would not help them at all against the terrorist activities of Boko Haram.

I don't know what kind of blindness it takes or prejudice it takes to see the suffering in Africa, in a place like Nigeria, and hold the hands and weep with the parents of daughters who were kidnapped by Boko Haram, and understand the suffering being brought against Christians for their beliefs, these Christian girls that Boko Haram has kidnapped, forced into sexual slavery—what kind of callousness does it take to see that suffering and say, Oh, no, if you don't go against your religious beliefs in marriage between a man and a woman, we are not going to help you, and we are going to let Boko Haram continue to terrorize you and rape your women.

You talk about a war against women.

When I asked these mothers of the girls that were kidnapped there, Did

they initially attack your daughters' school because it was a girls' school? they said, No, no. They hate girls. They consider them nothing. But they attacked the school because it is Christian.

There is a report from Investor's Business Daily, March 13, that says Islamic State recruits could enter the United States via the Caribbean. Well, that is not really a news flash.

Another story, written by Thomas D. Williams, Ph.D., March 17: "ISIS Kidnaps 20 Doctors and Nurses in Libya."

A story from Charles Spiering, 17 March: "President Obama Blames Bush for Rise of ISIS."

Well, actually, if you want to talk about class, despite my disagreement with some of George W. Bush's policies and despite what some have said, he had enough class that after 9/11 he never pointed the finger at the Clinton administration. He knew that even though 9/11 was being plotted and planned during the Clinton administration and there was an opportunity in the Clinton administration to take out Osama bin Laden that was not seized upon, that there were so many things that might have been stopped along the way, he didn't blame President Clinton because he had enough class to know that it was an attack by terrorists, and they should be made to pay.

If you really want to point the finger, it would go clear back to the late seventies during the days I was in the United States Army and we had what was considered, under most everybody's version of international law, an act of war against the United States in Iran when our Embassy was attacked and our people were taken hostage. And we didn't help.

You go back before that, to the Carter administration turning its back upon the shah of Iran—not a great guy, not a good man, from what we understand, but he was able to keep radical Islam contained. But after the Carter administration turned its back on the shah and encouraged his overthrow, you had the coming from exile of Ayatollah Khomeini, and President Carter welcomed him as a man of peace. As a result, radical Islam, once again, raised its ugly head, as it does from time to time.

And it is only all-out war against radical Islam that puts it in a box—sometimes for 50 years, sometimes for 100 years. It depends on how staunch the fight is against them.

But President Bush did not blame President Carter. There were mistakes all along the way.

When the marine barracks in Beirut was hit, the Democrat-controlled Congress made clear that they were not going to fund any more U.S. peacekeeping troops in Beirut. Reagan brought them home. He should have taken them out and done whatever it took, but he didn't.

Now this administration, in order to get any deal that is a terrible deal, is willing to turn its back on the fact that Iran and Hezbollah have terrorists in their lead, and they should not be recognized as anything but terrorists.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### FAST-TRACKING THE TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, we are going to use these 30 minutes to speak to fast track and a process on trade agreements that are developed. I believe it is so important for the American public to understand exactly what fast track is all about.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. I also ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Tonight we are here to discuss, as I indicated, Trade Promotion Authority, most commonly known as fast track. Free trade agreements that would be accompanied by a fast-track process are a way to bring about devastating outcomes, if not done correctly, to the American economy and, most importantly, to the American worker.

Of late, most notably, the free trade agreement of which there is much concern expressed is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the TPP, which, by the way, would speak to a great number of nations which encompass about 40 percent of the international GDP. So it is no small compact here of which we speak.

Fast track, as a concept, would constrain Congress' ability to conduct oversight, restrain oversight that Congress should provide so as to be the voice of the people who elect them, to place their given concerns in the discussions here in the House.

It would delegate Congress' constitutional authority over trade policy in a way that would provide for no solid debate, no sharply restricting debate, and it would prohibit amendments. Basically, Congress would be limited to a simple up-or-down vote—thumbs up, thumbs down—on what could be a devastating outcome for the American economy and, most importantly, the American worker.

These so-called free trade agreements have far-reaching impacts on American life. They may address dynamics like food safety or affordable medicine or fi-

nancial regulations. So we cannot be reckless in our attempt, and we must make certain that we move forward deliberately to make certain that it is a good outcome for trade.

We are not against trade. Free trade, as it has been described in the past and agreed to in the past, has hurt the economy, but we want fair trade.

In exchange for fast-tracking bills, Congress is supposed to set these negotiating objectives. But let's face it: sadly, these objectives are nonbinding, so they could be rendered meaningless. And in the case of the TPP, which is nearly completed, setting them at this point is somewhat late in the process.

We know also that the TPP is going to model itself after NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement that dealt with Canada and Mexico, and also the Korean agreement. And the bottom line is, those deals have not been good for the American middle class, for working families.

Certainly we would be giving up a golden opportunity to exercise our responsibilities here in Congress to make certain it is the best outcome for America.

Promises of new jobs here in the U.S. are one of those promises for which we take great concern.

Decreased trade deficits—it can be said that trade deficits have provided the greatest dent in the American economy. There are huge deficits that have staggered the efforts to grow American jobs and improve labor and environmental standards. These are promises that have failed: jobs to be produced, environmental standards and labor standards never really come to be. Even if they are written on paper with the enforcement requirements, they have not reached their potential. And certainly the job count is not what it should be.

As we lost manufacturing jobs, millions of manufacturing jobs, one in every four manufacturing jobs, it was a devastating outcome. Three of every five American workers who lost those manufacturing jobs ended up with pay cuts, and one of three of those in the three-out-of-five category ended up with more than 20 percent of a paycheck reduction.

This is not what we want in the order of progressive policies that will speak to a stronger economy. So I have grave concern for the fast-track process.

Those joining us tonight and those like the gentlewoman from New York, Representative SLAUGHTER, who will share her thoughts in writing, which will be incorporated in the annals of these proceedings, for this Special Order, these are Members who are very concerned.

And chief amongst them, the one who has led us in this effort to draw public awareness and political attention to this issue, is none other than Representative ROSA DELAURO, our col-

league from Connecticut, who has done a solid job in bringing to everyone's awareness, attention, that the fast-track process is the first step in a process that could be devastating, as we authorize this Trans-Pacific Partnership, with the potential for job loss that we can ill afford, with the potential for abuse of children in the labor force, and beckoning us to bring about a situation that finds Vietnamese workers, for instance, working for 50 to 55 cents, 56 cents, perhaps, an hour. It is dumbing down, it is weakening the workforce across the world as we lose these American jobs.

So Representative DELAURO, it is great to have you on the floor. It is great to have you join us in this Special Order. Please share with us your passion, your concern for what could happen here to the American worker.

Ms. DELAURO. Thank you so much. I want to thank my colleague from New York for leading this effort tonight and for being shoulder-to-shoulder with so many of us, both inside the House of Representatives and in the large, vast coalition that is outside of the House of Representatives that says "no" to fast track; we are not going to do this.

So I applaud you and all of your efforts, and for standing up here on the floor most nights and talking about this issue so that the American public knows what is going on here because it is our responsibility to let them know.

They are not following fast-track Trade Promotion Authority or the Trans-Pacific Partnership every single day the way we are. But it is our responsibility to know how, in fact, it is going to affect their lives.

I would also say to you that I know you and I know so many of our other colleagues, we are not opposed to trade. We are not. We are in favor of fair trade. That is what we are about.

I believe you are—and I am—a strong proponent of the Export-Import Bank. It helped American business to compete around the world for 70 years. That is the kind of trade policy that we need. Reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank for another 7 years before its charter expires in June.

What we must not do is to sign up to yet another bad free trade agreement, a deal that subjects American workers to competition that is neither free nor fair. And far too many of these trade agreements—particularly, as you pointed out, in the last 20 years—have done nothing but deepen our trade deficit, lower our wages, and send American jobs overseas.

An example: 3 years ago, we signed the U.S.-Korea free trade agreement with the bells and rattles, the ruffle of drums and all of this effort that we are going to create jobs, increase wages. Yes, we are going to have more exports.

□ 1900

Well, you have got to know how to add and you have to know how to subtract. We have got exports, but look at the flow of imports which is hurting American workers.

Since this trade agreement 3 years ago, our trade deficit with South Korea has gone up 71 percent; and given the administration and the way they calculate the job loss, using their metrics, we are talking about 74,000 American jobs. The Trans-Pacific Partnership is built on that template of the U.S.-Korea free trade agreement, so it follows the same failed model, but it is on a much, much larger scale. It forces our manufacturing and technology base into unfair and unequal competition with other nations throughout the Asia Pacific region.

There are 11 countries. So as you pointed out, it pits good-paying American jobs against Vietnamese workers who make 56 cents an hour. It asks American exporters to compete against Japanese producers who are propped up by currency manipulation, an abuse that has cost our economy almost 6 million jobs in 2013 alone.

What happened? These countries—Japan, Singapore, and China—devalue their currency. Their goods become cheaper; ours are more expensive. It puts us at a serious disadvantage. As you know, my colleague, this trade agreement contains nothing that would disallow currency manipulation. We have been told by the administration that there will not be a currency chapter in this bill. So we are going to go down the road where these countries can continue to put our workers and our products at a disadvantage.

You have a predictable pattern here: cheap, foreign products flow in, American jobs flow out, and our wages are on a downward spiral. The ill effects don't stop there. Most of the TPP's 29 chapters are not about trade at all. They are about rolling back laws in a way that plays directly into the hands of Big Business.

The former director of the National Economic Council, Larry Summers, has highlighted corporate efforts to use the Trans-Pacific Partnership to "change health and safety regulations, extend and strengthen patent protections, and deregulate financial services." We know that Larry Summers, former Secretary of the Treasury, National Economic Council, is no leftwing radical. That is the way they would like to portray those of us who oppose TPP. He is a thoughtful individual. That is the conclusion he comes to: it changes health and safety regulations, extends and strengthens patent protections, and deregulates financial services.

A Nobel-Prize winning economist, Joseph Stiglitz, points out:

The overall thrust of the intellectual property section of the TPP is for less competition and higher drug prices.

TPP can weaken our environmental protection. It opens the door to unsafe food. It could raise the cost of medicines. It can make it harder to defend against financial risks.

The truth is proponents of the TPP know that their economic case has failed, and lately we have heard them try another tack. They tell us that TPP is going to help America counter the rise of Chinese power in the Asia Pacific region, and if we pass TPP, we will be able to set the rules. It is absurd. It really is absurd. Quite frankly, if you want to do something about China, do something about currency manipulation and what China has been doing as regular policy in buying up our reserves. Currency manipulation is their policy.

Rules that encourage offshoring, gut our manufacturing and our technology base, and compromise the health and safety of our consumers are not American rules, but rules that favor big corporations at the expense of everyone else.

You know as well as I do, Congressman TONKO, who is in the room and who is out of the room, who is in the negotiations and who is out of the negotiations. There is room at the table for a long list of multinational corporations: Walmart, Verizon, Halliburton, Dow, General Electric, Caterpillar, Hershey, Boeing, Advamed, Dupont, Intel, Lockheed Martin, and many others. But do you know who is not at the table? The American workers are not at the table who are going to be forced to pay the price in lost jobs and low wages. And there is no room for Members of Congress. We have been systematically frozen out of the process.

For months, I pressed to get a copy of the negotiating draft, and I was told it was classified, but now I have seen pieces of the text. When I got into the room with a small part of the text, I discovered that it was not classified at all, that they said it was classified, but it is classified as a confidential document. It is not secret. It doesn't have a top-secret classification. They just don't want us to see it. They have placed every single restriction on our ability to read this agreement front to back, to ask questions, to know who said what, what country said what, and what the U.S. position is about all of this.

They have been working at this for 4½ years, and now they have come because they know that fast track is in jeopardy. They know that this treaty is in jeopardy, and they say: Oh, we would like to have you read the text but it is classified, and you can't have any staff there except for someone who has a security clearance. They are holding us to a standard that the treaty does not impose.

Let's stop playing the games. Jobs are at stake. Workers have a right to

know what is being done in their name. We Representatives in Congress are their representatives. We have that responsibility to ensure that TPP either protects jobs or does not happen at all.

Now, you talked about Trade Promotion Authority fast track. What is it? It is a rubber stamp. It says: Okay, trust us. You can't see the document. You can only see bits and pieces of it. It is classified, but give us fast track where there is no public scrutiny of the document, limited congressional debate, and no ability to amend the document at all. Just vote for us, and we will take care of your interests.

President Reagan said trust, but verify. We are trying to verify. To give them that fast track authority, in my view, your view, this coalition's view, would be a big mistake. The potential consequences of the TPP are simply too great. We cannot surrender our constitutional authority, our ability to scrutinize this agreement and to amend it.

Working Americans are in trouble today. Their paychecks have been stagnant or in decline for over 30 years. They are struggling to put food on the table and to heat their homes, let alone take a vacation or send their kids to college. Bad trade deals have played a leading role in creating this situation, bad public policy, and these trade agreements have been bad public policy.

Good, stable manufacturing jobs used to be a bridge to the middle class until they were sent overseas to places where labor is cheap, only to be replaced with poorly paid service sector jobs. Workers who are laid off face an uphill battle to get rehired. If they find new jobs, three out of five are forced to work for lower wages. That is the reality of what happens when we sign these ill-considered free trade agreements.

Why would we volunteer America and American workers for yet more punishment? Why would we do that? If we want to help the middle class, if we are for middle class economics, why would we do this? Why would we make it easier for Big Business to send their jobs overseas?

The time has come. Enough is enough. No more low wages. No more lost jobs. No more bad trade deals. And that is where we are now. The Congress, the House of Representatives, has woken up. They are stirred up. They believe this is a bad deal. They haven't been allowed to investigate it, to read it, to read the bill as the public asked us to do with the Affordable Care Act those years ago, and then they want us to put our imprimatur on this effort. That is why there is so much consternation. That is why the Members of Congress, the Members of the House of Representatives, are saying no.

I believe we will defeat fast track because the American public doesn't



want this treaty. The American public doesn't want to see their representatives unable to talk to them about it, and the Members of Congress are reasserting their responsibility and saying, unless we see it, unless we read it, unless we ask the questions, unless we know who the negotiating partners are, and unless we say yes, then our answer to the administration is no.

I thank you for organizing this.

Mr. TONKO. Well, Representative DELAURO, let me just state that the people of Connecticut are so fortunate to have you bring your voice to this Chamber to speak so effectively and so nobly for the workers of this country. People of this country beyond Connecticut prosper from your advocacy and your passion. We respect that. All people who are tuned into this discussion, those who have heard about it in other dialogue, need to call their Representatives: Where are you on fast track?

Ms. DELAURO. Bingo.

Mr. TONKO. A great number of us Democrats in this House have come together saying we are for growing paychecks and we want to strengthen that paycheck. We have stood for increasing the minimum wage, but we talk about the median wage. Let's strengthen that. Let's make certain there is an opportunity to say: Here is how it could be better; here is what you are skipping. You are walking past the currency manipulation issue, which is one of the biggest concerns right now.

Ms. DELAURO. Amen.

Mr. TONKO. As you pointed out, trade deficits have put the biggest dent into the American economy, and if we continue this, those who don't learn from history are bound to repeat it. And what we have here is an opportunity to learn from history that there have been all these negative outcomes. We have flattened if not gone south with the middle class income all because we have sent out of our country's borders these sound manufacturing jobs.

You talked about all these impacts, and I know where your heart is on social and economic justice. What are we doing to people with the four TPP negotiating partners in Vietnam, Malaysia, Mexico, and Peru? We are using forced labor or child labor in violation of international standards as reported by the United States Department of Labor in their report of List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor. We have situations where there are not unions allowed in Vietnam, a communist country. If it is allowed, they can't speak outside of these given standards. If they do, they are persecuted or jailed.

Ms. DELAURO. Or killed.

Mr. TONKO. Or killed. We have got documentation of how many union activists have been murdered and how many of those issues have been re-

solved, how many of those reviews by the judicial process or whatever system in their country would prosecute. None of these—very few have been resolved.

So it is not just the economic consequences. It is the social injustice that we can allow with these contracts.

So I thank you. I know we have been joined by Ms. KAPTUR.

Ms. DELAURO. Let me make one more point. Ms. KAPTUR is here, and she has really been in the forefront of these debates and these issues for so many years, because the other side tries to portray us as, well, if you don't want this fast track authority, what would you want? Over the years, and particularly over the last several months, the last year and a half, Democratic Members of the House of Representatives have written to the administration, to the USTR, that is the U.S. Trade Representative, and we have made suggestions of how we could increase congressional input into this process by looking at who the negotiating partners are, what the objectives are, the enforcement of those objectives, and how we have a chance to certify that the objectives have been met and say yes, and then we move forward, the administration moves forward.

We have been said no to over and over and over again. So, in fact, there has been no congressional input, though we have tried for a very, very long time to do that. The public needs to know that, because we just cannot have our head in the sand and just say no.

Mr. TONKO. Absolutely. You use that technical term, I have used it, "currency manipulation," over and over. Let's just throw an example out there. It is a \$6,000 edge for a competing automobile imported into this Nation against what is produced by our home-driven auto industry.

□ 1915

Well, that is going to upset the whole economy. It is going to impact consumers.

So currency manipulation is given a \$6,000 edge. It is like giving them a check saying: Put more conditions or more opportunities into the consumer's pocket to buy more features on a car.

Of course, \$6,000 is going to speak to their senses, so we need currency manipulation to provide for fair trade. As you indicated, we are all for trade but not this manipulation that has hurt the American working families.

We have Representative KAPTUR here, and I believe we have about 5 minutes remaining.

Representative KAPTUR, I yield to you to share your thoughts because this is so important an issue.

Again, I thank both of my colleagues for joining us here this evening and Representative SLAUGHTER for sending in written comment that can be incorporated. Thank you, Representative DELAURO.

Representative KAPTUR, please share with us your thoughts.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you very much, Congressman TONKO. Thank you for your leadership and bringing us to the floor. As Congresswoman DELAURO completes her remarks, I just want to thank her for leading all of us in this great quest to move toward trade agreements that create jobs in our country and trade balances rather than trade deficits.

I thought that if I could contribute anything to the conversation when this administration or any administration says, Well, what do you want, I can tell you what we don't want.

We don't want agreements like this. This was the agreement with Korea where they said that the United States would be getting the ability to ship all these cars over to Korea.

What actually happened was the reverse. We get a trickle in there; they get a deluge in here. Our trade deficit with Korea has gone up 84 percent since the agreement was signed.

We say to the administration: Give us a trade agreement that gives America not just a trade balance, which would mean we wouldn't lose any jobs, but a trade surplus, not a trade deficit, which costs us 5,000 jobs for every billion dollars of trade deficit.

We want balanced agreements; we want agreements in surplus, not in deficit. Every American knows what I am talking about. They have experienced it in their own communities.

The other thing we want is we, as a Congress, want the ability, when an agreement deals with so many different aspects, to treat trade like a treaty, not an agreement that is sent up here and we are told, You can't amend it, you can't read it actually, everything is in secret, the administration is coming up here this week, and everything is in secret, but we don't get to see the whole agreement.

I guess we look through a keyhole, and we can see 10 words or something. That isn't the way this country should conduct business. My own feeling is: Until we fix what is wrong with past agreements like the Korea agreement, why should we sign any more?

I have many stories I am going to put in the RECORD tonight, Congressman TONKO, about people in Ohio who have lost their jobs due to these backward trade agreements that ship our jobs out, not our products.

I want to thank you for helping to be here tonight, long after hours—you don't have to be here, but you are—trying to say to the American people this is really important. We understand what the American people are saying to us; we are trying to fight for them here in Washington.

How fortunate are the people of New York who have sent you here and that you are nobly carrying their cause against very, very powerful forces on



the face of the globe that really don't care what happens to the people of the United States. They have a much narrower agenda. They really don't care about liberty when it comes right down to it.

Thank you for holding to a higher standard and for trying to heal our country and to create jobs in America and opportunity in America and respect for liberty on the face of this Earth first because that is what America is supposed to be about.

I don't want to take up the remaining time. I want to make sure you have opportunity to conclude.

Mr. TONKO. You are fine, Representative KAPTUR. I thank you for contributing, as you always do in such meaningful measure.

I think you agree with me—I am certain you do—that Congress and the American workers deserve a meaningful role in these debates to make sure that our trade policy reflects our values as a country, as a people; and those include middle class prosperity, workers' rights, consumer safety, and environmental sustainability.

When we have those rights guaranteed, when we have those ideals protected and advanced and enhanced, we are a great, great nation that comes out of trade negotiations even more powerful.

We are a great nation; we need to stay great. We can't give away all of these golden opportunities simply by trade agreements that are unfair that provide an unlevel playing field for the American worker.

It is about those values that we are meeting tonight, speaking tonight, advocating tonight, and encouraging that hope be brought to each and every worker and working family out there across this great Nation in a way that reflects a sound bit of dialogue on this House floor.

Ms. KAPTUR. This is one of the most important elements of America's economic policy, and we are at a critical moment to change what was wrong in the past.

We have an opportunity to fix these trade agreements and to reshape the way we handle trade with the world, beginning with those partners who share our value of liberty and then inviting in other nations of the world that want opportunity for their people and they want a chance for rising living standards, not to be turned into worse sweatshops with no environmental standards, with no worker standards, with no hope for a better way of life, just moving from one exploitative country to another exploitative country.

I compliment you for standing up for the highest values of this Republic. I know the American people are going to win this fight because they have suffered far too long the job devastation from coast to coast. For the sake of

workers in other places in the world, we are standing up for their opportunities and their rights as well.

I am so privileged to join you this evening. Thank you for setting aside time for this Special Order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues in showing why Members of Congress must have an opportunity to weigh in on provisions included in the free trade deals currently under negotiation.

#### SECRECY OF TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

Negotiations of the Trans Pacific Partnership and the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership have been notoriously secretive. Despite the calls from hundreds of Members of Congress to the US Trade Representative to protest the needless secrecy of TPP, we continue to be denied basic access to the deal. And those few who have been granted access have been restricted from sharing any part of the agreement with their constituents or expert staff.

Tomorrow, the Administration will come to Capitol Hill to brief Members, but the conversation remains closed. Staffers without a security clearance are excluded and, again, disclosure of the terms of this deal to our constituents is prohibited under threat of federal prosecution. All this while foreign nations have the text of the provisions and know exactly what is included and what is excluded.

The American people are being left in the dark with these negotiations. They are the very same people who have suffered the most as a result of past free trade deals negotiated in the same way: in secret.

#### PERSONAL STORIES

Tonight, I want to share a few personal stories of people from my district, people whose lives were uprooted and thrown into turmoil as a result of past free trade deals. These deals lacked sufficient worker and labor protections and ushered in a wave of offshoring of American jobs.

#### MR. CHUCK HAMAIDE'S STORY

I'll begin with Mr. Chuck Hamaide, a resident of Vermilion, Ohio. In December 2000, at 50 years old, Mr. Hamaide was laid off from his job at a software company in Cleveland. He found another job at a Columbus company, which had recently outsourced a first wave of production to Mexico. Three years later, it outsourced the remainder of its domestic production to China.

Mr. Hamaide was lucky. He saw the writing on the wall and began the search for a new job before he was laid off. Many of his co-workers were not as lucky. Many who were late in their careers were laid off, losing their paychecks and their livelihoods. Many were in their fifties and faced the stigma of elder discrimination as they sought new employment.

Many did not find jobs to replace the ones that were shipped overseas, where labor is cheap and conditions are appalling. This is the legacy of free trade deals in America. And there are many more stories like it.

#### GLORIA'S PERSONAL STORY

Gloria, a bright 17 year old from Huron, Ohio, wrote to tell me her family's story, a story that is not unique. Gloria's father worked for General Motor, then Delphi, and Kyklos Bearing International for 41 years. He clocked

12 hour shifts, seven days a week. Despite years of dedication, his pay was recently cut and the factory where he works is under threat of closure.

His company may be able to offer him a replacement job—but it will be at another factory, 100 miles away from his home and his family. Whether or not Gloria's father takes the job, he and his family will suffer.

Gloria shared with me her concern about her own future: she will soon go to college and fears she will not be able to find a job once she graduates. She worries that she will not be able to support herself and that she will have to live on welfare, despite ample motivation and capability on her part. This is the legacy of free trade deals in America.

#### MIDDLE AMERICA HURT THE HARDEST BY FREE TRADE

These fears are the repercussions emanating throughout Middle America. A new generation of younger Americans, many of whom witnessed their parents being downsized and outsourced, is now entering the workforce with little hope of stability and opportunity. The American dream is looking more and more like a pipe dream to them.

These free trade deals lead to outsourced jobs and fewer opportunities for young people like Gloria who are about to enter the labor market. And they contribute to lower wages for hardworking people like Gloria's father, who dedicated their lives to their jobs and the industries in which they worked.

From the little we know from past trade deals and the shroud of secrecy being kept around the TPP and TTIP, we have to assume that these deals will be equally devastating for American workers like Chuck and future workers like Gloria.

The fact that these deals are so veiled in secrecy is unsettling, but the real economic danger comes in the form of trade promotion authority. This so-called "fast track" authority would compel Congress to vote on these massive trade deals within just a few weeks of being allowed to read them, without any opportunity to push for important changes including improvements to environmental and labor standards. I can imagine reasons why trade supporters would want to fast track a secret trade deal, but none of them involve the benevolent treatment of American workers or increasing the market value of their labor.

#### KORUS ANNIVERSARY

This week the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement passed its third year in effect. I would like to remind everyone that it was sold to us on a promise of "more exports, more jobs." In truth, we have seen exactly the opposite since the deal went into effect. U.S. exports to Korea have fallen and imports have surged.

Our overall trade deficit with Korea is 84 percent higher than it was the year before the agreement was signed, an increase of 12.7 billion dollars. A large portion of that increase comes from manufacturing imports, especially passenger vehicles.

Yes, auto exports to Korea are up an estimated 23,000 cars from a pre-KORUS number of around 15,000. The bad news is that the U.S. imported 450,000 more passenger cars over the same period. This works out to another 5.7 billion dollars or 36 percent alone for our auto trade deficit with Korea. That means

more than lost profits for U.S. companies; it also means lost wages and lost jobs for thousands of U.S. workers.

Let me also remind everyone that the Korean trade agreement is the model for the much larger Trans Pacific Partnership that remains shrouded in secrecy.

Gloria put it perfectly in her letter: "America has seemingly given up." Is this what we want our young people to think? That we no longer care, that we are no longer committed to offering them a better future?

Lost jobs and downward pressure on wages are the legacy of trade in America, and we owe it to these young people to do better. We owe it to them to protect the American economy, to protect American jobs and to protect the middle class. We have a chance to show them that we haven't given up, and that we've learned from past mistakes, like NAFTA and KORUS. We can do this by putting an end to unfair free trade deals, and negotiating fair trade deals that work for everyone, including American workers.

We owe it to the next generation to build a new legacy for American trade. There are mutual gains to be had if the free people of the world can work together, maintaining real labor and environmental standards and showing the world a better, and freer, way to live and work. We have seen glimpses of what this can look like, but for decades, when push comes to shove, our leaders have decided to balk and cave, letting false promises and voodoo economics drive the selling out of American workers time and again. We need to demand more of this administration and the massive global trade deals it strives to enact. We need real transparency and real standards or we need to say no more to terrible trade!

Mr. TONKO. Thank you so much, Representative KAPTUR.

Let's move forward with socioeconomic environmental justice, where we can grow this Nation and job opportunities and undo those trade deficits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Mr. TONKO for the time to discuss the troubling issue of "fast track" trade authority.

President Obama and some of our Republican colleagues want to use this process to ensure that the massive Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, trade deal is passed quickly and without input from Congress. Under this authority, we would have to vote on this far-reaching trade agreement that has been negotiated in secret without the ability to offer amendments or engage in meaningful debate.

Considering the TPP under fast track authority is simply another symptom of this closed Congress, where we have been deprived of our authority and responsibility to protect our constituents. And if past trade deals are any indication, American workers and manufacturers need our help now more than ever before. For as long as the United States has been signing free trade agreements, we have watched helplessly as quality, middle class jobs have flowed overseas. Quite frankly, over my career, I have never seen a trade agreement that benefited the American worker or the American manufacturer.

I come from a district that has been devastated by short-sighted trade agreements like

NAFTA, CAFTA, and recent agreements with Korea and Colombia. It is estimated that since NAFTA went into effect, the United States has lost 5 million manufacturing jobs. In the Rochester area alone, we have only half the manufacturing jobs that we did then.

Our economy simply cannot afford another NAFTA-style, job-killing trade agreement, which is exactly what the Trans-Pacific Partnership is.

I have great confidence in the American worker and American businesses to compete and succeed in the global marketplace if given a fair and level playing field. For generations, our country has shown that hard work and ingenuity are the engines of progress and economic prosperity. Innovations that shaped the 21st century economy were conceived and produced here in the United States, many in Rochester I might add.

In return for allowing other countries to benefit from our hard work and innovation, America was rewarded with a strong middle class.

But other countries have taken advantage of us, and we have to stand strong against them. American workers should not be forced to compete against workers in countries like Vietnam where wages are as low as 50 cents per hour.

We need to level the economic playing field and stop jobs from being shipped overseas. We're not going to do that by enacting fast track and allowing more poorly conceived trade agreements like the TPP to decimate our economy.

Congress cannot afford to give this administration—or any future one—the benefit of the doubt by passing fast track authority. By now, it should be clear that a closed legislative process isn't good for Congress or the American people. I firmly oppose fast track authority and I urge my colleagues to stand up for our constituents before it's too late.

#### RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, AND COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignations as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on House Administration:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: Effective today I hereby resign from my assignments to the House Committee on Ways & Means, House Committee on the Budget and the Committee on House Administration.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

#### PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC.

MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA. Mr. Speaker, section 3(h) of House Resolution 5 requires the concurrent resolution on the budget to include a section related to means-tested and non-means-tested direct spending programs. Section 3(h) of House Resolution 5 also requires the Chair of the Committee on the Budget to submit a statement in the Congressional Record defining those terms prior to the consideration of such concurrent resolution on the budget.

Enclosed please find two tables prepared in order to fulfill this requirement. I have also included a communication and associated tables from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, with whom I have consulted in the preparation of this material. While the non-means-tested list is not exhaustive, all programs not considered means-tested can be considered non-means-tested direct spending.

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, March 13, 2015.

Re Spending for Means-Tested Programs.

Hon. TOM PRICE, M.D.,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you requested, enclosed are two tables that show federal spending for each of the government's major mandatory spending programs and tax credits that are primarily means-tested (that is, spending programs and tax credits that provide cash payments or other forms of assistance to people with relatively low income or few assets). Table 1 shows the Congressional Budget Office's January 2015 baseline projections for the 2015–2025 period; Table 2 shows historical spending data from 2005 through 2014, along with CBO's estimates for 2015.

The tables also include a line showing total spending for mandatory programs that are primarily not means-tested. Some of those programs have means-tested components (for example, student loans), but the tables do not show separate entries for such programs. They also do not include means-tested programs that are discretionary (for example, the Section 8 housing assistance programs and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program). However, the tables show discretionary spending for the Pell Grant program as a memorandum item because that program has both discretionary and mandatory components and the amount of the mandatory Pell Grant component depends in part on the annual amount of discretionary funding.

In the projections that CBO published in *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025* in January 2015, mandatory outlays for means-tested programs are projected to grow over the next decade at an average annual rate of 4.6 percent, compared with an average rate of 5.5 percent for non-means-tested programs, which include, for example, Social Security, most of Medicare, and civilian and military retirement programs (see Table 1).<sup>1</sup>

Overall, the growth rates projected for total mandatory spending over the coming decade are slower than those experienced in the past 10 years—by a little less than one-half percentage point per year, on average. Projected growth from 2016 to 2025 is slightly higher for non-means-tested programs (which will have grown at an average rate of

5.4 percent from 2006 to 2015, CBO estimates), but much lower for means-tested programs (which will have grown at an average rate of 6.8 percent from 2006 to 2015, by CBO's estimate; see Table 2).

A number of programs shown in Tables 1 and 2 have been or are scheduled to be significantly affected by changes in law, the most recent recession, and the continuing recovery. As a result, important aspects of the programs in the future may differ significantly from historical experience, and those differences may be the source of some of the variation between the growth rates in the past 10 years and those in the coming decade. For example, spending for Medicaid, the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), subsidies for health insurance purchased through an exchange, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and the refundable portions of the earned income and child tax credits has been or will be significantly affected by program changes that unfold over time:

Medicaid spending shot up by 35 percent from 2008 to 2010, during the most recent recession. After dropping off a bit in the following few years, it has been boosted by the expansion of Medicaid coverage under the Affordable Care Act. As that expansion has been phased in, spending for the program increased by 14 percent last year and is projected to rise by 11 percent in 2015. Under current law, the rate of growth in Medicaid spending will decline through 2018, CBO projects, after which it will level off at a rate of roughly 5.5 percent per year through the end of the projection period.

Spending authority for the CHIP program expires at the end of fiscal year 2015. Con-

sistent with statutory guidelines, CBO assumes in its baseline spending projections that annual funding for the program after 2015 will continue at \$5.7 billion.<sup>2</sup> As a result, in CBO's baseline, spending for CHIP is projected to drop from \$11 billion in 2016 to about \$6 billion in subsequent years; it had grown from \$5 billion to \$10 billion from 2005 to 2015.

Payments of subsidies for health insurance purchased through an exchange began in January 2014 and are projected to grow rapidly between 2015 and 2018, largely as a result of significant growth in enrollment. CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation project annual growth will average about 4 percent between 2019 and 2025.

SNAP spending increased markedly during the most recent recession—roughly doubling between 2008 and 2011—as more people became eligible for those benefits. In addition, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) raised the maximum benefit under that program; subsequent legislation eliminated that increase as of October 31, 2013. The program's caseload peaked in 2014, and CBO expects that it will fall in each year of the projection period as the economy continues to improve. As a result, spending for SNAP is projected to decline slightly over the next several years, after growing by an average of 9 percent per year over the 2006–2015 period.

Outlays for the earned income and child tax credits rose by almost 40 percent from 2007 to 2008 and have grown slowly since then. They are expected to dip after 2018 because provisions expanding the refundability of those credits (which were originally enacted in ARRA and were subsequently ex-

tended) are scheduled to expire on December 31, 2017.<sup>3</sup> In 2025, those outlays are projected to be about what they were in 2014.

Finally, because of the unique budgetary treatment of the Pell Grant program—which has both mandatory and discretionary components—the growth rates for the mandatory portion of that program give incomplete information. The bulk of the funding for Pell grants is provided annually in appropriation acts and thus is discretionary. In recent years, spending for Pell grants also has included two mandatory components, which have allowed the discretionary budget authority provided by the regular appropriation acts to remain well below the full cost of the program.

In keeping with procedures that govern CBO's baseline, the projection for the discretionary portion of the Pell Grant program is based on the budget authority appropriated for fiscal year 2015, adjusted for inflation. (Discretionary spending for the program is shown as a memorandum item in both tables.) Thus, the baseline projection for both discretionary and mandatory spending for Pell grants does not represent an estimate of the expected future costs of the program; such a projection also would take into account such factors as changes in eligibility and enrollment.

I hope that you find this information helpful. If you have any further questions, please contact me or my staff. The primary staff contact is Barry Blom.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,

*Director.*

Enclosure.

**Table 1.**  
**Mandatory Outlays in CBO's January 2015 Baseline**  
(Outlays by fiscal year, billions of dollars)

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Average Annual Growth 2016-2025
<b>Means-Tested Programs</b>												
Health Care Programs												
Medicaid	335	360	384	405	428	452	477	503	530	558	588	5.8%
Medicare Part D Low-Income Subsidies	24	28	28	28	32	34	37	44	46	46	54	8.4%
Health insurance subsidies <sup>a,b</sup>	28	55	75	86	89	91	97	102	105	109	112	15.1%
Children's Health Insurance Program	10	11	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	-5.9%
Subtotal	397	454	493	524	555	584	617	656	687	719	760	6.7%
Income Security												
SNAP	78	78	76	75	74	74	74	73	74	74	75	-0.4%
Supplemental Security Income	55	60	57	54	61	63	64	71	68	65	72	2.7%
Earned income and child tax credits <sup>b,c</sup>	83	85	86	87	75	76	77	78	79	80	82	-0.1%
Family support and foster care <sup>d</sup>	31	32	32	32	33	33	33	34	34	34	35	1.0%
Child nutrition	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	31	32	4.3%
Subtotal	268	277	274	273	267	271	275	285	284	284	295	1.0%
Veterans' pensions	6	7	6	6	7	7	7	8	7	7	7	2.0%
Pell Grants <sup>e</sup>	11	6	7	9	9	9	9	9	10	10	10	-1.3%
Subtotal, Means-Tested Programs	683	744	781	811	838	871	909	957	988	1,019	1,072	4.8%
Non-Means-Tested Programs <sup>f</sup>	1,847	1,947	2,018	2,094	2,241	2,370	2,516	2,708	2,820	2,933	3,165	5.5%
<b>Total Mandatory Outlays<sup>g</sup></b>	<b>2,530</b>	<b>2,691</b>	<b>2,799</b>	<b>2,905</b>	<b>3,079</b>	<b>3,241</b>	<b>3,425</b>	<b>3,666</b>	<b>3,808</b>	<b>3,952</b>	<b>4,237</b>	<b>5.3%</b>
<b>Memorandum</b>												
Pell Grants (Discretionary) <sup>h</sup>	20	27	27	23	24	24	25	25	26	26	27	3.0%

Source: Congressional Budget Office, staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Notes: The projections shown here are the same as those reported in Congressional Budget Office, *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2015 to 2025* (January 2015). CBO recently updated its baseline projections as reported in Congressional Budget Office, *Updated Budget Projections: 2015 to 2025* (March 2015). Some of the projections are different in the March baseline, but at the request of the committee staff, the projections shown are from the January baseline.

The average annual growth rate over the 2016-2025 period encompasses growth in outlays from the amount projected for 2015 through the amount projected for 2025.

Projections of spending for benefit programs in this table exclude administrative costs that are classified as discretionary but generally include administrative costs classified as mandatory.

SNAP = Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

Because October 1 will fall on a weekend in 2016, 2017, 2022, and 2023, certain federal payments that are due on that date will instead be made at the end of the preceding September and thus be shifted into the previous fiscal year. Those shifts primarily affect outlays for Supplemental Security Income, veterans' compensation benefits and pensions, and Medicare.

a. Differs from the amounts reported in Table 3-2 from *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2015 to 2025* because it does not include payments to health insurance plans for risk adjustment (amounts paid to plans that attract less healthy enrollees) and reinsurance (amounts paid to plans that enroll individuals who end up with high costs). Spending for grants to states to establish exchanges is also excluded.

b. Does not include amounts that reduce tax receipts.

c. Differs from the amounts reported on Table 3-2 from *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2015 to 2025* because it does not include other tax credits that were included in that table.

d. Includes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, the Child Support Enforcement program, the Child Care Entitlement program, and other programs that benefit children.

e. Includes mandatory spending designed to reduce the discretionary budget authority needed to support the maximum award level set in the appropriation act plus mandatory spending that, by formula, increases the total maximum award above the amount set in the appropriation act.

f. Does not include offsetting receipts.

g. Does not include outlays associated with federal interest payments, which are not considered part of mandatory spending.

h. The discretionary baseline does not represent a projection of expected costs for the discretionary portion of the Pell Grant program. As with all other discretionary programs, the budget authority is calculated by inflating the budget authority appropriated for fiscal year 2015. Outlays for future years are based on those amounts of budget authority and also reflect a temporary surplus of budget authority provided in 2015.

Table 2.

**Mandatory Outlays Since 2005**  
(Outlays by fiscal year, billions of dollars)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Estimated, 2015	Average Annual Growth 2006-2015
<b>Means-Tested Programs</b>												
Health Care Programs												
Medicaid	182	181	191	201	251	273	275	251	265	301	335	6.3%
Medicare Part D Low-Income Subsidies	0	11	17	17	19	21	24	20	22	22	24	8.9% <sup>a</sup>
Health insurance subsidies <sup>b,c</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	28	n.a.
Children's Health Insurance Program	5	5	6	7	8	8	9	9	9	9	10	7.3%
Subtotal	187	197	213	225	277	302	308	279	297	346	397	7.8%
Income Security												
SNAP	33	35	35	39	56	70	77	80	83	76	78	9.1%
Supplemental Security Income	38	37	36	41	45	47	53	47	53	54	55	3.7%
Earned income and child tax credits <sup>c</sup>	49	52	54	75	67	77	78	77	79	82	83	5.3%
Family support and foster care <sup>d</sup>	31	30	31	32	33	35	33	30	32	31	31	0.3%
Child nutrition	13	14	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	20	21	5.1%
Subtotal	163	168	170	202	217	247	260	254	266	263	268	5.1%
Veterans' pensions	4	4	3	4	4	4	5	5	5	6	6	5.0%
Pell Grants <sup>e</sup>	0	0	0	1	2	4	14	12	16	8	11	n.a.
Subtotal, Means-Tested Programs	354	369	386	431	501	557	587	550	584	623	683	6.8%
Non-Means-Tested Programs <sup>f</sup>	1,094	1,188	1,242	1,349	1,787	1,553	1,648	1,710	1,752	1,757	1,847	5.4%
<b>Total Mandatory Outlays<sup>g</sup></b>	<b>1,448</b>	<b>1,556</b>	<b>1,628</b>	<b>1,780</b>	<b>2,288</b>	<b>2,110</b>	<b>2,236</b>	<b>2,260</b>	<b>2,336</b>	<b>2,380</b>	<b>2,530</b>	<b>5.7%</b>
<b>Memorandum</b>												
Pell Grants (Discretionary)	13	13	13	15	13	20	21	21	17	23	20	4.3%

Source: Congressional Budget Office, staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Notes: The average annual growth rate over the 2006-2015 period encompasses growth in outlays from the amount recorded in 2005 through the amount projected for 2015.

Data on spending for benefit programs in this table exclude administrative costs that are classified as discretionary but generally include administrative costs classified as mandatory.

SNAP = Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program; n.a. = not applicable.

Because October 1 fell on a weekend in 2006, 2007, and 2012, certain federal payments that were due on that date were instead made at the end of the preceding September and thus shifted into the previous fiscal year. Those shifts primarily affected outlays for Supplemental Security Income, veterans' compensation benefits and pensions, and Medicare.

a. The average annual growth rate reflects the program's growth from its inception in 2006 through 2015.

b. Differs from the amounts reported in Table 3-2 from *The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2015 to 2025* because it does not include payments to health insurance plans for risk adjustment (amounts paid to plans that attract less healthy enrollees) and reinsurance (amounts paid to plans that enroll individuals who end up with high costs). Spending for grants to states to establish exchanges is also excluded.

c. Does not include amounts that reduce tax receipts.

d. Includes the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, the Child Support Enforcement program, the Child Care Entitlement program, and other programs that benefit children.

e. Includes mandatory spending designed to reduce the discretionary budget authority needed to support the maximum award level set in the appropriation act plus mandatory spending that, by formula, increases the total maximum award above the amount set in the appropriation act.

f. Does not include offsetting receipts.

g. Does not include outlays associated with federal interest payments, which are not considered part of mandatory spending.

## ENDNOTES

1. CBO published *Updated Budget Projections: 2015 to 2025* in March 2015; some of the amounts shown in Table 1 are different in the March baseline, but at the request of the committee staff, these tables show the projections from the January baseline. In total, for mandatory spending, the differences between the two baselines are small, and the average annual growth rates over the 2016–2025 period are very similar—5.3 percent in the January projections versus 5.2 percent in the March baseline.

2. Under current law, funding for the program in 2015 consists of two semiannual allotments of \$2.85 billion—amounts that are much smaller than the allotments made in the four preceding years. (The first semiannual allotment in 2015 will be supplemented by \$15.4 billion in onetime funding for the program.) Following the rules prescribed by the Deficit Control Act, CBO extrapolates the \$2.85 billion provided for the second half of the year to arrive at projected annual funding of \$5.7 billion.

3. Refundable tax credits reduce a filer's overall income tax liability; if the credit exceeds the rest of the filer's income tax liability, the government pays all or some portion of that excess to the taxpayer. Those tax credits also affect the budget, to a lesser extent, by reducing tax revenues; those revenue effects are not shown in the tables.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 18, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

785. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Minnesota, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0023] received March 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

786. A letter from the Administrator, FSA Regulatory Review Group, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Biomass Crop Assistance Program (RIN: 0560-AI27) received March 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

787. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement pursuant to Sec. 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, on a transaction involving U.S. exports to Korean Air Lines (KAL) of Seoul, South Korea; to the Committee on Financial Services.

788. A letter from the Director, Division of Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting

the Department's direct final rule — Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: Transmission of Documents and Information (RIN: 1240-AA09) received March 13, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

789. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Office, OPS, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Professional Standards for State and Local School Nutrition Programs Personnel as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 [FNS-2011-0030] (RIN: 0584-AE19) received March 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

790. A letter from the Deputy Director, ASPA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Official Symbol, Logo and Seal received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

791. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of Sec. 621(a)(1) of the Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984, as amended by the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992 [MB Docket No.: 05-311] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

792. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a letter asking Congress to raise the debt limit as soon as possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

793. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Correction and Disclosure for Charitable Hospitals (Rev. Proc. 2015-21) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

794. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Empowerment Zone Designation Extension Notice [Notice 2015-26] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

795. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Reporting for Premium; Basis Reporting by Securities Brokers and Basis Determination for Debt Instruments and Options [TD 9713] (RIN: 1545-BL46) (RIN: 1545-BM60) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 152. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and providing for consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Na-

tional Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures (Rept. 114-45). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. LUMMIS, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1385. A bill to provide for a legal framework for the operation of public unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 1386. A bill to include subcontracting goals for small business concerns in the responsibilities of certain members of a Federal agency responsible for acquisition; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina (for herself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the determination of the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act without regard to alien agricultural seasonal workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. JONES, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LONG, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HULTGREEN, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BLUM, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 1388. A bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BARR (for himself and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 1389. A bill to improve the mortgage finance system and the regulation of financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 1390. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to modify the requirements for joint venture offers for bundled or consolidated contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NEAL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO,

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 1391. A bill to protect our Social Security system and improve benefits for current and future generations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1392. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to reduce the amount of Federal highway funding available to States that do not enact a law prohibiting the use of certain communication devices while operating a motor vehicle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. HARPER, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1393. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish an innovation in surface transportation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. NOLAN):

H.R. 1394. A bill to prohibit land border crossing fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 1395. A bill to eliminate the payroll tax for individuals who have attained retirement age, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1396. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize a bipartisan majority of Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission to hold non-public collaborative discussions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself and Ms. GRAHAM):

H.R. 1397. A bill to allow seniors to file their Federal income tax on a new Form 1040SR; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1398. A bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, and Armed Services, for a period to be subse-

quently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida (for herself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1399. A bill to reauthorize and improve a grant program to assist institutions of higher education in establishing, maintaining, improving, and operating Veteran Student Centers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. BUCHSHON):

H.R. 1400. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to transition the Medicaid thresholds applied for determining acceptable provider taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada (for himself and Mr. QUIGLEY):

H.R. 1401. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to stimulate international tourism to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1402. A bill to direct the Commandant of the Coast Guard to convey certain property from the United States to the County of Marin, California; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1403. A bill to require that, in cases in which the annual trade deficit between the United States and another country is \$10,000,000,000 or more for 3 consecutive years, the President take the necessary steps to create a more balanced trading relationship with that country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Ms. ESTY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. FARR, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1404. A bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPINSKI (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 1405. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to ensure railroad safety; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1406. A bill to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. ASHFORD,

Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KIND, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. YOHIO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. COSTA):

H.R. 1407. A bill to establish an independent advisory committee to review certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 1408. A bill to require certain Federal banking agencies to conduct a study of the appropriate capital requirements for mortgage servicing assets for nonsystemic banking institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1409. A bill to amend the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to restore the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to adopt certain rules relating to preserving the open Internet and to direct the Commission to take all actions necessary to restore to effect vacated portions of such rules; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1410. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require the implementation of a data quality improvement plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1411. A bill to provide for a grants program to develop and enhance integrated nutrition and physical activity curricula in medical schools; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1412. A bill to achieve border security on certain Federal lands along the Southern border; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JONES, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. CONAWAY):

H.R. 1413. A bill to terminate Operation Choke Point; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1414. A bill to direct the Secretary to make interim payments of disability compensation benefits for certain claims for such compensation prior to the adjudication of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States waiving the application of the first article of amendment to the political



speech of corporations and other business organizations with respect to the disbursement of funds in connection with public elections and granting Congress and the States the power to establish limits on contributions and expenditures in elections for public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 153. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Middle Level Education Month; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1385.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 1386.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 1387.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Power to tax and pay debts—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1: “The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

The Commerce Clause—Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3: “To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1388.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1389.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: “The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mr. KNIGHT:

H.R. 1390.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1391.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1392.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 3 (relating to the authority to regulate commerce among the several states).

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1393.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1, Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 1394.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution. “The Congress shall have Power \*\*\* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. DESANTIS:

H.R. 1395.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 1396.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

Article IV, Section 3

By Mr. FLEMING:

H.R. 1397.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Amendment 16 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1398.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States

By Ms. FRANKEL of Florida:

H.R. 1399.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 (Clauses 1, 12, 13, and 14) of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes for the purpose of spending; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 1400.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HECK of Nevada:

H.R. 1401.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1402.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1403.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes...

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1404.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 1405.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution, which allows for Congress to regulate commerce amongst the several states.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1406.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 1407.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article 1 Section 8 Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, which states that the Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 1408.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 1409.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. RADEWAGEN:

H.R. 1410.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1411.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The above mentioned legislation is based upon the following Section 8 statement:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 1412.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV Section 4: The United States shall guarantee to every state in this union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion; and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 1413.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1. Section 8

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1414.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Amendment XVI, of the United States Constitution

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.J. Res. 38.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. BOST, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 131: Mr. WALBERG and Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 174: Mr. REED.

H.R. 184: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 188: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 217: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. PERRY, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 223: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 232: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 242: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 249: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 266: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 270: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 281: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 292: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 296: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 304: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 333: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 335: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 360: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 369: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 379: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 430: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 449: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 452: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 456: Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms.

MENG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 511: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 524: Mr. POSEY and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 540: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DESANTIS, Ms. LEE, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 542: Mr. TAKAI, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 546: Mr. PETERS and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 551: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 572: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 588: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 592: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 601: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 605: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 610: Mr. FINCHER and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 612: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 613: Mr. JOYCE and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 662: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 672: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 681: Mr. SCHOCK.

H.R. 721: Mr. HARPER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. KILMER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 723: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 746: Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 751: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 764: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 766: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 767: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 784: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 805: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 815: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 816: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 818: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 829: Ms. NORTON and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 831: Mr. HONDA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 837: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 846: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 850: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 852: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 855: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 868: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 879: Mr. MESSER and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 881: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 885: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 887: Mr. HARPER and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 908: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HAHN, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 911: Mr. ASHFORD and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 919: Ms. KUSTER and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 940: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NUGENT, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. TURNER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 957: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 971: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 976: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 985: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. POSEY, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 986: Mr. PALMER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 990: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 997: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1021: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1035: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1037: Mr. PETERS, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIND, Mrs. Kirkpatrick, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1058: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1059: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1092: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1094: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1095: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 1104: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1105: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. OLSON, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. REED, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BOST, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1117: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 1136: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 1142: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1143: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HARPER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1148: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1151: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 1172: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1174: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1190: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1197: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1198: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BEYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 1209: Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HARPER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1227: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1232: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1234: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1249: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 1257: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. LEE, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1271: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1293: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SIREN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1299: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. STUTZMAN.

H.R. 1300: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 1309: Mrs. ROBY.  
H.R. 1328: Mr. BYRNE.  
H.R. 1333: Mr. LONG.  
H.R. 1365: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.  
H.J. Res. 9: Mr. KLINE.  
H.J. Res. 22: Ms. DUCKWORTH.  
H.J. Res. 29: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H. Con. Res. 14: Mrs. BEATTY, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.  
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. TIBERI.  
H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H. Res. 28: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. WALZ, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. FARR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. LANCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
H. Res. 50: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. MENG, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H. Res. 53: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H. Res. 109: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
H. Res. 116: Mr. PETERS.  
H. Res. 118: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
H. Res. 119: Mr. BYRNE.

H. Res. 122: Mr. RIBBLE and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.  
H. Res. 139: Mr. BYRNE.

---

#### DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 296: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## TRIBUTE TO WADSWORTH, OHIO

## HON. JAMES B. RENACCI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. RENACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a city I am proud to call home: Wadsworth, Ohio.

This past year, Wadsworth celebrated its bicentennial. It was an opportunity to reflect on how far our city has come and how much we can achieve in the years ahead.

Founded in 1814, the city was named after Elijah Wadsworth, a Revolutionary War hero. Though he never lived in Wadsworth, he was an active member of his community and served as the postmaster, sheriff, and the commander of the 4th Division State Militia. He led by example and showed us just how important it is to give back to a community that has given you so much.

Wadsworth is important to me not only because it's where I have called home for more than 30 years, it's also where I raised my three children. That is why, over a span of 18 years, I served the city in capacities as a volunteer firefighter, a member of the Board of Zoning appeals, a member of the Planning Commission, president of the city council, and as mayor.

Now, as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I am working on behalf of the people of Wadsworth and Ohio's 16th District to encourage economic growth in our region and solutions that hold the promise of a bright future.

President Lincoln once said, "The best way to predict the future is to create it." I came to Washington to fight to pass on a better America with more opportunities to our children and grandchildren, and each day I work toward that goal.

## RECOGNIZING 100TH EAGLE SCOUT OF TROOP 67

## HON. REID J. RIBBLE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of Patrick McCormick. Mr. McCormick has selflessly dedicated much of his life to Boy Scout Troop 67. Since founding the Troop in 1966, Mr. McCormick has mentored 100 Eagle Scouts. An Eagle Scout himself, Mr. McCormick is a role model for each and every member of Boy Scout Troop 67.

I need not go into detail of the importance Eagle Scouts have played in our country's history with men such as Neil Armstrong and President Gerald Ford. Under the leadership

of Patrick McCormick, Troop 67 has ten Eagle Scouts whom are veterans of the United States of America's Armed Forces. One is a Boy Scouts of America District Scout Executive, one is a minister, thirty-two Scouts that have earned their Eagle Scout Award are now registered as Assistant Scoutmasters and twenty-five have earned their Eagle Scout Palms. The Eagle Scouts, throughout their community service, have identified projects and built the necessary relationships to move those projects forward. These Eagle projects enhance the communities in which they are performed, and provide a road map of encouragement to the scouts that follow in their footsteps.

I commend Mr. McCormick for his many years of service, dedication and mentorship to the young men of this nation. It is men like Mr. McCormick that inspire and engage the youth of our country to grow and do great things.

## IN MEMORIAM OF CONGRESSMAN DONALD "DON" HOLST CLAUSEN

## HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I honor the memory of former Congressman Donald "Don" Holst Clausen, who passed away on February 7, 2015, at the age of 91. Mr. Clausen, a native of Humboldt County, California attended several colleges, including St. Mary's College. From there, he joined the V5 Naval Aviation Cadet Program and enlisted in World War II. His service in aviation during the war carried over to starting a flight school and ambulance service at the Del Norte airport.

Mr. Clausen served on the Del Norte County Board of Supervisors from 1955 to 1962. He was elected to Congress in 1963 following the death of Congressman Clement Woodnutt Miller. During his time in the U.S. House of Representatives, he worked on the formation and expansion of Redwood National Park, and was an ardent supporter of the Klamath, Eel and Russian Rivers. He also worked to establish a 200-mile fishing boundary to prevent the exploitation of ocean fisheries by foreign fleets.

Following his defeat for reelection in 1982, Mr. Clausen was appointed by President Ronald Reagan to be director of special projects for the Federal Aviation Administration, in which he served until 1990.

It is with deep respect that we mourn the passing of Mr. Don Clausen and extend condolences to his daughters Dawn Marie Baumgartner and Bev Mendenhall. His presence will be sorely missed.

## HONORING MR. WILLIE THOMAS GRAY

## HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great community leader, Mr. Willie Thomas Gray.

Mr. Gray is a native of the Citronelle area in north Mobile County, where he graduated from Citronelle High School. He is the owner and publisher of two weekly newspapers in the area: The Call News and the Washington County News. Under his leadership, the papers have consistently received various press association awards. He is also an active member of the Alabama Press Association and the National Newspaper Association.

After his local chamber of commerce went inactive a number of years ago, Willie Gray stepped up to the plate. He arranged meetings of local business, civic, church, and education leaders to promote the continuation of civic involvement and formed the Citronelle Business Association. Today, Mr. Gray remains active in economic development efforts in the community. His work has included the execution of a professional study, including following-up on the results and planning for development based on its findings.

Mr. Gray has also taken an active role in the betterment of the north Mobile County schools. As a foremost advocate for education, he worked with the Mobile County Public School System to move ahead with construction of a new Citronelle High School and Calcedaever Elementary School and an extensive renovation of historic Rosa A. Lott Middle School. The renovations and new constructions were critical, as some of the buildings were over 100 years old.

Mr. Speaker, we need more people like Willie Gray in our nation. His commitment to the local schools, businesses, and civic organizations serves as a bright example of community involvement. I look forward to a continued partnership with Mr. Gray as we work towards the common goal of making Southwest Alabama a better place to live, work, and raise a family.

## IN SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF THE CITY OF FINDLAY, OHIO ON BEING NAMED THE 2014 TOP MICROPOLITAN COMMUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

## HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to recognize the City of Findlay,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

which is located in Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. Findlay was recently named the 2014 Top Micropolitan Community in the United States by Site Selection magazine, the official publication of the Global FDI Association and the Industrial Asset Management Council.

The magazine ranked 576 of the nation's micropolitan areas, cities with populations ranging from 10,000 to 50,000 that cover at least one county. While Findlay has ranked well for many years, placing fourth in 2013, this is the first time the city has topped the list.

The City of Findlay has focused its efforts on economic development within the community, and this year's recognition is a testament to the collaboration among local, county and state leaders, the Findlay-Hancock County Economic Development office and the city's community partners. Their efforts continue to make Findlay a great place to live, work, and raise a family. Findlay's future remains bright for the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the City of Findlay, Ohio, on being named the 2014 Top Micropolitan Community in the United States. I am extremely proud of the growth and investment that have occurred in Findlay over the past year, and am excited about the potential this development brings to the city's residents and businesses who are proud to call Findlay home.

#### REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. ALEXANDER E. "AL" TEODOSIO

#### HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Mr. Alexander E. "Al" Teodosio, 90, who passed away on Tuesday, February 10, in the presence of his loving family.

Al dedicated his life to spending time with his family and friends, showing compassion to others, and while serving his country in the armed forces. Al honorably served during World War II as a Private First Class in the Army Air Corps Squadron in the Pacific Theater and demonstrated tremendous strength and courage throughout his tenure. After his service Al returned to the states and became a widely respected attorney and practiced for many years in the city of Akron, Ohio with his late brother, Ernie. In 1950, Al married the love of his life Anna and the two shared over 64 years of love and happiness together. Regardless of his official title, Al aimed to make his community a better place to call home; and he undoubtedly succeeded. From 1976 to 1990, he served as Chairman of the Summit County Democratic Party, and made it a priority to inspire and mentor other local public servants.

Al was preceded in death by his loving parents; dear siblings; son, Alan; and granddaughter, Andrea. He is survived by his loving wife Anna Marie; children, Mary Anne, Thomas, Carol Anne, Robert, Alex; grandchildren, Christine, Kathleen, Joseph, Christopher, David, Lexi, Nicholas, Joseph, Ellen, and Alice. Perhaps the most fitting tribute to Al

was written by his own children commemorating the Teodosio's 60th wedding anniversary in 2010. "Thank you mom and dad," it read, "for teaching us the meaning of love, commitment, and family." My dear friend Al helped to make the world a brighter place and he will be dearly missed.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SANDRA CARAVELLA—28TH CONGRES- SIONAL DISTRICT WOMAN OF THE YEAR

#### HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my Congressional District. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Sandra Caravella of Atwater Village, a unique neighborhood in Los Angeles, California.

Born and raised in the Atwater Village area of Los Angeles, Ms. Caravella attended Atwater Elementary School, Irving Junior High School and John Marshall High School. With the exception of a few years when she and her husband, Joe, also an Atwater Village native, resided in Michigan, Sandra has been a lifetime resident of Atwater Village, where she and Joe raised their family. While a young mother, Sandra volunteered at her sons' school, Atwater Avenue Elementary School as a teacher's aide, and became involved in the Parent Teacher Association. When her youngest son was six years old, she took a part time job at the Los Angeles Convention and Visitors Bureau working as a registration supervisor at conventions, seminars and trade shows, where she remained for over two decades.

Well regarded in her community, Ms. Caravella is a passionate and dedicated volunteer. She is a founding member and current Board member of the Friends of Atwater Village (FAV), whose first venture was to successfully save the historic Van de Kamp Bakery building. As a FAV Board member, Sandra has been instrumental in attaining grants for community beautification projects that include murals illustrating the area's history, flower containers, and a decorative gate at the Los Angeles River and Acresite Street. With three other FAV Board members, she produced calendars featuring local history and a book entitled: Images of America: Atwater Village. Ms. Caravella is a member of the Atwater Village Chamber of Commerce, was the chamber's project manager of the sign committee, and serves on the Tree Lighting and River Committees for the Atwater Village Neighborhood Council.

Married for nearly half a century, Sandra and her husband, Joe, have two sons, Jeff and Brian, two grandsons, Vincenzo and Nico, all of whom live in Atwater Village.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Sandra Caravella.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for votes on Tuesday, March 17, 2015, due to my attendance at the funeral of my close friend, John Rainey. By any account he lived an extraordinary life based on the lives he touched, the difference he made and the degree to which he was a great friend to all those blessed to call him just that. I was one of those so fortunate, and accordingly I will miss him dearly. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner:

Roll call no. 116: Previous Question on H. Res. 138—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1029—EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 and consideration of H.R. 1030—Secret Science Reform Act of 2015: Yea

Roll call no. 117: Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1029—EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 and consideration of H.R. 1030—Secret Science Reform Act of 2015: Yea

Roll call no. 118: H.R. 1191—Protecting Volunteer Firefighters and Emergency Responders Act: Yea

Roll call no. 119: McKinley Amendment: Yea

Roll call no. 120: Motion to recommit H.R. 1029 with instructions: Nay

Roll call no. 121: H.R. 1029—EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015: Yea

#### TRIBUTE TO JENNA EKSTROM

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Jenna Ekstrom for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Jenna has the determination and drive to be successful in anything she does, and her exemplary work with the Des Moines Art Center is a testament to that. As the Manager of Membership with Des Moines Art Center, Jenna is passionate about going the extra mile. Jenna is active and passionate about volunteering her time to support worthy causes such as the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute, Junior League of Des Moines

and Housing Tomorrow. In all aspects of her life Jenna's example of hard work and service makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Jenna in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Jenna on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. MARIE PULLIN

### HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one woman, Dr. Marie Pullin, who gave of herself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, her legacy of dedicated service to enrich the children and others in her community through her volunteerism, creative ability and unwavering advocacy for the youth, the elderly, the poor and the arts are present in DeKalb County, Georgia for all to see; and

Whereas, this remarkable, positive woman with a beautiful smile gave of herself, her heart and her talent; never asking for fame or fortune but only to uplift, expose and inspire those in need; and

Whereas, she led by example from behind the scenes, as well as front and center for the state of Georgia, DeKalb County and the City of Atlanta, multiple ministries, homeowner associations, the Atlanta Edgewood-Kirkwood Neighborhood Center; and in her beloved church, Israel Baptist Church; and

Whereas, this virtuous Proverbs 31 woman was a mother, a wife, a daughter, a friend, a warrior, a matriarch, and a woman of great integrity; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Dr. Marie Pullin for her leadership, friendship and 50 years of service to all of the citizens in Georgia and throughout the Nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Dr. Marie Pullin of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor" Dr. Marie Pullin, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 14th day of March, 2015.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF RUTH HYMAN

### HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Ruth Hyman as she is honored

by the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group at their Ruth Hyman Spiritual Support in the Jewish Tradition Hospice Program Tree of Life Donor Wall Dedication.

A lifelong resident of Long Branch, New Jersey, Ruth Hyman continues her philanthropic endeavors to improve the well-being of New Jersey's residents. As the recipient of a generous donation by Ms. Hyman, the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group has named its hospice program's special services for Judaic pastoral care in her honor. The Ruth Hyman Spiritual Support in the Jewish Tradition program will continue to provide important spiritual and pastoral care and comfort to individuals and their families. The Visiting Nurse Association Health Group's mission to make the community a better place reflects Ms. Hyman's passion for helping others.

The largest non-profit visiting nurse association in New Jersey, the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group provides an invaluable service to our communities through compassionate home health care and support services. Its skilled health aides continue to meet the needs of over 120,000 individuals in the comfort and security of their homes each year.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in thanking Ruth Hyman and the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group for their immeasurable contributions to our community.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF MONSIGNOR JOHN BENDIK, RECIPIENT OF THE ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM THE GREATER PITSTON FRIENDLY SONS OF SAINT PATRICK

### HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Monsignor John Bendik, who will receive the Achievement Award from the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

Monsignor Bendik was ordained on May 27, 1967, by Bishop J. Carroll McCormick, after studying at St. Meinrad Seminary and School of Theology in Indiana. His first assignment was to St. Matthew's Parish in East Stroudsburg. He taught at Notre Dame High School and served as Director of Campus Ministry at East Stroudsburg University. In 1970, he was assigned full-time to serve the University students where he developed an ecumenical and inter-faith United Campus Ministry.

In 1981, Monsignor Bendik was assigned as Chaplain at Misericordia University in Dallas where he organized student, faculty, and staff programs to outreach to the needy. His first assignment as a pastor was in 1986 at the parish of Our Lady of the Snows in Clarks Summit. Today, Monsignor Bendik is the pastor of St. John the Evangelist in Pittston.

In addition to serving as the current pastor for St. John's, Monsignor Bendik is also on a variety of boards within the community. He is the Dean for the priests and deacons of Northern Luzerne County. Monsignor Bendik and his parishioners also operate Care and Con-

cern Ministries. Care and Concern provides the Greater Pittston Area with a free health clinic and a food pantry.

It is an honor to recognize Monsignor Bendik for his many accomplishments. I commend him for his service to our local communities throughout his career. I offer my deepest congratulation on receiving the Achievement Award from the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

#### A TRIBUTE TO MINDY BOCKEWITZ

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Mindy Bockewitz for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

As a member of the Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co., Mindy created a program underwriting team that has grown to more than \$17 million in premiums. She sits as co-chair for the Education Leadership Initiative and has initiated a volunteer project at Nationwide for the company to donate catering and cafeteria leftovers to food pantries. In all aspects of her life Mindy is an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Mindy in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Mindy for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Mindy on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### TRIBUTE TO MR. SAMUEL BARBER

### HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one man, Samuel Barber, Jr., who has given so much to our state and nation; and

Whereas, Samuel Barber has been instrumental as a pioneer in the information technology industry with his talents, his high standards and innovating mind; and

Whereas, this giant of a man accomplished so much during his lifetime; he served our country honorably in the U.S. Navy for eleven years and was honored with the National Defense Service Medal; he was a successful entrepreneur with multiple businesses and he was recognized as Honorary Consul General for the Embassy of Ghana; and

Whereas, he was a strong community advocate, a motivator, a mentor, and a friend to all; he was dedicated to God, his church, his family and his community; and

Whereas, Samuel Barber was a husband, a father and a grandfather; he was our warrior, our patriarch, a man of great integrity who remained true to his childhood nurturing by his maternal grandparents in Alabama; and

Whereas, Samuel Barber was an ambassador of goodwill who will be truly missed; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Samuel Barber as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that he is deemed worthy and deserving of this Congressional Honor by declaring Mr. Samuel Barber, Jr. U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 6th day of March, 2015.

A TRIBUTE TO LYNDA RESCIA—  
28TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT  
WOMAN OF THE YEAR

**HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Women's History Month. Each year, we pay special tribute to the contributions and sacrifices made by our nation's women. It is an honor to pay homage to outstanding women who are making a difference in my congressional district. I would like to recognize a remarkable woman, Lynda Rescia of Silver Lake, a unique neighborhood in Los Angeles, California.

Lynda Rescia was born in Ludlow, Massachusetts, and attended Ludlow High School. She went on to study Communications with a specialization in Film at Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan. When Lynda moved to Los Angeles, California, she worked for a few years in the film industry in editing, and then for a commercial house working on television commercials.

In 1984, Lynda married Michael Miller, who is a freelance photographer, and had a son, Byron, in 1986. Ms. Rescia continued to work freelance on commercials until the birth of her daughter, Haviland, in 1988. Soon after, Lynda went back to school part time to complete a degree in Child Development, and graduated magna cum laude with a Bachelor of Arts and received her teaching credential in 1994.

Ms. Rescia has been passionate about education for many years. She worked in the

Pasadena Unified School District and did substitute work for the Los Angeles Unified School District, before she was hired by Ivanhoe Elementary School as a kindergarten teacher in 1995. Since then, she has remained at Ivanhoe Elementary School spending most of her years as a primary teacher, then as a coach/coordinator, and currently as Principal. Under her leadership, the school, which is well-known for its high level of parent involvement, was honored as a "California Distinguished School" in 2014, and has maintained its glorious reputation for academic excellence. In addition to dedicating herself to Ivanhoe Elementary School, Lynda has volunteered with The Great Los Angeles River CleanUp.

I ask all Members to join me in honoring an exceptional woman of California's 28th Congressional District, Lynda Rescia.

TRIBUTE TO NuVISION FEDERAL  
CREDIT UNION

**HON. MIMI WALTERS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize NuVision Federal Credit Union, a financial institution based in Orange County, California, for 80 years of outstanding service to their members and for their organization's philanthropic support of the communities in which they operate. I would also like to recognize Roger Ballard, who has provided exemplary leadership as Chief Executive Officer of NuVision Federal Credit Union since 2004.

NuVision Federal Credit Union is one of Southern California's leading credit unions with over \$1.3 billion in assets and 87,000 members. Headquartered in Huntington Beach, California, NuVision Federal Credit Union was founded in 1935 to serve employees of Douglas Aircraft Company. Additions to the NuVision family have resulted in a diverse group of sponsor companies in their field of membership in industries including aerospace, utilities, municipal, retail, automotive, housing, engineering, and healthcare. NuVision continues to serve aerospace employees from Boeing, employees of Sempra Energy/The Gas Company, and employees of Tesoro.

NuVision Federal Credit Union has been very active in giving back to the communities they serve. In fact, NuVision Federal Credit Union employees and members have donated over \$75,000 since 2010 to support the Children's Hospitals of Orange County and Los Angeles, and the Leukemia & Lymphoma Society. The credit union also participates in numerous philanthropic activities every year such as adopting military families for the holidays, sponsoring toy drives in their branches for Toys for Tots, providing backpacks and school supplies for underprivileged children, and raising money for the victims of natural disasters.

As a not-for-profit financial cooperative, NuVision remains proudly owned by the members it serves. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the members and employees of NuVision Federal Credit Union for their strong history of success

in the community, and I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO JARAD BERNSTEIN

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Jarad Bernstein for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Jarad is the Director of Public Relations and Media Management at Drake University. Jarad previously worked in San Francisco in various public relations positions, however he found the community was not as enriching as he would have liked. He visited Des Moines, Iowa, and was welcomed by the Midwestern charm and the community involvement that he had been missing in San Francisco. Not to mention his future wife, Lilliana, was in the area as well. Since arriving, Jarad's community service has flourished. He now serves as the chairman for the Jewish Community Relations Commission, and has served as treasurer of the Central Iowa chapter of the Public Relations Society of America.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Jarad in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Jarad for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Jarad on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

RECOGNIZING FATHER HAROLD  
RAHM

**HON. BETO O'ROURKE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to recognize Jesuit Father Harold Rahm, whom holds a commendable record of service to the El Paso community.

Father Rahm arrived in El Paso, Texas in July 1952 and served at Sacred Heart Parish until 1964. He was often seen traveling around the streets of South El Paso on his bicycle



and was named, "the Bicycle Padre." Father Rahm used this modest technique to reach out to the youth of the Segundo Barrio in efforts to deter them from joining youth gangs.

During his fourteen years in El Paso, Father Rahm established organizations such as Our Lady's Youth Center, the Guadalupe Employment Office, the Guadalupe Way of Life Homes for young people and adults, and Camp Juan Diego for children who could not afford to go to summer camp. Father Rahm played an instrumental role in pacifying youth gang warfare in the 1950's by encouraging teens to spend their time in the youth center and resolving their violence through safe interaction and exercise.

Father Rahm also established the Guadalupe Employment Office in 1953, the Guadalupe Thrift Store in 1954, the Tepeyac Credit Union, and advocated for decent housing for South El Paso residents.

In trying to reach people that were unable to attend mass, Father Rahm would often celebrate mass in people's backyards and take breakfast to the elderly on his bicycle. Because of his devout actions, 5th Avenue was renamed Father Rahm Avenue in his honor. Father Rahm's legacy lives on through inspired El Pasoans that have carried on his work.

I thank Father Rahm for being an honorable man of God to our community and to the world through his notable service. Father Rahm represents the ambition, dedication, perseverance and resilience that is so indicative of the many great El Pasoans I have the distinct privilege to represent.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR.  
NICHOLAS J. IVANS

**HON. DAVID G. VALADAO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I along with Mr. COSTA rise today to honor the life and accomplishments of Nicholas J. Ivans, who passed away on February 15, 2015.

Mr. Ivans was born in Hanford, California on February 17, 1924 to Peter Ivancovich and Danitza Ninkovich, immigrants from Boznia-Herzegovina. He attended Hanford High and Visalia Junior College before he was drafted into the United States Armed Services during World War II. Mr. Ivans was a member of the H Company, 101st Regiment of the 26th Yankee Division and saw combat duty in France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia.

After the war, Mr. Ivans returned to the United States and attended California State University, Fresno for his undergraduate degree and the University of Southern California's (USC) Pharmacy School for his graduate degree. While at USC, Mr. Ivans met Edna Logan. The two married in 1949 and would have three of their own children and five foster children.

Mr. and Mrs. Ivans returned to the Central Valley after they received their Doctor of Pharmacy degrees. Not long after their return, Mr. Ivans purchased Tomer Drug Store in Avenal,

California, launching his career as Avenal's community pharmacist.

Throughout his life, Mr. Ivans was a dedicated member of his community. He was involved in the Avenal Rotary Club and the Avenal Chamber of Commerce, where he served multiple terms as President. He was responsible for several improvements and additions to Avenal, including house to house mail delivery in unincorporated communities, a lighting district in an area with no street lights, and a state prison.

Mr. Ivans passed away just two days short of his 91st birthday on February 15, 2015. He touched the lives of many and will be dearly missed by his family, friends, and community.

Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join us in commemorating the life of Nicholas J. Ivans.

TRIBUTE TO MS. XERNONA  
CLAYTON

**HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, many years ago a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve the citizens across our nation and the international community; and

Whereas, Ms. Xernona Clayton began her career in service working diligently to assist in the Civil Rights Movement alongside Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., she has served as the first Southern African American to host a daily prime time talk show, "The Xernona Clayton Show"; she served as the Corporate Vice President for Urban Affairs at Turner Broadcasting; she is the President and CEO of the Trumpet Awards Foundation wherein she is the Creator and Executive Producer of the Trumpet Awards honoring individuals that give of themselves to make the world better; Ms. Clayton continues to assist individuals and families across the world through education and service; and

Whereas, this phenomenal Proverbs 31 woman has shared her time and talents, giving the citizens of our district a friend to help those in need, a fearless leader and a servant to all wanting to ensure that the system works for everyone; and

Whereas, Ms. Xernona Clayton is a cornerstone in our community that has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our district and nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Xernona Clayton for her outstanding leadership and service to our district and to congratulate her for an exemplary life of leadership and service to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim March 14, 2015 as Ms. Xernona Clayton Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 14th day of March, 2015.

NO SUCH THING AS AN HONOR  
KILLING

**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, right now, this very moment, a woman in Pakistan is hiding from her husband in a squat brick house.

She is covered from head to toe, only showing her eyes.

She lives in constant fear, every second of the day.

Why is she hiding?

Because her husband is trying to kill her.

An honor killing, it is deemed.

And sadly she is not alone.

Honor killings in Pakistan are a common practice.

When it is believed a woman has brought dishonor to her family or gone against their will, she is murdered.

But there is nothing honorable in hacking, beating or stoning a woman—a wife, a mother, a sister—to death.

The existing laws do not protect women from this unthinkable crime, because the idea is supported by the local community.

No woman should have to live in constant fear of the man she married, because Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as an honor killing.

And that's just the way it is.

A TRIBUTE TO KATHERINE  
BARTON

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Katherine Barton for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

I would like to start by extending my gratitude to Katherine for her tour in Iraq and her service in the Iowa National Guard. Her leadership and selflessness to her country have continued in Iowa, with a focus on veterans. With her support, Iowa Workforce Development, the Iowa Economic Development Authority, the Iowa National Guard and other state organizations worked out the framework of the Home Base Iowa program, which helps veterans find jobs in Iowa.

Katherine also impacts state policy as the Iowa National Guard's government relations

officer, which occasionally brings her to the halls of Congress. Katherine's commitment to service, community and country is a prime example of service and Iowa work ethic that makes our state deeply proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Katherine in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Katherine for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Katherine on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### RECOGNIZING KENSINGTON VIDEO

##### HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 2015, a San Diego institution closed its doors. After more than 30 years in business the curtain came down on Kensington Video.

Kensington Video premiered in 1984 with Winnie and Rich Hanford and their children, Guy and Pam, rolling out the red carpet for its customers.

Since then, their video library has grown to an astounding 70,000 titles—perhaps one of the largest in the country.

Among the stacks of VHS, Beta, and DVDs, you could find not only the latest blockbusters but also that rare, special-interest film or foreign-language movie.

Amazingly, they never computerized. They just knew where every film title was, like seasoned shopkeepers familiar with their stock.

If the movie you wanted was not in their library, they would track it down for you.

It was that commitment to film and their customers that had people coming from miles away to Kensington Video.

Like a classic black and white movie, Kensington Video had the feel of a classic American small business. Customers came for the people behind the counter as much as they came for the films on the shelf.

They came to rent a movie and also get the latest news and gossip of what was happening in the neighborhood.

I was a proud member of Kensington Video and just as proud of my low membership number—74.

In 1948, mystery writer Raymond Chandler, who was also a Hollywood screenwriter, wrote: "Not only is the motion picture an art, but it is the one entirely new art that has been evolved on this planet for hundreds of years."

Kensington Video was the curator of that art for San Diego.

I hope the House of Representatives will join me in recognizing and thanking Kensington Video for years of service to the neighborhood of Kensington and city of San Diego.

#### TRIBUTE TO MR. HUGH R. WILLIAMS

##### HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one man . . . who has given of himself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, U.S. Air Force retired TSG. Hugh R. Williams III served our nation with honor and valor during his tours in Vietnam, Korea, Guam and Germany; and

Whereas, Mr. Williams never asked for fame or fortune, nor found a job too small or too big; but gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life to uplift those in need by demonstrating unwavering commitment to protecting and serving the citizens of the United States of America; and

Whereas, he was a husband, a father, a son and a friend; he was also our warrior, a man of great integrity who remained true to the uplifting and service to our nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Mr. Hugh R. Williams as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Mr. Hugh R. Williams is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor" by declaring Mr. Hugh R. Williams III, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 2nd day of February, 2015.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF KATHLEEN CRAMPSIE FOR RECEIVING THE 2015 PVIAA SHAMROCK AWARD

##### HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kathleen Crampsie. On March 17, 2015, Kathy will receive the Shamrock Award during the Panther Valley Irish American Association's 67th Annual Banquet. Kathy is a well-known musician throughout the Panther Valley. She uses her musical talent to bring joy to the people whether it is at church services, nursing homes, or public events. She also is a mentor of young men and women aspiring to musical careers.

Kathy began her music career, in 1977 when she volunteered her time to play guitar at her parish church, St. Joseph Catholic in Summit Hill. After joining, Kathy started the church's guitar group, which became known as "Kathy's Angels." Mrs. Crampsie became an active and leading participant in the St. Joseph Catholic Church choir and its music program. She also started a children's choir that has performed at area nursing homes around the holidays. The children's choir even had the opportunity to sing the national anthem at a Philadelphia Phillies game.

Kathy's service to the community does not stop at music. She volunteers as a CCD for

the Catholic community of the Panther Valley. As the secretary of the Summit Hill Lions Club, Kathy coordinates the organization's eye glass program. In the past, she has coached cheerleading at Panther Valley High School, Our Lady of the Valley School, and for the Summit Hill Knee Hi Association. Kathy also coached girls softball for Summit Hill and volleyball for Our Lady of the Valley.

Kathy has been married to Bob Crampsie for four decades, and the couple has raised four children and been blessed with eight grandchildren.

I congratulate Mrs. Crampsie on receiving the Panther Valley Irish American Association's Shamrock Award, and I commend her for all the selfless work she has done for her community.

#### IN HONOR OF THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SELMA TO MONTGOMERY MARCH ON THE STEPS OF THE ALABAMA STATE CAPITOL, MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

##### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following:

REMARKS BY PEGGY WALLACE KENNEDY

Montgomery, Alabama, a city that bears the scars of struggle and the nobility of change. A city that sits on the soil of shared sorrows for those that suffered and died for equality. A place of repose. Monuments of stone that connect us to each other. A place of hope and promise. A place to lay our grief down and shoulder the burden of moving beyond the sunset of despair to the place we call home.

All of us come to this moment and to this place on the road of our own life's personal journey. We are diverse, both in our experiences and our aspirations and our dreams. But we are united in the common belief that a vision for a Just America is worth the saving.

Stepping away from a painful past has not always been easy, but it has always been right. None of us can be held responsible for the circumstances of our birth, but each one of us will be held responsible for who we have become.

When my son Burns was young, my husband and I took him to the Martin Luther King Historic Site in Atlanta. As we moved through the exhibits we came across the photographs of fire hoses in Birmingham, the 16th Street Baptist Church, Governor Wallace standing in the Schoolhouse Door and the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

Burns stood still as the truth of his family's past washed over him. He turned to me and asked, 'Why did Paw Paw' do those things to other people? I realized that at that moment I was at a crossroad in my life and the life of my son. The mantle had passed, and it was now up to me to do for Burns what my father never did for me. It was the first step in my journey of building a legacy of my own. I knelt down beside my son, drew him close and said, 'Paw Paw never told me why he did those things, but I know that he was wrong. So maybe it will just have to be up to me and you to help make things right.'

Standing here before you today is yet another day for the fulfillment of the promise that I made to my son. For today and for all the tomorrows to come there are opportunities for all of us to raise the call for justice in our lifetime.

Montgomery, Alabama, Dexter Avenue and the State Capitol are enshrined in the annals of American history. A historic place for historic times. But for me, it is much more personal, for it brings to mind the events that shaped my life.

It was here that I attended four inaugurations of my father and one of my mother.

It was here that I heard my father say the words "segregation now, segregation tomorrow and segregation forever."

It was here that my father fought to support a culture of exclusion, riding on the wings of fear rather than seeking justice on the wings of eagles.

It was here that my mother Governor Lurleen Wallace lay in state following her death at the age of 41 while thousands of Alabamians both white and African American stood in line for hours to pay their last respects.

It was here that my father met Vivian Malone for the second time and told her that she was an icon of the civil right movement.

It was at the Dexter Avenue King Memorial Church that my father went to ask for forgiveness for his racist past. A moment that could not rewrite his personal history but an opportunity brought about by my father's own suffering that allowed him to see the hurt of history in the eyes of African American men and women who had been denied the right to live the American Dream.

But on March the 25th of 1965, as Ralph Abernathy, Juanita Abernathy, Martin Luther King and thousands more gathered in the shadow of this Capitol, there was never an opportunity to address their concerns or state their grievances to the one person who could have changed the course of American History then and there. For Governor Wallace watched through a window in the privacy of his office, while others persevered and changed the history of America without him.

Today, we must not allow others to make the right choices for us. We must have courage each day to stand up for equality and the rights of all Americans. We must lead by example and live our lives with inspiration, always aspiring to make the choices that lead us to higher ground, that guides us to understanding and purpose of not just who we are but who we can become. An opportunity for each of you, an obligation for all of us, to see others, feel others and celebrate others, respecting their humanity for who they are.

Working each day to inspire the nobility that lies in the heart of each of us, Martin Luther King taught that there is power in all of us to reach out, to support and stand firm in the belief that all of our lives count for something. There is no better time than now for Americans to hold hands, rather than holding down, the inherent rights of the common man.

One can never measure the true worth of a mended heart that beats again because someone cared. How many more anniversaries of the struggle for civil rights can we celebrate by looking over our shoulder rather than standing shoulder to shoulder to face the challenges that lay ahead? How can Americans reach for higher ground if we do not inspire others with what we do? We cannot expect the next generation of Americans to do something to change the world, if we aspire to do nothing to protect liberty and recognize our individual obligations to service.

How can we teach future generations about positive social change if we see injustice and turn our backs? For injustice knows no death. It rises like a dark mist on the horizon, laying low in the hearts of those that are unwilling to accept the notion of unconditional love.

We must promise that when we say all men are created equal, it means something, protects something and encourages us to embrace the belief that the diversity among us has nothing to do with equality, but has everything to do with strength. Tolerance must be more than what we believe, it must be what we live and leading by example is what we must do. Tolerance does not always mean agreement, but tolerance always requires understanding and compassion for others.

Very few of us will have monuments built to honor us after we are gone, but ALL OF US can do monumental things each day to help America be better. Those moments in Selma yesterday will stand as a testament to all of our lives. For there is power in moving forward, there is joy in an unburdened heart and there is strength in stepping away from beneath the shadows of your lives.

I sometimes wonder what my mother and father would think of their daughter that stands here today, and my mind's eye returns to a wood framed house on Eufaula Street in Clayton, Alabama, when life was uncomplicated and happiness was something you lived not something you just hoped for. And my father would smile at me and say "little girl, you're doing just fine, I sure am proud of you."

But for today, I am most thankful for the life and inspiration of Congressman John Lewis.

Congressman Lewis, in March of 2009 you held my hand and walked with me across the Edmund Pettus Bridge; the very bridge where, as a young man, you were beaten by Alabama State Troopers. That walk with you helped me understand the power of forgiveness and gave me the courage to speak with my own voice. Since that time I have looked for an opportunity to return, in some small measure, the gift of love and understanding you gave to me.

Fifty years ago, you stood here in front of your State Capitol and sought an opportunity as a citizen of Alabama to be recognized and heard by your Governor and he refused. But today, as his daughter and as a person of my own, I want to do for you what my father should have done and recognize you for your humanity and for your dignity as a child of God, as a person of goodwill and character and as a fellow Alabamian and say "Welcome Home."

#### TRIBUTE TO MS. DORIS WELLS

**HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Ms. Doris Wells' service to DeKalb County can be seen in the programs instituted in the Public Library System in our district; and

Whereas, her dedicated service touched the lives of many in our district from the moment she was hired as the first African American employee for the DeKalb County Library Sys-

tem in 1974, she has innovated the service of the Wesley Chapel-William C. Brown Library by introducing programs such as the Kwanzaa Awareness Festival and the Jubilee of Reading Adult Book Club Conference; and

Whereas, this remarkable, positive woman gave of herself, her time and her talent; educating and assisting those in need; and

Whereas, she led by example as the manager of the Scott Candler Library and the Wesley Chapel-William C. Brown Library; she was dedicated to her family, community, her church Clifton United Methodist Church and her beloved Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.; and

Whereas, this virtuous Proverbs 31 woman was a mother, a daughter, a friend, a warrior, a matriarch, and a woman of great integrity; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Ms. Doris Wells for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens in Georgia and throughout the Nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Ms. Doris Wells of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor": Ms. Doris Wells, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 4th day of March, 2015.

#### A TRIBUTE TO NICK ACKERMAN

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Nick Ackerman for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Nick has the determination and drive to be successful in all that he does. At the American Prosthetics & Orthotics Inc., Nick works as a technician, where he is passionate in providing prosthetic limbs for those in need. Nick's commitment to his work is evident in his philanthropic activities. As a member of the Amputee Golf Association he assists annually in a golf event to raise money for charity. Nick also organizes a Wounded Warrior softball game for veterans of our military. In all aspects of his life, Nick gives his full effort, it is that effort and dedication that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Nick in the United States

Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Nick on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 2015, I was unable to vote on roll call votes 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, and 105. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on Ordering the Previous Question for H. Res. 129, "yea" on H. Res. 129, "yea" on the Motion to Request a Conference on H.R. 240, "nay" on Approving the Journal, "yea" on H.J. Res. 35, and "nay" on a Motion to Instruct Conferees on H.R. 240.

Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 2015, I was unable to vote on roll call votes 113, 114, and 115. Had I been present I would have voted "yea" on H.R. 647, "yea" on H.R. 648, and "yea" on H.R. 876.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF MS. NANCY McDARMENT

### HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Nancy McDarment on her retirement after 40 years of working for the Tule River Tribe and its members.

Ms. McDarment was born on March 2, 1947 to Joe Vera and Bonnie Kambick. She has been married to her husband, Willie McDarment, for over thirty years and is blessed with four children, eight grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren.

Around 1968, Ms. McDarment began her service to the Tule River Tribe in a position with the Tule River Indian Health Center. In September 1974, she went on to work for the Tule River Tribal Council, where she would spend the rest of her career in a variety of different positions. She began as a secretary for the Tule River Tribe, before going on to serve as the Contract and Grant Manager for many years with intermittent terms as both the Secretary of the Tule River Tribal Council and the Acting Tribal Administrator.

After a final two year term as Secretary of the Council and forty years of service to the Tule River Tribe, Ms. McDarment is retiring.

The Tule River Tribe has been extremely fortunate to have had someone as talented and dedicated as Ms. McDarment working on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Nancy McDarment for

her 40 years of dedicated service to the Tule River Tribe and congratulating her on her retirement.

#### LOUISIANA NATIONAL GUARDSMEN REMEMBERED

### HON. GARRET GRAVES

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the lives and service of eleven Guardsmen and Marines who were lost to us on March 10, 2015, when their UH-60M Black Hawk helicopter crashed off the coast of Florida during a training exercise.

The lives of these brave service personnel, who perished while serving our country, are remembered by my colleagues Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina and the North Carolina delegation, the state which is home to those Marines who trained at Camp Lejeune, and Congressman JEFF MILLER of Florida and the Florida delegation, the location of the sad incident.

I am joined by the Louisiana delegation on the House floor today to share with our colleagues the memory of our Louisiana Guardsmen, to stand silently in a moment of prayer, and to state for the record the poignant words of Louisiana Adjutant General, Major General Glenn Curtis, who eloquently memorialized the honorable service of our Louisiana Guardsmen in his March 16, 2015, statement, which is submitted for the RECORD herein:

Four Louisiana National Guardsmen from the 1st Assault Helicopter Battalion, 244th Aviation Regiment who died in a training accident, March 10, have been identified.

Chief Warrant Officer 4 George Wayne Griffin Jr., 37; Chief Warrant Officer 4 George David Strother, 44; Staff Sgt. Lance Bergeron, 40; and Staff Sgt. Thomas Florich, 26; died when a UH-60M Black Hawk they were riding on crashed into the Santa Rosa Sound, Florida.

"These Guardsmen represent the best of us," said Maj. Gen. Glenn H. Curtis, the adjutant general of the Louisiana National Guard. "These are brave men, true men. These Heroes' names will forever be etched on our hearts and in our minds."

Griffin, of Delhi, joined the Louisiana National Guard in 1994. He deployed to Iraq in 2004-2005 and again in 2008-2009. He also served during state deployments during Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Isaac as well as in support of Operations River Guardian and Deepwater Horizon.

Griffin commissioned as a warrant officer in 1999 before going on to become the battalion standardization pilot with over 6,000 flight hours, including more than 1,000 combat hours.

"G Wayne Griffin was born to be an Army Aviator," said Chief Warrant Officer 5 Reggie Lane, commander of Detachment 38, Operational Support Airlift Command. "As one of the most talented and respected Warrant Officers in the Louisiana National Guard, he had a tremendous passion for flying, and a God-given natural ability to fly both helicopters and airplanes and to teach others to be the best aviators and crewmembers that they could be."

"He was a great friend and brother to all. With his loss, there will be a void that may never be filled."

Griffin is survived by his wife, four children and father.

Strother, of Alexandria, served in the Louisiana National Guard from 1988-2007, and again from 2009 until his death. He deployed to Iraq in 2004-2005, Afghanistan in 2011 and Kosovo in 2014. He also served during state deployments for Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Isaac.

Strother commissioned as a warrant officer in 1994 before going on to become an instructor pilot with over 2,400 flight hours, including more than 700 combat hours.

"To describe Dave Strother as a big personality would not be accurate. He was more like a force of nature that could best be observed and marveled at, never opposed or altered," said Maj. Andre Jeansonne, commander, F Co., 2nd Battalion, 135th Aviation Regiment. "His huge heart touched the lives of all he met."

Strother is survived by his wife, son and step-daughter, and mother.

Bergeron, of Thibodaux, enlisted into the U.S. Marine Corps in 1998 before joining the LANG in 2001 as a Black Hawk repairer. His extensive experience as a qualified enlisted flight instructor, graduate of the aircraft crewmember standardization instructor course, aircraft maintainer course, and warrior leader course made Bergeron a crew chief others aspired to be, according to members of his unit.

The combat veteran deployed to Iraq twice, in 2004-2005 and 2008-2009. Bergeron also served during state deployments for Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, Isaac and Operation River Guardian.

According to Sgt. 1st Class Brian Marquez, platoon sergeant, A Co., 1-244th AHB, Bergeron was one of the most qualified crew chiefs in the Guard, with more than 1,300 flight hours, including 377 combat hours.

"Lance was one of the most dedicated crew chiefs that I have ever had the pleasure of serving with during my leadership," Marquez said. "As the senior most standardization crew chief instructor in the Battalion, he was a subject matter expert in his job who exhibited an excitement of learning new skills and educating new unit members on the UH-60 aircraft, pilots and crew chiefs alike."

"Lance was a very family oriented father and husband, and he impacted many in the ranks. He will be greatly missed."

Bergeron is survived by his wife, two children and his parents.

Staff Sgt. Thomas Florich, of Fairfax County, Virginia, enlisted in the LANG in 2007 as a Black Hawk repairer. He was posthumously promoted from sergeant to staff sergeant.

Florich served during state deployments for Operation Deepwater Horizon and Hurricane Isaac. He earned more than 125 flight hours and was a graduate of the warrior leader course.

"Tom was full of life, and his personality could light the room," said Marquez. "He was 'family' with unit members and felt at home working with his brothers in Alpha Company. His dedication to duty and loyalty was without equal, always ready to accept any mission and extra duty in order to help the unit meet the mission. He will be greatly missed by the unit and the flight facility."

Florich is survived by his wife, father and stepmother.

"These are not ordinary men. They were extraordinary people, as well as amazing aviators and crew chiefs," said Lt. Col. John L. Bonnette II, commander of the 1-244th. When I say they were heroes, I mean it many times

over. They risked their lives under difficult conditions flying in combat, and during national emergencies, to ensure our security and help save thousands of people. I don't have the words to sum up their lives in a few sentences. You just can't.

"Our whole aviation family is reeling from this loss, the hole that is left is enormous. They were part of the fabric of this unit, the difference they made with everyone they served with will be a lasting legacy. Personally flying with all of them was a privilege and honor—I am a better person for having known them."

These aviators had a camaraderie that was second to none in the military.

"This crew was made up of larger-than-life men who had a passion for Army Aviation that was so evident in the dedication that they had towards their profession," said Col. Patrick R. Bossetta, commander of the State Aviation Command. I know this as I have personally flown with each one of them. They were driven by their intense desire to selflessly serve their country, fellow Soldiers and Marines.

"Whether flying in combat or during national emergencies, this crew arose everyday with a fever to serve and keep safe the citizens of this great Nation. While their families and our aviation community are heartbroken and immensely suffering over their tragic loss, these heroic men would want us to catch their fever to honorably serve the citizens of this Nation and continue to grow."

"These brave men died doing something they loved. May we all be so lucky, and may they always fly high," said Curtis.

The Louisiana Army National Guard was participating in a routine night-time training exercise with the Marine 2nd Special Operations Battalion. The Black Hawk carrying the four aircrew and seven Marines crashed into the Santa Rosa Sound in Navarre, Florida, March 10.

Griffin's awards and decorations include the Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal (2nd Award), Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal (6th Award), National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Service Star, Iraq Campaign Medal with two Campaign Stars, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Armed Forces Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal (2nd Award), Armed Forces Reserve Medal with Silver Hour Glass and M Device, Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon (2nd Award), Army Reserve Component Overseas Training Ribbon (4th Award), Louisiana War Cross (2nd Award), Louisiana Emergency Service Medal (3rd Award), Louisiana General Excellence Ribbon and Louisiana Longevity Ribbon. He had earned the Combat Action Badge, Senior Army Aviator Badge and Basic Aviation Badge.

Strother's awards and decorations include the Air Medal (3rd Award), Army Commendation Medal (3rd Award), Army Reserve Component Achievement Medal (7th Award), National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Service Star, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal with Campaign Star, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Armed Forces Reserve Medal with Silver Hourglass and M Device, Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon (3rd Award), NATO Medal, Louisiana War Cross (3rd Award), Louisiana Cold War Victory Ribbon, Lou-

isiana Emergency Service Medal (3rd Award), Louisiana General Excellence Ribbon and Louisiana Longevity Ribbon (4th Award). He had earned the Combat Action Badge and Master Aviator Badge.

Bergeron's awards include the Meritorious Service Medal, Air Medal, Army Commendation Medal (3rd Award), Army Good Conduct Medal, Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal (3rd Award), National Defense Service Medal with Bronze Service Star, Iraq Campaign Medal with 2 Campaign Stars, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Armed Forces Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal (2nd Award), Armed Forces Reserve Medal with Bronze Hour Glass and M Device, Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon (2nd Award), Army Reserve Components Overseas Training Ribbon, Sea Service Deployment Ribbon (Navy), Louisiana War Cross (2nd Award), Louisiana Emergency Service Medal (3rd Award), Louisiana General Excellence Ribbon (3rd Award) and Louisiana Longevity Ribbon (2nd Award). He had also earned the Combat Action Badge and Senior Aviation Badge.

Florich's awards include the Army Achievement Medal, Army Reserve Components Achievement Medal (2nd Award), National Defense Service Medal, Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon, Army Service Ribbon, Army Reserve Components Overseas Training Ribbon, Coast Guard Special Operations Service Ribbon, Louisiana Emergency Service Ribbon (2nd Award), Louisiana General Excellence Ribbon and Louisiana Longevity Ribbon. He had also earned the Basic Aviation Badge.

#### TRIBUTE TO WHITE'S CHAPEL UNITED METHODIST

#### HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, White's Chapel United Methodist Church has been and continues to be a beacon of light to our district for the past one hundred forty-five years; and

Whereas, Pastor Lillian Owens and the members of the White's Chapel United Methodist Church family today continues to uplift and inspire those in our district; and

Whereas, the White's Chapel United Methodist Church family has been and continues to be a place where citizens are touched spiritually, mentally and physically through outreach ministries and community partnership to aid in building up our district; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious Church of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the needy and empowered our community for the past one hundred forty-five (145) years, being organized in 1870 after Captain White donated two acres of land to a small group of former slaves in order for them to continue to worship together as a congregation; and

Whereas, White's Chapel has produced many spiritual warriors, people of compassion, people of great courage, fearless leaders and servants to all, but most of all visionaries who

have shared not only with their Church, but with Rockdale County their passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the White's Chapel United Methodist Church family for their leadership and service to our District on this the 145th Anniversary of their founding; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim March 1, 2015 as White's Chapel United Methodist Church Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 1st day of March, 2015.

#### A TRIBUTE TO ANNETTE ADAMS

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Annette Adams for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Annette Adams currently works for Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co., and she has certainly left her mark. She has founded Women Aiming for Success in 2012, to create a passion for women to aspire to leadership roles. She has served as a Greater Des Moines Partnership Diversity Council member, as well as, serving as a mentor for Nationwide's Emerging Leaders Program. Annette is a leader and an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Annette in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Annette for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Annette on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCEAN CHAPTER OF DRIFTERS, INC.

#### HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the Ocean Chapter of Drifters, Inc.

as its members gather to commemorate its 40th anniversary at a luncheon on March 14, 2015. This milestone and its commitment to service is truly deserving of this body's recognition.

Sponsored by the Montclair Chapter, the Ocean Chapter of Drifters, Inc. was founded by Marilyn Joyce of Morganville, New Jersey, who was also one of the eight charter members. Forty years later, there are thirteen members of the Ocean Chapter, including four of the charter members, Ms. Joyce, Marjorie Clark, Mary Inge and Yvonne Russell.

Since its inception, the Ocean Chapter of Drifters, Inc. has provided opportunities for women to engage in charitable and civic involvement to enrich the lives of others. In this endeavor, its members work closely with various agencies, organizations and individuals such as Meridian Health, the Special Olympics, Monmouth University and I.C.C.C. Monmouth County Head Start. The Ocean Chapter of Drifters, Inc. also aims to improve the well-being of seniors and promote opportunities for youth, through special programs and scholarships for graduating high school seniors.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating the Ocean Chapter of Drifters, Inc. on its 40th anniversary and thanking its members for their dedication to volunteerism and community involvement.

**RECOGNIZING RICHARD FISHER ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF DALLAS**

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pleasure to recognize Mr. Richard Fisher of Dallas, Texas.

Mr. Fisher has served as president and CEO of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas since 2005. He will be retiring this month after ten years of tireless service. During his tenure, Mr. Fisher aimed to create sensible solutions to the economic problems of Dallas residents.

Molded from humble beginnings, Richard Fisher is no stranger to hard work. He is a first generation American, who persevered to earn an economics degree from Harvard University and an MBA from Stanford University.

Throughout his career, Mr. Fisher has built quite an impressive resume. He began his career on Wall Street working at investment bank, Brown Brothers Harriman & Co in 1975. He specialized in fixed income and foreign exchange markets. From there, he went on to become an assistant to the secretary of Treasury during the Carter Administration. He later returned to Brown Brothers to found their Texas operations, which was based in the city of Dallas.

He later returned to public service as a trailblazer for expanded trade agreements. From 1997 to 2011, Richard Fisher served as deputy trade representative where he oversaw the implementation of NAFTA and various trade agreements of Vietnam, Korea, Japan, Chile

and Singapore. He was a senior negotiator for the bilateral accords for China's and Taiwan's accession to the World Trade Organization.

More than forty years ago, Richard Fisher married the love of his life, Nancy Collins, the daughter of the late U.S. Congressman Jim Collins. They are the parents to three children. In the future, Mr. Fisher hopes to someday re-enter the financial world in the hopes of spreading financial literacy throughout South Dallas.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Fisher is truly a phenomenal leader. A man fueled by dedication and committed to public service, Mr. Fisher has set the bar high for his successor. He is the 2006 recipient of the Service to Democracy Award and the Dwight D. Eisenhower Medal for Public Service from the American Assembly. He was inducted into the Dallas Business Hall of Fame in 2009 and received the Woodrow Wilson Award for Public Service in 2014. I stand today to honor Mr. Richard Fisher and to thank him for his work in service to the people of Dallas and to everyone within and beyond our borders who benefit from his economic vision and exemplary public service.

**A TRIBUTE TO ASHLEY DANIELSON**

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Ashley Danielson for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honour based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Ashley has the determination and drive to be successful in anything she does, and her exemplary work with the Trilix Marketing Group is a testament to that. As a project manager with Trilix, Ashley is passionate about going the extra mile for her clients. Ashley is active and passionate about serving organizations that help children and animals, and was also a member of this year's Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute class. In all aspects of her life, Ashley is an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Ashley in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Ashley on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking

those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

**TRIBUTE TO REV. DR. GEORGE MOORE**

**HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one man, Rev. Dr. George W. Moore who has given so much of himself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, his work is present across our nation for all to see; the retired pastor of Saint Philip AME Church in DeKalb County, Georgia, who was instrumental in spreading the gospel and enriching the lives of many in the Atlanta area and beyond; and

Whereas, this giant of a man accomplished so much during his time on earth; he was a Master Pastor, a business owner, a community advocate and a friend to all; and

Whereas, he gave of himself, his time, his talent and his life to uplift those in need never expecting fame or fortune; his calling was to be a motivator and to inspire others throughout the community by spreading the gospel and leading by example; and

Whereas, Rev. Dr. George W. Moore led by doing both behind the scenes and on the front lines; he was an ambassador of goodwill who will be truly missed; and

Whereas, Rev. Dr. George W. Moore was a husband, a father, a grandfather, and a friend; he was our warrior, our patriarch, a man of great integrity who remained true to his divine mission until his end; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia recognizes Rev. Dr. George W. Moore as a citizen of great worth and so noted distinction; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that he is deemed worthy and deserving of this Congressional Honor by declaring Rev. Dr. George W. Moore, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 13th day of February, 2015.

**IN RECOGNITION OF THOMAS J. REILLY, SR., THE GREATER PITTSBURGH FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK MAN OF THE YEAR**

**HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Thomas J. Reilly, Sr., who will be named Man of the Year by the Greater Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

Mr. Reilly is chairman of Reilly Associates, an engineering firm that operates in Pennsylvania and New York. With more than 50 years



of experience, Reilly has built a reputation as a leader in civil engineering. Early in his career, he worked on stabilizing large dams for the Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company. When Hurricane Agnes hit in 1972, Reilly worked to restore infrastructure and rebuild roads throughout Pennsylvania's Wyoming Valley.

In the 1980s and 1990s, Mr. Reilly replaced highway bridges, designed the six mile-long Casey Highway, and constructed a new wastewater treatment plant serving the Wyoming Valley that processes 50 million gallons of wastewater a day. Mr. Reilly's work in recent years includes a flood control system in the Keyser Valley and Green Ridge sections of Scranton; infrastructure for the Center Point Commerce and Trade Park; improved water quality through the separation of storm and sanitary sewer lines in West Pittston and Pittston; and plans for the revitalization of Pittston's Main Street.

Mr. Reilly is a parishioner of St. John the Evangelist and serves on the Church's finance council. He has volunteered his expertise on many of his parish's construction projects. He is also a member of the Knights of Columbus. Reilly previously served as the president of the Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce and the Pittston Kiwanis Club, and as a trustee of his alma mater, Scranton Preparatory School.

It is a distinct privilege to honor Thomas Reilly on receiving the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons Man of the Year Award, and I commend him on his lifetime of public and community service.

**U.S. MUST DO EVERYTHING TO  
CONTAIN RADICAL ISLAM**

**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it was a cold winter morning in Paris just before lunchtime. Two masked men armed with AK-47s approached a woman standing outside the door of the Charlie Hebdo office, forcing her to let them inside. Once inside the doors, they gunned down the security guard in the lobby and ran up to the second floor shouting, "Where is Charb? Where is Charb?" Charb was the nickname for the newspaper's editor, Mr. Charbonnier. After reaching their target, they executed him and 10 others. They exited the building shouting, "Allah Akbar" or "God is the Greatest."

They killed a police officer outside, fled the scene and continued to yell: "We have revenged the Prophet Muhammad!" before getting in their car and speeding away. Over the next two days, the French government conducted a massive manhunt for the two masked gunmen. The brothers were on the run for two days until January 9th when police cornered them in a standoff near the Paris airport where they held one hostage. Later that day, police rescued the hostage and the terrorists were killed, going out just like they wanted in a massive firefight as "martyrs".

The two men responsible for the initial attack were Cherif and Said Kouachi, brothers

with a long history of terrorist connections. A decade ago, Cherif and Said were involved in a Paris jihadi outfit that worked to send French Muslim men to Iraq to fight Americans.

Cherif tried to go to Iraq but never made it because French law enforcement arrested him before he could leave the country.

In his trial, Cherif said he dreamed of attacking Jewish targets in France before deciding to try to fight in Iraq. Having already spent 3 years in pre-trial detention, Cherif was released. While in detention, Cherif befriended Djamel Beghal, a French-Algerian champion of jihad who was jailed in 2001 for planning an attack on the American Embassy in Paris. Cherif was also connected to a 2010 plot to break out an Algerian Islamist from prison who was in jail for being connected with a 1995 wave of bombings in the Paris Métro and on regional trains.

Perhaps the most dangerous friend the Kouachi brothers made along the way was the late Anwar al-Awlaki—the American born leader of al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula. It has now been confirmed that Kouachi met with al-Awlaki in 2011 and that al-Awlaki financed the attack that was apparently in the works years ago.

Hours before he met his maker, one of the Kouachi brothers called in to a French TV station to brag about his terrorist connections: "We are just telling you that we are the defenders of the prophet, peace and blessings be upon him, and that I, Cherif Kouachi, was sent by al-Qaida in Yemen. . . . And that I went there and that it's imam Al-Awlaki that financed me." Al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, or AQAP, has also claimed responsibility for the attack.

We have heard this story before. Young, vulnerable people across the globe are recruited to travel overseas where they are befriended and brainwashed by radical Islamic jihadists who preach hate and murder. Their terrorist mentors indoctrinate and infect them with the cancer of radical Islam and send them back to their home country to inflict terror and kill. The seeds of violent extremism are planted all over the world and the attacks come whether it is days (or in this case years) later.

Lately, we have seen this in America where terrorist groups like the Islamic State (ISIS) have targeted and recruited disillusioned young people primarily through the Internet and social media. This is one of the most overlooked weak spots in our national security today.

American passport holders who travel overseas to fight with the Islamic State are not going to come back to open coffee shops; they are coming back to kill. We cannot let them come back at all. That is why I have reintroduced the FTO Passport Revocation Act.

This legislation would authorize the revocation or denial of passports and passport cards to individuals affiliated with foreign terrorist organizations.

The Benedict Arnold traitors who have turned against America and joined the ranks of foreign radical terrorist armies should lose all rights afforded to our citizens.

This bill will help law enforcement locate these individuals by preventing them from traveling internationally so that they can be captured and brought to justice.

Most important, this legislation will prevent turned Americans from entering the United States under the radar and undetected. As we saw in France, sleeper cells that are well-financed by groups in the Middle East have a longstanding order to attack whenever the time is right. We need to act before, not after, they come back to the United States.

The French prime minister said it best: "We're fighting a war, not a war against a religion, not a war of civilizations, but to defend our values, which are universal. It's a war against terrorism and radical Islamism, against everything that aims to shatter solidarity, liberty, brotherhood."

The Paris attacks are a reminder that the cancer of radical Islam stretches far beyond the borders of the Middle East. The United States must do everything in its power to contain it outside our borders before the fight once again comes to us.

And that's just the way it is.

**A TRIBUTE TO BRAD DUFFY**

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Brad Duffy for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Brad has the determination and drive to be successful in anything he does, and his exemplary work with Per Mar Security Services is a testament to that. As President of Security Officer Services, Brad is passionate about hard work and dedication, and is active within volunteer organizations in the community. He specifically volunteers with the Greater Des Moines Committee and Youth Home of Mid-America. Along with his wife, Alison, they volunteer their time to InnerVisions Healthcare; a West Des Moines based non-profit organization. In all aspects of his life, Brad is an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Brad in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Brad for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Brad on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.



IN RECOGNITION OF MAYOR  
MICHAEL B. RYAN

**HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Honorable Michael B. Ryan on his retirement as Mayor of Lake Como, New Jersey. As a mayor, union member and United States Army Veteran, Mayor Ryan embodies the American spirit and his contributions are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

Mayor Ryan has been an outstanding public servant and labor advocate for both New Jersey and his home state of California. Mayor Ryan's introduction to labor and politics began in his native California, but he continued his efforts upon moving to New Jersey after marrying his wife, Marlene Brown. Mayor Ryan dedicated many years to leading his community as a council member, council president and mayor. Although retiring from elected office, Mayor Ryan remains active in local and state politics. For nearly 20 years, he has been Democratic Municipal Chairman of South Belmar and Lake Como. He has also been elected to the New Jersey State Democratic Committee and previously served as President of the south Belmar Democratic Club. Mayor Ryan is also committed to protecting labor rights, currently serving as Secretary Treasurer of the Monmouth and Ocean Counties Central Labor Council AFL-CIO and as a member of Teamsters-GCIU 612M.

In addition to his work in the public and labor sectors, Mayor Ryan is an Account Representative at Dimensional Management Corporation and is an active member of the community, volunteering at Camp Zehnder YMCA, serving as an usher at St. Rose Church and as a member of the Friendly Sons of the Shiloh of the Jersey Shore and the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Mayor Michael Ryan on his retirement. It is my hope that my colleagues will join me in thanking him for his leadership and service to the Borough of Lake Como.

TRIBUTE TO MS. JULIA SNELL

**HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one woman who has given of herself to her family, church, community, and nation; and

Whereas, Mrs. Julia Ann Holt Wilson Snell's good works are present across our nation, as an exemplary wife, aunt, neighbor, community worker, business owner and friend; and

Whereas, this giant of a woman, was reared in Buena Vista, Alabama, born July 1, 1907, to the late Mr. Daniel and Mrs. Irene Holt; and

Whereas, Mrs. Julia Ann Holt Wilson Snell was a virtuous woman, a woman of great in-

tegrity who remained true to the uplifting of her community and family which in turn uplifted others; and

Whereas, she was an exemplary matriarch, serving as a compass and wise counselor while bringing great joy to our district, her family and friends; and

Whereas, Mrs. Julia Ann Holt Wilson Snell loved her family, encouraged all of those around her to make a difference in her 107 years and blessed the lives of many in the states of Alabama, California, the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia and in her beloved church, Beulah Missionary Baptist Church where she was a faithful member; and

Whereas, this remarkable woman gave of herself, never asking for fame or fortune as she became a quiet storm, a spark that starts a flame; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional Recognition on Mrs. Julia Ann Holt Wilson Snell for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens across the United States; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Mrs. Julia Ann Holt Wilson Snell, of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Recognition," Mrs. Julia Ann Holt Wilson Snell, U.S. Citizen of Distinction.

Proclaimed, this 31st day of January, 2015.

HONORING THE WORK OF THE  
TOGETHER CENTER

**HON. SUZAN K. DELBENE**

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Together Center in Redmond, Washington. This month, they will be celebrating their 25th anniversary.

For the past quarter-century, Together Center has worked as a coalition of several agencies, providing services and resources such as shelter, counseling, child care, mental health services, and medical and dental care. Together Center has an incredible impact on the lives of more than 40,000 individuals in East King County every year.

Together Center has become an integral part of the community, supporting individuals and other organizations by connecting them in a convenient and efficient manner. Individuals may address a variety of needs on one of Together Center's three campuses, which conveniently house 20 agencies.

I greatly appreciate the work Together Center does to lower the barriers to getting critical help that many people need, such as medical care or temporary shelter.

I want to thank Together Center for their steadfast commitment to our local community, and congratulate them on their impressive record of achievement since 1990.

A TRIBUTE TO CHRISTINA  
FERNANDEZ-MORROW

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Christina Fernandez-Morrow for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Christina has the determination and drive to be successful in anything she does, and her exemplary work with the Latina Leadership Initiative of Greater Des Moines is a testament to that. As executive director she uses her abilities to communicate with people from different cultures to advance both women and the Latino community. She dedicates her time to numerous organizations that elevate and advance the Latino community, especially as one of the founding board members of the Latino Heritage Festival. In all aspects of her life Christina is an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Christina in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud Christina for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Christina on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL  
DEBT

**HON. MIKE COFFMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,428,120,668.55. We've added \$7,525,551,071,755.47 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. JOHN F. CALLAHAN, RECIPIENT OF THE SWINGLE AWARD FROM THE GREATER PITTSSTON FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK

### HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. John F. Callahan, who will receive the 2015 Swingle Award from the Greater Pittston, Pennsylvania Friendly Sons of Saint Patrick.

A native of Pittston, Dr. Callahan is a son of the late John A. Callahan and Catherine McNulty. He attended Scranton Prep High School and graduated from The University of Scranton. Before practicing medicine, Dr. Callahan was a school teacher, and he continued to teach medical students after becoming a doctor. Upon graduating from the Pennsylvania College of Osteopathic Medicine, Dr. Callahan operated a family practice in Pittston and worked as an emergency room physician at the Pittston Hospital and Geisinger Wyoming Valley Medical Center.

Dr. Callahan was instrumental in establishing the Care and Concern Free Clinic in Pittston. The clinic provides medical services to those who are underinsured or without insurance. In addition to medical care, the clinic offers dental care, psychiatric counseling, children's clothing and toys, and food.

Dr. Callahan was president of the Pennsylvania Osteopathic Medical Association (POMA) from 1998 to 1999. In 2000, he was named Physician of the Year by POMA. He also served on the POMA board for eight years. Dr. Callahan has acquired several other awards and recognitions from varying organizations throughout his career.

It is an honor to recognize Dr. John Callahan for his many accomplishments. I commend him for his service to our community, and I offer my deepest congratulation on receiving the Swingle Award from the Greater Pittston Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

### A TRIBUTE TO DREW BUHROW

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Drew Buhrow for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees

will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Drew is Assistant Director of IT at Principal Financial Group, managing a multimillion-dollar budget and more than 40 information technology professionals. His career is demanding, but Drew looks to give back to his community at every opportunity. Drew is a volunteer leader at the St. John the Apostle Parish in Norwalk. He also volunteers for the IT Leadership Forum Charity Open, which raises money for college scholarships for qualifying students. Drew spends any additional free time following sports and he actively directs the Norwalk Twin Rivers baseball program. Drew's leadership skills and deep commitment to his community makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Drew in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Drew on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

### TRIBUTE TO MR. EDWARD L. KEYTON

### HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation:

Whereas, Minister Edward L. Keyton is celebrating thirty-four (34) years in ministry this year and has provided stellar leadership to his church on an international level; and

Whereas, Minister Edward L. Keyton, under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained the Church of Christ at Bouldercrest as Senior Evangelist, he has enhanced the church as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has given hope to the hopeless, fed the hungry and is a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Minister Edward L. Keyton is a spiritual warrior, a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared not only with his church, but with our district and the world his passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Minister Edward L. Keyton as he celebrates thirty-four years in ministry and to salute him as he retires from ministerial leadership; A true Man of Excellence; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim April 17, 2015 as Minister Edward L. Keyton Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 17th day of March, 2015.

HONORING NOAH COUGHLAN'S RUN 4 RARE

### HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 17, 2015*

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Rare Disease Caucus Co-Chairs Congressman LEONARD LANCE and Congressman JOSEPH CROWLEY, and Rare Disease Caucus Members Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI and Congressman GUS BILIRAKIS, submit the following Resolution:

Whereas, rare diseases affect nearly 30,000,000 people in the United States and 350 million people worldwide, and therefore touch every State and Congressional district in America;

Whereas, Noah Coughlan from Vacaville, California, is set to complete his third "Run 4 Rare" journey across the United States of America on July 4th, 2015 to raise awareness for rare diseases, making him the third and youngest person to complete this achievement;

Whereas, the first steps of this journey were inspired by Catie and Annie Allio, two young girls born with Batten Disease, a rare disease that is heritable and which results in neurological degeneration that leads to death;

Whereas, rare diseases and disorders affect small patient populations in the United States of generally less than 200,000 individuals, and there are approximately 7,000 rare diseases identified in the United States at this time;

Whereas, millions of Americans have rare diseases for which there is no approved treatment, and people with rare diseases continue to face obstacles in accessing accurate diagnoses, sufficient treatment options, appropriate medical care expertise, and equitable reimbursement;

Whereas, the Orphan Drug Act and the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act have helped to drive innovative and patient-centered advancements in research and treatment for rare diseases, yet there is much to be done;

Whereas, for the 10,000 total known diseases, there are treatments for only 500, and new drug development currently takes around 14 years and over \$2 billion, causing 95 percent of drugs development efforts to fail before a product is brought to market;

Whereas, Noah completed the first Run 4 Rare in 2011, a 2,500-mile journey from California to Florida that spanned over four months and brought together families and supporters across the country;

Whereas, Noah completed the second Run 4 Rare in 2013, a 3,100-mile journey from California to Massachusetts that spanned 105 days and carried the hope and momentum of the movement over nine mountain ranges, across three deserts, and through 17 states;

Whereas, Noah's third Run 4 Rare began at the Statue of Liberty on February 28, 2015 in honor of Rare Disease Day, and will be a 3,000-mile journey spanning 14 states;

Whereas, Noah carries with him an American flag flown in Iraq given to him by the United States Air Force courtesy of Travis Air Force Base in Fairfield, California, representing the resilience of rare disease patients, the bravery they exhibit in the face of

adversity, and the freedom they seek through awareness and treatments;

Whereas, the Run 4 Rare effort symbolizes unity and hope across the United States for all Americans suffering from rare diseases, and all Americans who stand with them: therefore, be it

Resolved, that we the undersigned (1) support the spirit and message of Noah Coughlan's Run 4 Rare; (2) express solidarity with the rare disease community by committing to the development, advancement, and completion of a bipartisan 21<sup>st</sup> Century Cures Initiative to help accelerate the discovery, de-

velopment, and delivery of promising new diagnostic tools, treatments, and cures for patients; and (3) support a national and global commitment to raising awareness, advancing solutions, and celebrating the resilience and bravery of individuals with rare diseases and disorders worldwide.

**SENATE—Wednesday, March 18, 2015**

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Merciful God, enthroned above all powers, thank You for bestowing on us the dignity of being called Your children. You are mighty in power and we are grateful for the masterpiece of another day. Lord, forgive us when we forget that You are still in charge of what happens in our Nation and world. This world belongs to You, and though the wrong seems very strong, Your sovereignty still prevails. Your power is far beyond any conceivable authority.

Guide our Senators with Your sovereignty. Use them, Lord, to solve the critical problems in our time, contributing to the peace and stability of this land we love. Bless those who support them in their work as You surround us all with the shield of Your divine favor. We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

**HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it is hard to believe what we saw yesterday. Democrats actually filibustered a bill to help victims of modern slavery apparently because leftwing lobbyists told them to. Yes, their historic mistake is callous and extreme, but more than that it is tragic.

I mentioned the story of Melissa yesterday. Melissa was sold into sexual slavery before she had even become a teenager. She still bears the scars of her years of torment, the beatings, the shackling, the emotional cruelty. When Melissa finally escaped, she wasn't embraced as a victim, she was branded as a criminal.

Melissa's story is heartbreaking, but it is anything but unique. Stories such

as hers remind us how important the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act is. It is stories such as hers that remind us that no excuse about not reading a bill and no command from leftwing lobbyists could justify filibustering the critical help this human rights bill would provide.

So we have not given up on the thousands of victims in this country who suffer as Melissa did—shaken and shackled but still hanging on to hope. Democrats owe these victims, not lobbyists, help—help the Senate is so close to passing.

A strong majority of the Senate, including several Democrats, have already voted in favor of this human rights bill. Now all it takes is a few more Democrats of courage to ignore the lobbyists and do what is right. All that will mean is the Democrats on the Judiciary Committee supporting the very same bill they voted for just a few weeks earlier.

Apparently, all of these Senators were for this human rights bill before they were against it, and it is not like the bipartisan provision now suddenly in question is anything new. As the Congressional Research Service notes, bipartisan provisions such as this one "have been enacted in a variety of contexts since 1970," appearing in authorizing legislation as diverse as the State Children's Health Insurance Program, the Legal Services Corporation Act, the Department of Defense Authorization Act, the Foreign Assistance Act, and others—language that is quite common and has been voted for numerous times by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

That is why the distinguished Democratic leader, my friend, had been such a strong supporter of the bipartisan Hyde provision for so many years and why he said during his tenure as majority leader: "My belief in the sanctity of life is why I have repeatedly voted against using taxpayer money for abortions." That was my friend, the Democratic leader. That is the declared view of my friend. It is what he said just a few short years ago before he and his party voted to filibuster a bill that would help the victims of modern slavery.

So this afternoon we invite Democrats to ignore the lobbyists and do the right thing. We invite every Democrat to help us write a happy ending to this story, where the forces of hope and humanity, not powerful lobbyists, prevail.

**THE SENATE BUDGET**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, several weeks ago the White House released an unserious budget that would have raised taxes by nearly \$2 trillion and increase the national debt by more than \$7 trillion. In other words, it was more of the same old tired, failed policies of the past. Hardly anyone took that budget seriously mostly because it was not meant to be taken seriously.

Contrast that with the balanced budget the Senate will introduce this morning. It is a budget that controls spending, reduces the deficit, and improves programs such as Medicaid. It is a budget that will support economic growth and more opportunity for hardworking families while protecting our most vulnerable citizens. It is a budget that will allow us to repeal and replace a program that hurts the middle class, ObamaCare. It will allow us to repeal and replace a program that hurts the middle class, ObamaCare.

I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator ENZI, for his good work on this sensible budget.

We have heard some talk of shrinking deficits these days. Of course, Republicans are proud to take credit for helping force some fiscal responsibility on the Obama administration, but we know these deficits will soon shoot up dramatically if Washington does not start making more commonsense choices.

The reality is our country still has many tough fiscal challenges to confront. These are not challenges that can just be taxed away. These are not challenges that can be denied away either. But by working together these are challenges we can overcome, and the way we can overcome them is with sensible ideas to get spending under control and make government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable, just as the Senate's budget proposes to do.

**TRADE PROMOTION LEGISLATION**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have one final matter. For all the issues that may divide Democrats and Republicans these days, there is one thing many of us can agree on—trade is good for America. There is bipartisan agreement that trade is good for American wages with export-related manufacturing jobs paying nearly 20 percent more than other kinds of jobs, and there is bipartisan agreement that trade is good for American jobs overall.

According to one study, trade supports nearly 40 million jobs nationally—about one out of every five jobs

and more than one-half million jobs in my State of Kentucky alone. In fact, Kentucky's exports in goods and services have already increased dramatically since the enactment of trade agreements with countries such as Australia, from about \$10 billion a year to almost \$30 billion a year. Trade is good for Kentucky and trade is good for America, and that is why this is an issue where the White House and Congress are working together to support American jobs and wages.

While the United States has historically been a world leader in opening more markets to the products our country makes and grows, we have fallen woefully behind in recent years.

Thankfully, emerging agreements with countries in Europe and the Pacific present us with a real chance to catch up. These agreements present us with the unique opportunity to export more of what we make over there so we can create more American jobs right here at home. But we cannot make this important progress for America's middle class without passing the right kind of trade legislation in Congress first.

There is bipartisan agreement—at least in principle—to do exactly that, but the details will obviously be important. We want to ensure we get those details of that legislation right so we can get the best agreements possible for the American people. We certainly don't want to be considering legislation that would make these goals harder to achieve—undermining future economic and job growth.

The good news is our country has decades of experience with the kind of bipartisan trade promotion legislation that allows for the best deals for American workers to be negotiated by America's trade representatives and then approved by Congress. Several members of my conference will speak about that issue on the floor today. Like many of our Democratic friends, these Senators are interested in getting the best deals possible for the American people—the kind of deals that would only be possible with truly effective and bipartisan trade legislation. So they will explain this important issue, and that is just what is needed. They will explain it in further detail.

Before I leave the floor, I wish to recognize the good work of the chairman of the Finance Committee for being an incredible advocate on this issue, and allow me to also recognize the ranking member of the Finance Committee for working hard to try to get this right. We all look forward to working with these Members, and all Members, on this very important issue.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### THANKING SENATOR PAUL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, just as an aside, most everybody knows at this point that on New Year's Day I fell and hurt myself and injured my right eye.

During this period of time, the Presiding Officer—who by the way is a medical doctor, an ophthalmologist—has been so kind and thoughtful and considerate in visiting with me, giving me encouragement and some expert advice as to what he has seen in the past and given me hope for better sight out of my right eye. I appreciate it very much.

I want the people of Kentucky to know how thoughtful and considerate and kind the Presiding Officer has been to me over these past few months.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, instead of being bogged down in another Republican-contrived fight, I have proposed a path forward that is very simple and very direct. While we work toward an agreement to pass trafficking legislation—and there is work being done on that as we speak—we should move to the Executive Calendar and consider the nomination of a very fine person, Loretta Lynch.

Democrats are fully committed to voting for Lynch's nomination and returning immediately to the trafficking bill. The Senate can do two things at the same time. We can certainly work on coming up with a path forward on trafficking and also do something to move forward and have a vote for a new Attorney General.

The chief law enforcement officer of this country—the man who is now the Attorney General—said months ago he wants to leave. He has been winding down. It is not right for this country not to have a fully engaged Attorney General.

I am disappointed that with all the work the Senate needs to accomplish, the majority leader is bound and determined to waste the rest of this week with the same votes we took yesterday. I was told we are going to have the same votes today that we had yesterday, and we will have the same votes on Thursday that we are going to have today and that we had on Tuesday.

Albert Einstein, a genius, said the pure definition of insanity is somebody who does the same thing over and over again and comes up with the same result. It is insane to keep going forward on these votes that everyone knows are going to turn out the same way.

Loretta Lynch has waited 130 days. There is no reason to delay her confirmation another minute. We can vote for her confirmation now and move back to the trafficking bill right now.

#### THE HOUSE BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Gandhi said, "Action expresses priorities." Ac-

tion expresses priorities. Congressional Republicans' actions on the budget clearly demonstrate how little regard they have for the American middle class. I want to get into a few examples. Their budget proposal—the one the House is going to send to us soon—ends Medicare as we know it, replacing it with another voucher program. It takes health care away from 16.4 million Americans now insured through the Affordable Care Act. It guts Medicaid and undercuts millions of families who rely on it to fund nursing homes and other care. It cuts billions in education funding—billions—and it cuts job training and employment services for 4 million American workers. The list goes on and on.

But we know one thing their budget does not do. It doesn't cut a single tax loophole for the superwealthy to reduce the deficit. Not one. Instead, this budget is brimming with more tax breaks for the megarich—many new tax breaks. In fact, the Republican budget would drastically cut the tax bill for the average millionaire while raising taxes on the middle class. That is not just irresponsible, it is immoral.

Of course, lowering taxes for millionaires and billionaires will add to the deficit, not cut it. Republicans claim they are reducing the deficit, but that is not true. In truth, they are using mirrors and a lot of smoke in an effort to fool the American people.

House Republicans are really hiding the ball—moving the ball—claiming massive savings without explaining how. They are, for lack of a better description, cooking the books, using speculative and what they call "dynamic scoring." What is dynamic scoring? This is an effort to claim they are balancing the budget. Dynamic scoring says, here is all this tax revenue and other money we are going to get and it will help significantly. The fact is everyone knows there isn't any truth to that. It is only some numbers on paper. They are relying on transparent tricks to hide their refusal to protect our military from sequestration and budget cuts. Yet Republicans say of their own budget plan, we do not rely on gimmicks or creative accounting to balance our budget.

The definition of "gimmick" is a concealed, devious aspect or feature of something, as a plan or a deal—a concealed, devious aspect or feature.

Well, we have a perfect example of a gimmick in the Republican budget that the House is working on and we are told they will complete. It sounds like a gimmick to me. At least one Republican from the House agrees with me. Congressman KEN BUCK of Colorado said yesterday, "It's all hooey." The budget is all hooey. But as Dana Milbank said in today's Washington Post, speaking of the House Republicans' plan: "True, the budget does not rely on gimmicks. The budget is a gimmick." That is a direct quote.

We don't need gimmicks. We need a responsible budget and this is not a responsible budget. This is not responsible governance.

Unfortunately, though, this is the budget we have come to expect from today's Republican Party—a party that is so committed to supporting the superwealthy that they are throwing America's middle class and the military overboard.

Democrats are focused on the middle class. We want to create jobs, invest in the future, and make sure that all Americans benefit from an improving economy.

We are more than happy to work with our Republican colleagues in order to make our goals a reality. Unfortunately, helping the middle class just doesn't seem to be a priority for congressional Republicans.

Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and with the time equally divided, with the Democrats controlling the first half, and the majority controlling the second half.

The assistant Democratic leader.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is the Executive Calendar of the U.S. Senate. This Executive Calendar tells us the nominations that are pending before the U.S. Senate where action is needed. There is one name to be found on this calendar on page 4—a name which has been sitting on this calendar longer than any nominee for Attorney General of the United States of America over the last 30 years. This name has been sitting on this calendar for 20 days, which doesn't seem like an extraordinarily long period of time. However, it turns out that the previous nominees for Attorney General were moved so quickly on this Senate calendar that the last five combined, by Democratic and Republican Presidents, took less time to be confirmed than this one name. What is that name? It is Loretta E. Lynch of New York to be Attorney General—a name that was submitted to the U.S. Senate by President Barack Obama to make history—a name, a nominee to make history. This is the first African-American woman in the history of the United

States to be nominated to serve as Attorney General. It is a civil rights milestone that her name has been submitted.

I sat through the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, and it was a packed room. All the TV cameras were there. Loretta Lynch came and sat at the table, with her father behind her, with her family around her, with close friends gathered from all over the United States, and this woman calmly, in a dignified way, gave the most compelling testimony I have heard of any witness before the Senate Judiciary Committee, including those who came before us seeking to be appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court. She was excellent. No one laid a glove on her. No one raised any concern about her nomination. And then, when the public witnesses were invited to come in from both the Republican and Democratic sides to comment on her nomination, Senator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont asked all of them gathered: Is there any one of you who opposes the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General? Not one. Not one.

Yet, here we are now, with this nomination pending longer than any Attorney General nomination in the last 30 years. Why? Why has the Senate Republican leadership decided to target this good woman and to stop her from serving as the first female African-American Attorney General of the United States of America? There is no good reason. There is no substantive reason. She has been an extraordinary prosecutor in New York. She has the support of so many outstanding organizations. The National District Attorneys Association supports Loretta Lynch, as do the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys. The FBI Agents Association supports Loretta Lynch, and a long list of Republican- and Democratic-appointed former U.S. Attorneys, including Patrick Fitzgerald from my State of Illinois, and former FBI Director Louis Freeh, appointed by a Republican President, and Deputy Attorney General Larry Thompson from the George W. Bush administration. The list goes on and on.

The fact is there is no substantive reason to stop this nomination. The Republican majority leader announced over the weekend that he was going to hold this nomination of Loretta Lynch until the bill which is pending before the Senate passes, whenever that may be.

So Loretta Lynch, the first African-American woman nominated to be Attorney General, is asked to sit in the back of the bus when it comes to the Senate calendar. That is unfair. It is unjust. It is beneath the decorum and dignity of the U.S. Senate.

This woman deserves fairness. She seeks to lead the Department of Justice, and the U.S. Senate should be just in its treatment of her nomination. To think that we would jeopardize her opportunity to serve this Nation and to make history is fundamentally unfair.

What is the issue? The issue is this important bill. It is a bill which relates to human trafficking. As chairman of the constitution subcommittee, I have held hearings on this subject and it is heartbreaking to hear how primarily young women have been enslaved and exploited not just around the world but in the United States. I support this legislation. I think we should move it forward. What is holding this up is very simple: one sentence. Out of a 112-page bill, there is 1 sentence on pages 50 and 51 that relates to the issue of abortion.

I needn't tell anyone following this debate how controversial and divisive that issue can be and has been for so many decades in the United States. The fact is that issue has nothing to do with human trafficking. It should be debated at another moment, another time, on another bill. But, sadly, this 1 sentence in this 100-page bill is holding it up from being considered on the floor.

If the senior Senator from Texas, who is the lead sponsor on this bill, would come to the floor and simply remove this one sentence, this bill would pass. It would pass this afternoon, overwhelmingly. There is no question about it. He knows it. We have told him that. We have offered that to him, but he refuses.

So this good bill language is on the calendar, the Senate is mired in controversy, and Loretta Lynch sits on the calendar for another day.

It has been 130 days since President Obama announced the nomination of this woman to serve as our Attorney General. That is more than three times the period of time it took for us to confirm Attorney General Ashcroft. It is more than 2½ times as long as it took to confirm Attorney General Mukasey and twice as long as it took to confirm Attorney General Holder.

It is time for us to give Loretta Lynch an opportunity to continue to serve America and to make civil rights history by allowing this African-American woman to step forward and serve. It is time to stop holding her hostage to a political debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate that has nothing to do with her obvious qualifications to serve this Nation.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is one thing Americans have made clear, it is that they want their leaders to do something about the economy. The recession may have officially ended almost 6 years ago, but millions of Americans are still struggling economically and opportunities are still few and far between.

One big thing we can do to help the economy and expand opportunities for American workers is pass trade promotion authority or what we refer to as TPA. Our prior trade agreements have been a boon to the economy, providing American workers with jobs and American farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers with new markets for their goods. In my home State of South Dakota, 74 percent of exports go to countries with which the United States has a free-trade agreement. Between 2005 and 2014, South Dakota saw a 110-percent increase in exports to free-trade agreement countries. That has been a huge benefit to South Dakota farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers.

Speaking of farmers and trade, today is National Agriculture Day. I would just like to add as an aside that the substantial agriculture trade surplus the United States currently enjoys is a tribute to the efficiency and the productivity of America's farmers and ranchers. I salute American farmers, ranchers, and agribusinesses that provide America and the world with a safe and abundant food supply.

Passing trade promotion authority is one way we can ensure an even greater global expansion of U.S. agricultural trade. Currently, the administration is in the process of negotiating two new trade agreements that would open vast new markets for American products and put American goods on a level playing field internationally. The first of these agreements, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, is being negotiated with a number of Asia-Pacific nations, including Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, and Vietnam. Currently, American goods face heavy tariffs in many of these countries—at times as high as 85 percent. Tariffs of that size put American goods at incredible disadvantage compared to their foreign competitors. Tariffs provide a powerful disincentive for citizens in other nations to purchase American products. Removing this disincentive would increase foreign demand for U.S. products, which would mean more business for U.S. farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers and more jobs and opportunities for American workers.

Just to give an example of how important trade is to American agriculture, we currently export half of U.S. wheat, milled rice production, and soybean production; 70 percent of almond, walnut, and pistachio production; more than 75 percent of cotton production; 40 percent of grapes; 20 per-

cent of cherries; 20 percent of apples; 20 percent of poultry and pork production; and 10 percent of beef production.

If you think about it, there are approximately now 260 preferential trade agreements worldwide. Only 20 of those involve the United States. Every time we have entered into a new trade agreement where we have been able to eliminate tariffs and duties on a lot of our products, we see an explosion in exports into those particular markets. That is why negotiating the strongest possible transpacific trade agreement, as well as the agreement the United States is negotiating with the European Union, has to be a priority. For that, we have to have trade promotion authority.

Trade promotion authority has been the means by which nearly every U.S. free-trade agreement has been negotiated. The idea behind TPA is very simple: Congress sets the negotiating priorities the administration must follow and then requires the administration to consult with Congress during the negotiating process. In return, Congress promises a simple up-or-down vote on the final agreement, instead of a lengthy amendment process that could leave the final agreement looking nothing like the deal the administration negotiated.

The promise of that up-or-down vote on a final agreement is the key. That is what gives our trading partners the confidence they need to put their best offers on the table, which allows for a successful conclusion of negotiations. Trade promotion authority demonstrates that Congress and the administration are on the same page when it comes to the content of trade agreements and that the final agreement will be either accepted or rejected, not amended beyond recognition.

Trade promotion authority expired in 2007. Republicans have been pushing for renewing it ever since. The President is also on board. He called for trade promotion authority in this year's State of the Union Address.

This is an excellent chance, I would add, for Democrats and Republicans to accomplish something significant for the American people and to show that Washington is working again.

Unfortunately, while the President and Republicans are united on this issue, many Senate Democrats continue to oppose trade promotion authority legislation. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is currently engaged in negotiations on a TPA bill with the committee's ranking member, the senior Senator from Oregon. I am hopeful and I know a lot of us on the committee and many of us in this Chamber are hopeful that these efforts will yield legislation both Republicans and Democrats can support.

Republicans are very open to suggestions and improvements. In fact, I expect the final agreement will include

many elements advocated by the senior Senator from Oregon and other Senate Democrats, such as greater transparency surrounding trade negotiations. However, the one thing Republicans cannot support is an attempt to undermine the core of trade promotion authority—that guaranteed up-or-down vote that gives other countries the confidence to put forward their best offers in trade negotiations. Simply put, we cannot afford to weaken TPA.

I know the senior Senator from Utah, who is the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee—who is on the floor right now; and we will hear from him in just a few minutes—is working very hard to ensure that we have a strong TPA agreement that we can bring to the floor of the Senate, that we can pass through the Congress, and that we can put on the President's desk so that we can enable these trade negotiations to continue in a way that will lead to a conclusion, to a result that is good for American manufacturers and service industries and American farmers and ranchers.

If we fail to pass TPA, which will likely spell the failure of the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the United States-European Union trade agreement, we will not be maintaining the status quo. Just because we are not negotiating agreements does not mean other countries will not be. Other countries will secure favorable treatment of their goods, and American goods will fall further and further behind. That is not something we can afford in this economy.

If we pass TPA, on the other hand, that will allow the transpacific trade agreement and the United States-European Union trade agreement to move forward, which means American producers will benefit from new markets for their goods and American workers will benefit from new jobs and opportunities. Since 2009, exports have accounted for more than 1 million new jobs here in the United States. If we pass the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the United States-European Union trade agreements, we could be looking at more than 1 million more new jobs over the next few years.

It is time to pass TPA, to get these agreements concluded, and to let American workers and businesses start experiencing the benefits. It has been far too long. Mr. President, 2007 is when the last TPA expired. We are losing ground by the day when we are not in the room and a part of negotiating new trade agreements that are beneficial to American businesses, farmers, and ranchers.

I wish to point out one more time that there are approximately now 260 preferential trade agreements worldwide, only 20 of which involve the United States. So if we want to participate in a growing global economy



where 95 percent of the world's population lives, we have to become aggressive in creating the trading opportunities that will enable our businesses to prosper, to create good-paying jobs here in the United States, to raise incomes for middle-income families in this country, and to give us as a country an opportunity to lead the world when it comes to an economy that benefits all people—not just those here in the United States but all around the world. We have the wherewithal, the know-how, the technology, the creativity, and the innovation in our economy to make that possible, to make it happen. That is why these trade agreements are so essential.

These trade agreements, as I pointed out, do not happen unless we have trade promotion authority in place to make sure they happen. If we do not have it in place and these trade agreements do not get done, it is not that America—that we are just going to be standing still, we are going to be losing ground as countries around the world that are aggressively trying to negotiate trade agreements and improve the economies of their countries continue to do that, leaving us further and further behind.

So I hope we can get this passed through the Senate Finance Committee, passed through the Senate, the House of Representatives, and on the President's desk where it can be signed into law. The sooner that happens, the better it will be for our economy, for jobs, for American businesses, and for American farmers and ranchers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues, and I appreciated the wonderful remarks of the senior Senator from South Dakota, Mr. THUNE. He is working very hard on that committee and really making a difference, as I think most people on the committee are trying to do. But he makes a difference, and I truly appreciated his remarks today.

I am pleased to join my colleagues on the floor to talk about the importance of Trade Promotion Authority, or TPA, to the health of our Nation's economy. At the beginning of this Congress, I, along with many of my colleagues, stated publicly that trade was one of the few areas where the new Republican Congress would be able to find common ground with President Obama. I still believe that is the case.

I chatted with him just last week—one of the few conversations I have had with him since he has been President—and I was very appreciative. He would like to get this done, and he is right.

The Obama administration is currently negotiating some of the most ambitious trade agreements in our Nation's history. The first is the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, an Asia-

Pacific trade agreement being negotiated between the United States and 11 other countries. On the other side of the world, the United States is negotiating a bilateral trade agreement with 28 countries of the European Union; that is called T-TIP.

Together, these two trade agreements have the potential to greatly expand access to U.S. trade with other countries, allowing our job creators to sell more American-made goods and services. They are in demand. We just have to get in the game. This helps us create and support more high-paying export-related jobs at home. Of these two agreements, the TPP negotiations, or the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations, are further advanced. According to administration officials, the agreement could be concluded over the next few months. That is good news.

Now, I wish talk about the bad news. Without renewal of effective TPA procedures, the administration will simply not be able to conclude a strong TPP agreement.

Why is TPA, or trade promotion authority, so important?

TPA is a compact between the Senate, the House, and the administration. Under this compact, the administration agrees to pursue specified objectives and consult with Congress as it negotiates trade agreements. Both the House and the Senate agree to allow for expedited consideration of trade agreements without amendments. This is essential for the conclusion and passage of strong trade agreements.

Put simply, without TPA, our trading partners will not put their best offers on the table because they will have no guarantees the agreement they sign will be the same one Congress will vote on in the end. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota made that very clear. They don't want to agree with our Trade Representative and then have countless amendments in the House and the Senate that could change the whole agreement they had agreed to. That is why trade promotion authority became such an important part of our international relations.

As former Deputy USTR Miriam Sapiro said in a recent speech:

Neither our Asian nor our European partners want to get into the real give-and-take that's necessary to reach a final agreement until they are sure that the president has the authority that he needs to conclude the deal. Absent that, they are content to wait.

In other words, if we want good trade agreements, we must have strong TPA procedures in place, and we need to be clear on one other point: The specifics of those procedures matter. They matter a great deal. This is bipartisanship at its best.

Our goal should not be to pass just any TPA bill. Our goal should be to pass the strongest bill possible. That is the only way to ensure we get the best possible deal out of our trade negotia-

tions, which is, in the end, the purpose of TPA. We have used the same basic TPA structure for every major trade agreement over the last four decades and, quite frankly, the results speak for themselves.

As my colleagues have so eloquently stated today, we do not need new, untested changes to establish TPA procedures that can hamper the process and make it harder for both our negotiators to reach a good deal and for Congress to be able to vote on agreement up or down.

When Republicans took control of the Senate this year and I became the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I made renewing TPA my top trade priority for this Congress. I set out to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to craft the best possible bill. We already had a good framework in place—the bill I introduced last year with former Chairman Baucus and Chairman Camp, which had broad support in Congress, in the administration, and in the business community.

My goal has been to see if we could improve upon that product in order to broaden support for TPA. I am certainly willing to do that, but I have made it clear throughout this process that I cannot agree to any bill that would dilute the effectiveness of TPA as a tool to negotiate and enact strong trade agreements.

Recently, I had the opportunity to talk personally with President Obama about TPA, as I mentioned. I think he understands the importance of getting a strong TPA bill through Congress. That is why I am willing to work with him to make the advancement of our Nation's trade agenda a higher priority. I am hoping the President will do his part to help persuade the Members of his party to support an effective TPA bill. He says he will, and I believe him.

Make no mistake. Our competitors are not sitting on their laurels when it comes to trade. There are literally hundreds of trade agreements under negotiation throughout the world, and the United States is party to only a few.

This hurts our exporters badly. This bill is really necessary. We need to do better. We need to do everything we can to ensure that the United States is not only a participant in international trade but a leader. The only way we can do that is by passing a strong TPA bill.

I stand ready and willing to work with the White House and my colleagues in the Senate to get an effective TPA bill introduced out of committee and onto the Senate floor as soon as possible.

We cannot afford to miss this opportunity. This is a grand opportunity for us. It is bipartisan down the line, and I think it would be a great accomplishment for the Congress of the United

States to get this done. But, more importantly, it would be a great accomplishment for the President and this administration to have this done. It would give him the tools to do a lot of the things that need to be done.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

Portman amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking.

Portman amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth.

Vitter amendment No. 284 (to amendment No. 271), to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I did not come down to speak on this particular bill. I am back for week No. 4 of waste of the week.

In recent weeks, I have highlighted what I describe as excess spending of taxpayer dollars. We have talked about double dipping in unemployment insurance, where if we could close this loophole, we could save the taxpayer \$5.7 billion in savings.

We have also talked about duplication in Federal economic development programs. There are 50-some programs that provide for workforce training spread among a number of agencies. Surely we can reduce that number significantly. And if we could do so, we could save the taxpayer \$200 million.

And last week—somewhat tongue in cheek, nevertheless not small change—I talked about a \$387,000 grant issued

by the National Institutes of Health in which 18 New Zealand white rabbits were given, four times a day, 30-minute massages to determine whether they would be relieved of some soreness after they were given some physical exercise. Then four massages a day, 30 minutes apiece, costing \$387,000, to prove that a massage helped to make them feel better or removed some of those aches and pains.

I think we could have asked any athlete from any college. As we are moving into college basketball's March Madness and Final Four that we all engage in at this time of year, we could ask any college athlete, or any person for that matter who is doing work in the yard: Do you think 4 30-minute massages a day would help you feel a little better and help you with some of those aches and pains? Do we need to spend \$387,000 of taxpayer dollars in order to prove this and give rabbits massages?

So up we go with the chart. Waste of the week. This is week No. 4, and I would like to talk about a so-called bonus that has been given by our Federal Government that is quite egregious.

I am sure many look forward to a potential bonus at the end of the year—though it doesn't apply in our business here. A bonus sounds like something that comes along with something that was earned, but what if it was a bonus you didn't earn? Is it still a bonus or does it become fraud?

Internal Revenue Service Commissioner John Koskinen recently confirmed to the Senate that unless action is taken, an amnesty bonus would be available to millions who have broken our immigration laws. All of this stems from the President's announcement in November of 2014 to grant 3 years of tentative legal status to as many as 4 million individuals who crossed America's borders into this country illegally. Fortunately, President Obama's Executive amnesty has been temporarily blocked by a Federal court. Hopefully, that blockage will survive all legal challenges to undo it. But if this amnesty plan moves forward, 4 million illegal individuals will be granted Social Security numbers.

Why does this matter? Well, when you are granted a Social Security number, it triggers certain benefits, including eligibility for the earned income tax credit for up to 3 prior years in future tax filing years.

The earned income tax credit is a benefit for working people who have low to moderate income. It is an incentive and a reward for those who choose to work, and it does help to reduce the number of those who are dependent on government welfare programs. It allows some individuals to receive payments from the U.S. Treasury just by filing a tax return. It reduces the amount of tax an individual owes and it may also provide a tax refund.

Why is this issue qualified as waste of the week? Since the President is trying to legalize an additional 4 million individuals, if his action is upheld by the court, 4 million people will now have retroactive access to this benefit and taxpayers foot the bill for these 4 million illegal immigrants who will be in a position to earn this tax credit.

The Joint Committee on Taxation says this so-called amnesty bonus for those who have come into our country illegally will drain about \$2.1 billion from the United States Treasury.

I am for legal immigration. The United States has a rich history as a destination where people from all over the world can come to make a better life for themselves. We are a nation of immigrants. As a matter of fact, I am the son of an immigrant. My mother came here with her family, and it has been the narrative of our family. Legal immigration is what has made America the great prosperous country it is today. But we also are a nation of laws, and Congress should help ensure that legal immigrants to our country can benefit from the opportunities they need to succeed, but that doesn't include rewarding those who are gaming our immigration system to receive benefits they do not legally qualify for.

To address this matter, I have joined with Senator GRASSLEY and several other of my colleagues to introduce legislation that would correct this issue. If we can correct this issue, we will save the taxpayers an estimated \$2.1 billion in future spending.

So up we go with the thermometer here, and we will be adding another \$2.1 billion to the money that can be saved our taxpayers by eliminating duplication, by pursuing awards that are not legally given, by looking at the way the Federal Government wastes money by giving rabbits back rubs, and we are going to continue to fill this up until we hopefully reach the \$100 billion goal. That is not small change.

I continue to hear from Hoosiers and others who write and say: Yes, we haven't been able to address the big issues of debt and deficit, but we can go after government waste. And those who say we can't afford to cut spending a nickel because we have cut so much so far clearly have not paid attention to the billions of dollars that can be saved the taxpayers simply by addressing the waste and illegal use of the taxpayer money.

I look forward to sharing some more of these in coming weeks, and I thank the sponsor of the bill here for giving me the time to come down and add another waste of the week to the list climbing toward our goal of \$100 billion in savings for the taxpayer, who is overtaxed already.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the pending business, the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Bill.

The Senate is now on the second week of the trafficking bill and my colleagues in the minority refuse to allow this body to amend or pass this bipartisan bill. When this legislation was reported out of committee, not a single Democrat on the committee raised any concern with the inclusion of the protections offered by the Hyde amendment. This was hardly surprising, after all, Democrats have previously voted in favor of legislation that includes similar long standing statutory protections—such as the Affordable Care Act. That is why it's so shocking that Democrats—out of nowhere—have had a change of heart on the Hyde amendment, and are now obstructing efforts to help victims of human trafficking.

I urge my colleagues who are filibustering this legislation to consider the gravity of their actions. While Democrats play politics as usual, thousands of victims—many of whom are children—are assaulted and abused every day, hoping someone will hear their cries for help. We cannot and must not allow political gamesmanship to stand in the way of helping thousands of victims of human trafficking. Now is the time we must work together to protect our Nation's most vulnerable from a horrific trade that robs our children of their childhood and rejects the sanctity of life.

Let us honor our commitment to protect children from abuse, neglect and rape. Let us put aside politics and do the right thing by moving forward on this bill.

Mr. COATS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am here today for two reasons. One is to manage the bill at hand for the next few hours, and the other is to talk a little bit about Loretta Lynch, and how I hope we can resolve both these issues.

I believe when it comes to the human trafficking bill on the floor, as well as my bill, the safe harbor bill—which is not the one on the floor, but it is also a strong bipartisan bill that passed out of the Judiciary Committee with every single person voting for it, 20 to 0. I want to talk a little bit about the bill so people don't forget it. It is expected to be an amendment to the bill on the floor when we get these issues resolved.

I am hopeful that at some point here—and I hope it is today—we are going to turn the corner on some of the language we have been hearing on the floor. I think it is becoming a sad situ-

ation, especially sad for the victims of trafficking, and I think we have a moment in time today and tomorrow where we can actually work on this and try to resolve it. I believe this great august body, which has dealt with many large issues in the past—100 people who I think have come to this place with good will—should be able to resolve it in some way, get through this, and get this bill done.

As we continue to work on the issues with the bill at hand, Senator CORNYN's bill, I also want to talk about the bill I have and why both these bills are important and actually work together.

On trafficking. First, we know the numbers. More than 27 million people around the world are victims of some kind of trafficking each year. It is not always sex trafficking. Sometimes it is labor trafficking and other things. When it comes to sex trafficking, the average age of a victim when she is trafficked is 13 years old. She is not even old enough to go to a high school prom, not even old enough to get a driver's license.

When you look at the statistics around the world, it is the third biggest international criminal enterprise in the world. The first is the illegal trafficking of drugs. I don't think that is a surprise. The second is the illegal trafficking of guns, and the third is the illegal trafficking of children, mostly little girls. But what people don't always realize when they think about trafficking—I think they often think about kids who are found in the bottom of a boat. That does happen, horrible stories like that. But when it comes to the United States of America, 83 percent of the victims—83 percent of the victims—are from our own country. They are from our own country. They are girls such as Tamara Vandermoon of Minnesota. She was 12 when she was first sold for sex. She was not even a teenager. She was just mad at her mom, and she ran away. A pimp found her and made her all kinds of promises—promises that sounded pretty good when you are a scared kid away from home. It happened when she was the most vulnerable. He took advantage of her before she even had a chance to grow up and be an adult. She has worked to change her life around through services and help in our State.

Our State has been the leader in this area. That is one of the things why I introduced the safe harbor bill, which I hope will be the first amendment to this bill after we resolve these issues. My bill also is sponsored with Senator CORNYN. He and I have worked together on this bill.

Another example—because people always use numbers. I used a bunch of numbers at the beginning of this speech, but I think sometimes people know behind those numbers, every single one of those numbers, is a child.

Two weeks ago, out of the U.S. Attorney's office in Minnesota, our case was

charged, and it happened a few months ago. It was a 12-year-old in Rochester, MN, which is an idyllic community, a beautiful place. This little 12-year-old got a text. She was with a girl who was a little older than herself. The text invited them to a party. She thought that was pretty cool. She goes to the McDonald's parking lot. She is at the McDonald's parking lot, and this pimp puts her in the car. She thinks she is going to a party. She gets carted up to the Twin Cities. She gets raped. He takes sexually explicit pictures of her. He puts them on Craigslist. She gets sold the next day to two other guys, raped by two other guys.

Finally they were able to track down this perpetrator. He has been charged with a very serious crime by the U.S. Attorney's office. This happened in Minnesota. We can ask Senator HEITKAMP, who has been involved in this issue. It happens in the oil patches in North Dakota. It happens on the streets of Washington, DC. It happens all over this country.

We may say, why is everyone talking about this now in this day and age? I look at this, as a former prosecutor, as back when people viewed domestic violence as a crime that was behind doors, that no one wanted to talk about it, and no one realized it was a crime. They thought of it as a family issue.

When we start seeing kids who are in situations of domestic violence are multiple times more likely to commit crimes themselves because they grow up seeing it, we realize it is not just an issue between two people. As horrible as the injuries are to the immediate victim, it is also an issue for their entire family and for the entire community. We learned that about domestic violence. We learned that about child abuse. Now we are starting to see this about trafficking.

We can't have a 12-year-old who is a criminal, right? The 12-year-old is a victim of this. The 12-year-old doesn't know what they are doing. They are only 12 years old, but they are a victim, they are not a criminal. That is the focus of the Safe Harbor Act.

I want to thank my colleague, Republican ERIK PAULSEN in the House, who has taken this bill on. We have worked together on it. A version of it has passed the House. We like ours a little bit better because it has the national sex trafficking strategy in it, and that is the bill we are going to be putting on as an amendment. ERIK has been a true leader on this issue, and we just talked yesterday about it. This bill actually now has—a version of it, my safe harbor bill—has passed the House twice. It doesn't have the issues with the Hyde amendment. Hopefully it will be the first bill, the first amendment, when we resolve these other issues.

What does the bill do? What it does is looks at what has been working in

States across the country. According to a report by Polaris—a group that is among many groups as a leader on sex trafficking—it shows that 15 States across the country have taken these safe harbor laws. The laws basically say we are not going to treat these kids as criminals. We are going to make sure they are treated as victims, that they get the services they need. And mostly then from a law enforcement perspective—from someone who was a prosecutor for 8 years, ran an office of 400 people and saw these cases coming in and out of our doors all the time—what it means is these victims will then better testify against the people whom we want to get. Those are the perps. Those are the people running the rings. Those are the johns who are buying the sex. By having this approach, we have a much better chance of going after the people who are doing this.

The Ramsey County attorney's office out of St. Paul, MN, with their leader John Choi, was able to get a 40-year sentence last year of someone who was running one of these rings. We have had numerous prosecutions in Minnesota.

This idea of having a shelter, a place for the victims to go—because otherwise what is going to happen if they don't think they are going to get help or maybe get some job training, have a place to stay, they are going to go right back to the pimp, and then they are not going to be willing to testify and tell their story. That is what has happened through history, and that has enabled the rings to get worse and worse.

The other thing we know that has enabled them to get worse is the Internet. We love the Internet, but it has allowed people to market things on all kinds of Web sites and in all kinds of devious ways. They are able to sell young girls and young boys on these Web sites. They get a text and they show up and think they are going to a party. That is what is happening. It is behind closed doors and it is hidden. That is one of the reasons we are seeing this increase and these problems coming up, in addition to the realization we are not going to tolerate this anymore.

We have 15 States across the country that already have the safe harbor laws. Another 12 States are making good progress in this direction. It is not starting from scratch. As I said, my home State is one of the first ones, but we are seeing them. What our bill does is create incentives for States to adopt these kinds of laws. It is not involving a lot of money. It is taking existing programs and trying to create incentives so that States will adopt these laws.

The other piece of the bill is that it allows victims of these crimes to qualify for certain Federal job programs

that they may not qualify for now. It also creates a national strategy, as I mentioned, to combat human trafficking.

I always found when I was a prosecutor that people didn't care who took on the case, whether it was a local prosecutor or the State AG or the U.S. Attorney's office. They just wanted people to get the job done. They didn't actually understand the jurisdictional divisions. By making this national sex trafficking strategy the idea—and I have seen this with the Violence Against Women Act—it may not be that we are mandating people do a certain thing, but we put out there some best practices that local offices can cover. We look at what is working in certain States. Then we put those out there because we have a national sex trafficking strategy, and we give people ideas of what they can do best.

Those are parts of the bill. It is pretty straightforward. Again, it is not the bill on the floor right now which, of course, has an important purpose, to help fund some of the shelters and pay for it by an increase on the fees on perpetrators, but it is a part of the solution.

Another part of the solution we haven't talked too much about over the last few days, because there have been a lot of other things going on, I think we have to also remember the role of the private sector. We certainly have seen this in our State, where Marilyn Carlson Nelson, who is a wonderful business leader, headed up Carlson Companies for many years. Carlson Companies owns the Radisson Hotels. She has made training of her workforce a major part of this because it is the people on the frontline—and you can see Delta and all the others, American, United, a lot of the airlines are making this a priority as well. They are training their workers because they are on the frontline, and they are going to see this happen. They are going to see the victims. They are going to figure out something is going on that is wrong, so they can at least report it to their hotel's security or whatever authorities they think they need to; they can stop it right there on the ground floor and report it to the authorities.

We shouldn't forget that. Because unless these private sector entities who see it happening come forward—this isn't in any of our bills. This is something they are doing on their own. Unless they do that, we can have all the laws we want on the books, but it is really hard to catch these things from happening. I am proud of the work they have done.

My good friend Cindy McCain, HEIDI HEITKAMP, and I went to Mexico last spring with the major focus on sex trafficking. We met with the attorney general of Mexico and met with the head of their law enforcement in Mexico City about this very topic. Because

Mexico, along with many other countries, has girls who do come in and are brought in for purposes of sex trafficking. I do want to emphasize, however, this is not just an international problem, but over 83 percent of the victims are from our country. But they have been coordinating with us on a number of successful prosecutions by giving us information so when the cases come to the United States, we view this. They have their own internal problems with this and other things as well, obviously, in Mexico. We went there not to say you are doing something wrong. We went there to say we have our own problems, and so do you. Let's figure out how we can work together on this issue.

Again, Cindy McCain is an example of someone who on the private side has been very involved with her foundation in working on this issue and helping with shelters and other things. The private sector piece of this, they can be called trafficking facilitators, unknowingly, because they are allowing this to happen. But in a way, they are a major part of the solution. I do not want us to forget that as we go forward and as they work with us to address the needs of the victims, and mostly to be able to catch these cases and bring them to law enforcement.

That is kind of a tour through what the safe harbor bill does. Again, Senator CORNYN and I have talked about it being the first amendment to the bill. I am very aware that we need to work out the issues on the underlying bill, and I am hopeful after days of acrimony that at some point we are going to be able to work together. I am hoping there will be a different flavor to people's discussions about this issue today.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

The Loretta Lynch nomination now has been tied into this. I have a little bit of a different approach because I do not think we should be slowing it down anymore. I understand that we have to work out the issues on the sex trafficking, and there is plenty of blame that can go around. But I think the major focus should be on working it out instead of playing this blame game.

Loretta Lynch, on the other hand—I do not understand why our friends on the other side of the aisle have been delaying this for so long. I understand this is a major job, but this is a woman who has had 900 written questions and an 8-hour job interview, to my mind, where members of the Judiciary Committee could ask her whatever they wanted, in several rounds of questions, if they wanted. She also met with members of that committee. I am sure that anyone who wanted to meet with her—I know she has met with at least 59 Senators to date. That is a pretty major job interview. Twenty-five U.S. Attorneys from Republican and Democratic administrations have approved

and suggested that she is more than fit for this job.

How do I come down on this? I come down on this as a perspective of knowing that Attorney General Holder wants to leave. I think he has done some really good things. I know some of my colleagues have not been a big fan of his. This is an opportunity for them to put someone new in. We will start with that.

The second thing is this is someone who is highly qualified. Coming from a State where we have indicted 20 people for criminal activity related to al-Shabaab with their terrorist activities in Somalia, we have recently indicted a number of people who decided they were going to go fight with ISIS, coming out of our State. And I am proud of our communities, our Muslim and Somali communities, that have been working with law enforcement on this. This has been an effort, because no kid should be going over there and no parent wants their kid to go join a terrorist organization.

That being said, to keep our communities safe, we have to be very aggressive about these cases. So given that these cases are going on right in my hometown, I would really like to have the support of an Attorney General in place, and one who is nominated before this body. And as the nominee, she is someone who is uniquely qualified to handle these kinds of cases that the citizens in my State want to have handled, these terrorism cases. In fact, her office is No. 1 in the country when it comes to how many terrorism cases they have successfully handled in New York. So she is a seasoned U.S. attorney. She is not someone who comes from a political background; she is someone who comes from a prosecutor background and is a former prosecutor and someone who wants to see that kind of commonsense, no-nonsense mentality in the Attorney General's office.

I highly recommend that my colleagues not only vote for her confirmation but just let this come to the floor as soon as possible.

Some of the critiques I have heard against her from some of my colleagues—some have said she has been lawless, and that doesn't quite make sense to me, especially when we look at who has been backing her from the law enforcement community, such as the 25 U.S. attorneys I mentioned. The New York police commissioner has endorsed her, as has the president of the Federal Law Enforcement Association and the president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. These people are not exactly known for supporting lawlessness.

The other thing that has been mentioned by many of my colleagues that concerns me as to the reason they gave for blocking her nomination is that she said when she was at a hearing that she

would be supportive, as the chief law enforcement person for our country, of the President's policies when it comes to immigration.

Let's start with the law. We know this is now tied up in the courts, and there are different court decisions. One court is upholding the Executive order of the President, and another court has said it is not legal. We have had disputes on it in the courts. All right. But when we look through time, we realize every President since Dwight Eisenhower has done some kind of Executive order of varying degrees. George H.W. Bush did a major Executive order involving many immigrants. When we look at those through history, we realize those Presidents to some degree or other—I know the Liberian community in Minnesota. They have been for decades on an emergency order, and that is why they are in our State. Every year, they have to come back, and sometimes Congress does something and sometimes the President does something. But year after year, they need this Executive order because of the status under which they came to this country. They are law-abiding citizens. They are working throughout our State and have been here for 15 or 20 years. And that is just one example.

These Executive orders on immigration have been going on since Dwight Eisenhower. I don't really have the time to look back and see what every Attorney General did at the time, but my guess is that the Attorneys General under Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon and both Bushes and Bill Clinton all said: OK, this is legal. You can go ahead and do this Executive order.

I am not saying this one is not of more magnitude. It is. But there was a major Executive order when George Bush was President. We know that. So why we would then somehow take that history and extrapolate it into, OK, well, Loretta Lynch is somehow lawless just because she said the President could issue an Executive order—it just doesn't make any sense to me at all.

We have a woman who has been prosecuting these cases of terrorism for years. We have someone who has significant support from Democratic and Republican U.S. attorneys from many administrations. We have someone who really did pass her senatorial job review. I understand that my colleagues feel strongly about immigration and that they didn't like what the President did, and the President himself said he would like to tear up that piece of paper that contained the Executive action if only this body and the House would pass comprehensive immigration reform.

When I look back through this whole story, one of my proudest moments was when the Senate came together on comprehensive immigration reform. I am on the Judiciary Committee, and I believe that was the best moment for

the Judiciary Committee in the last few years. Under Chairman LEAHY's leadership, our committee was able to work together across party lines, starting with the Gang of 8 who came up with the base concept, which was half Democrats and half Republicans, including Senator DURBIN, Senator MCCAIN, Senator SCHUMER, Senator BENNET, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator FLAKE, and the work of many other Members, which made it possible to get that bill done.

So the Gang of 8 got that done, and from there we went to the committee with a bill, and we spent days voting on amendments. We voted on amendments that stretched over every part of the bill, whether it was the fence at the border or what would happen with undocumented workers or the work Senator HATCH and I did on making sure we had the green card and visa system up to date. We have a situation in our country right now where we have literally unlimited visas for wild hockey players. We love our hockey team in Minnesota, and they are able to recruit a bunch of Canadians. That is good for us, but doctors from the Mayo Clinic are not able to bring in a spouse if they want to come from another country.

We have to look at this as to the undocumented workers who are here, we have the border issues, and we also have these issues related to agriculture and the innovation economy that make this comprehensive reform so important. Let's remember that when it comes to business issues, we have a case where 200 of our Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or kids of immigrants. Ninety of our Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants. Thirty percent of our U.S. Nobel laureates were born in other countries.

I neglected to add MARCO RUBIO to the Gang of 8 as I recall in my mind everyone who was in it.

That is why I was such a fan of the comprehensive immigration reform—because it was so important to look at all parts of the issue.

So now I get to Loretta Lynch. We passed a bill with pretty strong support here—I think it was like 68 votes or something in that neighborhood—and then it went over to the House and it sat there in a deep freeze. That bill sat there for over a year somewhere between the chocolate ice cream and the frozen peas. We were never able to get it out of the House, and that is what led to the President's Executive order, and now somehow—OK, that is fine, it was bad enough that that all happened, and I am still hopeful we will be able to get this done, but how that story leads to Loretta Lynch's confirmation being held up is beyond belief to me. I think it is time to get her nomination voted on. I don't think it should be related to the present difficulties we are having with this bill that I care so much about

and mostly also with my safe harbor legislation, which has been slotted to be the first amendment.

I am hopeful we will be able to work everything out with the bill that is on the floor right now—I truly am—because I don't think it is fitting of the Senate to keep up this fight when there are victims of sex trafficking every single day, such as that 12-year-old girl out of Rochester, MN. How are we going to explain this to that little girl, that we are fighting it out every single day instead of trying to come to a resolution?

I remember when we were down in Mexico—HEIDI HEITKAMP and Cindy McCain and I—and visited one of the shelters there. We met all the girls who were there. There was one girl there named Paloma. All the other girls had an interpreter and they talked to us through the interpreter, but she spoke a little English. She introduced herself, and then she just started to cry and could not stop crying. As she cried, you just knew that whatever happened to her was so bad, she could not even talk about it.

It reminded me of when Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator GRAHAM, Senator HOEVEN, and I were on a trip and went to a refugee camp in Jordan and met with a group of refugees. One of the women there said that what she had seen happen to her family in Syria was so sad that it would make stones cry. That is what I thought of when I saw Paloma, that what had happened to her—this little, young, beautiful, 12-, 13-year-old girl—what had happened to her was so sad that it would make stones cry.

I hope my colleagues keep this in mind as we work on these two bills. I am tired of talking about how this happened or how we got where we are. There is a way to resolve this problem, and certainly the nomination of the Attorney General of the United States should not be held up because of it.

I yield the floor.

I see my good friend Senator ISAKSON from Georgia is here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I encourage the Members of the Senate to vote favorably on cloture so we can move forward on the important bill on human trafficking.

Mr. President, I come to the floor to ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I don't normally come to the floor and address a question that was asked rhetorically on the floor the night before, but I am compelled to do so today.

There were two instances that happened in the last week where my name and the Coca-Cola name came up, and I

thought I should set the record straight.

This weekend, in an op-ed published in USA TODAY, the Democratic leader, HARRY REID, and SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, the Senator from Rhode Island, made the following statement:

Republicans in Congress who represent great corporations headquartered in their states ignore those corporations—Walmart in Arkansas, Coca-Cola in Georgia, VF Corporation in North Carolina—when they explain the business case for addressing climate change and are already reducing their own pollution.

Republicans in Congress who root boisterously for their state university sports teams ignore the warnings of scientists and researchers at those very universities on climate change.

Then last night on the floor of the Senate, in his 93rd speech on global warming, Senator WHITEHOUSE made the following statement and asked this rhetorical question: "I don't know whether Coca-Cola has ever spoken about climate change to Senator ISAKSON . . . from Coca-Cola's home State of Georgia." So I came to answer that rhetorical question and to answer the reference that was made in the editorial by Senator REID and Senator WHITEHOUSE.

This is a picture of me and Senator COONS in Ghana, Africa. It is 5 years old. At the request of the Coca-Cola Company, he and I traveled the continent of Africa looking at clean water projects all over that continent. African people who never had the opportunity to drink clean water now have sustainable clean water plants thanks to the Coca-Cola Company. These plants are environmentally safe, environmentally friendly, noncarbon-emitting water purification systems.

During the course of the years I have been in the U.S. Senate, the Coca-Cola Company has briefed me on the following things about their business as it deals with climate change or carbon.

They have saved 7 billion gallons of water in the United States with facility improvements in the United States. They have donated 70,000 ingredient drums for reuse as rain barrels, have supported over 100 watershed projects across North America, and have partnered with the National Forest Service to provide water to 60 million Americans.

On energy and climate, they have improved cooling equipment efficiency by 60 percent in their operation since the year 2000. They own the largest heavy-duty hybrid electric truck fleet in North America and have improved energy efficiency in manufacturing by 8 percent since 2008.

In packaging, over 96 percent of total waste is diverted away from landfills.

Since 2007, they have distributed 240,000 public recycling bins. They have achieved a 70 million-pound reduction in packaging material, and innovative packaging avoids 150,000 metric tons of

CO<sub>2</sub> emissions—150,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

As far as agriculture, they have invested over \$1 million to support sustainable agriculture in Georgia and across the United States. They have supported the planting of 25,000 acres of new orange groves in Florida and 4,100 new jobs in energy efficiency.

That is what the Coca-Cola Company has advised me of since I have been in the U.S. Senate in terms of their commitment to a clean environment for our world and country.

I believe the climate does change, but I don't believe climate change is a religion, I think it is science. I have done everything I can as a Senator to educate myself on the carbon and climate change issue. Seven years ago, I went with Senator BOXER from California to Disko Bay in Greenland with Dr. Ally, the leading glaciologist in the world, to study what he says about the possibility of carbon being the cause of climate change. There are mixed reviews and mixed scientific evidence on that.

I am the first person to say we should reduce our carbon footprint. It is good for the atmosphere and our health. Eight years ago, when I had just entered the U.S. Senate, I bought a hybrid vehicle. I still drive that hybrid Ford Escape today. I did so because I thought it was a good business and a good atmospheric decision. I didn't buy it because someone made me; I bought it because I cared. My wife and I recycle because we think it is a good idea.

There are lots of things we can do to reduce the footprint of carbon, but to infer in USA TODAY or in a speech that we are not cognizant of the things that are done by our corporations to reduce carbon emissions and reduce the danger to the environment is just wrong and it is just unfair.

Senator WHITEHOUSE wrote a great book, which I read, called "Virtues." It is about the great virtues of living a good and healthy life, and one of those virtues is truth. The truth is that all of us care about the environment; we just don't all subscribe to the same theory about what happens.

We should all be praising the good things that corporations are doing and recognize that it is not just Democrats and not just Republicans, but it is American politicians who make the policies that determine where we go in the future.

I think it is very important that we reduce carbon emissions, but I think it is important to be practical in those reductions. We can pass all the great regulations in the world that are good for the environment, but if they shut down the American economy and American business, they are probably not a very good idea.

The environment and business should work in harmony together rather than be adversaries and enemies. Publications like what appeared in USA



TODAY over the weekend or speeches like the one that was made last night don't do anything to foster harmony or a good commitment; instead, they raise controversy.

I love SHELDON WHITEHOUSE. He is a great U.S. Senator. I appreciate Leader REID and what he does. But I don't appreciate the references that were made about Coca-Cola or about me in the article they wrote over the weekend or the speech that was made last night.

In fact, as I thought about what I would do in terms of responding to what was said, I sat down last night and made an interesting observation. Monday of this week before I left Georgia to come up here, I met with the Southern Company, and one of the discussions that came up were the solar panels they put out in the Southwest to amend the grid out there with solar energy—something that is environmentally sound and doesn't emit carbon. They talked about Plant Vogtle, where they are adding three or four reactors, which is renewable energy and recyclable, and it emits no carbon and is now being generated in Georgia—reliable electricity with carbon-free generation through nuclear power.

Yesterday, I had a meeting with the UPS corporation, which just happens to be one of the leaders in the world using nonfossil fuel-burning waste to deliver their packages.

You can go down the list of corporate America and the things they are doing to reduce carbon emissions every single day, and they deserve the credit. But they don't need to be criticized or lectured by Members of the Senate for not lobbying me because they do lobby me. They believe, as I believe, that reducing carbon is good, but it shouldn't be a religion; it should be dealt with scientifically. It is important that we understand that every contribution we can make to a carbonless environment is a good contribution, but we can't abolish it absolutely. Every regulation we pass to improve our environment is important, but if it shuts down American business, it probably is not the right decision to make.

So since the question was asked rhetorically last night on the floor of the Senate, I thought I would come to the floor and answer it in person. I believe truth is a virtue. The truth is the Coca-Cola Company has informed me continuously about the efforts they have made to reduce carbon emissions and to improve their environmental contribution. There is no greater evidence of that than me drinking water that just came out of a purification plant in Ghana, Africa, out of a Coca-Cola cup. I think that is about the best evidence we can possibly find that they have delivered their message. They are doing their job. I am proud of the Coca Cola Company.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wanted to clarify something I said when I spoke about the work the Senate did on comprehensive immigration reform in relation to the Loretta Lynch nomination. I mentioned the Gang of 8, and I think I got seven of them right. I wish to clarify exactly who was a Member of the Gang of 8: Senator SCHUMER, Senator DURBIN, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator BENNET, Senator McCAIN, Senator FLAKE, Senator GRAHAM, and Senator RUBIO. That was the starting-off point for the comprehensive immigration reform that passed through the Senate.

I wish to get back to the matter at hand. As I stand in the Chamber today, I am going to keep reminding people of why we are really here, why the bill is on the floor—which is about sex trafficking—and the reason we want to try to resolve these issues and actually focus on the matter at hand and not on extraneous issues and other issues and other fights. My own Republican Congressman who carries my bill, the safe harbor bill—which of course is not the bill at issue but we hope will be the first amendment—has noted that we just need to move on and get these bills done and not play politics as usual. That is going to be my focus today as I manage this bill.

So I thought I would read on the floor a book that has been a national bestseller by Nicholas Kristof of the New York Times and his wife Sheryl WuDunn. It is a book about sex trafficking. It is an incredible book. It focuses more on international sex trafficking. As we know, our bills here—the one that is on the floor and the one I have authored—are about how our own country gets a handle on this, by getting better laws in place and creating incentives and working with the private sector and doing things so our country, I think from my perspective, internationally can be a true leader. We can't be a true leader and tell these states and democracies and countries that aren't even democracies across the world that they need to do a better job if we don't do a better job.

To me, this should be a major tenet of our foreign policy. Once we get women so that they are not treated as slaves and they are not treated as chattel—once we get them to that circumstance—countries always do better. When we have women who can work and own businesses, women who can serve in government, it changes a whole society.

So that is why the sex trafficking bill is on the floor and the one that I have that will be considered as an amendment. The reason we need to get through where we are right now and focus on the real issue at hand is that our country can not only help the victims in our own country, but by shining a light on this, by being a leader on this internationally, it will help us

internationally. We want to be able to work with other countries—not saying they are doing something bad when we have our own problem, but saying, Here is what we did and here is how we are handling this and we want to work with you as partners and we want to have women be treated with respect throughout the world.

So this book, as I said, focuses on international sex trafficking. It is called "Half the Sky." I love this name. It is a Chinese proverb. It talks about how women basically are holding up half the sky. That is what it is about. Women are holding up half the sky. We can't forget about half the sky and just let half the sky go and let them be sold into slavery and not be treated equally and expect a society to function.

So this is how the book starts out. It has a great quote from Mark Twain. I like jokes. Listen to this one: "What would men be without women? Scarce, sir, mighty scarce."

It is making the point again that women hold up half the sky.

So this is the book and how it starts:

Srey Rath is a self-confident Cambodian teenager whose black hair tumbles over a round, light brown face. She is in a crowded street market, standing beside a pushcart and telling her story calmly, with detachment. The only hint of anxiety or trauma is the way she often pushes her hair in front of her black eyes, perhaps a nervous tic. Then she lowers her hand and her long fingers gesture and flutter in the air with incongruous grace as she recounts her odyssey.

Rath is short and small-boned, pretty, vibrant, and bubbly, a wisp of a girl whose negligible stature contrasts with an outsized and outgoing personality. When the skies abruptly release a tropical rain shower that drenches us, she simply laughs and rushes us to cover under a tin roof, and then cheerfully continues her story as the rain drums overhead. But Rath's attractiveness and winning personality are perilous bounties for a rural Cambodian girl, and her trusting nature and optimistic self-assuredness compound the hazard.

When Rath was fifteen, her family ran out of money, so she decided to go work as a dishwasher in Thailand for two months to help pay the bills. Her parents fretted about her safety, but they were reassured when Rath arranged to travel with four friends who had been promised jobs in the same Thai restaurant. The job agent took the girls deep into Thailand and then handed them to gangsters who took them to Kuala Lumpur, the capital of Malaysia. Rath was dazzled by her first glimpses of the city's clean avenues and gleaming high-rises, including at the time the world's tallest twin buildings; it seemed safe and welcoming. But then thugs sequestered Rath and two other girls inside a karaoke lounge that operated as a brothel. One gangster in his late thirties, a man known as "the boss," took charge of the girls and explained that he had paid money for them and that they would now be obliged to repay him. "You must find money to pay off the debt, and then I will send you back home," he said, repeatedly reassuring them that if they cooperated they would eventually be released.

Rath was shattered when what was happening dawned on her. The boss locked her



up with a customer, who tried to force her to have sex with him. She fought back, enraging the customer. "So the boss got angry and hit me in the face, first with one hand and then with the other," she remembers, telling her story with simple resignation. "The mark stayed on my face for two weeks." Then the boss and the other gangsters raped her and beat her with their fists.

"You have to serve the customers," the boss told her as he punched her. "If not, we will beat you to death. Do you want that?" Rath stopped protesting, but she sobbed and refused to cooperate actively. The boss forced her to take a pill; the gangsters called it "the happy drug" or "the shake drug." She doesn't know exactly what it has, but it made her head shake and induced lethargy, happiness, and compliance for about an hour. When she wasn't drugged, Rath was teary and insufficiently compliant—she was required to beam happily at all customers—so the boss said he would waste no more time on her: She would agree to do as he ordered or he would kill her. Rath then gave in. The girls were forced to work in the brothel seven days a week, fifteen hours a day. They were kept naked to make it more difficult for them to run away or to keep tips or other money, and they were forbidden to ask customers to use condoms. They were battered until they smiled constantly and simulated joy at the sight of customers, because men would not pay as much for sex with girls with reddened eyes and haggard faces. The girls were never allowed out on the street or paid a penny for their work.

"They just gave us food to eat, but they didn't give us much because the customers didn't like fat girls," Rath says. The girls were bused, under guard, back and forth between the brothel and a tenth-floor apartment where a dozen of them were housed. The door of the apartment was locked from the outside. However, one night, some of the girls went out onto their balcony and pried loose a long, five-inch-wide board from a rack used for drying clothes. They balanced it precariously between their balcony and one on the next building, twelve feet away. The board wobbled badly, but Rath was desperate, so she sat astride the board and gradually inched across.

"There were four of us who did that," she says. "The others were too scared, because it was very rickety. I was scared, too, and I couldn't look down, but I was even more scared to stay. We thought that even if we died it would be better than staying behind. If we stayed we would die as well."

Once on the far balcony, the girls pounded on the window and woke the surprised tenant. They could hardly communicate with him because none of them spoke the language, but the tenant let them into his apartment and then out the front door. The girls took the elevator down and wandered the silent streets until they found a police station and walked inside. The police first tried to shoo them away, then arrested the girls for illegal immigration. Rath served a year in prison under Malaysia's tough anti-immigrant laws, and then she was supposed to be repatriated. She thought a Malaysian policeman was escorting her home when he drove her to the Thai border—but then he sold her to a trafficker, who peddled her to a Thai brothel.

So I say to my colleagues, this is what we are talking about. This story is in another country, but this same story is repeated in our country day in and day out. If we are going to try to lead in Cambodia and try to change the

world for these girls, we have to lead in our own country. Certainly we have to lead by focusing on the issue at hand, which is sex trafficking, and what we can do in our country. What can we do? Well, we can have better services for the victims. We can set up our law enforcement system in a way that works by not treating—for so long, these young 12-year-olds and 13-year-olds were thought of as criminals when, in fact, they are victims. How can we say someone is not raped, how can we say the story of this girl, who thought she was going to work to have a better life for herself as a dishwasher, then gets raped—how can we say that is not rape, that it is prostitution or a crime? No. She is a victim.

That is what the safe harbor bill—which I have introduced and which I am hopeful will be the first amendment once we work out these other issues—would do. It would treat these girls and boys as victims.

So I wish to remind my colleagues what we are truly dealing with. This is not supposed to be a fight over abortion. This is a fight about how to help these young girls throughout our country and by virtue of us being a leader throughout the world.

So I am going to continue reading from the book, just so we are all reminded what we are talking about.

Rath's saga offers a glimpse of the brutality inflicted routinely on women and girls in much of the world, a malignancy that is slowly gaining recognition as one of the paramount human rights problems of this century.

The issues involved, however, have barely registered on the global agenda. Indeed, when we began reporting about international affairs in the 1980s—

This is a book by Nicholas Kristof and his wife Sheryl, whose book, "Half the Sky," is a national best seller. The subhead is "Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide."

Again, why am I reading this? Because this is what we are supposed to be talking about here. This is a bill we are supposed to be getting done and not talking about extraneous issues that I think we should be able to resolve because they have been resolved in the past. To do that, we have to decide that these girls are important enough to do that.

Continuing on, they talked about how these issues have barely registered on the global agenda:

Indeed, when we began reporting about international affairs in the 1980s, we couldn't have imagined writing this book. We assumed that the foreign policy issues that properly furrowed the brow were lofty and complex, like nuclear nonproliferation. It was difficult back then to envision the Council on Foreign Relations fretting about maternal mortality or genital mutilation. Back then the oppression of women was a fringe issue, the kind of worthy cause the girl scouts might raise money for—

And I hope that is not how we are treating this in the Senate. I hope that

is not how we are treating it, and I hope we are not treating it as a political football.

We preferred to probe the recondite "serious issues."

So this book is the outgrowth—

The writers write—

of our own journey of awakening as we worked together as journalists for The New York Times. The first milestone in that journey came in China. Sheryl is a Chinese-American who grew up in New York City, and Nicholas is an Oregonian who grew up on a sheep and cherry farm near Yamhill, Oregon. After we married, we moved to China, where seven months later we found ourselves standing on the edge of Tiananmen Square watching troops fire their automatic weapons at prodemocracy protestors. The massacre claimed between four hundred and eight hundred lives and transfixed the world. It was the human rights story of the world. It was the human rights story of the year, and it seemed just about the most shocking violation imaginable.

Then the following year, we came across an obscure but meticulous demographic study that outlined a human rights violation that had claimed tens of thousands more lives. This study found that thirty-nine thousand baby girls die annually in China because parents don't give them the same medical care and attention that boys receive—and that is just in their first year of life. One Chinese family-planning official, Li Honggui, explained it this way: "If a boy gets sick, the parents may send him to the hospital at once. But if a girl gets sick, the parents may say to themselves, 'Well, let's see how she is tomorrow.'"

... A similar pattern emerged in other countries, particularly in South Asia and the Muslim world. In India, a "bride burning"—to punish a woman for an inadequate dowry or to eliminate her so a man can remarry—takes place approximately once every two hours, but these rarely constitute news.

In ... Pakistan, five thousand women and girls have been doused in kerosene and set alight by family members or in-laws—or, perhaps worse, been seared with acid—for perceived disobedience in the last nine years. Imagine the outcry if the Pakistani or Indian governments were burning women alive at those rates. Yet when the government is not directly involved, people shrug.

Again, how does this apply to the matter at hand? We know there are girls who are victims of trafficking who are put into slavery—sex slavery—every single day in this country. So if we think we can be a leader when it comes to what is going on around the world and we want to hold our Nation up, then we have to be a leader in this Chamber this week and get this bill done and get these extraneous issues behind us that people feel strongly about. But, as I said, somehow we have been able to handle these issues in the past on other bills, and I hope the girls we are talking about here are just as important as those other issues.

When a prominent dissident was arrested in China—

I go back to the book—

we would write a front-page article; when 100,000 girls were routinely kidnapped and trafficked into brothels, we didn't even consider it news. Partly that is because we journalists tend to be good at covering events

that happen on a particular day, but we slip at covering events that happen every day—such as the . . . cruelties inflicted on women and girls. We journalists weren't the only ones who dropped the ball on this subject. [A tiny portion] of U.S. foreign aid is specifically targeted to women and girls.

They then go on to quote a Nobel Prize-winning economist who has developed a way to look at gender inequality that is a striking reminder of the stakes involved.

"More than 100 million are missing," Sen wrote in a classic essay in 1990 in "The New York Review of Books," spurring a new field of research. Sen noted that in normal circumstances women live longer than men, and so there are more females than males in much of the world. Even poor regions like most of Latin America and much of Africa have more females than males. Yet in places where girls have a deeply unequal status, they vanish. China has 107 males for every 100 females in its overall population . . . India has 108, and Pakistan has 111.

I remember at the McCain Institute, where Cindy McCain and HEIDI HEITKAMP and I spoke on a panel, that Senator MCCAIN had just returned from a trip abroad and had been in a country that was experiencing enormous upheaval. He had asked: "Where are the girls?" And someone said to him: "Most of them have been sold." They had been sold. So this is really happening, and the people in this Chamber know it is happening. That is why, again, I get back to the fact that if we want to do something about it here, we need to resolve these issues, we need to do it without going into a blame game, and we need to get this done so we can pass this bill—and not have a dispute over abortion—that, in fact, helps the very girls we are supposed to help. Only then can we be a leader in the world.

I will go back to the book:

The worst of these abuses tend to occur in poor nations, but the United States and other western countries are not immune. In America, millions of women and girls face beatings or other violence from their husbands or boyfriends and more than one in six undergo rape or attempted rape at some point in her life, according to the National Violence Against Women survey. Then there is forced prostitution. Teenage runaways are beaten, threatened and branded (with tattoos) by pimps in American cities, and thousands of foreign women are trafficked into the United States as well. Still, in poor countries gender discrimination is often lethal in a way that is usually not in America. In India, for example, mothers are less likely to take their daughters to be vaccinated than their sons—that alone accounts for one fifth of India's missing females—while studies have found that, on average, girls are brought to the hospital only when they are sicker than boys taken to the hospital. All told, girls in India from 1 to 5 years of age are 50 percent more likely to die than boys the same age. The best estimate is that a little Indian girl dies from discrimination every four minutes.

A big, bearded Afghan . . . once told us that his wife and son were sick. He wanted both to survive, he said, but his priorities were clear: A son is an indispensable treas-

ure, while a wife is replaceable. He had purchased medication for the boy alone. "She is always sick," he gruffly said of his wife, "so it's not worth buying medicine for her."

Again, why is this relevant to the matter at hand? I think these young girls and women in our own country and across the world deserve to be treated seriously. They deserve not to be treated as a political football on extraneous issues this Chamber likes to debate.

This bill needs to be treated just as seriously—and my safe harbor bill—as any other bill. Somehow, the people in charge of these institutions have been able to work out the differences.

Modernization and technology can aggravate the discrimination. Since the 1990s, the spread of ultrasound machines has allowed pregnant women to find out the sex of their fetuses—and then get abortions if they are female.

Again, we are talking about China.

"We don't have to have daughters anymore!" someone said in China.

To prevent sex-selective abortion, China and India now bar doctors and ultrasound technicians from telling a pregnant woman the sex of her fetus. Yet that is a flawed solution.

According to the book:

Research shows that when parents are banned from selectively aborting female fetuses, more of their daughters die as infants. Mothers do not deliberately dispatch infant girls they are obligated to give birth to, but they are lackadaisical about caring for them. A development economist at Brown University . . . quantified the wrenching trade-off: On average, the deaths of fifteen infant girls can be avoided by allowing 100 female fetuses to [die].

This is what is going on around the world right now.

The global statistics on the abuse of girls are numbing. It appears that more girls have been killed in the last fifty years, precisely because they were girls, than men were killed in all the battles of the twentieth century. More girls are killed in this routine "gendercide" in any one decade than people were slaughtered in all the genocides of the twentieth century. In the nineteenth century, the central moral challenge was slavery. In the twentieth century, it was the battle against totalitarianism. We believe that in this century the paramount moral challenge will be the struggle for gender equality around the world.

That will be the struggle to help these girls.

Maybe this is the battle we are having right now. Maybe this institution has to come up to speed. We have 20 Senators who are women. Twenty percent of the Senate are women. That is pretty good. It is the best we have ever gotten. But when you look at the numbers, the numbers aren't frequent when you look back through history. Maybe that is what we are going to have to do to have people take these bills seriously and not play king of the hill with a bill as serious as this one.

I will continue to read "Half the Sky" by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn.

The owners of the Thai brothel to which Rath was sold did not beat her and did not constantly guard her. So two months later, she was able to escape and make her way back to Cambodia.

Upon her return, Rath met a social worker who put her in touch with an aid group that helps girls who have been trafficked start new lives. The group, American Assistance for Cambodia, used \$400 in donated funds to buy a small cart and a starter selection of goods so that Rath could become a street peddler. She found a good spot in the open area between the Thai and Cambodian customs offices. . . . Travelers crossing between Thailand and Cambodia walk along this strip, the size of a football field, and it is lined with peddlers selling drinks, snacks and souvenirs.

Rath outfitted her cart with shirts and hats, costume jewelry, notebooks, pens and small toys. Now her good looks and outgoing personality began to work in her favor, turning her into an effective saleswoman. She saved and invested in new merchandise, her business thrived, and she was able to support her parents and two younger sisters. She married and had a son, and she began saving for his education.

In 2008, Rath turned her cart into a stall, and then also acquired the stall next door. She also started a "public phone" business by charging people to use her cell phone. So if you ever cross from Thailand into Cambodia at Poipet, look for a shop on your left, halfway down the strip, where a teenage girl will call out to you, smile, and try to sell you a souvenir cap. She'll laugh and claim she's giving you a special price, and she's so bubbly and appealing she'll probably make the sale.

Rath's eventual triumph—

If you remember from the first part of the book that I read, she was sold into slavery when she simply thought she was going to work as a dishwasher; she was sold into sex and repeatedly raped—

is a reminder that if girls get a chance, in the form of an education or a microloan, they can be more than baubles or slaves; many of them can run businesses. Talk to Rath today—after you've purchased that cap—and you'll find that she exudes confidence as she earns a solid income that will provide a better future for her sisters and for her young son.

Many of the stories in this book are wrenching, but keep in mind this central truth: Women aren't the problem but the solution. The plight of girls is no more a tragedy than an opportunity.

I will repeat that:

Women aren't the problem but the solution. The plight of girls is no more a tragedy than an opportunity.

That was a lesson we absorbed in Sheryl's ancestral village, at the end of a dirt road amid the rice paddies of southern China. For many years we have regularly trod the mud paths of the Taishan region to . . . the hamlet in which Sheryl's paternal grandfather grew up. China traditionally has been one of the most oppressive and smothering places for girls, and we could see hints of this in Sheryl's own family history. Indeed, on our first visit, we accidentally uncovered a family secret: a long-lost stepgrandmother. Sheryl's grandfather had traveled to America with his first wife, but she had given birth only to daughters. So Sheryl's grandfather gave up on her and returned her to Shunshui, where he married a younger

woman as a second wife and took her to America. This was Sheryl's grandmother, who duly gave birth to a son—Sheryl's dad. The previous wife and daughters were then wiped out of the family memory.

Something bothered us each time we explored [the town] and the surrounding villages: Where were the young women?

This is, by the way, what Senator MCCAIN said when he returned from a country that was repressed.

Young men were toiling industriously in the paddies or fanning themselves in the shade, but young women and girls were scarce. We finally discovered them and we stopped in the factories that were then spreading throughout the [Guangdong] Province, the epicenter of China's economic eruption. These factories produced the shoes, toys, and shirts that filled America's shopping malls, generating economic growth rates almost unprecedented in the history of the world—and creating the most effective antipoverty program ever recorded. The factories turned out to be cacophonous hives of distaff bees.

Eighty percent of the employees on the assembly lines in coastal China are female, and the proportion across the manufacturing belt of East Asia is at least 70 percent. The economic explosion in Asia was, in large part, an outgrowth of the economic empowerment of women. "They have small fingers, so they're better at stitching," the manager of a purse factory explained to us. "They're obedient and work harder than men," said the head of a toy factory. "And we can pay them less." Women are indeed the linchpin of the region's development strategy.

Economists who scrutinized East Asia's success noted a common pattern. These countries took young women who previously had contributed negligibly to the gross national product and injected them into the formal economy, hugely increasing the labor force. The basic formula was to ease repression, educate girls as well as boys, give the girls the freedom to move to the cities and take factory jobs, and then benefit from a demographic dividend as they delayed marriage and reduced childbearing. The women meanwhile financed the education of younger relatives, and saved enough of their pay to boost national savings rates. This pattern has been "the girl effect." In a nod to the female chromosomes, it could also be called "the double X solution."

Evidence has mounted that helping women can be a successful poverty-fighting strategy anywhere in the world, not just in the booming economies of East Asia. The Self Employed Women's Association was founded in India in 1972 and ever since has supported the poorest women in starting businesses—raising living standards in ways that have dazzled scholars and foundations. In Bangladesh, Muhammad Yunus developed microfinance at the Grameen Bank and targeted women borrowers—eventually winning a Nobel Peace Prize for the economic and social impact of his work.

I would note here—just a little aside, as I am reading through Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn's book, to make everyone in this Chamber remember why we are here. We are here to help girls, not just in the United States, but in the world. We are here to hold up "Half the Sky." We are here to show that this Chamber, at its best, can actually help the people we are supposed to help, the most vulnerable

in our society, instead of debating extraneous issues that we are unable to resolve on this bill but that we seem able to resolve on other bills that just must be more important than the girls and the women of this world. That is all I can figure out.

But I would like to note, as I read about one of their suggestions for things that help girls and women around the world, this idea of microcredit. My dad, who is kind of an adventurer and goes around the world, actually wrote a book on microcredit called "The Miracles of Barefoot Capitalism"—in case he is watching on C-Span, I thought he would like that note—with his wife Susan Wilkes. They are big believers in helping women around the world with microcredit.

So then they go on in the book to talk about helping people through microcredit.

In the early 1990s, the United Nations and the World Bank began to appreciate the potential resource that women and girls represent. Investment in girls' education may well be the highest return investment available in the developing world.

I think it is something that we need to remember in the United States as we look at the low numbers of girls that go into science and technology and head up companies, because for some reason they do not have the confidence to go into those fields or they are not encouraged to go into those fields. If we in the Senate cannot even say they should not be trafficked and we cannot do anything to help them, I do not think we are helping that cause very much.

Larry Summers wrote, when he was the chief economist of the World Bank: "The question is not whether countries can afford this investment, but whether countries can afford not to educate more girls."

In 2001, the World Bank produced an influential study, *Engendering Development Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources, and Voice*, arguing that promoting gender equality is crucial to combat global poverty. UNICEF issued a major report arguing that gender equality yields a "double dividend" by elevating not only women but also their children and communities. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) summed up the mounting research this way: "Women's empowerment helps raise economic productivity and reduce infant mortality. It contributes to improved health and nutrition. It increases the chances of education for the next generation."

More and more, the most influential scholars of development and public health—including Sen and Summers, Joseph Stiglitz, Jeffrey Sachs, and Dr. Paul Farmer—are calling for much greater attention to women and development.

Private aid groups and foundations have shifted gears as well. "Women are the key to ending hunger in Africa," declared the Hunger Project. French foreign minister Bernard Kouchner, who founded Doctors Without Borders, bluntly declared of development: "Progress is achieved through women." The

Center for Global Development issued a major report explaining "why and how to put girls at the center of development." CARE is taking women and girls as the centerpiece of its antipoverty efforts. The Nike Foundation and the NoVo Foundation are both focusing on building opportunities for girls in the developing world. "Gender inequality hurts economic growth," Goldman Sachs concluded in a 2008 research report that emphasized how much developing countries could improve their economic performance by educating girls. Partly as a result of that research, Goldman Sachs committed \$100 million to a "10,000Women" campaign meant to give that many women a business education.

I think this is actually a really good book. I just plan to keep reading it whenever I can over the next few days until we get a resolution to this problem.

I am going to take a look at how many pages it is. Well, if you include the notes, it is 296 pages. I will obviously take breaks when our colleagues come down here. But I do think it is really important that we keep the pressure on, that the women and girls of this country demand that this get resolved, because as I said, we have somehow been able to resolve it on other bills. I think this bill and the bill that I have, the safe harbor bill, are just as important. I think our colleagues, in my discussions with them, know several ways we could resolve this problem, including just eliminating this extraneous provision. But there might be other ways as well. We know what they are. I hope they keep working on them.

Concerns about terrorism after the 9/11 attacks triggered interest in these issues as an unlikely constituency: the military and counterterrorism agencies. Some security experts noted that the countries that nurture terrorists are disproportionately those where women are marginalized. The reason that there are so many Muslim terrorists, they argued, has little to do with the Koran but a great deal to do with the lack of robust female participation in the economy and society of many Islamic countries. As the Pentagon gained a deeper understanding of counterterrorism . . . it became increasingly interested in grassroots projects such as girls' education. Empowering girls, some in the military argued, would disempower terrorists. When the Joint Chiefs of Staff hold discussions of girls' education in Pakistan and Afghanistan . . . you know that gender is a serious topic on the international affairs agenda. That's evident also in the Council on Foreign Relations. The wood-paneled halls that have been used for discussions of MIRV warheads . . . are now employed as well to host well-attended sessions on maternal mortality.

This is now Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn speaking in their book, which has been a national best seller, "Half the Sky." It is about sex trafficking and how important it is to take this issue on—not just in our own country but the world.

We will try to lay out an agenda for the world's women focusing on three particular abuses: sex trafficking and forced prostitution; gender-based violence, including honor killings and mass rape; and maternal mortality, which still needlessly claims one

woman a minute. We will lay out solutions such as girls' education and microfinance, which are working right now.

While the most urgent needs are in the developing world, wealthy countries also need to clear up their own neighborhoods. If we are to lead the way we must show greater resolution in cracking down on domestic violence and sex trafficking in our own neighborhoods, rather than just sputter about abuses far away.

It is true that there are many injustices in the world, many worthy causes competing for attention and support, and we all have divided allegiances.

This sounds kind of like us, right? There are a lot of different topics and things that we have to take on, and there are many worthy causes that are calling for our attention and support. We all have divided allegiances. I think that is kind of what is going on in this Chamber. But why do we need to focus on this? Well, I will go back to the book.

We focus on this topic because, to us, this kind of oppression feels transcendent—and so does the opportunity. We have seen that outsiders can truly make a significant difference.

Consider Rath once more.

Now, remember, this was the girl that was sold into sex trafficking in Malaysia.

We had been so shaken by her story that we wanted to locate that brothel in Malaysia, interview its owners, and try to free the girls still imprisoned there. Unfortunately, we could not determine the brothel's name or address. (Rath didn't know English or even the Roman alphabet, so she hadn't been able to read signs when she was there.) When we asked her if she would be willing to return to Kuala Lumpur and help us find the brothel, she turned ashen. "I don't know," she said. "I don't want to face that again." She wavered, talked it over with her family, and ultimately agreed to go back in the hope of rescuing her girlfriends.

Rath voyaged back to Kuala Lumpur with the protection of an interpreter and a local antitrafficking activist. Nonetheless, she trembled in the red light district upon seeing the cheerful neon signs that she associated with so much pain. But since her escape, Malaysia has been embarrassed by public criticism about trafficking, so the police had cracked down on the worst brothels that imprisoned girls against their will. One of those was Rath's. A modest amount of international scolding had led a government to take action, resulting in an observable improvement in the lives of girls at the bottom of the power pyramid. The outcome underscores that this is a hopeful cause, not a bleak one.

Honor killings, sexual slavery, and genital cutting may seem to Western readers to be tragic but inevitable in a world far, far away. In much the same way, slavery was once widely viewed by many decent Europeans and Americans as a regrettable but ineluctable feature of human life. It was just one more horror that has existed for thousands of years. But then in the 1780s a few indignant Britons, led by William Wilberforce, decided that slavery was so offensive that they had to abolish it. And they did. Today, we see the seed of something similar, a global movement to emancipate women and girls.

By the way, later in the book—since I have read it already, but now I will be

able to read it again—they talk about how, in fact, it was the evidence of that brutality of the slavery, of the stench of the people who were slaves who were in the bottom of that ship that really drove action. Yes, the activists and William Wilberforce understandably get a lot of the attention and well-deserved credit for what happened, but it was the evidence that led to Britain, the people and their society, long before many other countries had even thought about abolishing slavery—it was the evidence of the brutality that led them to make a change.

That is one of the things that we need to talk about and why I am talking about this here today. We have to get back on what really matters here, such as the story of the 12-year-old girl in Rochester, MN—a 12-year-old girl who just got a text message and went to a McDonald's parking lot and was shoved into a car and then brought to the Twin Cities and then raped. Then her pictures were taken—sexually explicit pictures—and put on Craigslist. Then she was sold the next day and raped by two men.

That is what this is really about. It is not about these extraneous fights and what has been going on, dragging this Chamber down, and even stopping us from confirming a well-qualified person for the Attorney General of the United States. That is what they are talking about here. It is the evidence that the American people see. They start demanding change. I hope that is happening today.

So let's be clear about this up front. We hope to recruit you to join—

These are the authors.

—an incipient movement to emancipate women and fight global poverty by unlocking women's power as economic catalysts. That is the process underway—not a drama of victimization but of empowerment, the kind that transforms bubbly teenage girls from brothel slaves into successful businesswomen.

This is a story of transformation. It has change that is already taking place, and change that can accelerate if you will just open your heart and join in.

I think we need some opening of hearts here in the Chamber. I am going to take one break to talk to our staff, and then I will be back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am reading the book "Half the Sky," by Nicholas D. Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn. I think it is a beautiful book. It is on sex trafficking around the world and what has been happening

around the world. A part of this is that I think we need to make the point that we can lead in our country when it comes to sex trafficking.

We have Senator CORNYN's bill, and we know there is an issue with one of the provisions that needs to be resolved—and I don't think it is a provision that is related to this topic—but we are hopeful people of good will can come together and resolve this issue. The easiest way would be to take it out. We can have other discussions. Somehow, through history, the Senate has been able to come together and take care of this issue with the Hyde amendment and other bills.

I think the point I am trying to make today is this bill is just as important as those bills and that these girls who are victims of sex trafficking are just as important as anyone else in this country.

I am going to continue reading this book. I am hopeful—as I mentioned, it is very long, and I will obviously pause for my colleagues who come to the floor, but I am going to continue reading it until we get this resolved.

We are now on chapter 1, "Emancipating Twenty-First-Century Slaves." The quote on this is actually from Christopher Buckley, one of my favorite authors, from "Florence of Arabia," from the beginning of the chapter: "Women might just have something to contribute to civilization other than their vaginas."

That might not have been said on this floor that many times, but he is a humorous writer. Now, let's go on with the book:

The red-light district in the town of Forbesgunge does not actually have any red lights. Indeed, there is no electricity. The brothels are simply mud-walled family compounds along a dirt path, with thatch-roof shacks set aside for customers.

Children play and scurry along the dirt paths, and a one-room shop on the corner sells cooking oil, rice, and bits of candy. Here, in the impoverished northern Indian state of Bihar near the Nepalese border, there's not much else available commercially—except sex.

As Meena Hasina walks down the path, the children pause and stare at her. The adults stop as well, some glowering and the tension rises. Meena is a lovely, dark-skinned Indian woman in her thirties with warm, crinkly eyes and a stud in her left nostril. She wears a sari and ties her black hair back, and she seems utterly relaxed as she strolls among people who despise her.

Meena is an Indian Muslim who for years was prostituted in a brothel run by the Nutt, a low-caste tribe that controls the local sex trade. The Nutt have traditionally engaged in prostitution and petty crime, and theirs is the world of intergenerational prostitution, in which mothers sell sex and raise their daughters to do the same.

Meena strolls through the brothels to a larger hut that functions as a part-time school, sits down, and makes herself comfortable. Behind her, the villagers gradually resume their activities.

"I was eight or nine years old when I was kidnapped and trafficked," Meena begins.

She is from a poor family on the Nepal border and was sold to a Nutt clan, then taken to a rural house where the brothel owner kept prepubescent girls until they were mature enough to attract customers. When she was twelve—she remembers that it was five months before her first period—she was taken to the brothel.

"They brought in the first client, and they'd taken lots of money from him," Meena recounted, speaking clinically and without emotion. The induction was similar to that endured by Rath in Malaysia, for sex trafficking operates on the same business model worldwide, and the same methods are used to break girls everywhere. "I started fighting and crying out, so that he couldn't succeed," Meena said. "I resisted so much that they had to return the money to him. And they beat me mercilessly, with a belt, with sticks, with iron rods. The beating was tremendous." She shook her head to clear the memory. "But even then I resisted. They showed me swords and said they would kill me if I didn't agree. Four or five times, they brought customers in, and I still resisted, and they kept beating me. Finally they drugged me: They gave me wine in my drink and got me completely drunk." Then one of the brothel owners raped her. She awoke, hungover and hurting, and realized what had happened. "Now I am wasted," she thought, and so she gave in and stopped fighting customers.

In Meena's brothel, the tyrant was a family matriarch, Ainul Bibi. Sometimes Ainul would beat the girls herself, and sometimes she would delegate the task to her daughter-in-law or her sons, who were brutal in inflicting punishment.

"I wasn't even allowed to cry," Meena remembers. "If even one tear fell, they would beat me. I used to think that it was better to die than to live like this. Once I jumped from the balcony, but nothing happened. I didn't even break a leg."

Meena and the others girls were never allowed out of the brothel and were never paid. They typically had ten or more customers a day, seven days a week. If a girl fell asleep or complained about a stomachache, the issue was resolved with a beating. And when a girl showed any hint of resistance, all the girls would be summoned to watch as the recalcitrant one was tied up and savagely beaten.

"They turned the stereo up loud to cover the screams," Meena said dryly.

India almost certainly has more modern slaves, in conditions like these, than any other country. There are 2 to 3 million prostitutes in India, and although many of them now sell sex to some degree willingly, and are paid, a significant share of them entered the sex industry unwillingly. One 2008 study of Indian brothels found that of Indian and Nepali prostitutes who started as teenagers, about half said they had been coerced into the brothels; women who began working in their twenties were more likely to have made the choice themselves, often to feed their children. Those who start out enslaved often accept their fate eventually and sell sex willingly, because they know nothing else and are too stigmatized to hold other jobs.

China has more prostitutes than India—some estimates are as high as 10 million or more—but fewer of them are forced into brothels against their will. Indeed, China has few brothels as such. Many of the prostitutes are freelancers working as ding-dong xiaojie (so called because they ring hotel rooms looking for business), and even those working in massage parlors and saunas are typi-

cally there on commission and can leave if they want to.

Paradoxically, it is the countries with the most straightlaced and sexually conservative societies, such as India, Pakistan, and Iran, that have disproportionately large numbers of forced prostitutes. Since young men in those societies rarely sleep with their girlfriends, it has become acceptable for them to relieve their sexual frustrations with prostitutes.

The implicit social contract is that upper-class girls will keep their virtue, while young men will find satisfaction in the brothels. And the brothels will be staffed with slave girls trafficked from Nepal or Bangladesh or poor Indian villages. As long as the girls are uneducated, low-caste peasants like Meena, society will look the other way—just as many antebellum Americans turned away from the horrors of slavery because the people being lashed looked different from them.

In Meena's brothel, no one used condoms. Meena is healthy for now, but she has never had an AIDS test. (While HIV prevalence is low in India, prostitutes are at particular risk because of their large number of customers.) Because Meena didn't use condoms, she became pregnant, and this filled her with despair.

"I used to think that I never wanted to be a mother, because my life had been wasted, and I didn't want to waste another life," Meena said. But Ainul's brothel, like many in India, welcomed the pregnancy as a chance to breed a new generation of victims. Girls are raised to be prostitutes, and boys become servants to do the laundry and cooking.

In the brothel, without medical help, Meena gave birth to a baby girl, whom she named Naina. But soon afterward, Ainul took the baby away from Meena, partly to stop her from breast-feeding—customers dislike prostitutes who are lactating—and partly to keep the baby as a hostage to ensure that Meena would not try to flee.

"We will not let Naina stay with you," Ainul told her. "You are a prostitute, and you have no honor. So you might run away." Later a son, Vivek, followed, and the owners also took him away. So both of Meena's children were raised by others in the brothel, mostly in sections of the compound where she was not allowed to go.

"They held my children captive, so they thought I would never try to escape," she said. To some degree, this strategy worked. Meena once helped thirteen of the girls escape, but didn't flee herself because she couldn't bear to leave her children. The penalty for staying behind was a brutal beating for complicity in the escape.

Ainul had herself been a prostitute when she was young, so she was unsympathetic to the younger girls. "If my own daughters can be prostituted, then you can be, too," Ainul would tell the girls. And it was true that she had prostituted her own two daughters. ("They had to be beaten up to agree to it," Meena explained. "No one wants to go into this.")

That is a good place to stop and talk a little about what we are doing on the floor. No one wants to go into this. That is what these bills are about. These bills are about having a victims fund. These bills are about creating a safe harbor so we don't treat these young victims as criminals, like we have in Minnesota with the safe harbor law. And it is about trying to get something done.

We know an extraneous provision is on this bill and that we need to resolve this one way or another. As I have noted, we have been able to resolve this in the past, and I welcome my colleagues to come and speak about this issue. I hope this blame game is behind us, and that we won't be making accusations but instead we will actually work on getting this bill done. Because lost in all of this is the fact this isn't just some game people can play. These are actual young girls.

As I said, why is this international prostitution relevant to what we are talking about? It is relevant because our country can actually become a leader in this area. We can be a leader. We can actually do something in America to show we are taking this on. Our bill, the safe harbor bill I am leading, which we hope will be the first amendment to this bill, sets up a national sex trafficking strategy. We don't have one right now.

As a former prosecutor, I know when we work between Federal and State and local authorities, and we take on these cases and do it in a smart way, we actually are able to get things done. We did it with the Violence Against Women Act, when everyone thought that was just a situation where you can beat your wife and no one is going to notice. It happened behind closed doors. But we took it on as a country and we changed things and changed things for women in this country. Now we can do this with prostitution.

We can no longer see this as a victimless crime. There is a victim. The victim is 12 years old. She is someone in your State right now. So that is why these bills are so serious and why we need to continue to get them done. I am going to keep talking about this issue because I think at some point we have to realize why we are here and what we are talking about, instead of using it as a political football.

So the story goes on:

Meena estimates that in the dozen years she was in the brothel, she was beaten on average five days a week. Most girls were quickly broken and cowed, but Meena never quite gave in. Her distinguishing characteristic is obstinacy. She can be dogged and mulish, and that is one reason the villagers find her so unpleasant. She breaches the pattern of femininity in rural India by talking back—and fighting back.

The police seemed unlikely saviors to girls in the brothels because police officers regularly visited the brothels and were serviced free. But Meena was so desperate that she once slipped out and went to the police station to demand help.

"I was forced into prostitution by a brothel in town," Meena told the astonished officer at the police station. "The pimps beat me up, and they're holding my children hostage." Other policemen came out to see this unusual sight, and they mocked her and told her to go back.

"You have great audacity to come here!" one policeman scolded her. In the end, the police sent her back after extracting a promise from the brothel not to beat her. The

brothel owners did not immediately punish her. But a friendly neighbor warned Meena that the brothel owners had decided to murder her. That doesn't happen often in red-light districts, any more than farmers kill producing assets such as good milk cows, but from time to time a prostitute becomes so nettlesome that the owners kill her as a warning to the other girls.

Fearing for her life, Meena abandoned her children and fled the brothel. She traveled several hours by train to Forbesgunge. Someone there told one of Ainul's sons, Manooj, of her whereabouts, and he soon arrived to beat up Meena. Manooj didn't want her causing trouble in his brothel again, so he told her that she could live on her own in Forbesgunge and prostitute herself, but she would have to give him the money. Not knowing how she could survive otherwise, Meena agreed.

Whenever Manooj returned to Forbesgunge to collect money, he was dissatisfied with the amount Meena gave him and beat her. Once Manooj threw Meena to the ground and was beating her furiously with a belt when a respectful local man intervened.

"You're already pimping her, you're already taking her lifeblood," remonstrated her saviour, a pharmacist named Kuduz. "Why beat her to death as well?"

It wasn't the same as leaping on Manooj to pull him off, but for a woman like Meena, who was scorned by society, it was startling to have anyone speak up for her.

To have anyone speak up for her. That is what I hope we are going to be doing in this Chamber in the next few days, that we are going to speak up for these victims and show that we want to actually get something done and that they have value outside of being a political football.

Manooj backed off, and Kuduz helped her up. Meena and Kuduz lived near each other in Forbesgunge, and the incident created a bond between them. Soon Kuduz and Meena were chatting regularly, and then he offered to marry her. Thrilled, she accepted.

Manooj was furious when he heard about the marriage, and he offered Kuduz 100,000 rupees (\$2,500) to give Meena up—a sum that perhaps reflected his concern that she might use her new respectability as a married woman to cause trouble for the brothel. Kuduz wasn't interested in a deal.

"Even if you offered me two hundred fifty thousand rupees, I will not give her up," Kuduz said. "Love has no price."

After they were married, Meena bore two daughters with Kuduz, and she went back to her native village to look for her parents. Her mother had died—neighbors said she had cried constantly after Meena disappeared, then had gone mad—but her father was stunned and thrilled to see his daughter resurrected.

Life was clearly better, but Meena couldn't forget her first two children left behind in the brothel. So she began making journeys back—five hours by bus—to Ainul Bibi's brothel. There she would stand outside and plead for Naina and Vivek.

"As many times as I could, I would go back to fight for my children," she remembered. "I knew they would not let me take my children. I knew they would beat me up. But I thought I had to keep trying."

It didn't work. Ainul and Manooj didn't let Meena in the brothel; they whipped her and drove her away. The police wouldn't listen to her. The brothel owners not only threatened to kill her, they also threatened to kidnap

her two young daughters with Kuduz and sell them to a brothel. Once a couple of gangsters showed up at Meena's house in Forbesgunge to steal the two little girls, but Kuduz grabbed a knife and warned: "If you even try to steal them, I'll cut you into pieces."

Meena was terrified for her two younger girls, but she couldn't forget Naina. She knew that Naina was approaching puberty and would soon be on the market. But what could she do?

So these stories are pretty raw, and they are stories we usually don't tell on the floor of the United States Senate. But I think we need to, because maybe it is the only way people will remember why we are here and what we are supposed to be doing right now, which is to get these bills done and then hopefully confirm an Attorney General of the United States, which is something else we need to do that seems completely unrelated to these sex trafficking stories of these girls, except for one reason, and that is that we would want to have an attorney general in place so they can enforce the law.

Some of these cases are actually Federal, such as the one we had in Minnesota involving the little girl from Rochester, or the case in Senator HEITKAMP's State of North Dakota involving the incident of a sex trafficking ring in the oil patch. This is going on right now in this country. So what could an Attorney General do? I would ask: What can we do? What we can do is to get this bill done.

Again, I welcome my colleagues to come and talk about this issue, but I hope when they talk about it we will actually focus on the matter at hand—not blame anyone anymore, not talk about the things we disagree on but what we agree on. And then, hopefully, that will lead to the discussions I know are going on to resolve this bill because we can get this resolved.

Continuing to read, this is the writers talking now:

Interviewing women like Meena over the years has led us to change our own views on sex trafficking. Growing up in the United States and then living in China and Japan, we thought of prostitution as something women may turn to opportunistically or out of economic desperation. In Hong Kong, we knew an Australian prostitute who slipped Sheryl into the locker room of her "men's club" to meet the local girls, who were there because they saw a chance to enrich themselves. We certainly didn't think of prostitutes as slaves, forced to do what they do, for most prostitutes in America, China, and Japan aren't truly enslaved.

Yet it's hyperbole to say that millions of women and girls are actually enslaved today. (The biggest difference from nineteenth-century slavery is that many die of AIDS by their late twenties.) The term that is usually used for this phenomenon, "sex trafficking," is a misnomer. The problem isn't sex, nor is it prostitution as such. In many countries—China, Brazil, and most of sub-Saharan Africa—prostitution is widespread but mostly voluntary (in the sense it is driven by economic pressure rather than physical compulsion). In those places, brothels do not lock

up women, and many women work on their own without pimps or brothels. Nor is the problem exactly "trafficking" since forced prostitution doesn't always depend on a girl's being transported over a great distance by a middleman.

The story I told, by the way, of the girl in Rochester, she just went about an hour-and-a-half drive. So this idea the trafficking is just about going from one nation to another or being in the hold of a boat or something like that is not necessarily always the case. So we use the words sex trafficking because people have to understand this is more than just one pimp and one prostitute, that these are usually rings and these girls are usually brought someplace where they do not want to be. But it doesn't necessarily mean they are brought long distances.

So when we talk about the bills on the floor, let's remember that, and I think this is a good reminder from this book.

And, by the way, if I ever mispronounce names or words, my apology to the authors Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn. I have to say it is kind of small print, and I am trying my best. I know the Presiding Officer has a good command of English and will help me out or correct me if I make a mistake.

The horror of sex trafficking can more properly be labeled slavery.

The total number of modern slaves is difficult to estimate. The International Labour Organization, a UN agency, estimates that at any one time there are 12.3 million people engaged in forced labor of all kinds, not just sexual servitude. A UN report estimated that 1 million children in Asia alone are held in conditions indistinguishable from slavery. The Lancet, a prominent medical journal in Britain, calculated that "1 million children are forced into prostitution every year and the total number of prostituted children could be as high as 10 million."

Antitrafficking campaigners tend to use higher numbers, such as 27 million modern slaves. That figure originated in research by Kevin Bales, who runs a fine organization called Free the Slaves. Numbers are difficult to calculate in part because sex workers can't be divided neatly into categories of those working voluntarily and those working involuntarily. Some commentators look at prostitutes and see only sex slaves; others see only entrepreneurs. But in reality there are some in each category and many other women who inhabit a gray zone between freedom and slavery.

I will note this number—I have always tried to get the right number of how many victims we are talking about—but as I noted at the beginning of my remarks this morning, the 27 million modern slaves includes victims of not just sex trafficking but also labor trafficking.

Back to the book.

An essential part of the brothel business model is to break the spirit of girls through humiliation, rape, threats and violence. We met a 15-year-old Thai girl whose initiation consisted of being forced to eat dog droppings so as to shatter her self-esteem. Once a girl is broken and terrified, all hope of escape squeezed out of her, force may no longer



be necessary to control her. She may smile and laugh at passersby, and try to grab them and tug them into the brothel. Many a foreigner would assume that she is there voluntarily, but in that situation complying with the will of the brothel owner does not signify consent.

Our own estimate is that there are 3 million women and girls (and a very small number of boys) worldwide who can be fairly termed enslaved in the sex trade. That is a conservative estimate that does not include many others who are manipulated and intimidated into prostitution. Nor does it include millions more who are under eighteen and cannot meaningfully consent to work in brothels. We are talking about 3 million people who in effect are the property of another person and in many cases could be killed by their owner with impunity.

Technically, trafficking is often defined as taking someone (by force or deception) across an international border. The U.S. State Department has estimated that between 600,000 and 800,000 people are trafficked across international borders each year, 80 percent of them women and girls, mostly for sexual exploitation. Since Meena didn't cross a border, she wasn't trafficked in the traditional sense. That's also true of most people who are enslaved in brothels. As the U.S. State Department notes, its estimate doesn't include "millions of victims around the world who are trafficked within their own national borders."

The bills that we have—the one before us and my bill, the safe harbor bill, which we would like to see as the first amendment, which passed the Judiciary Committee with 20 votes on a bipartisan basis—these bills are focused on sex trafficking within our own borders, although some of the victims will be brought in from other countries. This book, "Half the Sky," is so good because it really is about what is going on all around the world and all these victims around the world. Every country has their own problems. Despite all of the political machinations and extraneous provisions and other things, what we are trying to get done today is to do something real to help the victims of sex trafficking through the fund Senator CORNYN has in his bill and then in my safe harbor bill, which is also a strong bipartisan bill, to make it clear there is a good model we can use across the country that has been used in 15 States and others, and one dozen more are working on them, where Minnesota has been one of the States leading the way to view these girls as victims and not as criminals, when the average age is 12 years old, not even old enough to go to a high school prom, not even old enough to drive the car.

Again, I welcome my colleagues to come down and talk about this issue. I am just going to keep filling in reading this book when no one is on the floor. I only hope that when we talk about this bill and this issue, we do it with some respect for the victims of these crimes and the respect they deserve.

Technically, trafficking is often defined as taking someone (by force or deception) across an international border. The U.S.

State Department has estimated that between 600,000 and 800,000 people are trafficked across international borders each year, 80 percent of them women and girls, mostly for sexual exploitation. Since Meena didn't cross a border, she wasn't trafficked in the traditional sense. That's also true of most people who are enslaved in brothels. As the U.S. State Department notes, its estimate doesn't include "millions of victims around the world who are trafficked within their own national borders."

Again, as I have noted, 83 percent of the victims in the United States are from the United States, and I don't think that is what we think of when we first think about sex trafficking, but those are facts.

In contrast, in the peak decade of the transatlantic slave trade, the 1780s, an average of just under eighty thousand slaves were shipped annually across the Atlantic from Africa to the New World. The average then dropped to a bit more than fifty thousand between 1811 and 1850. In other words, far more women and girls are shipped into brothels each year in the early twenty-first century than African slaves were shipped into slave plantations each year in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries—although the overall population was of course far smaller then. As the journal *Foreign Affairs* observed: "Whatever the exact number is, it seems almost certain that the modern global slave trade is larger in absolute terms than the Atlantic slave trade in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was."

As on slave plantations two centuries ago, there are few practical restraints on slave owners. In 1791, North Carolina decreed that killing a slave amounted to "murder," and Georgia later established that killing or maiming a slave was legally the same as killing or maiming a white person. But those doctrines existed more on paper than on plantations, just as Pakistani laws exist in the statute books but don't impede brothel owners who choose to eliminate troublesome girls.

While there has been progress in addressing many humanitarian issues in the last few decades, sex slavery has actually worsened. One reason for that is the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe and Indochina. In Romania and other countries, the immediate result was economic distress, and everywhere criminal gangs arose and filled the power vacuum. Capitalism created new markets for rice and potatoes, but also for female flesh.

A second reason for the growth of trafficking is globalization. A generation ago, people stayed at home; now it is easier and cheaper to set out for the city or a distant country. A Nigerian girl whose mother never left her tribal area may now find herself in a brothel in Italy. In rural Moldova, it is possible to drive from village to village and not find a female between the ages of sixteen and thirty.

I believe this is one of the countries that Senator MCCAIN visited, when I talked to him after he came back last Easter, where he simply didn't see the girls. He asked: Where are the girls? And they said: Well, the girls—many of them have been sold into sex. So these are things that are happening right now in this world and in our own country.

A third reason for the worsening situation is AIDS. Being sold to a brothel was always

a hideous fate, but not usually a death sentence. Now it often is. And because of the fear of AIDS, customers prefer younger girls whom they believe are less likely to be infected. In both Asia and Africa, there is also a legend that AIDS can be cured by sex with a virgin, and that has nurtured demand for young girls kidnapped from their villages.

These factors explain our emphasis on sex slaves as opposed to other kinds of forced labor. Anybody who has spent time in Indian brothels and also, say, at Indian brick kilns knows that it is better to be enslaved working a kiln. Kiln workers most likely live together with their families, and their work does not expose them to the risk of AIDS, so there's always hope of escape down the road.

Inside the brothel, Naina and Vivek were beaten, starved, and abused. They were also confused about their parentage. Naina grew up calling Ainul [the brothel's owner] Grandma, and Ainul's son Vinod, Father. Naina sometimes was told that Vinod's wife, Pinky, was her mother; at other times she was told her mother had died and that Pinky was her stepmother. But when Naina asked to go to school, Vinod refused and described the relationship in blunter terms.

"You must obey me," he told Naina, "because I am your owner."

The neighbors tried to advise the children. "People used to say that they could not be my real parents, because they tortured me so much," Naina recalled. Occasionally, the children heard or even saw Meena coming to the door and calling out to them. Once Meena saw Naina and told her, "I am your mother."

"No," Naina replied. "Pinky is my mother."

Vivek remembers Meena's visits as well. "I used to see her being beaten up and driven away," he says. "They told me that my mother was dead, but the neighbors told me that she was my mother after all, and I saw her coming back to try to fight for me."

Naina and Vivek never went to a day of school, never saw a doctor, and were rarely allowed out. They were assigned chores such as sweeping floors and washing clothes, and they had only rags to wear—and no shoes, for that might encourage them to run away. Then, when Naina was twelve, she was paraded before an older man in a way that left her feeling uncomfortable. "When I asked 'Mother' about the man," Naina recalled, "she beat me up and sent me to bed without dinner."

A couple of days later, "Mother" told Naina to bathe and took her to the market, where she bought her nice clothes and a nose ring. "When I asked her why she was buying me all these things, she started scolding me. She told me that I had to listen to everything the man says. She also told me, 'Your father has taken money from the man for you.' I started crying out loudly."

Pinky told Naina to wear the clothes, but the girl threw them away, crying inconsolably. Vivek was only eleven, a short boy with a meek manner. But he had inherited his mother's incomprehension of surrender. So he pleaded with his "parents" and his "grandma" to let his sister go, or to find a husband for her. Each appeal brought him only another beating—administered with scorn. "You don't earn any income," "Father" told him mockingly, "so how do you think you can look after your sister?"

Yet Vivek found the courage to confront his tormenters again and again, begging for his sister's freedom. In a town where police officers, government officials, Hindu priests, and respectable middle-class citizens all



averted their eyes from forced prostitution, the only audible voice of conscience belonged to an eleven-year-old boy who was battered each time he spoke up. His outspokenness gained him nothing, though. Vinod and Pinky locked him up, forced Naina into the new clothes, and the girl's career as a prostitute began.

So I think that is a pretty good place to break for a minute as we talk about "the only audible voice of conscience belonged to an eleven-year-old boy." I think we have an opportunity in the Senate to be an audible voice of conscience and to move on this bill.

When I came to the floor today, my job was to just manage the bill for 4 hours; then I just decided, after being somewhat disgusted by all of the anger that I have heard in this Chamber, that maybe I would just start reading from this book. I had no plan to do it. I happened to have it with me because I have used it when I have given speeches. This isn't an official filibuster, as I guess we have been asked. I am just going to keep reading from the book. When my colleagues want to come down, I welcome them. But I only ask them one thing—if maybe they could just focus on the issue at hand and stop all of this vengeance and anger, and then maybe we will have an opportunity, if we stop throwing darts, to get this done—and then also to confirm the next Attorney General of the United States, which is completely unrelated to this.

So let me continue on with this story, as we have an 11-year-old boy in the story whose voice was the only voice of conscience.

"My 'mother' was telling me not to get scared, as he is a nice man," Naina remembered. "Then they locked me inside the room with the man. The man told me to lock the room from the inside. I slapped him. . . . Then that man forced me. He raped me."

Once a customer gave Naina a tip, and she secretly passed on the money to Vivek. They thought that perhaps Vivek could use a phone, a technology that they had no experience with, to track down the mysterious woman who claimed to be their real mother and seek help from her. But when Vivek tried to use the telephone, the brothel owners found out and both children were flogged.

Ainul thought that Vivek could be distracted with girls, and so he was told to try to have sex with the prostitutes. He was overwhelmed and intimidated at the thought, and when he balked, Pinky beat him up. Seething and fearful of what would become of his sister, Vivek decided that their only hope would be for him to run away and try to find the person who claimed to be their mother. Somewhere Vivek had heard that the woman's name was Meena and that she lived in Forbesgunge, so he fled to the train station one morning and used Naina's tip to buy a ticket.

"I was trembling because I thought that they would come after me and cut me into pieces," he recalled. After arriving in Forbesgunge, he asked directions to the brothel district. He trudged down the road to the red-light area and then asked one passerby after another: Where is Meena? Where does she live?

Finally, after a long walk and many missed turns, he knew he was close to her

home, and he called out: Meena! Meena! A woman came out of one little home—Vivek's lip quivered as he recounted this part of the story—and looked him over wonderingly. The boy and the woman gazed at each other for a long moment, and then the woman finally said in astonishment: "Are you Vivek?"

The reunion was sublime. It was a blessed few weeks of giddy, unadulterated joy, the first happiness that Vivek had known in his life. Meena is a warm and emotional woman, and Vivek was thrilled to feel a mother's love for the first time. Yet now that Meena had news about Naina, her doggedness came to the surface again: She was determined to recover her daughter.

"I gave birth to her, and so I can never forget her," Meena said. "I must fight for her as long as I breathe. Every day without Naina feels like a year."

Meena had noticed that Apne Aap Women Worldwide, an organization that fights sex slavery in India, had opened an office in Forbesgunge. Apne Aap is based in Kolkata, the city formerly known as Calcutta, but its founder—a determined former journalist named Ruchira Gupta—grew up partly in Forbesgunge. Other aid groups are reluctant to work in rural Bihar because of the widespread criminality, but Ruchira knew the area and thought it was worth the risk to open a branch office. One of the first people to drop in was Meena. "Please, please," Meena begged Ruchira, "help me get my daughter back!"

There had never been a police raid on a brothel in Bihar State, as far as anyone knew, but Ruchira decided that this could be the first. While Ainul Bibi's brothel had warm ties with the local police, Ruchira had strong connections with national police officials. And Ruchira can be every bit as intimidating as any brothel owner.

So Apne Aap harangued the local police into raiding the brothel to rescue Naina. The police burst in, found Naina, and took her to the police station. But the girl had been so drugged and broken that at the station she looked at Meena and declared numbly: "I'm not your daughter." Meena was shattered.

Naina explained later that she had felt alone and terrified, partly because Ainul Bibi had told her that Vivek had died. But after an hour in the police station, Naina began to realize that maybe she could escape the brothel, and she finally whispered, "Yes, you're my mother."

So Apne Aap whisked Naina off to a hospital in Kolkata, where she was treated for severe injuries and a morphine addiction. The brothel had drugged Naina constantly to render her compliant, and the morphine withdrawal was brutal to watch. In Forbesgunge, life became more difficult and dangerous for Meena and her family. Some of the brothel owners there are related to Ainul and Manooj, and they were furious at Meena. Even those in the Nutt community who didn't like prostitution disapproved of the police raid, and so the townspeople shunned Apne Aap's school and shelter. Meena and her children were stigmatized, and a young man working with Apne Aap was stabbed. Threats were made against Meena's two daughters with Kuduz. Yet Meena was serene as she walked about the streets. She laughed at the idea that she should feel cowed.

"They think that good is bad," she scoffed, speaking of the local villagers. "They may not speak to me, but I know what is right and I will stick to it. I will never accept prostitution of myself or my children as long as I breathe." Meena is working as a commu-

nity organizer in Forbesgunge, trying to discourage parents from prostituting their daughters and urging them to educate their sons and daughters alike. Over time the resentment against her has diminished a bit, but she is still seen as pushy and unfeminine.

Apne Aap later started a boarding school in Bihar, partly with donations from American supporters, and Meena's children were placed there. The school has a guard and is a much safer place for them. Naina now studies at that boarding school and hopes to become a teacher, and in particular to help disadvantaged children.

One afternoon, Meena was singing to her two young daughters, teaching them a song.

This is how it went:

India will not be free,  
Until its women are free.  
What about the girls in this country?  
If girls are insulted and abused and enslaved  
in this country,  
Put your hand on your heart and ask,  
Is this country truly independent?

The next part of the chapter: "Fighting Slavery from Seattle." This is a book, "Half the Sky," by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn. It is about sex trafficking, and I am reading it, one, because it is a really good book and so people understand the issue, two, so people will refocus on why we have these bills on the floor and work together. We all know some potential ways to resolve this on both sides of the aisle so we can pass this bill and resolve this Hyde amendment provision which should not be on this bill. But there are ways to resolve this, and we know what they are, and then, also, hopefully, pass my safe harbor bill which was the bill that in addition to Senator CORNYN's bill passed through our Committee on the Judiciary unanimously. Every single person voted for it. It is slated to be the first amendment vote on this bill, and it establishes safe harbor incentives so that other States will do what Minnesota and about 15 States have done, which is not to consider these victims as criminals but to consider them as victims. Then not only do we help these girls so they have a chance of turning their lives around but also so that we actually make better criminal cases.

I know as a former prosecutor, running an office of 400 people for 8 years—seeing some of these major cases come in our doors—the best way to make these cases, if you have victims who feel that they are protected, who feel they have another life they can lead, who feel they can do something with their lives between going back to their pimp and going back to the person who has beaten them up and gotten them hooked on drugs, is by doing something like that. So those are two worthy bills that are on the floor.

Again, my colleagues are welcome to come down here and join me. I think it would be nice for a change if people focused on the issue at hand instead of a partisan fight that has been going on, because I think this institution is better than what we have seen in the last week.

The next part of the chapter: "Fighting Slavery from Seattle."

People always ask how they can help. Given concerns about corruption, waste, and mismanagement, how can one actually help women like Meena and defeat modern slavery? Is there anything an ordinary person can do?

That is a good question. I finally decided to start reading this book because I was sick of what was going on here. I think ordinary people around the country can do something about sex slavery by supporting strong laws and making sure Congress gets its job done but also doing work on their local and State level.

The authors say:

A starting point is to be brutally realistic about the complexities of achieving change. To be blunt, humanitarians sometimes exaggerate and oversell, eliding pitfalls. They sometimes torture frail data until it yields the demanded "proof" of success. Partly this is because the causes are worthy and inspiring; those who study education for girls, for example, naturally believe in it. As we'll see, the result is that the research isn't often conducted with the same rigor as is found in, say, examinations of the effectiveness of toothpaste. Aid groups are also reluctant to acknowledge mistakes, partly because frank discussion of blunders is an impediment in soliciting contributions.

The reality is that past efforts to assist girls have sometimes backfired. In 1993, Senator Tom Harkin wanted to help Bangladeshi girls laboring in sweatshops, so he introduced legislation that would ban imports made by workers under the age of fourteen. Bangladeshi factories promptly fired tens of thousands of young girls, and many of them ended up in brothels and are presumably now dead of AIDS.

Again, I am reading from the book "Half the Sky," by Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn, which is a great book about sex trafficking in order to refocus this Chamber on what we should be doing, which is getting these bills done and coming up with a way to resolve timeworn disputes which we somehow have been able to do with other bills.

I am trying to make the case here that these girls, as reflected in some of these stories, are just as important as some of the other work that we do in the Senate and deserve our greatest efforts.

Yet many forms of assistance—particularly in health and education—have an excellent record. Consider the work of Frank Grijalva, the principal of the Overlake School in Redmond, Washington, a fine private school with 450 students in grades five through twelve. Annual tuition hovers around \$22,000, and most of the kids are raised in a sheltered upper-middle class environment. Grijalva was looking for a way to teach his students about how the other half lives.

"It became clear that we, as a very privileged community, needed to be a bigger, more positive force in the world," Grijalva recalled. Frank heard about Bernard Krisher, a former Newsweek correspondent who was so appalled by poverty in Cambodia that he

formed an aid group, American Assistance for Cambodia. Rescuing girls from brothels is important, Krisher believes, but the best way to save them is to prevent them from being trafficked in the first place—which means keeping them in school. So American Assistance for Cambodia focuses on educating rural children, especially girls. Bernie Krisher's signature program is the Rural School Project. For \$13,000, a donor can establish a school in a Cambodian village. The donation is matched by funds from the World Bank and again by the Asian Development Bank.

Grijalva had a brainstorm. His students could sponsor a school in Cambodia and use it as a way of emphasizing the importance of public service. Initially the response from students and parents was polite but cautious, but then the attacks of 9/11 took place, and suddenly the community was passionately concerned with the larger world and engaged in this project. The students conducted bake sales, car washes, and talent shows, and also educated themselves about Cambodia's history of war and genocide. The school was built in Pailin, a Cambodian town on the Thai border that is notorious for cheap brothels that cater to Thai men.

In February 2003, the school construction was completed, and Grijalva led a delegation of nineteen students from Overlake School to Cambodia for the opening. A cynic might say that the money for the visit would have been better spent on building another Cambodian school, but in fact that visit was an essential field trip and a learning opportunity for those American students. They lugged along boxes of school supplies, but as they approached Pailin by car, they realized that Cambodia's needs were greater than they ever could have imagined. The dirt-and-gravel road to Pailin was so deeply rutted that it was barely passable, and they saw a bulldozer overturned beside a crater—it had hit a land mine.

When the Americans reached the Cambodian school, they saw a sign declaring it the OVERLAKE SCHOOL in English and Kmer script. At the ribbon cutting, the Americans were welcomed by a sea of excited Cambodians—led by a principal who was missing a leg, a land-mine victim himself. Cambodian men then had an average of only 2.6 years of education, and Cambodian women averaged just 1.7 years, so a new school was appreciated in a way the Americans could barely fathom.

The school dedication—and the full week in Cambodia—left an indelible impression on the American students. So Overlake students and parents decided to forge an ongoing relationship with its namesake in Cambodia. The Americans funded an English teacher at the school and arranged for an Internet connection for e-mail. They built a playground and sent books. Then, in 2006, the American school decided to send delegations annually, dispatching students and teachers during spring vacation to teach English and arts to the Cambodian pupils. And in 2007, the group decided to assist a school in Ghana as well, and to send a delegation there.

"This project is simply the most meaningful and worthwhile initiative that I have undertaken in my thirty-six years in education," Frank Grijalva said. The Overlake School in Cambodia is indeed an extraordinary place. A bridge has washed out, so you have to walk across a stream to reach it, but it looks nothing like the dilapidated buildings that you see in much of the

developing world. There are 270 students, ranging in age from six to fifteen. The English teacher is university educated and speaks good English. Most stunning of all, when we dropped by, the sixth graders were busy sending e-mails from their Yahoo accounts—to the kids at Overlake School in America.

One of those writing an e-mail was Kun Sokkea, a thirteen-year-old girl who would soon be the first in her family ever to graduate from elementary school. Her father had died of AIDS, and her mother was sick with the same disease and needed to be nursed constantly. Kun Sokkea is rail-thin, a bit gangly, with long, stringy black hair. She is reserved, and her shoulders sag with the burdens of poverty.

"My mom encourages me to stay in school, but sometimes I think I should go out and earn money," Kun Sokkea explained. "I have no dad to support Mom, so maybe I should provide for her. In one day, I could earn seventy baht, [a bit more than two dollars] cutting hay or planting corn."

To address these financial pressures, American Assistance for Cambodia started a program called Girls Be Ambitious, which in effect bribes families to keep girls in school. If a girl has perfect attendance in school for one month, her family gets \$10. A similar approach has been used very effectively and cheaply to increase education for girls in Mexico and other countries. Kun Sokkea's family is now getting the stipend. For donors who can't afford to fund an entire school, it's a way to fight trafficking at a cost of \$120 per year per girl. The approach helps because it is typically girls like Kun Sokkea who end up trafficked. Their families are desperate for money, the girls are poorly educated, and a trafficker promises them a great job selling fruit in a distant city.

Kun Sokkea showed us her home, a rickety shack built on stilts—to guard against flooding and vermin—in a field near the school. The house has no electricity, and her possessions were in one small bag. She never has to worry about choosing what to wear: She has just one shirt, and no shoes other than a pair of flip-flops. Kun Sokkea has never been to a dentist and to a doctor only once, and she gets the family's drinking water from the nearby creek. That's the same creek in which Kun Sokkea washes the family clothes (she borrows someone else's shirt to wear when she has to wash her own). She shares a mattress on the floor with her brother, as three other family members sleep a few feet away. Kun Sokkea has never touched a phone, ridden in a car, or had a soft drink; when she was asked if she ever drank milk, she looked confused and said as a baby she had drunk her mother's milk.

Yet one thing Kun Sokkea has beside her bed is a photo of the American Overlake students on their campus. In the evenings before she goes to sleep, she sometimes picks up the photo and studies the smiling families and neat lawns and modern buildings. In her own shack, with her mother sick and often crying, her siblings hungry, it is a window into a magical land where people have plenty to eat and get cured when they fall ill. In such a place, she thinks, everybody must be happy all the time.

For one thing, we know that is not quite true in our country. As we know, we have these same crimes occurring in our country every single day. Every single day, we have thousands of girls who are victims of sex trafficking. We had it happen in Minnesota. We have had it happen across the country. We have it happen when some girls are brought in from other countries. We know it is going on every day in our own Nation. We have an opportunity to do something about it, to tell the rest of the world that this place is a place where good things get done. But somehow we have gotten bogged down in a political game again with blame going back and forth and back and forth, and I just don't think that is dignified for the Senate.

While we can battle it out—and we should—on issues such as the budget and on issues where we don't have an agreement when it comes to our country's international affairs, this is an issue on which we actually agree, but somehow we found a way to not agree, and I think we need to find our way back. That is why I am going to continue to read from this book.

Someone asked me if this is a filibuster. It is not a filibuster because obviously I don't mind if my colleagues come down. I would like them to come down and talk about this important topic. But I will point out that at least when it comes to this issue of sex trafficking, we can stop going back and forth on who is to blame and who knew what when and what people did wrong and instead just focus on resolving this issue and getting a bill passed and certainly not attaching it to the Attorney General of the United States.

I will say that it is attached to the Attorney General in one way, and that is when it comes to Federal sex trafficking cases. Most of these cases are on the local level, county level, State level, the DA's office, but there are cases that are handled federally. I know from talking to the nominated Attorney General, Loretta Lynch, that she cares very much about these cases. It would be good to have her in place so we can start working on this national sex trafficking strategy. So in that way they are connected, but they certainly are not connected, in my mind, procedurally.

I know some of my colleagues have addressed this. I have spoken out for her several times. Not everyone knows about Loretta Lynch's background. Loretta Lynch is someone who grew up in a neighborhood—her family didn't have a lot of money. Her dad was a pastor at the church.

When she was in elementary school, she took a test and did really well on that test. The teacher came to her and said: You know what, we don't really know if that was really you who took that test or if that was really your score. So she took the test again, and she scored even higher the second time.

When Loretta Lynch graduated from high school, she was actually the valedictorian. The principal of that school came up to Loretta Lynch and said: You know what, it is a bit controversial to have you as our valedictorian, so you will have to share it with a White student. That happened to Loretta Lynch, and she just waited it out, and that is what she is going to do with this Chamber. She is going wait it out, and in the end she will be confirmed as the next Attorney General.

Why is this relevant? Because some of our friends on the other side of the aisle are attaching it to the sex trafficking issue, and I don't think it should be attached to the sex trafficking issue. I think we should get her confirmed.

But most importantly and the reason I am here on the floor reading from this book is just to say, can we just stop going back and forth and the vengeance and get this bill done?

From the very beginning, Senator CORNYN and I have worked on my bill, the safe harbor bill—which is not the bill on the floor—together. While I was not involved in the beginning of the drafting of his bill, I believe that idea of helping victims in some way with some kind of funding with shelters is a really good idea as well.

I hope we can resolve the issue on his bill, the Hyde amendment provision, and that we can then go on to pass my bill as the amendment. As we know, there is significant support in the House for these bills, and they are very important bills.

I will continue with the book:

Kun Sokkea and her family are not the only beneficiaries. The Americans themselves have been transformed as much as the Cambodians. And that is something you see routinely: Aid projects have a mixed record in helping people abroad, but a superb record in inspiring and educating the donors. Sometimes the lessons are confusing, as Overlake found when it tried to help Kun Sokkea get to middle school after graduating from elementary school. She needed transport because the middle school was far away, and young men in the area often harassed girls on their way to school.

So, at the teacher's suggestion, Overlake bought Kun Sokkea a bicycle, and for several months that worked very well. Then an older woman, a neighbor, asked to borrow Kun Sokkea's bicycle; the girl felt she couldn't say no to an older person. The woman then sold the bicycle and kept the money she received for it. Frank Grijalva and the American students were beside themselves, but they learned an important lesson about how defeating poverty is more difficult than it seems at first. The Americans decided they couldn't just buy Kun Sokkea another bicycle, so the girl returned to walking an hour each way to school and back. Perhaps in part because of the distance involved and the risks of getting to school, Kun Sokkea began to miss a fair number of days. Her grades suffered. In early 2009, she dropped out of school.

America's schools rarely convey much understanding of the 2.7 billion people (40 percent of the world's population) who today

live on less than \$2 a day. So while the primary purpose of a new movement on behalf of women is to stop slavery and honor killings, another is to expose young Americans to life abroad so that they, too, can learn and grow and blossom—and then continue to tackle the problems as adults.

"After going to Cambodia, my plans for the future have changed," said Natalie Hammerquist, a seventeen-year-old at Overlake who regularly e-mails two Cambodian students. "This year I'm taking three foreign languages, and I plan on picking up more in college."

Natalie's Cambodian girlfriend wants to be a doctor but can't afford to go to university. That grates on Natalie: A girl just like me has to abandon her dreams because they're unaffordable. Now Natalie plans on a career empowering young people around the world: "All anyone should do is to use their gifts in what way they can, and this is how I can use mine. That is the weight of how valuable seeing Cambodia was for me."

This is now chapter 2 of Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn's book "Half the Sky: Turning Oppression into Opportunity for Women Worldwide." And I noted that really most of the book is about sex trafficking and prostitution and why this is such a major problem worldwide.

Look at what happened that night when those girls were doing nothing but learning at a school and Boko Haram came in and broke into that school and took those girls away. Their parents had nothing but motorcycles and bicycles and bows and arrows to try to chase them. They were never able to get their daughters back, and now Boko Haram said they sold many of those children into sex slavery.

This should not be happening, but it is going on right now—and not just internationally. It is going on everywhere in this country, and that is why it is important. It is important not just for the victims in America, it is also important because of the victims internationally. We have an opportunity in this country to actually stand up and say: We want to be a leader on this internationally. We are going to cast this dysfunction aside and actually get this done and show the world we can be a leader when it comes to elevating girls and young women, when it comes to holding up half the sky.

Chapter 2, "Prohibition and Prostitution." It starts with a quote by Abraham Lincoln:

Although volume upon volume is written to prove slavery a good thing, we never hear of the man who wishes to take the good of it, by being a slave himself.

After visiting Meena Hasina and Ruchira Gupta in Bihar, Nick crossed from India into Nepal at a border village with stalls selling clothing, snacks, and more sinister wares. That border crossing is the one through which thousands of Nepali girls are trafficked into India on their way to the brothels of Kolkata. There they are valued for their light skin, good looks, docility, and inability to speak the local language. As Nick filled out some required paperwork at the border post, Nepalis streamed into India, without filling out a form.

While sitting in the border shack, Nick began talking to one Indian officer who spoke excellent English. The man said he had been dispatched by the intelligence bureau to monitor the border.

"So what exactly are you monitoring?" Nick asked.

"We're looking for terrorists, or terror supplies," said the man, who wasn't monitoring anything very closely, since one truck after another was driving past. "After 9/11, we've tightened things up here. And we're also looking for smuggled or pirated goods. If we find them, we will confiscate them."

"What about trafficked girls?" Nick asked. "Are you keeping an eye out for them? There must be a lot."

"Oh, a lot. But we don't worry about them. There's nothing that we can do about them."

"Well, you could arrest the traffickers. Isn't trafficking girls as important as pirating DVDs?"

The intelligence officer laughed genially and threw up his hands. "Prostitution is inevitable." He chuckled. "There has always been prostitution in every country. And what's a young man going to do from the time he turns eighteen until he gets married at thirty?"

"Well, is the best solution really to kidnap Nepali girls and imprison them in Indian brothels?"

The officer shrugged, unperturbed. "These girls are sacrificed so we can have harmony in society. So that good girls can be safe."

It is unfortunate. I hope that is not what we are going to be saying in this body—from the Senate to the rest of the world and to trafficked girls and to those groups who are advocating so hard, especially over the last 2 years, in trying to get this done. I hope we will not say: It is unfortunate. We were not able to resolve this. These are major fights, and this person did this, and this person knew about this, and this person didn't know about that.

That is what has been going on over this past week, and we are better than that. People keep backstabbing and going after each other, but personally I have had it. So if anyone wants to join me here—I know the women in the Senate have always worked together—and at least talk about this issue instead of simply fighting with each other, I think we would really improve our chances of getting it done.

"But many of the Nepali girls being trafficked are good girls, too."

"Oh, yes, but those are peasant girls. They can't even read. They're from the countryside. The good Indian middle-class girls are safe."

Nick, who had been gritting his teeth, offered an explosive suggestion: "I've got it! You know, in the United States we have a lot of problems with harmony in society. So we should start kidnapping Indian middle-class girls and forcing them to work in brothels in the United States! Then young American men could have fun, too, don't you think? That would improve our harmony in society!"

There was an ominous silence, but finally the police officer roared with laughter.

"You are joking!" the officer said beaming. "That's very funny!"

Nick gave up.

People get away with enslaving village girls for the same reason that people got

away with enslaving blacks 200 years ago: The victims are perceived as discounted humans. India had delegated an intelligence officer to look for pirated goods because it knew that the United States cares about intellectual property. When India feels that the West cares as much about slavery as it does about pirated DVDs, it will dispatch people to the borders to stop traffickers.

The tools to crush modern slavery exist, but the political will is lacking. That must be the starting point of any abolitionist movement. We're not arguing that Westerners should take up this cause because it is the fault of the West; Western men do not play a central role in prostitution in most poor countries. True, American and European sex tourists are part of the problem in Thailand, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Belize, but they are still only a small percentage of the Johns. The vast majority are local men. Moreover, Western men usually go with girls who are more or less voluntary prostitutes, because they want to take the girls back to their hotel rooms, while forced prostitutes are not normally allowed out of the brothels. So this is not a case where we in the West have a responsibility to lead because we are the source of the problem. Rather, we single out the West because even though we are peripheral to the slavery, our action is necessary to overcome a horrific evil.

One reason the modern abolitionist movement has not been more effective is the divisive politics of prostitution. In the 1990s, the American left and right collaborated and achieved the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, which was a milestone in raising awareness of international trafficking in the global agenda. The anti-trafficking movement then was unusually bipartisan, strongly backed by some liberal Democrats, such as the late senator Paul Wellstone, and by some conservative Republicans, such as Senator Sam Brownback.

I do want to pause from this book for a second to note that when I was at the McCain Institute out in Arizona, Cindy McCain and HEIDI HEITKAMP and I spoke about this issue to all of those gathered. At the end, a guy came up to me and said that he was with the State Department under a Republican administration, and he talked to me about how when Paul Wellstone died, they put forward some kind of a scholarship in his honor for students who wanted to work in the area of combating sex trafficking and trying to eliminate sex trafficking.

It was at that moment last spring that I actually found out that Paul Wellstone, the Senator from Minnesota, whom we miss so dearly, who died in that tragic plane crash, had taken on this issue. He had taken on so many other issues, speaking for the voiceless, from mental health to domestic violence, that I did not know—and I think this shows how sometimes this issue gets second shrift—that he was such a hero when it came to sex trafficking.

I think part of that was Paul always believed that there were a lot of causes around this building that had people advocating for them, that keep people busy at meetings all day or that they get called up for that are so important,

but, in fact, those who can't afford that kind of help—the victims of domestic violence or those with mental illness or victims of sex trafficking—they don't have a lot of lobbyists coming over here to meet with people and they need someone to stand up for them, and they should not be forgotten or dismissed or marginalized in becoming a political football, that maybe they need someone advocating on their behalf.

The other thing about Paul is he always embraced that immigrant experience. He believed that no matter where one comes from in this country, or no matter what one's roots were, they should be able to rise up. He also believed that everyone should be treated with dignity.

I will never forget when I first came to the Senate, Darrell, the train driver who recently retired, came up to me and I told him I am a Senator from Minnesota, and all he said was, "Paul Wellstone," because he remembered him. Whether it was the cops at the front desk or the secretaries, they remember Paul. So it is no surprise that Paul Wellstone, along with conservative Republican Sam Brownback, actually took this issue on.

In this book, "Half the Sky," Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn continue talking about who worked on this when people were actually working together. They say:

Hillary Rodham Clinton was also a leader on this issue, and no one has been a greater champion than Carolyn Maloney, a Democratic Congresswoman from New York.

In fact, Congresswoman MALONEY, in conjunction with Congressman POE, a Republican Congressman, are sponsoring a bill that is not exactly the same as Senator CORNYN's bill, but similar. They are also cosponsors of the bill I am carrying, the safe harbor bill that ERIK PAULSEN is carrying in the House. So we can see this work has continued. Some of the people are the same, but somehow back then, we were able to reach some kind of an agreement, and this was treated as a serious issue and a serious bill which we need to do.

They go on to talk about who else worked on this.

They say:

... Paul Wellstone, Sam Brownback, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Carolyn Maloney, a Democratic Congresswoman from New York. Likewise, one of George W. Bush's few positive international legacies was a big push against trafficking. Vital Voices and other liberal groups were stalwart on sex trafficking, as were International Justice Mission, and other conservative evangelical groups. Yet, while the left and the right each do important work fighting trafficking, they mostly do it separately. The abolitionist movement would be far more effective if it forged unity in its own rank.

Now we get back to something I always remember MIKE ENZI talking about, about how we can have disagreement on something like 20 percent of

the things, but we have agreement on 80 percent. Maybe that is what we have to remember with this bill. We know how Senator ENZI always worked well with Ted Kennedy, as did Senator HATCH, even with how different they were politically. But they were able to find some common ground.

Certainly this bill should not be devolving into a fight over abortion. There is so much we agree on in this bill. There is also so much we agree on in the safe harbor bill which doesn't contain the Hyde provision.

So this idea that we are going back and forth and dwelling on whose fault this was and how it happened—frankly, I think: Enough. I think we need to resolve this. I know there are ways to resolve this. I hope that is continuing to go on today. We have a lot of things, in addition to passing this bill, we need to get done. We need to get the vote on the next Attorney General of the United States. We have a major budget that we need to get done. The budget needs to be approved. I am looking at our staff and I know they are looking forward to one of those nights where we are going until 3 or 4 in the morning. Maybe we wouldn't have to do that if we could stop these kinds of fights.

This is kind of a practical argument for getting this done, I know that, but one has to be slightly practical as we look at the fights before us on important matters that we need to resolve. One of the fights shouldn't be this. This is a fight against evil. This is a fight against those who are trafficking in little girls. It shouldn't be a fight across the aisle.

The authors talk about the groups that have worked on it and how we would be more effective if we forged unity.

They continue:

One reason for discord is a dispute about how to regard prostitution. The left often refers nonjudgmentally to "sex workers" and tends to be tolerant of transactions among consenting adults. The right . . . refers to "prostitutes" or "prostituted women".

Do my colleagues know what is so interesting about this—let me see when this book was written: 2009. So even since that time, what is sort of a cool thing is that we have gotten some agreement now on the fact that when we see a Republican House of Representatives being able to pass the safe harbor bill—the bill I wrote in the Senate, the bill that is not yet on the floor, to make clear, but the bill that would be considered as the first amendment—we have gotten some agreement here in these two Houses that these younger victims are, in fact, victims. I think that is really important for our country to hear that. Because when we do things such as that—such as when we pass the Violence Against Women Act, it changes the whole way people think about these crimes. Who is committing the crime? It is the people run-

ning the ring. It is the johns. It is not the victims.

So I think that is why as we move forward, trying to get these bills passed, it is so important beyond the immediate bills.

OK. So they are talking about this debate. I don't think we should dwell on debate. We have had enough of them in this Chamber, but that is what this part of the book is about.

They continue:

What policy should we pursue to try to eliminate that slavery? Originally, we sympathized with the view that a prohibition won't work any better in prostitution today than it did against alcohol in America in the 1920s. Instead of trying fruitlessly to ban prostitution, we believed it would be preferable to legalize and regulate it. That pragmatic "harm reduction" model is preferred by many aid groups because it allows aid workers to pass out condoms and it permits access to brothels so that they can be more easily checked for underage girls.

Over time, we've changed our minds. That legalize-and-regulate model simply hasn't worked very well in countries where prostitution is often coerced.

This is a change. I think we remember back decades ago where people were talking about legalizing prostitution. I think what we have realized, those of us who have worked as prosecutors, is that so often prostitution is not consensual. So often there are reasons—either the pimp is keeping someone hooked on drugs to keep someone being a prostitute or they are threatening their lives or threatening their family lives—and this is something that we don't want to have be legal.

I am going to finish this paragraph, and then I see we have been joined by the great Senator from New Jersey who I am really happy has come so I can sit down and drink some water.

It continues:

That legalize-and-regulate model simply hasn't worked very well in countries where prostitution is often coerced. Partly, that is because governance is often poor so the regulation is ineffective, and partly it is because the legal brothels tend to attract a parallel illegal business in young girls and forced prostitution. In contrast, there's empirical evidence that crackdowns can succeed, when combined with social services such as job retraining and drug rehabilitation, and that is the approach we have come to favor. In countries with widespread trafficking, we favor a law enforcement strategy that pushes for fundamental change in police attitudes and regular police inspections to check for underage girls or anyone being held against their will. That means holding governments accountable not just to pass laws but also to enforce them, and monitoring how many brothels are raided and pimps are arrested. Jail-like brothels should be closed down, sting operations should be mounted against buyers of virgin girls, and national police chiefs must be under pressure to crack down on corruption as it relates to trafficking. The idea is to reduce the brothel owners' profit.

With that, I will take a pause from this book. I will say that Senator BOOKER has done not only an amazing

job as a Senator, but he also knows a little bit about being a mayor. He knows the struggle of poverty and also understands that to govern, we have to have a change of tone. I have always appreciated the work he has done across the aisle and the tone he brings to the Senate. We are really trying to push today as we try to come together to work on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for those incredibly generous words. I recognize the Presiding Officer, Senator PERDUE. I am grateful to be able to serve with him, and it is great seeing him in the captain's chair, to use my "Star Trek" parlance. I am happy to have the chance to formally welcome the Senator from Georgia to the Senate. It is good to serve with him as well.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. President, I am honored to stand on the Senate floor to express my strong support for the historic nomination of Loretta Lynch to be the Attorney General of the United States. Our Nation is fortunate to have Ms. Lynch as the nominee for Attorney General. She is seasoned, competent, wise, extraordinarily dedicated, and has already served this Nation for many years, receiving accolades from across the country. She is historic in and of herself and exceptionally well qualified. I wish to tell everyone a little bit more about her.

First, though, I want to ask—and this should not be necessary, but I want to ask: Why do we almost have a double standard for Ms. Lynch's nomination? She is the first African-American woman appointed to head the Department of Justice. She has had her nomination pending on the Senate floor longer than any nominee for Attorney General going back three decades. Ms. Lynch has had to wait 81 days for a hearing in committee—longer than any of President George W. Bush's nominees for Attorney General had to wait; more than twice as long for Attorneys General John Ashcroft and Michael Mukasey; and 24 days longer than Alberto Gonzalez. She waited 27 days for a committee vote after her hearing, again longer than any of George Bush's nominees to be Attorney General. Now her nomination has lingered on the Senate floor without a vote for 20 days, which is again longer than the wait for any of the last five Attorneys General combined. Her historic nomination has now been pending in the Senate for more than 130 days since the President first nominated her. I have not heard a single good reason germane to her qualifications, to her values, to her views, and to the kind of service she has rendered or will render, as to why she should not be promptly confirmed.

She comes before the Senate having been twice appointed by two different Presidents and twice unanimously confirmed by this very body, to be a U.S. attorney. She has been a career Federal prosecutor for almost a decade, a partner at a prestigious law firm, and led one of the finest Federal prosecuting offices in the country, the Eastern District of New York.

Her nomination has the support of dozens of law enforcement organizations, civil rights organizations, and outspoken citizens from across the country.

So, again, I wonder why are we here today still waiting? Why does this President's exceptionally well-qualified nominee deserve such unfair treatment?

Attorneys General are important because they lead the Department that keeps us safe and secure and protects our rights. From securing the right to vote to combating the violence of organized crime, to bringing terrorists to justice, this position is too important for any kind of political games and for any kind of delay.

Seventy-five years ago, another Attorney General, Robert H. Jackson, spoke eloquently about the qualities of a good Federal prosecutor and hence a good Attorney General, when he said: "The citizen's safety lies in the prosecutor who tempers zeal with human kindness, who seeks truth and not victims, who serves the law and not factional purposes, and who approaches her task with humility."

This is the type of prosecutor Ms. Lynch has always been and the type of Attorney General she will be.

This appointment is historic. Once confirmed, Ms. Lynch will be the first Black woman to serve in the Nation's highest law enforcement position. She will be only the second woman and second African American to be Attorney General. Her story is our story. It is an American story. It reflects a long history of our Nation, the distance we have traveled as a country.

It is a story of a Black woman who grew up in the Jim Crow South, the daughter of a fourth-generation minister and segregation-fighting mother who overcame discrimination and achieved the American dream despite the early obstacles she faced. Once, while a student at a predominantly White elementary school, her standardized test scores were so high that the disbelieving school demanded she retake her test. The great thing about that story is she retook the test and got a higher score. On one other occasion, she was named the valedictorian of her high school class which was a predominantly White high school, but the White administrators in the school did not think it was appropriate to have a Black girl as the top student, so they asked her to share that honor with a White student, and she did so with dignity and grace.

She would go on to earn an Ivy League education, climb the highest ladders of her profession, and stand today nominated by the President of the United States of America, and when confirmed by the Senate, she will be our 83rd Attorney General. Only in this great Nation can a story such as this be possible, can a story such as this be told.

Today, we continue our efforts. All of us—Republicans and Democrats—in this body are committed to building a more perfect Union. I know this confirmation will inspire people all across our country—people who may have lost their faith in law enforcement or in our government's ability to get things done, to know that despite the odds or challenges, we are still a great nation, that we are devoted to overcoming our challenges.

We celebrate someone who has broken glass ceilings, who has broken barrier after barrier, and now as a qualified candidate will hopefully soon ascend to this position. It is a reaffirmation of the American dream.

While history is important, I don't want to overshadow those qualifications. I want to reiterate them.

She is a well-qualified nominee. She graduated with Harvard College and Harvard Law School degrees, and went on to gain exceptional experience as a prosecutor and as a manager. As U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of New York, she led one of the Nation's most challenging prosecutorial offices. I know this. I live right across the river from where she works. Her tough approach to fighting crime became almost legendary. She won acclaim throughout our metropolitan region as well as in the law enforcement community.

In that office she established a record that would make any prosecutor proud. She led an office that had the tenacity to take on violent criminals, to confront political corruption, and to disrupt organized crime.

At a time when the Senate is considering legislation to combat human trafficking, we need an Attorney General who will vigorously, unapologetically, and courageously prosecute traffickers. Ms. Lynch has been a leader on that very issue. Her office prosecuted over 100 child exploitation cases and brutal global trafficking cases. Her office tried more terrorism cases since 9/11 than any other office in the country.

I was impressed when she first came to my office. She was candid, straightforward, and down to earth. What is clear from Ms. Lynch's record is not just that she is a tough prosecutor but that she is a leader with a vision and the right values to be Attorney General.

Too many Americans distrust the ability of law enforcement to fairly enforce our laws. Ms. Lynch believes in

the principles of equality and justice first and foremost, and she will restore even more faith in our system. In her committee testimony she articulated a vision about how in a great time of tension in our country we can rebuild the trust between dedicated, committed law enforcement officers on the streets and the communities they serve. Too many Americans, as I said time and again, go to prison for far too long. The majority of people incarcerated today in Federal prisons are there for nonviolent offenses. We have a nation that leads the globe in incarcerating people, and we do it often in a way that is discriminatory against poor people and minorities.

Ms. Lynch has a vision of alternatives to incarceration for nonviolent offenders that are based on facts and based on her experience. She supported her district's drug court with a diversion program taking first-time nonviolent offenders out of the prosecution system and giving them access to drug treatment. Her innovation and successes speak volumes about her commitment to saving taxpayer dollars and addressing our swelling prison population while also driving down crime.

So I say in conclusion, she has sterling character. She has incredible credentials. She has unflappable integrity. I am confident that as Attorney General she will ensure that the Department leads in a way that will make us proud.

The road to building a more perfect Union in this country has been long, and the work still continues. We are at a time in this Nation when cynicism with government is at an all-time high. One of the highest-ranked concerns that Americans have right now—issues of employment and education are now being caught up to by concerns that Americans have about whether their very government will work together to do what is right.

The delay in her nomination undermines the integrity of this body. It gives a signal to all those who are cynical to further surrender to that emotion. This great candidate passed through committee in bipartisan fashion. She is a great woman, a great African American, and most of all a great American and she should not be delayed on the sidelines when there is work to be done, when her very delay begins to undermine what we say this body can do when we all work together and put petty partisan politics aside and stand up for something far more important, which is the work to make this country a more perfect Union.

We can do that together, all of us in the Senate, by confirming Ms. Lynch who will use that post to do the very same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly echo the passionate and cogent presentation that my colleague from New Jersey has just given,



that this body can be well served—very well served—for us to go immediately to the confirmation of Loretta Lynch. The delay in this critical position is unacceptable, does a disservice to the individual, a disservice to the office, a disservice to the executive branch, and a disservice to justice in America.

Let's have that vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the committee-reported amendment to S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the committee-reported amendment to S. 178.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

The motion was agreed to.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, James Lankford, Deb Fischer, Tom Cotton, Ron Johnson, Richard Burr, Daniel Coats, Roy Blunt, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Pat Roberts, Bill Cassidy, Jerry Moran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Leg.]

#### YEAS—57

Ayotte	Ernst	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blunt	Flake	Paul
Boozman	Gardner	Perdue
Burr	Graham	Portman
Capito	Grassley	Risch
Casey	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rounds
Coats	Heller	Rubio
Cochran	Hoeven	Sasse
Collins	Inhofe	Scott
Corker	Isakson	Sessions
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kirk	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker

#### NAYS—41

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Kaine	Reid
Blumenthal	King	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Schatz
Boxer	Leahy	Schumer
Cantwell	Markey	Shaheen
Cardin	McCaskey	Stabenow
Carper	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Udall
Durbin	Mikulski	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warren
Franken	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Nelson	Wyden
Heinrich	Peters	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Alexander	Brown
-----------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 41.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion, upon reconsideration, is rejected.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity in the 40 years I have been in the Senate to lead with others of both parties many efforts to help support victims—crime victims, domestic violence victims, victims of child abuse, and human trafficking victims.

One of the things I have learned during that time is we have to pay attention to what the survivors tell us when they tell us what they need. None of us have walked in their shoes.

We can offer advice, but we can't second-guess them. We can't assume we know best. Our job is to listen and try to help them rebuild their lives.

If we would all just stop the political rhetoric and listen, the message from these survivors is clear.

Earlier this week, the National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women—this, incidentally, is a coalition of thousands of organizations representing millions of survivors of domestic and sexual violence—wrote:

We write today to express our deep concern about the controversy of inserting the Hyde provision into the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. The House passed a version of that Act that did not include this new Hyde provision and we ask the Senate to the do the same.

I agree with them. I worked very closely with this group for more than 2

years as we drafted the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act. They are some of the most dedicated advocates I have ever worked with and I listen to what they say. I believe they are showing us the way forward.

The House version of the very bill we are debating today does not contain the unnecessary destructive provision that wreaks such havoc here. Speaker JOHN BOEHNER found a way to bring the House together—Republicans and Democrats—and passed a bill without injecting abortion politics into the discussion. Now, if that deeply divided body can do it, I would assume we can do it here in the Senate.

Some are being very casual about the divisive partisan provision that Senate Republicans injected into this Senate bill. They call it boilerplate. Well, it is not. It places limitations on the health care services victims can use as they access money collected from the very people who trafficked them.

We are not talking about taxpayers' money. We are not talking about taxpayers' dollars. We are talking about traffickers' money. This is the money traffickers would pay in fines.

Criminals have already taken away so many choices for these young women and girls, and we shouldn't be taking away their right to make their own health care choices. We certainly should not require these survivors to have to prove they were raped. That is offensive. It is wrong.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEAHY. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator for coming to the floor. I know how much he supports this bill to end human trafficking, sex trafficking, and what a frustration he must feel—and which I share—that we have been unable to bring a bill before us that has strong bipartisan support and with few amendments is likely to be considered and would pass very quickly in the Senate.

I thank him for pointing out what I tried to point out this morning. In this 112-page bill, there is one sentence related to the Hyde amendment, which changes what we have been doing here for more than 30 years and which is holding up the passage of this important bill. What we have been pleading with the Republican leaders to do is to remove this sentence, and then let's pass this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. I say to the Senator from Illinois, that the Republican House of Representatives passed this Act without this provision, and Democrats and Republicans here in the Senate should do the same.

Mr. DURBIN. Well, there may be partisan differences over this one sentence, but there is bipartisan support for ending the trafficking and helping the victims.



Thank you, because I know you want to offer another amendment about runaways, which is very important. I have met so many of them, as you have. It is a heartbreaking story how so many are abused and exploited. Thank you for your leadership and for bringing this issue to our attention today.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Senator from Illinois, who has worked on this throughout his career, both in the House and in the Senate. It means a lot. I will state what one survivor, Tina Frundt, a survivor of human trafficking who now helps counsel other young trafficking victims, said:

It is not for us to judge the type of services a survivor of sex trafficking needs. We need the basic rights of medical services without judgment.

I think, instead of our trying to be political about this, we should listen to survivors such as Tina. We can't pass a bill that ignores the requests of the various survivors it is designed to help.

Experts across the political spectrum who treat survivors of trafficking are telling us to remove the language.

I heard, for example, from a group called HEAL Trafficking, an organization of health care professionals who treat survivors. These are physicians, nurses, and counselors. They wrote a letter to me and said: "We implore the Senate to pass S. 178 without the inclusion of Hyde amendment language, which would place limits on trafficking survivors' access to vital health services."

I also heard from the service providers, whom I know and respect, at the Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth. They work with young people who are exceptionally vulnerable to becoming victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation. They wrote: "There should be no doubt that legislation involving the well-being of individuals who have been victimized by the most base of human behavior should be free of partisan wrangling."

It is time to listen to the people this bill is supposed to help. They say: Take out the provision; pass the bill.

I hope that we will.

I can only imagine what these victims of trafficking go through. I have said several times on the floor—I remember so vividly; I remember as though it were yesterday, listening to some of the victims when we were trying to prosecute the people who trafficked them or harmed them or exploited them. I thought, wouldn't it be great if we had some help to stop this horrible crime from happening in the first place.

But at least we did not have politicians telling us: Well, you can offer this service, but you cannot offer that service. They simply said: Find the best experts you can and use their advice.

The experts are there day by day by day. Let them do their work. Don't play politics with them.

I have said before, when we considered the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, a victim is a victim is a victim. We ought to do what we can to help them.

#### SSCI STUDY OF THE CIA'S DETENTION AND INTERROGATION PROGRAM

Mr. President, on another matter which goes into an interesting area, each year, Sunshine Week reminds us we cannot take for granted our democratic system of government. Our Nation's Founders understood that to maintain a true democracy, we have to have an open government. Only an open government can be truly accountable to the people.

But pulling back the curtain on the internal workings of governmental agencies is not always easy. Sometimes, it is not even popular. In some cases, it generates great controversy, as was the case of Senator FEINSTEIN's hard-fought efforts last year to declassify the executive summary of the Senate Intelligence Committee's historic torture report.

This extraordinary report thoroughly reviewed the CIA's use of torture during the Bush administration and revealed that it was far more brutal than we knew. Now, shedding light on the CIA's actions demonstrates to the world that America is different. We acknowledge our mistakes, so that we can learn from them. We do not sweep them under a rug and pretend they never happened. But some seem to want just that.

When Senator FEINSTEIN publically released the executive summary, she also provided the full report, which totaled, I am told, more than 6,700 pages. She provided the full report to the President and the relevant executive branch agencies. The report details the failures that allowed this program to happen. She rightly put these details in the hands of those officials who had appropriate clearances who could learn from the mistakes and ensure that they do not happen again—whether it is a Republican or a Democratic administration.

Unfortunately, some of the program's defenders will stop at nothing in an effort to erase this ugly history. Immediately after the report was issued, there was an unabashed campaign to discredit it and an attempt to portray what happened as something other than what we all know it was—torture.

I have had enough of the disingenuous euphemisms and acronyms used to mask the truly brutal nature of what was done to other human beings. We should acknowledge what it was. It was torture. The President has acknowledged that. And Attorney General nominee Loretta Lynch did during her hearing, when she stated clearly and unequivocally that waterboarding is torture. Instead, defenders of this brutality call it something else. They claim it was justified, but then they

offer no evidence to support their assertions and insist outright that they would do it again. Even though they have no evidence that it helped, they imply as much.

But if that wasn't bad enough, some now want to make the report itself disappear. In January, the incoming chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee asked the President and the agencies to return the full report to the Senate.

That is essentially saying: let us pretend we made no mistakes. Let us erase history. Let us be able to open the history book and just see blank pages. We did nothing wrong.

Well, that is outrageous. Neither this historic Senate report nor the shameful truths it reveals can be wiped out of existence.

It is also appalling to learn that several of the agencies that received the full report in December haven't even opened it. In a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) lawsuit seeking release of the full report, Justice Department and State Department officials submitted declarations stating that their copies remain locked away in unopened, sealed envelopes. So they can say: I see nothing. It is locked up. It is sealed.

I don't know if this was done in an attempt to bolster the government's position in the FOIA lawsuit or to otherwise avoid Federal records laws. I certainly hope not. But regardless of the motivation, it was a mistake that should be rectified.

The executive summary of the torture report, which they have seen, makes clear that both the State Department and the Justice Department have much to learn from the history of the CIA's torture program. Both agencies were misled by the CIA about the program. Both should consider systemic changes in how they deal with covert actions. Yet neither agency has bothered to open the final, full version of the report or, apparently, even those sections most relevant to them.

The fight for government transparency and accountability is never complete. I have joined with the distinguished Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, over the years to write and pass tougher provisions in FOIA. I think the importance of the public release of this report's executive summary cannot be overstated. It is one of the most important oversight achievements of this body. Now we must ensure the full report, containing the results of years of painstaking work, is put to good use by those within the executive branch.

So today, as we recognize Sunshine Week, I send this message to the executive branch agencies who received the full Intelligence Committee torture report: Do not return your copy to the Senate. Ensure that the appropriate people in your agencies, with appropriate clearances, have access to it and learn from it. Initiate a process to consider the lessons your agency should

learn from this experience. Follow the example of FBI Director Comey, who last week testified he would designate appropriate people to consider the report and what improvements could be made, because there are no instances when torture is acceptable.

The Convention Against Torture does not make exceptions. There is no doubt that if these actions were committed against American soldiers, by a hostile government, we would immediately condemn them as torture and a violation of international law. We have to make clear to the rest of the world we follow international law. We don't torture. We have to ensure that America never allows this to happen again.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, again today, just like yesterday, we saw all but four Senate Democrats filibuster a bill that passed the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously, including nine Democratic Senator votes. This is a bill that is cosponsored by 12 Democrats and a bill that came to the floor by unanimous consent of the Senate—all 100 Senators. Any single Senator could have barred that from happening and forced us to go through procedural hoops. I would like to believe they did so because all of us agree—Democrat and Republican alike—that helping the victims of human trafficking should be our sole and solitary focus in this legislation. And that is what this bill does.

This bill is probably the last bill you would imagine would be controversial—certainly one that people would be loath to politicize—but, indeed, that is exactly what has happened. I just can't explain it. Maybe some of our colleagues who have done this can. How can you cosponsor a bill, how can you vote for it and then come to the floor of the Senate on two occasions and vote to kill it?

Well, as I said earlier, we have four Senate Democrats who have joined with Republicans to pass this piece of legislation, then reconcile it with the House bill, and send it on to President Obama, where I am confident he would sign it. I am confident he would sign it because this is an issue where, if we can't do a bill to help victims of human trafficking, I wonder what we can possibly accomplish. If politics and the divisiveness here in Washington so polarizes people on this bill, how are we going to do the other things we need to do, such as pass a budget? How are we going to take care of our national security needs? How will we deal with the immigration issue? How will we deal

with other things that are far more controversial?

Just to reiterate what this bill does, it focuses on the people on the demand side of sex trafficking and the sex trade. In other words, the people who actually pay for the services provided by these 12-to-14-year-old girls and the pimps that basically manage them.

This takes the money from the people who create the demand. Once they have been convicted and penalized, they pay into a crime victims compensation fund. We estimate, if our calculations are correct, that could generate as much as \$30 million a year—\$30 million a year. That money would then be subject to grants to help organizations that are set up to help the victims of human trafficking.

So not only are we interested in trying to rescue these children from the grasp of these criminal organizations that run human trafficking rings, we want to find a way to help them heal and get better. We have all heard story after story about the tragedy of human trafficking. I have talked to the distinguished ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, who, as a former prosecutor, understands this issue and the human wreckage left in the wake of the people who purchase these services and help facilitate these criminal organizations. So somehow, some way, we need to find a way to help the victims. Our focus ought to be on them and them alone.

We have heard a lot of, to my mind, phony excuses about this bill. I actually had some Senators tell me they didn't know of this provision that limits the use of the fines and penalties. This is a rule that has prevailed for 39 years, known as the Hyde amendment. They say they didn't know it was there. They didn't read the bill, apparently.

I don't actually quite believe that. I know that staff on both sides in the Judiciary Committee and generally the staff in the Senate are highly professional people. They are not going to let something slip by. But if there is a reason why they did, I believe it is because this language has become routine. It has become routine. It has been in literally every appropriations bill since 1976. It had been in things such as the Children's Health Insurance Program. It has been in Defense authorization bills. It has been in ObamaCare. All of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have voted for this sort of language over and over and over again.

I happen to be proudly pro-life, but we have many colleagues who consider themselves pro-choice who have said: Well, I don't think we ought to appropriate tax dollars to pay for abortions. I agree with the Hyde amendment. So they have clearly had an opportunity to read and understand the bill. I don't believe 12 Senators on the other side would cosponsor a bill they hadn't read

and didn't understand. I don't believe nine members of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the other side would vote for it, including the distinguished ranking member, without knowing what was in the bill.

The reason why this was so unremarkable is because, as I said, it has become routine, and virtually all the legislation that touches on this area has passed since 1976. So why here and why now? Why are we threatening to kill this important piece of legislation to help the most vulnerable victims that exist in America?

It is estimated that about 100,000 children are sex trafficked a year in the United States. It happens in Texas, sadly; it happens in Vermont; and it happens everywhere. The fact of the matter is, most Americans are simply unaware of it because this is an underbelly of life, a criminality that is really unbeknownst to most of us because it happens outside of our view and outside of our experience. But we have thousands of scared and abused children who need our help.

By killing this bill, as our friends across the aisle have done, with the exception of four brave exceptions, instead of our helping hand we are giving them a shrug of indifference. We are saying: You know what. Our political fights here in Washington are more important than your future and your life and the fact that you have been treated as human baggage.

I happen to believe—and I know many share this belief—that we are all created in the image of God, and it is a terrible sin and it is an evil thing to treat a human being created in the image of God as a commodity, as a thing to be bought and sold.

We went through a terrible period in our Nation's history where we had African Americans treated as less than human. We fought a civil war, where 600,000 people died, and then we passed a constitutional amendment and other important legislation to try to heal those wounds that existed from the very beginning of our Nation. Indeed, it has not yet finished healing even today.

Knowing what we know about human slavery and what that has been in our history, why in the world wouldn't we want to do something about modern-day human slavery to try to rectify, to try to rescue, to try to help heal these victims, which is what this legislation does?

To summarize: We have a piece of legislation that contains a provision that has been the law of the land for 39 years. We have a bill on the floor that was cosponsored by 12 Democrats on the other side of the aisle. Unfortunately, most of them have voted to filibuster this bill now that it has come to the floor because of this provision they said they didn't know about or they weren't aware of or they object to.

We have a piece of legislation that will not cost taxpayers anything because it is financed by the fines and penalties assessed against people who demand and purchase these illicit services. That is why this is the sort of bipartisan consensus legislation I think the American people would like to see us pass.

We need to overcome this obstacle. I know the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, is determined to give those who are filibustering this bill a chance to change their mind and a chance to let us finish this piece of legislation. Indeed, we need two, maybe three more Senators on that side. I would think that among the 12 people who cosponsored the bill, among the 9 who voted for it already in committee, we could find at least 3 more who would vote for this legislation and allow us to finish it.

I know the distinguished ranking member from Vermont has an amendment he wants to offer on the bill, and he has that right. He should have that right. But we can't do it unless we get past this hurdle of the filibuster. This bill is simply too important to let politics get in the way of helping the innocent victims who need our support.

So the Senate being the way it is, which is somewhat broken these days, how in the world do we get to the point where we can actually help the victims of human trafficking, given the filibuster? Well, Senator MCCONNELL has said he is going to keep bringing this bill back again and again—and, indeed, this is now the second vote we have had on this—until we can recruit at least two more Democrats to vote to close off debate to allow us to finish the bill. He has also said we are not going to be able to get to the confirmation of Attorney General Loretta Lynch, which has been voted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, until we finish this bill. I agree with that. I think the majority leader has made the right call, because, apparently, if the cries and the needs of the innocent victims of human trafficking aren't enough to move our friends across the aisle to let us finish this bill, then we are going to have to look for whatever leverage we can.

Indeed, I would say this does not bode well for the future of the 114th Congress if this is the way we are going to be operating. I don't know how many nominations will be voted out of committee and be eligible for floor action that will not be considered on the Senate floor because we are stuck in situations such as this—where we know what the right thing to do is, all of the Senators know what the right thing to do is, but somehow we can't quite seem to get it done. We have to get it done. We have to get all of the Senate's business done, including considering the President's nominees.

So I hope we do. I look forward to having another opportunity, perhaps

tomorrow, to vote to close off debate. My hope is that overnight, sometime during the next 24 hours, at least 2 more of our colleagues—we would be glad to have more—can examine their conscience, can think about why it is they actually ran for the Senate, why it is they are here. Is it to try to actually do something good to help people who can't help themselves? I believe it is. I think that is why all of us came here, to try to do that. But somehow, some way, we have gotten off track, and some people think that political games and obstruction are more important than actually doing what we got elected to do and the reason why we actually volunteered to serve in the United States Senate.

So I hope we have at least two more Senators on the other side examine their conscience and reconsider their "no" vote and decide to close off debate by providing the votes. We need to do that tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I totally agree with the senior Senator from Texas that the Hyde amendment has been in a number of bills that spend tax dollars. I have been in the Appropriations Committee for nearly 40 years. I am aware of that. But as the distinguished senior Senator from Texas just stated, there are no tax dollars in this matter. The way he has drafted this bill, it would take moneys from fines levied against those who are convicted of sex exploitation.

This would be the first time, to my knowledge—and I would stand corrected if I am wrong, but I cannot think of a time in the past 40 years that we have applied the Hyde amendment to such funds. I think that is probably why—because there are tax dollars in the House companion bill—that the House of Representatives did not include the Hyde amendment.

I have voted for appropriation bills with the Hyde amendment in it so we could move them to the floor. But to go to this expansion when all these different groups who have written in to us tell us please don't do this, and the groups who actually work with victims—they say don't include it. I agree with them.

I think there can be a way forward. We came together in this body to pass the Leahy-Crapo Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, with the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act as an amendment. We worked for some time, but we passed it.

I also want to say that—again, based on my experience here—I cannot think of a time, whether the Senate was under Democratic control or Republican control, that a piece of legislation has been used like this to hold up a key member of the President's Cabinet. Loretta Lynch has been held up

longer than the past four Attorney General nominees—four men—put together. She is still being held up. I think that is unfortunate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend and colleague, the Senator from Vermont, whom I have worked with closely on a number of pieces of legislation and whom I would love to be able to work with to find a solution to the current impasse that we have on this legislation—I would say to my friend that if the objection is that this fund is not subject to the appropriations process, then that is something we ought to discuss and talk about.

Why the fund is so important to me is because the fines and penalties that go into this save the taxpayers money. It actually takes the money from the people who create the demand and uses that to help heal and save and rescue the victims.

I guess I would have a little difference of opinion—and maybe it is just semantics—that once the fines and penalties are paid to the Treasury, my view is they become public dollars although they technically aren't derived from taxes, *per se*. But beyond that point, I would say once this money is paid into the fund, I think we could come up with a mechanism that would then allow the Appropriations Committee to play its traditional role in directing the money to the purposes for which Congress designates. And I know, as a long-time member of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator believes—and I respect—that is an important part of the process.

It is important, though, to note that this would still be subject to the same rule which has prevailed for 39 years, and that is the Hyde amendment. Here is where I don't understand the principle of the objection—because the Hyde amendment has an exception, as the Senator knows, for the physical health and mental health of the mother, as certified by a physician, and also in cases of rape. I can't imagine any case where a potential beneficiary of this fund would be excluded from services that would be allowed under the legislation as written. But I would say if the Senator thinks that might be a fruitful area for us to continue conversations and to figure a way to structure this so that it would be subject to an annual appropriation process—subject to those limitations that have prevailed now since 1976—I think there might be some room for discussion.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. WARREN pertaining to the introduction of S. 793 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. WARREN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I was here for nearly 3 hours this morning when there was some spare time on the floor to get us refocused on the issue at hand, which is the issue of the victims of sex trafficking.

As I noted this morning, this is now the third biggest criminal enterprise in the world. The first is illegal drugs, the second illegal guns, and the third is the illegal sale of children. The average age of a victim of sex trafficking is 12 years old—not even old enough to go to their first prom or not even old enough to get a driver's license. That is what we are talking about here.

As I said, we have seen it in every part of the country. Just last week, there was a case out of Rochester, MN, of a 12-year-old girl who was charged by the U.S. Attorney's office. She got a text and went to a McDonald's parking lot. She thought she was going to go to a party. She got shoved in a car and got brought up to the Twin Cities, got raped. Sexually explicit pictures were taken and posted on Craigslist by the pimp. She was sold for sex to two men, raped by two men. Finally, the guys got caught and they have charged the case. So that is what we are talking about here.

I know there are disagreements on the issues of our time, whether they are the issues of our economy and the budget fight that is going to be coming up next week, or whether it is the issues of foreign relations, but there shouldn't be a disagreement about this. This is a bipartisan bill. There is a provision in this bill that I don't believe needs to be in this bill. There are some potential solutions here and I hope my colleagues are talking about them.

We have to refocus our efforts on what matters. That is what we have to remember. I am tired of looking back at who is blaming who and whose fault it is and now, somehow, it has gotten tied to the confirmation of the next Attorney General of the United States. This makes no sense at all. If these issues are connected at all, it is simply because the Attorney General of the United States helps to enforce the sex trafficking laws. Their office sometimes takes on Federal cases such as

we saw in the oil patch of North Dakota. They enforce our other laws, such as what we care about right now in Minnesota where we have had a number of people indicted for going to help ISIS, or we have had 20 people indicted and 9 convictions for helping al-Shabaab, and here we have an Attorney General who is immensely qualified and who literally has the highest number out of her office of terrorism prosecutions in the Nation. So let's just get Loretta Lynch confirmed. That is for starters.

As to this bill, I would like to see a different tone as we discuss it. I would like to see people on both sides of the aisle talk about solutions and remember what we are dealing with here. We have been able to deal with this issue on other bills. I don't understand why we can't deal with it on this bill. Are these girls less important? Is this something that can just be a political football back and forth? I don't think so.

I want to remind people that in addition to the bill that is on the floor, Senator CORNYN's bill, which sets up a victims fund, there is another bill, and that is the Stop Exploitation Through Trafficking Act. That is my bill. Senator CORNYN is the cosponsor. There are 19 bipartisan cosponsors. It is a bill that went through the Judiciary Committee a few weeks ago—unanimously on the vote. Every single Senator voted for it. A similar version led by Representative ERIK PAULSEN of Minnesota has gone through the House. I like ours a little better because it includes a national sex trafficking strategy. Those two bills will be easily resolved to get this done.

My hope is—my bill is supposed to be the first amendment once we can go on to this bill, once we get the fix of the bill—the provision of the bill that is in controversy. I want to remind people that this bill is equally important. It sets a standard—the safe harbor bill—so other States will start looking at Minnesota and what about 15 other States have done. It says these 12-year-olds are not criminals; they are victims.

How can you say a 12-year-old is a criminal? They are victims. Once you start thinking like that, it changes the way you handle the cases. As a former prosecutor, what matters to me is that when you change the way you look at the case, you have a better case because then you have a victim who feels they have some place to go—a shelter. They can get a job. They can get an education. They are much more likely to turn on the pimp and to turn on the perpetrator that is running the sex ring.

In Minnesota, last year we got a 40-year sentence against a guy. John Choi, the chief attorney for Ramsey County, got a guy that was running one of these rings. That is what is

going on here when we talk about this bill and the importance of passing this bill.

We have the 20 women Senators who came together and asked for a hearing on sex trafficking. We got that done. Now is the time where I hope we can come together and resolve this.

So one of the things I have taken to doing is reading Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn's great book "Half the Sky."

"Half the Sky" refers to women holding up half the sky. It refers to the fact that we have countries and systems that marginalize women and don't treat them as equal. This is not good for our world.

We have seen countries that do it the worst, that treat them as sex slaves, that allow that to happen. Those countries tend to have very poor human rights records. They tend not to be good partners for our country. If we want to lead the way for the world, we have to start on our own turf, where 86 percent of the victims in sex trafficking in the United States are from the United States.

If we are going to reach out to other countries, such as HEIDI HEITKAMP, Cindy McCain, and I did last spring—we went down to Mexico to work with them on some of the issues of cases on which they have actually helped in the United States with the U.S. attorney's office. We need to be able to show that our country is doing the right thing, and this is an opportunity to do that.

So I have been reading from this book in part in the hope that we can change the tone and remember who we are here to protect. It is also a great book. They have actually written another book as well that is focused on domestic sex trafficking that I will be reading from tomorrow as well.

I note this is not an official filibuster, but whenever I have time and there is time on the floor, I am simply going to come down here to remind people of the importance of getting this bill done.

So we are talking in the book—I was in the chapter on "Prohibition and Prostitution." I talked about the fact that "the tools to crush modern slavery"—I am reading from the book—"but the political will is lacking."

That seems to be what is going on in this Chamber when extraneous bills are in the way of getting this done. When my Republican coauthor over in the House has said that these kinds of politics don't belong on these bills, I agree.

The tools to crush modern slavery exist, but the political will is lacking. That must be the starting point of any abolitionist movement. We're not arguing that Westerners should take up this cause because it's the fault of the West; Western men do not play a central role in prostitution in most poor countries. True, American and European sex tourists are part of the problem in Thailand, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Belize, but they are still only a small percentage of the Johns. The vast majority are

local men. Moreover, Western men usually go with girls who are more or less voluntary prostitutes, because they want to take the girls back to their hotel rooms, while forced prostitutes are not normally allowed out of the brothels. So this is not a case where we in the West have a responsibility to lead because we're the source of the problem. Rather, we single out the West because, even though we're peripheral to the slavery, our action is necessary to overcome a horrific evil.

So that is my argument here, that by doing something here in this Chamber and by showing that we care about these girls in the United States, then we show we care internationally and it should be a major tenet of our foreign policy.

One reason the modern abolitionist movement hasn't been more effective is the divisive politics of prostitution.

I talked about this earlier today. The issue that we have is that a number of people way back—including the late great Senator Paul Wellstone of Minnesota, Senator Brownback of Kansas, Hillary Rodham Clinton, CAROLYN MALONEY, whom I just left on the Joint Economic Committee, and George W. Bush—showed great leadership in this area. So we have seen time and again people being able to come together across party lines to get this done.

So they talk about how things have changed, and they say that “over time, we’ve changed our minds” about how we look at this. They talk about the fact that it used to be: Well, let’s legalize prostitution and regulate. That will really work. I think we have learned that it will never really work. It doesn’t work in those countries that have tried it, and it certainly doesn’t work for these young girls who are victims of the sex trade. So they talk about how we, in fact, through law enforcement, need to go after the profits and we have to take this on. That is what the bills we are considering help to do. They give State and local prosecutors and shelters the tools that they need.

They say:

We won’t eliminate prostitution. In Iran, brothels are strictly banned, and the mayor of Tehran was a law-and-order hard-liner until, according to Iranian news accounts, he was arrested in a police raid on a brothel where he was in the company of six naked prostitutes. So crackdowns don’t work perfectly, but they tend to lead nervous police to demand higher bribes, which reduces profitability for the pimps. Or the police will close down at least those brothels that aren’t managed by other police officers. With such methods, we can almost certainly reduce the number of fourteen-year-old girls who are held in cages until they die of AIDS.

This is happening in our world.

“It’s pretty doable,” says Gary Haugen, who runs International Justice Mission. “You don’t have to arrest everybody. You just have to get enough that it sends a ripple effect and changes the calculations. That changes the pimps’ behavior. You can drive traffickers of virgin village girls to fence stolen radios instead.”

Many liberals and feminists are taken aback by the big stick approach we advocate, arguing that it just drives sex establishments underground. They argue instead for a legalize-and-regulate model based on empowerment of sex workers, and they cite a success: The Sonagachi Project.

Sonagachi, which means “golden tree,” is a sprawling red-light district in Kolkata. In the 1700s and 1800s, it had been a legendary locale for concubines. Today it has hundreds of multistory brothels built along narrow alleys, housing more than six thousand prostitutes. In the early 1990s, health experts were deeply concerned about the spread of AIDS in India, and in 1992 they started [this project]. . . . A key element was to nurture a union of sex workers . . . which would encourage condom use and thus reduce the spread of AIDS through prostitution.

DMSC seemed successful in encouraging the use of condoms. It publicized its role as a pragmatic solution to the public health problems of prostitution. One study found [this project] increased . . . condom use by 25 percent.

They go on to explain it.

But then they say—and this is key to our approach to trying not to allow prostitution to continue:

As we probed the numbers, however, we saw that they were flimsier than they at first appeared. HIV prevalence was inexplicably high among new arrivals . . . 27.7 percent among sex workers aged twenty or younger. Research had also shown that, initially, all sex workers interviewed . . . claimed to use condoms nearly all the time. But when pressed, they admitted lower rates.

This goes on and they talk about the problem with this. What we are talking about here is underage girls and what is really going on.

I am going to quote from one story they told when they went to this brothel.

While the madam spoke with others in the room, gushing about the group’s success, the three of us on the bed asked the prostitute in Hindi to tell us if those things were true. Afraid and timid, the prostitute remained silent until we assured her that we wouldn’t get her in trouble. Barely audible, she told us that almost none of the prostitutes . . . came with aspirations of being a sex worker. Most of them like herself were trafficked. . . . When I asked her if she wanted to leave Sonagachi, her eyes lit up; before she could say anything, the DMSC official put her hand on my back and said that it was time to move on. . . .

These are stories about how it doesn’t really work to have this model of allowing the prostitution to continue and regulate.

In the developing world, however, this difficult, polarizing debate is mostly just a distraction. In India, for example, brothels are technically illegal—but, as we said earlier, they are ubiquitous—the same is true in Cambodia. In poor countries, the law is often irrelevant, particularly outside the capital. Our focus has to be on changing reality, not changing laws.

Congress took an important step in that direction in 2000 by requiring the State Department to put out an annual Trafficking in Persons report—the TIP report.

I will remind again that this was done on a bipartisan basis. We didn’t

see the kind of fights we are having now because people decided that here is one thing that we could agree on—from Paul Wellstone to Sam Brownback—and that perhaps without having outside political debates, we can agree that we do not want young girls aged 12 to be sex trafficked.

What did this report do?

The report ranks countries according to how they tackle trafficking, and those in the lowest tier are sanctioned. This meant that for the first time U.S. embassies abroad had to gather information on trafficking. American diplomats began holding discussions with their foreign ministry counterparts, who then had to add trafficking to the list of major concerns such as proliferation and terrorism. As a result, the foreign ministries made inquiries of the national police agencies.

Simply asking questions put the issue on the agenda. Countries began passing laws, staging crackdowns, and compiling fact sheets. Pimps found that the cost of bribing police went up, eroding their profit margins.

This approach can be taken further. Within the State Department, the trafficking office has been marginalized, even relegated to another building. If the secretary of state publicly and actively embraced the trafficking office—

I think we see this has happened since this book was written—since 2009 under Secretary Clinton and Secretary Kerry.

. . . that would elevate the issue’s profile. The President could visit a shelter . . .

And, by the way, that is something that HEDI HEITKAMP, Cindy McCain, and I did when we went to Mexico.

Europe should have made trafficking an issue in negotiating the accession of Eastern European countries wishing to enter the European Union, and it can still make this an issue for Turkey in that regard.

The big-stick approach should focus in particular on the sale of virgins. Such transactions, particularly in Asia, account for a disproportionate share of trafficker profits and kidnappings of young teenagers. And the girls, once raped, frequently resign themselves to being prostitutes until they die. It is often rich Asians, particularly overseas Chinese, who are doing the buying—put a few of them in jail, and good things will happen: The market for virgins will quickly shrink, their price will drop, gangs will shift to less risky and more profitable lines of business, the average age of prostitutes will rise somewhat, and the degree of compulsion in prostitution will diminish as well.

This is from “Half the Sky,” written by New York Times reporter Nicholas Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn. They have a more recent book that they have written called “A Path Appears,” and this is about domestic prostitution, which I will also be reading from. But I thought I would start that tomorrow, as we continue to focus on this, so people understand what we are really talking about.

As we all know, the bills before the Senate today are about domestic trafficking. They are about what is happening in the United States right now in every town in this country.

We talked earlier this morning about why this is happening, why we are seeing this kind of increase, and we are

talking about it more. The reason is that more and more because of the Internet people can anonymously advertise. They can send instant messages and texts. It is just more hidden, and it is harder to track down for law enforcement. That is part of why we are seeing this going on right now and why this is such a major issue in our country.

I would tie it into our international theme, because, again, first of all, we have a percentage of these victims—mostly girls—who come from foreign countries. So it matters to us what goes on in foreign countries with their law, which is the focus of “Half the Sky.”

But it also matters to us because we want a better world, and we want these countries to do better. We don’t want to put all our money in military spending. We want these countries to become democracies, to become trading partners, to become places that we can work with. Instead, if we allow these girls to be subjugated and we allow them to be chattel and we allow them to be treated like slaves, they are never going to get the kind of democracy that we want them to get to and that will allow for a better country. You are not going to have a woman elected to the Senate in one of these countries if they believe that women can be treated as chattel, as we are seeing in so many of these places.

So I am going to go to the next part of the chapter, which is called “Rescuing Girls Is the Easy Part.”

We became slave owners in the twenty-first century the old-fashioned way: We paid cash in exchange for two slave girls and a couple of receipts. The girls were then ours to do with as we liked.

Rescuing girls from brothels is the easy part, however. The challenge is keeping them from returning. The stigma that the girls feel in their communities after being freed, coupled with drug dependencies or threats from pimps, often lead them to return to the red-light district. It’s emotionally dispiriting for well-meaning aid workers who oversee a brothel raid to take the girls back to a shelter and give them food and medical care, only to see the girls climb over the back wall.

That is what I talked about earlier. That is why, when we look at it from a U.S. perspective, what these bills focus on is trying to turn these girls’ lives around and trying to set that standard. We are not mandating it in other States; we are simply creating some incentives and giving them some funding so that States can start doing these cases in a different way and start seeing them as victims and making it easier to go after the people who are running the ring.

Back to the book:

Our unusual purchase came about when Nick—

Referring here to Nick Kristof—traveled with Naka Nathaniel, then a New York Times videographer, to an area in

northwestern Cambodia notorious for its criminality. Nick and Naka arrived at the town of Poipet and checked into an \$8-a-night guest house that doubled as a brothel. They focused their interviews on two teenage girls, Srey Neth and Srey Momm, each in a different brothel.

Neth was very pretty, short and light-skinned. She looked fourteen or fifteen, but she thought she was older than that; she had no idea of her actual birth date. A woman pimp brought her to Nick’s room, and she sat on the bed, quivering with fear. She had been in the brothel only a month, and Nick would have been her first foreign customer. Nick needed his interpreter present in the room as well, and this puzzled the pimp, who nevertheless accommodated.

Black hair fell over Neth’s shoulders and onto her tight pink T-shirt. Below, she wore equally tight blue jeans, and sandals. Neth had plump cheeks, but the best of her was thin and fragile; thick makeup caked her face in a way that seemed incongruous, as if she were a child who had played with her mother’s cosmetics.

After some awkward conversation through the interpreter, as Nick asked Neth about how she had grown up and about her family, she began to calm down. She stopped trembling and mostly looked in the direction of the television in the corner of the room, which Nick had put on to muffle the sound of their voices. She responded to questions briefly and without interest.

Now we have been joined—I am going to stop reading from the book for a while. Senator FEINSTEIN has come to the floor. Senator FEINSTEIN has been a true leader on this issue of sex trafficking. She is a senior member of the Judiciary Committee—the only other woman on the Judiciary Committee besides me, with, I think, 20-some guys. She knows how important this issue is. I know she is going to talk a little bit about that as well as some other things. I welcome her to the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for such time as I may consume.

As Senator KLOBUCHAR stated, I come to the floor to speak on the sex trafficking bill. I know it is now held up by certain language, which I will go into in the details of my remarks, but briefly, I would like to begin by describing the bill’s highlights. The bill clarifies that a person who buys a sex act from a minor or other trafficking victim can be prosecuted under the Federal commercial sex trafficking statute. The bill authorizes block grants for State and local governments to develop programs to rescue trafficking victims and investigate and prosecute traffickers. The bill also includes nearly all of the provisions from the Combat Human Trafficking Act which Senator PORTMAN and I introduced in January.

I am very grateful to the authors—Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator CORNYN—for adding these. Those provisions establish a minimum period of 5 years of supervised release for a person who

conspires to violate the commercial sex trafficking statute.

It would require the Justice Department to train on investigating and prosecuting buyers, on seeking restitution, and on connecting victims with health services. It would require reporting on sex trafficking prosecutions. It would expand wiretap authority to cover all human trafficking offenses. It would expand the rights of crime victims—something I have been interested in since Senator Kyl and I did the Crime Victims’ Bill of Rights.

The bill, which is not controversial, should pass, except for the surreptitious inclusion—I use this word considered—of a provision that is known as the Hyde amendment. The provision was not included by language but by cross-reference to provisions in another previously enacted appropriations bill.

Here is what it says:

Limitations. Amounts in the Fund, or otherwise transferred from the Fund, shall be subject to the limitations on the use or expending of amounts described in sections 506 and 507 of division H of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76; 128 Stat. 409) to the same extent as if amounts in the Fund were funds appropriated under division H of such Act.

This provision was not included in the bill Senator CORNYN introduced last Congress, which I cosponsored. His staff approached my staff and staffs of other Senators early in 2015. They asked if I would cosponsor again. My staff asked whether the bill was identical to last year’s bill and for an explanation of any changes that were made. Senator CORNYN’s staff then sent back an email with a list of changes—seven changes in all. That list did not include the Hyde amendment language that had been added. That language was not mentioned to my staff at any point.

In other words, an important and sensitive change was made to the bill and was not disclosed upon request. That does not excuse us for not catching this, but if you see the complicated and sort of obfuscated nature of this—I am not saying it is intended obfuscation, but all of the numbers that are in there—I think it makes it understandable.

If the Hyde amendment—which is what this is—if that language comes out, this bill will pass easily.

Let me address for a moment the enormous problem we are trying to address with this bill. Today, high demand and easy access fuels a huge amount of sex trafficking. Human trafficking today is the second largest criminal industry in the world. It is only behind illegal drugs.

In 2005, human trafficking was a \$32 billion criminal enterprise. Today, some 9 years later, it is a \$150 billion estimate of illegal gains. Two-thirds of the proceeds from human trafficking come from sex trafficking.

Children as young as 12, 13, and 14 can be found on the street or over the



Internet. It is not an exaggeration to say that this is modern-day slavery. Those victims are moved against their will to cities throughout the country and even to other countries, wherever demand is high.

Trafficking rings are also run by gangs. In San Diego, for example, profits are so great and the risk of being caught so minimal that rival gangs do not fight each other over sex trafficking, as they do when drugs are involved.

Some traffickers make as much as \$33,000 per week. These are numbers gathered by the Urban Institute: Atlanta, gross take per trafficker per week, \$32,833; Denver, \$31,200; Seattle, \$18,000; Miami, \$17,741; Dallas, \$12,025; Washington, DC, \$11,588; and San Diego, \$11,129. This is weekly gross cash intake per individual trafficker.

Traffickers lure victims through promises of love and money or sometimes use an older trafficked girl as a recruiter. Those criminals prey on the most vulnerable children in our society, including those who are homeless or in the foster care system. They target children who have been victims of sexual abuse. Once they have a victim under their control, they may traffic him or her from city to city based on demand.

For example, this is a slide of California. It is from the Orange County Human Trafficking Task Force, and it shows the route traffickers take to move victims around the State of California to meet demand. You can see these circles from Oakland to Sacramento and then down into the Inland Empire and then from Los Angeles all the way around into the Inland Empire. So you can actually track various routes. Orange County did this. The orange center here is meant to be Orange County.

This particular task force is comprised of a number of Federal and local law enforcement agencies in Orange County, including Anaheim and Huntington Beach police departments, the U.S. Attorney's Office, the FBI, and the District Attorney's Office.

Now, here it comes: Regardless of how children are first trafficked, one thing is almost universal—victims will be advertised on the Internet. By one estimate, 76 percent of child sex trafficking victims—76 percent of them are sold over the Internet.

My staff and I have spoken with a number of law enforcement officials in California about the Internet's role in connecting sellers of underage children with buyers. Nearly every single official we spoke with said the Internet is the primary means to connect sellers with buyers. So this is where we next must take decisive steps to stop sex trafficking. Purveyors of these online ads must be held accountable. Senator KIRK and I have an amendment that will do that.

There are at least 19 distinct Web sites that accept ads relating to trafficking underage boys and girls. Here they are: Backpage.com; EscortAds.xxx; ErosAds.com; EscortsInCollege.com; AsianEscortSF.com; EscortsInThe.us; LiveEscortReviews.com; MyProviderGuide.com; EroticMugShots.com; NaughtyReviews.com; EscortPhoneList.com; RubAds.com; Eros.com; TheEroticReview.com; RubMaps.com; APerfectSin.com; EscortDater.com; MyRedBook.com; and NightShift.com. Nineteen Web sites act as purveyors of child sex trafficking in this country. They ought to be ashamed of themselves.

This site I am going to show you, Backpage.com, allows a purveyor to post an advertisement for an escort or a body rub. In fact, nearly all of these ads are for commercial sex acts; many of them depict minors. When you view an ad for an escort or a body rub, you will see pictures of young girls, often with few or no clothes on.

Now I am going to show you two girls. The first is a missing 17-year-old girl. She is here as a runaway. This is a listing of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, a very legitimate organization which I am fully in support of. It is entitled "Endangered Runaway," and it is information about her, her date of birth, her age, her sex, her race, and all of it, and where you can get in touch if you have any information.

I wish to show how this is also used. This is the same girl on Backpage, and this essentially says:

Hello Texas,  
Are you looking for an unforgettable experience? Look no further!  
I am 100% Great service provider!  
I am very down to earth, warm, sensitive, passionate,  
and genuinely interested in giving you a great experience.

And it goes on and on.  
This is the same picture of this same girl.

We blocked out the image, and it is shocking. It is simply shocking that this is going on to the extent it is in our country, right in a ribald way on the Internet.

Law enforcement officials and anti-trafficking organizations say there are a number of key indicators that allow them to identify ads that are likely for trafficking victims.

In this advertisement we see three of those key indicators. First, the title states the victim is "New to your City." Anti-trafficking organizations say this is code for being underage. You may also see girls in ads described as "new," "fresh," or "new in town" to indicate they are underage. Second, we see a victim is listed from outside the area. Here she is listed as from Miami for a posting that is in the Houston area.

Third, the victim also has an out-of-area phone number.

Those are three indicators of what this ad is for—to sell sex with children. Law enforcement and experts confirm this point.

The Cook County Sheriff's Office in Illinois found that 100 percent of women claiming to be massage therapists or platonic escorts on one Web site, Backpage, were being sold for sex. This isn't mine, this is the Cook County Sheriff's Office.

The sheriff's office set up so-called dates with 618 girls via Backpage. All 618 agreed to provide sex for money.

The sheriff's office concluded: "This presents irrefutable evidence that Backpage is indeed a haven for pimps and sex solicitors who are victimizing women and girls for their own gain. Any notion that Backpage employs a legitimate business model simply does not stand up to the facts."

This is a direct letter from Sheriff Tom Dart, Cook County, IL.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum to Sheriff Tom Dart.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOK COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE MEMORANDUM  
Date: 6/9/2014.

To: Sheriff Thomas J. Dart.

From: Deputy Chief Michael Anton, Cook County Sheriff's Police.

Subject: Backpage.com Arrests.

Per Sheriff Dart's direction, the Cook County Sheriff's Police Vice Unit has utilized Backpage.com as its primary forum for recovering victims of human trafficking in Cook County. Please find our year-to-year Backpage arrest statistics

Cook County Sheriff's Police Arrests Off of Backpage:

2009:	142
2010:	108
2011:	63
2012:	121
2013:	135
2014 (through the end of May):	49
Total:	618

Additionally, the Cook County Sheriff's Police Vice Unit has made 42 arrests for Involuntary Servitude, Human Trafficking or Prostitution since 2007, with many of those investigations originating from responses to Backpage ads.

It is important to note that 100% of the women claiming to be massage therapists or platonic escorts on Backpage have accepted the offer of money for sex from our undercover male officers. Our team has set up "dates" with 618 via this website—all 618 have turned out to be prostitutes. This presents irrefutable evidence that Backpage is indeed a haven for pimps and sex solicitors who are victimizing women and girls for their own gain. Any notion that Backpage employs a legitimate business model simply does not stand up to the facts.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. A study of ads placed in this year's Super Bowl in Phoenix concludes that 65 percent of the ads placed on Backpage's Phoenix Web site around the weekend of the game had indicators that the ad was for a victim of sex trafficking.

Simply put, there are Internet companies that are profiting off the rape and abuse of children. This must stop.



One way we can combat sex trafficking over the Internet is to make it a crime for a person such as the owner of a Web site to knowingly advertise a commercial sex act with a minor. As I said, Senator KIRK and I have introduced such an amendment. It would create a new offense of knowingly advertising a commercial sex act with a minor on the Internet.

The amendment is identical to a House bill that has 52 cosponsors and passed that Chamber by voice vote.

If we come to a point where we are voting on amendments to Senator CORNYN's bill, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I know Senator KIRK and I would bring it to the floor.

Last October, 53 attorneys general offered a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of the bill that Senator KIRK and I introduced last June that is similar to the amendment. This is the list of the attorneys general.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of 53 attorneys general.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF  
ATTORNEYS GENERAL,  
Washington, DC, October 20, 2014.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,  
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK GRASSLEY,  
Ranking Member, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY AND RANKING MEMBER GRASSLEY: We, the undersigned state and territorial attorneys general, urge you to join us in the fight against human trafficking in the United States. We commend your recent action to pass legislation to increase federal penalties and victim restitution and encourage you to act to protect children from being trafficked on the Internet by passing S. 2536, the Stop Advertising Victims of Exploitation Act (SAVE Act).

Human trafficking is tied as the second largest and is the fastest growing criminal industry in the world, generating roughly \$150 billion each year. According to a study of Department of Justice human trafficking task force cases, 83 percent of sex trafficking victims identified in the United States were U.S. citizens. Shockingly, there are numerous cases nationally of children being used in prostitution as young as 12.

Every day, children in the United States are sold for sex. The use of the "adult services sections" on websites such as Backpage.com has created virtual brothels where children are bought and sold using euphemistic labels such as "escorts." The involvement of these advertising companies is not accidental—these companies have constructed their business models around income gained from those participating in commercial sex. In just one week this June, law enforcement arrested 281 alleged sex traffickers and took 168 children out of prostitution in a nationwide FBI crackdown where many child victims were offered for sale on "escort" and other "adult services" websites. Organized crime groups as well as street gangs are involved with human traf-

ficking, and many of these perpetrators use the Internet to sell their victims.

The undersigned attorneys general respectfully request that the Senate Judiciary Committee pass the SAVE Act so that these websites that are facilitating trafficking through their very business model will have to take steps to verify the identity of individuals posting advertisements and the age of those who appear in these advertisements.

We thank you in advance for your continued dedication to the eradication of human trafficking.

Greg Zoeller, Indiana Attorney General;  
Luther Strange, Alabama Attorney General;  
Tom Horne, Arizona Attorney General;  
Kamala Harris, California Attorney General;  
George Jepsen, Connecticut Attorney General;  
Irvin Nathan, District of Columbia Attorney General;  
Robert W. Ferguson, Washington Attorney General;  
Michael Geraghty, Alaska Attorney General;  
Dustin McDaniel, Arkansas Attorney General;  
John W. Suthers, Colorado Attorney General;  
Joseph R. "Beau" Biden III, Delaware Attorney General;  
Pamela Jo Bondi, Florida Attorney General;  
Samuel S. Olens, Georgia Attorney General;  
David Louie, Hawaii Attorney General;  
Lisa Madigan, Illinois Attorney General;  
Derek Schmidt, Kansas Attorney General;  
James "Buddy" Caldwell, Louisiana Attorney General;  
Douglas F. Gansler, Maryland Attorney General.

Bill Schuette, Michigan Attorney General;  
Lenny Rapadas, Guam Attorney General;  
Lawrence Wasden, Idaho Attorney General;  
Tom Miller, Iowa Attorney General;  
Jack Conway, Kentucky Attorney General;  
Janet Mills, Maine Attorney General;  
Martha Coakley, Massachusetts Attorney General;  
Lori Swanson, Minnesota Attorney General;  
Jim Hood, Mississippi Attorney General;  
Tim Fox, Montana Attorney General;  
Catherine Cortez Masto, Nevada Attorney General;  
John Jay Hoffman, New Jersey Attorney General (Acting);  
Eric T. Schneiderman, New York Attorney General;  
Wayne Stenehjem, North Dakota Attorney General;  
Michael DeWine, Ohio Attorney General;  
Chris Koster, Missouri Attorney General;  
Jon Bruning, Nebraska Attorney General;  
Joseph Foster, New Hampshire Attorney General.

Gary King, New Mexico Attorney General;  
Roy Cooper, North Carolina Attorney General;  
Gilbert Birnrich, Northern Mariana Islands Attorney General (Acting);  
Scott Pruitt, Oklahoma Attorney General;  
Ellen F. Rosenblum, Oregon Attorney General;  
César R. Miranda Rodriguez, Puerto Rico Attorney General;  
Alan Wilson, South Carolina Attorney General;  
Herbert H. Slatery, III, Tennessee Attorney General;  
Sean Reyes, Utah Attorney General;  
Mark R. Herring, Virginia Attorney General;  
Peter K. Michael, Wyoming Attorney General;  
Kathleen Kane, Pennsylvania Attorney General;  
Peter Kilmartin, Rhode Island Attorney General;  
Marty J. Jackley, South Dakota Attorney General;  
Greg Abbott, Texas Attorney General;  
William H. Sorrell, Vermont Attorney General;  
Patrick Morrissey, West Virginia Attorney General.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. The attorneys general wrote:

The use of the "adult services sections" on websites such as Backpage.com has created virtual brothels where children are bought and sold using euphemistic labels such as "escorts."

This is a quote from a letter to this effect—I don't want anybody to think this is what I am saying, it is what they are saying.

The use of the term "adult services sections" on websites such as Backpage.com has created virtual brothels where children are bought and sold using euphemistic labels such as "escorts."

Put simply, if you have knowledge that an advertisement placed on your Web site is for commercial sex with a minor, then you should be prosecuted. That is what our amendment would do.

I have no doubt that prohibiting misconduct by a Web site owner is constitutional. As the Supreme Court has held on several occasions: "Offers to engage in illegal transactions are categorically excluded from First Amendment protection."

In fact, the Supreme Court in 1973 wrote: "We have no doubt that a newspaper constitutionally could be forbidden to publish a want ad proposing a sale of narcotics or soliciting prostitutes."

This amendment targets illegal conduct—commercial sex with minors—that would not be protected by the First Amendment.

It imposes liability on Web sites that know that their sites are being used to advertise minors for sex.

In conclusion, the Internet has made this industry what it is, the second largest criminal industry in the world, second only to drugs, and it is up to us to do something about it.

One of our duties in this body is to protect the most vulnerable of individuals. That includes children, and this is what this amendment does.

Some say other parts of the bill will help stop sex trafficking, and we don't need to touch the Internet. That makes no sense to me. Seventy-six percent of sales of sex trafficking victims begin on the Internet. So you can just touch a small part of it—this touches 76 percent of victims.

We cannot allow these Web sites to continue to operate with impunity. It is time to take a stand, stop the ads, and stop the exploitation of children.

I look forward to Senator KIRK coming to the floor, presenting our amendment, assuming we can get past this block. This is so much more important than putting the Hyde amendment, cloaked in difficult language, in this bill, when the House bill doesn't contain it. The House understands that it is going to have difficulty passing it with this in the bill. Why isn't that recognized in this House? If they take that out, this bill swims through.

Mr. CORNYN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CORNYN. I was in my office and watching the Senator on TV, so I thought I would come to the floor and maybe we could get to the bottom of this. There seems to be a ship passing in the night, it seems to me.

I know the Senator from California cares passionately about this issue, and I don't question that for a moment. It is very clear to me. But I ask the Senator from California, she graciously agreed to cosponsor this legislation?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I did.

Mr. CORNYN. She voted for it in the Senate Judiciary Committee that passed unanimously. It does contain, on page 50 and 51 of this bill, the language that the Senator referred to. I saw it on my TV screen in my office, which incorporates the limitation that was contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014. It incorporates that into the bill by reference.

Not only—I believe the Senator voted for the bill in committee and cosponsored it. The Senator also voted for that limitation in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014. This is the same or similar language of what was contained in the Affordable Care Act, contained in the Defense authorization bill, and contained in literally every appropriations bill since 1976.

This is what I would love to have my friend, the Senator from California, explain to me: Why is it that it all of a sudden becomes objectionable on this legislation—when you care and I care so passionately about getting help for these victims—that this is the reason to derail the legislation?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Because of what this legislation is. This legislation is the raping and the misconduct, sexually, with young girls, girls 14, 15, and 16. What if they are impregnated? Should they be entitled to be able to go and get an abortion? Does this body really want them to be forced to bear somebody else's child?

So this offers the opportunity for some funding. These aren't wealthy girls. They don't live in Beverly Hills, Hyde Park, or any of these places that are prominent. They are on the streets. They are lost, maybe lost mentally, lost physically. They may have been abused, and now they are caught up in an industry where they are held hostage in the night.

I have read of some in a neighborhood in my city being handcuffed at night, stripped, so they don't have clothes and can't run away. They are put out on the streets, they are watched. They are moved around. If it becomes too hot in one area, they are moved to another. They are moved to another State, and they come from other countries.

It just seems to me to have this in this bill—and, Senator, I have great respect for you. I have wanted to work with you on this. I know you are sincere.

It is not in the House bill. So maybe the House understands this. I can't speak for the House.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I am pleased to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Otherwise, we are going to have to keep addressing questions through the Chair and keep asking for permission. I think it is great to have an honest conversation with my friend.

So it is clear that the Senator from California has voted for this restriction on use of taxpayer funding for abortions previously, correct?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Not to my knowledge. Let me put it that way. Now you can blame me and say I should have known—I am not the only one on our committee, Senator, who is in this position, either, who communicated with your staff and was under the impression that the bill was identical to last year, with the exception of seven pieces, which are not this. The seven were detailed to us.

Mr. CORNYN. I am not going to engage in a debate about whether the Senator should have known or how she voted in the past. I believe the record would demonstrate that she and others voted for the Affordable Care Act, which actually National Abortion Rights Action League says is an expansion of the Hyde amendment.

I ask the Senator, you rightly point out that these child victims of sexual assault will have been raped, either statutory rape—they are below the age of consent—or they are adults and they have been assaulted, criminally assaulted.

Isn't it your understanding of the Hyde amendment that the exclusion to the Hyde amendment would still allow them to gain access to the services that you believe they need or deserve?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Yes. I think that is correct. I suppose we could change this to have a rape implication, but the gauntlet has been thrown down. And it is not up to me alone to remove it. There was no open discussion in our committee when we discussed this that there was a highly sensitive issue in it, Senator.

Now, I will plead mea culpa. And guess what. I will wave a whip and get my staff and say: Look henceforth at every code change. But my colleague and I both know that occasionally things slip through. I will plead mea culpa on that. But once I found out, I had an obligation to do something about it.

So I am pleading with my colleague, let's just take it out. Let's just pass this bill. Let's put the Kirk-Feinstein

amendment in. Let's go after the Internet purveyors. Let's go after 19 sites that put pictures of girls 12, 13, and 14 to be sold all around the United States, to be sold after big football games in various areas of the country. Let's go after them. Isn't that more important?

I would like to ask my colleague a question.

Mr. CORNYN. That is the reason I am so confused by the filibuster of this legislation by people, including my friend, who are cosponsors of the legislation and who already voted for it.

I am not about pointing fingers in terms of what staff or Members should have read or understood about the legislation, but I believe the reason it was not debated at the Judiciary Committee level is because it had become a routine matter since 1976, when the Hyde amendment was passed. Every appropriation of Labor-HHS or other funding that could arguably use tax dollars for abortions has been limited by the Hyde amendment language.

I had a couple of Senators in my office yesterday afternoon who are proudly pro-choice. I am proudly pro-life. But even my pro-choice friends said we still believe taxpayer funds should not be used for abortions except in the case of rape or to protect the health of the victim.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Well, why then, if I may ask a question, respectfully.

Mr. CORNYN. Sure.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Why isn't it in the House language?

Mr. CORNYN. I would say to my friend that I can't vouch for the House's product. I can just say what the Congress as a whole has done since 1976, and it has limited the expenditure of funds for this purpose under the terms of the Hyde amendment.

That was the reason we referred in the legislation, on page 50, which my colleague has blown up here, referring to the language in the Committee on Appropriations, which I am confident my friend, the Senator from California, voted for, just as she did in the limitation that was contained in the Affordable Care Act and all the other times that Hyde has been part of our process. This has become so unremarkable and so routine that it hardly seems like something someone would point out because this language doesn't change the status quo at all.

So we have talked about ways to get past this impasse, and I would just have to say I think abandoning the Hyde amendment would be a dramatic mistake and something I am not willing to be a part of. It has become this one area, in a divisive area of abortion, where there has been bipartisan consensus for 39 years, at least to the point it has remained the law of the land effectively. To take it out and say somehow we are going to depart from that today or this week would, to me, be a dramatic expansion of taxpayer

funding for this purpose that I can't support.

So I would say, if there are ways we can deal with this fund, as a fund that can be appropriated on an annual basis subject to the normal restrictions—that is something I talked about with the ranking member, our friend from Vermont, that possibility—I think there are ways we might be able to get to a solution. But stripping out this limitation, which has been the law of the land for 39 years, is not acceptable because it would represent a huge expansion on the use of taxpayer funding for abortions in ways many of my pro-choice friends don't support.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Well, I guess I disagree with that. Those of us who believe a woman should control her own reproductive system, in concert with her family and her doctor, have objection to the government getting involved and telling us what to do. It is actually not your reproductive system—and I say “you” generically, as a man—it is our reproductive system. In a sense this has been a battle for our identity.

I sat on a term-setting and paroling authority in California in the 1960s, when abortion was illegal. I sentenced women to State prison for abortion. It had then an indeterminate sentence of between 6 months and 10 years. I saw abortionists come back to prison. I asked one, when I was setting the sentence: Why do you keep doing this? Her first name was Anita. And she said: Because I feel so sorry for the women.

That was the way it was. I remember passing the plate at Stanford for a young woman to go to Tijuana for an abortion. The morbidity that was done to women through back-alley abortions, this has opened a Pandora's box of big emotional issues for women.

As to the Hyde amendment, if there is rape and you can prove it, that is right; and then there is a 12-year-old, a 13-year-old who is out on the streets as a prostitute, which is a different thing—sort of the same but sort of different. The overwhelming evil of this trade overcomes any of this, because you take a young woman, and you probably change their life for the worse for the rest of her life.

Imagine your daughter being out on the street; my daughter, my granddaughters being out on the street like this and what it would do to them being handcuffed and moved and traded around the country and girls brought from Nepal through India, all over Europe. This is what is going on in the world today, and we are sitting here arguing essentially about the availability of an abortion in this area. To me, that is so secondary to the enormous harm that is being done.

I have great respect for my colleague. He has been a very distinguished jurist in his State. He makes sense when he speaks on the Judiciary Committee.

We have listened to each other for more than a decade now. Let this drop. Let us get on with the work of this bill—and the work of this bill isn't completed until we get some of the amendments that relate to the bill—and then I think we can debate this another day.

I would say I plead a mea culpa. I wish I had known. All I can say is I did not know. Is that my fault? Probably. But I didn't know. So if you don't know, and you make a mistake, isn't the right thing to try to set that right? That is what we have tried to do, and women on our side, and some on my colleague's side, feel very strongly about this.

My colleague knows over the years we have lost virtually every battle that has been on this floor and we are tired of it. So we are taking a stand and we are going to hold that stand.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I obviously don't agree with my friend from California, but I respect her for answering the questions I have posed here today. I just find it a terrible shame we are going to relitigate what has been the law of the land for 39 years on this bill in a way that would block help to the very people I know the Senator from California cares so passionately about.

If we are going to undo the Hyde amendment, which the Senator has voted for in some form or another repeatedly over the years, then we are not going to make any progress. If we can find some other way to structure the funds so the appropriators will have a more direct role in appropriating the fines and penalties paid into this fund on an annual basis, I think maybe there is some room to talk. But I thank the Senator for her courtesy in answering my questions. I am sorry we find ourselves at this loggerhead, but I hope at some point that can be resolved.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. May I say one more thing? It is my understanding—breaking news coming here—that there is no language in Federal statute on sex trafficking that defines a trafficking survivor as a victim of rape. So the victim would have to prove she is a victim of rape.

Now, look at what happens. I don't know if in my colleague's legal career it took him close to very young victims of this who cover up and who don't want to let people know. I am sure my colleague knows all of the vicissitudes, the hard life. We are asking someone to prove it.

Mr. CORNYN. I would say to my friend that when I was attorney general of Texas for 4 years, I had responsibility for administering the Crime Victims' Compensation Fund as part of my duties of office, and we worked very directly with victims groups, including those who took care of very young children who had been sexually assaulted,

sometimes by members of their own family—just the worst, the most reprehensible sorts of crimes.

But if I can ask the Senator just one last question. Of course, we have had the procedural vote on the floor, twice now, where Democrats have blocked our ability to both vote on amendments, including amendments the Senator may have with the Senator from Illinois, Mr. KIRK. Why is there an objection to processing those amendments and allowing the Senate to work its will? Why can't we vote on them? Why can't the Democratic minority take up the majority leader's offer for a vote to strip the language out that your side objects to?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Can I answer that as honestly as I feel?

Mr. CORNYN. I wish the Senator would.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Because there are many of us who believe this is one small step for womankind. It is one battle we can win, and we have had loss after loss after loss.

You know, many of us ran on the right to choose. I was one of them. I am old enough to have seen the way it was before, to have sentenced women who committed illegal abortions with coat hangers. That is sort of the systemic root of all of this. It is our history, Senator. We are trying to change that history, and we keep losing. So there is one small thing in this.

My colleague is right, we didn't see it, and we have to live with that. I understand that. But now we see it and we are trying to do something about it and, thankfully, our party is standing up with us. So we say make that small change and we pass this bill, and maybe we can even strengthen it with amendments.

My colleague has done a superior job in putting the bill together. Let it go.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would just say, in conclusion, that I think it is a terrible shame that my colleague's side of the aisle has decided to take this bill hostage to try to litigate something that has been the law of the land for 39 years. I understand she feels passionately about it. I don't question that for a minute—the sincerity of my colleague's deeply held personal views.

But why in the world would my colleagues take as a hostage a piece of legislation that is going to help those 100,000 children who are sex-trafficked each year? Why should they suffer so my colleagues can make a point on this particular piece of legislation?

I don't understand that and I think it is a terrible shame.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Well, let me answer a question with a question. Why doesn't my colleague just take it out? It is not in the House bill. Then we don't have to conference it, we don't have to have another fight, we can get the amendments in the bill to strengthen the bill, and we can move

on, with the two parties together doing something that is right for the Nation. Why don't we do it?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend, I don't blame her for asking, but why in the world would we change settled law for 39 years in order to accommodate the minority's view on this bill, and to change, as I said, what has been the law of the land?

Since the Senator voted for this very language previously this year in the Judiciary Committee—since she cosponsored it, I don't really understand it since she voted for the legislation that is referred to here that has that amendment. Does the Senator see this as breaking new ground? Is she trying to expand or eliminate the Hyde amendment?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I see it for standing up for a principle. I know something about these girls. I know something about the history of abortion in this country. I am old enough to have gone through it and know that I don't want to go back to those days. I don't want young women who take the law now so much for granted to have to return back.

This is just one small step. There is nothing wrong with accommodating the minority on what is a relatively small point. In the House, 435 people over there didn't want it in. So why not accommodate the minority? The Senator just comes out a bigger person.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend I appreciate her courtesy and her indulgence in having this conversation. I also feel on principle this limitation on tax dollars is an appropriate one. I understand the Senator disagrees and she would like to eliminate this from this point forward. But I am simply unable on principle to accommodate the Senator in that request.

As I said, I do appreciate her courtesy.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I appreciate it, too. And I appreciate the discussion. Principle doesn't know minority and majority. Principle is deeply held.

I thank the Senator very much.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MORNING BUSINESS

### DEMOCRACY RESTORATION ACT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I support the Democracy Restoration Act. This important legislation would re-

store a voice in our democracy for millions of Americans who cannot vote simply because they have a criminal conviction. I thank Senator CARDIN for his leadership on this issue. I am honored to be an original cosponsor of this important criminal justice reform legislation.

The right to vote for all is a principle that goes to the very heart of all democracy. Voting is a fundamental right because it is the right from which all other rights derive. Participation in the political process is about giving a voice to the voiceless. It is about who we are as a Nation and whether we want citizens that contribute to our society to have a say in who represents them in the Federal Government.

The road to extend voting rights to all Americans has been long and not without bumps. Our country was founded at a time when African Americans were denied the right to vote. For over a hundred years, we silenced entire populations of Americans and deemed them unworthy of participating in the political process merely because of their race.

During his famous Gettysburg Address, President Lincoln called for the country to have a "new birth of freedom." After the Civil War, the States ratified the Civil War Amendments to the Constitution to honor President Lincoln's promise. One of those amendments, the Fifteenth Amendment, gave African Americans the right to vote. Decades later, the Nineteenth Amendment gave women suffrage.

Despite this progress, many States passed laws during the Jim Crow era to disenfranchise African Americans, including literacy tests, poll taxes, and grandfather clauses. These States also passed laws that banned people with certain convictions from voting. With the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, many of these State disenfranchising laws were outlawed. But the ban on voting for people with certain convictions was not touched and it remains the law in many States.

Today, 35 States restrict voting rights of persons who were formerly incarcerated. In fact, felony disenfranchisement laws prevent 5.85 million Americans from voting. This is a staggering number of Americans that do not have a say in our political process.

Punishment is a legitimate goal of our justice system. But once someone has served their time and been released, we must help our fellow citizens get back on their feet. As President George W. Bush said in his State of the Union Address in 2004, "America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life." To further punish people who are back in the community by denying them the right to vote counters the expectation that citizens have rehabilitated themselves after a conviction.

The Democracy Restoration Act would restore voting rights in Federal elections to millions of disenfranchised Americans who have been released from prison. It would require prisons receiving Federal funds notify people about their right to vote in Federal elections upon leaving prison or being sentenced to probation. It would empower the Department of Justice and former offenders harmed by a violation of this legislation with the right to sue.

This bill corrects a civil rights wrong. It would sweep away the last vestige of Jim Crow laws. It would outlaw State disenfranchisement laws that have a disparate impact on racial minorities. It would provide a uniform standard to govern the restoration of voting rights.

This bill reforms the criminal justice system. Every year, over 600,000 people leave prison. We must find ways to reintegrate them back into the community. Civic participation gives offenders a stake in government, which motivates law-abiding behavior and reduces the likelihood of future crimes. No evidence exists that denying voting rights to people after release from prison reduces crime. To the contrary, it makes sense that people who have paid their debt to society should reclaim their rights.

This bill builds off of the progress in the States. Recently, 8 States have either repealed or amended lifetime disenfranchisement laws. Two states expanded voting rights to persons on probation or parole. Ten States eased the restoration process for people seeking to have their right to vote restored after the completion of their sentence. The Federal Government should follow their lead.

Nothing is more powerful than an idea whose time has come. This Congress can remedy the barriers to full citizenship faced by millions of formerly incarcerated people in our country, if this bill is enacted into law. Restoring the right to vote is good public policy.

To protect basic public safety and strengthen the core of our democracy, I urge my fellow Senators to support the Democracy Restoration Act and quickly pass this important legislation.

### CONGRATULATING NANCIE ATWELL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the inspiring accomplishments of Nancie Atwell from Southport, ME, who was awarded the first Global Teacher Prize by the Varkey Foundation. This international, nonprofit organization is committed to improving the quality of education worldwide. Nancie's selection as the foundation's first ever prize recipient is a testament to her outstanding contributions to the teaching

profession and her effect on countless students and teachers. The \$1 million prize was awarded at a ceremony in Dubai attended by former President Bill Clinton and Sheikh Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum, Prime Minister of the United Arab Emirates.

Heralded as the "Nobel Prize of Teaching," the prestigious Global Teacher Prize shines a spotlight on the critical role that teachers play in our society. Nancie was selected from more than 5,000 nominations received from 120 countries. The candidates were evaluated based on their innovative teaching practices, including their ability to prepare students to be global citizens.

The pool of thousands was narrowed down to a group of 10 remarkable nominees, including teachers from Afghanistan, India, Kenya, Haiti, Malaysia, Cambodia, and the United States. Within this elite group, Nancie Atwell rose above the rest. Nancie has been a teacher since 1973. In 1990, she used money from her own pocket to found the Center for Teaching & Learning, an independent demonstration school that educates students from kindergarten through eighth grade in the small town of Edgecomb. Her vision was to foster a more meaningful education for Maine students. The center serves a close-knit population of approximately 75 students who travel from several surrounding towns because they are attracted to the school's small class sizes, research-based curriculum, and teacher outreach programs.

In a gesture that exemplifies her deep commitment to her students, Nancie announced that she intends to donate every last penny of the \$1 million prize back to her school to support its resources, scholarships, library, and to replace its worn out furnace.

Nancie, who has authored many books and articles about education and hosted 140 education workshops, embodies a teaching philosophy based on student engagement, not just assignments. She encourages her pupils to identify and pursue their passions. By enabling students to choose to read and write about what interests them, the center has created an environment where children are excited to learn and eager to demonstrate their knowledge.

In addition to teaching students, the center does remarkable work teaching teachers. Educators from other schools regularly visit the center for professional development. Once there, they observe school-wide morning meetings, libraries in every classroom, and student-driven writing workshops. The center facilitates a teacher internship program that pairs visiting educators with teachers at the school. These intern-teachers observe and confer about instruction methods and leave equipped to make substantive changes back in their own schools.

In her acceptance speech, Nancie said:

When children are engaged, when learning is joyful, those are the lessons that stick. Those are the lessons that are worthwhile and meaningful and hang around.

This philosophy has inspired teachers and students alike. In fact, it was one of Nancie's former students who nominated her for the prize.

Under Nancie's leadership, the Center for Teaching & Learning has earned national praise. How wonderful it is that Nancie's work has now earned global recognition. The people of Maine—and especially its students—are fortunate to have such a pioneering and driven educator fighting for a brighter future. Nancie is a remarkable ambassador for both the State of Maine and our country, and I congratulate her on this outstanding accomplishment.

#### RECOGNIZING TONY ALEXANDER

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Tony Alexander, executive chairman of the board of FirstEnergy Corporation. Tony's 43-year career at FirstEnergy and its predecessor companies was characterized by a commitment to superior customer service, greater value to shareholders, and more opportunities for employees. As FirstEnergy's longest serving chief executive officer, Tony's vision, drive, and leadership helped propel the company to the forefront of the energy industry.

Through Tony's management, Akron-based Ohio Edison quadrupled in size to become today's FirstEnergy. Over the course of his career, he guided the company through significant mergers, acquisitions, and divestitures; complex regulatory and environmental challenges; and a wide range of operational and financial issues. His willingness to push hard for important ideas and policies made him a strong advocate during one of the most challenging periods in the history of the electric industry.

Tony's principled leadership has also shown through his tireless work to improve his community. As a recognized leader in his community, he currently serves as an advisor to the boards of trustees for Akron Tomorrow, Team NEO, and the University of Akron. Additionally, he serves on the board of directors and President's Advancement Council of the Austen BioInnovation Institute.

Tony's service has not gone without notice. He has been awarded the Dr. Frank L. Simonetti Distinguished Business Alumni Award from the University of Akron—a testament to his community leadership.

I congratulate Tony, his wife Becky, and their four sons for the profound impact he has made throughout his community and the energy industry.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:09 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1029. An act to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1191. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1029. An act to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 1191. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-941. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Dimethomorph; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9923-59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-942. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Boscalid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9921-01) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-943. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Professional Standards for State and Local School Nutrition Programs Personnel as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010" (RIN0584-AE19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-944. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and

Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Minnesota, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin" (Docket No. APHIS-2014-0023) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 13, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-945. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Homeland Defense and Global Security), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a consolidated budget justification display that includes all programs and activities of the Department of Defense combating terrorism program (OSS-2015-0286); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-946. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General James L. Huggins, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-947. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report describing activities under the Secretary of Defense personnel management demonstration project authorities for Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories (STRs) for calendar year 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-948. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-949. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-950. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 on April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-951. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to South Korea; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-952. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Obsolete Section 8 Rental Assistance Certificate Program Regulations" (RIN2577-AC93) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-953. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to discretionary appropriations legislation; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-954. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of all extensions granted by Congress regarding the require-

ments of Section 13 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-955. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Low Emission Vehicle Program" (FRL No. 9915-05-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-956. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, South Coast Air Quality Management District and Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9923-07-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-957. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Steam Generating Units" (FRL No. 9923-98-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-958. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Consolidated Rules of Practice Governing the Administrative Assessment of Civil Penalties, Issuance of Compliance or Corrective Action Orders, and the Revocation, Termination or Suspension of Permits; Correction" (FRL No. 9922-62-OECA) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-959. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Region 4 States; 2008 Lead, 2008 Ozone and 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide Prevention of Significant Deterioration Infrastructure Plans" (FRL No. 9924-47-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-960. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Indiana; Minor NSR for Title V and FESOP Sources" (FRL No. 9924-22-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-961. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Amendments to Gasoline Vapor Recovery Requirements for Illinois" (FRL No. 9922-71-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-962. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards of Performance for New Residential Wood Heaters, New Residential Hydronic Heaters and Forced-Air Furnaces" (FRL No. 9920-50-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-963. A communication from the Chief Counsel for Administrative Law, Office of the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy United States Trade Representative, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-964. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reporting for Premium; Basis Reporting by Securities Brokers and Basis Determination for Debt Instruments and Options" (RIN1545-BL46 and RIN1545-BM60) (TD 9713) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-965. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Empowerment Zone Designation Extension" (Notice 2015-26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-966. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beginning of Construction for Sections 45 and 48" (Notice 2015-25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-967. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rulings and Determination Letters" (Rev. Proc. 2015-21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-968. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2015 Calendar Year Resident Population Figures" (Notice 2015-23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-969. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice Under Section 529A" (Notice 2015-18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-970. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safe Harbor Method for Determining a Wagering Gain or Loss from Slot Machine Play" (Notice 2015-21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.



EC-971. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "User Fees and Change of Address for Submission of Applications for Approval of Section 403(b) Pre-approved Plans" (Rev. Proc. 2015-22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-972. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Health Insurance Providers Fee" ((RIN1545-BM52) (TD 9711)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-973. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Alternative Simplified Credit Election" ((RIN1545-BL78) (TD 9712)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-974. A communication from the Chair of the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-975. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0274); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-976. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-0275); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-977. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2014, through November 30, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-978. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the waiver of the restrictions contained in Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act of 1992; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-979. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-143); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-980. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015-0026—2015-0028); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-981. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for the Handling of Retaliation

Complaints Under Section 806 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, as Amended" (RIN1218-AC53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 17, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-982. A communication from the Director of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: Transmission of Documents and Information" (RIN1240-AA09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-983. A communication from the General Counsel, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chairperson, National Endowment for Humanities, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-984. A communication from the Deputy Director, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Official Symbol, Logo and Seal" (45 CFR Part 18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-985. A communication from the Chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 FAIR Act Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-986. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Examination of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Receiving Local District Funds to Provide Homeless Services in fiscal year 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-987. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Executive Summary of the 2014 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts" and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Office's 2014 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 792. An original bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KING, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr.

KIRK, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 768. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 769. A bill to streamline the permit process for rail and transit infrastructure; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 770. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 771. A bill to emphasize manufacturing in engineering programs by directing the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies including the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and National Science Foundation, to designate United States manufacturing universities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 772. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 773. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 774. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BURR, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. BARASSO):

S. 775. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group health plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 776. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.



By Mr. CASEY:

S. 777. A bill to permit employees to request, and to ensure employers consider requests for, flexible work terms and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 778. A bill to prohibit the provision of certain foreign assistance to countries receiving certain detainees transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 779. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 780. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 781. A bill to improve knowledge about the best practices for teaching financial literacy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 782. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a bison management plan for Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 783. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 784. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish microlabs to improve regional engagement with national laboratories; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 785. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to repeal a certain exemption for hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 786. A bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 787. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 788. A bill to require the termination of any employee of the Department of Veterans Affairs who is found to have retaliated against a whistleblower; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

S. 789. A bill to establish the Social Work Reinvestment Commission to provide independent counsel to Congress and the Secretary of Health and Human Services on policy issues related to recruitment, retention, research, and reinvestment in the profession of social work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 790. A bill to provide for the establishment of free market enterprise zones in order to help facilitate the creation of new jobs, entrepreneurial opportunities, enhanced and renewed educational opportunities, and increase community involvement in bankrupt or economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 791. A bill to free the private sector to harness domestic energy resources to create jobs and generate economic growth by removing statutory and administrative barriers; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 792. An original bill to expand sanctions imposed with respect to Iran and to impose additional sanctions with respect to Iran, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 793. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 794. A bill to extend whistleblower protections for defense contractor employees to employees of contractors of the elements of the intelligence community; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 795. A bill to enhance whistleblower protection for contractor and grantee employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S.J. Res. 10. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S.J. Res. 11. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Human Rights Amendment Act of 2014; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. Res. 103. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. Res. 104. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the success of Operation Streamline and the importance of prosecuting first time illegal border crossers; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 139

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 139, a bill to permanently allow an exclusion under the Supplemental Security Income program and the Medicaid program for compensation provided to individuals who participate in clinical trials for rare diseases or conditions.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 308

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 308, a bill to reauthorize 21st century community learning centers, and for other purposes.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 319

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to designate a mountain in the State of Alaska as Mount Denali.

S. 396

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 396, a bill to establish the Proprietary Education Oversight Coordination Committee.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 565

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 565, a bill to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 616

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 616, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide recruitment and retention incentives for volunteer emergency service workers.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 677

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 686

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a limitation on certain aliens from claiming the earned income tax credit.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 751, a bill to improve the establishment of any lower ground-level ozone standards, and for other purposes.

S. 753

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 753, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 87, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism.

AMENDMENT NO. 300

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 300 intended to be proposed to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 779. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 779

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Fair Access to Science and Technology Research Act of 2015".

### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government funds basic and applied research with the expectation that new ideas and discoveries that result from the research, if shared and effectively disseminated, will advance science and improve the lives and welfare of people of the United States and around the world;

(2) the Internet makes it possible for this information to be promptly available to every scientist, physician, educator, and citizen at home, in school, or in a library; and

(3) the United States has a substantial interest in maximizing the impact and utility of the research it funds by enabling a wide range of reuses of the peer-reviewed literature that reports the results of such research, including by enabling computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies.

### SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF FEDERAL AGENCY.

In this Act, the term "Federal agency" means an Executive agency, as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

### SEC. 4. FEDERAL RESEARCH PUBLIC ACCESS POLICY.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO DEVELOP POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, each Federal agency with extramural research expenditures of over \$100,000,000 shall develop a Federal research public access policy that is consistent with and advances the purposes of the Federal agency.

(2) COMMON PROCEDURES.—To the extent practicable, Federal agencies required to develop a policy under paragraph (1) shall follow common procedures for the collection and depositing of research papers.

(b) CONTENT.—Each Federal research public access policy shall provide for—

(1) submission to the Federal agency of an electronic version of the author's final manuscript of original research papers that have been accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals and that result from research supported, in whole or in part, from funding by the Federal Government;

(2) the incorporation of all changes resulting from the peer review publication process

in the manuscript described under paragraph (1);

(3) the replacement of the final manuscript with the final published version if—

(A) the publisher consents to the replacement; and

(B) the goals of the Federal agency for functionality and interoperability are retained;

(4) free online public access to such final peer-reviewed manuscripts or published versions as soon as practicable, but not later than 6 months after publication in peer-reviewed journals;

(5) providing research papers as described in paragraph (4) in formats and under terms that enable productive reuse, including computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies;

(6) production of an online bibliography of all research papers that are publicly accessible under the policy, with each entry linking to the corresponding free online full text; and

(7) long-term preservation of, and free public access to, published research findings—

(A) in a stable digital repository maintained by the Federal agency; or

(B) if consistent with the purposes of the Federal agency, in any repository meeting conditions determined favorable by the Federal agency, including free public access, interoperability, and long-term preservation.

(c) APPLICATION OF POLICY.—Each Federal research public access policy shall—

(1) apply to—

(A) researchers employed by the Federal agency whose works remain in the public domain; and

(B) researchers funded by the Federal agency;

(2) provide that works described under paragraph (1)(A) shall be—

(A) marked as being public domain material when published; and

(B) made available at the same time such works are made available under subsection (b)(4); and

(3) make effective use of any law or guidance relating to the creation and reservation of a Government license that provides for the reproduction, publication, release, or other uses of a final manuscript for Federal purposes.

(d) EXCLUSIONS.—Each Federal research public access policy shall not apply to—

(1) research progress reports presented at professional meetings or conferences;

(2) laboratory notes, preliminary data analyses, notes of the author, phone logs, or other information used to produce final manuscripts;

(3) classified research, research resulting in works that generate revenue or royalties for authors (such as books) or patentable discoveries, to the extent necessary to protect a copyright or patent; or

(4) authors who do not submit their work to a journal or works that are rejected by journals.

(e) PATENT OR COPYRIGHT LAW.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect any right under the provisions of title 17 or 35, United States Code.

(f) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1 of each year, the head of each Federal agency shall submit a report on the Federal research public access policy of that Federal agency to—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives;

(C) the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives;

(D) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate; and

(F) any other committee of Congress of appropriate jurisdiction.

(2) CONTENT.—Each report under this subsection shall include—

(A) a statement of the effectiveness of the Federal research public access policy in providing the public with free online access to papers on research funded by the Federal agency;

(B) the results of a study by the Federal agency of the terms of use applicable to the research papers described in subsection (b)(4), including—

(i) a statement of whether the terms of use applicable to such research papers are effective in enabling productive reuse and computational analysis by state-of-the-art technologies; and

(ii) an examination of whether such research papers should include a royalty-free copyright license that is available to the public and that permits the reuse of those research papers, on the condition that attribution is given to the author or authors of the research and any others designated by the copyright owner;

(C) a list of papers published in peer-reviewed journals that report on research funded by the Federal agency;

(D) a corresponding list of papers made available by the Federal agency as a result of the Federal research public access policy; and

(E) a summary of the periods of time between public availability of each paper in a journal and in the online repository of the Federal agency.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—A Federal agency shall make the statement under paragraph (2)(A) and the lists of papers under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (2) available to the public by posting such statement and lists on the website of the Federal agency.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 780. A bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 780

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Cameras in the Courtroom Act”.

#### SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO TITLE 28.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

#### “§ 678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings

“The Supreme Court shall permit television coverage of all open sessions of the Court unless the Court decides, by a vote of the majority of justices, that allowing such coverage in a particular case would constitute a violation of the due process rights of 1 or more of the parties before the Court.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 45 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“678. Televising Supreme Court proceedings.”.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 783. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this week is Sunshine Week, when we affirm the public's right to know how their government is run. Sunshine Week, which began as Sunshine Sunday in 2002, emphasizes the importance of transparency and accountability in a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. In the spirit of government transparency, we are pleased to introduce the Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2015. This important piece of bipartisan legislation furthers the public's access to court proceedings by permitting federal judges at all federal court levels to open their courtrooms to television cameras and radio broadcasts.

Openness in our courts improves the public's understanding of what happens inside our courts. Our judicial system remains a mystery to too many people across the country. That doesn't need to continue. Letting the sun shine in on Federal courtrooms will give Americans an opportunity to better understand the judicial process. Courts are the bedrock of the American justice system. Granting the public greater access to an already public proceeding will inspire greater faith in and appreciation for our judges who pledge equal and impartial justice for all.

For decades, States such as my home State of Iowa have allowed cameras in their courtrooms with great results. As a matter of fact, all 50 States and the District of Columbia now allow some news coverage of proceedings.

The bill I am introducing today, along with Senator SCHUMER and a number of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, including Judiciary Committee Ranking Member LEAHY, will greatly improve public access to federal courts by letting federal judges open their courtrooms to television cameras and other forms of electronic media.

The Sunshine in the Courtroom Act is full of provisions that ensure that the introduction of cameras and other broadcasting devices into courtrooms goes as smoothly as it has at the state level. First, the presence of the cameras Federal trial and appellate courts is at the sole discretion of the judges—it is not mandatory. The bill also provides a mechanism for Congress to study the effects of this legislation on our judiciary before making this

change permanent through a 3-year sunset provision. The bill protects the privacy and safety of non-party witnesses by giving them the right to have their faces and voices obscured. The bill prohibits the televising of jurors. Finally, it includes a provision to protect the due process rights of each party.

We need to open the doors and let the light shine in on the Federal Judiciary. This bill improves public access to and therefore understanding of our Federal courts. It has safety provisions to ensure that the cameras won't interfere with the proceedings or with the safety or due process of anyone involved in the cases. Our States have allowed news coverage of their courtrooms for decades. It is time we join them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

#### S. 793

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sunshine in the Courtroom Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. FEDERAL APPELLATE AND DISTRICT COURTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PRESIDING JUDGE.—The term "presiding judge" means the judge presiding over the court proceeding concerned. In proceedings in which more than 1 judge participates, the presiding judge shall be the senior active judge so participating or, in the case of a circuit court of appeals, the senior active circuit judge so participating, except that—

(A) in en banc sittings of any United States circuit court of appeals, the presiding judge shall be the chief judge of the circuit whenever the chief judge participates; and

(B) in en banc sittings of the Supreme Court of the United States, the presiding judge shall be the Chief Justice whenever the Chief Justice participates.

(2) APPELLATE COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term "appellate court of the United States" means any United States circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States.

(b) AUTHORITY OF PRESIDING JUDGE TO ALLOW MEDIA COVERAGE OF COURT PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) AUTHORITY OF APPELLATE COURTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under subparagraph (B), the presiding judge of an appellate court of the United States may, at the discretion of that judge, permit the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising to the public of any court proceeding over which that judge presides.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The presiding judge shall not permit any action under subparagraph (A), if—

(i) in the case of a proceeding involving only the presiding judge, that judge determines the action would constitute a violation of the due process rights of any party; or

(ii) in the case of a proceeding involving the participation of more than 1 judge, a majority of the judges participating determine

that the action would constitute a violation of the due process rights of any party.

(2) AUTHORITY OF DISTRICT COURTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided under clause (iii), the presiding judge of a district court of the United States may, at the discretion of that judge, permit the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising to the public of any court proceeding over which that judge presides.

(ii) OBSCURING OF WITNESSES.—Except as provided under clause (iii)—

(I) upon the request of any witness (other than a party) in a trial proceeding, the court shall order the face and voice of the witness to be disguised or otherwise obscured in such manner as to render the witness unrecognizable to the broadcast audience of the trial proceeding; and

(II) the presiding judge in a trial proceeding shall inform each witness who is not a party that the witness has the right to request the image and voice of that witness to be obscured during the witness' testimony.

(iii) EXCEPTION.—The presiding judge shall not permit any action under this subparagraph—

(I) if that judge determines the action would constitute a violation of the due process rights of any party; and

(II) until the Judicial Conference of the United States promulgates mandatory guidelines under paragraph (5).

(B) NO MEDIA COVERAGE OF JURORS.—The presiding judge shall not permit the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising of any juror in a trial proceeding, or of the jury selection process.

(C) DISCRETION OF THE JUDGE.—The presiding judge shall have the discretion to obscure the face and voice of an individual, if good cause is shown that the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising of the individual would threaten—

(i) the safety of the individual;

(ii) the security of the court;

(iii) the integrity of future or ongoing law enforcement operations; or

(iv) the interest of justice.

(D) SUNSET OF DISTRICT COURT AUTHORITY.—The authority under this paragraph shall terminate 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS BARRED.—The decision of the presiding judge under this subsection of whether or not to permit, deny, or terminate the photographing, electronic recording, broadcasting, or televising of a court proceeding may not be challenged through an interlocutory appeal.

(4) ADVISORY GUIDELINES.—The Judicial Conference of the United States may promulgate advisory guidelines to which a presiding judge, at the discretion of that judge, may refer in making decisions with respect to the management and administration of photographing, recording, broadcasting, or televising described under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(5) MANDATORY GUIDELINES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall promulgate mandatory guidelines which a presiding judge is required to follow for obscuring of certain vulnerable witnesses, including crime victims, minor victims, families of victims, cooperating witnesses, undercover law enforcement officers or agents, witnesses subject to section 3521 of title 18, United States Code, relating to witness relocation and protection, or minors

under the age of 18 years. The guidelines shall include procedures for determining, at the earliest practicable time in any investigation or case, which witnesses should be considered vulnerable under this section.

(6) PROCEDURES.—In the interests of justice and fairness, the presiding judge of the court in which media use is desired has discretion to promulgate rules and disciplinary measures for the courtroom use of any form of media or media equipment and the acquisition or distribution of any of the images or sounds obtained in the courtroom. The presiding judge shall also have discretion to require written acknowledgment of the rules by anyone individually or on behalf of any entity before being allowed to acquire any images or sounds from the courtroom.

(7) NO BROADCAST OF CONFERENCES BETWEEN ATTORNEYS AND CLIENTS.—There shall be no audio pickup or broadcast of conferences which occur in a court proceeding between attorneys and their clients, between co-counsel of a client, between adverse counsel, or between counsel and the presiding judge, if the conferences are not part of the official record of the proceedings.

(8) EXPENSES.—A court may require that any accommodations to effectuate this Act be made without public expense.

(9) INHERENT AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this Act shall limit the inherent authority of a court to protect witnesses or clear the courtroom to preserve the decorum and integrity of the legal process or protect the safety of an individual.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 793. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today to announce the introduction of the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act of 2015. This bill will allow student loan borrowers to take advantage of today's lower interest rates, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Last Congress, Democrats pressed for a similar bill which has strong support from the Senate and from the public. Every Democrat, every Independent, and three Republicans voted to move this bill forward. More than 700,000 people signed petitions in support of student loan refinancing, but Republicans filibustered the bill, so it didn't pass. It is time to try again, because a problem that was bad last year has gotten worse—much worse.

Since last year, nearly 1 million more borrowers have fallen behind in

their payments. Nearly 1 million more are watching their balances get bigger, not smaller. Nearly 1 million more people are sweating out how they are ever going to repay their student loan debt.

Last year, student loan debt was an economic emergency. Now, 1 year later, the emergency is getting worse. Just look at the numbers. Students are now struggling with \$100 billion more debt than 1 year ago. Since last year, total student loan debt has jumped to \$1.3 trillion, and the debt is crushing young people.

Last year, experts at the U.S. Treasury, the Federal Reserve, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau all sounded the alarm on student debt. This year, the alarm bells are sounding even louder. One year ago, the Federal Government was projected to take in tens of billions in profits on the backs of our kids as a result of artificially high interest rates. One year later, interest rates on new loans are even higher, and even with millions of people struggling to pay, even after accounting for administrative and other costs, the Federal Government is still raking in huge profits on its student loan program.

Despite overwhelming public support for cutting the interest rates on student loans, Republicans last year refused to even debate this bill. Republicans said there were other, better ways to tackle student debt, but Republicans did nothing, nothing except filibuster the only student loan bill on the table. So tens of millions of borrowers got nothing, no help at all. Today, millions of borrowers are left with interest rates of 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent, and even higher. Nearly 1 million more borrowers are falling behind, and the Republicans have done nothing. Nearly 1 million more borrowers are falling behind, and they are watching their debt load get bigger. Nearly 1 million more borrowers are falling behind, paying interest rates that produce obscene profits for the U.S. Government, and the Republicans will not even debate refinancing student loans.

Why can't people refinance their student loans? When interest rates are low, homeowners can refinance their mortgages to reduce their payments. Businesses can refinance their debts. Even governments can refinance their debts. But student loan borrowers are stuck with their loans, sometimes at 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent, and even higher.

Our proposal is simple: refinance outstanding loans down to 3.9 percent for undergraduates, and a little higher for graduates and PLUS loans. This single change would give borrowers across this country a chance to save hundreds—and for some, thousands—of dollars a year. That's real money—money they can put toward paying down the balance on their debt, saving for a

home, buying a car—money they can put toward building a solid future.

This bill doesn't add one dime to the deficit. It is fully paid for by closing up a tax loophole that allows millionaires and billionaires to pay a lower tax rate than middle class families.

If Republicans don't like that way to pay for the student loan bill, here's another idea. Senators REED and BLUMENTHAL have advanced a bill that would close a different tax loophole. They want to end the tax breaks for executive bonuses that are bigger than a million dollars.

I say to my Republican colleagues, if you don't like that way to pay for the student loan bill, there are other options as well. Let's sit down and talk about it, but don't close your eyes and pretend this isn't happening. Don't turn your backs on the 40 million Americans with student loan debt. Don't do nothing.

Refinancing student loans will not fix everything that is wrong in our higher education system. We need to cut the price of college. We need to reinvest in public universities. We need to shore up financial aid, crack down on for-profit colleges, and provide better protections on student loans, but let's start by allowing people to refinance their student loans. Let's start by cutting back on the interest payments that are sinking young people and holding back this economy.

We could have refinanced student loan debt 1 year ago, but Republicans said no. Now Americans owe \$100 billion more than they did. Now nearly 1 million more borrowers are falling behind. Now more people than ever are choking on student loan debt.

By refusing to act, Republicans are sinking the hopes of an entire generation. It is time for Congress to step up and fix this problem, before it drags down another million Americans and another and another. It is time to refinance student loan debt.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 103—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF SOCIAL WORK MONTH AND WORLD SOCIAL WORK DAY

Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 103

Whereas the primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic needs of all people, especially the most vulnerable in society;

Whereas social work pioneers have helped lead the struggle for social justice in the United States and have helped pave the way for positive social change;

Whereas social workers are key employees at the Federal, State, and local levels of gov-

ernment and work to expand policies and practices that promote equity and social justice for all people;

Whereas social workers stand up for individuals and support diverse families in every community;

Whereas social workers continue to work to improve the rights of women, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender ("LGBT") community, and communities of color;

Whereas social workers know from experience that discrimination of any kind limits human potential and must be eliminated;

Whereas social workers know from experience that poverty and trauma can create lifelong social and economic disadvantages;

Whereas social workers help people in every stage of life function better in their environments, improve relationships with others, and solve personal and family problems;

Whereas all children have the right to safe environments and quality education;

Whereas dignity and caregiving for older adults help define the character of a nation;

Whereas veterans and the families of veterans need community support to ensure successful transitions after service;

Whereas access to mental health treatment and health care services saves millions of lives;

Whereas research has shown that all people, no matter the circumstance, may at some point in their lives need the expertise of a skilled social worker;

Whereas social workers celebrate the courage, hope, and strength of the human spirit throughout their careers;

Whereas March is recognized as Social Work Month; and

Whereas World Social Work Day is recognized on March 18, 2015: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(2) acknowledges the diligent efforts of individuals and groups who promote the importance of social work and observe Social Work Month and World Social Work Day;

(3) encourages individuals to engage in appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote further awareness of the life-changing role that social workers play; and

(4) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring individuals who have chosen to serve their communities through social work.

##### SENATE RESOLUTION 104—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE SUCCESS OF OPERATION STREAMLINE AND THE IMPORTANCE OF PROSECUTING FIRST TIME ILLEGAL BORDER CROSSERS

Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 104

Whereas the Border Patrol's Yuma Sector has long grappled with the crossing of undocumented aliens and has seen illegal traffic decline precipitously from the early 2000s to the present;

Whereas a combination of increased manpower, technology implementation, and the delivery of appropriate consequences have resulted in gains in border security in the Yuma Sector;

Whereas a key to the success in the Yuma Sector has been the implementation of Operation Streamline, a program established in 2005 that was described by former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano as “a DHS partnership with the Department of Justice, . . . a geographically focused operation that aims to increase the consequences for illegally crossing the border by criminally prosecuting illegal border-crossers.”;

Whereas known for its “zero-tolerance” approach, the Yuma County Sheriff’s Office cites 100 percent prosecution of illegal border crossers as a shared goal of a partnership including Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies;

Whereas among the various consequences delivered to illegal crossers by the Department of Homeland Security, Operation Streamline is associated with a recidivism rate that is well below average and has seen a steady decrease in recidivism in recent years;

Whereas the United States Attorney’s Office for the District of Arizona will reportedly no longer be prosecuting those apprehended crossing the border illegally for the first time; and

Whereas according to the Sheriff of Yuma County, Operation Streamline “had a deterrent effect in Yuma County, which gained a reputation as an area to avoid crossing into because if caught, you were assured to go to court and possibly face penalties”, but now the program has been “has been severely diluted.”;

Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) gains made in border security in the Yuma Sector and positive trends in recidivism rates are of critical importance to those living and working in the border region and to the Nation as a whole;

(2) refusing to prosecute first time illegal border crossers under Operation Streamline will jeopardize border security gains;

(3) the border security steps that have led to some measure of improvement on the border, such as the historical implementation of Operation Streamline, should be preserved; and

(4) the Executive Branch should immediately remove any issued or related prohibition, policy, guidance, or direction to cease prosecuting first time illegal border crossers under Operation Streamline.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 319. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 319.** Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_. REVOCATION OF IMMIGRATION BENEFITS FOR ALIENS CONVICTED OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a covered alien is convicted of human trafficking or any con-

spiracy related to human trafficking, the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of State, as appropriate, shall—

(1) revoke any immigration benefit granted to the covered alien;

(2) revoke any relief from removal provided pursuant to policies implemented under, or substantially similar to policies implemented under, an Executive action or memorandum set out under subsection (c) granted to the covered alien; and

(3) place the covered alien in expedited proceedings for removal from the United States after the covered alien completes any term of imprisonment for such a conviction.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED ALIEN.—The term “covered alien”—

(A) means an alien present in the United States; and

(B) does not include an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(2) LAWFULLY ADMITTED FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE.—The term “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(c) EXECUTIVE ACTIONS.—The Executive actions and memoranda set out under this subsection are the following:

(1) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Civil Immigration Enforcement: Priorities for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens” dated March 2, 2011.

(2) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion Consistent with the Civil Immigration Enforcement Priorities of the Agency for the Apprehension, Detention, and Removal of Aliens” dated June 17, 2011.

(3) The memorandum from the Principal Legal Advisor of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Case-by-Case Review of Incoming and Certain Pending Cases” dated November 17, 2011.

(4) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children” dated June 15, 2012.

(5) The memorandum from the Director of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement entitled “Civil Immigration Enforcement: Guidance on the Use of Detainers in the Federal, State, Local, and Tribal Criminal Justice Systems” dated December 21, 2012.

(6) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Southern Border and Approaches Campaign” dated November 20, 2014.

(7) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies for the Apprehension, Detention and Removal of Undocumented Immigrants” dated November 20, 2014.

(8) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Secure Communities” dated November 20, 2014.

(9) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Who Are the Parents of U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents” dated November 20, 2014.

(10) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Expansion of the Provisional Waiver Program” dated November 20, 2014.

(11) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies Supporting U.S. High-Skilled Businesses and Workers” dated November 20, 2014.

(12) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Families of U.S. Armed Forces Members and Enlistees” dated November 20, 2014.

(13) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Directive to Provide Consistency Regarding Advance Parole” dated November 20, 2014.

(14) The memorandum from the Secretary of Homeland Security entitled “Policies to Promote and Increase Access to U.S. Citizenship” dated November 20, 2014.

(15) The memorandum from the President entitled “Modernizing and Streamlining the U.S. Immigrant Visa System for the 21st Century” dated November 21, 2014.

(16) The memorandum from the President entitled “Creating Welcoming Communities and Fully Integrating Immigrants and Refugees” dated November 21, 2014.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Federal Communications Commission.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized

to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 18, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The Impact of Abusive Parent Litigation Practices on the American Economy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 10 a.m. in room SD-G50 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a joint hearing with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWERS

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 18, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern,

Sirvat Tokatlian, be allowed privileges of the floor throughout the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 1191

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11 a.m., Thursday, March 19; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 178, with the time until the cloture vote at 12 noon equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Senators should expect up to two rollcall votes at noon.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:24 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 19, 2015, at 11 a.m.



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 18, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARDY).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 18, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CRESENT HARDY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### GAZA'S WATER SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, amidst the troubling picture coming out of the Israeli elections, there was some good news from the Middle East for a change. The Israeli Government announced that it would double the amount of water it sells to Gaza from 5 million to 10 million cubic meters annually. This is positive momentum we must build upon because, while it is an important step, the quantity is insufficient to prevent a humanitarian disaster looming for Gaza and the region.

The tunnels that were dug by Hamas from Gaza into Israel were not the only things underground that should generate public concern. Without rapid action, the drinking water beneath Gaza, or the lack thereof, poses a threat to the region that is as severe or worse than Hamas' tunnels. That is because the coastal aquifer, the only source of drinking water for 1.8 million Gazans, is near collapse, as soon as 2016.

Like the cities of Los Angeles or Tel Aviv, Gaza cannot currently meet its

water needs from within its boundaries. That dynamic is compounded by the fact that Gaza's population is rapidly increasing and now consumes three times the amount of water that is naturally replenished from rainwater.

The massive amount of water withdrawn from the aquifer over the last several decades has allowed salty Mediterranean seawater to contaminate the drinking water at an ever-increasing rate. A 2012 United Nations report said that 90 percent of the coastal aquifer salinity levels were too great for drinking purposes. Today that figure is 95 percent. By the end of 2016, the entire aquifer will be unfit for human consumption. And unless action is taken, by 2020, that damage will be irreversible.

To make matters worse, Gaza does not have large and modern sewage treatment plants and operations. The sewage from 1.8 million Gazans further pollutes the groundwater and risks the outbreak of pandemic diseases like cholera and typhoid. Sewage remains untreated as 90,000 cubic meters of raw sewage, flows into the Mediterranean every day.

Israeli intelligence knew about and warned about Hamas' tunnels long before they were used, but Israeli politicians chose not to take their counsel.

Environmental and water experts have been warning for many years about the imminent collapse of Gaza's coastal aquifer, but too many politicians everywhere have failed to respond.

While we don't want to minimize Israel's important move to authorize additional water into Gaza, we shouldn't overstate its impact in averting the region's looming water crisis.

What is going to happen if thousands of Gazans actually rush to the fences, trying to get to Egypt or Israel for water? What happens if the water crisis broadens the appeal of Hamas' malice in Gaza?

Look at the recent history in Syria, where the collapse of civil order and the civil war was precipitated by persistent drought that drove people from the countryside into the city. Such dire outcomes in Gaza could be avoided if additional and immediate long-term measures were employed.

Based on the existing infrastructure, Israel has the potential to double—overnight—the quantity of water supplied to Gaza. A wastewater treatment plant recently built under the management of the World Bank in Gaza could

reduce by a third the amount of untreated wastewater that pollutes both the groundwater and the beaches of Israel and Gaza.

It is clearly in Israel's interest to facilitate the private-public partnerships that lead to greater energy independence and assist the Palestinian Water Authority.

Strengthening the Palestinian Authority by increasing the flow of water into Gaza and dealing with the sanitation crisis weakens Hamas and highlights their inability to provide public services.

Last night's election was deeply troubling for the future of Israeli politics and a two-state solution, long the policy of the United States and, until recently, the leadership of Israel.

But taking action on water and sanitation is a small, critical, important step that everyone can support and will benefit Israelis and Palestinians alike. I hope this will be an important focus for those of us in Congress as we look at our aid packages going forward.

### IN REMEMBRANCE OF WYNONA HAYDON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Wynona Haydon, a beloved woman who recently passed away into the loving arms of our Lord.

Wynona married Julian Woodrow Haydon after graduating from high school, and then she began her career as an assistant with the Department of Defense. Throughout her 36-year career, she held positions at the Pentagon and at Military Ocean Terminal Sunny Point in North Carolina. There, she met General James Doolittle, General Omar Bradley, and General Dwight D. Eisenhower. She helped usher in the postwar era, alongside many other military officers and personnel.

Mr. Speaker, Wynona was proud to be an American, and she was equally proud of being a North Carolinian.

Someone once said of Wynona that she was "made of the stuff that makes life worth living." Though known only by those lucky enough to come within her orbit, Wynona lived a life of honesty and hard work, and instilled those traits in her son, her grandson, and her many nieces and nephews.

She was a loving and successful mother and grandmother, a smiling joy

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

and inspiration to her friends and those who came in contact with her. In short, Wynona Haydon lived a long and contributing life which brightened the lives of many others, including mine.

My thoughts and prayers are with her family and the members of Temple Baptist Church, who are mourning the loss of a beloved woman.

#### REPUBLICANS DECLARE WAR ON POOR WORKING FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, with the release of yesterday's budget, it is official: Republicans have declared war on poor working families in this country. I am deeply disappointed, but I can't say that I am all that surprised.

Yesterday's House budget once again slashes safety net programs that provide critical assistance to low- and middle-income families while offering big tax breaks to the superwealthy. I have seen this movie before. I didn't like it the first time, and I sure don't like it now.

Following in the footsteps of the recent Ryan budgets, Chairman PRICE's budget guts the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, the Nation's premier antihunger program. Like Republican budgets of past years, this year's budget converts SNAP into a block grant for States.

Mr. Speaker, this would end SNAP as we know it. Previous estimates of the impact of block granting SNAP show that it will result in about \$130 billion in cuts to the program. A cut of that magnitude to SNAP would have serious harmful consequences to the 46 million Americans who relied on SNAP last year to put food on their tables.

This is the same budget that includes a number of other devastating funding cuts to programs that support children, families, and seniors. The Republican budget would end the Medicare guarantees, block grant Medicaid, and repeal the Affordable Care Act, which has helped 16.4 million Americans gain affordable, high-quality health insurance.

The Republican budget also includes reconciliation instructions to the Agriculture Committee, requiring additional cuts to programs within the committee's jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't support last year's farm bill because it included an \$8.6 billion cut to SNAP, but the Agriculture Committee finished its work on a reauthorization bill. It is done. We should not be reopening the farm bill in this budget process.

It is bad enough that SNAP has been cut by nearly \$20 billion in recent years, with cuts coming in both the farm bill and with the expiration of the ARRA provisions that resulted in an

across-the-board cut for all SNAP beneficiaries. Every single one of those who were on SNAP received a cut. We certainly should not be making hunger worse by cutting our premier antihunger program even further.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans' fixation with attacking SNAP just doesn't make sense. SNAP is one of the most effective and efficient of all Federal programs. Its error rate is at an all-time low, and that includes underpayments as well as overpayments. And in recent years, USDA has successfully cracked down on trafficking of SNAP benefits.

The purpose of SNAP is to feed hungry people, which it does. SNAP is a program that works. Without SNAP, hunger would be much worse in this country.

We know from recent CBO estimates that SNAP spending and caseloads have already begun to decline and will continue to do so as our economy continues to recover from the Great Recession. We also know that SNAP is not contributing to our long-term deficit. According to CBO, its share of the economy will continue to decline.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be balancing the Federal budget on the backs of the working poor, period. Cutting food assistance and making hunger worse in this country will not solve our fiscal challenges. SNAP is not the problem.

For Republicans, cuts to programs for low-income Americans might rally their base, but it won't solve our budget challenges. Poor and working families did not cause our fiscal problems. But time and time again, programs that help them survive tough times and provide them with opportunities to get out of poverty are always targeted for drastic cuts.

And what is especially troubling to me is that the poorest and most vulnerable Americans continue to be the target of false and often mean-spirited rhetoric in this Chamber. It is time for that to stop.

Instead of cutting SNAP, we should be strengthening the program. We should be increasing the benefits so it enables struggling individuals and families to afford more healthy foods, including fresh fruits and vegetables. The current SNAP benefit is already woefully inadequate, about \$1.40 per person per meal, and many families run out of food 3 weeks into the month because the benefit level already is so low.

We also should be working to address one of the biggest flaws in our social safety net, the so-called food stamp cliff, where someone gets a job and loses their benefits but still earns so little that they end up worse off and are back to struggling to put food on their table.

Mr. Speaker, we know that budgets are not just about priorities. They are moral documents that represent a vision for this country.

The vision laid out by Republicans in yesterday's budget is deeply troubling. We should be striving to make the lives of every American better. We should be striving to end hunger now. Unfortunately, the Republican budget does neither of those things. Instead, it makes hunger worse in this country. And that, to be blunt, is shameful.

#### UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address Russia and its aggression in Ukraine.

Ukraine is ultimately a story of a ruler whose goal is to stifle opposition and turn away from a failing economy, corruption, and authoritarianism in his own country by creating the semblance of economic stability and popular support for his rule.

The United States and its allies must strive to ensure that the story of oppression and authoritarianism is not allowed to continue.

□ 1015

Putin is aiming to distract the focus of the West from his regime and his failing economy in Russia by directing the Russian people to an external enemy which has the potential to become a model of Western democracy, and that country is Ukraine.

Just over a year ago, not even a week after the end of the Sochi Olympics which President Putin staged for a record \$50 billion to boost his popularity in Russia and in the world, Putin quickly shed the garb of a successful master of ceremonies and sent his troops to reclaim and illegally annex Crimea, then trump up a referendum in an attempt to justify this annexation.

With his immediate mobilization of the Russian military to try to tamp down calls for democracy in Ukraine, Putin planned to send a signal to Russian citizens and the world that he remained popular and strong in the face of growing calls from protesters in Ukraine for pro-Russian President Yanukovich to step down.

But Putin's goal to maintain his popularity through military force failed. Although Putin temporarily conjured up nationalist sentiment in Russia with his annexation of Ukraine, polls show that the majority of Russian citizens oppose sending Russian troops to fight in Ukraine, diminishing his popularity at home.

Meanwhile, Putin continued to ignore, with impunity, calls by the United States and Europe to reverse the illegal annexation of Crimea and remove Russian military forces. Not only did Putin refuse to withdraw forces from those countries or reverse Crimea's annexation, he armed pro-Russian separatists in Ukraine with

Russian surface-to-air missiles, which downed a civilian airliner and killed nearly 300 passengers and crew, to the horror of the United States and Western Europe, just after the Sochi Olympics.

Less than 3 months ago on this floor, in early December 2014, I underlined my deep concerns, shared by my constituents, about Russia's aggression against Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova. I appreciate your overwhelming support of H. Res. 758 condemning Russian aggression as a violation of international law and a breach of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, Georgia, and Moldova.

However, as could be expected, Putin did not listen to us or our allies. Just a month later, in January of 2015, Russian troops reengaged with Ukrainian forces in the Donbass region of Ukraine, breaking the cease-fire protocol signed in Minsk in September of 2014.

Although the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, France, and Germany agreed to reinstate a cease-fire on February 12 of this year, Russian forces violated the agreement within days, attacking a railway hub in Ukraine and threatening other strategic cities. Russia's inability to honor a cease-fire underlines the importance of expanding the scope of U.S. military assistance to Ukraine, including the provision of lethal military weapons.

Putin and his advisers have consistently denied that economic sanctions have hurt Russia, adding that the drop in the price of oil has resulted in plunging Russia's GDP and lowering the standard of living in Russia.

In addition to suffering economically, Russians have enjoyed no freedom of expression under Putin's rule. Such denial of basic human freedoms await the citizens of Ukraine should Russian aggression continue.

The latest travesty proving Putin's stifling of dissent to his authoritarian rule is the "unexplained" gunning down of prominent and popular opposition leader Boris Nemtsov in front of the Kremlin just 36 hours before a rally he had planned to lead to protest corruption and direct military involvement in Ukraine. Not only was Nemtsov a threat to Putin, he was fearless. He exposed the truth of Putin's rule, his corrupt practices, and the fraudulent elections he held in 2011 and 2012 that allowed him to return to the presidency. Former Prime Minister Kasyanov stated that there was only one explanation for the murder: "He was shot for telling the truth."

The events over the past year have made clear our path forward. We must convince the administration to change U.S. policy toward Russia. Putin's aggression in Ukraine and violation of the most recent cease-fire are linked to the assassination and are directing

people's attention away from Russian corruption and authoritarianism and toward an external threat of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must work to restore the country's territorial integrity and ensure Russian military forces are removed from sovereign nations. We must convince our President that Putin's continuation of a war in Ukraine is a desperate attempt to divert attention.

I also call on Russia to release Nadiya Savchenko, the Ukrainian Air Force pilot who remains a prisoner in Russia. And I call on the administration and Congress to fund lethal military assistance to the Ukrainian Government.

#### THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of the anti-middle class budget introduced yesterday by the House Republicans.

I view a budget as a statement of priorities. Where we allocate our resources is a clear demonstration that we value our priorities as a nation. This budget moves the middle class backward, hurts families across my region, the State of Illinois, and in our Nation.

Their budget makes deep cuts to investments in education, such as Pell grants. I view education as a long-term down payment not only for the lives of individual students and families, but for the future of our country.

Last week, I toured the region of our State that I am privileged to represent, and I spoke with community college students about programs that help make college affordable and accessible to them. I spoke with a young lady named Annalea, who attends Spoon River College in Canton, Illinois.

Annalea is one of eight children in her family. She has been raised by a single mother. Her father was addicted to drugs and left their family in debt. She is a full-time community college student and also works 38 hours a week as a cashier at a local grocery store. Her family relies on her income to help make ends meet. She depends on Pell grants and student loans to finance her education, which she knows is a path for a better life ahead.

Annalea is studying psychology so she can one day work as a school psychologist and help other students with the same kind of problems that she has had to go through herself. She knows that access to education is a key pathway to success for her and other students in our region, throughout our State and throughout our Nation. She wants to give back to the community that has given her an opportunity to move beyond the circumstances in which she was born.

Mr. Speaker, we need to invest in students like Annalea and the future of our communities, not slash spending on our young people's futures. Let's stop pulling the rug from underneath our students and saddling them with a lifetime of debt. We need a budget that invests in working families and in the middle class and creates opportunity for all to succeed in today's economy.

That is why I am leading what I would call a commonsense approach to give more flexibility to Pell grant recipients so students can take advantage of this program year round. Many of those who would benefit most are nontraditional students who want to complete their courses faster so they can get back into the workforce and also with smaller student loan debt.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to join with me and support our young people, our students, and the economic well-being of our communities by opposing these shortsighted cuts to investments in our young people.

#### THE LAND ACQUISITION TO CUT NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a bill that I have just introduced, my first as a Member of this body.

The Land Acquisition to cut the National Debt, or LAND Act, is a commonsense piece of legislation that would prohibit the Secretary of the Interior from using Federal dollars to purchase land, resulting in a net increase in acreage under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, and the Bureau of Land Management, unless the Federal budget is balanced for the year in which the land would be purchased. The same would go for the Secretary of Agriculture. Unless the Federal budget for the given year is balanced, no net increase in the land acreage may be included in the National Forest system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some in this body may wonder why I have chosen to take up this charge in the 114th Congress. For my friends on both sides of the aisle, many of whom may not be too familiar with life out West, let me give you some background.

Just before I arrived in Washington, the national debt was over \$18 trillion. As a former small business owner, the Federal Government's spendthrift habits and utter disregard for the American taxpayer's hard-earned dollars continues to frustrate me today. Like countless Nevadans, it pains me to watch as we saddle our grandchildren with such an unsustainable debt burden, borrowing against the very future we are responsible for providing them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my father always said: Don't come to me with a problem unless you have a solution to fix it. I don't pretend to have all the answers on the biggest issues facing this government and this country, but I do bring the private sector, Western sensibility to tackling the problem before we get too far out of hand. That is why I am introducing the LAND Act.

Simply put, the bill tells the Federal Government that responsibly and efficiently managing the 640 million acres of land it already controls must be a higher priority than acquiring even more private, State, and tribal lands. Think about that number for a moment, Mr. Speaker: 640 million acres. That is roughly one-third of the United States. And on those acres that the Federal bureaucracy has kept within its iron grip, there is currently existing an estimated deferred maintenance backlog of \$23 billion—that is with a B.

So what does that tell the American people, Mr. Speaker? It tells them that the Federal Government has bitten off more than it can chew, and it cannot be trusted to serve as a responsible steward of even more of our lands and resources.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Nevadan. The Federal Government controls more than 81 percent of my State, and I think I speak for most of my constituents when I say enough is enough. It boggles the mind to think that each of the 640 million acres the Federal Government controls is too valuable to be parted with in order to improve overall management, let alone the fact that the Feds want to acquire even more land on top of an already embarrassing maintenance backlog.

The Departments of the Interior and Agriculture like to tout how important land acquisition is for conserving species, providing spaces for recreation, and preserving culturally significant sites. My bill would allow them to continue to acquire land as a tool for these purposes, but it would require them to focus their efforts on lands that truly need oversight by turning over unnecessary land to those who are best able to manage it—the States.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. The Department would have the opportunity to net more acreage under the aforementioned agencies' jurisdictions under my bill. That is, so long as the Federal budget is balanced for the given year. I do not believe this is too much to ask. Where I come from, in the private sector, if you don't have a successful business plan and you don't budget well, you go out of business.

We all know that the BLM, Fish and Wildlife, and the Park Service aren't going out of business anytime soon, much to my chagrin, but at least we can force them to behave more like one on the land they currently control by ensuring that our tax dollars no longer go towards more land for these agencies.

At a time when our debt continues to soar, we can ill afford irresponsible budgets like the Interior's \$13 billion request. We need to get our fiscal house in order, and we can help that process along by passing my bill. Let's allow State, local, and tribal governments to invest in developing their lands, creating jobs, and growing the economy instead of letting them fall in disrepair on the Federal Government's watch. Let's pass the LAND Act.

#### PUERTO RICO HOSPITAL MEDICARE REIMBURSEMENT EQUITY ACT AND THE PUERTO RICO MEDICARE PART B EQUITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. PIERLUISI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERLUISI. Mr. Speaker, today I am refiling two bills to eliminate disparities that Puerto Rico faces under the Federal Medicare program.

At the outset, I want to make clear that the only reason that I have to introduce these bills is because Puerto Rico is a U.S. territory. I look forward to the day when Puerto Rico becomes a U.S. State, when it is automatically treated fairly under Federal programs, and when the island's elected officials no longer need to implore Congress to treat our constituents the same as their fellow American citizens. That is why, 6 weeks ago, I introduced legislation that would provide for Puerto Rico's admission as a State once a majority of island voters affirm their desire for statehood in a federally sponsored vote. The bill already has 80 cosponsors and strong bipartisan support.

The first bill I am filing today involves Medicare part A, which covers inpatient hospital services. The Federal Government reimburses hospitals who admit Medicare patients under a system known as the inpatient prospective payment system. The payment made to the hospital is intended to cover the operating and capital costs that a hospital incurs in furnishing care. Each hospital is paid a base rate, which can then be adjusted upwards based on a variety of factors.

□ 1030

Every hospital in the States, whether in New York City or rural Alaska, is paid the same base rate, about \$5,870. In Puerto Rico, however, hospitals are paid a base rate that is just over \$5,000, about 14 percent lower than the base rate for stateside hospitals.

This adversely affects patient care in Puerto Rico and the financial stability of island hospitals. The American Hospital Association has endorsed my legislation to eliminate this unprincipled disparity, and I urge my colleagues in Congress to enact it into law.

The second bill I am filing today involves Medicare part B, which covers

doctors' services and outpatient hospital services. Puerto Rico is the only U.S. jurisdiction where individuals who become eligible for part A are not automatically enrolled in part B, but rather must opt in to receive part B coverage.

Individuals who do not enroll in part B during the 7-month initial enrollment period, which begins several months before they turn 65 and ends several months after they turn 65, are required to pay a late enrollment penalty. The penalty is significant and lasts for as long as that individual receives Medicare.

This system has operated to Puerto Rico's detriment. There are tens of thousands of seniors on the island who enrolled late in part B, and each year, they pay millions of dollars in late penalties to the Federal Government.

There are also over 100,000 seniors in Puerto Rico who are enrolled in part A but not in part B. When those individuals seek to enroll in part B in the future, they, too, will be required to pay lifetime penalties.

I am working to address this issue on both the administrative and the legislative front. I persuaded the Federal Government to improve the written materials they make available to island seniors so that they are better informed about the part B enrollment period and the financial consequences of late enrollment.

In addition, I am refiling legislation today that would convert Puerto Rico from the Nation's only opt-in jurisdiction to an opt-out jurisdiction, just like every other U.S. State and territory.

My bill would also reduce the late penalties now being paid by Puerto Rico seniors who enrolled late and authorize a special enrollment period during which island seniors who do not have part B could enroll on favorable terms.

I urge my colleagues to support the bills I am filing today. Until the day that Puerto Rico becomes a State and is treated equally as a matter of course, I will continue to fight for fair treatment for my constituents under all Federal health programs.

The 3.5 million American citizens of Puerto Rico deserve no less.

#### CHRISTIANS ATTACKED IN PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARDY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it seems now, more than any time in recent history, Christians around the world are being singled out and persecuted.

Most recently and unfortunately were occurrences in Pakistan, where two churches were targeted by suicide bombers. The two attacks that occurred resulted in the deaths of 14 people and injured at least 70.

The bombings were obviously coordinated as they occurred fairly close in proximity and time. One suicide bomber detonated inside one church, and the other was stopped at a security checkpoint and detonated when being tackled by a guard.

Pakistan, whose track record of protecting religious minority groups is spotty at best, has a history of attacks on Christians.

In an op-ed piece I wrote in *The Washington Times* in February, I discussed the suffering of Christians and other religious minorities around the world.

Last November, a mob of 1,200 in Pakistan lynched two Christians accused of burning a Koran, and a judge sentenced a Christian to death for blasphemy.

The State Department's International Religious Freedom Report for 2013 highlights Pakistan's inability to protect the religious minorities under its jurisdiction. The report speaks of Pakistan's enforcement of blasphemy laws that restrict religious freedom and are the symbols of religious intolerance.

While the government is vocal of its condemnation of attacks on Christians and other religious communities, it has not taken proper steps to ensure the attackers of such atrocities are brought to justice. Again, it seems to be that words matter more than actions to them. Pakistan is by far not the only country to possess such a dismal record of protecting Christians.

In my op-ed, I speak of China and North Korea as countries that target Christians. Across the Middle East and North Africa, Muslim terrorist organizations search out Christians and kill them in violent and graphic ways, only because the person chose to pray to a different God.

Fellow Americans, when you think about what I have just said, when you think about the freedom that we have here, the very essence of our religious freedom in America is the freedom for all to express their religious beliefs or express none at all; yet all over the world, countries such as Pakistan, Islamic extremist groups such as ISIS and others—who have no part in a civilized society and need to be banished and done away with in a civilized society—choose to horrendously kill someone for whom they pray and the faith that they have.

Explain to me how you are supposed to worship a God that says it is okay to behead 16 Christians or to blow up their church or desecrate their facilities. It is something that must be addressed.

You see, these atrocities should not just startle those of religious faith and of nonreligious faith as well; they should startle and shock the world to realize that this is something that must cease.

For me, it is personal. As a Christian, as one of faith, my faith is described to me as being one in Christ with other believers. For me, when one is beheaded, we are all persecuted, including those here in our comfort in America.

You see, religious freedom is not just something that we talk about in the comfort of America, but must be rung loud and true throughout the world.

You see, having a member of a common faith that is being decapitated, burned alive, impaled, or crucified, these are family members to me, but in the reality to the world, as the poet has once said: "Any man's death diminishes me."

What a tragedy it takes on when it takes the form of religious intolerance by people who want their own views believed.

You see, I desire now that the President seriously take into consideration the recommendation of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom. It provides recommendations to Congress and the President about the lack of religious freedoms in other countries and advises the White House on nonlethal actions that can be taken against those countries.

Since 2002, they have recommended that Pakistan be named as a "country of particular concern." The designation of "country of particular concern" allows the government to use non-military policies to encourage a country to increase protection for religious minorities.

I strongly encourage the White House to consider looking into designating Pakistan as a "country of particular concern."

I ask the question to this administration and to the world: How many more Christians have to be blown up, how many more have to be beaten in prison, how many more have to have their heads taken off before we act?

When I deployed to Iraq, I saw the multitude of faiths and lack of faith. I have seen it come together and understand what we are fighting for. When we talk about those who act in the name of a God and are Islamic extremists who want nothing but to eradicate the rest of the people's beliefs, this is something that cannot be tolerated. I cringe when I think of this.

While I disagreed many times with the decisions made at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, I ask that this administration take this very seriously and consider religious freedom for all around the world.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my good friend for rais-

ing an important issue about religious freedom. It certainly is critical.

As we look at some of the atrocities that are happening around the world, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise today to talk about the Armenian genocide that happened nearly 100 years ago. This year actually marks the 100th anniversary.

As the eyes of the world focus on ISIS and the brutal killings of innocent Christians in the Middle East, we must recognize the horrors of the past if we hope to avoid repeating them in the future.

Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the Armenian genocide, during which the Ottoman Turks systematically exterminated over 1.5 million Armenians and Christian minorities. This genocide is a fact and cannot be ignored. It is settled history.

Turkey, however, has never accepted the responsibility and has continued to hide behind its brutal tactics that shroud violations of human rights. Even as 11 of our NATO allies and 42 U.S. States have recognized Turkey's leading role in this atrocity, this body has yet to do so.

The continued campaign of denial sets a dangerous precedent that makes future atrocities, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, more likely. While ordering his military leaders to attack Poland, Adolf Hitler rationalized: "Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?"

Mr. Speaker, if we deny that these atrocities exist, we actually perpetuate the potential that it may happen again. We must join the international community to speak with a unified voice against this genocide.

Our bipartisan Armenian Genocide Truth and Justice Resolution, H. Res. 154—just dropped—would send an unequivocal message that we will never forget those that were lost, nor will we tolerate human rights abuses of any kind.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the 100th anniversary—on April 24, to be specific—of the Armenian genocide. I call on our colleagues in the United States Congress to speak out by passing the Armenian Genocide Truth and Justice Resolution so that we can end the denial once and for all.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

## PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Mark Gooden, Munsey Memorial United Methodist Church, Johnson City, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, I give You praise this morning for Your goodness and mercy, Your steadfast love, and Your wonderful grace. Holy is Your name.

I pray for these Congresswomen and -men who represent the people across this land. These faithful servants sought public office to make a difference. Help them to stay the course and to compromise when conscience allows, but stand strong in their convictions when they can do no less. For their work ahead, I pray that You grant them clarity of thought, wisdom, and understanding. Some here are hurting and grieving; please comfort them and give them peace.

I pray that You forgive us as a people when we react with hatred and not kindness, when we are quick to speak and slow to listen, when we seek not to be understood but to judge. Help us to remember what You require of us: that we act justly, that we love mercy, and that we walk humbly with You.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BEATTY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## WELCOMING REVEREND DR. MARK GOODEN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Mark Gooden of Johnson City, Tennessee, for his service today as a guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

For more than 30 years, Dr. Gooden has served as a spiritual light to over

half a dozen churches across Tennessee as a pastor and an elder. I have personally had the privilege of knowing him as the senior pastor of my home church, Munsey Memorial United Methodist Church, in my hometown of Johnson City, Tennessee.

Mark and his wife, Judy, have been a blessing in my life. Mark ministered my wife during her recent illness and prayed with my family minutes before she passed, and for this I will be eternally grateful.

I am proud to recognize Dr. Gooden today as a guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

## ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 155) electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

## H. RES. 155

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. BUCHANAN.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

## MILITARY OATHS

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution's very first amendment protects every individual's freedom of religion, but our servicemen and -women who protect our country with their lives are seeing that freedom under fire.

In 2013, the United States Air Force Academy made the phrase "so help me God" optional in the oath each cadet takes. And why did they do that? Because of one radical atheist group's demands.

Let me be clear: Americans have the freedom of religion—but not the freedom from religion. That is why I am

introducing legislation that requires congressional approval before any change could be made to our military oaths.

Mr. Speaker, the moral foundation of our country is in serious danger if we allow radical groups to dictate whether or not we can freely express our religious beliefs. I think it is time to take a stand.

## THE GOP BUDGET

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight a GOP budget proposal that can be summed up in one phrase: work harder for less. The GOP leadership put forth a budget that does nothing to boost paychecks of hard-working Americans.

Students will see education cuts, and college will be less affordable. Mr. Speaker, this budget takes away the tools that allow people to climb the ladder of opportunity.

It attacks retirement for seniors; and seniors on Medicare will immediately pay more for preventive health services, and those with high prescription drug costs will see prices skyrocket. It will mean the end of the current Medicare guarantee, and millions of seniors can be hurt.

While Republican leadership pushes this misguided budget proposal that doesn't work for my district and doesn't work for the Nation, Democrats will continue pursuing policies that provide the tools hardworking families need to achieve economic security.

## EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

(Mr. BUCSHON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, 90 years ago today, the deadliest tornado in U.S. history passed through the southwestern Indiana towns of Griffin, Owensville, and Princeton. Named the Great Tri-State Tornado, the deadly cyclone traveled three States and 219 miles over 3.5 hours, causing 695 deaths, destroying family farms, and devastating cities.

This catastrophic event is an important reminder to Hoosier families: don't wait to get prepared. Make an emergency plan ahead of time. As we enter tornado season, take the time to stay informed.

Hoosiers can access information on what to expect and how to prepare through the Department of Homeland Security at the Federal level, the Indiana DHS, the Red Cross, my office, and other organizations.

Don't wait. Take the time to get prepared today.

## THE COURAGE OF LARRY DARCEY

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning of my first term, I came across an article in a local newspaper about a constituent of mine named Larry Darcey.

Years after being exposed to nuclear components while working in a plant supporting the U.S. Navy in Attleboro, Massachusetts, Mr. Darcey was diagnosed with cancer in 1992. Facing the fear and uncertainty of his first cancer diagnosis, Mr. Darcey quickly found out that he was far from the only former employee at the plant with cancer. But he also learned that few of those employees were aware of the Federal compensation and medical payments that they deserved.

Over the past few years, he has helped over 200 of his former coworkers file compensation claims. His work and the tireless coverage of Rick Foster and the Attleboro Sun Chronicle have kept attention on this critical issue.

Guided by their efforts, I have worked with the Department of Labor and the Social Security Administration to provide former workers and their families with over \$34 million—more than twice as much as had been paid out in the 13 years of the compensation program's existence. To many families, Mr. Speaker, that support has changed or even saved lives, and it is all thanks to Larry Darcey for raising his voice when he saw a gap in our system.

Thank you, Larry, for all you have done and all you do.

## HAPPY 84TH BIRTHDAY, HOWARD COBLE

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Mr. Howard Coble on his 84th birthday, a living legend of North Carolina politics who faithfully served the Sixth District of North Carolina for 30 years.

From the very first day when he assumed office on January 3, 1985, and the nearly 11,000 days following, he was a pillar for outstanding constituent service. With his three decades in Congress, he became the longest-serving Republican in the history of North Carolina, and he was regarded as one of the friendliest Members of Congress and certainly the most fashionable.

But the title I believe he embodies is public servant. He spent a lifetime serving our great country and our State. Beyond Congress, he has served in a multitude of capacities for North Carolina, including as a State representative. Additionally, he is a Ko-

rean war veteran and spent more than two decades serving in the United States Coast Guard and the Reserves.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct pleasure to succeed Mr. Howard Coble. On behalf of all the Sixth District and my colleagues in Congress, I thank you for your service and wish you a very happy 84th birthday.

## NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to legislation that is nothing short of an attack on workers, a bill that will harm the economic security of American families all over this country.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that economic growth is the key to strengthening the middle class, but only if we have fair rules in place that allow workers to share in that growth by negotiating for decent wages and benefits.

The National Labor Relations Board put forward a rule that ensures workers are treated fairly in the election process, that reduces bureaucratic red tape and ensures the right to collectively bargain is guaranteed.

Unfortunately, this body is considering legislation that would overturn that rule. It is wrong, and it is a waste of time.

If Congress wants to support business, we should pass legislation to repair our crumbling infrastructure so that folks can get their products to market, reform our Tax Code to make it easier for small businesses to compete, or invest in workforce development so that our kids are prepared to compete in a 21st century economy.

Mr. Speaker, there are Democrats who stand ready to work with you on an agenda that actually strengthens the middle class, but this resolution doesn't do that. I urge my colleagues to stand up for workers by voting down this resolution.

## HONORING STAFF SERGEANT RYAN PITTS, AMERICAN HERO

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of New Hampshire's own, Staff Sergeant Ryan Pitts, an American hero and recipient of the Medal of Honor. As one of only nine living soldiers to be awarded this distinct honor, his is a shining example of this generation's sacrifice on our behalf.

Staff Sergeant Pitts demonstrated an incredible amount of courage, bravery, and honor as he fought to hold off a

Taliban ambush during one of the bloodiest battles of the war in Afghanistan. Despite being attacked by more than 200 Taliban militants and sustaining injuries of his own, Pitts singlehandedly defended his platoon's observation post—his fight unwavering.

Every day our servicemembers like Staff Sergeant Pitts put themselves in harm's way to defend our liberties, our Nation, and our freedom, and for that we are forever grateful.

Mr. Speaker, during that very ambush, nine of his comrades made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom. We shall not and we will not forget their bravery and sacrifice.

Since 1861, the Congressional Medal of Honor has been awarded to just over 3,400 of our Nation's bravest soldiers. It is my honor to recognize Staff Sergeant Pitts today.

□ 1215

## HONORING JONATHAN MYRICK DANIELS

(Ms. KUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KUSTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the memory of a Granite Stater who played an important role in the Civil Rights Movement: Jonathan Myrick Daniels of Keene, New Hampshire.

During his studies at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Dr. Daniels' faith inspired him to travel to Alabama, where Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., had sought to help the fellow clergymembers in registering African Americans to vote.

Along with other students, including our esteemed colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, Jonathan spent the summer and spring advocating for civil rights, standing guard during the march from Selma to Montgomery, and even helping to integrate an Episcopal church in Selma.

While many of his fellow students ultimately traveled back north, Mr. Daniels chose to indefinitely remain in Alabama and continue to fight for equal rights.

Sadly, on August 20, 1965, Mr. Daniels was walking with fellow students when a sheriff's deputy happened upon the group and threatened them with his gun. Seeing the weapon pointed in their direction, Mr. Daniels placed himself in front of a 17-year-old girl and took the bullet that was meant for her. Friends of Jonathan had noted that he was "willing and prepared to die to help others," and tragically, that is indeed what happened.

Jonathan Daniels would have been 76 years old this Friday. He left this world far too soon, and he died fighting for the values he held dear: justice, equality, and human dignity.



As we celebrate this year's 50th anniversary of the landmark Voting Rights Act, we honor the memory of Jonathan Daniels and those like him who fought for the essential rights of every American.

#### COMMENDING VENTURE HIVE AND THE LAB MIAMI FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOUTH FLORIDA

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of two local south Florida innovative tech hubs: Venture Hive and LAB Miami.

Venture Hive is a business accelerator, and LAB Miami is a tech incubator, and both are local leaders working to help our community's entrepreneurs grow, create more jobs, and expand our economy.

Building on these lofty goals, Susan Amat, the founder of Venture Hive, has partnered with Miami-Dade County Public Schools to engage students in the business of innovation at an early age.

Meanwhile, Wifredo Fernandez, or "Wifi," has worked to build a place known as the Ellis Island of Miami for tech entrepreneurs. Both of these wonderful places are examples for cities across our Nation to help strengthen our economy and spur innovation.

Congratulations—felicidades to Venture Hive and LAB Miami.

#### TRIBUTE TO CD1 FIREFIGHTERS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the first responders and fire crews who put their lives on the line for more than 24 hours to fight the five-alarm mill fire in Providence last week.

Firefighters from across my district came to the scene to help, working through the night to contain the blaze that consumed the 90,000-square-foot building.

Thank you to the members of the Providence Fire Department and to fire crews at Central Falls Ladder, North Providence Engine, East Providence Engine, Pawtucket Engine and Ladder, North Providence Ladder, and Cumberland Ladder for your willingness to help the Providence Fire Department and your dedicated service to keep Rhode Islanders safe all throughout the year.

I would also like to thank the companies from the Second Congressional District who pitched in, Warwick Engine and Cranston Ladder and Johnston Engine and Ladder.

I applaud their service today and hope this reminds all of us of the he-

roic and important work that our firefighters and first responders do and of our responsibility to support them in every way that we can.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF OFFICER BURKE J. RHOADS OF NICHOLASVILLE, KENTUCKY

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and note the recent passing of Officer Burke J. Rhoads of Nicholasville, Kentucky.

On March 11, Officer Rhoads was suddenly and tragically killed in a car accident while on duty as an officer with the Nicholasville Police Department. Officer Rhoads was 35 years old and is survived by his wife, Melissa Suzanne Mason Rhoads, and his three children, Jacquelyn, Bryan, and Kevin. Officer Rhoads was a U.S. Army veteran and served on the Nicholasville police force for 8 years.

We grieve the loss of this promoter of peace, advocate of laws, and sentry of safety and security in our community; however, we also celebrate and honor his life and his service.

Inscribed on the wall of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial are the words "in valor there is hope." Officer Rhoads helped to bring his community hope in knowing that they were safer on his watch.

I thank Officer Rhoads for his service and devotion to our community.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, today, Americans are working more and earning less. The cost of college is rising, young people are in debt, and America's infrastructure is in decay.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget, however, does nothing to help struggling Americans. It gives tax breaks to the wealthy, ends the Medicare guarantee, makes it harder for Americans to buy a home, and cuts funding for education.

Our military leaders even testified that the Republican budget will put the lives of our men and women in uniform at risk.

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. The American people elected us. We owe it to them to pass a budget that addresses their needs, keeps them safe, and gives them the best opportunity possible to live the American Dream.

Let's focus on creating good-paying jobs, providing universal pre-K, and restoring food stamp programs that have helped many American families through these tough times. Let's ensure that our military has the re-

sources they need to make sure that they can fight the fight that America wants.

Democrats will keep standing with the American people and do the job that we were elected to do on their behalf.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House Republicans rolled out next year's budget and laid out a clear plan to balance the budget in less than 10 years, cut \$5.5 trillion in deficit spending, and fully repeal ObamaCare.

It will work to cut waste and create a lean and effective government that truly works for the people. Every day, hardworking taxpayers across our Nation are forced to balance their budgets. It is about time that the Federal Government does the same.

Over the last several years, we have seen reckless spending that is saddling future generations with massive amounts of debt. I want our children and grandchildren to have a better opportunity to succeed than we did, and on the current trajectory, that is just not possible.

Unlike the budget President Obama submitted to Congress, the House budget calls for a fairer, simpler Tax Code and promotes job creation and a healthy economy. It will work to cut red tape that is suffocating our private employers, and it creates a more transparent and accountable government.

It is time to put money back in the pockets of our hardworking American taxpayers, and this budget will do just that.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. FOSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the latest budget proposal from House Republicans.

When Bill Clinton left office in 2001, our government was running a surplus and on track to pay down our national debt to zero by 2009.

Republicans then took control of the House, Senate, and Presidency, and we saw 8 years of Republican budgets that drove us into debt and wrecked our economy. By the time Democrats regained control in 2009, our economy was in collapse, and the deficit was over \$1 trillion a year.

Republicans are now proposing to return to the very same policies that destroyed our economy in the first place: wars and military spending paid for on the backs of the middle class; tax cuts

skewed to the wealthy that produce no jobs; and underinvestment in education, research, and infrastructure that are the lifeblood of our Nation's economic growth.

Once again, we are seeing a budget that would increase financial stress on the middle class and the Medicare guarantee and force seniors to pay more for health care and for prescription drugs.

We can and we must do better.

#### OCEAN ACIDIFICATION

(Mr. BEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring our attention to an increasingly urgent problem: ocean acidification.

About 25 percent of manmade carbon dioxide emissions are absorbed by our oceans. This is the great carbon sink, which helps buffer the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> in our atmosphere. This absorption is making our waters more acidic, which has a damaging effect on the ability of shellfish to build their shells.

Ocean acidification has already cost the United States shellfish industry millions in lost profits and jobs. I am deeply concerned because the Chesapeake Bay has been identified as a main hotspot for rapid ocean acidification. Nitrogen pollution from agricultural and sewage runoff into the bay are key culprits exacerbating the effects of acidification.

The clearest solution to address this problem is to reduce the amount of carbon dioxide emissions entering our waters. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to stand with the Safe Climate Caucus in supporting efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

We need to support the EPA's proposed carbon rules for power plants, and we need to protect our ecosystems, and we need to protect the long-term viability of our coastal economies.

#### DETERGENT POISONING AND CHILD SAFETY ACT

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, this looks like it could be candy for kids, but it is not. These are detergent packs that we use in our dishwasher or in our washing machines.

Last year, the National Poison Data System received 17,230 calls involving children who are exposed to chemicals in these packs. They bite into them, or they squirt them into their eyes. These are concentrated packs, and so they do much more damage—in fact, even burning the esophagus. 769 of these children had to go to the hospital, and one child died.

I am introducing, along with Senator DICK DURBIN, the Detergent Poisoning and Child Safety Act to require that companies that produce these detergent packs provide more child-resistant packaging.

This is a consumer issue that should be addressed, and I urge my colleagues to join with me.

#### BRING BACK OUR GIRLS

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Hear ye, hear ye. Wake the town and tell the people that ISIS and Boko Haram are teaming up for terror. Boko Haram plus ISIS equals a "marriage from hell," says CNN.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram has courted ISIS for months, but this is the first time that the intelligence community has acknowledged that ISIS has responded to the overtures in a way that could pave the road for the two to collaborate.

We cannot forget the people of Nigeria. We cannot forget our school girls who were kidnapped. We cannot forget those awful unions between ISIS and Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to tweet to keep the reports of corruption, election shenanigans, and sheer terror in the national spotlight.

Tweet #bringbackourgirls and #joinrepwilson.

Tweet, tweet, tweet.

#### IT'S MORNING IN AMERICA

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, while Congress was away last week, we had another strong jobs report. You might even say, as former President Reagan used to say, "It's morning in America," in his famous ad.

In February, the economy added another 295,000 private sector jobs, and the unemployment rate edged down to 5.5 percent. That means that there have been 12 straight uninterrupted months of private sector job growth of over 200,000 jobs a month. That is the first time that has happened since 1977.

Inflation remains tame; gas prices are low; the dollar is strong, and by many measures, the economy's performance under the Obama administration has been stronger than the economy under former President Reagan.

Though I suspect that some may find it unusual to compare President Obama and President Reagan, their efforts are good news for the economy and good news for America.

□ 1230

#### REJECT HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, congressional Democrats are trying to move the country forward, but the House Republican budget is designed to turn back the clock.

Instead of trying to take a balanced approach to dealing with our Nation's fiscal problems, the House Republican budget seeks to balance itself on the backs of working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, young Americans, college students, the poor, the sick, and the afflicted. Instead of trying to promote progress for everyone, the House Republican budget seeks to enact policies designed to simply benefit the privileged few.

It is a regressive, a retrograde, and an irresponsible Republican budget, and it should be soundly rejected. It does not add a single middle class job. It does not increase a single middle class paycheck. It does not help a single middle class family send its child to college. Mr. Speaker, I am urging that the House soundly reject this reckless Republican budget.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK) laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on the Judiciary:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on the Judiciary has received a subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, for documents in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I have determined that compliance is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,  
Chairman.

#### SECRET SCIENCE REFORM ACT OF 2015

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1030.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 138 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1030.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1233

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1030) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible, with Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act, requires the Environmental Protection Agency to base its regulations on unbiased, publicly accessible science that can be verified. Why would anyone want to hide this information from the American people?

This is essentially the same bill that was introduced in the last Congress by the former Environment Subcommittee chairman, DAVID SCHWEIKERT, and it passed with bipartisan support last November.

We must make sure that Federal regulations are based on science that is available for independent review. Many Americans are unaware that some of the EPA's most expensive and burdensome regulations, such as its proposed ozone rules, are based on data that not even the EPA has seen. The EPA contracts out scientific research to third parties whom the EPA relies upon to justify its regulations, but if independent scientists ask for details, the Agency claims that it doesn't have the data, and so results cannot be verified.

This is "trust me" science, which should make us suspicious, and it clearly conflicts with this administration's promise to be the most transparent in history. This bill ensures that the decisions that affect every American are based on independently verified, unbiased scientific research instead of on secret data that is hidden behind closed doors.

The Secret Science Reform Act does not weaken privacy laws. In fact, it states that nothing in the bill will supersede privacy laws. It does not give the EPA any new authority to take private information and make it public. The Secret Science Reform Act simply prohibits the Agency from relying on nonpublic data that cannot be verified by independent scientists. The bill requires the EPA to use data that is available to the public when the Agency writes its regulations. This allows independent researchers to evaluate the studies that the EPA uses to justify its regulations. This is the scientific method.

How can we believe claims by the government about the costs and benefits of regulations if the science that allegedly justifies them cannot be verified by independent experts? What does the EPA want to hide?

This bill does not require the EPA to pay to disseminate the data it relies on publicly. Unfortunately, the CBO's old cost estimate on a previous bill ignores this point. If a third party has researched data that it believes the EPA should rely on in its rulemaking, that third party should make it publicly available so that the EPA and other scientists can check its work. There is nothing in the bill that compels the EPA to shoulder this cost, which is where the CBO went wrong in scoring the cost of this bill. The EPA has received over \$8 billion this year. Billions of hard-earned taxpayer dollars have been spent by the EPA, and taxpayers deserve to know whether it went to good science or to politically correct science.

Today, we have an opportunity to set a new course and let the American people see the data. The EPA should use sound science based on public data, not secret data hidden from the American people. This bill also will help the EPA focus its resources on the best possible science. That, in turn, will ensure a healthier, happier, and more prosperous future for all Americans. The days of "trust me" science are over. An open government that is accountable to the people is essential to protect Americans from excessive government control. The EPA has a responsibility to be open and transparent with the people it serves and whose money it uses.

If you support the right of the people to see the EPA's data, then support this bill and help the administration keep its promise to be open and honest with the American people. In God we trust. All others, especially the EPA, must use public data, not secret science.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015.

First off, I would like to dispel the falsehood that the EPA relies on secret science. They do not. They rely upon tens of thousands of peer reviewed, publicly published research studies. The kind of science that Republicans call "secret" actually consists of research studies published in prestigious scientific journals like *Science*, the *New England Journal of Medicine*, the *Annals of Epidemiology*, the *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, and many more.

Moreover, it is not a secret that the EPA uses these studies. In all of the regulatory actions the EPA takes, they publish exhaustive information about exactly what science the Agency is relying upon to establish the scientific underpinnings of the regulations. These are public documents that are easily located on the Internet.

So what is the secret?

What my Republican colleagues are calling "secret" is actually confidential, personal health information from research study participants. Some of this information is protected from disclosure by law, and other information is protected by agreements between the study participants and the researchers. The disclosure of this kind of information would be a major breach of faith with the hundreds of thousands of research participants who volunteer to enter these types of public health studies.

That said, I don't actually think that my Republican colleagues want this personal health information to be publicly disclosed. If they did want that, it would be terribly hypocritical since they have been repeatedly bashing the Obama Web site [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov) for disclosing far less information to third-party vendors.

I think that the real motivation here is to prevent the EPA from using these public health studies altogether, because if the EPA cannot rely upon these public health studies, then it will be much more difficult for the EPA to justify its protections for public health. The effect of this is that certain public health regulations will be almost impossible to update regardless of what new things the health sciences tell us about pollution and its effects on public health.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is sad that today the Science Committee is on the floor of this House of Representatives putting forth a bill that will force a public health agency to ignore science. That is why some of our premier scientific organizations, such as the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the American Statistical Association, and others, have expressed their concerns about this bill. It would be nice, when we debate bills

which are supposedly about science, if we actually listened to the concerns of the scientific community instead of ignoring them, as the majority has done here.

Likewise, some of the Nation's premier public health organizations, like the American Lung Association, the American Thoracic Society, and the American Public Health Association, among others, have come out in opposition to this bill.

Again, when dealing with issues of public health, it would be nice to occasionally listen to what the public health experts have to say instead of ignoring their voices, like the majority has done here.

Finally, a number of well-known environmental groups have registered opposition to this legislation, including the Natural Resources Defense Council, the League of Conservation Voters, and Greenpeace, among others. There was a time not too long ago when the views of these groups would have mattered to some of my Republican colleagues. Not too many years ago, the then-Republican chairman of the Science Committee, Sherry Boehlert, made clear that we need to be good stewards of the environment we are leaving for future generations.

I want to believe that some of my Republican colleagues still believe that. However, legislation like the bill before us today makes me fear that what we are left with is a majority party which ignores science, ignores public health, and ignores environmental damage—all for the sake of polluting industries that have endorsed the majority's actions here today.

Now, I don't begrudge these companies for supporting legislation that helps their bottom lines. It is expected. What concerns me is that this Congress no longer looks at the industry's request with a critical eye. We simply rubberstamp them without any regard for our Nation's scientific experts, health experts, or environmental experts and their concerns.

Mr. Chairman, I include some of these letters in the RECORD today because Congress should care about these experts and what they have to say.

MARCH 16, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We are writing to express our opposition to H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015, and H.R. 1029, the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015. Our organizations are dedicated to saving lives and improving public health.

Science is the bedrock of sound regulatory decision making. The best science underscores everything our organizations do to improve health. We strongly believe in a transparent and open regulatory process. A vital element of research is patient confidentiality. Physicians and researchers have earned the trust of their patients by steadfastly maintaining patient confidentiality. Patient confidentiality is a clear legal and ethical obligation.

The Secret Science Reform Act of 2015 will compel the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to either ignore the best science by prohibiting the agency from considering peer-reviewed research that is based on confidential patient information or force EPA to publicly release confidential patient information, which would violate federal law. This is an untenable outcome that would completely undermine the ability of the EPA to perform its responsibilities under the Clean Air Act and myriad other federal laws. The legislation will not improve EPA's actions; rather, it will stifle public health protections.

The kind of information disclosure envisioned in this legislation exceeds that required by peer-reviewed journals. We believe much of the intent of this legislation is already achieved through the current peer-review process required by all academic journals. The vast majority of peer-reviewed journals require manuscript authors to register any trial using human subjects with clinicaltrials.gov. This public registry collects key information on the study population, research goals and methods that allow outside reviewers and scientists to either challenge or attempt to reproduce study results. Additionally, the peer-review process and publication of results invites the broader scientific community to debate study findings. Trial registry and manuscript publications are only part of the process by which scientific endeavors operate in a transparent environment.

Private organizations, public charities, research universities, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, corporations and many other entities conduct medical research. Many of these organizations compile large longitudinal data sets that track patients over a period of time. These data serve as the basis of many studies that permit epidemiologists to track disease and risk factor information for large patient populations.

The published peer-reviewed information from such data often inform regulatory decision making at the EPA and other federal agencies as well as future research. Not only do these data inform regulatory action, they help inform efforts to educate the public about the magnitude of a disease, risk factors and steps individuals can take to improve their health. In order for EPA to set the most appropriate standards, it must be informed by the best information.

Understanding the impact of air pollution on human health and the magnitude of harm caused by pollution at specific levels helps the agency meet its obligations under the Clean Air Act. Absent these data, it is unclear upon what basis the agency could make sound decisions.

H.R. 1029, The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 will also undermine the scientific basis for EPA policy, specifically by compromising the integrity of the panel that reviews that science. EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) is composed of independent scientific and technical experts who are tasked with evaluating the science and providing advice that EPA uses to inform its decision making. The current law provides for balanced panels and experts with diverse backgrounds.

This legislation would impose a hiring quota on the SAB that would require ten percent of members to be selected for qualifications other than their scientific expertise. This bill will compromise not only the sci-

entific integrity of the SAB, but also its independence, as the quota would open the door for representatives of the regulated industries to serve on the board.

Further, the bill will also, in some cases, prohibit SAB members from participating when their own research is involved—even indirectly. This requirement could block participation of the "best and the brightest" researchers in a particular field at the very time their expertise is needed to accurately inform the regulatory process.

Finally, the SAB is currently governed by the Federal Advisory Committee Act and already has a public comment system in place. H.R. 1029 would add on the burdensome requirement that the SAB respond to individual comments in writing, a requirement that could be so time-consuming as to render the board unable to carry out its function.

We urge the U.S. House of Representatives to stand up for sound science and public health protections, and vote NO on both H.R. 1030 and H.R. 1029.

Sincerely,

HAROLD WIMMER,  
National President &  
CEO,

American Lung Association;

GEORGES C. BENJAMIN, MD,  
Executive Director,  
American Public  
Health Association;

JEFFREY LEVI, PhD,  
Executive Director,  
Trust for America's  
Health;

STEPHEN C. CRANE, PhD,  
MPH,  
Executive Director,  
American Thoracic Society;

TONYA WINDERS,  
President & CEO,  
Allergy & Asthma Network.

MARCH 16, 2015.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,  
House Majority Whip,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTHY: As leading U.S. science, engineering, and academic institutions, we are writing to once again express our concerns regarding the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015 (H.R. 1030). We encourage you and your colleagues to take additional time to evaluate the unintended consequences of this bill before passing it on the House floor.

The research community is concerned about how some of the key terms in the bill could be interpreted or misinterpreted, especially terms such as "materials," "data," and "reproducible." Would the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) be excluded from utilizing research that involved physical specimens or biological materials that are not easily accessible? How would the agency address research that combines both public and private data?

With respect to reproducibility of research, some scientific research, especially in areas of public health, involves longitudinal studies that are so large and of great duration that they could not realistically be reproduced. Rather, these studies are replicated utilizing statistical modeling. The same may be true for scientific data from a one-time event (e.g., Deepwater Horizon Gulf oil spill) where the data are gathered in real time. We could foresee a situation in which the EPA would be constrained from making a proposal or even disseminating public information in a timely fashion.

Finally, the legislation could impose additional uncompensated burdens of cost and effort on those recipients of federal research grants where the research results are expected to be “relied on to support a covered action.” The bill is not clear on whether it is the EPA’s or the research institution’s responsibility to cover the costs associated with sharing and archiving this information.

The Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) is working with federal agencies to establish access to data policies that relate “to the dissemination and long-term stewardship of the results of unclassified research, including digital data and peer-reviewed scholarly publications.” Agencies are beginning to issue their data access policies, and given the complexities associated with access to research data as outlined above we suggest that Congress wait to review the agency policies before imposing new statutory requirements.

American Anthropological Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Chemical Society, American Geophysical Union, American Geosciences Institute, American Meteorological Society, American Society for Microbiology (ASM), American Society of Agronomy, American Society of Civil Engineers, Association of American Geographers, Association of American Universities, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), Biophysical Society, Brown University, Consortium for Ocean Leadership, Consortium of Social Science Associations.

Cornell University, Crop Science Society of America, Duke University, Ecological Society of America, Entomological Society of America, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, National Council for Science and the Environment, Society for Conservation Biology, Soil Science Society of America, Stanford University, The Ohio State University, The University of Texas at Austin, University of California System, University of California, Riverside, University of Maryland, University of Michigan, University of Oregon, University of Pennsylvania.

FEBRUARY 25, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
*Chairman, House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,  
*Ranking Member, House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH AND RANKING MEMBER JOHNSON, As president of the American Statistical Association, with 19,000 members, I write regarding the “Secret Science Reform Act of 2015.” We generally applaud the idea that researchers and federal agencies strive to make data available to others—under strict pledges to maintain confidentiality of data provided by individuals and establishments where necessary—and to encourage reproducible research. Access to data and reproducibility of research are crucially important for science to advance.

While the bill’s intent is to make data more widely available, we have several concerns and urge the bill be revised significantly before further consideration. Our concerns include those voiced by others last year (especially the American Association for the Advancement of Science) that the

bill’s statements do not account for the complexities common to the scientific process on research that involves biological materials or physical specimens not easily accessible, combinations of public and private data, longitudinal data collected over many years that are difficult to reproduce, and data from one-time events that cannot be replicated. The bill as written could have far-reaching consequences that would ultimately hamper or undermine the scientific process generally and EPA’s work specifically. We also agree with the point that it would be prudent to see the EPA’s data access policy—in accordance with the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010—expected later this year before further action on the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015.

Our nation should be striving for transparency in government and, as noted above, data accessibility, but these goals also must be balanced with the necessity to protect individuals’ and businesses’ privacy. The bill’s language of “publicly available” except when “superseding any nondiscretionary statutory requirement” acknowledges this balance, but that language is vague and may be insufficient to protect individuals and businesses. In particular, some data sets may not fall under “prohibited by law,” yet the data are still collected under a pledge to protect the identifiability and confidentiality of the reported values. For example, the government, as well as private and nonprofit sectors, routinely collects data—including private business information and private health information—under strict pledges to protect confidentiality. In some studies, this is backed up with penalties for violating those pledges. Such data should not be publicly available to every person who might ask for them. Rather, data subjects’ confidentiality should be protected, for example by policies and procedures that provide data access to trusted users (i.e., approved users committed to appropriate protections of the confidentiality of study participants) while discouraging breaches of confidentiality and/or by data redaction techniques developed in the statistical and computer science communities. Under the current wording, a choice may have to be made between maintaining data confidentiality and issuing needed regulations.

To emphasize the challenges and importance of confidentiality protection, we note that simple but necessary de-identification methods—like stripping names and other personally identifiable information (PII)—often do not suffice to protect confidentiality. Statisticians and computer scientists have repeatedly shown that it is possible to link individuals to publicly available sources, even with PR removed. Thus, allowing unrestricted public access without appropriate controls could result in unintended disclosures. These could cause significant harm to the advancement of science and the federal government—especially the federal statistical system—as people may be less willing to provide their data if highly publicized breaches occur.

In short, any requirements for making data available should carefully consider the complexities, challenges, and potential ramifications. We hope you will address these concerns, which would require major modifications to the bill. We would be happy to be of any assistance.

Sincerely,

DAVID MORGANSTEIN,  
*President, American Statistical Association.*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Before closing, I would simply

note that the Congressional Budget Office has scored this bill.

To quote the CBO:

The CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1030 would cost about \$250 million a year for the next few years.

As we prepare to debate the budget resolution and fiscal policy next week, I cannot fathom why so-called fiscal conservatives could support a bill that will increase bureaucracy at the EPA at a cost of a quarter-billion dollars a year. For a whole host of reasons, this is a bad bill, and I strongly oppose this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

I want to point out that this bill has been endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Farm Bureau, Small Business and Entrepreneurship Council, and The Center for Regulatory Solutions.

I want to call all Members’ attention to the actual language of the bill itself. If they will look on page 2, they will find out that this bill does protect privacy, and it does so specifically. It prevents the EPA from releasing confidential information, and it clarifies that this bill does not supersede any privacy laws. In fact, the EPA Administrator, herself, wrote this in a recent letter:

The Agency’s efforts ultimately resulted in the Center for Disease Control reaching the conclusion that all the research data could be provided without the need for de-identification, and further, the National Academy of Sciences has said the same thing. We are happy to stand with them.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BRIDENSTINE), who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank our chairman for his leadership on this very important bill.

I think it is highly appropriate that we ask our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to actually read the bill. If they did, they would find out that it prevents the EPA from releasing any confidential information. It prevents the EPA from releasing any confidential information. The idea that you are using or that somebody on this floor would use confidential information, they are hiding behind that in an effort to hide the actual science.

My children are in elementary school. They are required to show their work. If they don’t show their work, their integrity could be questioned, which would be appropriate, by the way. Mr. Chairman, is it too much to ask for the EPA to follow the same guidelines I give my children in elementary school? Show your work. We

need to see it. This is an Agency, as the chairman noted, that is funded by taxpayers at a level of \$8 billion a year. This is also an Agency that promulgates rules that cost the economy hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars every year, as well.

In my home State of Oklahoma, in Tulsa, Oklahoma, with the Clean Power Plan going forward and now new regulations on ozone, we are looking at the cost of electricity going up. We are looking at the cost of doing business going up.

By the way, when the cost of electricity goes up, it doesn't hurt me; it hurts the poor. This is a war on the poor. If we are going to punish poor people in my district, I would like to see the science behind it. I think it is perfectly appropriate that we have perfect transparency as it relates to the science behind the EPA.

The Secret Science Reform Act is a very simple bill. It simply makes the EPA show its work, as my children do in elementary school. It is not truly sound science unless the results can be replicated, and this bill would allow others to test the results and to challenge the assumptions of the EPA.

If we are truly for good science, for sound science, we must pass this bill. I encourage my colleagues to vote for it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Environment.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Ms. JOHNSON for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015, a short bill, which I have read, with a long list of problems.

I want to start by applauding the sponsors of the bill for their focus on and goal of transparency. It is something our constituents care about and deserve. But transparency is something that we should accomplish through collaboration and with input from the scientific community. This bill, on the contrary, is opposed, for good reason, by research institutions and scientists from across the country.

Mr. Chairman, we received a lot of feedback from outside groups, and I am going to place into the RECORD after my remarks some letters we have received from groups opposing H.R. 1030 from organizations like the American Association for Justice, Public Citizen, the National Physicians Alliance, the International Society for Environmental Epidemiology, and others.

Instead of working together to find a solution that increases transparency and access to federally funded research, the Secret Science Reform Act instead has the potential, in the long term, to compromise the health and well-being of Americans, and here is why: the Secret Science Reform Act, which looks

simple on its face, will actually encumber, if not eradicate, the EPA's ability to perform its most fundamental duty: protecting Americans from significant risks to their health and to the environment.

Because H.R. 1030 would require that the EPA rely only on studies that are publicly available online in a manner that is sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research results, the act will prevent the agency from considering the best and most relevant science.

The EPA relies on peer-reviewed science conducted by the brightest minds at our Nation's universities and other research organizations. Large cohort peer review studies, such as the American Cancer Society and Harvard Six Cities studies, which made an association between air pollution and mortality, are vital to the Agency's implementation of the Clean Air Act.

Let me be clear: the EPA does publicly disclose which studies it relies on to support its regulatory actions. For good reason, it doesn't make the raw data from these studies publicly available. This bill before us today, if adopted, would make it virtually impossible to use many reports and other sources of scientific data, such as those I mentioned earlier.

First, in many cases, the EPA cannot compel the release or disclosure of information of which it is not the custodian. Second, confidentiality requirements or other legal prohibitions on the sharing of certain types of data, like health information, would preclude studies from consideration simply because they conform to common ethical and legal standards.

Additionally, this act perpetuates the incorrect notion that the science relied on by the EPA is somehow hidden. This misconception is based on conflating the meanings of "secret" and "confidential." One thing should be made very clear: none of the information used by the EPA is secret. Some information might be confidential—if it includes, for example, the personal health information of millions of Americans—as it should be.

My colleagues supporting this bill argue that the data could be de-identified to protect confidentiality and privacy and concerns about disclosure of personal health information are unfounded, but according to a letter from the American Statistical Association, de-identification methods like stripping names and other personally identifiable information do not often suffice to protect confidentiality. Statisticians and computer scientists have repeatedly shown how easy is to be re-identify an individual using social media and public records.

The Secret Science Reform Act will have chilling consequences for the EPA and for every American who wants to enjoy clean air and clean water. Let's

bring back common sense and work together. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose this legislation and let the EPA go back to protecting the public health of all Americans.

FEBRUARY 24, 2015.

Hon. SUZANNE BONAMICI,  
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Environment,  
Committee on Science, Space and  
Technology, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BONAMICI: As the 114th Congress gets underway and your Committee considers its work ahead, I am writing on behalf of the International Society for Environmental Epidemiology to respectfully request a reevaluation of previously introduced and House-passed legislation regarding access to research data.

Last November, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 4012, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2014, a bill that our Society strongly opposed. Had it become law, H.R. 4012 would have prevented the EPA from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments unless all underlying data were reproducible and made publicly available. In so doing, the legislation would have barred EPA from considering much of the best available science investigating the effects of the chemical, physical and microbial environment on human health, because many of the related findings are based on confidential data, such as private medical information. Neither H.R. 4012, nor its companion, S. 2613, were considered in the Senate.

Our members support the sharing of epidemiological data when its purpose is to advance scientific knowledge and when data sharing protects the confidentiality of study subjects. We have participated in some of the largest data sharing efforts to advance scientific knowledge, and our Society has promulgated transparent procedures that protect patient confidentiality for assuring unbiased reanalysis of epidemiological data sets. Moreover, our members are developing and have applied new approaches to data sharing that both increase transparency and protect confidential information, with the objective of promoting rigorous evaluation of study results by other analysts.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our work with you and how we are sharing data for reanalysis and the advancement of science, while also protecting subjects' confidentiality. Furthermore, should legislation similar to H.R. 4012 and S. 2613 be introduced in the 114th Congress, we would appreciate the opportunity to share our strong concerns over the bill's likely impact on the privacy of individual study participants and on the scientific enterprise and human health.

The International Society for Environmental Epidemiology is an international organization with members from more than 60 countries. Topics addressed by ISEE members include environmental exposures, health effects, methodology, environment-gene interactions, and ethics and law. We thank you for your time and look forward to working with Congress in the future.

Sincerely,  
FRANCINE LADEN, Sc.D.,  
President, International Society for  
Environmental Epidemiology.



FEBRUARY 25, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,  
*Chair, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

Hon. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,  
*Ranking Member, Committee on Science, Space and Technology, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIR AND RANKING MEMBER: We are writing in strong opposition to H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015. The American Association for Justice (AAJ), formerly the Association of Trial Lawyers of America (ATLA) with members in United States, Canada and abroad, is the world's largest trial bar. It was established in 1946 to safeguard victims' rights, strengthen the civil justice system, promote injury prevention and foster public health and safety of numerous individuals who have been harmed by unsafe chemicals. AAJ is an advocate for strong chemical safety regulation and healthy environment, in combination with a strong civil justice system in order to protect the health and wellbeing of all Americans. In this capacity, AAJ robustly objects to the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015.

This legislation would severely limit the science that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) can consider while implementing public protections; upending numerous environmental statutes and longstanding Agency practices and is severely overbroad. In fact, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015 may make it impossible for the EPA to regulate at all. The EPA would no longer be able to use most health studies including peer-reviewed research as a result of the limitation on using data that is not "publicly available". Many accurate and reliable health studies contain personal health data that is currently and rightfully protected. Under the Secret Science Act, however, these studies would be erroneously excluded from use by the EPA, substantially narrowing the science the EPA may relay when considering public safeguards.

In addition, H.R. 1030 will also restrict the use of new and innovative science and well as long-term exposure studies. Oftentimes the newest and most innovative science and data may not be publically available. However, this shouldn't mean that the EPA is precluded from using it. Lastly, many of EPA's standards rely on long-term exposure studies that assess the link between diseases and pollutants; or on meta analyses that combine many different studies. If the Secret Science Act of 2015 becomes law these studies may also be barred from EPA use because they will be unable to be "substantially reproduced". The end result of this legislation is that the EPA will no longer be able to rely on the best science in order to protect American health and the environment.

We urge you to oppose the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015. This bill would seriously inhibit the EPA from protecting human health and the environment through its improper limitation on the use of sound science.

Sincerely,

LINDA LIPSEN,  
*Chief Executive Officer,  
 American Association for Justice.*

MARCH 2, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned individuals and organizations working on public health and science-informed regulation strongly oppose the H.R. 1029 the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015 and H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act

of 2015, to be considered by the House of Representatives this week.

Both bills would severely undermine the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to use the best available scientific evidence when making decisions regarding the protection of public health and safety and the environment.

When very similar bills were up for a vote in the House last November, the Administration issued veto threats for both bills. The Administration stated that the Secret Science Reform Act would "greatly impede the EPA's ability to use science to protect public health and the environment," and warned that the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would "weaken the scientific independence and integrity of the SAB."

The erroneously named Secret Science Reform Act would tie the EPA's hands by restricting the information it can use to develop protective regulations. The EPA could only regulate based on publicly available scientific data. This restriction would block the agency's use of many different types of public health data, such as those for which public release would violate privacy protections, or data from corporations that are designated as confidential business information. It also would restrict the use of scientific data that is not "reproducible." This provision seems to adopt a very narrow view of scientific information solely based on laboratory experiments. As major scientific societies including the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) have noted, such a restriction would eliminate the use of most epidemiological and public health data, such as those regarding the public health impacts of air pollution, because these data are collected in long-term studies following individuals longitudinally.

Not only do privacy concerns arise, but such studies are not inherently reproduced in the way a laboratory experiment or a clinical trial may be. It would be unethical to deliberately expose adults or children to air pollution merely to determine whether the increased rates of asthma and heart attacks caused by such exposures can be duplicated, or to encourage teenagers to smoke to re-assess the toxic effects of tobacco.

The EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act would greatly weaken the EPA's advisory process, making it far more likely that recommendations from its independent Science Advisory Board (SAB) will be dominated by corporate special interests. This bill opens the door to increased corporate influence on the Board, by encouraging the EPA to accept more SAB panelists with corporate ties.

The bill's overly broad restriction on SAB members with subject-matter expertise is equally counterproductive, and goes far beyond the common-sense limits imposed by the National Academies. Unlike the 2014 bill, the 2015 bill does appear to permit SAB experts with published, peer-reviewed research, to address those topics on which they have credentials, provided that their expertise is publicly disclosed. But the language in the bill is so vague that it raises many questions. Generally, experts have developed their knowledge base over time, and not purely through peer-reviewed publications. How is an expert supposed to make that distinction? What happens if a scientist relies on expertise that is not specifically permitted in the bill? Will there be legal ramifications? Clearly, scientific experts will think twice before joining the SAB if it means they will have to consult their lawyers before they give advice.

Even worse, the bill requires the SAB to remain in an endless loop soliciting public comment about the "state of the science" touching on every major advisory activity it undertakes and responding to nearly every comment before moving forward, without being limited by any time constraints. At best, the SAB will be reduced to busy work. At worst, the SAB's assessments will address the concerns of corporations, not the desires of citizens for science-informed regulation that protects public health.

These bills together will greatly impede the ability of EPA, and potentially other agencies, to utilize the best available science, independently reviewed, to inform regulations crucial to public health and the environment.

We strongly urge you to vote No on The Secret Science Reform Act and the EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act.

Sincerely,

Center for Science and Democracy at the Union of Concerned Scientists; Annie Appleseed Project; Breast Cancer Action; Center for Medical Consumers; Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies; Jacobs Institute of Women's Health; National Center for Health Research; National Physicians Alliance; Our Bodies Ourselves; Public Citizen; Woodymatters; John H. Powers, MD, Associate Clinical Professor of Medicine; The George Washington University School of Medicine; University of Maryland School of Medicine.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to the gentleman from Texas.

I would like to call Members' attention to page 1, line 12 of this bill. Again, it is only two pages long. I hope everybody will take the time to read it. Line 12 of the first page points out that the Administrator of the EPA shall use the best available science. Once again, the bill actually calls upon the Administrator to use the best available science.

The question is: Why does the EPA want to hide this science? Why does it want to hide this data? Why won't it let the American people see this data? That is the question of the hour.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015.

Last December, the EPA proposed a new regulation that is widely predicted to be the costliest regulation in U.S. history—I repeat, the costliest U.S. regulation in history. It would actually cost our economy \$140 billion per year, according to the National Association of Manufacturers—manufacturers, you know, those who manufacture or make things.

I like to say the things that make America great are the things that America makes. Likewise, in these hard economic times, more Americans



will make it in America when more things are made in America.

Therefore, regulations that hamper manufacturing should really be scrutinized, and regulations that have such a big impact on our economy should not be based on secret science in order to sell it to the American people. Unfortunately, the EPA has prevented outside researchers from accessing the data behind recent regulatory decisions. The public is just supposed to trust the EPA. Apparently, their policy is trust, but evade your eyes; we want a policy that says trust, but verify.

It is long past time that Congress increases transparency into the EPA's regulatory process. The Secret Science Reform Act would prohibit the EPA from proposing or finalizing regulations based upon science that is not transparent or available for independent review. Our constituents have a right to know whether EPA's regulations are based on sound science and have the stated benefits the Agency claims they have.

The legislation is simple, it is straightforward, and it is a message that government bureaucrats cannot propose costly regulations without the transparency that the American people deserve. We want more Americans and more American companies to make it in America.

I want to thank Chairman SMITH for bringing this important legislation to the floor today.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER), a scientist.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed to be here once again speaking out against the Secret Science Reform Act. There are many problems that our Nation faces that we need to tackle—growing income inequity, a badly broken immigration system, and underinvestment in Federal research and development—so I am having a hard time understanding why congressional leaders think that this body, composed largely of lawyers and career politicians, should devote its attention to telling scientists how to conduct their research.

We have heard many of these same politicians declare proudly, "I am not a scientist," as they excuse their ignorance on issues like climate change or the effectiveness of vaccines, yet they want to rewrite the rules for standards of research for EPA scientists.

As a scientist myself, as well as a manufacturer, one who started a business that now provides hundreds of manufacturing jobs in the United States and has kept those jobs in the Midwest and understands what is important for manufacturing to succeed in the United States, I always value the input of experts over political rhetoric.

So what have the experts said about the Secret Science Reform Act?

Today a letter was introduced into the RECORD from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, signed by 35 groups representing scientific organizations and research universities. In the letter, they state:

The research community is concerned about how some of the key terms in this bill could be interpreted or misinterpreted, especially terms such as "materials," "data," and "reproducible."

Would the Environmental Protection Agency be excluded from utilizing research that involved physical specimens or biological materials that are not easily accessible? How would the Agency address research that combines both public and private data?

These are all important questions that were not addressed when this bill was proposed last Congress and still remain unaddressed today. So I continue to stand alongside thousands of my colleagues in science in opposition to the Secret Science Reform Act. These are the standards that should be set by scientists and not by Washington politicians.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I almost feel like we ought to take a 5-minute recess and allow everybody a chance to read the bill, which, again, is only two pages long.

There is nothing in this bill that tells scientists how to conduct their science. All the bill does is to say that the data should be publicly available and should be independently verified and let the American people see it—nothing more, nothing less. That is why, according to a public opinion poll, 90 percent of the American people support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK), who happens to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak on this very important bill.

Mr. Chair, as I stand in the Chamber here, this historic Chamber, all around the top of the wall here are engraved images of great lawgivers who have influenced this Nation and the great institutions of government we have. As the Prime Minister of Israel pointed out, Moses is in the back, who gave us the natural laws our Founders referred to, but over my right shoulder, just above the rostrum, is the image of Thomas Jefferson.

□ 1300

Thomas Jefferson wrote about another set of laws and rights that are given to us. He also wrote 27 grievances—27 violations—of either the natural law that Moses wrote about or the natural rights of men that he wrote about in the Declaration of Independence. These were grievances against

the King of England for violations against the natural laws or the natural rights of men.

The 10th grievance, ironically, that he wrote about can also be seen as a warning to where we are today in this Nation. The 10th grievance says that:

The King has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass the people and eat out their substance.

What Jefferson was talking about was the multitude of regulations and regulatory agencies that the King of England had instituted here on the continent of North America.

Over the past decades, we have seen a rampant growth not only in the number of Federal agencies that have regulatory authority over Americans, but the scope of the regulations, that they have impacted our very lives. Every moment of your day is in some way impacted by regulation—and I argue overregulation—by the Federal Government.

As we speak here today, the EPA is considering a decrease in the amount of acceptable ozone in our atmosphere, which is questionable. Many scientists have said that that level of ozone that they are trying to achieve is unachievable. Even some of the most remote areas of our Nation would not even be able to achieve that. These are areas that don't have any type of industry or significant population.

The National Black Chamber of Commerce testified in a committee hearing the other day that this level of ozone in the regulation the EPA is trying to impose would have significant impact on the economy, especially small business owners and minority business owners. Most of their small businesses are in metropolitan areas. This overregulation is eating out the substance of Americans.

The Small Business & Entrepreneurship Council recently testified that the average American pays \$14,974 in hidden taxes. These are taxes because of regulation by the Federal Government. That is \$14,000 a year average Americans are spending out of their own pocket because of overregulation. Much of this is because of questionable science that is hidden and not transparent. That is 23 percent of their income.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

While this bill would not fix the overreach of this administration in their regulation, it will bring transparency—that the American people have a right to know that when their rights and their liberties are being restricted by government, that it is substantiated and it is sound science.

I fully support this measure. It is one of the most important ones, I believe, that we will do in this Congress.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN).

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, for the second time in a 6-month period, we are considering legislation specifically designed to delay implementation of EPA regulations and prevent the EPA from using the best available scientific data.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle don't like the EPA, and they don't believe in sound science—they have made that very clear during the time that they have the majority—but this so-called Secret Science Reform Act is a dangerous attack on the EPA's ability to use the best available science to protect public health and our environment.

Peer reviewed scientific research from our world class universities informs EPA rulemaking. To limit access to this research—and open the doors to industry-manipulated data—is just plain wrong.

I have cosponsored an amendment offered by my good friend JOE KENNEDY to allow the EPA to continue relying upon peer reviewed scientific data. Boy, what a radical idea. This commonsense amendment will ensure the EPA has access to the valuable research necessary to make sound decisions about our public health and environment.

Mr. Chairman, there isn't "secret science," just science that my Republican colleagues do not like. The contempt for science demonstrated by the Republican majority in this House is troublesome. Putting profits of a particular industry ahead of the safety and well-being of our citizens by rigging the data is dangerous.

People might wonder: Why are we debating this bill here today? Well, I would suggest you follow the money, follow where the political campaign contributions are going.

The notion that we, in this House, would disregard sound science and instead open the doors for profitmaking industries to come in and dictate what the rules and regulations are with regard to the safety and well-being of our citizens is just plain dangerous.

I urge my colleagues, at the very least, support the Kennedy amendment and defeat the underlying legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), who is a hard-working member of the Science Committee.

Mr. BABIN. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to end the era of secret science within the Environmental Protection Agency. This bill before us, H.R. 1030, does just that.

As the Representative of a very diverse district in Texas with timber; agricultural interests; four ports, including the Port of Houston; and more petrochemical plants than any other in the United States, I rise in strong support of this bill.

I cosponsored this bill because I believe that the American people deserve a greater level of accountability from the EPA and less bureaucratic regulation and dodging the facts. Let the facts speak for themselves.

Transparency is one of the fundamental tenets of science. I have a biology degree. I have had plenty of science, chemistry, and physics—I am a dentist—medicine. If they have the facts, there is no need to hide them.

The EPA spends about \$8 billion a year in taxpayer money, and I believe that the taxpayers of the United States have a right to know just how their hard-earned money is being spent.

As new sets of data are created, I hope that this level of transparency will encourage researchers, companies, and nonprofits towards a greater level of openness.

The President committed that his administration would be the most transparent administration in history. Unfortunately, I believe this administration has fallen short of this goal. This bill is necessary to ensure that the American people have transparency in the Environmental Protection Agency.

When the EPA overreaches, it costs Americans their jobs by putting U.S. workers at a competitive disadvantage. We need transparency and accountability so that American workers and their families are protected.

Let's put an end to "secret science." H.R. 1030 does exactly this, and I call on my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK).

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this will be the second time that I have cosponsored an amendment to the Secret Science Reform Act with Representatives KENNEDY and McGOVERN.

I have spoken in opposition to this bill before, but so long as the House continues to consider antiscience legislation that endangers public health, I will continue to point out why it is dangerous.

As written, the Secret Science Reform Act prohibits the EPA from considering any science that is not publicly available in its rulemaking process. A great deal of important research, particularly related to public health, is based on sensitive personal information that this bill would exclude from consideration.

This limit poses an impossible choice for the EPA: disregard critical research—even when it has been subject

to rigorous evaluation and peer review—or violate the privacy of volunteers.

Our amendment ensures that this will not happen. It simply provides that the EPA may rely on any peer reviewed scientific publication when making rules, even if all of the underlying data is not publicly available. This will protect the scientific integrity of the EPA's process without endangering the privacy of Americans who participate in scientific research.

Mr. Chairman, I include two letters in opposition to H.R. 1030 for the RECORD. One is from the Union of Concerned Scientists and the other is from a coalition of environmental organizations, including the Sierra Club and Clean Water Action.

UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS,

March 2, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Union of Concerned Scientists, with 450,000 members and supporters throughout the country, strongly opposes H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015, scheduled for a vote in the House of Representatives this week. The legislation represents a solution in search of a problem, and would greatly impede the agency's mission to protect public health and the environment.

As you know, this bill is nearly identical to the bill that the Committee reported out last November. That bill received a veto threat from the Administration, which noted that it would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from protecting public health and safety and the environment, "if the data supporting [its] decisions cannot, for legitimate reasons, be made publicly available."

It appears that the language changes in the 2015 version of this bill were made to obscure the drafters' true intent, making it more difficult to discern that it would cripple the ability of the EPA to regulate based on information supplied by industries that is designated confidential, or on public health and medical data where the privacy of patients must be protected.

The EPA already makes the data, methodology, and peer-reviewed research it relies on in its rule-making processes as transparent as possible. Moreover, the additional restrictions imposed by this proposed bill would make it almost impossible to base public protections on the best available scientific information. In particular, if enacted, the language appears to indicate that the agency would be inhibited by the following challenges:

The EPA wouldn't be able to use most health studies. The agency would likely be prevented from using any study that uses personal health data. The confidentiality of such data is usually protected by institutional review boards (ORB); thus, the data could not be made publicly available as demanded. Since many EPA rules are health-based standards, this rule would severely restrict the ability of the agency to base rules on science.

The EPA wouldn't be able to draw from industry data sources. The agency would be prevented from using data provided by industry to the agency. Since information from industry sources is often not publicly available, a law requiring as such would prevent the agency from utilizing industry data, a source of information that often provides otherwise unknown data to inform EPA rulemaking.

The EPA wouldn't be able to use new and innovative science. New scientific methods and data may be restricted by intellectual property protections or industry trade secret exemptions. This proposed bill would limit EPA's ability to rely on the best available science including novel approaches that may not yet be publicly available.

Long-term and meta-analyses would be unavailable. Many of EPA's health-based standards rely on long-term exposure studies that assess the link between chronic diseases/mortality and pollutants; or on meta-analyses that include many different studies and locations to provide a more robust look at the science. In H.R. 4012, the provision that studies be conducted "in a manner that is sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research" may prevent use of these vital studies by the EPA, as it is unclear whether such spatially and temporally comprehensive studies would be considered "sufficient for substantial reproduction."

I strongly urge you to oppose H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015. The proposed bill would inhibit the EPA's ability to carry out its science-based mission to protect human health and the environment. It does not deserve your or this Congress's support.

Sincerely,

ANDREW A. ROSENBERG, PH.D.,  
Director, Center for Science and  
Democracy, Union of Concerned Scientists.

MARCH 16, 2015.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters we strongly urge you to oppose the "Secret Science Reform Act of 2015" (HR), the "EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act of 2015". Collectively, these misleadingly named bills would radically diminish EPA's ability to protect public health. Under these bills, EPA would be required to ignore significant science; the Scientific Advisory Board would be required to ignore conflicts of interest; and enforcement officials would be required to ignore pollution emitted in violation of the law. These bills are broadly written and would have damaging impacts far in excess of what their sponsors will admit.

The "Secret Science Reform Act" is based on a faulty premise. Its notion of "secret science," based on claims about studies of fine soot pollution conducted almost two decades ago, is unfounded despite lengthy congressional inquiries. The bill would deny EPA the ability to rely upon peer-reviewed medical studies that involve commitments to patient confidentiality, when the agency carries out its statutory responsibilities to safeguard public health and the environment. Further, this bill would effectively amend numerous environmental statutes by forbidding EPA to use certain kinds of studies in setting health standards. It would also make it impossible for EPA to use many kinds of economic models it routinely relies on because those models are proprietary. This marks a radical departure from long-standing practices. Its end result would be to make it much more difficult to protect the public by forcing EPA to ignore key scientific studies.

Science Advisory Board bill would attack EPA's scientific process in a different way. The worst provision would mandate allowing the participation of scientists with financial conflicts of interest, as long as those conflicts are disclosed. This is inconsistent with a set of nearly universally accepted scientific principles to eliminate or limit finan-

cial conflicts. This bill would significantly weaken the content and credibility of the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) reviews—a textbook example of making a government program function poorly to the benefit of polluting industries and at the expense of public health and independent science. The bill will add unnecessary new burdens on the SAB, distorting its mission and altering its process with no benefit to EPA or the public. The bill also significantly broadens the scope of the SAB and creates a comment process that will add needless delay to the Board's work. The result would be further stalling and undermining of important public health, safety, and environmental protections.

This legislation will obstruct the implementation and enforcement of critical environmental statutes, undermine the EPA's ability to consider and use science, and jeopardize public health. For these reasons, we urge you to oppose these bills.

Sincerely,

BlueGreen Alliance, Center for Effective Government, Clean Water Action, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Environmental Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, League of Conservation Voters, Natural Resources Defense Council, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Sierra Club, Union of Concerned Scientists.

MS. CLARK of Massachusetts. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Kennedy amendment and "no" on the underlying bill.

MR. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), who is a former chairman of the Environment Subcommittee of the Science Committee.

MR. SCHWEIKERT. I thank Chairman SMITH for yielding, and to all my friends, I miss all of you, but are we having that sense of déjà vu all over again? Have you ever started listening to a debate and you are starting to think: Are we discussing two completely separate pieces of legislation here?

MR. CHAIR, this isn't that complicated. So far, I have got to tell you, this debate—and this is going to be a little harsh—has been absolutely intellectually vacuous because we are not saying things that are true. Let's try one more time—no, Madam Ranking Member, you are not. So let's try it one more time.

What does the piece of legislation do? It is public policy made by public data, public data by public policy. Why is that so terrifying to the left? This concept of, well, there's personal medical records used for part of this—there are.

That is why this White House, 3 or 4 years ago, did a series of memos instructing how to do the deidentification of personal data.

If you really object to that, then I am sure you are going to stand up and start saying that the FDA, the CFPB, all the others that get personal data, you don't want them to touch that either. Come on, a little intellectual consistency here, let's try it.

Something I chose not to do when we ran this bill last time—and I am going

to do this time—is that I will submit at a later time into the RECORD a handful of memos coming from my office from when this body was controlled by the Democrats and there was a Republican in the White House.

The Democrats were demanding this of the White House—and a series of senior Democrat officials—demanding this type of disclosure to make public policy. I think that would be sort of amusing to put into the public record, so folks can see how duplicitous this argument has started to become.

Now, back to sort of an underlying principle that I embraced—and I hope all those who actually are not at war with science and want to embrace the complete aggregation of information—is that we need to walk away from this arrogance that there is a small subset in our society that absolutely knows everything.

Because the fact of the matter is you put up a study today and a handful of smart folks at KENNEDY'S—do you represent MIT? Sorry. That is where all the really smart kids are, right?

But people like Arizona State, the next smartest school in the Nation, why can't they take that data set and bounce it up against studies they are doing? Why can't an industry group, why can't an environmental group, why can't an academic group, why can't someone who just really likes statistics?

What you are basically saying is all information, all knowledge, is housed in a tiny population and the rest of the world be damned.

There is a crowdsourcing concept of refining, and here is where I am fascinated that the left hasn't caught on. This bill, this piece of legislation may come back to us and say: EPA, you are actually not doing enough.

It could actually come back and say: When we make the data public, when we bounce it up against other data sources, when we do other latitudinal studies, we may find we are not doing enough. We may find there is a much better way to do a regulation set.

I would think, actually, in the modern world, where we know information is providing us so many opportunities, why aren't we embracing that? Why has that become partisan?

□ 1315

There are actually also a couple of other things that have been said from behind the microphone across the aisle that we need to, one more time, restate honestly.

What if a data set is provided by industry?

One of the biggest complaints in the past said, Well, if a Republican President had a Republican EPA and they used industry data to set up a reg—guess what? That falls under this same piece of legislation. That also is disclosed. All data that is used to create public policy is public.

Why does this terrify the left so much, public policy by public data and public data by public policy, and then the opportunity for everyone who takes an interest in this to be able to refine it and make it better and make it more efficient and more healthy for our families, for our environment, for our economy, instead of a small, arrogant population controlling all knowledge and all information?

The CHAIR. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to thank Science Committee member and Environment Subcommittee Chairman DAVID SCHWEIKERT for his great efforts on this particular subject. Our goal is to help advance not just any science, but the best science.

Costly environmental regulations should only be based upon data that is available to independent scientists and the public and that can be verified. H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act of 2015, gives independent scientists an opportunity to validate the studies EPA uses to make new regulations.

In 2012, the President's own science adviser testified that, "absolutely, the data on which regulatory decisions are based should be made available to the committee and should be made public."

The chair of EPA's Science Advisory Board testified that EPA's advisers recommend "that literature and data used by EPA be peer reviewed and be made available to the public."

Let me repeat. The chair of EPA's own Science Advisory Board said the data EPA relies upon should be public.

And a recent poll from the Institute for Energy Research found that 90 percent of Americans agree that studies and data used to make Federal Government decisions should be public.

Relying on public data prevents the manipulation of scientific evidence. So this bill is no different from any other sunshine law, such as the Freedom of Information Act.

It doesn't roll back the laws that protect the air we breathe and the water we drink; it simply requires the EPA to use the best available science when it makes new regulations.

In other words, the EPA should rely upon good science, not science fiction.

The bill does not change or repeal critical privacy laws that prevent the

EPA from releasing confidential information. It does not give the EPA any new authority to take private information and make it public. In fact, it prohibits that.

In a democratic society, regulations should not be based upon undisclosed data. Maybe in Putin's Russia, but not in the United States of America. Undisclosed data rightfully raises a lot of suspicions.

Actually, this bill is more than just about data. It is about an agency that apparently doesn't trust the American people. The EPA thinks it knows better than the American people what is good for them.

It is time to change that mindset. It is time to restore faith in our government and return the power to the people. It is time for honesty, and it is past time to ensure that the EPA bases their regulations on data that is public. The American people deserve to see the data.

Let us not forget the President also asked for this. H.R. 1030 ensures the speedy implementation of President Obama's Executive Order 13536, to give the public access to federally funded science.

This bill supports the administration's commitment to open science, but now they threaten to veto it. It makes you wonder what the administration is trying to hide and whether you can believe what they say.

If you support this administration's promise to be the most transparent in history and want to make the EPA's data public, then support H.R. 1030.

Mr. Chairman, finally, there are three questions that those who are opposed either can't answer or won't answer:

One, what is the EPA hiding?

Two, why won't they make the data public?

And three, why doesn't the EPA trust the American people?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Chair, I would like to submit the following quotes and excerpts:

Representative PETE WELCH in a press release dated February 14th, 2008 stated "President Bush needs to dust off this copy of the Constitution. Congress has a constitutional obligation to conduct oversight of the executive branch and we will not shrink from this responsibility" in regards to his yes vote of contempt against George W. Bush's administration officials, Harriet Miers and Josh Bolten.

Representative JOHN CONYERS (D-MI), then chairman of the Judiciary Committee, after announcing the committee vote on contempt on February 13th, 2008 stated "if the executive branch can disregard Congressional subpoenas in this way, we no longer have a system of checks." He goes on further to pose a question during an oversight hearing with Mr. Gonzales, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania on July 24th, 2007, "Do you think the constitutional government in the United States can survive if the president has the unilateral authority to reject Congressional inquiries?"

In a letter dated June 13th, 2008, Henry A. Waxman, then chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee informed the Honorable Susan E. Dudley, then the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, "I regret that your failure to produce responsive documents has created this impasse, but Congress has a constitutional duty to conduct oversight of the executive branch. Therefore, unless the documents are provided to the Committee or a valid assertion of executive privilege is made, the Committee will meet on June 20 to consider a resolution citing you in contempt. I strongly urge you to reconsider your position and comply with the duly issued subpoena."

Henry A. Waxman further goes on to state in a letter dated June 13th, 2008, on behalf of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to the Honorable Stephen L. Johnson that "the documents reviewed by the Committee also indicate that the rulemaking was drafted through an insufficiently open process, that regional technical staff were given only the briefest opportunity to comment, and that even the strongest objections of the staff were disregarded." Furthermore, Representative Waxman in the conclusion states that "Congress needs to be able to rely on the technical and scientific information provided by federal agencies. It is hard to do so, however, when technical and scientific data that has been carefully assembled over several years is suddenly cast aside as soon as it becomes inconvenient or embarrassing."

Senator BARBARA BOXER during the 110th Congress hearing before the Committee on Environment Public Works dated January 24th, 2008, on the Oversight of EPA's Decision to Deny the California Waiver stated, "There remains much work to be done as we work to uncover the facts behind this decision. EPA has failed to fully respond to our request for information, which I will go into in the question time. I have never seen anything like it. We asked for the documents. First we didn't get them when they were promised." She then says that "the mission of the EPA is to protect human health and the environment. The Administrator's decision does neither. The people who pay the Administrator's salary have a right to know how he came to a decision that is so far removed from the facts, the law, the science, the precedent, States' rights and all the rest that goes with it."

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-11. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1030

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Secret Science Reform Act of 2015".*

**SEC. 2. DATA TRANSPARENCY.**

Section 6(b) of the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 4363 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(b)(1) The Administrator shall not propose, finalize, or disseminate a covered action unless all scientific and technical information relied on to support such covered action is—

“(A) the best available science;

“(B) specifically identified; and

“(C) publicly available online in a manner that is sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research results.

“(2) Nothing in the subsection shall be construed as—

“(A) requiring the Administrator to disseminate scientific and technical information; or

“(B) superseding any nondiscretionary statutory requirement.

“(3) In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘covered action’ means a risk, exposure, or hazard assessment, criteria document, standard, limitation, regulation, regulatory impact analysis, or guidance; and

“(B) the term ‘scientific and technical information’ includes—

“(i) materials, data, and associated protocols necessary to understand, assess, and extend conclusions;

“(ii) computer codes and models involved in the creation and analysis of such information;

“(iii) recorded factual materials; and

“(iv) detailed descriptions of how to access and use such information.

“(4) The Administrator shall carry out this subsection in a manner that does not exceed \$1,000,000 per fiscal year, to be derived from amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated.”

The CHAIR. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be order except those printed in part B of House Report 114-37. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS**

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 114-37.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, lines 21 through 24, amend paragraph (4) to read as follows:

“(4) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this subsection \$250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019.”

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 1030, the so-called Secret Science Reform Act.

Let me just say first that I am opposed to the bill and the underlying premise that there is not good science, good research, and good data being gathered by the EPA.

Unfortunately, this bill would force the EPA to choose between protecting our health and environment and maintaining the privacy of patient medical records and the confidentiality of business records.

But my amendment highlights one issue that, to me, makes a mockery of this entire effort. The bill, as written, currently gives the EPA only \$1 million per year to carry out the provisions in the bill.

It wouldn't be so bad except that the Congressional Budget Office estimates the cost of the bill to be \$250 million per year to implement the bill.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that you perhaps think that you did not hear me correctly. But to put this disparity in some perspective, the Congressional Budget Office is estimating that implementing this bill would cost 25,000 percent more than the majority is providing.

Now I understand why the majority is doing this. They don't want to pass legislation that costs anything to implement. It wouldn't be fiscally conservative.

Now, I am not a math major, but simple math tells me that if a bill is \$1 million in the text but costs \$250 million to implement, you are asking the EPA to undertake \$250 million of work with \$1 million—not exactly fiscally or legislatively conservative or sound.

More importantly, it forces the Agency into an untenable position. They must either ignore the requirements of this legislation because the majority isn't providing them with the resources to carry them out, or they can comply with the requirements for—and Mr. Chairman, hold your breath—they could comply with the requirements for 1½ days. That is what the funding would allow: \$1 million, 1½ days, and then shut down all of the covered actions under the bill.

So I know we think it might be laughable, except that it is true. But if the majority really believes in the premise behind this legislation, which I do not, then the majority should provide the Agency with the \$250 million annually that, at a minimum, the Agency would need to carry out this bill.

Those are not my estimates. Those are the estimates of the independent Congressional Budget Office.

I am opposed to the bill for a number of reasons, and most likely, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would disagree with me on those points. However, I have a hard time believing that any responsible Member of Congress who supports fiscal conservatism would consciously support a bill that is guaranteed, absolutely guaranteed to cause failure.

So I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and not allow this bill to move forward with an unfunded mandate to the Agency.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland, for her amendment, but I must oppose it.

This amendment would allow the Environmental Protection Agency to continue its practice of hiding data from the American people.

This amendment is based upon what appears to be a misreading of the bill that has resulted in an inaccurate score by the Congressional Budget Office. In fact, the statutory language directly contradicts the CBO's analysis, and here is why.

For its analysis, CBO assumed that the bill requires the EPA to collect and disseminate the underlying data of the science it relies upon. Through some unknown calculation, CBO then came up with a \$250 million price tag for the collection and dissemination of the data.

However, the bill does not require the collection and dissemination of information. It simply says that the EPA must use data that is public and available to independent scientists.

The bill itself states that there is no requirement for the EPA to disseminate scientific and technical information. Again, I urge my colleagues to read the bill.

So let me say it again. This bill does not require the EPA to disseminate information. It simply says that, when the EPA decides to regulate, it needs to rely on the best available science that is publicly available for independent verification and review.

So the CBO is way off base—not for the first time—and, therefore, so is this amendment.

CBO's cost estimate also contradicts the clear statutory bill language, which reads: “The Administrator shall carry out this subsection in a manner that does not exceed \$1 million per fiscal year to be derived from amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated.”

When the CBO says that under this legislation the EPA will have to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to collect and disseminate new data, that is clearly inconsistent with the language and intent of the bill. So the CBO's cost estimate is meaningless.

But let's assume that the EPA decides it must collect and disseminate the data itself. EPA has an \$8 billion budget. It spends more than \$20 million of taxpayer money every day to issue regulations that cost taxpayers tens of

billions of dollars every year. And the President has asked Congress for an increase of \$50 million for the Agency this year.

Surely the EPA can base its rules on science that is transparent and available to everyone, and do it with funds from its already massive budget. A Federal agency that spends over \$8 billion a year in taxpayer money should be able to afford to honor the public's right to know.

This amendment would allow the EPA to continue business as usual and would ignore congressional intent and statutory language. For these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, so we know that the EPA's jurisdiction is to make sure that we have clean water and clean air. That is sort of the basics of it.

And now we are hearing from the majority, Mr. Chairman, that not only do they not believe the science and they think it is secret, they also don't believe the Congressional Budget Office.

But for the fact that we cannot pick and choose which numbers we believe out of the Congressional Budget Office, the fact is that the Congressional Budget Office, not just this year but in the last term as well, said that this bill would cost American taxpayers \$250 million if the Agency were implementing it according to the legislative language. So I don't think that the majority should be allowed to pick and choose its science or pick and choose its numbers.

The Congressional Budget Office, in fact, has said that this bill would cost \$250 million to implement, more than 25,000 times the amount that is authorized in the language, and I think it is unacceptable for us to just denigrate the EPA, say that it is engaged in secret science, and then tell them that we want you to implement a bill without providing the resources that it takes to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), my colleague and the ranking Democrat on the committee.

□ 1330

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlelady, and I fully support her amendment.

EPA normally relies upon approximately 50,000 scientific studies each year to support these actions. The Congressional Budget Office estimated that if EPA were to cut the amount of studies they considered in half, it would still cost the Agency roughly \$250 million annually to comply with this legislation.

This bill will effectively require EPA to pay more in order to do less, yet my

colleagues are only providing EPA with \$1 million annually to comply with the provisions of this bill.

This forces EPA into a lose-lose situation. Either drastically limit the amount of science used to protect the public health and the environment or spend hundreds of millions of dollars per year ensuring that the job is done right.

I think this legislation is seriously misguided.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman I really don't know why it is so difficult to read this bill. It is only two pages long. And those who are concerned about the cost ought to recognize—or I hope they have realized and seen—that the bill this year reads differently than the bill last year.

And what I would like to do is read to those who are opposed who raised the cost issue. Look at lines 17 and 18 of page 1 and lines 1 and 2 of page 2. They read as follows: "Nothing in the subsection shall be construed as requiring the Administrator to disseminate scientific and technical information."

I hope that allays their concerns. But it is always nice to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle so concerned about the cost of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, contrary to the CBO estimate, H.R. 1030 does not require the EPA to disseminate information. It requires the EPA to base their regulations on data that is public so that all Americans are better informed about the regulations that affect their daily lives.

Americans deserve all the facts, and they deserve all the data. They have the right to know if the regulations they are forced to live under are justified by sound science.

The EPA spends over \$8 billion a year. Surely it can base its rules on science that is transparent and available to everyone.

For these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 114-37.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 3. ENSURING THE USE OF THE BEST SCIENCE.**

Nothing in this Act shall prevent the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from considering or relying upon any peer-reviewed scientific publication even if such publication is based on data that is prohibited from public disclosure.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 138, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I echo the comments of my colleagues about the importance of transparency that we have heard over the course of this debate. An open government with transparent rules and regulations is at the very core of our democracy. But I am discouraged and disappointed that we are having this debate yet again, especially on a bill that undermines science even more dramatically than last year's version.

When this country's greatest minds come together to tackle our greatest problems, we are a stronger nation. Whether we are talking about achievements in cancer treatment or clean water, science makes us healthier, more innovative, and more competitive. Unfortunately, the bill we are considering today takes science off the table for the EPA, the very Agency entrusted with keeping our air clean, our water safe, and our homes clear of toxic substances.

The bill before us leaves EPA with unworkable standards, prohibiting it from using certain studies simply because they include information that, by law, cannot be made public, such as people's personal health records.

My amendment does a very simple thing. It fixes that oversight by clarifying that the EPA should use the most reliable scientific information available, regardless of whether that can be publicly disclosed.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the EPA relies on about 50,000 scientific studies every year. As written, H.R. 1030 would drastically shrink this number. The bill before us could even prohibit the EPA from using other government-funded research, like NIH studies that link toxic substances to premature births or CDC research on mitigating the impact of natural disasters on public health.

Furthermore, there are several protections in place already to ensure the science the EPA uses is properly vetted and credited. First, any and all studies go through a significant peer review process, including an independent analysis. Second, Mr. Chairman, the Office



of Science and Technology Policy is already working to ensure that all publicly funded research is available online. Third, public comment periods allow for anyone, an individual or organization, to submit evidence supporting or opposing a proposed regulation. However, this bill would actually put limits on the public comment period.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation jeopardizes our clean air, our clean water, and the health of our families. I urge the House to accept my amendment to clarify that the EPA may use the most reliable science available.

I would also like to thank my colleagues from Massachusetts, Congressman JIM MCGOVERN and KATHERINE CLARK, and the ranking member of the committee for their support of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank my colleague and friend from Massachusetts for offering this amendment, but I must oppose it.

The gentleman's amendment implies that the bill does something that, in fact, it does not. The amendment also creates a loophole the EPA Administrator could easily exploit.

First, by stating that nothing in the act prevents the EPA from considering or relying upon peer reviewed science, the amendment appears to imply that the bill would do otherwise. This is simply not true.

The EPA, through its implementation of the Information Quality Act, is already required to rely on peer reviewed information. Nothing in this legislation changes that.

What this bill would accomplish—and what the gentleman's amendment would undermine—is to ensure that the science the EPA relies upon is publicly available and verifiable.

Independent scientists don't have an opportunity to examine the assumptions and methodologies that EPA relies upon when it makes public regulations. It is time for the EPA to show its work and come out into the daylight. Peer review alone is not a sufficient check. Peer reviewers are not always provided the underlying data, and the quality of peer review is highly variable.

The simple premise behind H.R. 1030 is that public policy should be backed up by public data. Peer review alone does not allow independent scientists to verify the EPA's claims.

This amendment would destroy the purpose of the bill and provide the EPA Administrator with permission to disregard the basic principles of transparency and accountability that are

provided by H.R. 1030. For these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, if I could inquire into the time that I have remaining.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking the chairman of the committee, my friend from Texas, for his friendship and for the work that he has been doing. I know that we share the same goal of having a transparent government and a transparent enforcement mechanism. Unfortunately, I think he and I have come to disagree on the underlying impact of my amendment and the underlying bill itself.

The EPA—the goal of this amendment is to make sure that they are able to rely on the most sound, reliable information available. We heard from the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS), my colleague, earlier that there are already constraints put in place by this legislation that limit the EPA from doing so should this bill pass.

My amendment takes up that same challenge and tries to make sure that when we are making rules and regulations that are going to impact our society that we are using the best data that is available. All of that data and all of those studies must be peer reviewed. There is a process which the EPA goes through that is publicly available and not actually under any sort of challenge because the underlying bill here doesn't say that that peer review process is flawed.

So if we take it as given, then, that that peer review process is sound and is strong and can be relied upon, then the issue is the underlying data. And what we have seen here is an effort to try to ensure that, yes, the analysis and the method for the inquiry is actually available, but the underlying data that can contain people's personal health records, that can contain personally identifiable information is kept private to not expose people to the dissemination of data that they never even knew was going to be publicly available.

That is the sole point of this amendment: to ensure that our government is using information for the highest and best use as we promulgate rules and regulations that are going to impact the American people—nothing less, nothing more.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me just say to my friend from Massachusetts that I appreciate his comments and his friendship as well. While we agree on many things, we do happen to disagree on this one amendment.

Let me also say that I wish he was still a member of the Science Com-

mittee, and he would be welcomed back any time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment would allow the EPA to continue to hide the data it says justifies its regulations.

Peer review does not allow independent scientists to verify the EPA's claims. It is not a sufficient check to ensure that the EPA uses the best science available.

H.R. 1030 promotes the fundamental principles of transparency and accountability. This amendment would make it harder to achieve that goal.

Giving independent scientists an opportunity to examine the data that the EPA relies upon when it makes public regulations will ensure transparency and accountability.

Public policy should be backed up by public data. Peer review alone will not give the American people all the facts.

Americans deserve access to this data. They have the right to know if the regulations paid for with their tax dollars are based upon the best science available.

For these reasons, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 114-37 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. EDWARDS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 254, not voting 14, as follows:



[Roll No. 122]

## AYES—164

Adams Foster Moulton  
 Bass Frankel (FL) Nadler  
 Beatty Gabbard Napolitano  
 Becerra Gallego Neal  
 Bera Garamendi Nolan  
 Beyer Grayson Norcross  
 Bishop (GA) Green, Al O'Rourke  
 Blumenauer Green, Gene Pallone  
 Bonamici Grijalva Pascarell  
 Boyle, Brendan Gutiérrez Pelosi  
 F. Hahn Perlmutter  
 Brady (PA) Hastings Pingree  
 Brown (FL) Heck (WA) Pocan  
 Brownley (CA) Higgins Polis  
 Butterfield Himes Price (NC)  
 Capps Honda Rangel  
 Capuano Hoyer Rice (NY)  
 Cárdenas Huffman Richmond  
 Carney Israel Roybal-Allard  
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee Ruppertsberger  
 Cartwright Jeffries Rush  
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA) Ryan (OH)  
 Castro (TX) Johnson, E. B. Sánchez, Linda  
 Chu, Judy Keating T.  
 Cicilline Kennedy Sarbanes  
 Clark (MA) Kildee Schakowsky  
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer Schiff  
 Clay Kind Scott (VA)  
 Cleaver Langevin Scott, David  
 Clyburn Larsen (WA) Serrano  
 Cohen Larson (CT) Sewell (AL)  
 Conyers Lawrence Sherman  
 Costa Lee Sires  
 Courtney Levin Slaughter  
 Crowley Lewis Speier  
 Cuellar Lieu, Ted Swallow (CA)  
 Cummings Lipinski Takai  
 Davis (CA) Loeb sack Takano  
 Davis, Danny Lofgren Thompson (CA)  
 DeFazio Lowenthal Thompson (MS)  
 DeGette Titus  
 Delaney Lujan Grisham Tonko  
 DeLauro (NM) Torres  
 DelBene Luján, Ben Ray Tsongas  
 DeSaulnier (NM) Van Hollen  
 Deutch Lynch Vargas  
 Dingell Maloney, Veasey  
 Doggett Carolyn Vela  
 Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean Velázquez  
 F. Matsui Visclosky  
 Edwards McCollum Wasserman  
 Ellison McDermott Schultz  
 Engel McGovern Waters, Maxine  
 Eshoo McNeerney Watson Coleman  
 Esty Meeks Welch  
 Farr Meng Wilson (FL)  
 Fattah Moore Yarmuth

## NOES—254

Abraham Carter (TX) Fincher  
 Aderholt Chabot Fitzpatrick  
 Aguilar Chaffetz Fleischmann  
 Allen Clawson (FL) Fleming  
 Amash Coffman Flores  
 Amodei Cole Forbes  
 Ashford Collins (GA) Fortenberry  
 Babin Collins (NY) Foss  
 Barletta Comstock Franks (AZ)  
 Barr Conaway Frelinghuysen  
 Barton Connolly Garrett  
 Benishek Cook Gibbs  
 Bilirakis Cooper Gibson  
 Bishop (MI) Costello (PA) Gohmert  
 Bishop (UT) Cramer Goodlatte  
 Black Crawford Gosar  
 Blackburn Crenshaw Gowdy  
 Blum Culberson Graham  
 Bost Curbelo (FL) Granger  
 Boustany Davis, Rodney Graves (GA)  
 Brady (TX) Denham Graves (LA)  
 Brat Dent Griffith  
 Bridenstine DeSantis Grothman  
 Brooks (AL) DesJarlais Guinta  
 Brooks (IN) Diaz-Balart Guthrie  
 Buchanan Dold Hanna  
 Buck Duckworth Hardy  
 Bucshon Duffy Harper  
 Burgess Duncan (SC) Harris  
 Bustos Duncan (TN) Hartzler  
 Byrne Ellmers (NC) Heck (NV)  
 Calvert Emmer (MN) Hensarling  
 Carter (GA) Farenthold Herrera Beutler

Hice, Jody B. Hill  
 Holding Miller (FL)  
 Hudson Miller (MI)  
 Huelskamp Moolenaar  
 Huizenga (MI) Mooney (WV)  
 Hultgren Mullin  
 Hunter Mulvaney  
 Hurt (VA) Murphy (FL)  
 Issa Murphy (PA)  
 Jenkins (KS) Neugebauer  
 Jenkins (WV) Newhouse  
 Johnson (OH) Noem  
 Johnson, Sam Nugent  
 Jolly Nunes  
 Jones Olson  
 Jordan Palazzo  
 Joyce Palmer  
 Katko Paulsen  
 Kelly (PA) Pearce  
 King (IA) Perry  
 King (NY) Peters  
 Kinzinger (IL) Peterson  
 Kirkpatrick Tipton  
 Kline Pitts  
 Knight Poe (TX)  
 Kuster Poliquin  
 Labrador Pompeo  
 LaMalfa Posey  
 Lamborn Price, Tom  
 Lance Quigley  
 Latta Ratcliffe  
 LoBiondo Reed  
 Long Reichert  
 Loudermilk Renacci  
 Love Ribble  
 Lucas Rice (SC)  
 Lummis Rigell  
 MacArthur Roby  
 Marchant Roe (TN)  
 Marino Rogers (AL)  
 Massie Rogers (KY)  
 McCarthy Rohrabacher  
 McCaul Rokita  
 McClintock Rooney (FL)  
 McHenry Ros-Lehtinen  
 McKinley Ross  
 McMorris Rothfus  
 Rodgers Rouzer  
 McSally Royce  
 Meadows Ruiz  
 Meehan Russell

## NOT VOTING—14

Fudge Kelly (IL) Schock  
 Graves (MO) Luetkemeyer Scott, Austin  
 Hinojosa Payne Smith (WA)  
 Hurd (TX) Roskam Young (IN)  
 Kaptur Sanchez, Loretta

□ 1408

Messrs. FLORES, DUFFY, WALBERG, ABRAHAM, MILLER of Florida, WALZ, and YOUNG of Alaska changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. TORRES, and Messrs. ISRAEL and PASCRELL changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 122 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 231, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

## AYES—184

Adams Frankel (FL) Nadler  
 Aguilar Gabbard Napolitano  
 Bass Gallego Neal  
 Beatty Garamendi Nolan  
 Becerra Gibson Norcross  
 Bera Graham O'Rourke  
 Beyer Grayson Pallone  
 Bishop (GA) Green, Al Pascarell  
 Blumenauer Green, Gene Pelosi  
 Bonamici Grijalva Perlmutter  
 Boyle, Brendan Gutiérrez Peters  
 F. Hahn Peterson  
 Brady (PA) Hanna Pingree  
 Brown (FL) Hastings Pocan  
 Brownley (CA) Heck (WA) Polis  
 Butterfield Higgins Price (NC)  
 Capps Honda Quigley  
 Capuano Hoyer Rangel  
 Cárdenas Huffman Rice (NY)  
 Carney Israel Richmond  
 Carson (IN) Jackson Lee Roybal-Allard  
 Cartwright Jeffries Ruiz  
 Castor (FL) Johnson (GA) Ruppertsberger  
 Castro (TX) Johnson, E. B. Rush  
 Chu, Judy Keating Ryan (OH)  
 Cicilline Kelly (IL) Sánchez, Linda  
 Clark (MA) Kennedy T.  
 Clarke (NY) Kildee Sarbanes  
 Clay Kilmer Schakowsky  
 Cleaver Kind Schiff  
 Clyburn Kirkpatrick Schrader  
 Cohen Kuster Scott (VA)  
 Connolly Langevin Scott, David  
 Conyers Larsen (WA) Serrano  
 Cooper Larson (CT) Sewell (AL)  
 Costa Lawrence Sherman  
 Courtney Lee Sinema  
 Crowley Levin Sires  
 Cuellar Lewis Slaughter  
 Cummings Lieu, Ted Speier  
 Davis (CA) Lipinski Swallow (CA)  
 Davis, Danny Loeb sack Takai  
 DeFazio Lofgren Takano  
 DeGette Lowenthal Thompson (CA)  
 Delaney Lowey Thompson (MS)  
 DeLauro Lujan Grisham Titus  
 DelBene (NM) Tonko  
 DeSaulnier Luján, Ben Ray Torres  
 Deutch (NM) Tsongas  
 Dingell Lynch Van Hollen  
 Doggett Maloney, Vargas  
 Dold Carolyn Veasey  
 Doyle, Michael Maloney, Sean Vela  
 F. Matsui Velázquez  
 Duckworth Matsui Visclosky  
 Edwards McCollum Walz  
 Ellison McDermott Wasserman  
 Engel McGovern Schultz  
 Eshoo McNeerney Waters, Maxine  
 Esty Meeks Watson Coleman  
 Farr Meng Welch  
 Fattah Moulton Wilson (FL)  
 Foster Murphy (FL) Yarmuth

## NOES—231

Abraham Blum Carter (TX)  
 Aderholt Bost Chabot  
 Allen Boustany Chaffetz  
 Amash Brady (TX) Clawson (FL)  
 Amodei Brat Coffman  
 Bridenstine Dent Cole  
 Babin DeSantis Collins (GA)  
 Barletta Brooks (AL) Collins (NY)  
 Barr Brooks (IN) Comstock  
 Barton Buchanan Conaway  
 Benishek Buck Cook  
 Bilirakis Bucshon Costello (PA)  
 Bishop (MI) Burgess Cramer  
 Bishop (UT) Byrne Crawford  
 Black Calvert Crenshaw  
 Blackburn Carter (GA)

Culberson	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Curbelo (FL)	Kinzing (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Denham	Knight	Rohrabacher
Dent	Labrador	Rokita
DeSantis	LaMalfa	Rooney (FL)
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Lance	Ross
Duffy	Latta	Rothfus
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Rouzer
Duncan (TN)	Long	Royce
Ellmers (NC)	Love	Russell
Emmer (MN)	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Fincher	Lummis	Sanford
Fitzpatrick	MacArthur	Scalise
Fleischmann	Marchant	Schweikert
Fleming	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Flores	Massie	Sessions
Forbes	McCarthy	Shimkus
Fortenberry	McCaull	Shuster
Fox	McClintock	Simpson
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Garrett	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Gibbs	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Gohmert	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	McSally	Stefanik
Gosar	Meadows	Stewart
Gowdy	Meehan	Stivers
Granger	Messer	Stutzman
Graves (GA)	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Graves (LA)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Griffith	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Guinta	Mooleenaar	Tipton
Guthrie	Mooney (WV)	Trott
Hardy	Mullin	Turner
Harper	Mulvaney	Upton
Harris	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Hartzler	Neugebauer	Wagner
Heck (NV)	Newhouse	Walberg
Hensarling	Noem	Walden
Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Walker
Hice, Jody B.	Nunes	Walorski
Hill	Olson	Walters, Mimi
Hudson	Palmer	Weber (TX)
Huelskamp	Paulsen	Webster (FL)
Huizenga (MI)	Pearce	Wenstrup
Hultgren	Perry	Westerman
Hunter	Pittenger	Westmoreland
Hurd (TX)	Pitts	Whitfield
Hurt (VA)	Poe (TX)	Williams
Issa	Poliquin	Wilson (SC)
Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo	Wittman
Jenkins (WV)	Posey	Womack
Johnson (OH)	Price, Tom	Woodall
Johnson, Sam	Ratchliffe	Yoder
Jolly	Reed	Yoho
Jones	Reichert	Young (AK)
Jordan	Renacci	Young (IA)
Joyce	Ribble	Zeldin
Katko	Rice (SC)	Zinke
Kelly (PA)	Rigell	
King (IA)	Roby	

## NOT VOTING—17

Ashford	Holding	Sanchez, Loretta
Frelinghuysen	Kaptur	Schock
Fudge	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	Smith (WA)
Grothman	Payne	Young (IN)
Hinojosa	Roskam	

□ 1412

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 123 I was detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 123 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

WOODALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1030) to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible, and, pursuant to House Resolution 138, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TAKAI. I am opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Takai moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1030 to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following new section:

**SEC. 3. PROTECTING TAXPAYERS FROM SCIENCE PROMOTED BY POLLUTING COMPANIES.**

Under the amendment made by section 2, the Environmental Protection Agency shall not rely on advice from any scientist whose primary source of research funds comes from corporations or individuals convicted of major environmental crimes, including the release of toxic pollutants into safe drinking water, refusal to clean up Superfund waste sites, or violations from the release of air pollutants that endanger human health and safety.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill would immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is simple. It would prohibit the EPA from relying on advice from any scientist whose primary source of research fund-

ing comes from corporations or individuals convicted of major environmental crimes. The Democratic motion to recommit would help ensure the integrity and the independence of the EPA's scientific review process by prohibiting the reliance on advice from those who are funded by the biggest abusers of our environment.

H.R. 1030, the Secret Science Reform Act, would impose arbitrary, unnecessary, and expensive requirements that would seriously impede the EPA's ability to use science to protect public health and the environment, as required under an array of environmental laws, while increasing uncertainty for businesses and States. This bill would stack the cards in favor of industry-backed data studies rather than the most reliable studies. In doing so, it will prevent the EPA from using the best data possible to make decisions.

Think about 50 years of tobacco-backed studies that lied about the effects of cigarette smoking in order to avoid labeling, regulation, and fines. That is the type of data that this bill wants the EPA to rely on to make decisions about our environment—industry-backed data that shifts the favor to polluters, climate deniers, and those who do not have the best interests of public health and our environment in mind. This amendment would make sure that this data does not come from corporations or individuals who show disregard for our environmental laws, which is the main reason the EPA exists in the first place.

Consequences of H.R. 1030 could include the public release of industry-funded studies and data intended to bias the body of scientific evidence that the EPA is allowed to consider towards a particular industry position. For example, research that shows arsenic, mercury, or benzene is not bad for you could be in the majority of studies the EPA is allowed to base its recommendations and regulations on.

Unfortunately, Republicans will claim that this bill increases the EPA's transparency and accountability by ensuring that its regulations are based on public data that can be verified and reproduced. In reality, this bill would prevent the EPA from functioning effectively and from using the most relevant scientific data, including data that is legally protected from public disclosure.

An effort to limit the scope of science that can be considered by the EPA does not strengthen scientific integrity but undermines it. The EPA relies on peer reviewed scientific research from our universities as the backbone of its mission to protect public health and our environment. This amendment ensures that this data does not come from sources that routinely break our environmental laws. Because clinicians and researchers are legally prohibited from making the data publicly available, if this bill becomes law,

the EPA would be forced to ignore this valuable research when protecting the public.

At no point does this bill make the public safer, which is the fundamental function of government. The Secret Science Reform Act would only reduce the science available to the EPA on some of the most important decisions it makes.

Mr. Speaker, over 30 of the most respected groups that are dedicated to scientific and health research have opposed this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. However, before doing so, I urge my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment to this bill.

Again, all this amendment does is prohibit the EPA from relying on advice from any scientist whose primary source of research funding comes from corporations or individuals convicted of major environmental crimes. This ensures the integrity and independence of the EPA's scientific review process by prohibiting advice from those who are funded by the biggest abusers of our environment.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Democratic motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Hawaii, whom I have not actually had the chance to make friends with yet, you are actually hitting on one really good point: If there is data being used by bad actors, shouldn't we all know it?

The way the EPA operates right now with their keeping their data sets secret, none of you are going to get to know that. That is actually what this piece of legislation fixes. If there is going to be data of groups that are bad actors—industries that you consider dodgy—wouldn't it be a wonderful thing to have that data available for everyone, whether you be on the right or whether you be on the left, so it can be refined by sunshine? so it can be reviewed and meshed up against other data sets?

If you believe that making information public refines it, if you believe public policy should be made by public data and public data should be available in the making of public policy, you like this piece of legislation.

What is so fascinating in the debate we have had this time and last year is that I have a number of memos, demand letters, threats of subpoenas

from when the left in this body was in both the majority and the minority, but there was a Republican President who was demanding this type of legislation. Let's try something new around here: a little bit of intellectual consistency.

Do you believe the public—the researchers, the scientists, those who are academics, those who just have an interest in the subject area—should have the right to touch the data, to model it, to stress it, to put it up against other data sets and see if we are doing what is best for our environment? Are we doing it the best way? Is there a better way? Is there a more efficient way? Is there a more cost-effective way? That is what this bill accomplishes, and I have no idea why my brothers and sisters on the left are so fearful of that.

As I yield back, I beg all of my fellow Members here to vote "yes" on this legislation but to vote "no" on this motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 239, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

#### AYES—181

Adams	Clarke (NY)	Ellison
Aguiar	Clay	Engel
Ashford	Cleaver	Eshoo
Bass	Clyburn	Esty
Beatty	Cohen	Farr
Becerra	Connolly	Fattah
Bera	Conyers	Foster
Beyer	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Courtney	Galleo
Bonomici	Crowley	Garamendi
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cuellar	Graham
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Grayson
Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Green, Al
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Green, Gene
Bustos	DeFazio	Grijalva
Butterfield	DeGette	Gutiérrez
Capps	Delaney	Hahn
Capuano	DeLauro	Hastings
Cárdenas	DeBene	Heck (WA)
Carney	DeSaulnier	Higgins
Carson (IN)	Deutch	Himes
Cartwright	Dingell	Honda
Castro (TX)	Doggett	Hoyer
Chu, Judy	Doyle, Michael F.	Huffman
Cicilline	Duckworth	Israel
Clark (MA)	Edwards	Jackson Lee
		Jeffries

Johnson (GA)	McGovern	Schakowsky
Johnson, E. B.	McNerney	Schiff
Jones	Meeks	Schrader
Keating	Meng	Scott (VA)
Kelly (IL)	Moore	Scott, David
Kennedy	Moulton	Serrano
Kildee	Murphy (FL)	Sewell (AL)
Kilmer	Nadler	Sherman
Kind	Napolitano	Sires
Kirkpatrick	Neal	Slaughter
Kuster	Nolan	Speier
Langevin	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Larsen (WA)	O'Rourke	Takai
Larson (CT)	Pallone	Takano
Lawrence	Pascrell	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Perlmutter	Titus
Lewis	Peters	Tonko
Lieu, Ted	Peterson	Torres
Lipinski	Pingree	Tsongas
Loeback	Pocan	Van Hollen
Lofgren	Polis	Vargas
Lowenthal	Price (NC)	Veasey
Lowe	Quigley	Vela
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Rangel	Velázquez
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Rice (NY)	Visclosky
Lynch	Richmond	Walz
Maloney, Carolyn	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Maloney, Sean	Ruiz	Schultz
Matsui	Ruppersberger	Waters, Maxine
McCollum	Rush	Watson Coleman
McDermott	Ryan (OH)	Welch
	Sánchez, Linda T.	Wilson (FL)
	Sarbanes	Yarmuth

#### NOES—239

Abraham	Emmer (MN)	Knight
Aderholt	Farenthold	Labrador
Allen	Fincher	LaMalfa
Amash	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Amodei	Fleischmann	Lance
Babin	Fleming	Latta
Barletta	Flores	LoBiondo
Barr	Forbes	Long
Barton	Fortenberry	Loudermilk
Benishek	Fox	Love
Bilirakis	Franks (AZ)	Lucas
Bishop (MI)	Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Lummis
Black	Gibbs	MacArthur
Blackburn	Gibson	Marchant
Blum	Gohmert	Marino
Bost	Goodlatte	Masse
Boustany	Gosar	McCarthy
Brady (TX)	Gowdy	McCaul
Brat	Granger	McClintock
Bridenstine	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Brooks (AL)	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Brooks (IN)	Griffith	McMorris
Buchanan	Grothman	Rodgers
Buck	Guinta	McSally
Bucshon	Guthrie	Meadows
Burgess	Hanna	Meehan
Byrne	Hardy	Messer
Calvert	Harper	Mica
Carter (GA)	Harris	Miller (FL)
Carter (TX)	Hartzler	Miller (MI)
Chabot	Heck (NV)	Moolenaar
Chaffetz	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)
Clawson (FL)	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Coffman	Hice, Jody B.	Mulvaney
Cole	Hill	Murphy (PA)
Collins (GA)	Holding	Neugebauer
Collins (NY)	Hudson	Newhouse
Comstock	Huelskamp	Noem
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Nugent
Cook	Hultgren	Nunes
Costello (PA)	Hunter	Olson
Cramer	Hurd (TX)	Palazzo
Crawford	Hurt (VA)	Palmer
Crenshaw	Issa	Paulsen
Culberson	Jenkins (KS)	Pearce
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Perry
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Denham	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Dent	Jolly	Poe (TX)
DeSantis	Jordan	Poliquin
DesJarlais	Joyce	Pompeo
Diaz-Balart	Katko	Posey
Dold	Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom
Duffy	King (IA)	Ratcliffe
Duncan (SC)	King (NY)	Reed
Duncan (TN)	Kinzing (IL)	Reichert
Ellmers (NC)	Kline	Renacci

Ribble	Sessions	Walberg	Kelly (PA)	Noem	Sessions	Schrader	Takai	Velázquez
Rice (SC)	Shinkus	Walden	King (IA)	Nugent	Shinkus	Scott (VA)	Takano	Visclosky
Rigell	Shuster	Walker	King (NY)	Nunes	Shuster	Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Walz
Roby	Simpson	Walorski	Kinzinger (IL)	Olson	Simpson	Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Wasserman
Roe (TN)	Sinema	Walters, Mimi	Kline	Palazzo	Smith (MO)	Sewell (AL)	Titus	Schultz
Rogers (AL)	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)	Knight	Palmer	Smith (NE)	Sherman	Tonko	Waters, Maxine
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)	Labrador	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)	Sinema	Torres	Watson Coleman
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Wenstrup	LaMalfa	Pearce	Smith (TX)	Sires	Tsongas	Welch
Rokita	Smith (TX)	Westerman	Lamborn	Perry	Stefanik	Slaughter	Vargas	Wilson (FL)
Rooney (FL)	Stefanik	Westmoreland	Lance	Peterson	Speier	Speier	Veasey	Yarmuth
Ros-Lehtinen	Stewart	Whitfield	Latta	Pittenger	Stewart	Swalwell (CA)	Vela	
Ross	Stivers	Williams	LoBiondo	Pitts	Stivers			
Rothfus	Stutzman	Wilson (SC)	Long	Poe (TX)	Stutzman			
Rouzer	Thompson (PA)	Wittman	Loudermilk	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)			
Royce	Thornberry	Womack	Love	Pompeo	Thornberry	Fudge	Payne	Smith (WA)
Russell	Tiberi	Woodall	Lucas	Posey	Tiberi	Graves (MO)	Peters	Van Hollen
Ryan (WI)	Tipton	Yoder	Luetkemeyer	Price, Tom	Tipton	Himes	Roskam	Walker
Salmon	Trott	Yoho	Lummis	Ratcliffe	Trott	Hinojosa	Sanchez, Loretta	Young (IN)
Sanford	Turner	Young (AK)	MacArthur	Reed	Turner	Kaptur	Schock	
Scalise	Upton	Young (IA)	Marchant	Reichert	Upton	Pascarell	Scott, Austin	
Schweikert	Valadao	Zeldin	Marino	Renacci	Valadao			
Sensenbrenner	Wagner	Zinke	Massie	Ribble	Wagner			
			McCarthy	Rice (SC)	Walberg			
			McCaul	Rigell	Walden			
			McClintock	Roby	Walorski			
			McHenry	Roe (TN)	Walters, Mimi			
			McKinley	Rogers (AL)	Weber (TX)			
			McMorris	Rogers (KY)	Webster (FL)			
			Rodgers	Rohrabacher	Wenstrup			
			McSally	Rokita	Westerman			
			Meadows	Rooney (FL)	Westmoreland			
			Meehan	Ros-Lehtinen	Whitfield			
			Messer	Ross	Williams			
			Mica	Rothfus	Wilson (SC)			
			Miller (FL)	Rouzer	Wittman			
			Miller (MI)	Royce	Womack			
			Moolenaar	Russell	Woodall			
			Mooney (WV)	Ryan (WI)	Yoder			
			Mullin	Salmon	Yoho			
			Mulvaney	Sanford	Young (AK)			
			Murphy (PA)	Scalise	Young (IA)			
			Neugebauer	Schweikert	Zeldin			
			Newhouse	Sensenbrenner	Zinke			

## NOT VOTING—12

Castor (FL)	Kaptur	Schock
Fudge	Payne	Scott, Austin
Graves (MO)	Roskam	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	Sanchez, Loretta	Young (IN)

□ 1432

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 175, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

## AYES—241

Abraham	Collins (NY)	Goodlatte
Aderholt	Coststock	Gosar
Allen	Conaway	Gowdy
Amash	Cook	Granger
Amodel	Costa	Graves (GA)
Ashford	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Babin	Cramer	Griffith
Barletta	Crawford	Grothman
Barr	Crenshaw	Guinta
Barton	Cuellar	Guthrie
Benishek	Culberson	Hanna
Billirakis	Curbelo (FL)	Hardy
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Rodney	Harper
Bishop (UT)	Denham	Harris
Black	Dent	Hartzler
Blackburn	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Blum	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Boustany	Dold	Hice, Jody B.
Brady (TX)	Duffy	Hill
Brat	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Bridenstine	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Brooks (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp
Brooks (IN)	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Buchanan	Farenthold	Hultgren
Buck	Fincher	Hunter
Bucshon	Fitzpatrick	Hurd (TX)
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hurt (VA)
Byrne	Fleming	Issa
Calvert	Flores	Jenkins (KS)
Carter (GA)	Forbes	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (TX)	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Chabot	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Chaffetz	Franks (AZ)	Jolly
Clawson (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Jones
Coffman	Garrett	Jordan
Cole	Gibbs	Joyce
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Katko

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lipinski
Aguilar	F.	Loeb
Bass	Duckworth	Loftis
Beatty	Edwards	Lowenthal
Becerra	Ellison	Lowe
Bera	Engel	Lujan Grisham
Beyer	Eshoo	(NM)
Bishop (GA)	Esty	Luján, Ben Ray
Blumenauer	Farr	(NM)
Bonamici	Fattah	Lynch
Boyle, Brendan	Foster	Maloney,
F.	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Maloney, Sean
Brown (FL)	Galleo	Matsui
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	McCollum
Bustos	Gibson	McDermott
Butterfield	Graham	McGovern
Capps	Grayson	McNerney
Capuano	Green, Al	Meeks
Cárdenas	Green, Gene	Meng
Carney	Grijalva	Moore
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Moulton
Cartwright	Hahn	Murphy (FL)
Castor (FL)	Hastings	Nadler
Castro (TX)	Heck (WA)	Napolitano
Chu, Judy	Higgins	Neal
Cicilline	Honda	Nolan
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Norcross
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	O'Rourke
Clay	Israel	Pallone
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Connolly	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Conyers	Keating	Polis
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Courtney	Kennedy	Quigley
Crowley	Kildee	Rangel
Cummings	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kind	Richmond
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Kuster	Ruiz
DeGette	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Delaney	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeLauro	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DeBene	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda
DeSaulnier	Lee	T.
Deutch	Levin	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lewis	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schiff

## NOES—175

## NOT VOTING—16

Fudge	Payne	Smith (WA)
Graves (MO)	Peters	Van Hollen
Himes	Roskam	Walker
Hinojosa	Sanchez, Loretta	Young (IN)
Kaptur	Schock	
Pascarell	Scott, Austin	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1439

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 125 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 2015, I was unavoidably detained and missed one vote. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 125.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present to cast my vote on passage of H.R. 1030—The Secret Science Reform Act. I wish the record to reflect my intentions had I been able to vote. Had I been present for rollcall No. 125, I would have voted "no."

## HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

## NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, as a third-generation farmer from Washington State, I am amazed by the level of progress our Nation's agricultural community has made, even in just my lifetime. It is because of this great progress that today we celebrate March 18 as National Agriculture Day.

Few people realize that during the 1960s the average American farmer fed 25 people. Today it is 144 people. The difference is that today our farmers are growing more disease- and pest-resistant crops that require less water and pesticides and better conserve our natural resources. Advancements in technology and technique have allowed our

farmers to continue the long-held tradition of caring for the land they use and the people they grow for.

On National Agriculture Day, please join me in recognizing our farming community and the essential role they continue to fill in feeding our Nation and the world.

#### PAYING TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM E. "BRIT" KIRWAN UPON HIS RETIREMENT AS CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF MARYLAND

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of our Nation's greatest higher education leaders and a great advocate for accessible quality higher education. He is a dear friend and a colleague of mine for the last 40 years.

On June 30, Dr. William E. "Brit" Kirwan will retire after 12 years as chancellor of the University System of Maryland. Under his leadership, the University System has transformed from being a national leader in public higher education into a national model in several areas; these include campus diversity, academic innovation, and efforts to close the achievement gap.

There is, of course, a lot I could say, Mr. Speaker, to my colleagues about Dr. Kirwan's distinguished career and commitment to improving higher education across the country.

Mr. Speaker, on June 30, Dr. William E. "Brit" Kirwan, who has served as chancellor of the University System of Maryland (USM) for more than twelve years, will retire after a career dedicated to advancing higher education.

Dr. Kirwan has left his mark on academia and the State of Maryland in a way few others have. After a quarter-century as an educator and administrator at the University of Maryland, he was President of the University of Maryland, College Park, before serving as President of The Ohio State University. Later, he returned to Maryland to assume the position of USM Chancellor. Common threads throughout his fifty-one-year career in public higher education include an unwavering commitment to affordability, a passion for excellence, and a drive to increase access, especially for underrepresented minorities and low-income students.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kirwan's leadership has helped move the USM from a national leader in public higher education to a national model in several areas. The USM's groundbreaking Effectiveness and Efficiency (E&E) initiative—a reengineering of administrative and academic processes to cut costs and improve quality—has been profiled in national publications and specifically cited by President Obama. The "Closing the Achievement Gap" Initiative, which USM launched in 2007, targets the gap in college participation, retention, and graduation rates between low-income students, first-generation college students, and underrepresented minorities, on one hand, and the

general student population on the other. With this enhanced focus, these gaps in diversity have been narrowed—and even eliminated—on some USM campuses.

As President of the University of Maryland, College Park, Dr. Kirwan helped make that institution one of the most diverse public research universities in the United States. As President of The Ohio State University, he made diversity a centerpiece of the University's Academic Plan. When he left Ohio State in 2002, the University added his name to its interdisciplinary research institute dedicated to understanding racial and ethnic disparities worldwide, now known as the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity.

Dr. Kirwan's effort to establish a productive working relationship with Maryland's elected officials is another testament to his leadership. By aligning higher education goals with state priorities, the USM has ushered in an era of academic and research excellence, targeted workforce development, greater economic impact, and improved affordability. In fact, the average tuition for undergraduate in-state students at USM institutions, once the nation's seventh highest, has now dropped to twenty-sixth.

With the launch of its Course Redesign Initiative in 2006, the USM became the first university system in the nation to use innovative new technology to redesign entire courses. To facilitate academic transformation and excellence even further, in 2012 the USM established the Center for Academic Innovation (CAI) to develop, apply, and evaluate more ways to deliver high-quality courses optimizing technology and other resources system-wide. Today the USM is recognized as a national leader in the burgeoning academic innovation movement.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Kirwan's impact has also been felt beyond Maryland's borders. He currently serves or has served as Co-Chair of the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics; Chair of the College Board's Commission on Access, Admissions, and Success in Higher Education; a member of the Business-Higher Education Forum, and Chair of the National Research Council Board of Higher Education and the Workforce. Dr. Kirwan has also been called upon by U.S. Presidents from both parties to advise on national higher education efforts. His impact on higher education has been honored with two of the most prestigious awards in the field: the TIAA-CREF Theodore M. Hesburgh Award for Leadership (2010) and the Carnegie Corporation Leadership Award (2009).

Under Dr. Kirwan's leadership the USM has flourished, and his lifetime of achievement and service will be celebrated on April 18 at a special retirement gala that will raise endowment funds for the Center for Academic Innovation, which promises to continue exploring the themes of access, affordability, and excellence in higher education that have been hallmarks of his career.

I hope my colleagues in the House will join me in thanking Dr. Kirwan for fifty-one years of service to higher education in our country and congratulating him on his retirement.

□ 1445

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, March is Women's History Month, which honors

and celebrates the struggles and achievements of American women throughout the history of the United States.

Since 1917, when Republican Representative Jeannette Rankin of Montana became the first woman to serve in Congress, 313 women have served as U.S. Representatives, Senators, or Delegates.

In 2014, the American people made history by electing a record number of women to Congress. In January, 12 new women were sworn in to the House of Representatives, joining 72 incumbents who won reelection. The number of women serving in the Senate has reached 20, and four of the five non-voting Delegates are women.

These women with rich perspectives and a commitment to good ideas and teamwork are changing the way Washington does business. The women of the 114th Congress are shaping our Nation, and it is an opportunity and responsibility that we take seriously.

#### HONORING NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND MAYOR JEAN STOTHERT

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in observation of National Women's History Month. During this time, it is important to celebrate the achievements and contributions of women in our great Nation.

I am proud to recognize my friend, Mayor Jean Stothert, the 51st mayor of the great city of Omaha, Nebraska, and the first woman elected to this office.

In 1993, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Stothert moved to Nebraska, quickly embracing her new home. Her advocacy garnered an appointment to the Millard school board, a position to which she was re-elected three times.

Expanding her passion for service, she sought and won election to the Omaha City Council in 2009. With a strong work ethic and ambition, Mayor Stothert was elected mayor of the city of Omaha on May 14, 2013.

An illustration by our very famous editorial cartoonist Jeff Koterba of the Omaha World-Herald portrays Mayor Stothert breaking the proverbial glass ceiling in Omaha.

Good for her—she represents a phalanx of women in Omaha who are taking leadership positions in our community and in our State.

#### WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House Agriculture Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, which I

chair, held a hearing to review the definition of the “waters of the United States” proposed rule and its impact on rural America.

Enacted in 1972, the Clean Water Act established a Federal-State partnership to protect our Nation’s navigable waterways; however, despite strong opposition from Congress and the public, the Obama administration has taken upon itself to redefine the Clean Water Act’s jurisdictional waters. The EPA’s proposed rule could have serious consequences for rural America and the Nation’s economy.

Yesterday, members of the House Committee on Agriculture asserted that the administration has acted on its own, without input from the States and stakeholders, to broaden the scope of the Clean Water Act, threatening the livelihood of farmers, ranchers, and rural America.

It is my hope that yesterday’s hearing will spur the administration to pull the rule and consult with the States and stakeholders first or repropose the rule and allow a new round of public comment.

Mr. Speaker, there is too much on the line to continue down the current path.

#### ADDRESSING THE WEALTH GAP

(Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I have introduced the addressing the wealth gap resolution which calls on Congress to recognize the wealth gap and the racial wealth gap as national economic crises and focus its efforts on their elimination.

This country is facing the widest wealth gap since 1983. The statistics are alarming. Wealthy families make nearly seven times as much as middle class families and 70 times as much as lower class families. African Americans have 13 times and Latinos have 10 times less wealth than White households. White households have \$100,000 more in retirement savings than African Americans and Latinos.

The cause of the record-level wealth gap stems from a structural crisis that started well before the Great Recession. The recession hit, and the housing market collapsed and made everything worse.

In the aftermath, middle-income families and people of color have had to endure income inequality, slow wage growth, skyrocketing student loans, and continued unequal access to quality education and barriers to the housing market. These are problems that widened the gap and require Congress to implement pragmatic solutions.

We cannot sit idly by and expect things to change. This is why I am introducing the addressing the wealth

gap resolution. The first step to resolving this problem is acknowledging that it exists, and I encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join and focus on the goal of rebuilding wealth in America.

#### CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: THE PEOPLE’S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today representing the Congressional Progressive Caucus and to discuss our budget, the people’s budget. I pray that I am not the only one that is speaking for the 60 minutes allotted.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives released their budget proposal. Although they have a new chairman, they are following the same game plan: privatize Medicare, slash spending on safety net programs, and hope that tax cuts for the rich trickle down from top earners to the rest of the country.

That is not what the American people need. They need a plan that levels the playing field, that gives them an opportunity to succeed, and puts their interests above the interests of corporations and the wealthy. They need a budget that is of the people, by the people, and for the people. That is what we are offering in the people’s budget.

If you need a way to pay for affordable child care while you are at your job, we have got it in the people’s budget. If you need access to quality education for your children, teachers that are trained to give them the knowledge they need to be great, we have got it in the people’s budget.

If you worked hard to get into college but now need a way to pay for your tuition, we have got it in the people’s budget. If you can’t make ends meet, if the pay you take home barely keeps a roof over your head and you are making important choices between food and shelter and you are looking for a livable wage, we have got it in the people’s budget.

Mr. Speaker, in the hands of the GOP, this Congress has offered tax break after tax break after tax break after tax break for corporations and billionaires while cutting the very programs that working Americans rely on to pull themselves up the economic ladder that has given generations of American families access to the middle class.

If anyone deserves a tax cut, it is not millionaires. It is the folks that are loading the trucks, the folks that are scanning the groceries, the folks that are cleaning the office buildings, the

folks that are working as clerks, the folks that are working as secretaries, and the folks that are doing the important service jobs that our society so needs.

The people’s budget would invest in priorities that will keep the American people strong, just for everyone. It offers jobs that will restore our middle class. It addresses our Nation’s most pressing challenges, issues like climate change, aging transportation infrastructure, access to education at every level, and good-paying jobs.

This, Mr. Speaker, is about restoring Congress’ commitment to serving hard-working Americans who are playing by the rules but still not getting ahead. This, Mr. Speaker, is about the lives that regular Americans are able to live.

Some say that it is not hard to find any old job and get a paycheck, but does that job offer a high enough wage or enough hours to pay the rent? Can you take time off for illness or to take care of your kids? Do you know that you will have enough to pay for child care while you are at the job? Do you have health insurance in the event that you need it?

My Congressional Progressive Caucus colleagues and I think that taxpaying Americans deserve to confidently answer “yes” to all of these questions, and that is what we are fighting for.

Today, we were given the distinct opportunity to present tenets of our budget to a group of interested people—everyday working people—people who are working for decent-paying jobs.

They are not looking for handouts. They are looking for recognition that they are part of this American Dream, and it is our responsibility to ensure that we are not impediments, but that we are facilitators of that American Dream for everyone.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the chairman of the Progressive Caucus, Congressman ELLISON.

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentlewoman for yielding, the Congresswoman from New Jersey, BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

As I said earlier today, BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN may have just got sworn in as a Member of Congress a few months ago, but she is no stranger to fighting for people.

That was on full display when she spoke at a rollout of our Progressive Caucus budget where she talked about how you can look at any aspect of the Progressive Caucus budget and you will find the same thing in every place: prioritizing people, making sure people can get their needs met in this government, making sure that workers can get access to a job, making sure that people who are sick but who are working can actually get a sick day so that they don’t bring that sickness back to their workplace and don’t have to

abandon their children that might be sick, too.

You pointed out, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN, the fact is that job creation should be the primary metric of any budget. How are we doing putting people back to work in good jobs? How are we helping take care of them while they are on the job? If they are sick, can they take time off? How are we educating people? You focused on the key elements of the Progressive Caucus budget, and I was proud to hear you do it.

The fact is this is our fifth budget that we have put out. It is a budget that is about working people. That is why we call it the people's budget. We urge people to check out the people's budget online at the Congressional Progressive Caucus Web site.

Let me name a few things about the Progressive Caucus budget that are important to highlight. It creates 8.4 million good-paying jobs by 2018.

Now, you just take the Republican budget that was put out yesterday. It was interesting to me that none of my Republican colleagues wanted to tout how many jobs their budget would create, how many jobs the economists—after looking at the Republican budget proposed—would create because that is not what they consider to be a priority; but it is a priority to the Progressive Caucus budget. Our priority is 8.4 million good-paying jobs investing in America, making sure Americans are working again.

Now, you might correctly ask: How are you going to get all these jobs? One way we are going to get the jobs is we are going to invest \$820 billion to repair America's rapidly aging roads and bridges and upgrade our energy systems to address climate change, keep our communities safe, and prepare for the next generation to thrive in our society and workforce.

I would like to share with the Speaker that I come from a town—Minneapolis, Minnesota—where, 6 years ago, the I-35 bridge fell into the Mississippi River because we had not taken care of it. We had not done adequate maintenance on this bridge.

Thirteen people died when that bridge fell. They were Black. They were White. They were wealthy. They were low income. They were born in America. They were born abroad. They were America. That is who lost their lives on that bridge, and 100 more people got injured.

This Progressive Caucus investment in infrastructure repair is not just a job creator and a productivity increaser; it is public safety to have decent, safe infrastructure. I am very proud of that.

We also provide \$945 million to help States and municipalities hire police, firefighters, health care workers, teachers, librarians, and other public employees.

Mr. Speaker, I have got to tell you, I met with my chiefs of police in the Fifth Congressional District about a week ago. Of course, all of us here tonight represent more than one city.

I met with the chiefs of police—I am very proud to represent a city where law enforcement is dedicated—and they were asking me: What's going on with the Byrne grants? What's going on with the JAG grants? What's going on with the COPS grants? These things that have helped us be a better police department have shrunk. Our ability to protect the public is weakened by our limited resources.

□ 1500

Well, we are going to do something about that. We are going to rehire teachers. So if you have got a teacher with 30 second graders in the classroom trying to keep up with all of them, we can hire a teacher's aide who might be able to actually help that teacher do what that teacher does most effectively.

We put \$1.9 trillion in America's future by investing in the working families. This restores and enhances funding for vital programs that Americans rely on, like SNAP, like food, nutrition, so that young people can be in the classroom and can be fully fed and ready to learn.

So these are just a few things about the Progressive Caucus budget. But I wonder if the gentlewoman from New Jersey or the gentlewoman from Michigan will yield to a question.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Should a budget be a moral document which lists the priorities of the Nation?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to respond to that question, Congressman.

As a State legislator, I spent many years in appropriations and on the budget committee, and I came to realize that there is no other document that represents the values and the priorities of the governing entity than the budget statement.

So where we put our money is where we think our interests lie; where we put our money represents our priorities; where we put our money represents our values. And that is one of the major reasons that I am just so proud to be associated with the people's budget as crafted by the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Thank you for giving me that opportunity.

Mr. ELLISON. Will the gentlewoman yield for another question?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. So the Progressive Caucus budget was not just written by members of the Progressive Caucus. We didn't just sit in a room and write up a

budget. We actually pulled in our partners, like the Economic Policy Institute, labor.

How important were our progressive partners in pulling our budget together?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Well, I certainly would like to yield to the gentlelady from Michigan. I just simply want to say that the associations, the affiliations, and the organizations that you identified just very quickly represent the interests of working class people, represent the interests of those who wish to be part of the middle class, and represent those individuals who are responsible for the standards that we have that protect people in the working environment, that protect jobs here in America, and that protect the aspirations and hopefulness of those who recognize that things like public education are great equalizers.

Congressman, I would very much appreciate the opportunity to yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan, my classmate and my friend, Congresswoman BRENDA LAWRENCE.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues, thank you for yielding.

I am here today to speak in my support for the Congressional Progressive Caucus alternative budget and their fight for greater access to affordable housing.

As you know, I was previously a mayor, and the quality of life in America is determined by our housing options, and the CPC budget acknowledges that.

We have an affordable housing crisis. Only one in four families eligible for housing assistance receive it. There is a shortage of low-income apartments and rental homes that are affordable in low-income households.

We have seen the results of sequestration taking housing assistance from 70,000 families, and the CPC budget moves us from trying to preserve existing affordable housing to making significant improvements and investments in new production.

When you are an elected official or a mayor of a community, you see firsthand the challenges from unemployment, the challenges of jobs that are being reduced, the unemployed, and trying to maintain housing.

It is important that we realize that in this budget we call for two new sources for affordable housing, the National Housing Trust Fund and the Capital Magnet Fund, to be fully funded by contributions from Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, as is already required by law. This budget gives families and communities devastated by foreclosure the resources to renovate and resell homes and maintain overall property values.

I come from Michigan, and I represent Detroit. Here I have an article that states: "Downtown Detroit Tenants Rally to Demand Decent and Affordable Housing." This conversation is



happening all over the country while we see some communities where families are actually being displaced as a result of the upper class of our communities being able to buy and push prices up while those in the bottom of our economic class are being challenged every day to find the simple thing that we call quality of life in America, and that is housing.

In my State of Michigan, we have a campaign to end homelessness, to promote housing, first, through the prevention and rapid rehousing activities.

We understand in Michigan that in order to effectively approach homelessness, a community needs a clear, deliberate, and comprehensive strategy. The low incomes of so many families across this country make this increasingly difficult for them to manage the rising cost of housing. This puts them at risk, and some lose their housing and fall into homelessness. We may call this a homelessness crisis, but it is primarily a housing affordability crisis.

Permanent housing subsidies like section 8 need to do a better job of addressing the family housing crisis. However, as this body knows, such subsidies are severely underfunded. Nationally, only one-quarter of the need for such subsidies are being met.

Before I conclude, I want to be clear that we, as members of the Progressive Caucus, stress strongly that we present a budget that is funded, that will ensure that in America the American Dream and the basic quality of life right to have a home is maintained through our budget.

Mr. ELLISON. I represent Minneapolis, Minnesota, and I was talking with my Housing Authority people who were here in town the other day, and I bet your Housing Authority folks were in town, too. One of the things that they said to me is that they opened up their list, and for 2,000 available units, they had 37,000 people who applied for those positions.

Here is another separate fact which I would like you to react to, if you don't mind. In Minneapolis, we pride ourselves on being a progressive town. We have got 4,000 kids who leave shelters every day to go to a public school, and those kids are asked to take standardized tests.

How important is it for a budget, particularly a Progressive Caucus budget, to house America's people?

Mrs. LAWRENCE. It is extremely important.

Thank you.

It is extremely important, and those of us who understand the cry of the people for housing, and understand the impact of homelessness on Americans today, funding of housing, affordable housing, is critical.

I served on the local government board, and one of the things we looked at consistently is: How do we sustain the low-income or sustainable housing for our population?

Children repeatedly, every day across this country, awaken, go to school, and then their families, they are living in cars or they are living in shelters, and they have to take on that responsibility, as a child, and adjust to an environment that they can learn. We know that this is a total distraction. Some of them, through this homelessness, the school is the only stable place for them to go to every single day.

So now we are in a position where we are looking at cutting back on education. We are cutting back on housing. In America, are we sending a message through a budget that will not support sustainable housing for American citizens who are not in the top 1 percent, who some, by no fault of their own, are unemployed? Are we, in this country and as a government, turning our backs on those people?

That is why we have, through the Progressive Caucus, a budget that will awaken the minds of so many in this country and this government, and we want our colleagues across the aisle—and all of our colleagues—to look at this budget and say that this is the time in America we need to step up and fund sustainable housing in America.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, can you tell us just how much time we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey has approximately 40 minutes remaining.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I appreciate the comments that have been offered by both of my colleagues here. I think that you can certainly understand that a lot of work went into the creation, the development, and the evolution of this budget. We are happy to note that, over the years, some of those issues that were identified by the Progressive Caucus have now become part of the regular budget that is presented by the Democratic Caucus.

I want to highlight a couple of other things, because I think we just talked about the need for housing. And we recognize that not only did we lose a lot of housing during the predatory lending crisis, a lot of that housing is still vacant, and we need to figure out a way to recapture that housing and use it for affordable housing purposes. Our budget proposes the extension of the use of vouchers for housing because we recognize how fundamental the need is to have safe and secure housing.

We recognize that, over the last several years, millionaires, billionaires, and corporations have been getting tremendous tax breaks, that the very wealthy have received extremely generous credits.

We want to see working people get credit for work, get tax advantages for the work that working people do, get additional child care credits so that they can provide the kind of safety and security and healthy environment for their families.

Everybody has the desire to have a healthy family. Everybody has a desire to be able to participate in our society, to even pay taxes, Mr. Speaker. They just need to have the mechanisms, the infrastructure, the opportunity, the policies that will provide those opportunities, and this budget does just that.

It is known that one in five children live, in the United States of America, in poverty. One out of three African American children live in poverty. That is unacceptable for any child to live impoverished in a nation that is as rich and that has so much wealth concentrated in so few hands.

To whom much is given, much is required, and it is pay now or pay later.

We need to recognize the significance of our budget that recognizes that education is, indeed, the equalizer here. Not only are we looking to expand access to preschool care, but full funding of K-12.

In addition to that, we recognize that higher education is what distinguishes our middle class from those who never can get into the middle class. But we want to make sure that students have access to education without being overly burdened with debt. So we want to look at creating opportunities for students to refinance their debt.

Let's look at this country as a country of diplomacy, of humanitarianism. Let's look at this country as a country of peacefulness and hopefulness for goodwill for all nations. Let us move away from the sort of cold war mentality; look at modernizing our militaristic events; look at what we are doing with our resources; invest our resources here in America, not overseas; seek to bring humanitarian aid; seek to bring diplomacy. Seek, first, peace; seek, first, coalitions; but seek, first and foremost, to invest in America.

□ 1515

Our unemployment rate is supposedly somewhere around 5 or 6 percent, but that is so misleading. It is so misleading on so many different levels.

Number one, that is not true in rural areas, and that is not true in urban areas, and that is not true for minority communities, and that is not true for those who simply aren't looking anymore because they have been so doggone discouraged that they don't even think that there is any hope for them to have a job. For those people, for that cohort that I am speaking of, unemployment is double digits. It could be 25 percent. It could be 13 percent. It is something that we really don't even know exactly what it is, but we need to be focusing on lifting up all of our communities.

And if we truly, absolutely want the American economy to expand, then we need to know that we need more consumers. We need more jobs. We need more paychecks. We need more customers. And we do that by investing in

our middle class. We do that by investing in small businesses, in new businesses, in startups, in education, and in research and development. This budget recognizes that if we are going to be the great America that we are supposed to be, that we need to make these investments.

Today was monumental for me because I got to articulate and to stand with individuals who expressed things that I have believed. Even as a legislator in the State of New Jersey, I believed that if we are to experience an America that really works, an America where our communities are safe because there is full employment—so no one is trying to rob anybody or no one is feeling a need to engage in illegal activity simply to put some food on the table—if we are going to be competitive globally, then we need to be investing in education. We need to be building schools. We need to ensure that even the schools in the poorest districts across the United States of America have all of the 21st century technology and opportunities to learn and produce. And we need to have high expectations. We need to have high expectations for everyone.

So I thank you very much for this opportunity, and I will take this moment to yield back to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON), the cochair of our Progressive Caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I was really intrigued by the things that you were saying about the Progressive Caucus budget because I have always believed that you know someone's treasure by how they prioritize their expenses.

You can look at a family's budget, and if you see a lot of money being spent on television and movies and candy, you know that they care a lot about that. And if you see people spend a lot of money on books and education, you know they care about that.

What does it mean if you have the budget of a nation where the biggest amounts of the budget are spent on helping rich people get richer and cutting health and safety regulations? What does that mean at a time when income inequality is at its height since the Great Depression?

My problem with the Republican budget is that they have been acting like rich people don't have enough money and poor people have too much for 40 years. What it has brought us is massive income inequality. And their answer to that is to do it some more.

It has hurt this economy to prioritize the well-to-do over everyone else. It doesn't even help rich people very much because rich people own stores and factories and stuff like that. If regular folks, ordinary people don't have any money, how can they even help boost the consumer demand?

This economy that we have, it is important to point out that the United States is a country of tremendous resources. This is still the richest country in the world. Not only is America the richest country in the world but America itself has never been richer.

If you look at per capita income and you scale it on a graph and compare it over time, you are looking at a steadily rising line. Yet the American budget, our governmental expenditures as a proportion of it, we have seen one of the lowest proportions of government spending relative to GDP in a great many years.

The fact of the matter is, the reason the proportion of government expenditure to GDP has been going down is because America has been giving away the resources that it needs to take care of the needs of its people. I am talking about lifesaving research in medicine. I am talking about dealing with issues of climate. I am talking about infrastructure investment.

One of the things that the Progressive Caucus budget does to try to recapture some of the money that the government is due and owed is we end corporate inversion and deferral.

What is corporate inversion? Corporate inversion is where the company does not actually physically move anywhere, but they sell themselves to a foreign corporation with a lower tax rate or no tax rate, thereby escaping the payment of moneys in taxes as an American corporation but not really moving anything. In fact, they might even increase their physical footprint in the country that they are in.

We have had that happen in my own community. And before I went to criticize the company that did it, I had to deal with the fact that it is legal to do.

How are you going to blame a corporation for trying to get money when it is legal to do? Well, I say, rather than blame the company, I will blame Congress, you know? So we went and did something about it. We went to the Progressive Caucus budget and we ended inversions. You can't do that anymore.

We are also in this process of deferral, this idea that corporate profits don't have to be paid as long as they are deferred and kept overseas. We end this process. We end deferrals. I think that these two things alone will bring money back to the United States Government so we can invest in roads and bridges and infrastructure, so we can make sure that no 5-year-old kid is leaving a shelter and going to a public school in the morning, so we can make sure that there is enough SNAP, that kids have a decent meal to eat, and that our seniors can actually hope to one day be able to beat Parkinson's and Alzheimer's and all of these kinds of diseases. These things take public investment to solve these kinds of medical problems.

So the Progressive Caucus budget, I am very proud to be a part of it because it is a budget that looks at the needs of the American people and does something about it.

Let me just talk about the education side of it. We have universal pre-K. Now, it doesn't matter if you are a conservative economist or if you are a liberal economist; they all agree that the best return on investment is educating little kids. You educate those little guys and it will keep them out of trouble. It will put them on a path to college or some form of higher education. And they will not become a government expense; they will be a government asset. They will not be an expenditure on the taxpayer; they will be paying taxes.

Yet the Progressive Caucus doesn't just know that, we actually do something about it by funding universal pre-K. I am so happy about that because, you know, those little guys are so cute, and we definitely want to see those bright-eyed little children maximize their talents. They are actually really smart. And if you put them in an educational environment, an academic environment where they can do more than just learn how to count—they can maybe even learn how to use a computer—you never know what tremendous benefits they will bring to our society. And we move from there.

In K-12 education, we help fund municipal and local public employees who need that kind of help. We have placed \$95 billion in that, where we can, again, put a teacher or a teacher's aide back into the classroom. Ever since the recession in 2008, local governments have been shedding public employees, including teachers.

Now, what does this mean? To the average teacher, the average teacher used to have a classroom of 28 kids, 19 kids. Well, those classes are bigger because you have got fewer teachers. You used to be able to have a little budget to decorate the classroom, to put inspiring messages and notes and pictures up there.

I would actually like to ask the gentlelady from New Jersey a question. Have you had the experience of talking to a teacher where they tell you that they are going into their own pocket to decorate the classroom? Have you ever heard that?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Not only have I heard it, but I have helped some of the teachers buy the supplies for their classrooms.

Mr. ELLISON. Right. So the fact is, we need to respond to these kinds of things.

I would also like to ask the gentlelady, What does it mean to a police department that needs about, you know, 40 people to protect the people of the city but only has 20 folks? What does that mean? Does that mean the officers aren't getting out of their cars and

forming relationships? Does that mean they are just running from call to call to call? Does that mean they may not have the equipment that they need? What does it mean?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Thank you for that question, Congressman. It means all of those things.

What it means for communities like the capital of the State of New Jersey, which is the city of Trenton, it means that our neighborhoods are unsafe. It means that police are running to situations that have already occurred, as opposed to having the resources and the capacity to understand what is happening out there and be proactive and preventative in nature. So it certainly does negatively impact the quality of life for those who live in the city—and cities particularly—and those who work there.

I am particularly concerned about the seniors who invested in the cities years ago when the cities where the thriving environments, Congressman, and now they are still living there because they can't afford to move. So they are finding themselves in communities where, because of the housing crisis, there are vacant houses all around them. Members of gangs have settled into some of those houses, creating almost prison-like environments for the people who can't even go outside and sit on their porch. And all of this has been the function of our disinvestment in our cities.

Mr. ELLISON. The Progressive Caucus budget is trying to step up and address these issues. When you talk to officers and firefighters, health care workers, teachers, librarians, all of these local government functions have been cut.

I would like to ask the gentlewoman another question:

What does it mean to see the library hours cut in your city because the Federal assistance or the local municipalities just don't have enough funding for the library, so the hours get cut, the library staff gets cut. What does that mean to a local community?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank you for the opportunity to address this because I know this firsthand. In the capital city in the State of New Jersey, they have had to actually close libraries.

Now, we already experience a digital divide in urban centers and in poor environments, and sometimes the only access that students have to computers and the Internet and the capacity to do research is in the libraries, in the local libraries. So it has negatively impacted their ability to get the information that they need to succeed in school.

It has also negatively impacted those who are looking for jobs, who go to libraries to be able to research jobs on the Internet. It has had a devastating impact on the community.

So when we look at our budget, the Progressive budget, and we recognize

that we wish to restore services, restore funding to programs that empower our communities, it is giving them a chance, again, to become productive, productive in the work environment, productive in the school environment. It restores hope where hope has been taken away for so long.

Mr. ELLISON. That is right.

If I could just say, putting workers back on the job who are firefighters, librarians, police officers, teachers, these are very important to the quality of life.

I would like to refer to these people as everyday heroes. They may not wear big letters on their chest. But when I think about the people other than my parents who helped inspire me, it was probably a teacher, probably a cop who saw me hanging on the corner and said, Hey, man, we know you are smart. You can do better than what you are doing.

You know what I mean? All of these people are the everyday heroes that make neighborhoods run every single day. So I just think it is important for the Progressive Caucus to say, We are going to prioritize rehiring these people who have been let go in the course of this recession.

We have seen private sector employment increase every single month. But you know what? We have also seen public sector employment actually go down.

□ 1530

One of the things I would also like to get your take on, if you wouldn't mind sharing your views on this issue, is restoring and enhancing emergency unemployment compensation. As you know, back on December 26, 2013, the long-term unemployed were just cast adrift by the Republican majority. These are people who were working but just couldn't find a job soon enough. Some people tried to imply that they were lazy and just didn't want a job, so we had to kick them off unemployment so they would actually look for a job.

I wonder what your thoughts are about this.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. First of all, let me just say for those individuals who, without any fault of their own, were victims of the trickle-down economics that have failed us from 40 years ago to even today, those individuals who but for the shift in policies and having this negative impact because of trickle-down economics which doesn't work except for perhaps on an essay paper, they struggled. They struggled. They lost their homes; they lost their family; they lost their health care; and they lost their health.

The people's budget recognizes the responsibility that government has to those individuals. So to extend the unemployment benefits for the 99 weeks, I believe it is over a 2-year period, gives people an opportunity, as well as gives the policymakers an opportunity

to create opportunities for these people to find jobs and to have some meager form of income while they are looking, because they basically have been left with absolutely nothing. So it is a further illustration that the people's budget is a reflection of the people's needs. I am so very fortunate to be associated with it.

One last thing I wanted to raise as it relates to our urban centers, Mr. Speaker, right now in Washington, D.C., there is a conference of the urban mayors from the State of New Jersey. I am going to have an opportunity to speak to them later on this evening. I tell you, I am very excited to talk to them about what it means to support the Progressive budget, the alternative Progressive Caucus budget, and what it means to their communities, whether it is for education, for teachers, for aides, for paraprofessionals, for police, for nurses, for hospitals, whatever. They will understand that this is a budget that recognizes that where the majority of the people live in this country there is a budget that acknowledges that their needs are paramount to the success of collective success of our economy and our country.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right. I thank the gentlelady for yielding back to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out that, again, the Progressive Caucus budget is in dramatic contrast to the Republican budget. Take the Republican budget, for example. The Republican budget calls for repealing the Affordable Care Act. This is a piece of legislation that has extended health care access to literally millions and millions of people. The Republicans want to snatch health care access out of people who now, for the first time in their life, have acquired it; and they are doing it by saying: Oh, we want you to have freedom, and we think ObamaCare infringes on your freedom, so now be free to be sick with no access to health care other than an emergency room.

That is their idea of freedom, I suppose.

They want to partially privatize Medicare. Is that what we need is privatization of Medicare?

A few years ago, the Republicans wanted to privatize Social Security. They wanted to say: We are going to take all the money you saved, and we are going to put it in some Wall Street account. Of course, they will be administered for a "reasonable fee"—I put that in quotes—but don't worry about it. Everything will be fine.

Then we see stock market prices fall and plummet. They go up and they go down. But when you are talking about something like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, these have to be stable and reliable, and they want to privatize it as they have proposed to other important programs.

They want to turn Medicaid and food stamps into block grants for States. What does that mean? In some States, maybe the Governor will do the right thing. I am pretty confident in Minnesota our Governor would do the right thing. Our unemployment is at a record low. In our State, our wages have been climbing. We actually have a surplus in the State of Minnesota. Our next-door neighbor, Wisconsin, is run by Scott Walker. They have a big, ugly deficit, which is embarrassing, given that he is supposed to be this fiscal conservative. But facts don't seem to bother some people.

My point is that the Republicans want to block grant these programs. If you block grant it in Minnesota, it will be less money. Whenever there is a budget pinch, they will use that money for other things other than the intended purpose. But if you send it to a State like Wisconsin with a Governor like Scott Walker, the people who are intended to benefit from that money may never ever see it at all. And so this is a very important program not to block grant these programs.

Tax reforms that lower rates and eliminate any taxation on profits reported abroad—come on. As a matter of fact, if just cutting taxes to the bone and cutting taxes for rich people as much as we possibly can would be good for the economy, wouldn't we have avoided the recession of 2008? We should have more jobs than we could possibly imagine with these guys. We should have never had any recession, and every American should be paid, I don't know, \$100,000 a year if just cutting taxes was good for the economy. Cutting taxes is good for some people, but it is not good for the economy overall. The evidence is all around us. The Republicans want to turn the rest of the world into a tax haven for multinationals.

Now, the President has been trying to set the record straight. He has been trying to signal what an economy where there is shared prosperity should look like. But the fact is that, if you look at the Republican budget and you contrast it with other proposals, it certainly fails the test of being good for the American people. The Progressive Caucus budget, on the other hand, passes the test. We do programs that actually help the American people: universal pre-K, robust support for title I, and debt-free college to ensure every child gets a quality education. When you contrast their budget and you look at our budget, it is clear which one the American people find to be most meritorious.

So we ask people to look at the Progressive Caucus budget. We ask people to read it; share it with your friends; offer your views on it. We ask people to just support the budget that they think makes a lot of sense.

Probably we will be debating the budgets next week. Probably we will

have a vote. We think it is important for Americans to tune in to this debate. Because if you are an American person and you are busy, you are trying to raise kids, you are trying get to work on time, and you are trying to earn a living, you don't have time to be plugged in to politics like some of us who do this our whole lives. You are busy. But you are smart and you know what is going on.

I am going to ask Americans to actually slow down and say: Hey, look, what is going on in this budget? What does the Republican budget look like? They want to cut taxes. They don't want overseas corporations to return those profits and pay taxes on that. The Progressive Caucus wants to let the little kids go to school, let the teenagers and the young adults go to school. They want to train our workforce, and they want to invest in our Nation's infrastructure.

I guarantee this is what the people in this country want to see.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for upholding the Progressive Caucus message, and I wish you very great success in the people's budget.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for this opportunity to share the good news about the Progressive budget and to inform those who are here as well as those who are at home what this budget represents.

One last issue that I think I would like to address that we may not have clearly or substantively articulated has to do with environmental issues. This budget acknowledges the devastating impact that we have had on the environment, and it takes concrete steps to reverse it, forcing polluters to pay for the carbon that is causing so much of our climate change, eliminating fossil fuel subsidies for Big Oil that, frankly, don't need government support, and ensuring EPA has the resources it needs to help reduce our carbon footprint.

We have spent this last 45, 50 minutes—I am thankful for this opportunity—sharing the good news about the people's budget, the Progressive budget, and I hope that anyone who has a need for additional information will seek this information out online.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### STRENGTHENING HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today, too many Americans struggle to realize the dream of higher education. Our current

system is unaffordable, inflexible, and outdated, and it has resulted in too many students unable to complete college, saddled with loan debt, and ill-equipped to compete in our modern economy.

In recent years, burdensome Federal regulations, a lack of transparency, and a dizzying maze of student aid programs have only contributed to the problem. Students and families deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, when my husband and I were in high school and contemplating the possibility of college, we were penniless people. In his case, his parents had no formal education—they couldn't read and write—and my family had very limited education, but we understood then that the way out of poverty was to go to college, work hard, and get a good job. Folks like us who had no resources could do that. It is very difficult for people in this day and time to do what he and I did. He graduated from college with a very small debt. I graduated from college with absolutely no debt because of working my way through. It did take me 7 years to do it, but I was able to do it.

Mr. Speaker, we want to be able to provide an environment in this country where people with very limited resources can do what my husband and I and millions of other young people did in the past, which is get a higher education without going deeply into debt to do so.

The upcoming reauthorization of the Higher Education Act provides Congress an opportunity to help every individual—regardless of age, location, or background—access and complete higher education if they choose.

To inform the reauthorization process, the Education and the Workforce Committee has held 15 hearings over the last several years. After receiving feedback from students, institutions, innovators, administrators, and researchers, the committee established a set of key principles that will guide our reform of the postsecondary education law.

First, we must empower students and families to make informed decisions when it comes to selecting the institution that meets their unique needs. Today's higher education resources are incomplete and inaccurate and often complicate the financial aid process, misguiding students about their academic and financial options. Developing a more streamlined and transparent system, as well as enhancing financial literacy services, will help students better understand the higher education landscape and make choices based on easy-to-understand, relevant information.

Second, we must simplify and improve student aid. Currently, the Federal Government operates more than 10 aid programs, each with its own set of

rules and requirements. Many students, particularly first-generation and low-income students, are overwhelmed by the complexity of the current system, which can ultimately deter them from accessing the aid that will help make college a reality.

□ 1545

Consolidating this patchwork of aid programs will simplify the application and eligibility process and help more students understand, manage, and repay their debt.

Third, we must promote innovation, access, and completion. In recent years, as the postsecondary student population has changed, many institutions have developed new approaches to delivering higher education, including competency-based curriculums and on-line classes.

The Federal Government should make every effort to support these innovations, as they have enabled more Americans to earn a degree or certificate faster with less cost and without additional disruption to their daily lives.

Finally, we must ensure strong accountability by limiting the Federal role. The current administration has subjected institutions to onerous regulations and requirements, which have created a costly and time-consuming process, hampered innovation, and jeopardized academic freedom.

Eliminating ineffective Federal burdens will provide States and institutions the flexibility they need to deliver effectively a high-quality education to their students.

We are confident that these pillars will translate into meaningful Federal reforms that reflect the evolving needs of students and the workforce.

Yesterday, the Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training held its first hearing of the 114th Congress, where we heard policy recommendations on how we can strengthen America's higher education system to serve students, families, workers, and taxpayers better.

Former Indiana Governor and Purdue University President Mitch Daniels testified:

It is my great hope that this Congress will have the courage to see the challenges and treat reauthorization of the Higher Education Act as an opportunity for reform.

He continued:

The country needs a reauthorization that will reduce the costs of higher education's regulatory burdens, simplify and improve student aid, and create an environment more conducive to innovation in higher education.

Dr. Christine Keller, vice president of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, stressed the need for "access to clear, meaningful data . . . to answer questions and provide essential information for higher education stakeholders—for students and families to make more informed deci-

sions about where to attend college, for policymakers to determine allocations of public resources and evaluate institutional effectiveness, and for college leaders to facilitate innovation and successful student outcomes."

After outlining several opportunities for simplifying Federal aid, Mr. Michael Bennett, associate vice president for financial aid services at St. Petersburg College, recommended "a new repayment model that will simplify and streamline the repayment process by collapsing the various existing plans into two basic plans . . . simplifying repayment for students would certainly decrease default rates and the taxpayers' burden of having to shoulder the costs of defaulted loans."

In the coming months, there will be many conversations and what can be done to maintain the strength of our robust higher education system. We have a responsibility to act now to preserve our unique role in the world as a summit of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

##### RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I submit for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached copy of the rules of the Committee on Education and the Workforce for the U.S. House of Representatives for the 114th Congress:

##### RULE 1. REGULAR, ADDITIONAL, AND SPECIAL MEETINGS

(a) Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held on the second Wednesday of each month at 10:00 a.m., while the House is in session. The Committee shall meet for the consideration of a bill or resolution pending before the Committee or the transaction of other committee business on regular meeting days fixed by the Committee if notice is given in accordance with paragraph (g)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) The Chair may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business.

(c) If at least three members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chair, those members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chair for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the staff director of the Committee shall notify the Chair of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chair does not call the requested special meeting to be held within seven calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the members of the Committee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measure or matter to be considered at that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the staff director of

the Committee shall notify all members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered. Such notice shall also be made publicly available in electronic form and shall satisfy the notice requirements in clause (g)(3)(A)(ii) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

(d) Legislative meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be open to the public, including radio, television, and still photography coverage, unless such meetings are closed pursuant to the requirements of the Rules of the House of Representatives. No business meeting of the Committee, other than regularly scheduled meetings, may be held without each member being given reasonable notice.

(e) The Chair of the Committee or of a subcommittee, as appropriate, shall preside at meetings or hearings. In the absence of the Chair of the Committee or of a subcommittee, members shall preside as provided in clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. No person other than a Member of Congress or Congressional staff may walk in, stand in, or be seated at the rostrum area during a meeting or hearing of the Committee or subcommittee unless authorized by the Chair.

##### RULE 2. STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES AND JURISDICTION

(a) There shall be four standing subcommittees. In addition to conducting oversight in the area of their respective jurisdictions as required in clause 2 of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each subcommittee shall have the following jurisdiction:

*Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education.*—Education from early learning through the high school level, including but not limited to elementary and secondary education, special education, homeless education, and migrant education; overseas dependent schools; career and technical education; school safety and alcohol and drug abuse prevention; school lunch and child nutrition programs; educational research and improvement including the Institute of Education Sciences; environmental education; pre-service and in-service teacher professional development including Title II of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* and Title II of the *Higher Education Act*; early care and education programs including the *Head Start Act* and the *Child Care and Development Block Grant Act*; adolescent development and training programs, including but not limited to those providing for the care and treatment of certain at-risk youth, including the *Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act* and the *Runaway and Homeless Youth Act*; and all matters dealing with child abuse and domestic violence, including the *Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act* and child adoption.

*Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training.*—Education and training beyond the high school level, including but not limited to higher education generally, postsecondary student assistance and employment services, and the *Higher Education Act*; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; all domestic volunteer programs; all programs related to the arts and humanities, museum and library services, and arts and artifacts indemnity; postsecondary career and technical education, apprenticeship programs, and job training, including the *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act*, vocational rehabilitation, and training programs

from immigration funding; science and technology programs; adult basic education (family literacy); all welfare reform programs, including work incentive programs and welfare-to-work requirements; poverty programs, including the *Community Services Block Grant Act* and the *Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)*; the *Native American Programs Act*; the Institute of Peace; and all matters dealing with programs and services for the elderly including nutrition programs and the *Older Americans Act*.

*Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.*—Wages and hours of workers, including but not limited to the *Davis-Bacon Act*, the *Walsh-Healey Act*, the *Service Contract Act*, and the *Fair Labor Standards Act*; workers' compensation including the *Federal Employees' Compensation Act*, the *Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act*, and the *Black Lung Benefits Act*; the *Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act*; the *Family and Medical Leave Act*; the *Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification Act*; the *Employee Polygraph Protection Act of 1988*; trade and immigration issues as they affect employers and workers; workers' safety and health, including but not limited to occupational safety and health, mine safety and health, and migrant and agricultural worker safety and health; and all matters related to equal employment opportunity and civil rights in employment.

*Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.*—All matters dealing with relationships between employers and employees, including but not limited to the *National Labor Relations Act*, the *Labor-Management Relations Act*, and the *Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act*; the Bureau of Labor Statistics; and employment-related health and retirement security, including pension, health, and other employee benefits and the *Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA)*.

(b) The majority party members of the Committee may provide for such temporary, ad hoc subcommittees as determined to be appropriate.

#### RULE 3. EX OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Chair of the Committee and the ranking minority party member ("Ranking Member") shall be ex officio members, but not voting members, of each subcommittee to which such Chair or Ranking Member has not been assigned.

#### RULE 4. SUBCOMMITTEE SCHEDULING

(a) Subcommittee chair shall set meeting or hearing dates after consultation with the Chair and other subcommittee chair with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings, wherever possible. No such meetings or hearings, however, shall be held outside of Washington, D.C., or during a recess or adjournment of the House of Representatives without the prior authorization of the Committee Chair. Where practicable, 14 days' notice will be given of such meeting or hearing.

(b) Available dates for subcommittee meetings during the session shall be assigned by the Chair to the subcommittees as nearly as practicable in rotation and in accordance with their workloads. As far as practicable, the Chair shall not schedule simultaneous subcommittee markups, a subcommittee markup during a full Committee markup, or any hearing during a markup.

#### RULE 5. SUBCOMMITTEE RULES

The rules of the Committee shall be the rules of its subcommittees.

#### RULE 6. SPECIAL ASSIGNMENT OF MEMBERS

To facilitate the oversight and other legislative and investigative activities of the Committee, the Chair of the Committee may, at the request of a subcommittee chair, make a temporary assignment of any member of the Committee to such subcommittee for the purpose of constituting a quorum and of enabling such member to participate in any public hearing, investigation, or study by such subcommittee to be held outside of Washington, D.C. Any member of the Committee may attend public hearings of any subcommittee and any member of the Committee may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chair for that purpose.

#### RULE 7. HEARING PROCEDURE

(a) The Chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, and the appropriate subcommittee chair, in the case of hearings to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Chair of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member, determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date or the Committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the Committee for the transaction of business. In the latter event, the Chair or the subcommittee chair, as the case may be, shall have such an announcement promptly published in the Daily Digest and made publicly available in electronic form. To the extent practicable, the Chair or the subcommittee chair shall make public announcement of the final list of witnesses scheduled to testify at least 48 hours before the commencement of the hearing. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record as soon as practicable after such public announcement is made.

(b) Subcommittees are authorized to hold hearings, receive exhibits, hear witnesses, and report to the Committee for final action, together with such recommendations as may be agreed upon by the subcommittee.

(c) All opening statements at hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee will be made part of the permanent written record. Opening statements by members may not be presented orally, unless the Chair of the Committee or any subcommittee determines that one statement from the Chair or a designee will be presented, in which case the Ranking Member or a designee may also make a statement. If a witness scheduled to testify at any hearing of the Committee or any subcommittee is a constituent of a member of the Committee or subcommittee, such member shall be entitled to briefly introduce such witness at the hearing.

(d) To the extent practicable, witnesses who are to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the staff director of the Committee, at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance, a written statement of their proposed testimony, together with a brief summary thereof, and shall limit their oral presentation to a summary thereof. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly furnish to the staff director of the minority a copy of such testimony submitted to the Committee pursuant to this rule. The Chair of the Committee, or a member designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses.

(e) When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chair by a majority of those minority party members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon. The minority party may waive this right by calling at least one witness during a Committee hearing or subcommittee hearing.

(f) In the conduct of hearings of subcommittees sitting jointly, the rules otherwise applicable to all subcommittees shall likewise apply to joint subcommittee hearings for purposes of such shared consideration.

#### RULE 8. QUESTIONING OF HEARING WITNESSES

(a) Subject to clauses (b), (c), and (d), a Committee member may question hearing witnesses only when the member has been recognized by the Chair for that purpose, and only for a five-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The questioning of witnesses in both Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chair, followed by the Ranking Member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority party. The Chair shall exercise discretion in determining the order in which members will be recognized. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chair shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority party members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to place the members of the majority party in a disadvantageous position.

(b) The Chair may permit a specified number of members to question a witness for longer than five minutes. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this clause shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(c) The Chair may permit Committee staff for the majority and the minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods. The time for extended questioning of a witness under this clause shall be equal for the majority party and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate.

(d) In an investigative hearing or in an executive session, the Chair's authority to extend questioning under subsection (b) and (c) of this rule shall be equal for the majority and the minority party and may not exceed one hour in the aggregate, and shall only be conducted by counsel for the majority and the minority party when authorized under subsection (c) of this rule.

#### RULE 9. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY

The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chair of the full Committee, as provided for under clause 2(m)(3)(A)(i) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the Ranking Member prior to issuing any subpoena under such authority. To the extent practicable, the Chair shall consult with the Ranking Member at least 24 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and federal holidays. As soon as practicable after issuing any subpoena under such authority, the Chair shall notify in writing all members of the Committee of the issuance of the subpoena.



## RULE 10. DEPOSITION PROCEDURE

(a) In accordance with the Committee receiving authorization by the House of Representatives for the taking of depositions in furtherance of a Committee investigation, the Chair, upon consultation with the Ranking Member, may order the taking of depositions pursuant to notice or subpoena as contemplated by this rule.

(b) The Chair or majority staff shall consult with the Ranking Member or minority staff no less than three business days before any notice or subpoena for a deposition is issued. After such consultation, all members shall receive written notice that a notice or subpoena for a deposition will be issued.

(c) A notice or subpoena issued under this rule shall specify the date, time, and place of the deposition and the method or methods by which the deposition will be recorded. Prior to testifying, a deponent shall be provided with a copy of the Committee's rules, the House Resolution authorizing the taking of the deposition, and Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(d)(1) A deposition shall be conducted by one or more members or Committee counsel as designated by the Chair or Ranking Member.

(2) A deposition shall be taken under oath or affirmation administered by a member or a person otherwise authorized to administer oaths and affirmations.

(3) A deposition shall be, unless waived by the deponent, attended by a member of the Committee.

(e) A deponent may be accompanied at a deposition by counsel to advise the deponent of the deponent's rights. Only members and Committee counsel, however, may examine the deponent. No one may be present at a deposition other than members, Committee staff designated by the Chair or Ranking Member, such individuals as may be required to administer the oath or affirmation and transcribe or record the proceedings, the deponent, and the deponent's counsel (including personal counsel and counsel for the entity employing the deponent if the scope of the deposition is expected to cover actions taken as part of the deponent's employment). Observers or counsel for other persons or entities may not attend.

(f)(1) Unless the majority, minority, and deponent agree otherwise, questions in a deposition shall be propounded in rounds, alternating between the majority and minority. A single round shall not exceed 60 minutes per side, unless the members or counsel conducting the deposition agree to a different length of questioning. In each round, a member or Committee counsel designated by the Chair shall ask questions first, and the member or Committee counsel designated by the Ranking Member shall ask questions second.

(2) Any objection made during a deposition must be stated concisely and in a non-argumentative and non-suggestive manner. Deponent may refuse to answer a question only to preserve a privilege. When the deponent has objected and refused to answer a question to preserve a privilege, the Chair may rule on any such objection after the deposition has adjourned. If the Chair overrules any such objection and thereby orders a deponent to answer any question to which a privilege objection was lodged, such ruling shall be filed with the clerk of the Committee and shall be provided to members and the deponent no less than three days before the ruling is enforced at a reconvened deposition. If a member of the Committee appeals in writing the ruling of the Chair, the appeal shall be preserved for Committee consideration. A depo-

nent who refuses to answer a question after being directed to answer by the Chair in writing may be subject to sanction, except that no sanctions may be imposed if the ruling of the Chair is reversed on appeal. In all cases, when deposition testimony for which an objection has been made is offered for admission in evidence before the Committee, all properly lodged objections then made shall be timely and shall be considered by the Committee prior to admission in evidence before the Committee.

(g) Deposition testimony shall be transcribed by stenographic means and may also be video recorded. The clerk of the Committee shall receive the transcript and any video recording and promptly forward such to minority staff at the same time the clerk distributes such to other majority staff.

(h) The individual administering the oath shall certify on the transcript that the deponent was duly sworn. The transcriber shall certify that the transcript is a true, verbatim record of the testimony, and the transcript and any exhibits shall be filed, as shall any video recording, with the clerk of the Committee. In no case shall any video recording be considered the official transcript of a deposition or otherwise supersede the certified written transcript.

(i) After receiving the transcript, majority staff shall make available the transcript for review by the deponent or deponent's counsel. No later than ten business days thereafter, the deponent may submit suggested changes to the Chair. Committee majority staff may direct the clerk of the Committee to note any typographical errors, including any requested by the deponent or minority staff, via an errata sheet appended to the transcript. Any proposed substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments to the deposition testimony must be submitted by the deponent as an affidavit that includes the deponent's reasons therefore. Any substantive changes, modifications, clarifications, or amendments shall be included as an appendix to the transcript, a copy of which shall be promptly forwarded to minority staff.

(j) The Chair and Ranking Member shall consult regarding the release of deposition transcript or electronic recordings. If either objects in writing to a proposed release of a deposition transcript or electronic recording or a portion thereof, the matter shall be promptly referred to the Committee for resolution.

## RULE 11. QUORUMS

One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action other than amending Committee rules, closing a meeting from the public, reporting a measure or recommendation, or in the case of the Committee or a subcommittee authorizing a subpoena. For the enumerated actions, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. Any two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

## RULE 12. REFERRAL OF BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) The Chair shall consult with subcommittee chair regarding referral to the appropriate subcommittees of such bills, resolutions, and other matters that have been referred to the Committee. Once copies of a bill, resolution, or other matter are available to the Committee, the Chair shall, within three weeks of such availability, provide notice of referral, if any, to the appropriate subcommittee.

(b) Referral to a subcommittee shall not be made until three days have elapsed after written notification of such proposed referral to all subcommittee chair, at which time such proposed referral shall be made unless one or more subcommittee chair shall have given written notice to the Chair of the full Committee and to the chair of each subcommittee that he or she intends to question such proposed referral at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee, or at a special meeting of the Committee called for that purpose, at which time referral shall be made by the majority members of the Committee. All bills shall be referred under this rule to the subcommittee of proper jurisdiction without regard to whether the author is or is not a member of the subcommittee. Upon a majority vote of the Committee, a bill, resolution, or other matter referred to a subcommittee in accordance with this rule may be recalled at any time for the Committee's direct consideration or for reference to another subcommittee.

(c) The Chair shall announce the date, place, and subject matter of a Committee meeting, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which members have notice thereof; but this requirement may be waived if the Chair of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Member, determines that there is good cause or the Committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of members required under the rules of the Committee for the transaction of such business.

(d) When a bill or resolution is being considered by the Committee or a subcommittee, members shall provide the clerk in a timely manner a sufficient number of written copies of any amendment offered, so as to enable each member present to receive a copy thereof prior to taking action. A point of order may be made against any amendment not reduced to writing. A copy of each such amendment shall be maintained in the public records of the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

(e) In determining the order in which amendments to a matter pending before the Committee or a subcommittee will be considered, the Chair may give priority to:

(1) The Chair's mark, and

(2) Amendments, otherwise in order, that have been filed with the Committee at least 24 hours prior to the Committee or subcommittee business meeting on said measure or matter.

## RULE 13. VOTES

(a) With respect to each roll call vote on a motion to report any bill, resolution, or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered thereto, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(b) In accordance with clause 2(h) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chair of the Committee or a subcommittee is authorized to postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment. Such Chair may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

## RULE 14. RECORDS AND ROLL CALLS

(a) Written records shall be kept of the proceedings of the Committee and of each



subcommittee, including a record of the votes on any question on which a roll call is demanded. The result of each such roll call vote shall be made available by the Committee or subcommittee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee or subcommittee and shall be made available on the Committee's website within 48 hours of such record vote. Information so available for public inspection and on the Committee's website shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition; the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition; and the names of those members present but not voting. The text of an amendment offered to a measure or matter considered in Committee shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than 24 hours after its final disposition in Committee. A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member.

(b) In accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, any official permanent record of the Committee (including any record of a legislative, oversight, or other activity of the Committee or any subcommittee) shall be made available for public use if such record has been in existence for 30 years, except that—

(1) any record that the Committee (or a subcommittee) makes available for public use before such record is delivered to the Archivist under clause 2 of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be made available immediately, including any record described in subsection (a) of this Rule;

(2) any investigative record that contains personal data relating to a specific living individual (the disclosure of which would be an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy), any administrative record with respect to personnel, and any record with respect to a hearing closed pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall be available if such record has been in existence for 50 years; or

(3) except as otherwise provided by order of the House of Representatives, any record of the Committee for which a time, schedule, or condition for availability is specified by order of the Committee (entered during the Congress in which the record is made or acquired by the Committee) shall be made available in accordance with the order of the Committee.

(c) The official permanent records of the Committee include noncurrent records of the Committee (including subcommittees) delivered by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the Archivist of the United States for preservation at the National Archives and Records Administration, which are the property of and remain subject to the rules and orders of the House of Representatives.

(d)(1) Any order of the Committee with respect to any matter described in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be adopted only if the notice requirements of Committee Rule 12(c) have been met, a quorum consisting of a majority of the members of the Committee is present at the time of the vote, and a majority of those present and voting approve the adoption of the order, which shall be submitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, together with any accompanying report.

(2) This subsection applies to any order of the Committee which—

(A) provides for the non-availability of any record subject to subsection (b) of this rule

for a period longer than the period otherwise applicable; or

(B) is subsequent to, and constitutes a later order under clause 4(b) of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, regarding a determination of the Clerk of the House of Representatives with respect to authorizing the Archivist of the United States to make available for public use the records delivered to the Archivist under clause 2 of Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; or

(C) specifies a time, schedule, or condition for availability pursuant to subsection (b)(3) of this Rule.

#### RULE 15. REPORTS

(a) Reports of the Committee. All Committee reports on bills or resolutions shall comply with the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XI and clauses 2, 3, and 4 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(1) No such report shall be filed until copies of the proposed report have been available to all members at least 36 hours prior to such filing in the House of Representatives. No material change shall be made in the report distributed to members unless agreed to by the Ranking Member; but any member or members of the Committee may file, as part of the printed report, individual, minority, or dissenting views, without regard to the preceding provisions of this rule.

(2) Such 36-hour period shall not conclude earlier than the end of the period provided under clause 4 of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives after the Committee approves a measure or matter if a member, at the time of such approval, gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion as part of the printed report.

(3) To the extent practicable, any report prepared pursuant to a Committee or subcommittee study or investigation shall be available to members no later than 48 hours prior to consideration of any such report by the Committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

(b) Disclaimers.

(1) A report on activities of the Committee required under clause 1 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall include the following disclaimer in the document transmitting the report to the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and the Workforce or any subcommittee thereof and therefore may not necessarily reflect the views of its members.

Such disclaimer need not be included if the report was circulated to all members of the Committee at least seven days prior to its submission to the House of Representatives and provision is made for the filing by any member, as part of the printed report, of individual, minority, or dissenting views.

(2) All Committee or subcommittee reports printed pursuant to legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report:

This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Education and the Workforce (or pertinent subcommittee thereof) and therefore may not necessarily reflect the views of its members.

The minority party members of the Committee or subcommittee shall have three calendar days, excluding weekends and holidays, to file, as part of the printed report, supplemental, minority, or additional views.

(c) Reports of Subcommittees. Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution,

or other matter to be reported to the Committee, the chair of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the Committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so, may report such bill, resolution, or matter to the Committee. It shall be the duty of the chair of the subcommittee to report or cause to be reported promptly such bill, resolution, or matter, and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or matter to a vote.

(1) In any event, the report, described in the proviso in subsection (c)(2) of this rule, of any subcommittee on a measure which has been approved by the subcommittee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the staff director of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the subcommittee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the staff director of the Committee shall transmit immediately to the chair of the subcommittee a notice of the filing of that request.

(2) Bills, resolutions, or other matters favorably reported by a subcommittee shall automatically be placed upon the agenda of the Committee as of the time they are reported. No bill or resolution or other matter reported by a subcommittee shall be considered by the full Committee unless it has been delivered or electronically sent to all members and notice of its prior transmission has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to such consideration. A member of the Committee shall receive, upon his or her request, a paper copy of such bill, resolution, or other matter reported. When a bill is reported from a subcommittee, such measure shall be accompanied by a section-by-section analysis; and, if the Chair of the Committee so requires (in response to a request from the Ranking Member of the Committee or for other reasons), a comparison showing proposed changes in existing law.

#### RULE 16. APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES, NOTICE OF CONFERENCE MEETINGS, AND CONFERENCE MOTION

(a) Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chair shall recommend to the Speaker as conferees the names of those members of the subcommittee which handled the legislation in the order of their seniority upon such subcommittee and such other Committee members as the Chair may designate with the approval of the majority party members. Recommendations of the Chair to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party members to minority party members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority members to minority party members on the full Committee. In making assignments of minority party members as conferees, the Chair shall consult with the Ranking Member of the Committee.

(b) After the appointment of conferees pursuant to clause 11 of Rule I of the Rules of the House of Representatives for matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, the Chair shall notify all members appointed to the conference of meetings at least 48 hours before the commencement of the meeting. If such notice is not possible, then notice shall be given as soon as possible.

(c) The Chair is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

#### RULE 17. MEASURES TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION

A member of the Committee may not seek to suspend the Rules of the House of Representatives on any bill, resolution, or other matter which has been modified after such measure is ordered reported, unless notice of such action has been given to the Chair and Ranking Member of the full Committee.

#### RULE 18. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Television, Radio and Still Photography.—

(1) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee is open to the public, those proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography subject to the requirements of clause 4 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and except when the hearing or meeting is closed pursuant to the Rules of the House of Representatives and of the Committee. The coverage of any hearing or meeting of the Committee or any subcommittee thereof by television, radio, or still photography shall be under the direct supervision of the Chair of the Committee, the subcommittee chair, or other member of the Committee presiding at such hearing or meeting and may be terminated by such member in accordance with the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(3) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(b) Audio and Video Coverage of Committee Hearings and Meetings.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Committee shall provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public. Such coverage shall be fair and nonpartisan in accordance with clause 4(b) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules of the House of Representatives and of the Committee. Personnel providing such coverage shall be employees of the House of Representatives or currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

#### RULE 19. COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The employees of the Committee shall be appointed by the Chair in consultation with subcommittee chair and other majority party members of the Committee within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee.

(b) The staff appointed by the minority shall have their remuneration determined in such manner as the minority party members of the Committee shall determine within the budget approved for such purposes by the Committee.

#### RULE 20. SUPERVISION AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEE STAFF

The staff of the Committee shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chair, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate authority as he or she determines appropriate. The staff appointed by the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority party members of the Committee, who may delegate such authority as they determine ap-

propriate. All Committee staff shall be assigned to Committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

#### RULE 21. AUTHORIZATION FOR TRAVEL

(a) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolutions as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern travel of Committee members and staff. Travel to be paid from funds set aside for the full Committee for any member or any staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chair. Travel may be authorized by the Chair for any member and any staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee thereof and meetings, conferences, and investigations that involve activities or subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. The Chair shall review travel requests to assure the validity to Committee business. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

- (1) The purpose of the travel;
- (2) The dates during which the travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the travel is being made;
- (3) The location of the event for which the travel is to be made; and
- (4) The names of members and staff seeking authorization.

(b)(1) In the case of travel outside the United States of members and staff of the Committee for the purpose of conducting hearings, investigations, studies, or attending meetings and conferences involving activities or subject matter under the legislative assignment of the Committee or pertinent subcommittees, prior authorization must be obtained from the Chair, or, in the case of a subcommittee, from the subcommittee chair and the Chair. Before such authorization is given, there shall be submitted to the Chair, in writing, a request for such authorization. Each request, which shall be filed in a manner that allows for a reasonable period of time for review before such travel is scheduled to begin, shall include the following:

- (A) The purpose of travel;
- (B) The dates during which the travel will occur;
- (C) The names of the countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each;
- (D) an agenda of anticipated activities for each country for which travel is authorized together with a description of the purpose to be served and the areas of Committee jurisdiction involved; and
- (E) The names of members and staff for whom authorization is sought.

(2) Requests for travel outside the United States may be initiated by the Chair or the chair of a subcommittee (except that individuals may submit a request to the Chair for the purpose of attending a conference or meeting) and shall be limited to members and permanent employees of the Committee.

(3) The Chair shall not approve a request involving travel outside the United States while the House is in session (except in the case of attendance at meetings and conferences or where circumstances warrant an exception).

(4) At the conclusion of any hearing, investigation, study, meeting, or conference for which travel outside the United States has been authorized pursuant to this rule, each subcommittee (or members and staff attending meetings or conferences) shall submit a written report to the Chair covering the ac-

tivities of the subcommittee and containing the results of these activities and other pertinent observations or information gained as a result of such travel.

(c) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, or regulations of the House of Representatives and of the Committee on House Administration pertaining to such travel, including rules, procedures, and limitations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration with respect to domestic and foreign expense allowances.

(d) Prior to the Chair's authorization for any travel, the Ranking Member shall be given a copy of the written request therefor.

#### RULE 22. BUDGET AND EXPENSES

(a) The Chair, in consultation with the majority party members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, for necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee; and, after consultation with the minority party membership, the Chair shall include amounts budgeted to the minority party members for staff personnel to be under the direction and supervision of the minority party, travel expenses of minority party members and staff, and minority party office expenses. All travel expenses of minority party members and staff shall be paid for out of the amounts so set aside and budgeted. The Chair shall take whatever action is necessary to have the budget as finally approved by the Committee duly authorized by the House of Representatives. After such budget shall have been adopted, no change shall be made in such budget unless approved by the Committee. The Chair or the chair of any standing subcommittee may initiate necessary travel requests as provided in Committee Rule 21 within the limits of their portion of the consolidated budget as approved by the House, and the Chair may execute necessary vouchers therefor.

(b) Subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives and procedures prescribed by the Committee on House Administration, and with the prior authorization of the Chair of the Committee in each case, there may be expended in any one session of Congress for necessary travel expenses of witnesses attending hearings in Washington, D.C.:

(1) Out of funds budgeted and set aside for each subcommittee, not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending hearings of each such subcommittee;

(2) Out of funds budgeted for the full Committee majority, not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending full Committee hearings; and

(3) Out of funds set aside to the minority party members, (A) Not to exceed, for each of the subcommittees, \$5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending subcommittee hearings, and (B) Not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of witnesses attending full Committee hearings.

(c) A full and detailed monthly report accounting for all expenditures of Committee funds shall be maintained in the Committee office, where it shall be available to each member of the Committee. Such report shall show the amount and purpose of each expenditure, and the budget to which such expenditure is attributed.

#### RULE 23. CHANGES IN COMMITTEE RULES

The Committee shall not consider a proposed change in these rules unless the text of such change has been delivered or electronically sent to all members and notice of its

prior transmission has been in the hands of all members at least 48 hours prior to such consideration; a member of the Committee shall receive, upon his or her request, a paper copy of the proposed change.

## PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I submit for publication the attached copy of the rules of the Committee on Financial Services of the U.S. House of Representatives as adopted on January 14, 2015, for the 114th Congress:

### RULE 1

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Financial Services (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the "Committee") and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are privileged motions in the Committee and shall be considered without debate. A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

(b) Each subcommittee is a part of the Committee, and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) The provisions of clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House are incorporated by reference as the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable.

### RULE 2

#### MEETINGS

##### Calling of Meetings

(a)(1) The Committee shall regularly meet on the first Tuesday of each month when the House is in session.

(2) A regular meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with if, in the judgment of the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter in these rules referred to as the "Chair"), there is no need for the meeting.

(3) Additional regular meetings and hearings of the Committee may be called by the Chair, in accordance with clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(4) Special meetings shall be called and convened by the Chair as provided in clause 2(c)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

##### Notice for Meetings

(b)(1) The Chair shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular meeting of the Committee at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on any such day) before the time of the meeting.

(2) The Chair shall provide to each member of the Committee, at least three calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on any such day) before the time of each regular meeting for each measure or matter on the agenda a copy of—

(A) the measure or materials relating to the matter in question; and

(B) an explanation of the measure or matter to be considered, which, in the case of an explanation of a bill, resolution, or similar measure, shall include a summary of the

major provisions of the legislation, an explanation of the relationship of the measure to present law, and a summary of the need for the legislation.

(3) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, the Chair shall cause the text of such legislation to be made publicly available in electronic form.

(4) The provisions of this subsection may be waived by a two-thirds vote of the Committee or by the Chair with the concurrence of the ranking minority member.

### RULE 3

#### MEETING AND HEARING PROCEDURES

##### In General

(a)(1) Meetings and hearings of the Committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chair or, in the Chair's absence, by a member designated by the Chair to carry out such duties.

(2) Meetings and hearings of the committee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(3) Any meeting or hearing of the Committee that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House (which are incorporated by reference as part of these rules). Operation and use of any Committee operated broadcast system shall be fair and nonpartisan and in accordance with clause 4(b) of rule XI and all other applicable rules of the Committee and the House.

(4) To the extent feasible, members and witnesses may use the Committee equipment for the purpose of presenting information electronically during a meeting or hearing, provided the information is transmitted to the appropriate Committee staff in an appropriate electronic format at least one business day before the meeting or hearing so as to ensure display capacity and quality. The content of all materials must relate to the pending business of the Committee and conform to the Rules of the House. The confidentiality of the material will be maintained by the technical staff until its official presentation to the Committee members. For the purposes of maintaining the official records of the Committee, printed copies of all materials presented, to the extent practicable, must accompany the presentations.

(5) No person, other than a Member of Congress, Committee staff, or an employee of a Member when that Member has an amendment under consideration, may stand in or be seated at the rostrum area of the Committee rooms unless the Chair determines otherwise.

##### Quorum

(b)(1) For the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

(2) A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of reporting any measure or matter, of authorizing a subpoena (other than a subpoena authorized and issued by the Chair pursuant to subsection (e)(1)), of closing a meeting or hearing pursuant to clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House (except as provided in clause 2(g)(2)(A) and (B)) or of releasing executive session material pursuant to clause 2(k)(7) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(3) For the purpose of taking any action other than those specified in paragraph (2), one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.

##### Voting

(c)(1) No vote may be conducted on any measure or matter pending before the Committee unless the requisite number of members of the Committee is actually present for such purpose.

(2) A record vote of the Committee shall be provided on any question before the Committee upon the request of one-fifth of the members present.

(3) No vote by any member of the Committee on any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(4) In addition to any other requirement of these rules or the Rules of the House, including clause 2(e)(1)(B) of rule XI, the Chair shall make the record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded publicly available for inspection at the offices of the Committee and in electronic form on the Committee's Web site not later than one business day after such vote is taken. Such record shall include in electronic form the text of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition, the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting. With respect to any record vote on any motion to report or record vote on any amendment, a record of such votes shall be included in the report of the Committee showing the total number of votes cast for and against and the names of those members of the Committee present but not voting.

(5) POSTPONED RECORD VOTES.—(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Chairman may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment. The Chairman may resume proceedings on a postponed request at any time, but no later than the next meeting day.

(B) In exercising postponement authority under subparagraph (A), the Chairman shall take all reasonable steps necessary to notify members on the resumption of proceedings on any postponed record vote.

(C) When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(D) The Chair's authority to postpone recorded votes will not be used to prejudice a member with regard to the offering of another amendment. In the application of this rule, the Chair will consult regularly with the ranking minority member regarding the scheduling of the resumption of postponed votes.

##### Hearing Procedures

(d)(1)(A) The Chair shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the Committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the Chair shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

(B) Not less than three days before the commencement of a hearing (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on any such day) announced under this paragraph, the Chair shall provide to the members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject of the hearing, or, in the case of a hearing on

a measure or matter, a copy of the measure or materials relating to the matter in question and a concise explanation of the measure or matter to be considered. At the same time the Chair provides the information required by the preceding sentence, the Chair shall also provide to the members of the Committee a list of the witnesses expected to appear before the Committee at that hearing. The witness list may not be modified within 24 hours of a hearing, unless the Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines there is good cause for such modification.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable—

(A) each witness who is to appear before the Committee shall file with the Committee two business days in advance of the appearance sufficient copies (including a copy in electronic form), as determined by the Chair, of a written statement of proposed testimony and shall limit the oral presentation to the Committee to brief summary thereof; and

(B) each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years. Such disclosure statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

(3) The requirements of paragraph (2)(A) may be modified or waived by the Chair when the Chair determines it to be in the best interest of the Committee.

(4)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the five-minute rule shall be observed in the interrogation of witnesses before the Committee or any of its subcommittees until each present member thereof has had an opportunity to question the witnesses. No member shall be recognized for a second period of five minutes to interrogate witnesses until each present member of the Committee or such subcommittee has been recognized once for that purpose.

(B) The Chair may permit a specified number of members to question one or more witnesses for a specified period of time not to exceed 60 minutes in the aggregate, equally divided between and controlled by the Chair and the ranking minority member.

(5) Whenever any hearing is conducted by the Committee on any measure or matter, the minority party members of the Committee shall be entitled, upon the request of a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon. The Chair, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, will determine the date, time, and place of such hearing.

(6) At any hearing of the Committee, opening statements by members of the Committee shall be limited to 10 minutes in the aggregate. The Chair shall control five minutes and recognize members in the Chair's sole discretion. The ranking minority member shall control five minutes; the Chair shall recognize members for such five minutes according to the direction of the ranking minority member as communicated to the Chair.

(7) Notwithstanding any member's oral delivery of an opening statement, written opening statements by any member of the

Committee submitted to the Chair within 5 legislative days after the adjournment of a hearing shall be made a part of the official hearing record thereof.

#### Subpoenas and Oaths

(e)(1) The power to authorize and issue subpoenas is delegated to the Chair. The Chair will provide written notice to the ranking minority member at least 48 hours in advance of the authorization and issuance of a subpoena, except when exigent circumstances exist that do not permit such amount of notice, in which case the Chair shall provide such notice as soon as possible.

(2) Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chair or by any member designated by the Committee, and may be served by any person designated by the Chair or such member.

(3) The Chair, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chair, may administer oaths to witnesses before the Committee.

#### RULE 4

##### PROCEDURES FOR REPORTING MEASURES OR MATTERS

(a) No measure or matter shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

(b) The Chair of the Committee shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the Committee and take necessary steps to bring a matter to a vote.

(c) The report of the Committee on a measure which has been approved by the Committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the members of the Committee, for the reporting of that measure pursuant to the provisions of clause 2(b)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House.

(d) All reports printed by the Committee pursuant to a legislative study or investigation and not approved by a majority vote of the Committee shall contain the following disclaimer on the cover of such report: "This report has not been officially adopted by the Committee on Financial Services and may not necessarily reflect the views of its Members."

(e) The Chair is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chair considers it appropriate.

#### RULE 5

##### SUBCOMMITTEES

##### Establishment and Responsibilities of Subcommittees

(a)(1) There shall be five subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) SUBCOMMITTEE ON CAPITAL MARKETS AND GOVERNMENT SPONSORED ENTERPRISES.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises includes—

(i) securities, exchanges, and finance;

(ii) capital markets activities, including business capital formation and venture capital;

(iii) activities involving futures, forwards, options, and other types of derivative instruments;

(iv) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(v) secondary market organizations for home mortgages, including the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation;

(vi) the Federal Housing Finance Agency; and

(vii) the Federal Home Loan Banks.

(B) SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER CREDIT.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit includes—

(i) all agencies, including the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve System, and the National Credit Union Administration, which directly or indirectly exercise supervisory or regulatory authority in connection with, or provide deposit insurance for, financial institutions, and the establishment of interest rate ceilings on deposits;

(ii) all matters related to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection;

(iii) the chartering, branching, merger, acquisition, consolidation, or conversion of financial institutions;

(iv) consumer credit, including the provision of consumer credit by insurance companies, and further including those matters in the Consumer Credit Protection Act dealing with truth in lending, extortionate credit transactions, restrictions on garnishments, fair credit reporting and the use of credit information by credit bureaus and credit providers, equal credit opportunity, debt collection practices, and electronic funds transfers, including consumer transactions using mobile devices;

(v) creditor remedies and debtor defenses, Federal aspects of the Uniform Consumer Credit Code, credit and debit cards, and the preemption of State usury laws;

(vi) consumer access to financial services, including the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the Community Reinvestment Act;

(vii) the terms and rules of disclosure of financial services, including the advertisement, promotion and pricing of financial services, and availability of government check cashing services;

(viii) deposit insurance; and

(ix) consumer access to savings accounts and checking accounts in financial institutions, including lifeline banking and other consumer accounts.

(C) SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND INSURANCE.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance includes—

(i) insurance generally; terrorism risk insurance; private mortgage insurance; government sponsored insurance programs, including those offering protection against crime, fire, flood (and related land use controls), earthquake and other natural hazards; the Federal Insurance Office;

(ii) housing (except programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs), including mortgage and loan insurance pursuant to the National Housing Act; rural housing; housing and homeless assistance programs; all activities of the Government National Mortgage Association; housing construction and design and safety standards; housing-related energy conservation; housing research and demonstration programs; financial and technical assistance for non-profit housing sponsors; housing counseling and technical assistance; regulation of the housing industry (including landlord/tenant relations); and real estate lending including regulation of settlement procedures;

(iii) community development and community and neighborhood planning, training and research; national urban growth policies; urban/rural research and technologies; and regulation of interstate land sales; and

(iv) the qualifications for and designation of Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (other than matters relating to tax benefits).

(D) SUBCOMMITTEE ON MONETARY POLICY AND TRADE.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade includes—

(i) financial aid to all sectors and elements within the economy;

(ii) economic growth and stabilization;

(iii) defense production matters as contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended;

(iv) domestic monetary policy, and agencies which directly or indirectly affect domestic monetary policy, including the effect of such policy and other financial actions on interest rates, the allocation of credit, and the structure and functioning of domestic financial institutions;

(v) coins, coinage, currency, and medals, including commemorative coins and medals, proof and mint sets and other special coins, the Coinage Act of 1965, gold and silver, including the coinage thereof (but not the par value of gold), gold medals, counterfeiting, currency denominations and design, the distribution of coins, and the operations of the Bureau of the Mint and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing;

(vi) development of new or alternative forms of currency;

(vii) multilateral development lending institutions, including activities of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies as related thereto, and monetary and financial developments as they relate to the activities and objectives of such institutions;

(viii) international trade, including but not limited to the activities of the Export-Import Bank;

(ix) the International Monetary Fund, its permanent and temporary agencies, and all matters related thereto; and

(x) international investment policies, both as they relate to United States investments for trade purposes by citizens of the United States and investments made by all foreign entities in the United States.

(E) SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS.—The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations includes—

(i) the oversight of all agencies, departments, programs, and matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, including the development of recommendations with regard to the necessity or desirability of enacting, changing, or repealing any legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and for conducting investigations within such jurisdiction; and

(ii) research and analysis regarding matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee, including the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee.

(2) In addition, each such subcommittee shall have specific responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chair refers to it.

(3) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within its general responsibility.

#### Referral of Measures and Matters to Subcommittees

(b)(1) The Chair shall regularly refer to one or more subcommittees such measures and matters as the Chair deems appropriate given its jurisdiction and responsibilities. In making such a referral, the Chair may designate a subcommittee of primary jurisdiction and subcommittees of additional or sequential jurisdiction.

(2) All other measures or matters shall be subject to consideration by the full Committee.

(3) In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chair may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

(4) The Chair, in his or her sole discretion, may discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred to a subcommittee of the Committee.

#### Composition of Subcommittees

(c)(1) Members shall be elected to each subcommittee and to the positions of chair and ranking minority member thereof, in accordance with the rules of the respective party caucuses. The Chair of the Committee shall designate a member of the majority party on each subcommittee as its vice chair. The Chair may designate one member of the Committee who previously has served as the chairman of the Committee as the Chairman Emeritus.

(2) The Chair and ranking minority member of the Committee shall be ex officio members with voting privileges of each subcommittee of which they are not assigned as members and may be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees. The Chairman Emeritus shall be an ex officio member without voting privileges of each subcommittee to which he or she is not assigned and shall not count for purposes of establishing a quorum in such subcommittees.

(3) The subcommittees shall be comprised as follows:

(A) The Subcommittee on Capital Markets and Government Sponsored Enterprises shall be comprised of 30 members, 17 elected by the majority caucus and 13 elected by the minority caucus.

(B) The Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit shall be comprised of 30 members, 17 elected by the majority caucus and 13 elected by the minority caucus.

(C) The Subcommittee on Housing and Insurance shall be comprised of 21 members, 12 elected by the majority caucus and 9 elected by the minority caucus.

(D) The Subcommittee on Monetary Policy and Trade shall be comprised of 21 members, 12 elected by the majority caucus and 9 elected by the minority caucus.

(E) The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be comprised of 21 members, 12 elected by the majority caucus and 9 elected by the minority caucus.

#### Subcommittee Meetings and Hearings

(d)(1) Each subcommittee of the Committee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the full Committee on any measure or matter referred to it, consistent with subsection (a).

(2) No subcommittee of the Committee may meet or hold a hearing at the same time as a meeting or hearing of the Committee.

(3) The chair of each subcommittee shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chair with a view toward assuring the availability of meeting rooms and avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

#### Effect of a Vacancy

(e) Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the subcommittee as long as the required quorum is present.

#### Records

(f) Each subcommittee of the Committee shall provide the full Committee with copies

of such records of votes taken in the subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chair deems necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

#### RULE 6

##### STAFF

##### In General

(a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the professional and other staff of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the Chair, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of the Chair.

(2) All professional and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the ranking minority member of the Committee, and shall work under the general supervision and direction of such member.

(3) It is intended that the skills and experience of all members of the Committee staff be available to all members of the Committee.

##### Subcommittee Staff

(b) From funds made available for the appointment of staff, the Chair of the Committee shall, pursuant to clause 6(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House, ensure that sufficient staff is made available so that each subcommittee can carry out its responsibilities under the rules of the Committee and that the minority party is treated fairly in the appointment of such staff.

##### Compensation of Staff

(c)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Chair shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff of the Committee.

(2) The ranking minority member shall fix the compensation of all professional and other staff provided to the minority party members of the Committee.

#### RULE 7

##### BUDGET AND TRAVEL

##### Budget

(a)(1) The Chair, in consultation with other members of the Committee, shall prepare for each Congress a budget providing amounts for staff, necessary travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and its subcommittees.

(2) From the amount provided to the Committee in the primary expense resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, the Chair, after consultation with the ranking minority member, shall designate an amount to be under the direction of the ranking minority member for the compensation of the minority staff, travel expenses of minority members and staff, and minority office expenses. All expenses of minority members and staff shall be paid for out of the amount so set aside.

##### Travel

(b)(1) The Chair may authorize travel for any member and any staff member of the Committee in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is granted, there shall be submitted to the Chair in writing the following:

(A) The purpose of the travel.

(B) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(C) The names of the States or countries to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(D) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought.

(2) Members and staff of the Committee shall make a written report to the Chair on any travel they have conducted under this subsection, including a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and of pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

(3) Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

#### RULE 8

##### COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATION

##### Records

(a)(1) There shall be a transcript made of each regular meeting and hearing of the Committee, and the transcript may be printed if the Chair decides it is appropriate or if a majority of the members of the Committee requests such printing. Any such transcripts shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks. Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to require that all such transcripts be subject to correction and publication.

(2) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House and shall be available in electronic form and for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(3) All Committee hearings, records, data, charts, and files shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Chair, shall be the property of the House, and all Members of the House shall have access thereto as provided in clause 2(e)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(4) The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chair shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

##### Committee Publications on the Internet

(b) The Chair shall maintain an official Committee website for the purpose of carrying out the official responsibilities of the Committee, including communicating information about the Committee's activities. The ranking minority member may maintain an official website. To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form on the official Committee website maintained by the Chair.

##### Audio and Video Coverage of Committee Hearings and Meetings

(c)(1) To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings; and

(2) maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

## PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

### RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I submit for publication the attached copy of the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the U.S. House of Representatives for the 114th Congress:

#### JURISDICTION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives establishes the standing committees of the House and their jurisdiction. Under that rule, all bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to the subjects within the jurisdiction of any standing committee shall be referred to such committee. Clause 1(s) of Rule X establishes the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as follows:

- (1) Veterans' measures generally.
- (2) Cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad (except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior).
- (3) Compensation, vocational rehabilitation, and education of veterans.
- (4) Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.
- (5) Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.
- (6) Readjustment of servicemembers to civil life.
- (7) Servicemembers' civil relief.
- (8) Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

#### RULE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) **APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES**—The Rules of the House are the rules of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and its subcommittees so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in Committees and subcommittees.

(b) **SUBCOMMITTEES**—Each subcommittee of the Committee is a part of the Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and to its rules so far as applicable.

(c) **INCORPORATION OF HOUSE RULE ON COMMITTEE PROCEDURE**—Rule XI of the Rules of the House, which pertains entirely to Committee procedure, is incorporated and made part of the rules of the Committee to the extent applicable. Pursuant to clause 2(a)(3) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the full Committee is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(d) **VICE CHAIRMAN**—Pursuant to clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Chairman of the full Committee shall designate the Vice Chairman of the Committee.

#### RULE 2—REGULAR AND ADDITIONAL MEETINGS

(a) **REGULAR MEETINGS**—The regular meeting day for the Committee shall be at 10 a.m. on the second Wednesday of each month in such place as the Chairman may designate. However, the Chairman may dispense with a regular Wednesday meeting of the Committee.

(b) **ADDITIONAL MEETINGS**—The Chairman of the Committee may call and convene, as he considers necessary, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of

any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purpose pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(c) **NOTICE**—The Chairman shall notify each member of the Committee of the agenda of each regular and additional meeting of the Committee at least 24 hours before the time of the meeting, except under circumstances the Chairman determines to be of an emergency nature. Under such circumstances, the Chairman shall make an effort to consult the ranking minority member, or in such member's absence, the next ranking minority party member of the Committee.

#### RULE 3—MEETINGS AND HEARINGS GENERALLY

(a) **OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS**—Meetings and hearings of the Committee and each of its subcommittees shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House.

(b) **ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING**—The Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by the Committee, and the subcommittee Chairman, in the case of a hearing to be conducted by a subcommittee, shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee or the subcommittee determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman or the subcommittee Chairman, as the case may be, shall consult with the ranking minority member and make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Clerk of the Congressional Record and the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(c) **WIRELESS TELEPHONE USE PROHIBITED**—No person may use a wireless telephone during a Committee or subcommittee meeting or hearing.

(d) **MEDIA COVERAGE**—Any meeting of the Committee or its subcommittees that is open to the public shall be open to coverage by radio, television, and still photography in accordance with the provisions of clause 4(f) of House rule XI as follows:

(1) If audio or visual coverage of the hearing or meeting is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be conducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

(2) The allocation among the television media of the positions or the number of television cameras permitted by a committee or subcommittee chair in a hearing or meeting room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(3) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between a witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

(4) Television cameras shall operate from fixed positions but may not be placed in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing or meeting by the other media.

(5) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media may not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing or meeting room while the committee is in session.

(6)(A) Except as provided in subdivision (B), floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns may not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing or meeting.

(B) The television media may install additional lighting in a hearing or meeting room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in a hearing or meeting room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of a hearing or meeting at the current state of the art of television coverage.

(7) If requests are made by more of the media than will be permitted by a committee or subcommittee chair for coverage of a hearing or meeting by still photography, that coverage shall be permitted on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

(8) Photographers may not position themselves between the witness table and the members of the committee at any time during the course of a hearing or meeting.

(9) Photographers may not place themselves in positions that obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

(10) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

(11) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

(12) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner.

#### (e) REQUIREMENTS FOR TESTIMONY

(1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a subcommittee shall file with the clerk of the Committee, at least 48 hours in advance of his or her appearance, or at such other time as designated by the Chairman after consultation with the Ranking Member, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony. Each witness shall, to the greatest extent practicable, also provide a copy of such written testimony in an electronic format prescribed by the Chairman. Each witness shall limit any oral presentation to a summary of the written statement. (2) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House:

(A) In the case of a witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing.

(B) The disclosure required by this Rule shall include the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing and the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government.

#### (f) CALLING AND QUESTIONING WITNESSES

(1) Committee and subcommittee members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee for that purpose, and only for a 5-minute period until all members present have had an opportunity to question a witness. The 5-minute period for

questioning a witness by any one member may be extended only with the unanimous consent of all members present. The questioning of witnesses in both Committee and subcommittee hearings shall be initiated by the Chairman, followed by the ranking minority party member and all other members alternating between the majority and minority. Except as otherwise announced by the Chairman at the beginning of a hearing, members who are present at the start of the hearing will be recognized before other members who arrive after the hearing has begun. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) regarding the 5-minute rule, the Chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member may designate an equal number of members of the Committee or subcommittee majority and minority party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes. In no event shall the Chairman allow a member to question a witness for an extended period under this rule until all members present have had the opportunity to ask questions under the 5-minute rule. The Chairman after consultation with the ranking minority member may permit Committee staff for its majority and minority party members to question a witness for equal specified periods of time.

(3) Non-Committee Members may be invited to sit at the dais for Committee hearings with the unanimous consent of all Members present. Further, non-Committee Members may be recognized for questioning of witnesses but only after all Committee Members have first been recognized.

(4) When a hearing is conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee on any measure or matter, the minority party members on the Committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman of a majority of those minority members before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of the hearing thereon.

(g) SUBPOENAS—Pursuant to clause 2(m) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee or a subcommittee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present.

#### (h) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS—

(1) The text of all bills or resolutions for markup, and any amendments in the nature of a substitute to such bills or resolution to be first recognized by the Chairman, shall be made available, via written or electronic notice, to Committee members at least 48 hours prior to a scheduled markup, except as agreed to by unanimous consent.

(2) Subject to the second sentence of this paragraph, it shall not be in order for the Committee to consider any amendment proposed to a bill or resolution under consideration by the Committee, or proposed to an amendment in the nature of a substitute noticed under paragraph (1), unless a written or electronic copy of such amendment has been delivered to each Member of the Committee (or Subcommittee for purposes of Subcommittee markups) at least 24 hours before the meeting at which the amendment is to be proposed. This paragraph may be waived

by unanimous consent and shall apply only when the 48-hour written notice has been provided in accordance with paragraph (1).

(i) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE SCORING—The Committee shall not include any bill or resolution for consideration during a committee markup which is not accompanied by an accounting from the Congressional Budget Office of the mandatory and discretionary costs or savings associated with such bill or resolution.

The accounting from the Congressional Budget Office need not be official, but is expected to provide Committee members with an approximation of the budgetary impact a bill or resolution may have prior to any vote to favorably forward or report such bill or resolution. The requirements of this paragraph may be waived by a majority of Committee members, a quorum being present.

#### RULE 4—QUORUM AND RECORD VOTES; POSTPONEMENT OF PROCEEDINGS

(a) WORKING QUORUM—A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for business and a majority of the members of any subcommittee shall constitute a quorum thereof for business, except that two members shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(b) QUORUM FOR REPORTING—No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee was actually present.

(c) RECORD VOTES—A record vote may be demanded by one-fifth of the members present or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one member. With respect to any record vote on any motion to amend or report, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those members voting for and against, shall be included in the report of the Committee on the bill or resolution.

(d) PROHIBITION AGAINST PROXY VOTING—No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(e) POSTPONING PROCEEDINGS—Committee and subcommittee chairmen may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment, and may resume proceedings within two legislative days on a postponed question after reasonable notice. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, an underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

#### RULE 5—SUBCOMMITTEES

##### (a) ESTABLISHMENT AND JURISDICTION—

(1) There shall be four subcommittees of the Committee as follows:

(A) Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs, which shall have legislative, oversight and investigative jurisdiction over compensation; general and special pensions of all the wars of the United States; life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces; cemeteries of the United States in which veterans of any war or conflict are or may be buried, whether in the United States or abroad, except cemeteries administered by the Secretary of the Interior; burial benefits; the Board of Veterans' Appeals; and the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims.

(B) Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity, which shall have legislative, oversight and investigative jurisdiction over education of veterans, employment and training



of veterans, vocational rehabilitation, veterans' housing programs, readjustment of servicemembers to civilian life, and servicemembers civil relief.

(C) Subcommittee on Health, which shall have legislative, oversight, and investigative jurisdiction over the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) including medical services, medical support and compliance, medical facilities, medical and prosthetic research, and major and minor construction.

(D) Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, which shall have oversight and investigative jurisdiction over veterans' matters generally, information technology, procurement, and over such matters as may be referred to the subcommittee by the Chairman of the full Committee for its oversight or investigation and for its appropriate recommendations. The subcommittee shall have legislative jurisdiction over such bills or resolutions as may be referred to it by the Chairman of the full Committee.

(2) Each subcommittee shall have responsibility for such other measures or matters as the Chairman refers to it.

(b) VACANCIES—Any vacancy in the membership of a subcommittee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of that subcommittee.

(c) RATIOS—On each subcommittee, there shall be a ratio of majority party members to minority party members which shall be consistent with the ratio on the full Committee.

(d) REFERRAL TO SUBCOMMITTEES—The Chairman of the Committee may refer a measure or matter, which is within the general responsibility of more than one of the subcommittees of the Committee, as the Chairman deems appropriate. In referring any measure or matter to a subcommittee, the Chairman of the Committee may specify a date by which the subcommittee shall report thereon to the Committee.

#### (e) POWERS AND DUTIES—

(1) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

(2) Whenever a subcommittee has ordered a bill, resolution, or other matter to be reported to the Committee, the Chairman of the subcommittee reporting the bill, resolution, or matter to the full Committee, or any member authorized by the subcommittee to do so shall notify the Chairman and the ranking minority party member of the Committee of the Subcommittee's action.

(3) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee during any of its meetings and hearings, but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the meeting or hearing.

(4) Non-Committee Members may be invited to sit at the dais for subcommittee hearings with the unanimous consent of all Members present. Further, non-Committee Members may be recognized for questioning of witnesses but only after all subcommittee Members have first been recognized for questioning.

(5) Each subcommittee shall provide the Committee with copies of such record votes

taken in subcommittee and such other records with respect to the subcommittee as the Chairman of the Committee deems necessary for the Committee to comply with all rules and regulations of the House.

#### RULE 6—GENERAL OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITY

(a) PURPOSE—Pursuant to clause 2 of Rule X of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall carry out oversight responsibilities. In order to assist the House in—

(1) Its analysis, appraisal, evaluation of—

(A) The application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of the laws enacted by the Congress, or

(B) Conditions and circumstances, which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation, and

(2) Its formulation, consideration and enactment of such modifications or changes in those laws, and of such additional legislation, as may be necessary or appropriate, the Committee and its various subcommittees, consistent with their jurisdiction as set forth in Rule 5, shall have oversight responsibilities as provided in subsection (b).

(b) REVIEW OF LAWS AND PROGRAMS—The Committee and its subcommittees shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the applications, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, and the organization and operation of the Federal agencies and entities having responsibilities in or for the administration and execution thereof, in order to determine whether such laws and the programs thereunder are being implemented and carried out in accordance with the intent of the Congress and whether such programs should be continued, curtailed, or eliminated. In addition, the Committee and its subcommittees shall review and study any conditions or circumstances which may indicate the necessity or desirability of enacting new or additional legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee (whether or not any bill or resolution has been introduced with respect thereto), and shall on a continuing basis undertake future research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee.

(c) OVERSIGHT PLAN.—Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the Rules of the House.

(d) OVERSIGHT BY SUBCOMMITTEES—The existence and activities of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall in no way limit the responsibility of the other subcommittees of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for carrying out oversight duties.

#### RULE 7—BUDGET ACT RESPONSIBILITIES

(a) BUDGET ACT RESPONSIBILITIES—Pursuant to clause 4(f)(1) of Rule X of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall submit to the Committee on the Budget not later than six weeks after the President submits his budget, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request—

(1) Its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and

(2) An estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays re-

sulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

#### RULE 8—RECORDS AND OTHER MATTERS

(a) TRANSCRIPTS—There shall be a transcript made of each regular and additional meeting and hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees. Any such transcript shall be a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved.

#### (b) RECORDS—

(1) The Committee shall keep a record of all actions of the Committee and each of its subcommittees. The record shall contain all information required by clause 2(e)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House and shall be available for public inspection at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee.

(2) There shall be kept in writing a record of the proceedings of the Committee and each of its subcommittees, including a record of the votes on any question on which a recorded vote is demanded. The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those members present but not voting.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF ARCHIVED RECORDS—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3 or clause 4 of Rule VII of the Rules of the House, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on written request of any member of the Committee.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF PUBLICATIONS—Pursuant to clause 2(e)(4) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form to the maximum extent feasible.

#### RULE 9—TRAVEL

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR TRAVEL—All requests for travel, funded by the Committee, for Members and staff in connection with activities or subject matters under the general jurisdiction of the Committee, shall be submitted to the Chair for approval or disapproval. All travel requests should be submitted to the Chair at least five working days in advance of the proposed travel. For all travel funded by any other source, notice shall be given to the Chair at least five working days in advance of the proposed travel. All travel requests shall be submitted to the Chair in writing and include the following:

(1) The purpose of the travel.

(2) The dates during which the travel is to occur.

(3) The names of the locations to be visited and the length of time to be spent in each.

(4) The names of members and staff of the Committee for whom the authorization is sought. Travel by the minority shall be submitted to the Chair via the Ranking Member.

(b) TRIP REPORTS—Members and staff shall make a written report to the Chair within 15

working days on all travel approved under this subsection. Reports shall include a description of their itinerary, expenses, and activities, and pertinent information gained as a result of such travel.

When travel involves majority and minority Members or staff, the majority shall submit the report to the Chair on behalf of the majority and minority. The minority may append additional remarks to the report at their discretion.

(c) **APPLICABILITY OF HOUSE RULES**—Members and staff of the Committee performing authorized travel on official business shall be governed by applicable laws, resolutions, and regulations of the House and of the Committee on House Administration.

#### RULE 10—FACILITY NAMING

(a) **FACILITY NAMING**—No Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) facility or property shall be named after any individual by the Committee unless:

(1) Such individual is deceased and was:

(A) A veteran who (i) was instrumental in the construction or the operation of the facility to be named, or (ii) was a recipient of the Medal of Honor or, as determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, otherwise performed military service of an extraordinarily distinguished character;

(B) A Member of the United States House of Representatives or Senate who had a direct association with such facility;

(C) An Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, a Secretary of Veterans Affairs, a Secretary of Defense or of a service branch, or a military or other Federal civilian official of comparable or higher rank; or

(D) An individual who, as determined by the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member, performed outstanding service for veterans.

(2) Each Member of the Congressional delegation representing the State in which the designated facility is located must indicate in writing such Member's support of the proposal to name such facility after such individual. Evidence of a Member's support in writing may either be in the form of a letter to the Chairman and Ranking Member or co-sponsorship of legislation proposing to name the particular VA facility in question.

(3) The pertinent State department or chapter of each Congressionally chartered veterans' organization having a national membership of at least 500,000 must indicate in writing its support of such proposal.

(b) The above criteria for naming a VA facility may be waived by unanimous consent.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 19, 2015, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

796. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to Mexico, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms

Export Control Act, as amended, Transmittal No.: 15-04; to the Committee on Armed Services.

797. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the "Calendar Year 2014 Reports on the Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratory Personnel Management Demonstration Projects", pursuant to Sec. 1107(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008, as amended (Pub. L. 110-181), and Sec. 1107(g) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Pub. L. 113-66); to the Committee on Armed Services.

798. A letter from the Acting Director, Directorate of Whistleblower Protection Programs, OSHA, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Procedures for the Handling of Retaliation Complaints Under Section 806 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002, as Amended [Docket No.: OSHA-2011-0126] (RIN: 1218-AC53) received March 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

799. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Sec. 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Lansing, Michigan) [MB Docket No.: 15-2] [RM-11744] received March 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

800. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on the extensions of hydropower construction deadlines under Sec. 13 of the Federal Power Act, pursuant to the Energy Policy Act of 1992, section 1701(c)(5); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

801. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting in accordance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1987, Pub. L. 100-203, "A Report to the U.S. Congress and the Secretary of Energy", for the period January 1, 2008, through December 31, 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

802. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties, entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

803. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification pursuant to the reporting requirements of Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-143); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

804. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Somalia that was declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

805. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Sec. 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order

13313 of July 31, 2003, a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses during the period from July 1 through December 31, 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

806. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

807. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization for nine officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

808. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "Examination of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Receiving Local District Funds to Provide Homeless Services in Fiscal Year (FY) 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

809. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 17(a) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, Pub. L. 101-576, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (as amended), the GPRCA Modernization Act of 2010, the provisions of Sec. 5 (as amended) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, and the Reports Consolidation Act of 2000, the Corporation's 2014 Annual Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

810. A letter from the General Counsel, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

811. A letter from the Chief Counsel for Administrative Law, Office of the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

812. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the "Executive Summary of the 2014 Annual Report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts" and "Judicial Business of the United States Courts", pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 604(a)(4); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

813. A letter from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, transmitting the Annual Management Report for Fiscal Year 2014, pursuant to Sec. 105 of the Railroad Retirement and Survivors' Improvement Act of 2001; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

814. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (RIN: 2700-AE01 and 2700-AE09) received March 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

815. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "FY 2012 Annual Report to Congress on the Child Support Program", pursuant to Sec. 452(a) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

816. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Beginning of Construction for Secs. 45 and 48 [Notice 2015-25] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

817. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2015 Calendar Year Resident Population Figures [Notice 2015-23] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

818. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Notice under Sec. 529A [Notice 2015-18] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

819. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe Harbor Method for Determining a Wagering Gain or Loss from Slot Machine Play [Notice 2015-21] received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

820. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — User Fees and Change of Address for Submission of Applications for Approval of Sec. 403(b) Pre-approved Plans (Rev. Proc. 2015-22) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

821. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Health Insurance Providers Fee [TD 9711] (RIN: 1545-BM52) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

822. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Alternative Simplified Credit Election [TD 9712] (RIN: 1545-BL78) received March 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

823. A letter from the Chairman, United States World War One Centennial Commission, transmitting the Commission's periodic report for the period ending December 31, 2014, pursuant to Public Law 112-272, section 5(b)(1); jointly to the Committees on Financial Services, Natural Resources, and Oversight and Government Reform.

824. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation titled "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, Veterans' Affairs, Science, Space, and Technology, and Foreign Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1021. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the integrity of the Medicare program, and for other purposes; with an amendment

(Rept. 114-46, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Energy and Commerce discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1021 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1415. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen enforcement of spousal court-ordered property distributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina (for herself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1416. A bill to prevent application of sequestration to payment for certain physician-administered drugs under part B of the Medicare program in fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1417. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide parity to Puerto Rico hospitals with respect to inpatient hospital payments under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1418. A bill to amend part B of the title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply deemed enrollment to residents of Puerto Rico and to provide a special enrollment period and a reduction in the late enrollment penalties for certain residents of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1419. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to improve the Social Security Administration's ability to fight fraud, prevent errors, and protect the Social Security Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 1420. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to establish a surveillance system regarding traumatic brain injury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. MENG, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KILMER, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANGGEVIN, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. RUZ):

H.R. 1421. A bill to prevent harassment at institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1422. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1423. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the definition of health insurance coverage certain medical stop-loss insurance obtained by certain plan sponsors of group health plans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1424. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to allow the marketing, distribution, or sale of solid antimicrobial copper alloys with certain claims, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to exclude certain solid antimicrobial copper alloys from regulation as drugs or devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. LAMBORN):

H.R. 1425. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to require congressional approval before any change may be made to the oaths required for appointment as an officer in the Armed Forces, enlistment in the Armed Forces, or appointment as a cadet or midshipman at a military service academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas):

H.R. 1426. A bill to ensure public access to published materials concerning scientific research and development activities funded by

Federal science agencies; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 1427. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1428. A bill to extend Privacy Act remedies to citizens of certified states, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOST (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H.R. 1429. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to allow for petitions for reconsideration of size standards for small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. KIND, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. REED, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1430. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the look-through treatment of payments between related controlled foreign corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1431. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prohibit the preemption of State stalking laws; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1432. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prohibit the preemption of State identity theft laws; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 1433. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the establishment of supermarkets in certain underserved areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. BASS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BRENDAN

F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. HAHN, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SIREN, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. WALZ, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1434. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 1435. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require States to develop policies on positive school climates and school discipline; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1436. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1437. A bill to amend the Coquille Restoration Act to clarify certain provisions relating to the management of the Coquille Forest; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 1438. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CARSON of Indiana,

Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. BERA, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BONAMICI, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 1439. A bill to provide paid family and medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS (for himself and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H.R. 1440. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to treat employment as a field emergency medical service practitioner in the same manner as employment as a firefighter for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. ESTY (for herself, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1441. A bill to emphasize manufacturing in engineering programs by directing the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies including the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and National Science Foundation, to designate United States manufacturing universities; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HANNA, Mr. REED, Mr. KATKO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 1442. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Cornell Street in Kingston, New York, as the "Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona,

Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ZINKE, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 1443. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a bison management plan for Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. CHABOT, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 1444. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for procurements of covered contracts; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HARDY (for himself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1445. A bill to provide that there shall be no net increase in the acres of certain Federal land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Forest Service unless the Federal budget is balanced for the year in which the land would be purchased; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HURT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1446. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide privacy protections that enable certain individuals to remove their profiles from the healthcare.gov website, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1447. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to improve the Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 1448. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a transit accessibility innovation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1449. A bill to repeal certain impediments to the administration of the firearms laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1450. A bill to permit employees to request, and to ensure employers consider requests for, flexible work terms and conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, House Administration, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1451. A bill to provide for the land exchange involving Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 in Escambia County, Florida; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1452. A bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. HARPER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 1453. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize payments for ambulatory surgical centers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FARR, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 1454. A bill to modify the definition of armor piercing ammunition to better capture its capabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 1455. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to expedite review of pharmaceuticals that are approved for marketing in the European Union; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD (for himself, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1456. A bill to provide a biennial budget for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTA, Mr. LAMALFA, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MENG, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DENHAM, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. BASS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GARRETT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TROTT, Ms. LEE, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H. Res. 154. A resolution calling on the President to work toward equitable, constructive, stable, and durable Armenian-Turkish relations based upon the Republic of Turkey's full acknowledgment of the facts and ongoing consequences of the Armenian Genocide, and a fair, just, and comprehensive

international resolution of this crime against humanity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 155. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PETERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MICA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H. Res. 156. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H. Res. 157. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Social Work Month and World Social Work Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 158. A resolution condemning Dalit untouchability, the practice of birth-descent discrimination against Dalit people, which is widely practiced in India, Nepal, the Asian diaspora, and other South Asian nations, and calling on these countries to recognize the human rights of the Dalit people and end all forms of untouchability within their borders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BASS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. NADLER, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. LYNCH, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois):

H. Res. 159. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the current record breaking wealth gap is a national problem for the nation's economic security, and that broad-based, generational and systemic inequities continue to distort economic progress and opportunity for tens of millions of Americans—especially low and middle-income Americans and communities of color; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1415.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 1416.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause: Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution gives Congress the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1417.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 1418.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H.R. 1419.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 1420.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 1421.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 1422.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution to regulate commerce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1423.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, paragraph 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1424.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1425.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 16 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1426.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 1427.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1428.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 9

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 1429.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 1430.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1431.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1432.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes."

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to interstate commerce).

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution, and Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 1436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, of Section 8, of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 1437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, of Section 8, of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 1438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, of Section 8, of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 1440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. ESTY:

H.R. 1441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (The Property Clause)

The Property Clause states that Congress has the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. The Supreme Court in *Fort Leavenworth Railroad v. Lowe* (1885), reasoned that the authority of the federal government over federal lands is "necessarily paramount." The Court opinion went on to further reason that state governments also have rights though with regards to certain activities that take place on federal lands within state borders. The Act provides guidelines for controlling populations of bison in Grand Canyon National Park and requires the Secretary to coordinate with the appropriate State Wildlife Management Agency, thus making it constitutionally permissible.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 1444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 1445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution".

By Mr. HURT of Virginia:

H.R. 1446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 1447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States grant Congress the authority to enact this bill.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 1450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power \*\*\* To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. MILLER of Florida:

H.R. 1452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section III, Clause II

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 1455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. The Constitution's Commerce Clause allows Congress to enact laws when reasonably related to the regulation of interstate commerce.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 140: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 167: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 173: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 223: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 231: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 233: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 262: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 282: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 304: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KILMER, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 395: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 400: Mrs. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 408: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 504: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 531: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 540: Mr. POCAN and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 546: Mr. MULVANEY and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 588: Mr. MARINO and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 595: Mr. PITTENGER and Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 602: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 631: Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 650: Mr. DENT, Mr. BYRNE, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 663: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 670: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 711: Ms. GRANGER, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 722: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 727: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. HAHN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 729: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ESHOO, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 750: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 782: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 804: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 818: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 822: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 825: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 900: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 903: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 920: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 967: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 977: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 986: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 996: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 999: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. HANNA, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 1002: Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1009: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1019: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1027: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1042: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 1062: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1084: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1086: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1091: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1105: Mr. NEUGEBAUER and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1120: Mr. DENT and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1131: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1139: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1148: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1149: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1185: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1188: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 1206: Mr. WALKER, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 1221: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1247: Mr. POLIS and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 1249: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 1269: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1284: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1302: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 1310: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1332: Mr. OLSON, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1339: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1358: Mr. NADLER and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1368: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1369: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 1378: Ms. TITUS and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1384: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 1411: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.J. Res. 29: Mr. RUSSELL.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. DUFFY.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. BUCK, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 110: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.



## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### RECOGNIZING GALENA TRAIN DERAILMENT FIRST RESPONDERS

#### HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the first responders who helped to control and contain the fire caused by the recent train derailment in Galena, IL on March 5, 2015. These brave citizens responded to the derailment quickly and performed their duties flawlessly. Thanks to their bravery and hard work, the fire was ultimately contained, and disaster was averted. The state of Wisconsin thanks them for their courage and service.

On March 5, 2015, a Burlington Northern Santa Fe train derailed in Galena, Illinois, and started a fire in a rural area near the city. Firefighters from Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin responded to help control and contain the fire. Wisconsin fire departments from Cuba City, Darlington, Dickeyville, Hazel Green, Jamestown, Lancaster, and Platteville participated in the incident response. After arriving on the scene, first responders assessed the situation and enacted procedures to control the derailment. Their response was successful, the incident was contained, and crisis was averted.

Everyday, firefighters and other first responders go to work prepared to confront our most dangerous situations. These brave men and women are on the front lines, protecting our communities from disaster. Today, I recognize these courageous first responders and thank them for their service.

### HONORING THE LIFE OF BILLY CASPER

#### HON. DUNCAN HUNTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, San Diego has produced many sports heroes over the years. Rarely, a champion appears on the sports scene whose character and personal impact on others transcends his athletic accomplishments. Billy Casper was such a man.

Billy is known for his 51 victories on the professional golf tour, the seventh most in golf history. But I can tell you as a friend of Billy's, he was more than that; he radiated goodness and friendship. When Billy played, the game itself was secondary. Everyone just wanted to be around Billy and the love of his life, Shirley. And Billy Casper was "G" rated in the same sense as Roy Rogers. To put it simply, you could bring your kids to a Billy Casper event.

Billy's life was that of a San Diego legend. Billy elected to stay in San Diego when his mom announced she was moving to Los An-

geles with her new husband. From that point on, Billy bounced around the South Bay, staying with buddies, playing sports and venturing out to the greens of San Diego Country Club to practice his putting—at night. It was in these moments that Billy gained his impeccable touch, making him one of the greatest putters in the history of the game.

At a football game he spotted a pretty girl in the bleachers. Soon, they were inseparable, and after a short stint in the Navy and success on the local amateur circuit, Shirley and Billy Casper got married. They would remain a team for life.

They saw the movie, "Follow The Sun," in which Ben Hogan, played by Glenn Ford, came back from a near fatal accident to win the U.S. Open. Billy and Shirley were taken with the adventure of Ben Hogan and his wife Valerie, sallying forth on the PGA tour with no guarantees and only themselves to rely on. Soon after, they too decided to "Follow the Sun."

With a Buick Roadmaster and a Spartan Trailer, they headed out on the PGA Tour. Making less than \$50 in their first event, the difficulty of the tour became evident. Then, Billy's talent began to prevail. By the third round of the 1958 U.S. Open at Winged Foot, Billy was leading, with such legends as Ben Hogan and Sam Snead in hot pursuit. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the kid from San Diego knew how to close tournaments. He won that U.S. Open and proceeded in the next decade to win more golf tournaments than Arnold Palmer, Jack Nicklaus or Gary Player.

Along the way, Billy put together the best Ryder Cup record in U.S. history. At Olympic, in the 1966 U.S. Open, Billy shot the greatest come-from-behind closing nine holes in U.S. Open history, making up seven shots on Arnie, with a closing 32. He defeated Arnold Palmer the next day in an eighteen hole play-off with a 69.

In an age of sports psychologists and "living in the moment," where athletes are counseled to jettison all distractions, Billy Casper redefined the term "family man." He and Shirley were blessed with 11 children, who have given them 71 grandchildren over the years. Billy Casper thrived on what others would consider career distractions and his reward for building a family of love and unity is that the Casper support structure for young people will continue.

His annual golf tournament will be played this year as a memorial, run by the Casper children and grandchildren as usual, and with Shirley overseeing everything. Only one guy will be missing, the grandfather with the magic golf touch and the big heart; the guy who did us all proud . . . not just because of what he did, but because of who he was. Inside. Where it counts.

### HONORING JACOB LEE VELAZQUEZ

#### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob Lee Velazquez. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 43, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Jacob constructed two team benches for the St. Joseph Youth Soccer Association in St. Joseph, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob Lee Velazquez for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

### ALEXSANDER HAY

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexsander Hay for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alexsander Hay is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexsander Hay is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alexsander Hay for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING LAKE ALFRED,  
FLORIDA

**HON. DANIEL WEBSTER**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize Lake Alfred, Florida as the city celebrates its 100th anniversary. Lake Alfred is a beautiful community situated among the many lakes of Central Florida.

Lake Alfred's rich history began with its original settlement as a military outpost, called Fort Cummings, in 1839. In 1887, a railroad line connecting Sanford and Tampa was constructed through Lake Alfred and logging quickly became the community's primary industry. At the turn of the century, Frank C. Gardner of Fargo, North Dakota, sensibly seeking more clement weather in the Sunshine State, formed the Florida Fruitlands Company, purchasing vast tracts of land and planting citrus groves. In the subsequent years, the community underwent several name changes before finally choosing Lake Alfred, one of the most scenic lakes in the community. Lake Alfred has continued to grow as one of the most vibrant cities in Central Florida.

It is an honor to represent the residents of Lake Alfred, and I am excited to join them in celebrating this historical milestone.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE  
OF BARBARA AYMAR EARLE

**HON. ANNA G. ESHOO**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of an extraordinary American, Barbara (Bobbie) Aymar Earle who passed away in Essex, Connecticut on December 10, 2014, in the company of her five children.

Barbara was born in New York City on January 1, 1925, the daughter of Gordon Aymar, a noted illustrator and portrait painter, and Margaretta Aymar, a civic leader. She attended The Thomas School in Rowayton, Connecticut, Barnard College, and the Juilliard School of Music in New York City. She played the harp professionally for a short time before marrying the great love of her life, Harry W. Earle, of Norwalk, Connecticut, upon his return in 1944 from Air Force service in Europe during World War II. She devoted the next thirty years to raising her family, to civic activities, and to writing. She co-founded Person-to-Person, the Connecticut-based volunteer organization that provides clothing, food and other necessities to those in need. She also spent many years as a hospice volunteer, the organization that assisted her during the final days of her life. More than forty years after she first started college, Bobbie returned to earn her Bachelor of Science degree, graduating summa cum laude in 1983 from the University of Washington/Oshkosh, at the age of 58, with a major in human services and a minor in music. "Give Us This Day", a book of her poems will be published in 2015.

Bobbie is remembered for her love of life, music, gardening and poetry, her devotion to family and friends, and for her deep and lasting influence on the communities where she lived. Her daughters, Penrhyn Cook and Barbara Ballard; her sons, David, John and Gordon; and her sister Carol Armstrong survive her. She was the proud grandmother of eleven grandchildren: Matthew and Jonathan Earle, Geoffrey Bailey, Joby and Derry Earle, Margaret and Harry Kaplan-Earle, Gordon Earle, Benjamin and Emily Ballard, Naima Guzman, and one great granddaughter, Katherine Guzman. She was predeceased by her brother, Gordon Aymar, Jr. and by Harry Earle, her husband of 56 years.

I met Bobbie in 1966 when the Earle family moved to California from Connecticut. Her husband Harry had been named Vice President of Marketing at the newly formed J.W. Clement Company in Palo Alto and he hired me to be his assistant. From that time and throughout the rest of our lives, Bobbie and Harry remained dear friends. She enhanced and blessed my life with her boundless gifts of wisdom, laughter, poetry, gardening tips, charity, faith, integrity, humility and her sheer joy of life. Across all the decades, I have never known a finer person. A conversation with Bobbie was always a beautiful experience, sprinkled with sparks of divinity. Simply put, there was no one like her. Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life and work of Barbara Aymar Earle and in extending our deepest condolences to her magnificent family.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF THE MISSOURI  
FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th Anniversary of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation. The Missouri Farm Bureau has been a champion of advocating for farmers the past century. Over the years, this organization has built a reputation of service based on credibility, integrity, and thorough knowledge of the issues—a reputation that continues to grow.

On March 24, 1915, the county Farm Bureau movement changed forever. A group of farmers and ranchers gathered in Saline County to organize the nation's first state Farm Bureau organization. Since then, Missouri Farm Bureau has continued to grow in strength and is the state's most effective organization that works to improve the quality of life for farmers, rural Missouri, and all Missourians. When members join, their voice is heard at the county, state, and national level.

Over these one hundred years, Missouri Farm Bureau has worked on various issues on the state and national level that would affect the farming industry. This organization is also committed to teaching consumers and school children how crop/food production affects their daily lives. By educating future generations about the importance of agriculture, this industry will continue to be successful.

As a farmer and member of Missouri Farm Bureau, it is a privilege to recognize the impact this organization has had on the agriculture industry and families in Missouri. I am confident that Missouri Farm Bureau will continue to succeed in the years to come.

I ask you in joining me in recognizing the 100th Anniversary of the Missouri Farm Bureau.

HONORING GABRIEL STILLWELL

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Gabriel Stillwell. Gabe is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1286, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Gabe has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Gabe has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Gabe has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Gabe installed a flagpole and added landscaping to the front of Community of Christ Church in Odessa, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Gabriel Stillwell for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

EMMA EAKER

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Emma Eaker for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Emma Eaker is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Emma Eaker is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Emma Eaker for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. MARK GIESEN, THE SUNBURY, PENNSYLVANIA ROTARY CLUB'S SUNBURY CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

### HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Sunbury, Pennsylvania Rotary Club's Sunbury Citizen of the Year, Mark Giesen, or otherwise known by his radio name, "Mark Lawrence." The Sunbury Rotary Club is an organization within my district that reaches out locally and internationally to better the lives of others through an array of service projects. Mr. Giesen has acted both within the club and the medium of broadcast journalism to proudly serve his community.

Often referred to as "The Voice of the Valley," Mr. Giesen serves as the Program Director at Newsradio 1070 WKOK, and through his position, helps many constituents throughout my district promote events and fundraisers. His decorated professional experience includes previous roles at WHLM AM/FM in Bloomsburg, and as the News Director at WKOK/WQKX in Sunbury. Mr. Giesen has also worked at Clear Channel in Williamsport, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Giesen's passion for broadcasting began at a young age. As a child, he used to spin the dials on an old radio at night in an effort to reach as many stations as possible. Later on, Mr. Giesen became a fellow at WKOK/AM/FM in Sunbury, and would ride his bike to the studio in the Fort Augusta Museum to continually immerse himself in the world of broadcast journalism.

Mr. Speaker, for his committed service to the Sunbury Rotary Club, to his role as the Program Director at Newsradio 1070 WKOK, and to the constituents of my district, I commend Mr. Giesen and congratulate him on being named the Sunbury Rotary Club's Sunbury Citizen of the year.

### THE FLYING TIGERS

### HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, China will open the doors to a new museum in Chongqing. The museum will be dedicated to a group of American fighter pilots and heroes. The group was originally called the American Volunteer Group, though they are now famously referred to as the Flying Tigers.

Known for the shark face art on the nose of their planes, the Flying Tigers were a group of volunteers that fought alongside the Chinese in their defense against the Japanese at the beginning of World War II. The group was formed by Claire Chennault, a retired U.S. Army Air Corps Lieutenant General from Commerce, Texas, with permission from President Roosevelt himself. The Flying Tigers were comprised of over 100 pilots who hailed from the United States Army Air Corps, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

Before the creation of the Flying Tigers, Chennault was in China working as an aviation advisor to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-Shek and as the director of a Chinese Air Force flight school in Kunming. In 1941, Chiang Kai-Shek sent Chennault to Washington to obtain a war-time loan and some fighter planes, but Chennault came back with much more than that.

With directions from the President and in accordance with the Generalissimo, Chennault headed out to recruit pilots to volunteer with him in China. Since the United States was not yet at war, this all had to be done discreetly.

These brave men were secretly discharged from their respective units and sent to Burma for training. Within four months, the Flying Tigers were dropped into the battlefield and instantly made a name for themselves.

One of the most famous Tigers was David Lee Hill, known by his comrades as "Tex," due to his South Texas heritage. He's remembered as a hero, both in China and back home. He joined the Flying Tigers in 1941, and was credited with destroying over ten Japanese fighter planes in just his first battle in January of 1942. A couple of months after, Tex was officially named squadron leader, where he began planning for his new position and upcoming missions.

On May 7th, 1942, the Japanese began building a bridge across the Salween River that would allow them to easily move troops and supplies into China. However, much to the chagrin of the Japanese, Chennault and Tex learned of their plan. Tex led a flight to the river with the intention of blocking Japanese advancement, and the plan proved successful. According to Chennault, this was one of the most critical missions the Flying Tigers would go on to accomplish.

In July of 1942, after many successful combat missions, the Flying Tigers were disbanded. Though they're remembered for their successes and heroic air battles, their success came with a price. Lacking resources that typical U.S. air corps had, such as doctors, nurses, fresh food, and maintenance personnel, the Flying Tigers were constantly facing setbacks. Wounds were rarely properly treated and the threat of disease was constant. Sixteen Flying Tigers gave their lives in 1941 and 1942, though not before taking out nearly 300 Japanese aircrafts.

After the deactivation, Tex, and five other former Flying Tigers, officially rejoined the United States Army Air Force. On Thanksgiving of 1943, Tex led troops into Formosa where they were heavily outnumbered by the Japanese. Against all odds, his squadron returned home unscathed, despite having downed over 40 Japanese planes.

Tex left active duty in 1946, but joined the Air Force Reserves shortly after, where he would serve until his retirement in 1968 as a brigadier general. His career will go down as one of the most impressive in United States military history. He's been inducted into both the National and Texas Aviation Hall of Fames, and has received numerous awards from both the United States and China.

Tex and his fellow Flying Tigers, such as Claire Chennault, will go down in history as one of the most selfless and heroic service groups in United States military history. They

went to war when they didn't have to, to defend a country to which they held no allegiance. The selfless acts of the Flying Tigers will forever be remembered, and their duty, honor, and character should help guide Americans for years to come.

It's no surprise that many of those feisty, tenacious volunteers were from Texas. They would have made the defenders of the Alamo proud.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF CHARLES "CHUCKIE" WHEELER OF THE BOSTON POLICE DEPARTMENT

### HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS  
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 2015

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Charles "Chuckie" Wheeler, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the Boston Police Department and his hometown of South Boston, MA, and to commend him for over twenty-nine years of dedicated service to his community through his time at the department.

The son of Gerard and Anna Wheeler, Chuckie was born on October 1, 1955 in South Boston and lived on Carmody Court in the Old Colony Housing Projects for most of his growing years. He lived and raised his family all over Southie, from M Street to Preble Street, before moving to Braintree, MA where he currently resides.

Mr. Speaker, Chuckie Wheeler attended South Boston High School where he was a multi-sport all-star athlete and where he met his future wife, Charlene McGinn in the storybook football player meets cheerleader fashion. After graduation, he attended Saint Anselm College and Northeastern University as well as played for the South Boston Chipewas Football Club.

Throughout his career, Chuckie always worked to support his community. Chuck was employed by the Boston Housing Authority and the Boston Public Schools Police Department, prior to joining the Boston Police Department in 1986 where he remained until his retirement this year.

During his time with the Boston Police Department, Chuckie provided distinguished service at both the community level as well as at the Department's Headquarters. Chuckie patrolled the streets of South Boston through District C-6 for the early part of his career, always providing guidance and mentorship to the neighborhood youth. In the latter half of his career, Chuck became one of the cornerstones and first members of a newly-created Crime Scene Response Unit, where he remained until his retirement. During his time with the Crime Scene Unit, Chuckie held fast to his mentorship genes and was an integral part of bringing the Unit to the nationally-recognized success it is today. Chuckie's dedication to the Department and the Crime Scene Response Unit was only outshined by his commitment to his family and community, where Chuckie could regularly be found coaching the South Boston and Braintree youth in football, t-ball, baseball and softball.

Mr. Speaker, Chuckie Wheeler is known for his generous spirit and kind heart. He has had the good fortune to be married to Charlene for thirty-five years. Chuckie and Charlene are proud parents of three children and three grandchildren with a fourth on the way!

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to take the floor of the House today to join with Charles "Chuckie" Wheeler's family, friends, and contemporaries to thank him for his remarkable service to the Boston Police Department and his community.

---

AUSTIN GUT

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Austin Gut for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Austin Gut is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Austin Gut is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Austin Gut for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

---

HONORING CHARLES ALEXANDER VELAZQUEZ

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Charles Alexander Velazquez. Alex is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 43, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Alex has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Alex has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Alex has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Alex installed a 20 foot flagpole for the St. Joseph Youth Soccer Association in St. Joseph, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Charles Alexander Velazquez for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF CAPTAIN  
WAYNE HOSS, SAN MATEO POLICE DEPARTMENT

**HON. JACKIE SPEIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Wayne Hoss who is retiring as a Captain in the San Mateo Police Department after 28 years of distinguished service. The San Mateo Police Department relied heavily upon the talents of Captain Hoss over his decades of service, as indicated by the extraordinary range of responsibilities that he held while with the department.

Wayne Hoss worked in every major aspect of department operations, always giving outstanding service. He was initially assigned to patrol and then to Investigations. He kept his investigations skills well-honed throughout his career and later used these skills repeatedly during the times my district office and I relied upon Captain Hoss to respond to security concerns. In addition to working in Investigations, Wayne Hoss also worked in Field Operations, Special Operations, and the Street Crimes Suppression Team. Seeing his talent as an officer, the department assigned Wayne Hoss as a training officer. Noticing that he could manage a computer and other new technology better than many in the department, probably including many Chiefs and more senior personnel, Wayne Hoss was given oversight of technology-related projects.

He conducted neighborhood traffic patrols and worked in the K-9 unit. Narcotics, SWAT, major crimes and internal affairs were also entrusted to Captain Hoss as he rose through the ranks. He also worked on the most serious crimes impacting the community including robbery, homicide and sexual assault. As you can see from this unusually broad list, there were very few responsibilities that he did not have during his 28 years of service to the people of San Mateo. I am sure that he has many stories of difficult situations and also wonderful outcomes from the cases that he handled and the people he touched over these years.

My staff and I found Captain Hoss to be highly responsive. He would anticipate our concerns, raise our awareness about security, and inform us about other activities in the community that we needed to know about in order to do our jobs better. His department noted in its letter to us that he worked hard to build trust with the community. We can say from our own experience that Captain Hoss was exceptional in the thoroughness of his communications and the support that he offered.

San Mateo is a diverse city with a high quality of life. Its success is due in part to the dedication of the men and women of the San Mateo Police Department who face big-city policing challenges but also work in a city with a tight-knit sense of community. As spokesperson for the police department, leader and mentor, Wayne Hoss helped to create this quality of life and the tight relationship that the department has with populations originating from around the globe. I am sure that many of the skills that he demonstrated in San Mateo

originated with his service in our nation's armed forces as a military police officer. MP's have to cope with many unusual situations and sometimes extremely dangerous operating conditions. I want to offer my appreciation to this veteran who turned his military experience into service to his neighbors and friends in civilian life.

In closing, I want to salute Captain Hoss upon the occasion of his retirement from the police department and the city that he served. He was a talented carpenter on a team that is adept at getting a tough job done right the first time. Retirement for a professional with enormous talent is merely a stepping stone to the next adventure. We thank Captain Hoss for his time in service to us all and wish him all the best in these next adventurous years.

---

REINTRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY FRAUD AND ERROR PREVENTION ACT

**HON. XAVIER BECERRA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 80 years, Social Security has been the bedrock of economic security for American families. Generations of Americans have contributed to Social Security with every paycheck, earning birth-to-death protection for themselves and their families. As a result of their contributions—\$16.1 trillion over Social Security's lifetime—Social Security currently has a \$2.8 trillion surplus.

Social Security benefits are modest—about \$15,000 a year for an average senior and even less for a disabled worker—but for most recipients, their Social Security paycheck is more than half their monthly income.

As a representative of those Americans and the Ranking Democrat on the Social Security Subcommittee, I believe we have no more important responsibility than to make sure that Americans receive their earned Social Security benefits on time and in full. That means protecting Social Security beneficiaries from criminals and fraudsters who try to scam them out of their benefits, and it also means protecting Social Security's trust funds against fraud and errors so the money is available to pay earned benefits. And it means doing so in a way that does not delay needed benefits for honest, hard-working Americans.

On occasion Social Security will provide a recipient more than they are entitled to. That overpayment rate is only a fraction of one percent (0.22%). Most of these overpayments are due to errors, but a small part is due to fraud. Social Security employees believe—and I agree with them—that we could do more to safeguard Social Security.

Recently the Social Security Administration uncovered fraud conspiracies where Social Security contributions made by honest Americans were stolen to pay benefits to people who didn't earn them. In one of the conspiracies, the ringleaders even instructed people to pretend they were disabled as a result of the tragic events of September 11. Social Security's fraud investigators have also uncovered rings of criminals who electronically divert

Americans' Social Security checks into their own bank accounts.

The good news is, when you invest in training highly qualified employees to protect Social Security, it pays off. Social Security's front-line employees uncovered those recent cases of fraud. With the help of Social Security's trained investigators, the ringleaders have been charged with felonies, the beneficiaries have been made whole, and Social Security has begun the process of recovering the money stolen from the trust fund.

But the bad news is that these conspiracies show that Social Security is a tempting target for those willing to break the law. Recent Republican budget cuts have made it harder for Social Security to develop and use effective tools to fight them.

That's why, over a year ago, my colleagues and I decided Congress needed to do its part to protect Social Security. We introduced the Social Security Fraud and Error Prevention Act. Our bill would have given Social Security new tools to find fraud and errors, recoup money that should be in the trust funds, and thrown the book at people who steal from Social Security.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in Congress failed to act on our proposal and continued to shortchange Social Security's budget. This lack of leadership has had consequences for Americans.

For example, Republican budget cuts mean Social Security has fewer fraud cops on the beat than it had five years ago. Our bill would guarantee Social Security's fraud-fighting budget, expand SSA's special fraud-busting investigative units to cover all 50 states, and increase prosecutions of people who steal from Social Security.

Social Security has lost more than 5,000 front-line workers to budget cuts. And Republicans in Congress blocked hundreds of millions of dollars that the Budget Control Act authorized for SSA's most cost-effective methods of preventing waste, fraud and abuse.

Today, we are reintroducing the Social Security Fraud and Error Prevention Act, which would provide SSA with guaranteed funding for its most effective strategies to prevent fraud and errors. The bill will also provide additional resources to recoup benefits that shouldn't have been paid, along with penalties, if the payments were the result of fraud.

Our measure would demand something in exchange for the guaranteed money: complete transparency and accountability. Social Security could only use the dedicated funds for the most important and effective strategies. SSA would have to report annually to Congress how much was spent and what savings their efforts generated for Social Security's trust funds. And the new funds would only be available for additional fraud and error fighting—not to replace what SSA is already spending out of its regular budget.

Our bill isn't the complete answer to protecting Social Security's trust fund. As we consulted Social Security employees, managers, experts, and beneficiary advocates, they all told us the same thing: the best defense against fraud and errors is a well-staffed, well-trained SSA. And for that to happen, Republicans in Congress have to agree to fund SSA's overall budget.

But providing guaranteed funding to fight fraud will at least spare SSA from having to choose between preventing fraud and processing applications so that Americans receive the benefits they earned on time and in full.

I hope we can work together in a bipartisan way to enact this bill and protect Social Security.

#### RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF SCOTT JOHNSON TO THE TENTH DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

#### HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to a dedicated staffer in the office of the Tenth Congressional District of Florida. Scott Johnson will soon be moving on to new opportunities at the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Scott has done a wonderful job serving the people of Florida's Tenth District since he joined my staff in October 2013. As the face of my DC front office, he has welcomed visitors to my office and to the People's House, and demonstrated the responsiveness to the needs and concerns of the people of Florida's Tenth District that this institution was formulated to reflect. Scott is enthusiastic, hard-working, and dedicated to service. He has been a valuable asset to the people of Florida.

While I am sad to see Scott leave, I am grateful for his service. He will be truly missed in the office. I wish him success and fulfillment in his new position, knowing that his character and talents will assure him both, in this and any new adventure he chooses.

#### OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

#### HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,428,120,668.55. We've added \$7,525,551,071,755.47 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

#### MIRIAM GALVAN

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Miriam Galvan for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service

Ambassadors for Youth award. Miriam Galvan is a 12th grader at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Miriam Galvan is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Miriam Galvan for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### HONORING SPENCER COLE GOULDSMITH

#### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Spencer Cole Gouldsmith. Spencer is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 264, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Spencer has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Spencer has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Spencer has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Spencer Cole Gouldsmith for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

#### HONORING DR. KENNETH DOBBINS

#### HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank Dr. Kenneth Dobbins for his significant contributions to Missouri's higher education system over the past two decades. After a distinguished fifteen year tenure, Dr. Dobbins has announced his plans to retire from his position as the president of Southeast Missouri State University at the end of this year's spring semester. His leadership will be difficult to replace and will undoubtedly be missed.

During his tenure as president of Southeast Missouri State University, the university and its programs were nationally recognized by prestigious publications such as U.S. News and the Princeton Review. SMSU increased access to higher education for many Missourians, and enrollment increased steadily each

year under Dr. Dobbins' leadership. In 1994, only about 7,900 students attended SMSU. But, as a result of his continued guidance, enrollment for the fall semester of 2014 has increased to 12,087 students.

This gradual increase in enrollment is attributed to Dr. Dobbins' goal of making Southeast Missouri State University's enrollment representative of diversity of the state of Missouri. Moreover, throughout Dr. Dobbins' tenure access to higher education increased dramatically with record enrollments in the SMSU's 25-county service region as a result of regional campuses in Sikeston and Kennett serving place-bound students in and near those rural communities.

Dr. Dobbins also served a two-year term as president of the Missouri Council on Public Higher Education, which is the organization for presidents and chancellors of Missouri's public colleges and universities. In addition, in 2007 he was selected to serve a three-year term on the American Association of State Colleges and Universities Board of Directors, an organization which represents over 420 U.S. public college and university presidents, which equates to 56 percent of the enrollment at all public four-year institutions.

I am extremely proud of all that Dr. Dobbins has done for Missouri's higher education system. It is my honor to recognize him before the U.S. House of Representatives.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for roll call votes # 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, and 118 because I was attending the funeral of community leader and former United Auto Workers vice president General Holiefield in Detroit. Had I been present, I would have voted AYE on roll call votes # 113, 114, 115, and 118 and NAY on roll call #116 and #117.

#### IN HONOR OF CHARLENE WHEELER OF SOUTH BOSTON AND BRAINTREE, MASSACHUSETTS

### HON. STEPHEN F. LYNCH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Charlene Wheeler, in recognition of her outstanding contributions to the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority and to commend her for 32 years of dedicated service to the MBTA and the South Boston community where Charlene was raised.

The daughter of Robert and Mary McGinn, natives of South Boston, MA, Charlene was born on May 5th, 1955 in South Boston and lived all over the neighborhood, from D Street to Middle Street to Dorchester St. until she moved to Braintree, MA with her family in 1991. Charlene attended the John Boyle

O'Reilly School, Cardinal Cushing and South Boston High School, graduating in 1973.

Prior to joining the MBTA, Charlene worked a number of jobs in her South Boston community including as a counselor with Jobs for Youth. Additionally, Charlene volunteered her time by teaching Catholic education at St. Brigid's School where her children attended.

In her time with the MBTA, Charlene held a number of positions, starting as Track Walker and progressing to her final position as Train Starter for the Red Line. At times, Charlene was one of the first females to hold positions of authority at the "T" and always did so with the mindset of professionalism and equality. She took pride in each position she held at the MBTA and made endless contributions to the Authority.

Mr. Speaker, Charlene is known for her caring heart, outgoing personality, and her dedication to family, friends and her work. Charlene has had the good fortune to be married to her high school sweetheart, Chuckie Wheeler for 35 years. They are the proud parents of three children and three grandchildren, with a fourth on the way.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to take the floor of the House today to join with Charlene Wheeler's family, friends, and contemporaries to thank her for 32 years of remarkable service to the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority and the communities of South Boston and Braintree in which she lived and worked.

#### AYLA SCHUETZ

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ayla Schuetz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Ayla Schuetz is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ayla Schuetz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ayla Schuetz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### INTRODUCTION OF FLEXIBILITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES ACT

### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, across all sectors and industries,

flexible work arrangements are a key to meeting the 21st century's diverse workforce needs. Such voluntary arrangements have been shown to boost employee satisfaction and their physical and mental health as well as improve businesses bottom line by helping to retain key talent, reduce absenteeism, and enhance employee productivity.

Flexible workplace policies are a win-win for businesses and workers. To help promote these policies, I am introducing the Flexibility for Working Families Act. This legislation guarantees employees the right to request flexible work arrangements and provides employers with flexibility by encouraging them to review these requests, propose changes, and even deny them if they are not in the best interest of the business. Such voluntary arrangements between employees and employers include changing the time, amount, and/or place that work is conducted.

It is time for our country's workplace policies to reflect the reality of a 21st century economy—where both parents are working and overtime is expected. I urge my colleagues to support the Flexibility for Working Families Act, and I thank Sen. BOB CASEY for his work on this important legislation.

#### HONORING DANIEL GARNETT SHAY

### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Daniel Garnett Shay. Daniel is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 264, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Daniel has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Daniel has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Daniel has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Daniel Garnett Shay for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND BRAVERY OF JAMES A. CARTER

### HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of a very special constituent of mine, James A. Carter.

James Carter was born on January 28, 1921, in Hannibal, Missouri, and passed away on February 22, 2015.

On that infamous day in 1941, James was stationed at the Pearl Harbor military base in Hawaii as a machinist. As you already know, on December 7, 1941, the Japanese Imperial Navy launched a surprise attack on the U.S. Naval Fleet stationed in Pearl Harbor. This heinous act by the Japanese Empire struck a massive blow to our armed forces in the Pacific theater of operations, costing the lives of over 2,400 people.

None could have anticipated the events that occurred that day, but even as fiery death rained down upon servicemen and civilians alike, the brave men and women of Pearl Harbor rose to meet the occasion. On that day, James himself, caring nothing for his own life or safety, swam time and time again through the raging inferno of burning oil which blanketed the surface of the harbor, dragging many back to safety on the shore. James sought no recognition for his actions that day, and never spoke of his valiant actions upon returning to civilian life.

I raise my voice today to honor, in memorial, the life of a brave and humble man. I am deeply honored to recognize James Carter and his service to our nation. May his life be an example to us all.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call votes 113, 114, and 115. If present, I would have voted "yea" on roll call vote 113, "yea" on roll call vote 114, and "yea" on roll call vote 115.

#### ROBERT CHRYSAFIS

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Robert Chrysafis for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Robert Chrysafis is a 12th grader at Arvada High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Robert Chrysafis is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Robert Chrysafis for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### CELEBRATING CARLOS VILLARREAL

#### HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a noteworthy American: Carlos Villarreal. From April of 2007 until 2014, Mr. Villarreal served as City Manager of Laredo, Texas. In his own words, he worked diligently to "shape the growth and prosperity of [his] community."

Carlos Villarreal graduated from Texas A&M University with a Bachelor of Arts in Public Administration. He began his career in public service with the City of Laredo, serving as the Director of Community Development. During his time in this role, he became the department's chief planner and director for the renewal of urban housing programs, working tirelessly to ensure affordable housing for low-income Laredoans. Mr. Villarreal then served as the Assistant City Manager for ten years and went on to become the Executive Administrator for Webb County, where he oversaw the administration and management of all county departments and worked with county officials to improve county services. For the past eight years, Mr. Villarreal has served as the City Manager of Laredo.

With his experience in government spanning over thirty-five years, Mr. Villarreal successfully procured two presidential permits for the Colombia Solidarity Bridge and World Trade Bridge, both of which allowed Laredo's port to become the country's number one land port for commercial trade. He has also maintained a valuable working relationship with the Mexican government at the local, state, and federal levels.

Mr. Villarreal has also served as Past President of LULAC Council #12. He is the recipient of various awards such as the Republic of Mexico-Jose Lopez Portillo Presidential Medal for Outstanding Service, the Sportsman of the Year by the Latin American International Sports Hall of Fame, and the Tejano Achievers Award for Community Service.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Carlos Villarreal for his outstanding service to the City of Laredo and its people.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF LYDIA I. BEEBE

#### HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Lydia I. Beebe, a leader in the Bay Area and role model for women in corporate America, who is retiring after a remarkable career at Chevron Corporation that spanned four decades. For the last 20 years, Lydia served as the Corporate Secretary and Chief Governance Officer. In addition, she served as the secretary of the board, the Executive Committee and the Board Nominating and Governance Committee.

Lydia's history with Chevron dates back to 1977 when she originally joined as a contract attorney. She then worked as a legislative representative in Washington, D.C. from 1981–1985, and a senior management and tax counsel in the tax department from 1985–1995.

Lydia's competent, calm and clear advice has earned her the trust and admiration of the Board of Directors senior management at Chevron. Her leadership style has also earned her my trust and admiration. I had the great privilege of working with Lydia Beebe on the Board of Directors of PBWC, the Professional Business Women of California, an organization I founded 26 years ago to give women a platform to connect and help each other grow and thrive. Lydia helped guide PBWC from 1998–2003, the last two years as chair of the board.

For Lydia, no problem is ever life-threatening and there is always a Plan B. Her contributions to PBWC were and remain invaluable to the organization and in 1996 she deservedly was awarded the "Breakthrough Award."

As you can surmise from Lydia's achievements in the corporate world, she is a trailblazer who simply ignored the glass ceiling and burst through it. Her impact reaches far beyond one company. She is a frequent speaker and panelist addressing corporate governance topics. She has also been very active with the Society of Corporate Secretaries and Governance Professionals.

Lydia Beebe is a native of Kansas and earned her bachelor's degree in journalism in 1974 and her Juris Doctor degree in 1977 from the University of Kansas. She moved to California and received her master's degree in taxation from Golden Gate University in 1980.

We in California are extraordinarily fortunate that she relocated from the Midwest. Her intelligence, resolve and philanthropy have benefited many organizations and countless individuals. Lydia serves on the National Association of Corporate Directors of Northern California, the San Francisco Symphony, and the advisory board of the Arthur and Toni Rembe Rock Center for Corporate Governance at Stanford. Lydia was appointed to the Board of Directors of the Presidio Trust in 2003 by President George W. Bush and served until 2008. In 1991, she was appointed by Governor Pete Wilson to the California Fair Employment and Housing Commission where she served for eight years, from 1995–1999 as chair.

As a Golden Gate University graduate, she served as board secretary and member of the executive committee and received the 2004 Alumna of the Year award. She was also a member of the San Francisco Municipal Fiscal Advisory Committee to the mayor for more than 10 years.

But Lydia, with her inexhaustible energy, didn't abandon her roots; she also serves on the governing boards of the Kansas University Endowment Association and the Kansas University Law Alumni. At the University of Delaware, the John L. Weinberg Center and Corporate Governance is lucky to have her on the advisory board.

In her retirement, she will undoubtedly enjoy more time with her husband Charles Doyle



and their three children Bion, Jason and Louise.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to rise with me to honor an amazing woman whom Chevron named its first woman officer, whom the San Francisco Business Times named one of the most influential businesswomen in the Bay Area for eight consecutive years, and whom I feel humbled to count as a dear friend and irreplaceable adviser. Lydia Beebe is a role model for women and men everywhere. I am honored to congratulate her on her retirement from Chevron on the eve of the 26th PBWC conference.

RECOGNIZING LANCASTER HIGH SCHOOL, TEXAS'S 2015 CLASS 5A STATE BASKETBALL CHAMPIONS

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to honor the Lancaster High School Tigers for winning the State of Texas title in the class 5A State Basketball Championship on Saturday, March 14, 2015. On behalf of all the proud residents of the 30th Congressional District of Texas, I stand with great pride to salute the Tigers for their unmatched athleticism, dedication, perseverance and teamwork. This victory is historic. The 2015 State Championship Team is the 100th basketball team in Lancaster I.S.D.'s history, and they are the first team to ever bring home this title to the great City of Lancaster.

The Lancaster Tigers worked hard throughout the season in preparation for the challenge that awaited them in San Antonio, Texas. The Tigers entered the 2015 State Tournament on a remarkable 27 game winning streak. After a hard fought battle with the Clifton J. Ozen Panthers of Beaumont, Texas, the Tigers emerged victorious. The team was led by Senior Forward, Elijah Thomas, a Top 20 pick, who contributed seventeen points to the team's winning score of 59-47.

The talented young men who make up Lancaster's remarkable team have assembled a fine record ending the season with 33 wins and only 4 losses. Members of the team include: Junior Power Forward, Nate Morris; Senior Point Guard, Antwain Portley; Junior Shooting Guard and Forward, JaColby Pemberton; and Junior Guard, Deon Barrett.

This accomplishment is a testament to the inspirational leadership of Head Coach, Ferrin Douglas and his Varsity Assistant coach, Mr. Joseph Mayberry. Coach Douglas has built an impressive basketball program at Lancaster High School during his 9 year tenure. "Coach Doug," as he is affectionately called, provides guidance that his players describe as crucial in helping them realize their potential both on and off the court.

On behalf of the 30th District of Texas, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the accomplishments of the Lancaster High School basketball team for their victory in the 2015 Texas Class 5A State Basketball Championship. We are proud of your accomplishment,

and we share in the pride and excitement felt by the city of Lancaster, Texas, the Superintendent of Lancaster I.S.D., Mr. Michael McFarland, the Principal of Lancaster High School, Mr. Michael Showell and the entire school.

HONORING DEVIN MCCOMBS

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Devin McCombs. Devin is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Devin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Devin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Devin has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Devin McCombs for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

BIANCA MARTINEZ

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Bianca Martinez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Bianca Martinez is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Bianca Martinez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Bianca Martinez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING LT. COLONEL GREG GADSON

**HON. BILL FLORES**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of America's finest, Lt. Colonel

Greg Gadson who is in command of Ft. Belvoir in Virginia, a graduate of West Point in 1989. Greg was also a star linebacker on the United States Army football team. Greg, a twenty-year veteran, has received three bronze stars and a purple heart. While serving in Operation Iraq Freedom, he was almost killed as the commander of a surge unit by an IED explosion, losing both of his legs. He has since done nothing but climbed mountain after mountain. He is also well-known as an inspirational public speaker, and many give him credit for helping inspire the New York Giants to their Super Bowl XLVI season. He has also appeared in the movie "Battleship" and truly is an American hero and a man for all seasons. I submit this poem, penned in his honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

HOLD THAT LINE

Hold  
That  
Line  
All in our lifetimes  
Past what new goal lines will we so drive?  
When, it all so seems our backs are up  
against the wall to find  
All in these the moments of our lives  
Coming off that line  
All in hearts now carried deep  
What promises to ourselves will we so keep?  
To find the faith and courage to compete  
To strive  
Will we get up and fight?  
When it all so lies on the line  
And hold  
That  
Line  
Or will we give in,  
In these our darkest of all nights as they  
begin?  
Or will we go deep?  
All in our hearts of honor so to seek  
Whether, on football fields of green  
Or out upon most heroic battlefields of honor  
seen  
You Lt. Colonel Gadson,  
Have always gleamed  
Will our hearts choose to stand and fight,  
To compete?  
All in the seeds we've sown so deep  
All in our hearts to reap  
Emanating from somewhere inside,  
So down so very deep  
Is the place Lt. Colonel,  
Where all of your promises you would so  
keep  
All in your strength in honor which speaks  
To be the best as you would seek  
All in your actions,  
And deeds  
Firing out across that line to death to beat  
Tackling all of those obstacles in your way  
to compete  
As so gallantly you sow heroism seeds  
As why in the game of life you shine so brilliantly  
As it's your faith Greg you were so to keep  
Running from end to end,  
As up ahead you would lead  
To take control and command  
To hold  
That  
Line  
As there you'd stand  
When this battle before you so lie  
As across that goal line of life for victory  
you'd strive  
All because of men like you Colonel who so  
courageously compete  
We all may live in peace  
Because, in the game of life  
It's all about digging in,

And digging in deep  
Through thick and thin,  
How far we are all willing to go for victory  
to reach

To  
Hold  
That  
Line

To walk through that valley of death,  
With clenched fists to one day Heaven reach  
For these are the things in life which speak  
And who have we saved?

And who have we blessed?  
And what have we taught to pass that test?  
By all our actions, whom have we reached  
By our examples to beseech  
Will we stand up and go deep?

As have you Colonel,  
As to such new heights you'd so reach

In this new battle you began,  
And you so chose to fight and stand  
While, all in the midst of hell  
As your most courageous heart began to  
swell

And you had to start all over again  
Without your once strong legs upon which  
you so ran

As you looked down as the red blood ran  
As in that moment your new battle so began  
Being from The Point,  
Your heart gave you a command  
To hold

That  
Line

As once again it was first and goal  
With your back to the wall  
As you had to plug up all those holes,  
And somehow find the strength to stand  
To tackle all that misery at hand  
And somehow hold

That  
Line

As you had done before,  
Time and time again  
As somehow you got up and stood,  
And started your whole life over as you  
would

Listening to your heart,  
As you brought tears to all our eyes  
Thanking your Father and your brothers for  
being alive

As a winner in that game of life you crossed  
that recovery goal line

As Greg you crushed it  
As death you sacked it  
Firing out to victory to find  
And Colonel,

If I ever have a son

I pray to God,  
He could lead a life like yours as won

Who when it was all on the line,  
Did not thing think twice

To win that day, that fight

As a winner before us now stands here this  
night

Because it's on our legs we stand  
But it's with our hearts we run to daylight

And we

Hold  
That  
Line

For Greg you are Army strong  
And why such men as you and MacArthur to

The Point so belong  
Whose hearts of honor in history will live on

Hoo ah

Mr. Speaker, before I close, I ask everyone  
to continue to pray for our country and for our  
military men and women that protect it.

God bless the United States of America.

## HONORING THE CAREER AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF DUNKIRK FIRE CHIEF KEITH AHLSTROM

### HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the career and accomplishments of heroic member of the Western New York community, Dunkirk Fire Chief Keith Ahlstrom, on the occasion of his retirement after a remarkable career.

Since joining the Fire Department in 1979, Ahlstrom has provided wonderful leadership, serving as chief for the last 8 years. His team of 25 paid firefighters and numerous volunteers work together to provide safety for the residents of Dunkirk. Ahlstrom follows his brother, who also recently retired from the fire service, but his 35 years of committed work will not be forgotten.

Along with his tenure as Fire Chief, Keith Ahlstrom also served as valuable member of the community, spending time as a high school baseball umpire and serving as the most senior Chautauqua County legislator. Ahlstrom looks forward to spending time with his children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to deeply thank Keith Ahlstrom for his dedicated years of service and sacrifice for his community. We wish him all of the greatest happiness in his future.

## HONORING THE LIFE OF MAIME ERNA STRIEBER SHEPPERD

### HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Maime Erna Strieber Shepperd. Maime passed away in January, just weeks after celebrating her ninety-seventh birthday. Bright from a young age, Maime graduated high school as class valedictorian at the age of fifteen and enrolled in the University of Texas at Austin Journalism School. It was at the University of Texas where she met her husband of 51 years, the late John Ben Shepperd. They were married shortly after her graduation.

Maime and John raised four children together, living in both Austin and Odessa throughout their marriage. She was first-lady to John's political career, first as Texas Secretary of State and then as Attorney General. When the family moved to Odessa, Maime got involved with many cultural, philanthropic, and political organizations. She served on the board for the West Texas Rehabilitation Center and founded the Crystal Ball, an annual benefit event. She was also involved as a board member for the Midland-Odessa Symphony, and was tapped by the New York Metropolitan Opera to serve as their West Texas representative.

During Lyndon Johnson's campaign for president in 1964, Maime served as the Chairman of the Ladies for Lyndon West Texas

committee. She also joined Lady Bird Johnson on the whistle-stop Lady Bird Special train as it toured eight southern states. Maime's legacy also extends to the University of Texas Permian Basin's library. As the Odessa chairman of the book drive which founded the library in the early 1970s, she helped obtain over 300,000 books to start the collection that students at the University of Texas Permian Basin still use to this day.

Maime's dedication to her many cultural and philanthropic pursuits was admirable, as was the stable and loving home she provided for her family. She is survived by her son and daughter-in-law, Alfred and Honey Shepperd, her daughter and son-in-law, Suzanne and Gary McIntosh, nine grandchildren, and twenty great-grandchildren. Please join me in remembering the extraordinary life of Maime Shepperd.

### YURITZI MORA

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Yuritzi Mora for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Yuritzi Mora is a 12th grader at Wheat Ridge High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Yuritzi Mora is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Yuritzi Mora for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

## REMEMBERING A HEINOUS ATTACK AGAINST THE KURDISH PEOPLE

### HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pause and remember a heinous attack against the Kurdish people that occurred 27 years ago this week.

On March 16, 1988, Saddam Hussein's regime dropped chemical weapons on the city of Halabja, killing 5,000 innocent men, women, and children.

Thousands more suffered permanent injuries.

This crime against humanity was the worst part of a larger campaign of more than 40 gas attacks aimed at exterminating the Kurds.

The Kurdish people, however, have proudly persevered, rebuilt, and now provide stability and an ally in an often unstable region.

Today, while we look back on this solemn anniversary, it is important to offer our gratitude to the Kurdish people for their courage and sacrifice in the current fight to defeat our mutual enemy ISIL.

THANKS MR. BASEM MUALLEM  
FOR YOUR SERVICE TO  
CALTRANS DISTRICT 8

### HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bid farewell to Basem Muallem who will be retiring after 29 years with Caltrans at the end of March. A true man of the people, Muallem will always be remembered as an extraordinary leader who listened and understood the growing infrastructure needs of Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. As District 8 Director, Muallem is currently responsible for the largest of the 12 statewide Caltrans districts geographically, with four interstates and 32 routes totaling over 7,000 lane miles within its boundaries. Muallem manages a staff of 1,280 and an operating budget of \$181 million. He oversees all facets of design, construction, operation and maintenance of the state highway system in the greater Inland Empire region. Muallem works in partnership with both regional transportation and local resource agencies to provide a safe and reliable highway network for the traveling public. For as long as I have been in public office, our region continues to face massive growth. As more people, businesses and vehicles come into the area, the challenges of providing a highway system to meet the region's growing needs increase. Muallem has been a good friend to these needs in the various positions he has held within Caltrans. What's next for him you might ask? Muallem, who holds a Bachelors of Science degree in biology, and a Bachelors and Masters of Science degrees in Civil Engineering is headed to Parsons corporation, an engineering and construction company. I wish him the best of luck in his new endeavors.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. CARL  
DJERASSI

### HON. JACKIE SPEIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the iconic Dr. Carl Djerassi who died at the age of 91 on January 30, 2015. In the weeks since his death, a great deal has been said about Dr. Djerassi.

Most of these comments focus on his key role in developing the contraceptive pill. Because Dr. Djerassi and two other scientists were able to synthesize norethindrone, a key ingredient of the pill was finally available for widespread use and commercialization. The human race owes Dr. Djerassi a great deal.

Because women were finally able to control their own fertility, they were able to spend time in school, obtain work and to fully join the economy. Millennia spent bearing children and being denied education and advancement due to the demands of raising children were now upended in those nations that embraced artificial contraception. The pill is often characterized as a great advancement for women but in truth all human beings were advanced as women were freed to increasingly contribute their talents and intellect fully to the great research and economic challenges of their eras. For this reason alone, Carl Djerassi should be heralded as an advocate for human rights and economic development.

Dr. Djerassi came to the United States with his mother as a refugee from a Europe increasingly dominated by Nazi Germany. After writing to Eleanor Roosevelt about his impoverished state, but inquiring mind, she offered him a scholarship. It was a fateful offer for Carl Djerassi and for human beings globally. Dr. Djerassi graduated summa cum laude from Kenyon College before his 19th birthday and then earned his doctorate in chemistry from the University of Wisconsin. He subsequently worked for or founded several private companies, including early work for Syntex, the company that commercialized norethindrone into the pill. His research was also key to the synthesizing of antihistamines and cortisone.

After positions at a number of other universities, Dr. Djerassi moved to Stanford where he conducted research and taught for decades. He was the ultimate professor who, because of his extraordinarily high standards, did not suffer fools gladly. Stanford University indicated that Dr. Djerassi published more than 1,200 scientific papers, and made early and important contributions in many areas of chemistry, including the use of analytical tools of chemistry such as mass spectrometry, magnetic circular dichroism and optical rotary dispersion. Those he mentored remarked on his willingness to look after their careers despite an extraordinary schedule that at times committed him to travelling 100,000 miles per year. In 1973, Dr. Djerassi was awarded the National Medal of Science by President Nixon. Stanford noted that he was the only awardee to simultaneously be given that award by the President while also being on Nixon's enemies list.

In our region, Carl Djerassi was also known for his extraordinary love of art, poetry, and his books of "science-in-fiction." According to those who knew him well, his short stories, novels and plays provided unusual detail about the lives and difficult choices of scientists who bear the burdens of historic discoveries.

Mr. Speaker, some individuals leave as their legacy an endowment or a building or fond memories of a life well lived. At least from my perspective, Carl Djerassi left us all something that is much more valuable than any of these gifts: He gave us options in life. Thanks to Carl Djerassi, we can choose to live as human beings have lived for tens of thousands of years or we can acknowledge that human beings may seek a different path—one of self-determination and thus personal responsibility to leave the world a better place than when

we entered it. Carl Djerassi left the world a much better place than when he entered it, having explored the greatest secrets of chemistry and some of the most difficult moral dilemmas confronted by inquiring minds. He was truly a man for all ages, and we can only hope that his insights passed down through these past decades will endure and be improved upon for decades yet to come.

RECOGNIZING ROBERT LEE FINK  
FOR HIS SERVICE

### HON. LEE M. ZELDIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert Lee Fink for his 50 years of dedicated service to the field of Emergency Medical Services. Bob's EMS career began when he was just 12 years old, when he witnessed an 8 year old unconscious boy being pulled from a public swimming pool. The boy was placed upon the ground, but no one rendered aid to him. This was before CPR, but as a Sea Scout, Bob was taught the Holger-Nielson back pressure arm lift, which saved the boy's life.

This is what drove Bob to become a life-guard, a career he officially began at 16 when he took his first CPR and first aid classes through the City of New York. A few years later, Bob was granted a waiver by the Mayor of New York City to become the first lay person to be a CPR instructor. After graduating college, Bob had a successful 20 year career promoting health and fitness as a Physical Education teacher in Bedford Stuyvesant. In 1977, Bob became an EMT and then in 1979, he became a Critical Care EMT. A few years later, in 1988, Bob was honored with the New York State Advanced Medical Technician of the year. This honor was bestowed upon him for saving the life of a 12 year old boy who was submerged in the waters of Lake Ronkonkoma.

Bob went on to become an EMT instructor in 1996, and since then, he has prepared thousands of students to become EMT's and Critical Care EMT's. At the age of 60, Bob returned to school yet again to become a Paramedic as one of the oldest students in his class at St. Vincent's Catholic Medical Center.

To this day, Bob remains dedicated to serving the public, continuing to volunteer and serve his community as a mentor and a Paramedic. Today, I thank and congratulate Bob for his 50 years of dedication and service.

CARLY BAUER

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Carly Bauer

for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Carly Bauer is a 12th grader at Ralston Valley High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Carly Bauer is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Carly Bauer for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

---

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF MICHAEL GRAVES, FAIA

#### HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michael Graves, FAIA, a prominent and respected architect, who passed away last Thursday March 12, 2015 at the age of 80 at his home in Princeton, NJ.

Mr. Graves was born in Indianapolis on July 9, 1934. Upon graduating from Broad Ripple High School in 1952, he went on to pursue a bachelor's degree in architecture at the University of Cincinnati. Enamored with design, Mr. Graves went on to obtain a masters degree in architecture from Harvard University, before teaching at Princeton University as the Robert Schirmer Professor of Architecture, Emeritus, a pursuit that would turn into a 40-year career.

While at Princeton, Mr. Graves was an inspiring professor who taught architectural design and theory to thousands of undergraduate and graduate architecture students, as well as extending his reach beyond Princeton through serving as guest lecturer at over 1,000 public conferences.

In 1964, Mr. Graves founded his own firm, now called Michael Graves Architecture & Design or MGA&D in Princeton, NJ. Since its establishment, Mr. Graves has been tasked with designing everything from office buildings, resorts and retail stores, to hospitals, monuments and university buildings. Renowned across the country as one of the New York Five, a group that redefined modernism in architecture, Mr. Graves became among the most celebrated of the postmodernist architects in the 1980's.

Mr. Graves designed more than 350 buildings around the world. Among his most notable projects are the Netherlands Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport in The Hague, the Walt Disney Co. corporate headquarters in Burbank, CA, the NCAA Hall of Champions, the Newark Museum, and an innovative design scaffolding for the Washington Monument Restoration here in our nation's capital. He and his firm have designed over 2,500 prod-

ucts for manufacturers and retailers. Mr. Graves received more than 300 awards and citations, including the National Medal of Arts presented by President Bill Clinton in 1999 for his exceptional achievements in architecture, design and education. In 2001, he was awarded the Gold Medal from the American Institute of Architects (AIA), the highest honor the AIA bestows on an individual whose body of work has had a lasting influence on the theory and practice of architecture.

Mr. Graves received 14 honorary degrees from various universities, including Rutgers, NJIT, Emory University, the University of Virginia, and the University of Miami. In his most recent project, Mr. Graves established the Michael Graves School of Architecture at Kean University in New Jersey and Wenzou-Kean University in China, where his architectural legacy will continue for generations to come.

As a United States Congressman, it is my great honor to recognize and commemorate the life of Michael Graves. I am proud to say that he was from my home state—truly his impact was felt in New Jersey and throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Mr. Graves' coworkers, family and friends, all those whose lives he has touched, and me, in recognizing Mr. Michael Graves.

---

#### RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF THE "THE BORINQUENEERS"

#### HON. ALAN GRAYSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the brave individuals listed below for their service in the U.S. Army's 65th Infantry Regiment, an all-volunteer Puerto Rican unit known as "the Borinqueneers." This exceptional group of veterans has made Central Florida their home. As their representative, it is my honor to recognize each one of them for their service to our nation.

Aida I. Rodriguez, Andre Vergara, Andres Medina, Angel L. Mendoza, Anibal Albertorio, Carlos Diaz-Husband, Carlos Guffain, Carlos Soya, Celio Freytes Melendez, David Flores Mendez, Despian Quilles, Diego Melendez, Edwin Aviles, Efrain Diaz, Enrique De Jesus.

Enrique Quiñones, Epifanio Agosto, Eriberto DeJesus, Esteban Alejandro, Felipe Ramos Gonzalez, Feliz Lopez, Ferdinand Lopez, Francisco Mendez Lugo, Francisco Torregoza, German R. Colon, Gilberto Ramirez, Gisele Ayala-Granddaughter, Hector M. Perez, Jesus Asencio, Jose A. Feria.

Jose Alujo, Jose Angel Colon, José Ángel Ramírez, Jose Mercado Pacheco, Jose Semidey, Jose Troche, Juan B. Melendez Rodriguez, Juan Bautista, Juan Ramos Flores, Leonardo Justiniano, Leonardo Zeno, Luis F. Suarez, Luis Martinez, Luis Muñoz, Luis Ramirez.

Luis Sabater, Marcia Mojica, Moises Rivera, Narcisco Villot, Nelson Gonzalez, Nestali Franco Baez, Nicolas Ayala, Osvaldo Alvarado, Osvaldo Rivera, Pedro Martinez, Rafael Donis, Rafael Gonzalez, Rafael Lopez Machado, Rafael Martinez Negrón.

Ramon Mendez, Raul Aldarondo Galdan, Raul E. Reyes Castaneira, Raymond Medina, Richard Acosta Guerreo, Ruben Aquino, Samuel Collazo, Santiago Villafañe, Victor M. Rosario, Victor Mesias, Victor Ortiz, Victor Roldan, Wilfredo Lopez.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to honor these members of the 65th Infantry Regiment for their exceptional service to our nation.

---

#### HONORING AUSTIN CONWAY

#### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Austin Conway. Austin is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 395, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Austin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Austin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Austin has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Austin Conway for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

---

#### INTRODUCTION OF SUPERMARKET TAX CREDIT FOR UNDERSERVED AREAS ACT

#### HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 18, 2015*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Supermarket Tax Credit for Underserved Areas Act, which I introduced earlier today. If enacted, this bill would provide tax incentives for the establishment of supermarkets in urban and rural areas without access to fresh food.

It is hard to believe, but more than 23 million Americans, including many residents in my hometown of Memphis, Tennessee, live in communities that lack access to fresh food. I believe that is simply unacceptable in a nation as great as ours.

No American should have to live in a so-called, "food desert." According to the Department of Agriculture, a "food desert" is a low income neighborhood that lacks grocery stores within a 1 mile proximity for urban residents and 10 miles for rural residents. Many families in these neighborhoods face transportation challenges and rely on corner convenience stores that often stock processed snack products (potato chips, soft drinks, and candy)

rather than fresh meat and produce. Studies have shown that access to healthy food choices can help prevent many diet-related illnesses, including diabetes, obesity, hypertension, heart disease and digestive diseases.

That is why I introduced Supermarket Tax Credit for Underserved Areas Act. This legislation seeks to reduce food deserts, create jobs and boost local economies by increasing the rehabilitation tax credit for supermarkets that open stores in food desert communities. The bill would also increase the work employment tax credit for supermarkets that hire disadvantaged youth, community residents, veterans and ex-felons. Finally, Supermarket Tax Credit for Underserved Areas Act would provide a tax credit for supermarkets that purchase their fresh fruits and vegetables from local growers.

I urge my colleagues to support this much needed legislation.

CRUZ GARCIA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cruz Garcia for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Cruz Garcia is a 12th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cruz Garcia is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cruz Garcia for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 19, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States Middle East policy.

SH-216

10 a.m.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to examine waters of the United States, focusing on stakeholder perspectives on the impacts of the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed rule.

SD-106

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the regulatory regime for regional banks.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security

To hold hearings to examine surface transportation reauthorization, focusing on performance, not prescription.

SR-253

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine management reforms to improve forest health and socioeconomic opportunities on the nation's forest system.

SD-366

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine continuing America's leadership, focusing on advancing research and development for patients.

SD-430

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine securing the border, focusing on assessing the impact of transnational crime.

SD-342

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Sally Quillian Yates, of Georgia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice.

SD-226

10:30 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Judiciary.

SD-138

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment

To hold hearings to examine capital formation and reducing small business burdens.

SD-538

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security

To hold hearings to examine unmanned aircraft systems, focusing on key considerations regarding safety, innovation, economic impact, and privacy.

SR-253

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Veterans Choice Act, focusing on exploring the distance criteria.

SR-418

MARCH 25

9 a.m.

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Department of Defense

To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Defense Health Program.

SD-192

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

2 p.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine securing the border, focusing on understanding and addressing the root causes of Central American migration to the United States.

SD-342

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Paul A. Folmsbee, of Oklahoma, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, and Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, all of the Department of State.

SD-419

Special Committee on Aging

To hold hearings to examine the fight against Alzheimer's disease, focusing on a treatment by 2025.

SD-106

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support

To hold hearings to examine the current state of readiness of U.S. forces in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-232A

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

MARCH 26

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. Central Command, U.S. Africa Command and

U.S. Special Operations Command programs and budget in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.

SD-G50

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to examine the Administration's Quadrennial Energy Review.

SD-366

10 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine securing the border, focusing on defining the cur-

rent population living in the shadows and addressing future flows.

SD-342

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Airland

To hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

**SENATE—Thursday, March 19, 2015**

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace, glory, and power, the battle belongs to You. We are grateful that even though storms rage, we can continue to anchor our hopes in You. Forgive us for sometimes painting a caricature of the many because of the pathology of the few.

Inspire our lawmakers to keep their eyes fixed on You. Imbue them with wisdom that they may know the road to take. Lord, rescue them from danger, as You carve tunnels of hope through mountains of despair.

Let the peace we seek in our world be first conceived in our own hearts.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

**MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1191**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1191) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the Calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

**HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, throughout the Democratic filibuster of the antislavery legislation, this is basically what they have been telling us: We don't read legislation we vote on. Even so, it was always a stretch to believe that not a single one—not one—of the 13 original Democratic cosponsors of this bill, nor the many Democrats who voted for this bill in committee, nor their well-educated staffs could not have been bothered to make it to page 4 before deciding to support it—well, support it at least until far-left lobbyists told them they could not support it anymore.

So yesterday's revelation that the Democratic side was indeed aware of the language in question could hardly have surprised anyone. It also makes clear that Democrats decided to yank their support for an antislavery bill for one simple reason: Because far-left lobbyists said they needed to—not because the American people said so.

Nearly 70 percent of Americans support the kind of bipartisan provisions Democrats now claim they object to, and many Democrats have voted for similar bipartisan Hyde language many times before in both appropriations and authorizing legislation. They voted for it many times before in other bills, most recently just this past December.

So our Democratic colleagues obviously lack a rationale for this continued filibustering of the antislavery legislation. If Democrats are truly sincere about wanting to move to an Attorney General vote as soon as possible, then they should consider some of the recent advice from the Chicago Tribune.

Here is what the Tribune said. "Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have endorsed" the same bill they are now filibustering, the Tribune noted. So "all they have to do is allow a vote" on the same bill to move to another vote they claim to want to have.

Yet, as the Tribune also noted, Democrats do not "want to go on the record against a bill aimed at combating the evils of human trafficking. So they are blocking a vote—yes, blocking a law to combat human trafficking—in hopes that they can get their way."

Here is how the editorial concluded—and this is the part our Democratic friends should listen to: "Democrats, . . . vote to move forward with the human trafficking bill. Then the Senate can get on with approving a new attorney general. And Democrats can resolve never again to vote for a bill they haven't read."

Just resolve to never again vote for a bill you haven't read. It seems pretty simple. Ignore the lobbyists and vote to give hope to the victims of slavery instead. That is the right thing to do, and today we will give our friends another chance to show where they stand in this debate over modern slavery.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 799 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Democratic leader is recognized.

**HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in a few hours, the Senate will vote for a third time on whether to end debate on human trafficking. The result will be the same the third time as it was the second time and the first time, which indicates to me that this week was a waste of time.

I indicated that the vote will fail, and it will fail because the debate is such that this is an important issue. We are determined to fix this bill, and we will fix it by removing the unrelated abortion provision from the pages of this legislation. I hope we can do that soon.

My friend the majority leader referenced reports that Democratic staffers should have—it should not have been plural—a Democratic staff member knew about the abortion provision prior to the legislation coming to the floor. Perhaps that is true, but I don't really know how the abortion language got in the bill for sure. I think I know. But it got in the bill. I think I know who put it in there, but it really doesn't matter. The fact of the matter is it is in the bill, and I am more concerned about getting the bill out.

We have had some columnists make fun about the fact that we should have read the bill more closely. I will not go into a lot of detail, but page 4 of the original bill—the section to which a lot of people love to point—was eliminated. If you look at it, it is crossed out.

If you go to page 50 or 51, it is stuck back in that part of the bill, and this is where the controversy gets pretty interesting. A Republican Senator who was responsible for this bill in the committee sent out a notice to all Senators, including Democrats, saying



that we made some changes in the bill that passed last year—one, two, three, four, five, six changes that were made. The problem is he didn't indicate that they put the abortion language back in. It was really misleading, as was indicated on the floor yesterday by Senator FEINSTEIN.

We can go into why the language is in the bill. I have indicated I think I know who put it in and why they put it in. But they did put it in the bill. It is in the bill. We can have all of these accusations about paper trails and why it is in the bill, but it is in the bill, and it needs to come out.

Remember, Speaker BOEHNER, who has good qualifications for being the protector of abortion rights, as seen by the Republicans, was able to pass a version of this legislation without the abortion language. No one can question BOEHNER's qualifications for being anti-abortion. If they passed it in the House, why can't we do the same thing here?

Were the House Republicans wrong to pass the bill? I don't think so.

So before we embark upon a third iteration of the vote today, which is going to fail, I ask the Republican leadership: Are you interested in working toward a solution on this human trafficking legislation? If so, take this language out.

My friend the Republican leader was talking about leftwing lobbyists. The leftwing lobbyists are women, who—as indicated on the floor yesterday by Senator FEINSTEIN—are concerned about protecting their bodies and reproductive rights. They are interested in protecting themselves, as they should be, and they are protecting women all over America.

So are they only interested in scoring political points by forcing these show votes or are they interested in reaching a solution? If they are interested in a solution, we are willing to work with them, but the abortion language is going to come out of this legislation.

For the first time in the history of our country, we are now focused on not doing what has been done with the Hyde amendment for 30 years, and that is making sure there are no government taxpayer dollars spent for performing abortions. Now they have moved beyond that to private funding. It is wrong and we are not going to go there.

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will re-

sume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

Portman amendment No. 270, to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to enable State child protective services systems to improve the identification and assessment of child victims of sex trafficking.

Portman amendment No. 271, to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth.

Vitter amendment No. 284 (to amendment No. 271), to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are nationals and citizens of the United States at birth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to address a very serious accusation leveled yesterday against Republican Members of this body by the Democratic whip, the Senator from Illinois. I do so with some regret. The Senator from Illinois and I have been friends for many years. We served in the House together and here in this body, and we have worked together. That is why I was so surprised and disappointed in the comments he made yesterday on the floor of the Senate—comments that are totally inappropriate to be made on the floor of the Senate.

My colleague from Illinois said:

The Republican majority leader announced . . . that he was going to hold this nomination of Loretta Lynch until the bill which is pending before the Senate passes, whenever that may be.

Then he went on to say:

So Loretta Lynch, the first African-American woman nominated to be Attorney General, is asked to sit in the back of the bus when it comes to the Senate calendar. That is unfair. It is unjust. It is beneath the decorum and dignity of the U.S. Senate.

What is beneath the decorum and dignity of the U.S. Senate, I would say to the Senator from Illinois, is for him to come to this floor and use that imagery and suggest that racist tactics are being employed to delay Ms. Lynch's confirmation vote. Such inflammatory rhetoric has no place in this body and serves no purpose other than to further divide us.

Perhaps my colleagues, and the Senator from Illinois in particular, need to be reminded of their own record when it comes to the treatment of African-American women whose nominations

were before this body. In 2003, Janice Rogers Brown—an African American—was nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia—a court that had never included an African-American woman judge. The Senator from Illinois voted to filibuster her nomination in 2003 and again in 2005. When she was finally confirmed, after waiting 684 days, the Senator from Illinois voted against the historic nomination. I would never suggest—even with veiled rhetoric—that Judge Rogers Brown's race was the reason for the opposition to her nomination by the Senator from Illinois. And he should extend, I say to my colleague from Illinois, that same courtesy to me and my colleagues.

I would also like to remind the Senator from Illinois about how we were able to fill vacancies in the U.S. District Court of Arizona last year—effectively alleviating a judicial emergency. With tremendous bipartisan support of the nomination of Senator FLAKE and myself, we confirmed a diverse and historic slate of six nominees which included an Hispanic, an African American, and the first Native American woman ever to serve on the Federal bench. But their race had nothing to do with their successful confirmations, just as the race of Ms. Lynch should have no impact on her consideration in this body. Those six judges were approved by this body because each of them had shown a commitment to justice, public service, and the people of Arizona. Each had also demonstrated the judicial temperament and the professional demeanor necessary to serve with integrity.

I further point out to the Senator from Illinois that at no time has the majority leader ever indicated that he would not bring the Lynch nomination to the floor; in fact, the opposite is true. We have made it very clear time and again that we will consider the Lynch nomination once we have disposed of the bipartisan trafficking bill. Had the Senator from Illinois and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not filibustered this bill over a manufactured crisis, we could have considered the Lynch nomination this week. They chose otherwise.

I deeply regret that the Senator from Illinois chose to come to the floor yesterday and question the integrity and motivation of myself and my Republican colleagues. It was offensive and unnecessary. I think he owes this body, Ms. Lynch, and all Americans, an apology.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am glad I heard the comments of my colleague firsthand and I wish to respond to them directly.

As of today, Loretta Lynch, who is the President's nominee for Attorney

General, has had her nomination pending before the U.S. Senate for 131 days. How does that compare to previous nominees for Attorney General? It is three times longer than the period of time that Attorney General Ashcroft was pending before the U.S. Senate, 2½ times longer than the time taken to confirm Attorney General Mukasey, and twice as long as the time taken to confirm Attorney General Holder.

Why? In some cases, these nominees had questions that were raised by Members of the Senate—questions about their political views, their background; legitimate questions requiring time to answer.

I sat in the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing for this nominee, Loretta Lynch. There were no questions raised of any nature, of any kind, questioning her ability to serve as Attorney General. None.

When my colleague from Arizona notes the fact that I have voted against African-American women nominees in the past, it is true. I am not arguing that every Member of the Senate should vote for Loretta Lynch simply because she would be the first African-American woman to serve in that capacity. All I am saying is she deserves the same fair treatment we have given to other nominees for this job.

She has now been pending before the Senate longer than any nominee for Attorney General in the last 30 years. She has been on the calendar now—on the calendar waiting for a vote—for a longer period of time than the last five nominees for Attorney General combined. Why? It has nothing to do with her qualifications for the job, which are the very best.

Why in the world are we taking this important post—Attorney General of the United States of America—why are we taking this important civil rights moment, when the first African-American woman in history is being given an opportunity to serve, and entangling it in the politics of the Senate?

A week ago, the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, said right outside this Chamber he was going to call her nomination this week. We breathed a sigh of relief; she has been waiting so long. Then, over the last weekend, he announced she wouldn't be called until a bill pending on the floor is passed.

Yes, I am upset and frustrated on her behalf to think that she is being treated in this manner. I am not going to use any pejorative terms other than to say I believe it is insensitive for the Senate to hold her up for such a lengthy period of time with no objection to this woman's character, fitness, and ability to continue to serve the United States.

She has served. She is currently in a position as a U.S. attorney in New York. She has the support of the following organizations: the National District Attorneys Association, the Fed-

eral Law Enforcement Officers Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, the FBI Agents Association, and a long list of Republican- and Democratic-appointed former U.S. attorneys, including Patrick Fitzgerald and Scott Lassar from the Northern District of Illinois. She has the support of former FBI Director Louis Freeh and former Deputy Attorney General Larry Thompson from the George W. Bush administration.

Under ordinary circumstances, this would have been an easy ask for the President to bring a person of this quality to the Senate for confirmation. She had three votes supporting her on the Judiciary Committee from the Republican side. I don't understand the objections of the others, but I respect whatever their reasoning.

All I am asking for—all the President is asking for and all the Senate is asking for—is a vote. Bring her off the pages of the calendar, before the Senate, for a vote. Don't make it contingent on some bill or some political agreement in the future. Let this woman, who has led such an extraordinary life, have her chance to continue to serve the United States of America. That, to me, is only fair and only just and would be in keeping with the traditions of the Senate to follow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be divided equally between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we find ourselves in the unusual posture of being stuck on a piece of legislation that had 12 Democratic cosponsors and was supported unanimously by all Republicans and all Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee, and which uncharacteristically was brought to the floor without having to jump through the regular procedural hoops that legislation usually has to jump through that requires consent by all 100 Senators.

So when you think about combating human trafficking and particularly the targeting of 12- and 14-year-old girls who are of the typical ages and gender of the people who are victims of human trafficking, you would think that if there is anything that ought to be able to avoid the partisan wars here in Washington, DC, and the divisions that

seem to separate us, it ought to be the subject of human trafficking. Well, I guess to say I was disappointed is an understatement. But I am determined to keep our focus on the victims of human trafficking, the people this would help rescue and help heal and get on with their lives. Yes, I am also determined to make sure we can demonstrate that we can function, something I thought Senators wanted to do.

After this last election there were a number of people who said: Gee, we would really like to change the Senate to restore its reputation as the world's greatest deliberative body, where we actually treasured and valued solutions more than we did scoring partisan political points.

I come here today in the spirit of trying to offer a solution that will help us get unstuck from where we have found ourselves. I see my friend, the Senator from Maine, who has been working tirelessly to try to help us get unstuck, and perhaps this will help.

Just to recap: The way this bill was structured is it would deal with the demand side of human trafficking; in other words, it would take the fines and penalties from the people who purchased these services and it would create a crime victims compensation fund, which in essence would be used to help provide the money to faith-based and other organizations that help rescue and help heal these victims of human trafficking. Then we heard from some of our colleagues on the other side that they wanted to change the way this was structured so that it was subject to the routine appropriations process and didn't enlarge the way the traditional limitations on appropriations were treated under the so-called Hyde amendment.

Just to refresh everybody's memory: Since 1976, all funding, all appropriations bills, and many authorization bills, including the Affordable Care Act and the Defense authorization bills, have been subjected to a limitation on the use of tax dollars for abortions except in the case of rape and in the cases where a physician certifies the health of the mother is at stake. The bill we introduced that was passed out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously and has 12 Democratic cosponsors has a reference to an appropriations bill that had that same limitation. The idea was that we wouldn't try to change the status quo; we would try to maintain the status quo which has existed for 39 years. But then some of our colleagues on the other side said, when offered an opportunity to vote on an amendment stripping that language out, they would not even vote. They wanted to obstruct and filibuster this legislation instead.

I, for one, am more interested in getting to a solution than I am engaging in this partisan point scoring. I believe there is a sufficient number of Members of the Senate who are sick and

tired of the dysfunction and who don't want to be distracted by the politics but want to focus on how to help those 100,000 victims of human sex trafficking who are estimated to exist on an annual basis.

What I have come to the floor to do is to say let's make this fund subject to the annual appropriations process that will preserve the money for the victims and it cannot be used for any other purpose, but it will be subject to the Appropriations Committee and the usual riders that have existed for 39 years. It won't represent an expansion of the Hyde amendment, as some of our colleagues have expressed concerns about. It would, basically, again, maintain the status quo.

I came to the floor yesterday and my friend, the Senator from California, was here. I pointed out that not only did she cosponsor this legislation, she voted for it in the Judiciary Committee. But she now feels so strongly—and I know it is a matter of good faith and true conviction for her, but she feels like this is the place where we ought to fight this fight—we ought to relitigate the scope of the Hyde amendment. I don't think we have to do that. I am proudly pro-life and I believe the Hyde amendment represents one little island of consensus in the wars over abortion that we have. That is why for 39 years we have had a limitation on tax dollars. Indeed, fines paid into this fund would be public dollars. It wouldn't be generated from revenue, but it is not private money; once they are paid into this fund they are public dollars under my proposal, subject to appropriation on an annual basis by the Appropriations Committee. So now the money will flow from the victims fund through the relevant appropriations bills. It will be preserved for the victims and cannot be used for any other purpose, and all spending limitations that have routinely applied to those bills would apply to these funds as well.

So the question is, Can our friends who have been obstructing and filibustering this legislation take yes for an answer? Can they take yes for an answer? I think this will also be very revealing, because we will find out whether people are actually interested in a solution or are they trying to shut down the Senate and prevent us from functioning on anything. As I said before, if we can't get the yes on an antitrafficking bill, Heaven help us on issues where there is not consensus, where there are genuine policy differences.

I believe we can do exactly, for example, what Senator LEAHY, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, asked for on the floor on March 10. He said "but let's have it on things it should be on—appropriations bills." So I would say yes, my proposal would give what Senator LEAHY asked for.

Then the minority whip, Senator DURBIN, the Senator from Illinois, said on March 16:

Henry Hyde authored the Hyde amendment that said no Federal funds should be used to pay for abortion procedures except in very limited circumstances: rape, incest, and life of the mother. That has been put in appropriations bills every year since—without question, without challenge.

That was stated by the minority whip, Senator DURBIN from Illinois. My proposal would facilitate exactly what he is arguing for. Can he say yes, take yes for an answer?

The minority leader, Senator REID, said on the 11th: I served in the House of Representatives with Henry Hyde; a very fine man. He has had his name affixed to an anti-abortion bill, anti-abortion legislation for almost three decades. And it's been continued year after year in appropriations bills.

That was spoken by Senator REID, the Democratic leader.

As I pointed out, what has perplexed me so much about all of this is that our Democratic friends have routinely voted for appropriations bills that contain the same restriction. When it was said, well, now you are extending it to an authorization bill, I pointed out that they voted for this very similar restriction in the Affordable Care Act and the Defense authorization bill, so that argument doesn't hold water; but I am giving them a chance to say yes, and, in essence, trying to find a way to break this impasse that has existed now for the last couple of weeks.

So that is the question. Now that we have made a proposal to them to give them what they have asked for and still preserve the 39-year limitation on the use of public dollars for abortion, can they take yes for an answer? I can't wait to hear what their response is to that proposal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, let me first commend the senior Senator from Texas for his efforts to work out a compromise that I hope will allow this bill to go forward. Senator HEITKAMP and I also have been working with the senior Senator from Texas to try to come up with a solution that is similar to what he has outlined, and we will have more to say about that after the vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for the purpose of a bill introduction, unless someone else is seeking the floor to speak on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 804 are printed in today's RECORD under

"Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Maine, my neighbor in New England.

We actually still have some debates on this floor. We had an important one yesterday. Someone called it a "C-SPAN moment." It was a focused and memorable discussion of a significant issue now before the Senate. It was an honest discussion about what is at stake in the debate we are having right now. The core question is how we are going to support the survivors, in what every Senator agrees is a heinous and deplorable crime.

Late yesterday, Senator FEINSTEIN spoke with powerful clarity about why the Hyde amendment has no place in what we are trying to do here, particularly when this legislation we are debating does not involve taxpayer funds. The Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund included in S. 178 is funded by a special assessment fine collected from convicted sex traffickers. It is intended to help survivors rebuild their lives.

Now, whether taxpayer dollars should be used to ensure the full range of health care options available to this very vulnerable population is an important debate. We will have that another day. But the application of the Hyde amendment when zero taxpayer dollars are involved is unprecedented. It represents a very significant change in Federal policy.

When asked why the Hyde amendment has resulted in such an outcry, Senator FEINSTEIN said simply but powerfully:

Because of what this legislation is. This legislation is about the raping . . . of young girls.

Senator FEINSTEIN is right. I encourage everyone to go back and watch her moving remarks that got right to the heart of this debate.

These are children who have been bought and sold like animals. They have had every choice taken away from them. Now, if they survive, if they escape, we should not put limits on what health services they can seek. I stand with the survivors of these crimes. I stand with Senator FEINSTEIN.

This is a line we should not cross. Human trafficking victims are often not treated as rape victims. Too often these young girls are treated as prostitutes, even though they had no choice in it. That is a fact we are trying to change, but we cannot ignore the reality that many of these girls are put through our juvenile justice system and prosecuted as criminals, rather than treated as victims.

It is easy for some to claim that there is a so-called "rape exception" to the Hyde restriction but the reality is that for the survivors of this terrible crime, the rape exception feels more

like an overwhelming bureaucracy. In many States, victims are forced to jump through hoop after hoop to qualify for the exception. They have to obtain police reports or certifications from State agencies. They have to relive the details of their trauma again and again. One State even requires the Governor to approve any exception. Another State refuses to recognize the rape exception at all.

The easiest, most appropriate solution here is to simply remove the Hyde restriction so that survivors can make their own health care decisions. That is what the survivors are asking us to do. That is what the professionals who work with human trafficking survivors are asking us to do.

Yesterday, my friend, the senior Senator from Texas, argued that the inclusion of the language was routine, that this does not change the status quo at all. Well that is simply not accurate. The Hyde amendment is about keeping taxpayer dollars out of the abortion debate. We may have different opinions on the issue, but that is not what we are talking about here.

The money at issue in this bill is not taxpayer dollars, it is money collected from sex traffickers. The bottom line is that the offender-financed fund created in this bill relies on zero taxpayer dollars.

So if you want to maintain current practice, you have to remove this provision. The House bill, that passed unanimously almost 2 months ago, does not contain this expansion of the Hyde amendment's reach. It does not apply the Hyde amendment to nontaxpayer dollars. If Speaker BOEHNER could find a way to bring the House together and pass this bill without injecting abortion politics into the discussion, then why can't we do that in the Senate?

Senator FEINSTEIN is right. We have amendments we need to consider if we can simply get past this stalemate, but she is also right that the issue at stake is too important to turn our back on. This is not a provision we can just ignore and dismiss as the status quo. But I believe, as Senator FEINSTEIN and others have said, we can find a path forward. The path forward should not be one that expands restrictions on the health care choices of human trafficking survivors.

These survivors—many are 12 or 13 years old—let's not put further hurdles in front of them. Let's not push for a political agenda on either side. The Hyde amendment will appear on taxpayer-funded matters, as it usually does. That is one thing the Appropriations Committee will face. We are not talking about taxpayer dollars here. We are not talking about taxpayer dollars.

This would be like reaching into a State and saying: Oh, by the way, you have people who have raised money for

a particular organization, not taxpayer dollars, but we in Congress are going to restrict what you can use that money for. Well, we do not do that. The reason we do not do it is because our involvement is with taxpayer dollars. If we want to go and appropriate money in this area, that is the time to bring up the issue.

The Appropriations Committee—I have served on that Committee for almost 40 years—we handle that issue there, but not here.

What is the pending parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is on consideration of S. 178, with the time until 12 noon equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. LEAHY. Is there a vote scheduled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 12 noon.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time and ask unanimous consent that the vote begin now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, David Vitter, Richard Burr, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Daniel Coats, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Mark Kirk, Cory Gardner, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the committee-reported substitute amendment to S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Leg.]

#### YEAS—56

Ayotte	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Perdue
Boozman	Gardner	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Casey	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

#### NAYS—42

Baldwin	Hirono	Peters
Bennet	Kaine	Reed
Blumenthal	King	Reid
Booker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown	Leahy	Schatz
Cantwell	Markey	Schumer
Cardin	McCaskill	Shaheen
Carper	McConnell	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warner
Franken	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Nelson	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—2

Alexander Boxer

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, James Lankford, David Vitter, Richard Burr, Chuck Grassley, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Daniel Coats, James M. Inhofe, Shelley Moore Capito, Mark Kirk, Cory Gardner, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 178, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Leg.]

#### YEAS—56

Ayotte	Ernst	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Flake	Perdue
Boozman	Gardner	Portman
Burr	Graham	Risch
Capito	Grassley	Roberts
Casey	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rubio
Coats	Heller	Sasse
Cochran	Hoeven	Scott
Collins	Inhofe	Sessions
Corker	Isakson	Shelby
Cornyn	Johnson	Sullivan
Cotton	Kirk	Thune
Crapo	Lankford	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

#### NAYS—42

Baldwin	Hirono	Peters
Bennet	Kaine	Reed
Blumenthal	King	Reid
Booker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Brown	Leahy	Schatz
Cantwell	Markey	Schumer
Cardin	McCaskill	Shaheen
Carper	McConnell	Stabenow
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Feinstein	Mikulski	Warner
Franken	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Nelson	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—2

Alexander	Boxer
-----------	-------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I wish to speak about the bill that I would have thought a few days ago would have passed by now—the bill before the Senate and the bill that addresses this topic of modern-day slavery. This bill

came out of the Judiciary Committee in a unanimous fashion before it came to the Senate floor. Then, there was no dissent; we agreed we should get right to the bill and pass it.

I am pleased to cosponsor the Victims for Justice of Trafficking Act, which includes sexual trafficking and labor trafficking. This bill would help innocent victims of trafficking by creating grants for State and local governments to develop comprehensive systems to address these problems in every State, we are told, and certainly in almost every city—if not every city—where this is a problem.

This bill allows law enforcement to deal with the problem by giving them the tools they need to hold the people accountable who are forcing these violent crimes and violent living conditions and the abuse of people's dignity in so many ways on others. Apparently, approximately 100,000 American children each year are victims of commercial sex and child prostitution and child trafficking, according to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children. It is like so many numbers that we think of. I would encourage everybody to think of any city they can think of that has 100,000 people. Most of us would see that as a big community and a lot of people—100,000 children every year—100,000 children every year, not every decade or every century—every year, in the United States of America, not all over the world.

I would guess most Americans would assume if this is a problem, it has to be a bigger problem in any other country, but 100,000 children here among us are victims of this tragedy.

The Justice Department says there are more human trafficking cases prosecuted by Federal attorneys in Missouri's Western District, the district where the U.S. Attorney's office is in Kansas City, MO, than anywhere else in the country. I hope that means the people in the Western District of Missouri who run that office are doing an extraordinary job, but I think it would be foolish for me to think that this isn't also an extraordinary problem. My house in Springfield, MO, is in that district, as are Springfield, Joplin, and Kansas City. These are places one wouldn't think, what is the No. 1 prostitution area for victims of human trafficking in the country? The Western District of Missouri.

St. Louis, MO, is also one of the top 20 cities, we are told, for human trafficking, according to the Department of Justice. These are bad statistics, as every single statistic any of us could look at in our State could be. Of course, one case of human trafficking is one case too many, but we are not, unfortunately, just talking about one case; we are talking about lots of cases.

Earlier this month the FBI arrested a person in my State who was charged with transporting a minor across State

lines with the intent to engage in prostitution. The FBI reported the man involved was physically abusive, verbally abusive, emotionally abusive, and sexually abusive to this young person he was using for himself and offering to others. This modern-day slavery should not be allowed to continue.

The bill that is before the Senate right now, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, has been endorsed by 200 different advocacy groups, including the NAACP, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, Exodus Cry, a Grandview, MO, group, Rights4Girls, the National Association to Protect Children, the Fraternal Order of Police, and the National Conference of State Legislatures. We can't vote on it here on the Senate floor? We can't get this bill on the President's desk? Why is that?

Why again today did the minority refuse to provide the votes we needed to get from where we are to 60? We did have a few Members from that side join us this week, but we are still short.

Let's deal with this problem. They say it is because there is a section of the bill that deals with the Hyde amendment. OK, the Hyde amendment has been around now for part of four decades. What does the Hyde amendment do? It bans taxpayer-provided abortions.

One of the things we have done in this country is to say because there is vast disagreement on this—we understand there is vast disagreement. Surely we are not going to take money from some taxpayers who are totally opposed to this and use it to pay for something they are totally opposed to. There is a provision in this bill. It was there when the bill was voted out of committee. It was there when everybody voted to move to the bill. Suddenly, it is a provision that nobody was aware of before. In fact, in committee, there was at least one amendment that amended the sentence right below this sentence. So are we not doing our job? Are we not reading these bills, or, are we just looking for a reason not to get anything done? Surely the Senate in the last half dozen years has proven to the country that the Senate can be dysfunctional. Surely we don't need to continue to make that case.

So let's get to work. Let's get down to business. Let's look at what needs to be done here. Let's see what we could do to set an example for the world. Frankly, there were colleagues who had amendments that could have been at least debated that would have talked about what could be done to carry this beyond our borders to deal with this modern-day slavery—whether for labor or for sex—in ways this issue should be dealt with.

I would love to see the President step forward and encourage the leaders of his party to get together and get the votes needed to pass this. Let's move

to a conclusion and put this on the President's desk. I think without the language that some people now suddenly find objectionable, this bill wouldn't pass the House. But the bill will pass the House as reported out of committee, if the Senate would pass it, and it would be on the President's desk. There is nothing new here.

I hope we get this done. I think people are ready to see the Senate work. Let's get this done.

Let's get on with a budget for the first time in 7 years, if we could join with the House of Representatives and say, OK, let's present a plan to the country of how we are going to get back to a balanced budget and what our priorities are.

But one of our priorities should be to end the nightmare for victims of human trafficking, and we can't do that unless we face reality and get on this bill.

#### LETTER ON IRAN NEGOTIATIONS

Also, Madam President, while I am here, I want to talk a little bit about the letter I signed along with Senator COTTON and 45 others a few days ago. I thought the interesting thing about that letter is that the letter was essentially addressed to the Foreign Minister of Iran but released to every newspaper in America. In many ways it was an idea that is important that the American people understand.

I am sure the Iranian Foreign Minister, by the way, already understood it. If one had any interest in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or watching C-SPAN or reading any newspaper in the last 6 months, you would have seen that the Senate was very concerned in a bipartisan way that the President was negotiating an agreement with another country and was refusing to come to the Senate and ask for the approval that the Constitution anticipates should be there.

I was surprised by the Iranian Foreign Minister's response, which was: Well, really, when you are dealing with this kind of situation, it is international laws that prevail. The laws of any individual country don't matter. Well, we all take an oath when we are sworn in to the Senate that the law and the Constitution of the United States do matter and it is our job to uphold and defend the law and the Constitution of the United States. There was nothing I saw that suggested the Iranian Foreign Minister or anybody else should interpret that for me. The Constitution is pretty clear, by the way, that there is an advise-and-consent responsibility. Frankly, advise means to talk to the Senate while you are negotiating.

I read somewhere the other day that, well, it is so presumptuous for the Senate to want to give advice to the President before he has negotiated an agreement. Well, the Constitution says that we are in a position to do that. The

traditions of the country say if the President doesn't keep at least the right people in the Senate informed—the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the minority senior person of that committee, the chairman of the defense committee, the Armed Services Committee—if they aren't kept informed, you are not going to bring people along as you should. That is obviously part of trying to make the government work.

No matter what the President thinks, the Senate is not just an inconvenience; the Congress is not just an inconvenience. There is a reason for these branches of government.

Actually, in another interesting response, the Secretary of State said: Well, obviously this agreement is not binding on anybody but the person who signs it. That is what I have been saying for about a year, but it was interesting that it took this letter for the Secretary of State to say that. This agreement really doesn't bind anybody. If the President signs this agreement, it is an agreement, not a treaty. What does that mean? It means if it is not a treaty, then the government of the United States hasn't agreed to it. Only the President of the United States has agreed to it. President after President have brought agreements about nuclear weapons to the Senate—the START treaty, all the treaties which were approved by the Senate. It would have been unthinkable just a few years ago that one would even think about committing our country to something that involves nuclear weapons potential and not involve the U.S. Senate.

So I think getting these issues on the table is a good thing. Frankly, I think a nuclear-weapons-capable Iran is the most destabilizing thing that could happen in the world today. Not only our great ally and friends in Israel, but countries all over the Middle East will immediately be concerned. Countries within reach of those potential future weapons in Europe and other places would soon be concerned. We are headed down a bad path here, negotiating not that Iran will never be allowed to have nuclear weapons but apparently negotiating how long it will be from the moment they start until they can have the enriched material it would take to have a nuclear weapon.

There are many countries in the world today that have nuclear power that don't enrich in a way that would allow them to ever have a nuclear weapon. Iran, if it wanted to, could have added itself easily to that list. Iran, one of the most energy-rich places in the world, could easily have added itself to that list, if it wanted to add to all that nuclear energy power. I think it is obvious the shadow that Iran would like to cast over the next decade in the region they are already dominating in a handful of capitals is a shadow of nuclear weapons capability.

The United States should be very concerned, and this discussion at the highest levels is the right kind of discussion for the country to be having.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President and colleagues, in my professional life I always considered myself to be a numbers guy. As I have sat back and listened to the debate over these past 17 days since the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Act was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, I decided I would maybe try a different take on the numbers we should be concerned about.

As I said, it has been 17 days since the bill we are considering came out of the Judiciary Committee—56 days since the bill was first introduced on January 13th. Now, some of my colleagues on the other side have said that somehow between when the bill was introduced on January 13th and when it was reported out of Committee on March 10th, there was a provision placed in the bill that they were not made aware of. This is simply not the case. My colleagues had days to review this bill, but unfortunately, some of them are in the habit of passing something and then finding out later what they were actually voting for.

It has been 39 years since the Hyde language we are currently discussing was first passed into law. It was so long ago I was even young—16 years old. The Hyde language was first enacted in 1976, and since then, has become known, well-settled law. Obviously, this is not some sort of new concept. It is language that everybody who is in this body—and every staffer who has served somebody in this body—should know about.

Now, with the Hyde amendment being around for some four decades, I was trying to figure out: Well, maybe we are talking about Members who are familiar with the Hyde language, but never voted for it.

So I decided to go back to my numbers and take a look at the voting history of the Senators in this Chamber today, many of whom—all of whom, actually—on this graphic are now preventing this very important human trafficking legislation from moving forward.

The minority leader has voted in support of the Hyde amendment 14 times, and all these other Senators on my chart at least a dozen times, with the exception of Senator BOXER who has voted in support of the Hyde language

10 times. Senator BOXER stood on the floor last week and said it was offensive language. However, Senator BOXER has voted for this language 10 times, most recently this past December when they passed the fiscal year 2015 omnibus bill.

So one wonders what they are really trying to accomplish here. I hear them. My Democrat colleagues are very sympathetic to the content of the bill. I hear them say that human trafficking is horrible, and we need to do something about it. But their words do not fit their actions. Their words say we ought to move forward and end these horrible situations—and I will talk a little bit more about those numbers later—but their actions are just burning time in this body preventing us from moving on to the many other important things we need to address—such as our national security, our economic security, and our energy security. But no, we have spent 17 days on a bill that my colleagues in the Democratic caucus say we should act on, but are at the same time impeding the process.

Now, as confusing as these numbers are, as confusing as it is to hear so many Senators say that this language is offensive and needs to be taken out—despite the fact that they have regularly voted for it in the past—the very sad result of their actions are what we are not getting done, and that is getting the human trafficking bill passed so we can end the horrible conditions that are imposed on the many people who are enslaved on a daily basis.

I'm going to give my colleagues a couple of numbers to think about. The State Department and other agencies estimate that there are 600,000 to 800,000 people trafficked across global borders each year. That is about 1,600 to 2,200 boys, girls, men, and women being enslaved every single day in this world.

Now, in our country, it is estimated that 17,500 people are trafficked across our borders into the U.S. sex trade every year and that there are about 100,000 people already here.

Think about that in terms of the numbers. Every day that goes by, there are another 50 victims from overseas trafficked into the U.S. for sex trade—every single day another 50 people.

This week, we have had five votes on this bill. This means, another 250 young girls, young boys, women, and men will have been trafficked into our country for sex trade.

This is a good bill, and it works to stop the growth of human trafficking and free those who are currently enslaved.

Colleagues, I am a freshman. I have been here fewer than 70 days. When I read the human trafficking bill, I knew that the Hyde amendment was in it. Anybody who is doing their job in the Senate should have been able to figure that out.

So it raises a very interesting question—how could we come out of the Judiciary Committee, which I serve on, with a unanimous vote? As a matter of fact, there are 12 Democrat cosponsors of this bill. Certainly, those Members of the Democratic Caucus read the bill and their staffs had time to read the bill in the months that the language has been public.

So, colleagues, I wonder if it is really about the human trafficking bill and the language or if it is about a strategy just to slow the process down, but what I think is so sad is the human consequences of this inaction, and we need to move forward.

I just came from the Senate steps to take a picture with about 100 students from my great State of North Carolina.

While I had time before the photographer arrived to let them ask me few questions, I said: I am going to have to go to the Senate floor soon and speak. They said: What are you going to speak on?

I was really at a loss for words. I was wondering how I was going to tell them I am trying to help pass legislation that makes them safer, but we are having a petty fight in the Senate over process.

So I really ask Members of the Democratic caucus to look into their hearts and to understand the human tragedy this legislation is attempting to correct and join with us to pass this bill and move on to the many other things we need to do for this great Nation.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have had a lot of discussion regarding the pending bill. I thought again I would emphasize what Senator FEINSTEIN said earlier, which was so good, and I hope people will listen to her words. I would just follow on to that to say my good friend—and he is my friend—the distinguished senior Senator from Texas has suggested that we make the funds collected from traffickers subject to the appropriations process to get around this impasse, but that does not solve the problem.

The pending legislation came out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, an authorizing committee that does not appropriate funds. We should be telling appropriators that we believe services to trafficking victims are important by authorizing funds. As the most senior member of that Appropriations Committee I can tell you that this is an important process that results in real money for victim services.

It is a process that works well. Under Democratic leadership of the Senate Appropriations Committee, total appropriations for trafficking victims' services more than doubled from \$28.1 million in FY2014 to \$58.1 million for FY2015.

Senator CORNYN's proposal to simply funnel fees collected from traffickers through the appropriations process still presents the same problem—this is not taxpayer money, and subjecting it to the Hyde amendment would expand the amendment's reach to an offender-financed fund meant for women and children who should have all options available to them when it comes to health services after being sexually exploited.

I would quote what the House Republican author of this bill, Congressman POE, said today:

We passed a bill. The Senate should take it up and pass it.

That could be done immediately. I don't think there would be anybody trying to block it. The Republican House of Representatives passed this bill unanimously. We could take up and pass it, and not waste 2 weeks of having this dance on the floor, vote after vote, which both sides know isn't going anywhere. The easiest and best thing to do is to remove the Hyde restriction so survivors can make their own health care decisions.

I will not do it again today, but I put into the RECORD letters and statements from hundreds of people—survivors' organizations and the people they represent—and they have said: Let us make our own health care decisions.

Now, to argue what my friend from Texas says, that the inclusion of this language is routine and it does not change the status quo at all, is not accurate. In fact, that is probably why, I suspect, a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives—who support the Hyde amendment—did not include it in the House version of the bill. The Hyde amendment is about keeping taxpayer dollars out of the abortion debate. Now, we can have different opinions on the issue, but that is not what we are talking about here. The money at issue in this bill is collected from sex traffickers.

The bottom line is the offender-financed funds raised in this bill rely on zero taxpayer dollars. Maintaining the current practice, if that is what you want to do, means removing the provision. Maybe we ought to listen to some of the leadership on the Appropriations Committee and how they feel about this. They are not the ones asking to do this. The Appropriations Committee is not asking us to turn them into some kind of a superauthorizing committee, and we should not put them in that position.

I hope cooler heads will prevail and come together on this. I think it will be very easy for both sides who do want



to stop sex trafficking to come together, and pass this bill.

Then, let us also take the steps to correct what has been a shameful position in the U.S. Senate and confirm Loretta Lynch as Attorney General. She has waited on the floor much longer than the four men who preceded her put together. This woman has waited longer than those four men before her put together, and yet everybody applauds her as a superb prosecutor. We talk about sex trafficking, and she is about the only person we have seen in here as a nominee who has actually prosecuted sex traffickers. Let's get on with the job.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I saw on television my friend from Vermont, the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, talking about the virtues of the House human trafficking bill, and I thought it would be worthwhile for Members and whoever else is listening to understand the difference between the two bills.

First of all, our bill, the one that is being filibustered by our Democratic colleagues—I should say, all but four of them—contains a \$30 million fund that is financed through criminal funds. This is analogous to a crime victims compensation fund. For example, when I was attorney general of Texas, we administered one, and we were able to make grants to various organizations. That is what this \$30 million fund would be. The bill on the House side actually has no fund. It is an authorization. It is a \$5 million authorization. It has no money. It has no mechanism to generate funds like ours does.

Our bill contains language increasing restitution for trafficking victims by using criminal assets to satisfy these needs and allowing law enforcement to pay witness-assistance award money to victims.

The bill in the House does nothing. In other words, we have an asset-forfeiture provision in our bill to take the people who profit from human trafficking and to forfeit those funds and use that to add to the fines and use that money to help rescue and heal the victims. The House bill has nothing in it in that regard.

Our bill requires law enforcement agencies to file regular reports of human trafficking case totals as part of the Uniform Crime Reporting Program. That is important because so much of the human trafficking damage is never reported to law enforcement.

First of all, many victims of human trafficking are children who may or may not actually consider themselves victims. They may be runaways. They may find some adult who has taken them under their wing, only to turn them out on the streets as prostitutes and the like. They may not actually consider themselves victims, at least initially, which they are.

Our bill would make sure the statistics and reports of human trafficking totals are reported in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program so we would actually have a better objective record about the number of cases and so people could appreciate the severity of this problem. The bill in the House has nothing in that regard.

Next, our bill clarifies that child pornography producers are engaged in commercial sex acts. The bill on the House side does nothing in that regard.

Our bill requires persons indicted for human trafficking to be treated as violent criminals for purposes of pretrial, in terms of the availability of bail. The bill on the other side of the Capitol, in the House, does nothing in that regard. Our bill requires prosecutors and judges to undergo training to improve restitution in traffic cases. Again, our friends on the other side of the Capitol—their bill does nothing in that regard.

Finally, our bill requires human traffickers to remain under supervision for at least 5 years after they are released from prison. On the House side, it doesn't touch on that.

I don't say that to criticize the House bill, because I think they have done some good work. But it is important to recognize that the bill over here, which is being filibustered by our Democratic minority, does a lot more and a lot of different things, and things that I think are going to be a lot more helpful to the victims of human trafficking, which I can only imagine should be our collective goal.

I came to the floor this morning, and I said that we would be willing to work with our Democratic colleagues to try to address some of their stated concerns with the original bill. I said that notwithstanding the fact that 12 Democrats cosponsored the bill, the original bill that is now being filibustered. Nine Democrats, along with all of the Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, voted to pass the bill out of the Judiciary Committee. Literally all 100 Senators had to consent for the bill to come to the floor without going through the typical procedural hurdles with which we are all very familiar.

Imagine my surprise, when in the middle of last week, these objections came up. What was the nature of the objection? The objection was that this bill contained a reference to an appropriations bill that was passed in 2014 and for which all of our Democratic colleagues voted. But that reference

was to a restriction on the use of taxpayer dollars to fund abortions, known as the Hyde amendment. Then after they saw that or after they claimed that this was something new and unbeknownst to them, they objected.

I just simply cannot accept this argument that a provision that colleagues on that side of the aisle have routinely voted for on appropriations bills, that they routinely voted for on Defense authorization bills, and one they voted for on the Affordable Care Act, restricting the use of taxpayer funds under these circumstances—why they would pick this vehicle to object to that very same provision.

I accept at face value that some of our colleagues said that this is something they perhaps should have read more closely but they failed to do. I personally find it a little hard to believe, given the nature of the professional staff we have here in the Senate, that Members did not know that this restriction, known as the Hyde amendment, was part of the underlying bill. But assuming that is the case, what we are now offering them is a middle ground—to say that instead of this fund being a separate pool of money outside of the appropriations process, we would agree that the Appropriations Committee would appropriate money out of this fund in the same manner as they do all appropriations, with the exception that the money would be specifically designated to help the victims of human trafficking and not be able to be used for any other purpose.

So the reports are—after we made this proposal trying to address some of the concerns on this side of the aisle—that they would not be happy unless we stripped out all reference to the Hyde amendment in the bill. That is unacceptable. That is unacceptable for the same reason that they would object to a change in the status quo by an expansion of the Hyde amendment. We have now brought the Hyde amendment back within the appropriations process where it has been for 39 years. But to say we are going to eliminate any reference to those restrictions, which have been the law of the land for 39 years, would be viewed as an erosion of the Hyde amendment—hardly a status quo.

I don't know how long this is going to take. I appreciate the perseverance and commitment of the majority leader who, as you know, determines what bills come to the floor and when and who says we are going to stay on this bill until it passes. We have had a number of votes, and four of our Democratic colleagues have joined us to get to a place where we could actually pass this legislation. We just need a handful more—two or three more—to help us.

I know that a number of Senators are going to be hearing from their constituents back in their States because

200 different organizations—law enforcement organizations and victims' rights organizations that are very concerned about this human trafficking plague—are going to be lighting up the phone lines, sending emails, and communicating with their elected officials—as they should.

There is no reason we cannot get to “yes” on this bill unless this whole debate is a phony debate, and what the leadership on the Democratic side is more concerned about is trying to make the Senate as dysfunctional in the 114th Congress as they did in the 113th Congress.

I suspect, unfortunately, because of the phony issues saying take out language we voted for time and again—yes, it was contained in a bill we cosponsored. Yes, it was contained in a bill we voted for already. Now we are going to come to the floor, and we are going to block it.

We know who pays for this political gamesmanship. Sadly, it is the very same victims whom our colleagues here on the floor say they want to help—the children—the 100,000 children who are subjected to human trafficking each year. Other people who need our help and deserve our help are among the most vulnerable people we can possibly imagine.

All of us are mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers. We all understand this could happen to anybody's family. Why in the world would we want to indulge in this sort of gamesmanship and phony objections to provisions that have been voted for time and again by the same Members who now object to them on this legislation and say to these victims of human trafficking that we don't care and we are not going to help?

I don't believe for a minute that is why Members of the Senate come here. I know virtually all 100 Senators, and I believe that most Senators—if not all Senators—come here because they actually want to do something. They actually want to solve problems. They actually want to help people who need the help. I cannot think of anybody more deserving than the victims of human trafficking.

I see the distinguished Senator from Colorado here. I will yield for him momentarily.

I wanted to come to the floor and respond to the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, that all we need to do is take up and pass the House bill. The House bill doesn't appropriate any money. It is an authorization bill. It authorizes \$5 million in appropriations.

The great thing about our bill is it doesn't take any tax dollars. These are all fines and penalties and asset forfeitures from people engaged in the criminal enterprise, and this takes some of the profit out of this terrible crime.

It also does a number of other things, which I mentioned earlier. But the idea that we can somehow just take up and pass the House bill and avoid this bogus objection and somehow solve the problem, I think, just misses the point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, through the Chair, I would like to thank the senior Senator from Texas for his courtesy in allowing me to speak this afternoon.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be our next Attorney General. It has been 131 days since President Obama nominated her for this position. By Monday, she will have waited longer on the Senate floor than the last seven Attorney General nominees combined.

When it comes to Ms. Lynch's nomination, it seems as if we are setting records—but for all of the wrong reasons. The irony of that is that she is probably one of the most qualified and least political Attorney General nominees that this Chamber has seen in decades.

She has spent a significant portion of her career as a Federal prosecutor in the Eastern District of New York, having twice served as the U.S. attorney. There she took on corrupt public officials and expanded the office's national security practice. She has also worked in private practice at one of the country's top law firms, where she specialized in commercial litigation, white-collar criminal defense, and corporate compliance.

In 2011, she was recognized as the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association Foundation honoree of the year. In 2014, she was honored as the recipient of the Women in Federal Law Enforcement Foundation President's Award. She has received support—no surprise—from all across the political spectrum.

Just this week, even former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani—hardly a great friend of the President—wrote that she was “balanced, professional and a dedicated public servant.” He went on to write that he can “further attest that her skill set seems very appropriate to the tough tasks she would face as attorney general.”

The Major Cities Chiefs Association, which represents the 67 largest law enforcement agencies in the country, wrote this to the Senate: “Ms. Lynch has overseen many important criminal prosecutions for terrorism, organized crime, corruption, drug and gang related cases. It is clear that her familiarity with the Department, managing a fast-paced and high profile office as well as her integrity and private sector legal experiences make her a qualified candidate.”

What are we waiting for?

Some 25 former U.S. attorneys who worked in both Democratic and Republican administrations wrote to this body saying: “Ms. Lynch has the experience, temperament, independence, integrity, and judgment to immediately assume this critically important position.” They should know. They should know. These are the folks with whom she has worked closely, and will continue to work as Attorney General. Both as a Federal prosecutor and in private practice, they have seen firsthand her character, intellect, and her integrity.

I myself once worked for the Deputy Attorney General of the United States at the Department of Justice. I know how close the collaboration is when things are working well between the Attorney General and the U.S. attorneys all throughout the United States of America, and it is something to see.

I know it has become fashionable around this place to continually criticize our Federal employees, but I recommend that our new colleagues, if they ever have the chance, go see the investiture of a new judge in their State, as I have had a chance to do in my State. When you see how the U.S. attorney's office, the Federal public defender's office, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the FBI, and the U.S. Marshals Service are all represented, you will say to yourself: Thank God I live in a country that is committed to the rule of law. Thank God I live in this country instead of most of the countries around the world where they don't even know what the rule of law is.

That is what we have in the United States, and the chief law enforcement officer of this country is our Attorney General.

Everybody who has looked at this nomination from the outside has said she would be an excellent Attorney General. So given all of that, it is awfully difficult to understand why she has had to wait so long just to receive a simple up-or-down vote. Has anyone challenged her qualifications? Come to the floor today and do it. Has anyone questioned her character or integrity? Of course not. Has she failed to provide necessary information to the Senate? It is my understanding that she testified for almost 8 hours and responded to about 900 questions for the record. Is her nomination delayed just to make political points on completely unrelated issues?

I have gotten to the point now that when people come to my office after they have been nominated to be a judge or have been nominated to do something in the Federal Government, the first words out of my mouth are not “Congratulations” anymore; the first words to come out of my mouth are “Don't take it personally. Don't take this process personally.”

We are losing talented people who want to serve the United States of

America in these important and in many cases nonpolitical jobs because the Senate cannot confirm them. It is because we tell somebody like Loretta Lynch: Sorry, it is going to be zillions of days before you have a chance to even serve this country.

It is not right. I am amazed at the capacity of people in this place to waste their own time, but we should not waste other people's time.

Unfortunately, the delay in confirming Ms. Lynch is having real-world consequences. Earlier this week, the former Deputy Attorney General expressed his concern that the protracted nomination process is adding unnecessary uncertainty to the Department of Justice. He highlighted the importance of having continuity in undertaking long-term investigations or in developing national security policy and how it is harder to facilitate continuity the longer Ms. Lynch's nomination is delayed.

As I said, this has become in many ways the new norm in our politics where these fights in Congress are having real-world consequences on the people we represent. It is incredibly counterproductive to the people we represent, whether it is shutting down the Department of Homeland Security or running the government on continuing resolutions or passing 2-week tax extender bills, for goodness' sake. There is not a mayor or county commissioner in the entire State of Colorado who could get away with governing like this, and neither should we. It is obvious to everybody watching the Senate that we have not been productive. We have not really been productive for a long time but certainly not for the last 90 days. We barely managed to keep the Department of Homeland Security open for another 6 months. We passed a resolution of disapproval that the President will veto.

At the very least, we should be able to find the time to confirm Loretta Lynch as the Nation's next Attorney General. Her experience, temperament, and independence make her abundantly qualified for one of the most important positions our country has, and she has waited too long to receive an up-or-down vote.

I am not worried about her; she will be fine no matter what she does. I am worried about the Department. I am worried about our homeland security. I am worried about the willingness of other Americans to put their hand up and say "Let me serve" for fear that they will get caught in the crazy politics of the Senate.

I look forward to supporting Ms. Lynch's nomination. I hope we will have the opportunity to consider that nomination in the coming days.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, this is an important subject. For many, it is a

matter of life and death. So I am pleased that we are taking up this bill so early in the session.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act can save lives, it can restore dignity to the victims of these heinous crimes, and it can help end modern-day slavery. I believe, without a doubt, every Member of this body wants to see this bill become law. I hope we can overcome this delay and send the bill to the President so we can make it a reality.

As the father of three girls and as a grandfather of granddaughters, I support the bill. I cosponsored it. I am eager to see it become law. By doing so, we will build on our previous efforts that have dramatically reduced instances of human trafficking around the globe.

Since the passage of the landmark Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, the United States has been a leader in the international community's fight to end modern-day slavery. This law ushered in a new strategy that addressed human trafficking on multiple fronts.

Combining strong protection for victims, including shelter and asylum, with tough punishments for traffickers, including long jail sentences and asset confiscation, and, most importantly, sanctions for offending governments, the law has enabled us to crack some of the biggest international human smuggling rings.

The most recent statistics show that during the 12-year period from 2000 to 2012, over 1,100 traffickers were charged in the United States, resulting in 755 successful convictions. The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act can replicate these successes in combating international trafficking by helping us take on the traffickers here at home.

This is an effort by my colleagues that we can all agree is worthwhile, which is clear by how easily this passed in committee and by the level of bipartisan cosponsorship it maintains. So I am not quite certain I understand what the Democratic leadership's strategy aims to accomplish. The language they now find objectionable has been in the bill all along. It is standard language that has been around for decades.

On top of that, the majority leader offered a vote to strip the language. Yet the minority continues to block this bill from floor consideration. Not only can they offer an amendment to strip that language, but Members of the minority can offer any amendment they want, any amendment they believe will make the bill stronger. That is the amazing thing about regular order. I know some Senate Democrats are still getting used to the idea after years of being forced to the sidelines by their own leadership, but this is a good change which we should all embrace.

I believe this particular bill was strong from the onset, but I have of-

fered a couple of amendments to make it even stronger and better. Both of these amendments make improvements to our efforts to address trafficking on the global stage.

The first one deals with countries that try to game the system to avoid sanctions. The State Department's tier system for ranking offending countries is an excellent tool for ferreting out the problem governments and prompting positive change. By utilizing the threat of sanctions, we can effect change for the better.

Regrettably, some countries have abused the system and taken advantage of the "special watch list" designation that is supposed to be reserved for troubled nations making good-faith efforts to actually change. These nations have been able to get this designation without ever attempting to address human trafficking and, in turn, avoiding the sanctions that they deserve. China is a perfect example.

With this amendment, we can put an end to the games. It will close the loopholes that allow governments to retain the "special watch list" designation without making immediate progress to reduce human trafficking or face quick removal. This will force governments to take real action, not just a nod and a wink to the problem to buy sanctions relief.

The second amendment aims to put more teeth in the State Department's Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking. This amendment seeks to rename it and elevate it to the status of bureau to increase its effectiveness so that those responsible for this essential diplomatic tool are heard within the State Department.

These two amendments will help our overall strategy to combat trafficking, but again, this bill, as it was introduced, would be a huge help in our efforts to save lives.

The bill has the support of 200 advocacy groups, many of which are law enforcement organizations. These advocacy groups are voicing the same concerns we hear on the local level in our communities back home—that this is a real problem with real victims—and our local officials want this bill passed for that exact reason.

Just last week, I was visiting with some of my State's mayors who were in Washington for the Arkansas Municipal League fly-in, and the issue came up. The mayor of Hot Springs, AR, Ruth Carney, said that this is an issue which is really close to her heart and highlighted that Garland County has a task force to tackle human trafficking. She said: "It's a great thing to see that Congress is working to help with this situation because I feel like it's very important for our country." I imagine that the Senators holding up this bill hear the same thing from their State and local officials. Perhaps they should

listen to them about the importance of getting this done.

So why drag this on longer? We could pass this bill within hours if the Democrats would drop this manufactured outrage over language that has been in the bill since its introduction. This language has literally been applied to similar legislation for decades.

The senior Senators from Texas and Minnesota came together in a bipartisan manner to draft this important legislation. It was passed by the committee, in regular order, in a similar bipartisan manner.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the victims, pass this bill, get them help, and get our communities the resources they need to save thousands more from becoming victims.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today, we are continuing our consideration of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. I should note from the outset this is a bill that essentially every Senator—every single one of us—supports. How could we not? Right now in this country there are thousands of human beings living as slaves—stolen from their homes, stripped of their God-given rights, and robbed of their human dignity. A disproportionate number of these victims are women and children, often forced into sex slavery. These are crimes that shock the conscience, and every single one of us should do everything in our power to stop this scourge and help make the victims whole again.

The legislation we are currently considering makes important steps toward achieving those goals. It treats children trapped in these horrible circumstances for what they are—victims, not criminals. It imposes stiff penalties on traffickers, exactly the sort their despicable crimes merit. It establishes an effective means of restitution for the victims, helping them to begin to rebuild their lives in the wake of enormous suffering.

I applaud the majority leader for his commitment to getting this bill passed. It is exactly the sort of legislation the Senate should be considering. While this may seem an obvious point, it is worth spelling out why this is true.

The majority leader's traditional right to be recognized first gives him control over what sort of legislation we consider. There is always a temptation to bring up partisan bills, so-called messaging bills. These bills are not designed to actually pass; after all, we all

know we need 60 votes for cloture and 67 votes to override a veto. Instead, the goal of these messaging bills are to make a political point for the next election or even just for the next news cycle.

In the last Congress, the Democratic leadership called up these sort of messaging votes week after week. They repeatedly moved to bring up highly partisan bills that they refused to let us attempt to amend, with full knowledge that many of us would therefore have to vote against them and in most cases have to make them get at least 60 votes.

In last fall's election, the American people showed just how fed up they were with partisanship and gridlock by voting in a new Republican majority that promised a return to productive legislating through regular order. The majority leader's commitment to passing this human trafficking bill demonstrates how those of us in the new majority are trying our hardest to keep our promise to get the Senate back to work for the American people. This is not about partisan messaging votes doomed for failure. This is about getting a bill with broad bipartisan support passed into law that makes meaningful progress in our fight against the evils of human trafficking. Scoring political points for our party is rightfully taking a backseat for producing important results for our country.

Nevertheless, our majority can only do so much on its own. Simply put, it is hard to get much done in the Senate without bipartisan cooperation. So for all the restraint the majority has shown by bringing up bills such as this one that enjoy broad bipartisan support, we need at least some measure of restraint from the minority. By restraint, I do not mean to call for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to give up all their principles and simply give in to everything the majority wants. Instead, I mean the minority cannot demand getting their way on every single issue, that they should be willing to work through the open amendment process to reach an accommodation. Unfortunately, we find ourselves at an impasse with the minority claiming we somehow ambushed them with supposedly controversial language that they now are demanding we remove. My colleagues and I have come to the floor repeatedly over the past few days to illustrate just how ridiculous that claim is—how the language that is in the bill has been in there every step of the way since its introduction and how the Democrats had voted for it over and over again over the nearly 40 years it has been settled law.

Beyond all of the rhetoric, the pivotal moment in this debate came when the majority leader came to the floor and offered an up-or-down vote to strip

out the language in question. This offer should have settled this controversy once and for all. It represented the majority leader extending his hand across the aisle in hopes of cooperation, but the minority leader objected, demanding a guarantee the provision would be removed. Well, that is not the way it works around here. That moment revealed what this logjam is really about. This is about the minority leadership resorting to the same "my way or the highway" tactics they abused when they were in the majority, tactics that have no place in a body built on compromise. This is about trying to stir up a fake controversy to fit a discredited war-on-women narrative.

Above all else, this is about scoring political points and trying to embarrass the majority by undermining our efforts to govern responsibly. This behavior is itself embarrassing and unworthy of this great institution in which we all serve, but it comes at a price.

It comes at a price for the victims of human trafficking whose suffering we are all committed to alleviate. It comes at a price for those men, women, and children living in silence, fear, hopelessness, and unspeakable anguish.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not bad people—far from it. They are men and women of great character who want to do the right thing for their constituents and for the Nation. I have enormous respect for each and every one of them, but in this latest maneuver, I feel many of them have gotten so caught up in partisan rhetoric—something that is so easy to do in Washington—that they have staked out an unjustifiable position that is prolonging the suffering of trafficking victims.

Let's be honest about it. The Hyde amendment has been in many bills that we all voted for time after time after time. However, NARAL, the National Abortion Rights Action League, and Planned Parenthood have tried to make this into an issue that it should never have been made into. Unfortunately, we don't have any courage on the other side of the aisle except for a few Senators who are willing to vote with us. We don't have any real courage to take on these people.

My gosh. I mean there comes a time—keep in mind, how do Republicans give in on this when this has been such an established law of our country?

I ask my colleagues to take a step back from the heat of the debate to think about this language that has been in the bill from the very beginning, that they have voted for in so many other contexts, that has been the settled law of the land for nearly 40 years, that they have rejected an up-or-down vote to remove, and that they have demanded be removed as a condition for passing this important legislation.

Is picking this fight really worth it?

Is scoring points against Republicans really worth the costs of victims of human trafficking?

Is trying to undermine our efforts to govern worth sacrificing the opportunity to help these men, women, and children in need?

The choice is clear. I applaud my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are pushing to end this stalemate, especially my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are willing to sacrifice temporary political gain to do the right thing for these victims we all want to help. I plead with those who have yet to join our efforts to move this bill forward to realize the suffering they are prolonging and to change their approach at the earliest possible opportunity.

#### GEOSPATIAL DATA REFORM ACT

Mr. President, in addition to urging the passage of the bill under consideration to fight human trafficking, I want to highlight another important bipartisan bill I have introduced and urge its speedy consideration. It is exactly the sort of productive legislating in which I believe the Senate should be engaged.

I rise in strong support of the Geospatial Data Reform Act, a bipartisan bill that will save taxpayers money while improving public safety, bolstering public development and preserving our natural resources through wider accessibility to geospatial data.

I am grateful for Senator WARNER's collaboration on this bill. Without his partnership this legislation would not have been possible, and I wish to thank him for his support over the past several months. Together we have worked tirelessly to craft bipartisan legislation that streamlines the way Federal agencies collect, manage, and distribute geospatial data to better serve the American people.

Whether we realize it or not, geospatial data is ubiquitous in our everyday lives. Geospatial data is the information that identifies the geographic locations and characteristics of natural or constructed features and objects. To make this abstract concept more tangible, consider that every time we turn to the GPS on our phones we rely on geospatial data to find our destination. Geospatial data is an invaluable information resource, and we are just beginning to tap its full potential.

Every year, private businesses and government agencies are finding new and innovative ways to use this information to better deliver services to the public and to improve overall quality of life. FEMA's use of geospatial data during Hurricane Sandy is testament to the merits of this information resource.

The tragedy of Hurricane Sandy is still fresh in our memories. In 2012, this late autumn storm ravaged our eastern

seaboard, battering buildings, toppling homes, and demolishing power lines, leaving behind a wake of destruction and shattered lives. Sandy was the deadliest hurricane to reach our shores since Katrina in 2005. In addition to the human toll, Sandy extracted a heavy financial cost, with estimated damages exceeding well over \$50 billion. By using geospatial data, our government was better equipped to respond to this catastrophe. As victims rummaged through the rubble and wreckage of their broken homes, FEMA set to work analyzing geospatial datasets to identify over 40,000 homes damaged by the storm. This information allowed the Agency to pinpoint the most devastated neighborhoods and dispatch emergency personnel to those areas more quickly and efficiently. The use of geospatial data in response to this tragedy played an integral role in coordinating emergency response and helping families repair their damaged lives.

The way FEMA used geospatial data to aid victims of Hurricane Sandy is just one powerful example of the positive impacts geospatial data has on our lives.

But there are many more. The CDC also uses geospatial data to track disease outbreaks, informing decisions that ultimately save lives, the Department of Education uses geospatial data to analyze test scores from schools across the country to make plans for improvement, and the National Park Service uses geospatial data for resource management and to conserve our Nation's natural treasures.

There is almost no end to the sundry uses and benefits of geospatial data, but as the Federal Government invests billions of dollars every year in the collection and storage of geospatial data, there is a serious problem of interagency duplication. This duplication stems from a glaring lack of coordination between agencies on efforts to collect this information. In short, agencies are spending inordinate sums in taxpayer dollars to collect the same geospatial data other agencies may have already collected.

These duplicative efforts are a monumental and inexcusable waste of taxpayer money. Although the executive branch has been working for decades to reduce duplication and standardize the process for collecting and storing geospatial information, it has received little help from Congress.

The legislation Senator WARNER and I have introduced provides the executive branch the resources and direction it needs to reduce duplication and engender cooperation among agencies to ensure the efficient collection and dissemination of geospatial data across all levels of government. To save the taxpayers money, our bill requires Federal agencies to implement international consensus standards for

geospatial data and assist in eliminating duplication.

The Geospatial Reform Act also codifies the implementation of the national spatial data infrastructure and provides agencies with a clear definition for geospatial data and metadata.

In addition, this bill standardizes the collection process by requiring agencies to comply with the Federal Geospatial Data Committee's standards for the development, sharing, and use of geospatial information.

Finally, our bill ensures accountability, transparency, and public access to nondefense-related Federal investments in geospatial data. Already, States, counties, municipalities, and the private sector are discovering dynamic ways to use and share geospatial data with one another.

Collaboration in this sphere is leading the way for new and improved services that were previously impossible to deliver. These entities outside of the Federal Government are finding new ways to coordinate investments and implement common standards. We need to do the same on the national level. We need proper Federal management for these data assets, and we need a national strategy for their many uses.

Our legislation provides the foundation for both. In a political environment clouded by polarization, this bill is a ray of hope. It is an opportunity for us to work together in a bipartisan fashion to pass commonsense legislation that is based on transparency and good governance.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the American taxpayer by supporting this bill. It is the right thing to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business, and that following me, the Senator from Washington be allowed to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### OSO MUDSLIDE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, almost 1 year ago, on a calm Saturday morning in the small town of Oso, more than a square mile of mud rushed down a mountainside in my home State of Washington. In a matter of seconds, dozens of homes were destroyed, dozens of people were missing, and they were trapped in the debris from the mudslide.

It was unclear at first the extent of the damage, the number of people trapped, and what could be done in the face of such devastation. First responders risked their own lives, braving dangerous conditions to look for survivors. Some were pulled from the rubble, but so many, too many, were lost. Houses over more than a square mile were simply swept away. The main highway to nearby Darrington was blocked, isolating that community. Forty-three

people—children, mothers, brothers, and aunts—were killed.

This was the deadliest mudslide in our country's history. A year later, there is not a single person in Oso who has not been affected by this devastating natural disaster. In the blink of an eye, they saw water and earth wipe away their homes and their entire community. Let me tell you what I found when I visited the small nearby town of Arlington, where recovery plans were being made just days after the mudslide occurred 1 year ago.

I saw small towns like so many across the country in all of our States, the types of towns where everybody knows each other, the types of places where everyone stops to say hello and lend a helping hand. What I saw that day last March was a community where there was not a single person who was not doing every single thing they could to help.

Amidst the terrible destruction, I saw hope. I spoke to firefighters who had not slept for days, refusing to stop searching for survivors. I saw neighbors and friends and volunteers providing food and shelter and hugs and prayers, anything to assist the community who had experienced the unthinkable.

I want to tell one story from the days following that awful moment, a story that has been told before but bears repeating. A local woman named Rhonda Cook heard about the slide and she found out that her friend was driving by and was buried when the slide hit. Rhonda spent days digging through that debris looking for that blue car she knew was there somewhere, determined to bring her friend out of the mud.

When that car was finally uncovered and her friend's body was lifted out, Rhonda paused to pay her last respects. But then she kept on digging, looking for others. Rhonda is just one of the many heroes. There were so many, and so many more who continue working to this very day.

Last year, I joined many others in a pledge to stand with the people of Oso and Darrington in the months and years to come and to do whatever we could to help them on the road to recovery. I was proud to work with my colleagues in the Senate and with our friends in the House to make sure the Federal Government was offering a hand, because we are a nation that sticks together when times are tough.

We worked to secure housing grants and FEMA funding and transportation investments to repair State Route 530. More than 600 National Guard soldiers were deployed to help in the emergency response. The main highway through Darrington reopened finally last summer. Homes are now being rebuilt. Lives are being pieced back together. While I am so grateful for all that has been done to aid the recovery, our work is far from done.

Although the devastation will eventually be cleared, injuries will heal, the emotional scars will always remain, and the memory of those who were lost will never leave us. A disaster of this magnitude requires long-term assistance to help these communities respond, rebuild, and cope. Now a year down the long road of recovery, there is one word that comes to mind when trying to explain what the people of Oso and Darrington are at their core: resilient.

Aid workers searched for remains to return to loved ones for as long as 4 months after that mudslide. A man who lost his wife and son gave thousands of dollars in donations to other victims who he thought needed the money more than himself.

The people of Oso and Darrington will look back on March 22, 2014, this weekend, remembering lost homes and lost loved ones and even pets. I want those communities to know that all the way here across the country in the other Washington, I stand with Oso. We stand with Oso. Their resiliency in the face of such unthinkable devastation is an inspiration to us all. We will always remember what it means to be "Oso strong." They have the thoughts and prayers of everyone in the country to continue rebuilding, from Washington State to Washington, DC, and everywhere in between.

I yield the floor to my colleague, Senator CANTWELL, who, as I was, was there time and time again with this community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague from Washington, Senator MURRAY, on the observance of this very solemn milestone. This Sunday will be 1 year since this catastrophic event. I want to thank Senator MURRAY for something she did not mention, which is her leadership on helping us get passed the Green Mountain Lookout legislation in the aftermath of this event, which is legislation that she had championed for a long time and yet had been stuck. When people realized there were things we could do for this community to help restore its recreational and economic activity, she got on it and we were able to pass that very quickly. So I thank her for that leadership.

This Sunday is a very solemn milestone, because 43 Washingtonians lost their lives in a very destructive mudslide that buried the highway between the communities of Darrington and Oso and nearby Arlington. These communities lost loved ones, friends. Their memory will be with us for a long time. These communities have shown that even in the most unimaginable devastation, people can come together in unity and persevere. They showed how light and hope can shine through even in grief.

Now, after many months, stores are reopening, the highway is again bustling, there are new connections of Internet and phone lines being restored, residents are rebuilding, and they are hoping for a brighter economic future.

As my colleague said, we were very inspired by the hope and grace of this community, that continues to demonstrate that on a daily basis. It is hard to believe that a year has gone by. On that morning, it became just like every other morning, a rainy Saturday morning, and people went about their business. But as the heavy rain weakened one of the hills in the Stillaguamish Valley, the resulting landslide was approximately 1 square mile. Forty-nine homes were destroyed, 530 were covered, and the Stillaguamish River was basically rerouted. So many problems arose. But immediately more than 1,000 volunteers descended. Many from the local community, with their own transportation systems, their own rigs, came to the river and devoted thousands of hours to try to help survivors and to help the community recover.

This American flag was hoisted by one of the firefighters. It is tacked to a standing nearby tree, just to show our resilience. Much like the American flag, this community was battered and bruised but was very proud. During those days, many Washingtonians would make sure that every resource was made available to this community. When faced with these immense challenges, these communities of Darrington and Oso pulled together and, yes, Oso became "Oso strong."

It was a rallying cry for the volunteers, to the young people, to many people who were working many hours a day. Private companies and individuals, corporations, tribes, charities, nonprofits—all sorts of governments chipped in. Everybody helped. We want to thank them for that help. It was just a year ago that it seemed as though every resource covered the festival grounds and the Forest Service parking lot, FEMA, Snohomish County, the Department of Natural Resources, the National Guard, fire departments up and down the State. They continued to make sure everything was addressed—recovery efforts underway, local people gathered, such as the small business owner there in Darrington, Kevin Ash, who tried to keep a plan for every business to stay open.

We looked at what could be accomplished for the future. Out of these meetings, we were able to secure a \$150,000 grant from the Economic Development Administration to draft an economic disaster recovery plan for the community. That plan is set to be unveiled in June and help the local economy that once was heavily dependent on logging that was hit hard by this disaster.

Senator MURRAY and I have worked with Mayor Dan Rankin from Darrington, whose leadership and on-the-job focus for this has helped the community continue to survive this incredible disaster. There are so many strategies Mayor Dan has put into place that are about how the community moves forward.

Over the past year, the Small Business Administration awarded \$400,000 in low-interest loans to help rehabilitate businesses in the area. It is helping the Darrington-Arlington economy and others in the affected area. Through their innovation and hard work, everybody is trying to help what is called the Upper Stillaguamish Valley not just get back to where it was but flourish in the future. This is some of the most beautiful territory in our State, from the heights of Glacier Peak to the depths of the Upper Stillaguamish Valley. This typifies the beauty of the Northwest.

I want to make sure we thank the appropriate people who helped us in this response: President Obama, who visited the area; Homeland Secretary Jeh Johnson; FEMA Director Craig Fugate; obviously our Governor; Representative DELBENE, who was there practically every moment of this disaster, from the moment it happened, for days and days and days, and then around the clock, shuttling back and forth between Washington, DC, and the site; Congressman LARSEN; obviously SBA Administrator Maria Contreras-Sweet, who came to the site; the Red Cross; the Oso fire station.

We talk about first responders here. But when you see first responders for small communities step up and address such an incredible natural disaster and coordinate everything—I want to say a thanks to Willy Harper from the Oso fire station, and Travis Hots, who was the incident command leader for the first several days from Snohomish County Fire District, which brought all of the resources together to try to make the planning and recovery efforts for this incredible disaster go as smoothly as possible; County Executive John Lovick and Sheriff Ty Trenary. I also want to say Arlington Mayor Barbara Tolbert did more for the community in using every resource she had to help support the recovery of these Washington residents. Some communities might say, well, that is somewhere down the road, and who is going to help us? But she put every Arlington resource onto this site, knowing it might be months and months and months before she ever saw any of the resources to reimburse them.

We want to thank Arlington for everything they did. So while we will this weekend be having a moment of silence on the site, we have to remember the individuals we lost, and how we need to move ahead. This hillside bears an unmistakable scar. It has inflicted deep

wounds. But it is healing because of the friends and neighbors who have strengthened us in this region.

We want to make sure that the memories of those we lost will fuel our determination to do better. Regardless, it is not going to be easy, it is not going to be quick, but we will continue to build off of the strength this community demonstrated in the aftermath of this disaster.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator HEITKAMP, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, for the past 10 days this body has been engaged in an important debate on a bill that has had widespread, bipartisan support, that was reported unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and that would help to end the scourge of human trafficking.

I am a cosponsor of this bill because I believe it will help equip law enforcement and prosecutors with the tools they need to combat these horrific sex trafficking crimes.

I, along with my colleague, Senator LEAHY, have also introduced a bill—that we have filed as an amendment—that would reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs so we can also have a prevention piece in this legislation.

Many Members of this body have worked very hard on this legislation. Senator CORNYN, whose bill we are considering, has been a real leader in the area of human trafficking. Senator KLOBUCHAR also has a bill I have been proud to cosponsor. Senator GRASSLEY and Senator LEAHY, at the request of all 20 of the women Senators, held a hearing on this issue at which I was privileged to testify, along with Senator AYOTTE, Senator MIKULSKI, and Senator GILLIBRAND.

I applaud the Judiciary Committee for its work in shining a light on some of the darkest stories imaginable. No State is immune from the evils of human trafficking.

Just recently in Maine, a couple was arrested for allegedly trafficking a girl who was only 13 years old. They used the Internet to sell her for sex.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act that Senator LEAHY and I have cosponsored seeks to prevent young people from ever getting trapped in these situations

in the first place, and I hope we can move on to that bill, which we have filed as an amendment.

But, regrettably, we find ourselves at an impasse—imagine that—an impasse on a bill that would help curb human trafficking. How can that be?

Senator HEITKAMP and I have joined forces to try to move this bill forward. That is our goal, and the goal of the amendment we have filed.

What our amendment would do, and it is very straightforward, is it would subject the fund that Senator CORNYN has created, and which I strongly support, to the annual appropriations process and to all of the usual restrictions that the Appropriations Committee can and does add to appropriations bills.

There is precedent for taking a fund that is not financed by tax dollars and sending it through the appropriations process. It, frankly, happens all the time. We have seen it with the oil and gas revenues that go to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Those are not tax dollars.

We have seen it with a number of fees and restitution programs that are not tax dollars but go through the appropriations process, where the Appropriations Committee can work its will.

Under our amendment, all of the money collected from special assessments imposed on certain trafficking criminals and deposited into the fund would still be made available to anti-trafficking and victims' services grant programs, but only through the direction of the annual appropriations process. By placing the fund squarely within the jurisdiction of appropriators, each and every penny collected would be subject to the limitations in those appropriations bills. Our amendment would strike the reference that has been the sources of this controversy from this authorizing bill, but does not alter that restriction on federal funds that has existed for 39 years.

Our amendment makes clear that money in the fund, or transferred from the fund, is subject to the limitations provided in appropriations acts.

I believe our amendment, by allowing the Appropriations Committee to put whatever restrictions are appropriate on this fund—and I have no doubt the usual restrictions will be put on by the Appropriations Committee—could get this bill to move forward, and those such as Senator CORNYN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and others who have worked so hard to bring this bill to the Senate floor, will see there is a path forward.

We owe it to the victims of human trafficking. We owe it to the victims of human trafficking. We owe it to them. We cannot fail in this task. If we cannot approve a bill to deal with human trafficking, then what will we be able to deal with?

We have to get past the tendency to score partisan, political points that



have affected too many bills on both sides of the aisle. In this case, it is simply too important.

I thank my dear friend and colleague from North Dakota, Senator HEITKAMP, who has been an attorney general, who has dealt with the victims of this terrible crime, for coming forward and joining with me as we attempt to put forth—for our colleagues' sincere consideration—a path forward that will end this impasse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I thank my great friend, the Senator from Maine. She has been so instrumental in achieving compromise in the body, whether it is in the Commonsense Caucus, when we were in shut down, or it is just bridging the gap many times and trying to find a path forward for us to legislate in the Senate. She truly is a champion in her efforts in trying to make this body work.

I wish to start off by saying that as an attorney general, the whole while I was attorney general—for 8 years—there was very little activity on prostitution. When I was running for office, I visited with law enforcement—and I still have a lot of friends in law enforcement—and I asked them: What are your challenges? Every local sheriff, especially those in western North Dakota, and every city chief of police said: We have a growing concern with prostitution.

I started thinking about that. I started thinking about what that meant. Then I started looking behind what those claims of prostitution were, and I began to realize that for very many of these young women—often children—who are in this life of prostitution, it is not by choice. This is some of the most horrific victimization that goes on in America today—the victimization of small children, the dehumanization of small children, the challenge of a recovery once they are given an opportunity to find a different path forward, the addiction that comes with it, the grooming that comes with it, and the shame that comes with it.

Many people say they want to prevent this, but very often we know the victims of human trafficking come from homes that weren't the healthiest of homes. These are very often runaways, they are homeless youth, and they have no other option for recovering, they have no other option for sustaining their life than being part of this horrific experience.

So as my great friend from Maine talks about this, we need to do a better job in getting the tools for prosecution, which is the excellent bill Senator KLOBUCHAR has advanced for promoting safe harbor legislation, which will not only help in the path to recovery but also will give us an opportunity to encourage more and more of these victims to come forward as witnesses for

the prosecution. It is very difficult to convince someone who has been told for years and years, as they have been in the life, that "If you tell about this victimization, what will happen is you will go to jail with me. So we have to stick together." How do we break that cycle of control? We break it by providing opportunity, which these bills do. We break it by passing the homeless youth and runaway bill. We break it by focusing a bright light on this problem.

I could not have been prouder of this body as we moved toward these series of bills on homeless youth and moved forward on these series of bills on trafficking. This body was speaking for some of the most disenfranchised citizens in our country—those victims of human trafficking. So you can imagine my despair and I think the despair of a lot of victims groups and the despair of a lot of people in this body when we reached this impasse.

It is important that we say that the goal now is not to rehash what has happened in the past, it is not to rehash the problems and the concerns everybody has had in the past. We must set aside all of that. Set aside all of the rancor we have heard for the last week and focus on one thing: Focus on a victim who may be watching us. Focus on a victim's advocate who may be wanting and needing and desperately seeking the help we can provide that advocate in providing a secure future for these victims. Let's focus on them. Let's focus on what we can do to bridge this impasse.

My friend Senator COLLINS and I think we have, as she has described it, advanced a proposal that we believe firmly resolves all the issues. It sets forth a path where we can, in fact, move forward and listen to the voices that don't get heard very often in places like Washington, DC, and respond to their concerns, respond to the victimization, be the empathetic body I know we can be by saying: Yes, we can help, and we will help.

So my colleague and I hope this will at least generate enough discussion, provide at least enough of a bridge forward that we can continue to have the dialogue, continue to address amendments—if we can get through this—and actually move this issue forward.

I yield to my great friend from Maine, but I would like to ask her a question. As an appropriator, I know there may be some controversy. She has raised this already. There is some discussion that this may not be an appropriate place to make this decision, and I would like my colleague to elaborate on the appropriations process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. If I could respond through the Chair, Mr. President, I do have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Appropriations, and I

have seen the restrictions we have put on funds over the years. One of those restrictions which is at issue here goes back 39 years. So it is not unusual for the Committee on Appropriations to put certain limitations on the use of funds.

As I explained earlier, the Committee on Appropriations also deals with nontax dollars. It is not unusual for us to appropriate money that comes from the collection of fines, of fees, of penalties, from leases. This is common. So what we are proposing in this bill is not anything new, unusual, or unique. It would be part of the standard appropriations process.

Indeed, Senator CORNYN actually raised the idea on the floor today of having the victims fund go through the appropriations process. We differ in language, so I don't want to imply there is any endorsement, but the concept is one the author of the bill has raised.

So in response to my colleague from North Dakota, who has spoken so eloquently of her experience in dealing with the victims of human trafficking, I would assure her that as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I know full well that we put restrictions and limitations on funding as a standard course.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I would like to have a moment where we think about this body and how impressed everybody throughout the country is, how proud they are of our system of government, how proud of the great decisions that have been made in this room and of the great deliberations and the great debates. This truly is a remarkable government, and it is a remarkable system. But it has always been remarkable because it is not just the wealthy and powerful who have a voice in this body. With us comes the opportunity to speak for the most disadvantaged Americans, the most disadvantaged people in our system. And I cannot imagine a more horrific life than the life of being sold into prostitution. I cannot imagine a more horrific life than being enslaved through the horrible events of human trafficking.

Let's speak for those victims. Let's speak for those advocates who work so hard, who have been so encouraged that an issue such as this has become a priority issue for the United States of America. Let's try to bridge this gap. Let's work across the aisle, and let's reach to find a way forward because these victims deserve our attention, they deserve this debate, and they deserve our voice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I again want to thank my colleague from North Dakota for her very eloquent plea to our colleagues.

I know we can do this. I know we can find a path forward. I know we can get a sufficient number of votes so that we can proceed and debate the many amendments that have been filed on this bill. I know we can do it. The victims of this horrific crime deserve no less from the United States Senate, so let's not fail them. Let's not fail them.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor again today to talk about the importance of getting the bill passed, and we have seen today for the first time—I talked I think 3 hours yesterday—the need to change the tone and try to work across the aisle on some ideas to move forward with this bill. That is happening in many conversations in this Senate Chamber and in offices, and I am pleased that we have had a change in tone and that we have some possibility of moving forward. I thank my colleagues for that.

Senator CORNYN and I have worked on this issue for a long time. In addition to the bill that is on the floor today, we also have the important safe harbor bill that I am leading and that Representative ERIK PAULSEN is leading in the House. This is a bill—since it went out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously and has none of the issues and controversy involved in the current bill on the floor—I hope will be able to get through this Senate Chamber in the coming week as either part of this bill or on its own.

This safe harbor bill, of course, is about treating the victims of sex trafficking as victims and not treating them as criminals when they are 12 years old. It is taking a model from Minnesota and 15 States and now creating incentives to bring it out to the rest of the country.

So what is it we have been talking about here over this last week? We are talking about 27 million people around the world who are victims of some kind of trafficking every year. Some of this is labor trafficking, but what we are focused on this week is sex trafficking. It is the third biggest criminal enterprise in the world. The first is illegal trafficking of drugs, the second is illegal trafficking of guns, and the third is illegal trafficking of girls and young boys. And the average age is 12 years old—not even old enough to drive a car, not even old enough to go to their first prom.

Last year, I went to Mexico with Cindy McCain, and we met with a number of officials and prosecutors and vic-

tim advocates who were working to fight this crime in Mexico. We visited a shelter for abused girls. We met with the Attorney General and with the Federal Police. But what I most remember of all of those meetings as to how we could better coordinate our focus on sex trafficking was the visit to the Covenant House in Mexico City, where there were girls as young as 11 years old who were victims of trafficking.

There was one girl who truly stood out. Her name was Paloma. She was new to the house which had taken her in and was in the first stage of recovery. Unlike the other girls who spoke through an interpreter, she could speak English, but all she could say was her name, and then she couldn't stop crying. And while some of the other girls told their stories, she never told her stories in words. She only told her story through her tears. That is a moment I won't forget.

It reminded me of something I heard when I visited a refugee camp once in Jordan, where a mother said she had seen things that would make stones cry. That is what that little girl Paloma was saying through her tears, that the experiences she had had of being trafficked at 11 years old would make stones cry. These are real stories.

When Polaris—one of the major groups working on this issue of sex trafficking—released their State-by-State rankings of efforts to fight human trafficking, here is what they had to say:

The scope and scale of human trafficking within the United States presents a daunting challenge to policymakers, service providers, law enforcement, and advocates. Originally, human trafficking was thought to be more of a problem in other countries, but now it is known to be happening in our own backyards. It is estimated that there are hundreds of thousands of victims of sex and labor trafficking inside our borders.

But what we know today is that 83 percent of the victims in the United States are from the United States. It is not just girls at the bottom of a ship—which does happen—it is girls right in our country, girls right in Minnesota, on the streets of Rochester, where just in the last few months we had a 12-year-old girl who got a text inviting her to a party, showed up at a McDonald's parking lot where she was supposed to go, a guy puts her in a car, takes her up to the Twin Cities, rapes her, takes sexually explicit pictures of her, puts them on the Internet. The next day she is sold on Craigslist to two other men and raped. That happened in Minnesota. That man has now been indicted by the U.S. Attorney's office. But we have seen these cases over and over again.

People say, why is this getting worse? Why is the Senate debating this issue right now? It is because, as much as we love the Internet, and we know

it has provided a vehicle for this kind of activity so that it is much easier for people to do behind closed doors where no one notices them basically get these young girls in their grasp.

Yesterday I spent nearly 3 hours reading from a book by Nicholas D. Kristof and Sheryl WuDunn about international sex trafficking called "Half the Sky." I did that because I felt the tone had gotten so bad in this Chamber on both sides, with people hurling accusations and not even being willing to talk about possible ways to resolve this, and I am glad again that now we are finally talking today.

They have another book about domestic sex trafficking, which is the focus of the bill on the floor today, as well as our safe harbor bill. They tell a story of a girl named Clemmie. The book is called "A Path Appears." They say:

One of the first women whom Becca helped was Clemmie Greenlee, an African American woman who had been raped repeatedly beginning at the age of five and then systematically pimped from the age of twelve. Clemmie began drinking at the age of eight, dropped out of school in fourth grade, and soon became a heroin addict and an expert at robbing johns. On one occasion she did more than steal. A customer was beating her so badly, so she pulled out a knife and stabbed him. "I didn't see blood, so I stabbed him again, four more times," she said. He almost died, but fortunately for Greenlee he was a married man who begged the police not to press charges, and without his testimony they didn't have a case. She was freed.

By 2001, Greenlee was a gaunt eighty-five pounds, sleeping on the streets or in abandoned buildings, all of her money was going to crack cocaine. She had had a son who was killed in gang violence. She was seen as having so little commercial value that pimps abandoned her. An old friend from the streets found Greenlee in a crack house and dragged her over to see Reverend Stevens at Magdalene.

This is an example of what we are seeing across this country—right in our own country. These stories are so raw and so ugly, but I tell them and read from that book yesterday just so people remember why we are here and what we are dealing with, so we can put some of these issues—extraneous issues, things we need to change in the bill and fix in the bill, that we have some motivation to do it. These girls really don't know how to change the laws in Congress. They need our help to do that.

My good friend Cindy McCain, through her work at the McCain Institute—and I see Senator RUBIO here from Florida, who is also familiar with that work and knows what she has done. They undertook a study looking to get some baseline data on sex trafficking around big events. We have seen what happens where we have increases in Web site advertising and other things, and we have seen what happens when law enforcement actually comes together across all jurisdictional lines—Federal, State, and

local—when the private sector engages, like our hotels—hotels like the Radisson Hotels in Minnesota. Marilyn Carlson Nelson has been such a leader on this, and has really set up and helped to fund foundations, because they see it. They know their workers are on the frontline and can actually stop it from happening—or airlines, like Delta, American, United that are on the frontlines and they train employees so they can stop this from happening.

So, yes, these bills will help. The bill we have on the floor right now that Senator CORNYN and I worked on, and many others in this Chamber, will help get funds for the victims and for these shelters. The bill I am leading with Senator CORNYN will actually help to make sure our States get incentives to make sure we are handling these criminal prosecutions in a way that works, that emboldens the victims so they don't go back to the pimps, so they don't go back to that cycle of violence, so they actually feel they are in a safe harbor, that they are in a safe place so they will testify against these perpetrators—the ones running these rings, these crooks, these people who are treating these young girls as chattel. That is what these bills are about.

So we need a path forward. I think for the first time today we are seeing—despite no agreement yet and a lot of ideas out there, we are seeing a different tone. I want people to remember that not only will this bill involve the fund I am talking about, but once we either join it or pass separately our safe harbor law, it will also create incentives for States to change their laws. It will also create a national sex trafficking strategy that is in my safe harbor law. It will also allow these young girls who are victims to be part of job training programs and other things, to make it easier for our law enforcement with an amendment that I included in my bill from Senator SESSIONS and Senator WHITEHOUSE with the U.S. Marshals. There are many good things that are going to help.

Mostly, we are going to send a message from this Chamber, finally, after all of this acrimony over the last days and all of the blame, that we can finally send a message to that little girl named Paloma that this country believes in her. We believe these lives have value, and we must stand up for these victims—not only in our country but internationally.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I thank my colleagues. I know these conversations are continuing as we work to find a path forward. I thank Senator CORNYN for the work we have done together. I look forward to getting this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, let me begin by acknowledging the work the sponsors of the human trafficking bill are doing. Trafficking is a sanitized way to discuss this issue. It is actually slavery, and I am glad that term is finding its way into the lexicon of how this is discussed.

It is not just the sex trafficking—sex slavery—it is also labor trafficking, which is a major problem in this country as well.

I do hope we can find a way forward on this one. It is an extraordinarily important issue, one that has taken far too long to pay attention to. It is not something that happens just around the world, but it happens here closer than we think.

#### ISRAEL

Mr. President, I want to talk about a separate topic today as well. It is one a lot of people have been reading about in the newspapers over the last 72 hours.

As we all know, there was an election in Israel this week, and many people are wondering: What is this aftermath of the election we keep reading about, where there is this controversy and back and forth? Certainly some of that happened a few weeks ago, when the Prime Minister of Israel visited Washington and spoke before the Congress. People are wondering, what is it that is going on here and why is there so much controversy around all this? I want to take a moment to delve deeper into this, because this is important.

First of all, to answer the fundamental question: Why should we care about what is happening with Israel, in Israel, and about Israel? There are two reasons I think we should care.

The first is because Israel represents everything we want that region of the world to be. Israel is a democracy, as evidenced by the vibrant election process they just underwent. Israel is a free enterprise economy, a developed economy, that provides prosperity for its people and its partners in trade and commerce. And Israel is a strong American ally—a democracy, a free enterprise, and a strong American ally.

Don't we wish the entire Middle East looked that way? Don't we wish we had more countries in the Middle East that looked like Israel—that were allies, that were democratic, and had a free and prosperous economy? How much better would the world be if the Middle East looked more like Israel and less like Iraq and Syria and other places look like at this moment?

There is another reason why we should care about Israel. Israel is not just another country. It has a special and unique purpose. It was founded as a homeland for the Jewish people in the

aftermath of the Second World War and of the Holocaust, where over 6 million human beings were slaughtered. It was founded on the promise that never again in the history of the world would there not be a place for the Jewish people to go and be safe. It is not just a nation, it is a nation with a special and unique purpose unlike any other nation in the world, and I for one am proud that the United States has stood with Israel for all these years, and I am proud that the American people on a bipartisan basis have stood behind the Jewish State of Israel for all of these years. So the security, safety, and future of Israel is in our national security interest, as well as a moral obligation of every Member of this body and us as a nation.

What are the underpinnings of Israeli security? There are two things. First, the ability of Israel to defend itself; and the second, the reality that if Israel ever has to defend itself, the United States will be there to support them.

There is little doubt about the first pillar of its security. As the Prime Minister reminded us: Unlike many other countries, Israel is not asking us to send American soldiers or aircraft to support them. They are willing to defend themselves. But the second pillar, about strong and unquestionable American support, is increasingly being questioned around the world. And there is good reason why.

Let's begin with the aftermath of this recent election.

As far as I know—maybe this has changed in the last few hours—after this election, the President has yet to call the Prime Minister. That is unlike, of course, the fact that in March of 2012, he was among the first to call and congratulate Putin in Moscow. Or that in June of 2012, he was among the first to call Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood when they won the Egyptian Presidency. Or that in November of 2012, he called to congratulate the top Chinese Communists on their new position—which, by the way, is not elected in the way you and I would consider there to be an election. Or the fact that in 2013, there was an historic phone call. They bragged about how he called the Iranian President and congratulated him on his election. And of course, in August of 2014, he called to congratulate Turkey's President Erdogan.

And on and on.

Time and again, this President has made a habit of quickly calling these leaders when they win. But as of 4:40 p.m. eastern time, as far as I know, that call has yet not been made. Thinking about all the things that have been going on with Israel, we would think he would be quick to make that call. It hasn't happened. Maybe it has already, but it certainly didn't happen fast enough.

But where does this come from? Is this new? Is this something that just happened recently? It isn't. In fact, we can start to see the trends here pretty early.

In October of 2008, then-Senator Obama told an audience in Cleveland:

There is a strain within the pro-Israel community that says unless you adopt an unwavering pro-Likud [one of the political parties in Israel] approach to Israel that you're anti-Israel.

Which is a silly comment to make, since at that time that party had been out of power.

In January of 2009, the President, upon taking office, makes a quick phone call to the Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas before he even phoned the Israeli Prime Minister. Abbas's spokesman Nabil Abu Rudeina quoted Obama as saying:

This is my first phone call to a foreign leader, and I'm making it only hours after I took office.

In July of 2009, the President hosted American Jewish leaders at the White House, and he reportedly told them that he sought to put "daylight" between America and Israel. Here is the quote that someone at that meeting says he made: "For eight years [during the Bush administration] there was no light between the United States and Israel, and nothing got accomplished," he declared.

In September of 2009, in his first address to the U.N. General Assembly, President Obama devoted five paragraphs to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, during which he declared—to loud applause; by the way, in the United Nations, no surprise—"America does not accept the legitimacy of continued Israeli settlements." He went on to draw a connection between rocket attacks on Israeli civilians with living conditions in Gaza. There was not a single unconditional criticism of Palestinian terrorism.

In March of 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton berated Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu on a now infamous 45-minute call, telling him that Israel had "harmed the bilateral relationship." By the way, the State Department triumphantly shared details of the call with the press. That same month, the Israeli Ambassador was dressed down at the State Department, and Mr. Obama's Middle East envoy canceled his trip to Israel, and the United States under his leadership joined the European condemnation of Israel.

In May of 2011, the State Department issued a press release declaring that the Department's No. 2 official would be visiting "Israel, Jerusalem, and the West Bank," as if Jerusalem was not part of Israel. So they left that separate.

Later in the month, only hours before Mr. Netanyahu departed from Israel to Washington, Mr. Obama deliv-

ered his infamous Arab Spring speech, which focused on a demand that Israel return to its indefensible pre-1967 borders with land swaps.

In November of 2011, an open microphone caught part of a private conversation with the President and French President Nicolas Sarkozy. Sarkozy said of the Israeli premier:

I can't stand Netanyahu. He's a liar.

But rather than defend Israel, the President piled on. He said:

You're tired of him; what about me? I have to deal with him every day.

In February of 2012, at a conference in Tunis, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was asked about Mr. Obama pandering to "Zionist lobbies." She acknowledged that it was "a fair question" and went on to explain that during an election season "there are comments made that certainly don't reflect our foreign policy."

In 2014, during the Gaza conflict, the White House and the State Department criticized Israel for the deaths of Palestinians who were being used as human shields by Hamas. But far worse and far more suggestive of the President's true feelings was the White House's decision to try and use arms supplies as a pressure point against Israel.

In October of 2014, an anonymous administration official called Prime Minister Netanyahu "a chicken—" I can't even finish it.

That is what has happened up to this point. That is what has happened up to this point. What has happened now? An election just happened 2 days ago. The first thing the White House says is: You used a lot of divisive language in that election. That is saying a lot from someone who has been elected at least once, probably twice, on extremely divisive language.

But what about when Iran had a fraudulent election in 2009 and the people of Iran took to the streets to protest in the famous Green Revolution? You know what the White House said? We are not going to comment on that election because we are not going to interfere in the sovereignty of Iran. They will comment on the elections of an ally, calling the rhetoric of the election divisive. But when an enemy—which is what Iran is—has a fraudulent election and kills people who protest against it, we can't comment. We can't comment because that would be infringing on their sovereignty.

The other thing that has happened is the Prime Minister made a statement about how a two-state solution isn't possible given the current circumstances. What does the White House do? They jump up and say: Well, that means we may have to reconsider. We may have to go to the United Nations Security Council now and support a resolution, and that means not to use our veto authority to stop a resolution that calls on Israel to create a Palestinian State with 1967 borders.

Why would the Prime Minister of Israel say that, by the way? He is right; the conditions don't exist. Do you want to know why the conditions don't exist? First of all, let's go through the history of peace negotiations.

In 2000, at Camp David, Israel offered the Palestinian Authority nearly all of the West Bank, Eastern Jerusalem, and Gaza. The Palestinians said no. In 2000, Israel withdrew from southern Lebanon. Do you know what that is today? That is a place where they launch rockets against Israel.

In 2005, Israel withdrew from Gaza. Do you know what that is today? A place where they launch rockets from against Israel.

In 2008, Israel offered—again, to the Palestinian Authority—nearly all of the West Bank, nearly all of Judea and Samaria and Eastern Jerusalem. The Palestinian authority said no.

What about the Palestinian record? Let's begin with the fact that according to many reports, about 6 percent of the Palestinian budget is diverted to pay the salary of prisoners. That means the salary of terrorists, of people who have blown up centers and killed civilians, including Americans. They are being paid salaries and benefits, including with money from donors, such as the United States, Great Britain, Norway, and Denmark.

Here is another material on how the PA routinely depicts a world without Israel. This is from a Palestinian schoolbook:

Palestine's war ended with a catastrophe that is unprecedented in history, when the Zionist gangs stole Palestine . . . and established the so-called State of Israel.

Or what about this particularly horrific expression of ideology which appeared in a Palestinian Authority daily as far back as 1998:

The difference between Hitler and [British Foreign Minister] Balfour was simple: the former [Hitler] did not have colonies to send the Jews to, so he destroyed them, whereas Balfour . . . [turned] Palestine into his colony and sent the Jews. Balfour is Hitler with colonies, while Hitler is Balfour without colonies. They both wanted to get rid of the Jews . . . Zionism was crucial to the defense of the West, [by] ridding Europe of the burden of the Jews.

This is from a daily of the PA. These are the people with whom we are pressuring them to cut a peace deal.

What about this?

The Palestinian Authority has named numerous locations and events after Palestinian terrorists responsible for killing Israeli civilians.

What about this? This opinion piece appeared in the New York Times in 2013:

The Palestinian Authority's television and radio stations, public schools, summer camps, children's magazines and Web sites are being used to drive home four core messages. First, that the existence of a Jewish state . . . is illegitimate because there is no Jewish people and no Jewish history. . . .

Second, that Jews and Zionists are horrible creatures that corrupt those in their vicinity. Third, that Palestinians must continue to struggle until the inevitable replacement of Israel by an Arab-Palestinian state. And fourth, that all forms of resistance are honorable and valid, even if some forms of violence are not always expedient. Instead of being schooled in the "culture of peace," the next generation of Palestinians is being relentlessly fed a rhetorical diet that includes the idolization of terrorists, the demonization of Jews and the conviction that sooner or later Israel should cease to exist.

These are the people with whom this President wants to put pressure on them to cut a peace deal. I think Netanyahu is right. The conditions do not exist for a peace deal with people who teach their children that killing Jews is a glorious thing. The conditions for peace do not exist with a people—with a government, I should say, not a people. The people are victims of this government, the Palestinian Authority—not to mention Hamas, which teaches people that killing Jews is a glorious thing, that there is no such thing as a Jewish people, that any methods of destroying them is valid, that pays them salaries and benefits.

This President is making a historic mistake. Allies have differences. But for allies such as Israel, when you have a difference with them and it is public, it emboldens their enemies—to launch more rockets out of southern Lebanon and Gaza, to launch more terrorist attacks, to go to international forums and delegitimize Israel's right to exist. This is what they are doing.

This is a historic and tragic mistake. Israel is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. If this were a Republican President doing these things, I would give the exact same speech. In fact, I would be even angrier. This is outrageous. It is irresponsible, and it is dangerous. It betrays the commitment this Nation has made to the right of a Jewish State to exist in peace. No people on earth want peace more than the people of Israel. No people have suffered more at the hands of this violence and this terrorism than the people of Israel. They need America's support unconditionally. If there are differences, they need to be dealt with privately as we do with other allies.

More than anything else, they deserve to be treated with more respect, not less than the respect this President and this White House is giving the Supreme Leader of Iran. He would not dare say the things about the Supreme Leader of Iran now that he is saying about the Prime Minister of Israel because he wouldn't want to endanger his peace deal or his arms deal that he is working out with them.

I hope he will reconsider. I hope the bipartisan nature of our support of Israel is reinvigorated. I hope that once again this body, this Congress, and this government will recommit themselves to this extraordinarily important rela-

tionship, because if America doesn't stand with Israel, who would we stand with? If Israel—a democracy, a strong American ally on the international stage—is not worthy of our unconditional support, then what ally of ours around the world can feel safe in their alliance with us?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, today I want to comment on the recent election in Israel and the Obama administration's outrageous reaction to it. Two days ago Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu's Likud Party won a decisive victory in the Israel election. For myself and on behalf of 3 million Arkansans, I want to offer hearty congratulations to Prime Minister Netanyahu. I have the greatest admiration for the Prime Minister's visionary and courageous statesmanship, as well as his service as a young man in his country's elite special operations forces. Prime Minister Netanyahu and his family have paid the highest price over the decades in the fight against the common enemies of Israel and the United States.

Yet let me also stress that the alliance between the United States and Israel is not an alliance for this or that Israeli statesman nor this or that Israeli political party. Nor, for that matter, does the alliance depend on whom or which party controls the White House or the Congress. Rather, it is an alliance between the American people and the Israeli people, between the ultimate defender of the West and the easternmost frontier of the West. Our alliance rests on our shared experiences and principles: our Judeo-Christian heritage, respect for the natural rights of mankind, democratic self-government, market-based economics, and strong provision for our common defense. Israel's commitment to democratic elections demonstrated just this week an important distinction from many of their neighbors and why they are our closest ally in the region.

Apparently, President Obama harbors such deep-seated and irrational antipathy for Prime Minister Netanyahu that he is now willing to upend this decades-long alliance. President Obama's antagonism toward Prime Minister Netanyahu is longstanding and well known. Last year, for example, anonymous administration officials used a vulgar epithet to question Prime Minister Netanyahu's courage.

I will point out, as an aside, that anonymity is the Washington coward's shield, just as I am also compelled to point out that, so far as I know, neither the President nor his senior political aides served in our country's elite special operations forces, unlike Prime Minister Netanyahu.

Back to my main point, in the last 48 hours, more anonymous administration

officials have suggested a fundamental rethinking of the United States-Israel alliance, citing Prime Minister Netanyahu's simple restatement of fact that there can be no Palestinian State until conditions change. The Palestinian Authority must, at a minimum, eject Hamas from its governing coalition, reclaim control of the Gaza Strip, accept a demilitarized eastern border in Judea and Samaria, and recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State. As Prime Minister Netanyahu has said, if the Palestinians lay down their arms, there will be peace. But if Israel lays down its arms, there will be no Israel.

The Obama administration, though, has gone off the deep end and let their personal bitterness towards the Israeli Prime Minister drive their public foreign policy toward our closest ally. Here are just a few quotes from administration officials suggesting a fundamental change in our relationship with Israel and a willingness to abandon Israel at the United Nations.

One official said: "We are signaling that [if the Israeli government's position is no longer to pursue a Palestinian state,] we're going to have to broaden the spectrum of options we pursue going forward."

According to reports, that same official "wouldn't rule out a modified American posture at the United Nations, where the U.S. has long fended off resolutions criticizing Israeli settlement activity and demanding its withdrawal from Palestinian territories."

Another senior White House official said:

The premise of our position internationally has been to support direct negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians. We are now in a reality where the Israeli government no longer supports direct negotiations. Therefore we clearly have to factor that into our decisions going forward.

Finally, State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said:

We're currently evaluating our approach. We're not going to prejudice what we would do if there was a UN action.

Some observers will dismiss these comments as the petulant response of a President and political operatives who didn't get their way in the elections this week. But there is something much more worrisome underway. While Prime Minister Netanyahu won a decisive victory, he still has just started assembling a governing majority coalition.

These kinds of quotes from Israel's most important ally could very well startle some of the smaller parties and their leaders with whom Prime Minister Netanyahu is currently in negotiations. This raises the question, of course, if the administration intends to undermine Prime Minister Netanyahu's efforts to assemble a coalition by suggesting a change to our longstanding policy of supporting

Israel's position with the United Nations.

After all, if you were an elected leader in Israel's parliament, you surely would worry about the United States refusing to exercise its veto at the U.N. Security Council. Consider the United Nations' long and dark history of anti-Semitism.

The U.N. Human Rights Council has condemned Israel in 45 resolutions since its creation in 2006. In 2013, the U.N. General Assembly adopted a total of 21 resolutions singling out Israel for disapproval and just 4 resolutions for the rest of the world.

Fifty percent of all emergency special sessions of the General Assembly over the last six decades were convened to denounce Israel. Meanwhile, no emergency special session has been called for any other state in over 30 years. Given this history and the stakes here and abroad, let me speak bluntly so there can be no misunderstanding. Under no circumstances will I or this Congress allow the Obama administration to abandon Israel to the United Nations or any other international institution or to change fundamentally the terms of our alliance with Israel.

This administration's latest outrageous pronouncement is even more difficult to understand as they simultaneously coddle the terrorist regime in Iran. The people of Israel should know the American people remain in solidarity with them in their quest to exist peacefully with their neighbors and that we will not allow them to be thrown to the jackals at the United Nations—a characterization made famous by a past Member of this body, the late Daniel Patrick Moynihan. I call on all Members of this body, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to join with me in one voice supporting our ally Israel against the jackals.

In the coming days—perhaps as soon as the debate over the budget resolution next week—I will propose legislation that reaffirms the longstanding policy of the United States to continue to defend Israel against attacks at the United Nations and other international agencies. I urge all Members of this body, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have a long history of supporting Israel, to join me in supporting such legislation.

Further, should the United Nations, its subordinate agencies, the International Criminal Court or any other international agency take adverse action against Israel, I will consider introducing legislation to restrict U.S. funding for the offending agency. Finally, if the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations does not exercise the American veto against any anti-Israel resolution, I will also consider introducing similar legislation to restrict funding to the Ambassador's office.

For decades, the relationship between Israel and the United States has transcended political and personal differences. Our shared interests were enough to overcome any ideology or personal disagreement, but I fear mutual respect is of little concern to this administration. The President and all those senior officials around him should carefully consider the diplomatic and security consequences of their words. This Congress certainly will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from Maryland.

#### SYRIAN WAR CRIMES ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the ongoing crisis in Syria. Sunday, March 15, marked the fourth anniversary of the beginning of the Syrian civil war.

Since this brutal war began, more than 3.8 million Syrians have fled Syria, 7.6 million have been displaced within Syria, and 12.2 million Syrians are in need of humanitarian assistance. Most tragically, more than 205,000 people have died as a result of the war. This past year was the deadliest year since the conflict began, with more than 76,000 dying in 2014 alone, including more than 3,500 children.

One thing has remained clear over the last 4 years—the war tactics employed in Syria by both government and opposition forces represent gross violations of human rights and fly in the face of internationally accepted rules of war.

The United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on Syria has reported that the progovernment forces have murdered, tortured, assaulted, and raped civilians in Syria. Antigovernment groups have also engaged in murder, execution, torture, hostage-taking, and shelling of civilian neighborhoods. Medical workers and hospitals across Syria have also been targeted, but nowhere was the brutality of this war more evident than the events of August 21, 2013, when the Syrian Army, under the direction of President Assad, launched a chemical weapons attack in the Damascus suburbs killing 1,400 Syrians.

The United States, along with the international community, has a long tradition of upholding international norms, including holding accountable those guilty of crimes against humanity and war crimes. The international community cannot stand by and allow the murder of innocent men, women, and children to go unchallenged. He must immediately bring Assad and all the perpetrators of gross human rights violations in Syria to justice. This cannot wait another year.

Earlier this week, I reintroduced the Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act, along with my colleagues Senators RUBIO, MENENDEZ, SHAHEEN, and PETERS. This bipartisan legislation establishes a Syria-specific standard of

reporting and accountability for crimes against humanity. The bill will require the U.S. State Department to report to relevant congressional committees on war crimes and crimes against humanity committed in Syria. This would include an account of war crimes and crimes against humanity committed by the regime of President Bashar al-Assad and violent extremist groups and other combatants involved in the conflict.

Today, as I stand on the floor of the Senate, the violence is continuing unabated.

Some of my colleagues may be aware of a Syrian defector and photographer named Caesar. Caesar fled from Syria in 2013 with more than 55,000 photos documenting the torture and murder of more than 11,000 civilians. Last week, some of those photos were put on display at the United Nations.

We must shine a light on the atrocities that have been committed in Syria and demand accountability. Ignoring these violations sends a message to the global community that war crimes and crimes against humanity are tolerable. The Syrian people deserve much more than that.

On this fourth anniversary of the beginning of the Syrian war, we must recommit to supporting the Syrian people through humanitarian efforts and by holding those individuals and groups which are guilty of committing war crimes and crimes against humanity accountable for their atrocities.

I ask my colleagues to stand with the Syrian people and join me in supporting the Syrian War Crimes Accountability Act.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. President, I will also take time to urge my colleagues to immediately bring Loretta Lynch's nomination to the floor of the U.S. Senate to be the next Attorney General of the United States.

Ms. Lynch currently serves as the Senate-confirmed U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. She has already been confirmed by the U.S. Senate. She served with great distinction as the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District.

I had the chance to visit with her last January and talk to her firsthand about her vision to be the next Attorney General of the United States. She is extremely impressive, very well qualified, and has the right values to be the Attorney General of the United States.

I will give a few examples. I know all of us are concerned about equal justice to the law. Well, Ms. Lynch has lived that through her own personal commitments. At Harvard Law School, she was a member of the Legal Aid Bureau, helping people who otherwise would not have been able to afford access to our legal system.



Ms. Lynch has a long and distinguished record of prosecuting terrorists, sex traffickers, organized crime cartels, corrupt politicians, and dangerous gangs. She has been endorsed by a wide variety of law enforcement agencies and individuals.

Put it this way: I have not heard anyone question her qualifications. I have not heard anyone question why she should not be confirmed to be the next Attorney General of the country.

Loretta Lynch's nomination has been pending on the Senate floor as long as the five most recent Attorneys General combined. If we take five of the most recent Attorneys General and add all the time it took for their nominations to be confirmed, Loretta Lynch is now exceeding that. That is not fair.

President Obama is entitled to have his team in place, and we have a responsibility to vote on his nominations. Let's do the right thing and take up this nomination, debate it, and then have Senators vote up or down, not maybe, on her nomination. We owe it to Ms. Lynch, the employees of the Justice Department, and the American people to have a newly designated Attorney General in place as the Nation's chief law enforcement officer and top defender of Americans' constitutional rights.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BISHOP GORMAN HIGH SCHOOL 60TH DIAMOND ANNIVERSARY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to honor the 60th anniversary of Bishop Gorman High School in Las Vegas, NV.

In 1954, Bishop Gorman High School opened as the first Catholic high school in Southern Nevada. I congratulate the institution on 60 years of leading our country in first-rate education while positively implementing Catholic values.

Bishop Gorman High School has graduated more than 9,000 students and currently has a 100 percent graduation rate and a college bound rate of 96 percent, making Bishop Gorman a national leader in college preparatory

education. The school is equipped with an impressively experienced and credited faculty, with nearly 70 percent holding advanced degrees. The administration and the faculty's dedication to providing excellent education in a Catholic setting, in addition to a low student-teacher ratio, has contributed to Bishop Gorman's success and helped ensure that its students can reach their full potential.

The school takes pride in providing its students with a well-rounded education that includes strong academic principles, faith, and competitive athletic opportunities. Over the past 60 years, students have won 97 State athletic championships and received State and national recognition in academics, fine arts, and extracurricular activities.

Bishop Gorman High School also gives back to the local community and the State. Every year they organize multiple service events, and this past year, art students designed a beautiful courtyard for a transitional home in Las Vegas. Additionally, the National Honor Society students volunteered each week at a local food bank.

I applaud Bishop Gorman High School President John Kilduff and Principal Kevin Kiefer for their strong leadership and recognize this year's Knight of the Gaels honoree, Jack Raftery, Sr. I am pleased that through your joint efforts and the dedication of those before you, this remarkable institution has been a part of our community for 60 years. Best wishes for continued success, and congratulations on this great achievement.

#### BLACK WOMEN'S HISTORY WEEK

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I request that the U.S. government officially recognizes the last week in March as Black Women's History Week. During the week of March 23, as part of Women's History Month and in honor of the U.N. declaration of 2015 as the decade of Afro descendants, this week marks the perfect occasion on which to begin an annual recognition and celebration of Black women's history and contributions to American society.

Black women have long gone above and beyond the call of duty in their contributions to American society through civic engagement, high voter turnout, and stepping up as leaders and bulwarks in their communities. Even in the face of grave oppression throughout our Nation's history, Black women have continued to stand strong and contribute to the well-being of their families, communities, and our country as a whole. A recognition of Black Women's History Week on the part of the Obama Administration and Congress would send a critical message that the government wishes to elevate their role in history and contemporary

society and recognizes the unique struggles they continue to experience today.

Black women have consistently played a critical role in this Nation's history, often with little thanks or recognition. Harriet Tubman escaped slavery and bravely returned to the enslaved South 13 times to herald her people to freedom on the Underground Railroad. A century later, Rosa Parks witnessed the oppression of her people—specifically her fellow Black sisters—and took an active role in organizing the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Today, a Black woman is our nation's First Lady. Recognition of Black Women's History Week would honor and uplift the sacrifices of women such as Harriet Tubman and Rosa Parks, who paved the way for Barack and Michelle Obama to reach the White House, and me to address you on their behalf today.

Yet at the same time that Black women from our Nation's history have become inspirational symbols of strength and perseverance, Black women today continue to face the necessity to persevere through undue burdens as they navigate American society. They must try to hold their families together as primary caregivers when family members are incarcerated or killed, support their children as they grow up in food deserts and attend failing schools, they must continue to persevere when our society does not provide them with adequate support and equal rights. All the while, many Black women struggle to forward their own careers and provide for their families. Recent U.S. Department of Labor data shows that while job prospects are improving for nearly every group in America, one glaring exception remains: Black women. Since August 2013, Black women are the only group for whom unemployment rates have not fallen.

Karen McLeod's experience as a 59-year-old college graduate with two degrees who cannot find steady employment sheds light on the economic tribulations many Black women face. Karen went from making \$30 per hour as a respiratory therapist to \$16 per hour at a nonprofit, to \$8.67 per hour, working only 4 hours per week. In her current circumstances, she has had to make a series of tough decisions to get by. Karen sold her jewelry to pay for gas, pawned her television for food, and was forced to ask local nonprofits for rent assistance. Karen's story represents the experiences of a growing number of Black women, whose conditions are not improving with economic recovery. White House recognition of Black Women's History Week will serve to acknowledge and call attention to the continued struggles Black women face in our society today and will send the critical message that their government cares about what they are going through.



This year, a coalition of organizations advocating for the well-being of women and communities of color will partner to elevate the stories, histories, and realities of Black women's lives. Each day of the week, starting on March 23 and continuing through March 29, will focus on a different issue Black women face in American society today, from economic disparities to educational achievement to police violence. Exploring these issues and acknowledging the centrality of Black women to our history and social fabric, along with recognizing the uniquely gendered and racialized inequities they face, is critical as we seek to extend equal rights to all Americans. I hope and request that this will be the first year in what will become an annual tradition of celebration and intentional recognition of our sisters through Black Women's History Week.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO DON SHORT

• Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I would like to recognize an exceptional Iowan who has been devoted to the State and to our agricultural heritage. After serving as president of Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area since 2001, Don Short has announced his retirement.

Don Short was raised in Winthrop, IA, where he took over the family farm. From early on, Don has dedicated his efforts to farming and agricultural policy. He was employed with Moews Seed Company, a family owned business since 1927 that specializes in corn seed production. Afterward, Don worked for DuPont Seed Company.

Don's experiences in agriculture have provided him the insight necessary to lead the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area. For 15 years, he has been able to protect and promote natural, cultural, and historic areas. He spearheaded efforts to maintain and strengthen the Silos and Smokestacks National Heritage Area and has been a dogged advocate on its behalf. He is a farmer whose desire is to keep agricultural heritage alive through partnerships, such as historic sites, tourist attractions, and businesses that bring economic benefits to Iowa.

I want to congratulate Don Short on his retirement and his success over the years. Silos and Smokestacks will no doubt miss his daily contributions; however, he plans on remaining a consultant on a part-time basis. I thank him for his unwavering commitment to improving agricultural policies and making Iowa a better place.●

##### REMEMBERING WILLIAM DAVID ROTH

• Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to speak today in remembrance of Wil-

liam David Roth, who passed away on March 17, 2015.

William "Bill" David Roth, 71, of Albany, NY, lived an extraordinary life and made major contributions to U.S. public policy. He was the son of Dr. Oscar Roth and Dr. Stefanie Zeimer Roth, refugees from Vienna who arrived in the United States just prior to the onset of World War II. Bill graduated magna cum laude from Yale University in 1964 after majoring in mathematics, economics, and politics. This is all the more remarkable given the fact that a neuromuscular disorder from the age of 8 left him unable to write. He performed complex mathematical equations and logical formulae in his head. He was also a formidable presence at Yale and later at the University of California, Berkeley, where he received his Ph.D. in 1970. He was that rare person who was both a man of thought and action and who inspired others by overcoming great odds and obstacles. From 1971 to 1972 he taught political science at the University of Vermont. He very well may have averted a Kent State tragedy in 1972 by permitting himself to be arrested at the Federal building in downtown Burlington during a nonviolent student protest against the Vietnam war. While Roth was offered immediate release because of his disability, he chose instead to remain until all the students had been released from the Burlington city jail. In this way he showed one of the virtues of civil disobedience, conducted with dignity and without violence, thus serving as an example and inspiration to others.

Subsequently, he went to work on the Carnegie Council on Children in Connecticut. He coauthored a landmark book that dealt searchingly with children with disabilities. His first major work was called "The Unexpected Minority: Handicapped Children in America." He also coauthored "The Grand Illusion: Stigma, Role-expectations, and Communication." These are widely acknowledged as providing the analytical basis for the disability rights movement as well as fostering a new academic discipline, disability studies.

Bill's work emphasized the disability movement's core vision: the most socially incapacitating aspects of disability are not the inescapable consequence of biology but the result of countless social decisions that do not acknowledge the needs of people with different bodies and, indeed, discriminate against people whose bodies are different. Bill went on to pioneer the use of computer technology for people with disabilities and in 1984 founded the Center for Computing and Disability at SUNY, Albany, one of the first such centers in the Nation. Bill was widely acknowledged through his scholarly research, technological imagination, and progressive politics,

as one of the founders of America's disability rights movement. He helped establish the framework for the Federal Disabilities Act and his work over the years addressed the architectural, transportation, and technological barriers to living with a disability in the United States.

As a longtime professor at the University at SUNY School of Social Welfare he taught courses in social policy and disability studies. In recent years, Bill's research and writing focused on illuminating the damage done in the aggressive pursuit of dismantling of the U.S. welfare state. His book, "The Assault on Social Policy," Columbia UP, is now in its second edition. It is recommended reading for all of my colleagues. Bill Roth fought not only with issues in disability but with his own neuromuscular disorder. He was a little like the phoenix—the bird that kept coming back. He was one of the most courageous people I have ever known. He was brilliant, imaginative, inventive, and utterly fearless. Bill inspired those of us who had the good fortune to know him. As Senator Joe Lieberman noted upon hearing of Bill Roth's death:

Bill was an extraordinary person—gifted, strong, funny, inspiring. We were blessed to know him.

As lawmakers, we have benefited from his many contributions to public policy and discourse. We remember and honor him for these accomplishments. Bill Roth overcame serious illnesses as well as disabilities. He served as a courageous example to his family, friends, colleagues, and students.●

##### RECOGNIZING HELM PAINT & DECORATING

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses often set the bar for quality and service across the United States. When quality and customer service are at the forefront of a business's mission, viable, sustainable jobs are created for countless members of our communities. Such is the case with the Small Business of the Week, Helm Paint & Decorating of Hammond, LA.

Ronald "Bunky" Helm opened shop in 1970 on Earhart Boulevard in New Orleans. Despite having to move from their original location after Hurricane Katrina in 2005, the Helm family has continued to bring excellent service and paint colors to south Louisiana. Today, Helm Paint is more than just a paint store—offering a wide variety of specialized paint, decoration, and accessory consultation. Helm's self-proclaimed goal is for their customers to have a customized and quality experience.

Last week, I had the distinct honor of officiating the grand opening ribbon cutting of Helm in Hammond, LA. The Hammond store is one of six locations serving south Louisiana communities.

Each store participates in its surrounding community, holding events throughout the year in support of local charities and other organizations. Helm Paint & Decorating is also a testament to how vital small businesses are for creating jobs for Louisianians. Much of the company's staff are second, third or even fourth generation employees who serve second, third, and fourth generation customers. Because Helm employees are experts in the products they sell, the majority of customers only have to complete a project once. As the locals like to say, Helm Paint & Decorating is not just a business, it is an experience.

Congratulations again to Helm Paint & Decorating for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your commitment to customer service and creating quality jobs in communities across the State.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1030. An act to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1030. An act to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1191. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emer-

gency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-988. A communication from the President of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 Annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Assessments from the Secretaries of Defense and Energy, the three national security laboratory directors, and the Commander, United States Strategic Command (OSS-2015-0289); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-989. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "NASA FAR Supplement, Contractor Whistleblower Protections" (RIN2700-AE08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-990. A communication from the Board of Trustees, National Railroad Retirement Investment Trust, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual management report relative to its operations and financial condition for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-991. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a semiannual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-992. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from October 1, 2009, through September 30, 2012; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-993. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the implementation of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission for the period from January 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-994. A communication from the Chief, Administrative Law Division, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Central Intelligence Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2015; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 796. A bill to incentivize State support for postsecondary education and to promote increased access and affordability for higher education for students, including Dreamer students; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 797. A bill to amend the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 798. A bill to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength or when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation places a lien against an insurance company's assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 799. A bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HATCH, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 800. A bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. COATS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HATCH, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 801. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide for appropriate designation of collective bargaining units; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 802. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 803. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide employees in the private sector with an opportunity for compensatory time off, similar to the opportunity offered to Federal employees, and a flexible credit hour program to help balance the demands of work and family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 804. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 805. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to make Hispanic-serving institutions eligible for technical and financial assistance for the establishment of preservation training and degree programs; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 806. A bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for preemployment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BENNET, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 807. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform and reset the excise tax on beer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 808. A bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 809. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified elementary and secondary education tuition; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 810. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 811. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require States to develop policies on positive school climates and school discipline; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 812. A bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 813. A bill to provide the Secretary of Defense with authority to transfer funds in order to mitigate the effects on the Department of Defense of a sequestration of funds available to the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 814. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 815. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 816. A bill to amend the Coquille Restoration Act to clarify certain provisions relating to the management of the Coquille Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 817. A bill to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 818. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 819. A bill to reauthorize and reform the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 820. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 821. A bill to establish requirements with respect to bisphenol A; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 822. A bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 823. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 206 West Commercial Street in East Rochester, New York, as the "Officer Daryl R. Pierson Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 824. A bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 825. A bill to terminate the authority to waive certain provisions of law requiring the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran, to codify certain sanctions imposed by Executive order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 826. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to sunset rules after 10 years unless agencies undergo notice and comment rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 827. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TOOMEY,

Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 828. A bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 105. A resolution recognizing the 194th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 106. A resolution designating March 22, 2015, as "National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day"; considered and agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 148

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) were added as cosponsors of S. 148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require State licensure and bid surety bonds for entities submitting bids under the Medicare durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DMEPOS) competitive acquisition program, and for other purposes.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 615

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Is-

land (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 624, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to enable hospital-based nursing programs that are affiliated with a hospital to maintain payments under the Medicare program to hospitals for the costs of such programs.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 737

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 737, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend the application of the Medicare payment rate floor to primary care services furnished under Medicaid and to apply the rate floor to additional providers of primary care services.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of

1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 783

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings.

S. 793

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 793, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 797. A bill to amend the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, our Nation faces an infrastructure investment crisis across the board, but one aspect of our infrastructure that has been particularly neglected by the Federal Government is rail. While the Nation's large freight rail carriers are able to invest in infrastructure with their own funds, the infrastructure used by passenger and many smaller freight railroads is deteriorating at an alarming rate. We need to be doing more to repair and modernize these tracks, roadbeds, bridges, tunnels, and train cars.

Nowhere is the investment crisis more pressing than in New Jersey, where a set of tunnels constructed under the Hudson River in 1910—badly damaged by Hurricane Sandy—must either be replaced or shut down sometime over the next two decades. The shutdown scenario is unacceptable to the economy of not only my State, but the entire northeast region, if not the country.

Amtrak has a plan, known as the Gateway Program, to replace these tunnels, as well as the century old Portal Bridge. Executing the Gateway Program will take a significant funding commitment from the Federal Government, and I stand ready to fight for that funding. But, given the significant upfront cost, and the long-term benefits and revenue potential, it makes sense to explore financing opportunities in addition to funding.

The Federal Government already has an established financing program in the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program, or RRIF. However, the RRIF program is fraught with limitations, particularly

in its ability to finance fixed infrastructure projects like a bridge or tunnel. The program is significantly underutilized, especially relative to other Federal financing programs.

That is why I am introducing the Railroad Infrastructure Financing Improvement Act. This bill would incorporate into RRIF the policies that make other Federal loan programs more successful. For instance, it will establish new creditworthiness criteria focused on the merits of the project, increase repayment flexibility, help leverage private financing opportunities, speed up the process of applying for and receiving a loan, and improve access to the program particularly for smaller applicants.

The bill is meant to start a conversation about the tools we currently have available for investing in rail infrastructure, and the improvements we can make to start getting critical projects like the Gateway Program off the ground. I look forward to working with my colleagues and rail stakeholders to build upon this proposal and move forward on a comprehensive passenger rail reauthorization bill.

By Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 799. A bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, next month I look forward to hosting our Nation's newest drug czar at a forum in Covington, KY. It is a forum that will allow Director Botticelli to hear firsthand accounts of the devastating impact of one of America's most significant public health challenges and one that continues to hit my State particularly hard—the growing epidemic of prescription drug and heroin abuse.

It is hard to overstate the challenge. Drug overdoses, largely driven by pain killers, now claim more Kentucky lives than car accidents, and rising heroin overdose rates now account for nearly one-third of all drug overdose deaths in Kentucky.

While statistics such as these are devastating enough, they hardly paint the full picture because they don't account for the thousands of innocent children born dependent on opioids. The numbers are hard to hear. Nationwide we have seen a staggering 300-percent increase in the number of infants diagnosed with newborn withdrawal since 2000. But in Kentucky, we saw similar numbers grow by an almost unbelievable 3,000 percent.

It is a tragic challenge, and I say that especially as a father of three daughters. But it is a challenge we can do something about. If Washington enacts the bipartisan Protecting Our Infants Act that I am introducing today,

along with Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania, it is a challenge we will do something about.

This bipartisan bill will do a number of important things. It will direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop recommendations both for preventing prenatal opioid abuse and treating infants dependent on opioids. It would direct the Secretary to help develop a strategy to address research and program gaps—a step recommended by GAO in one of their reports released last month—and it would encourage the Director of the CDC to work with States to help improve surveillance and data collection activities in this area.

Obviously, no piece of legislation would ever solve the challenge overnight, but the bipartisan Protect Our Infants Act can help move the country in the right direction. That is why it is supported by the March of Dimes, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. That is why an identical bill will also be introduced in the House today by Congresswoman KATHERINE CLARK of Massachusetts and Congressman STEVE STIVERS of Ohio.

I commend these Representatives and Senator CASEY for their leadership on this issue. I look forward to working with them to advance this important measure through Congress, and I look forward to discussing it with Director Botticelli during his visit to Kentucky in the next few weeks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 799

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Opioid prescription rates have risen dramatically over the past several years. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in some States, there are as many as 96 to 143 prescriptions for opioids per 100 adults per year.

(2) In recent years, there has been a steady rise in the number of overdose deaths involving heroin. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the death rate for heroin overdose doubled from 2010 to 2012.

(3) At the same time, there has been an increase in cases of neonatal abstinence syndrome (referred to in this section as “NAS”). In the United States, the incidence of NAS has risen from 1.20 per 1,000 hospital births in 2000 to 3.39 per 1,000 hospital births in 2009.

(4) NAS refers to medical issues associated with drug withdrawal in newborns due to exposure to opioids or other drugs in utero.

(5) The average cost of treatment in a hospital for NAS increased from \$39,400 in 2000 to \$53,400 in 2009. Most of these costs are born by the Medicaid program.

(6) Preventing opioid abuse among pregnant women and women of childbearing age is crucial.

(7) Medically-appropriate opioid use in pregnancy is not uncommon, and opioids are often the safest and most appropriate treatment for moderate to severe pain for pregnant women.

(8) Addressing NAS effectively requires a focus on women of childbearing age, pregnant women, and infants from preconception through early childhood.

(9) NAS can result from the use of prescription drugs as prescribed for medical reasons, from the abuse of prescription drugs, or from the use of illegal opioids like heroin.

(10) For pregnant women who are abusing opioids, it is most appropriate to treat and manage maternal substance use in a non-punitive manner.

(11) According to a report of the Government Accountability Office (referred to in this section as the “GAO report”), more research is needed to optimize the identification and treatment of babies with NAS and to better understand long-term impacts on children.

(12) According to the GAO report, the Department of Health and Human Services does not have a focal point to lead planning and coordinating efforts to address prenatal opioid use and NAS across the department.

(13) According to the GAO report, “given the increasing use of heroin and abuse of opioids prescribed for pain management, as well as the increased rate of NAS in the United States, it is important to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of planning and coordination of Federal efforts on prenatal opioid use and NAS”.

#### SEC. 3. DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTING AND TREATING PRENATAL OPIOID ABUSE AND NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”), acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (referred to in this section as the “Director”), shall conduct a study and develop recommendations for preventing and treating prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome, soliciting input from nongovernmental entities, including organizations representing patients, health care providers, hospitals, other treatment facilities, and other entities, as appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall publish on the Internet Web site of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality a report on the study and recommendations under subsection (a). Such report shall address each of the issues described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (c).

(c) CONTENTS.—The study described in subsection (a) and the report under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a comprehensive assessment of existing research with respect to the prevention, identification, treatment, and long-term outcomes of neonatal abstinence syndrome, including the identification and treatment of pregnant women or women who may become pregnant who use opioids or other drugs;

(2) an evaluation of—

(A) the causes of and risk factors for opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant women;

(B) the barriers to identifying and treating opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant and postpartum women and women with young children;

(C) current practices in the health care system to respond to and treat pregnant women with opioid use disorders and infants born with neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(D) medically indicated use of opioids during pregnancy;

(E) access to treatment for opioid use disorders in pregnant and postpartum women; and

(F) access to treatment for infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(3) recommendations on—

(A) preventing, identifying, and treating neonatal abstinence syndrome in infants;

(B) treating pregnant women who are dependent on opioids; and

(C) preventing opioid dependence among women of reproductive age, including pregnant women, who may be at risk of developing opioid dependence.

**SEC. 4. IMPROVING PREVENTION AND TREATMENT FOR PRENATAL OPIOID ABUSE AND NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.**

(a) **REVIEW OF PROGRAMS.**—The Secretary shall lead a review of planning and coordination within the Department of Health and Human Services related to prenatal opioid use and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(b) **STRATEGY TO CLOSE GAPS IN RESEARCH AND PROGRAMMING.**—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop a strategy to address research and program gaps, including such gaps identified in findings made by reports of the Government Accountability Office. Such strategy shall address—

(1) gaps in research, including with respect to—

(A) the most appropriate treatment of pregnant women with opioid use disorders;

(B) the most appropriate treatment and management of infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(C) the long-term effects of prenatal opioid exposure on children; and

(2) gaps in programs, including—

(A) the availability of treatment programs for pregnant and postpartum women and for newborns with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(B) guidance and coordination in Federal efforts to address prenatal opioid use or neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the review described in subsection (a) and the strategy developed under subsection (b).

**SEC. 5. IMPROVING DATA ON AND PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE TO NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.**

(a) **DATA AND SURVEILLANCE.**—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall, as appropriate—

(1) provide technical assistance to States to improve the availability and quality of data collection and surveillance activities regarding neonatal abstinence syndrome, including—

(A) the incidence and prevalence of neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(B) the identification of causes for neonatal abstinence syndrome, including new and emerging trends; and

(C) the demographics and other relevant information associated with neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(2) collect available surveillance data described in paragraph (1) from States, as applicable; and

(3) make surveillance data collected pursuant to paragraph (2) publicly available on an appropriate Internet Web site.

(b) **PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE.**—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall encourage increased utilization of effective public health measures to reduce neonatal abstinence syndrome.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 804. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, as the founder and the cochair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, I have learned much about this devastating disease affecting nearly 29 million Americans. Fortunately, due to the Special Diabetes Program and to increased investments in diabetes research, we have seen some exciting breakthroughs and we are on the threshold of a number of important new discoveries.

This is particularly true for the estimated 1.2 million Americans living with type 1 diabetes. Advances in technology such as continuous glucose monitors are helping patients control their blood glucose levels, which is key to preventing costly and sometimes deadly diabetes complications. We are moving closer and closer to our goal of an artificial pancreas.

The National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration have been extremely supportive of these innovations in diabetes care. I was, therefore, shocked and troubled to learn that insulin-dependent Medicare beneficiaries are being denied coverage for continuous glucose monitors because the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services has determined that they do not meet the definition for durable medical equipment and do not fall under any other Medicare category. As a consequence, we are seeing situations similar to what we saw with insulin pumps in the late 1990s, where individuals with type 1 diabetes have had coverage for their continuous glucose monitors on their private insurance, only to lose that coverage when they get old enough to become eligible for Medicare.

Let me give some brief background. A continuous glucose monitor is a physician-prescribed, FDA-approved medical device that can provide real-time readings and data about trends in glucose levels every 5 minutes, thus enabling someone with insulin-dependent diabetes to eat or take insulin and prevent dangerously high or low glucose levels.

There has been essential and extensive clinical evidence that shows that individuals using this device have improved overall glucose control and, thus, reduced rates of hypoglycemia or low blood glucose levels. That is why professional medical societies have rec-

ognized the clinical evidence and have published guidelines recommending that these monitors be used in appropriate patients with type 1 diabetes.

Now, here is the fact that is astonishing to me. About 95 percent of commercial insurers provide coverage for continuous glucose monitors, but Medicare is refusing to provide coverage for those devices. I recently heard about this problem from one of my constituents, 74-year-old Prudence Barry of Portland, ME. Diabetes treatments have changed dramatically since Pru was diagnosed with type 1 diabetes back in 1954. Back then, it was very difficult for her to control her insulin levels and to get her glucose levels properly read. Well, Pru has led an active and fulfilling life. Living with type 1 diabetes for more than 60 years has taken its toll.

Today, Pru no longer feels it when her blood glucose levels drop to dangerous levels, causing her to lose consciousness and suffer seizures more frequently. Nighttime low sugars are particularly troubling. She fears the possibility of her blood sugar developing so low during the night that she never wakes up. The continuous glucose monitor is a potential lifesaver for Pru because it prevents these dangerously high or low blood glucose levels by alarming the wearer when the glucose levels fall outside of the safe range.

So even though 95 percent of private insurers cover this technology, Medicare does not. As a consequence, Pru does not have access to the potentially lifesaving device because she cannot afford to pay for it out of pocket. Pru is not alone. There are thousands of seniors with type 1 diabetes who like my constituent are denied access to this technology that would help keep them healthy and safe.

The ironic thing is it is only because of advances in diabetes care, such as continuous glucose monitors, that people with type 1 diabetes can expect to live long enough to become Medicare beneficiaries. So I am very concerned about this decision by CMS. It makes absolutely no sense. It contradicts all the work NIH and the FDA are doing to get new innovative treatments and technologies to patients.

I brought this up in a recent hearing of the HELP Committee and asked the outgoing FDA Commissioner what she thought. She expressed her regret about the lack of consultation between her agency and CMS about payments for FDA-approved devices and drugs. I am particularly concerned given the implications that this coverage decision will have for future decisions regarding artificial pancreas systems, which will combine a continuous glucose monitor, insulin pump, and sophisticated algorithm to control high and low blood sugar around the clock.

This coverage decision on the part of CMS—which, after all, is also part of



the Department of Health and Human Services—directly counteracts all of the work that the NIH and the FDA are doing to get new innovative treatments and technologies to patients. As I said, I recently had the opportunity at a HELP Committee hearing to ask outgoing FDA Commissioner Hamburg whether CMS consults with her agency when making these kinds of coverage decisions. In response to my question, Commissioner Hamburg expressed regret that her agency does not routinely consult with CMS about payments for FDA-approved drugs and devices, saying that the FDA should “look at the whole ecosystem of biomedical product development and use, and recognize that each of the different components that often operate in silos actually are very interdependent.” I completely agree with her assessment.

I am therefore joining my colleague from New Hampshire and the Co-Chair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus in introducing the Medicare CGM Access Act of 2014 to create a separate benefit category under Medicare for the continuous glucose monitor and require coverage of the device for individuals meeting specified medical criteria.

Our legislation is strongly supported by a coalition of organizations, including the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, the American Association of Diabetes Educators, the Endocrine Society and the JDRF.

I encourage my colleagues to join us as cosponsors of this important legislation.

I see Senator LEAHY has come to the floor and undoubtedly wants to speak on the pending business. Let me conclude my remarks by saying I am very pleased the Senator from New Hampshire, JEANNE SHAHEEN, who is the co-chair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, is joining me in introducing the Medicare CGM Access Act to create a separate benefit category under Medicare for these monitors and to require coverage of the device for seniors who are meeting specified medical criteria.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of endorsement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 15, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,  
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. JEANNE SHAHEEN,  
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS COLLINS AND SHAHEEN, Therapy innovation is moving forward at a rapid pace for those living with insulin-dependent diabetes. As leaders of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, you have worked to catalyze these efforts by ensuring American patients have access to these life-saving technologies that can transform quality of life. Advancements in integrated insulin pump and continuous glucose monitoring (CGM) technologies are progressing toward closed-

loop “artificial pancreas” systems that will enable greater patient care and improved health outcomes. With these technology advancements, thankfully, most children with type 1 diabetes will be Medicare beneficiaries one day, something that could not have been said with such certainty even 20 years ago.

While thousands of people with insulin-dependent diabetes benefit from advanced diabetes technologies, including CGM, Medicare beneficiaries do not. CGM is covered by nearly all private health plans. Numerous studies have demonstrated conclusively that use of CGMs improves glucose control, enabling better patient care, thereby improving patient health. Studies have also shown that use of CGM devices reduce severe hypoglycemia events, which particularly impact elderly patients and can lead to falls, fractures and other complications. The average cost of an inpatient hypoglycemia admission is over \$17,500.

The undersigned organizations strongly support your legislation, the Medicare CGM Access Act that would remedy this disparity for those in Medicare. Your legislation creates a new benefit category for FDA approved CGM devices, including stand-alone CGM, CGM integrated with an insulin pump, and future artificial pancreas device systems. This therapy would be covered for those meeting appropriate medical criteria consistent with private coverage and professional clinical guidelines. Again, thank you for your continued leadership on behalf of those with diabetes and we look forward to working with you to move this legislation forward quickly.

American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists (AACE); American Association of Diabetes Educators (AADE); Dexcom; Endocrine Society; JDRF; Johnson & Johnson; Medtronic.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 814. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce five unique Oregon tribal bills S. 814, S. 815, S. 816, S. 817, and S. 818, that each deliver on promises made to the tribes long ago. By introducing these bills today I am renewing my commitment to the five Oregon tribes who will benefit greatly from passage of these bills—the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Coquille Indian Tribe, the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians, and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde.

For the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians, their bills put land into trust, the last two remaining federally-recognized Indian tribes in Oregon without a land base. The third bill amends the Restoration Act of the Coquille Indian Tribe to make forest management activities on tribal lands uniform with the management of other tribal forests. The final two bills streamline the Bureau of Indian Affairs

process for putting land into trust for the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians and the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde. These five unique bills honor and respect tribal sovereignty and support each tribe's right to be self-sufficient, build their economies, and support and provide for their communities. I am pleased to be joined on these bills by my colleague Senator MERKLEY and look forward to working with our Senate and House colleagues to advance the bills and to finally send them to the President's desk.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 814

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Oregon Coastal Land Act”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONFEDERATED TRIBES.—The term “Confederated Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

(2) OREGON COASTAL LAND.—The term “Oregon Coastal land” means the approximately 14,408 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance” and dated March 27, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

#### SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Oregon Coastal land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

#### SEC. 4. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Oregon Coastal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

#### SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this Act, nothing in this Act affects any right or claim of the Confederated Tribes existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.



## (b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 3.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) LAWS APPLICABLE TO COMMERCIAL FORESTRY ACTIVITY.—Any commercial forestry activity that is carried out on the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 3 shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

(d) AGREEMENTS.—The Confederated Tribes shall consult with the Secretary and other parties as necessary to develop agreements to provide for access to the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 3 that provide for—

(1) honoring existing reciprocal right-of-way agreements;

(2) administrative access by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(3) management of the Oregon Coastal land that are acquired or developed under chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, consistent with section 200305(f)(3) of title 54, United States Code.

(e) LAND USE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (c), once the Oregon Coastal land is taken into trust under section 3, the land shall not be subject to the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

**SEC. 6. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.**

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes under section 3.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located in the vicinity of the Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(c) MAPS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register 1 or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

## (d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 815. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Oregon to the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians; to the

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 815

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Cow Creek Umpqua Land Conveyance Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) COUNCIL CREEK LAND.—The term “Council Creek land” means the approximately 17,519 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance” and dated June 27, 2013.

(2) TRIBE.—The term “Tribe” means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

**SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Council Creek land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) SURVEY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

**SEC. 4. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Council Creek land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

**SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Unless expressly provided in this Act, nothing in this Act affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

## (b) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Council Creek land.

(2) NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.—Any real property taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) FOREST MANAGEMENT.—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Council Creek land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

**SEC. 6. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.**

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under section 3.

(b) IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located in the vicinity of the Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(c) MAPS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register 1 or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

## (d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 816. A bill to amend the Coquille Restoration Act to clarify certain provisions relating to the management of the Coquille Forest; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 816

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT.**

Section 5(d) of the Coquille Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 715c(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) MANAGEMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, shall manage the Coquille Forest in accordance with the laws pertaining to the management of Indian trust land.

“(B) ADMINISTRATION.—

“(i) UNPROCESSED LOGS.—Unprocessed logs harvested from the Coquille Forest shall be subject to the same Federal statutory restrictions on export to foreign nations that apply to unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land.

“(ii) SALES OF TIMBER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all sales of timber from land subject to this subsection shall be advertised, offered, and awarded according to competitive bidding practices, with sales being awarded to the highest responsible bidder.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (9); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 817. A bill to provide for the addition of certain real property to the reservation of the Siletz Tribe in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 817

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. PURPOSE; CLARIFICATION.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to facilitate fee-to-trust applications for the Siletz Tribe within the geographic area specified in the amendment made by this Act.

(b) CLARIFICATION.—Except as specifically provided otherwise by this Act or the amendment made by this Act, nothing in this Act or the amendment made by this Act, shall prioritize for any purpose the claims of any federally-recognized Indian tribe over the claims of any other federally-recognized Indian tribe.

#### SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE SILETZ TRIBE OF THE STATE OF OREGON.

Section 7 of the Siletz Tribe Indian Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 711e) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) TITLE.—The Secretary may accept title to any additional number of acres of real property located within the boundaries of the original 1855 Siletz Coast Reservation established by Executive Order dated November 9, 1855, comprised of land within the political boundaries of Benton, Douglas, Lane, Lincoln, Tillamook, and Yamhill Counties in the State of Oregon, if that real property is conveyed or otherwise trans-

ferred to the United States by or on behalf of the tribe.

“(B) TRUST.—Land to which title is accepted by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the tribe.

“(2) TREATMENT AS PART OF RESERVATION.—All real property that is taken into trust under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) be considered and evaluated as an on-reservation acquisition under part 151.10 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

“(B) become part of the reservation of the tribe.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON GAMING.—Any real property taken into trust under paragraph (1) shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).”.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 818. A bill to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 818

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. ADDITIONAL LAND FOR RESERVATION.

Section 1 of the Act entitled “An Act to establish a reservation for the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, and for other purposes,” approved September 9, 1988 (Public Law 100-425; 102 Stat. 1594; 102 Stat. 2939; 104 Stat. 207; 106 Stat.

3255; 108 Stat. 708; 108 Stat. 4566; 112 Stat. 1896), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Subject to valid” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid”; and

(B) by adding after paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (A)) the following:

“(2) ADDITIONAL TRUST ACQUISITIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may accept title to any additional number of acres of real property located within the boundaries of the original 1857 reservation of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon established by Executive Order dated June 30, 1857, comprised of land within the political boundaries of Polk and Yamhill Counties, Oregon, if that real property is conveyed or otherwise transferred to the United States by or on behalf of the Tribe.

“(B) TREATMENT OF TRUST LAND.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Applications to take land into trust within the boundaries of the original 1857 reservation shall be treated by the Secretary as an on-reservation trust acquisition.

“(ii) GAMING.—Any real property taken into trust under this paragraph shall not be eligible, or used, for any Class II or Class III gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), except for real property within 2 miles of the gaming facility in existence on the date of enactment of this paragraph that is located on State Highway 18 in the Grand Ronde community of Oregon.

“(C) RESERVATION.—All real property taken into trust within those boundaries at any time after September 9, 1988, shall be part of the reservation of the Tribe.”; and

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in the matter preceding the table, by striking “in subsection (a) are approximately 10,311.60” and inserting “in subsection (a)(1) are approximately 11,349.92”; and

(B) in the table—

(i) by striking the following:

“6	7	8	Tax lot 800	5.55”;
and inserting the following:				

“6	7	7, 8, 17, 18	Former tax lot 800, located within the SE ¼ SE ¼ of Section 7; SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 8; NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 17; and NE ¼ NE ¼ of Section 18	5.55”;
----	---	--------------	---	--------

(ii) in the acres column of the last item added by section 2(a)(1) of Public Law 103-445 (108 Stat. 4566), by striking “240” and inserting “241.06”; and

(iii) by striking all text after

“6	7	18	E ½ NE ¼	43.42”;
and inserting the following:				

“6	8	1	W ½ SE ¼ SE ¼	20.6
6	8	1	N ½ SW ¼ SE ¼	19.99
6	8	1	SE ¼ NE ¼	9.99
6	8	1	NE ¼ SW ¼	10.46
6	8	1	NE ¼ SW ¼, NW ¼ SW ¼	12.99
6	7	6	SW ¼ NW ¼	37.39
6	7	5	SE ¼ SW ¼	24.87
6	7	5, 8	SW ¼ SE ¼ of Section 5; and NE ¼ NE ¼, NW ¼ NE ¼, NE ¼ NW ¼ of Section 8	109.9
6	8	1	NW ¼ SE ¼	31.32
6	8	1	NE ¼ SW ¼	8.89
6	8	1	SW ¼ NE ¼, NW ¼ NE ¼	78.4
6	7	8, 17	SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 8; and NE ¼ NW ¼, NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 17	14.33
6	7	17	NW ¼ NW ¼	6.68
6	8	12	SW ¼ NE ¼	8.19
6	8	1	SE ¼ SW ¼	2.0
6	8	1	SW ¼ SW ¼	5.05
6	8	12	SE ¼, SW ¼	54.64

6	7	17, 18	SW ¼, NW ¼ of Section 17; and SE ¼, NE ¼ of Section 18	136.83
6	8	1	SW ¼ SE ¼	20.08
6	7	5	NE ¼ SE ¼, SE ¼ SE ¼, E ½ SE ¼ SW ¼	97.38
4	7	31	SE ¼	159.60
6	7	17	NW ¼ NW ¼	3.14
6	8	12	NW ¼ SE ¼	1.10
6	7	8	SW ¼ SW ¼	0.92
6	8	12	NE ¼ NW ¼	1.99
6	7	7	NW ¼ NW ¼ of Section 7; and	
6	8	12	S ½ NE ¼, E ½ NE ¼ NE ¼ of Section 12	86.48
6	8	12	NE ¼ NW ¼	1.56
6	7	6	W ½ SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 6; and	
6	8	1	E ½ SE ¼ SE ¼ of Section 1	35.82
6	7	5	E ½ NW ¼ SE ¼	19.88
6	8	12	NW ¼ NE ¼	0.29
6	8	1	SE ¼ SW ¼	2.5
6	7	8	NE ¼ NW ¼	7.16
6	8	1	SE ¼ SW ¼	5.5
6	8	1	SE ¼ NW ¼	1.34
Total				11,349.92''.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 821. A bill to establish requirements with respect to bisphenol A; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I remain concerned about the high levels of exposure Americans have to Bisphenol-A, BPA, an endocrine-disrupting chemical. BPA is a synthetic estrogen, which means that it mimics this hormone when in the body. Scientific studies continue to show cause for concern, especially for the health effects on babies, children, and expectant mothers. While these studies continue to examine the exact effects that BPA has on humans, consumers deserve more information.

BPA is most commonly found in food products, such as the lining of canned goods like string beans, but consumers have no clear way of knowing this. The BPA in Food Packaging Right to Know Act is a simple solution to fix this problem. This legislation requires that food packaging that uses BPA include a clear label that reads, "This food packaging contains BPA, an endocrine-disrupting chemical, according to the National Institutes of Health." This is basic information that consumers have the right to know so they can make informed decisions about the products they wish to purchase.

This legislation also directs the Department of Health and Human Services to do a safety assessment of food containers that use BPA to determine if there is reasonable certainty that no harm will come from exposure, including from low doses over the long term. This safety standard would also apply to the evaluation of alternatives to BPA to ensure that replacement chemicals are not simply causing the same harm by a different name. The legislation calls specific attention to the effects of exposure on vulnerable populations, such as infants, children, pregnant women, and workers who are exposed through production practices or handling of final products.

I am particularly concerned about the negative health effects to children who are exposed to chemicals both while they are developing in the womb and in the first few years of their lives. Children are particularly susceptible to toxins while their bodies are developing at such a rapid pace.

According to Dr. Heather Patisaul, a biologist at North Carolina State University, when pregnant women are exposed to BPA and other endocrine-disrupting chemicals, three generations are impacted: the mother, the fetus, and the reproductive cells in the fetus. She cites that nearly 100 studies have shown an association between BPA exposure and negative health effects in humans. These include reproductive disorders, behavioral problems in children, and heart disease. In addition, there are over 1200 published animal studies on effects of BPA that show potential links to cancer, tumors, and brain development disorders.

A recent study published in *Hypertension*, a journal by the American Heart Association, found that individuals who drank beverages from containers made with BPA had an acute increase in their blood pressure, compared with individuals who drank the same beverage from containers that did not use BPA. This shows the potential for an increased risk for heart disease. Another recent study, published in *Endocrinology*, a journal by the Endocrine Society, shows a link between fetal exposure to BPA and increased oxidative stress—an imbalance in the body's ability to protect against and repair cell damage.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 93 percent of Americans have BPA in their bodies. As a society we are constantly exposed to low doses of this chemical over a long timeframe. Consumers deserve the opportunity to have more control over their own exposure and at the least should be provided information about if BPA is in the food products that they purchase.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the BPA in Food Packaging

Right to Know Act and stand up for the rights of consumers to have this basic information.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 822. A bill to expand geothermal production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2015 with my colleagues Senators RISCH, MERKLEY, MURKOWSKI, and CRAPO.

This bipartisan bill will allow for the rapid expansion of already identified geothermal resources without the additional delays of competitive leasing and without opening up those adjacent properties to speculative bidders who have no interest in developing the resource. At the same time that the bill streamlines the leasing process, it also protects the taxpayer by requiring that developers pay fair market value for the new lease, and limiting the amount of adjacent Federal land that can be leased to 640 acres.

The Bureau of Land Management, which manages geothermal projects on federal land under lease agreements, estimates about 250 million acres of federal land contains geothermal power potential. Geothermal energy projects that are producing geothermal power under the BLM's management make up about half of the total geothermal generating capacity in the United States. This legislation takes an important step to speed the development of this tremendous clean energy potential on public lands, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 822

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 2. NONCOMPETITIVE LEASING OF ADJOINING AREAS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES.**

Section 4(b) of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1003(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ADJOINING LAND.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) FAIR MARKET VALUE PER ACRE.—The term ‘fair market value per acre’ means a dollar amount per acre that—

“(I) except as provided in this clause, shall be equal to the market value per acre (taking into account the determination under subparagraph (B)(iii) regarding a valid discovery on the adjoining land) as determined by the Secretary under regulations issued under this paragraph;

“(II) shall be determined by the Secretary with respect to a lease under this paragraph, by not later than the end of the 180-day period beginning on the date the Secretary receives an application for the lease; and

“(III) shall be not less than the greater of—

“(aa) 4 times the median amount paid per acre for all land leased under this Act during the preceding year; or

“(bb) \$50.

“(ii) INDUSTRY STANDARDS.—The term ‘industry standards’ means the standards by which a qualified geothermal professional assesses whether downhole or flowing temperature measurements with indications of permeability are sufficient to produce energy from geothermal resources, as determined through flow or injection testing or measurement of lost circulation while drilling.

“(iii) QUALIFIED FEDERAL LAND.—The term ‘qualified Federal land’ means land that is otherwise available for leasing under this Act.

“(iv) QUALIFIED GEOTHERMAL PROFESSIONAL.—The term ‘qualified geothermal professional’ means an individual who is an engineer or geoscientist in good professional standing with at least 5 years of experience in geothermal exploration, development, or project assessment.

“(v) QUALIFIED LESSEE.—The term ‘qualified lessee’ means a person that may hold a geothermal lease under this Act (including applicable regulations).

“(vi) VALID DISCOVERY.—The term ‘valid discovery’ means a discovery of a geothermal resource by a new or existing slim hole or production well, that exhibits downhole or flowing temperature measurements with indications of permeability that are sufficient to meet industry standards.

“(B) AUTHORITY.—An area of qualified Federal land that adjoins other land for which a qualified lessee holds a legal right to develop geothermal resources may be available for a noncompetitive lease under this section to the qualified lessee at the fair market value per acre, if—

“(i) the area of qualified Federal land—

“(I) consists of not less than 1 acre and not more than 640 acres; and

“(II) is not already leased under this Act or nominated to be leased under subsection (a);

“(ii) the qualified lessee has not previously received a noncompetitive lease under this paragraph in connection with the valid discovery for which data has been submitted under clause (iii)(I); and

“(iii) sufficient geological and other technical data prepared by a qualified geothermal professional has been submitted by the qualified lessee to the applicable Federal land management agency that would lead in-

dividuals who are experienced in the subject matter to believe that—

“(I) there is a valid discovery of geothermal resources on the land for which the qualified lessee holds the legal right to develop geothermal resources; and

“(II) that thermal feature extends into the adjoining areas.

“(C) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall—

“(I) publish a notice of any request to lease land under this paragraph;

“(II) determine fair market value for purposes of this paragraph in accordance with procedures for making those determinations that are established by regulations issued by the Secretary;

“(III) provide to a qualified lessee and publish, with an opportunity for public comment for a period of 30 days, any proposed determination under this subparagraph of the fair market value of an area that the qualified lessee seeks to lease under this paragraph; and

“(IV) provide to the qualified lessee and any adversely affected party the opportunity to appeal the final determination of fair market value in an administrative proceeding before the applicable Federal land management agency, in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

“(ii) LIMITATION ON NOMINATION.—After publication of a notice of request to lease land under this paragraph, the Secretary may not accept under subsection (a) any nomination of the land for leasing unless the request has been denied or withdrawn.

“(iii) ANNUAL RENTAL.—For purposes of section 5(a)(3), a lease awarded under this paragraph shall be considered a lease awarded in a competitive lease sale.

“(D) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of the Geothermal Production Expansion Act of 2015, the Secretary shall issue regulations to carry out this paragraph.”.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 826. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to sunset rules after 10 years unless agencies undergo notice and comment rulemaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, when I travel across the State of Montana, from Alzada to Whitefish, I meet many different people and small businesses. Although the diversity of thought in Montana is self-evident to anyone who has spent time there, everyone agrees on one thing. Regulation dictated by bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. is stifling entrepreneurial creativity, pushing opportunities overseas, and killing jobs.

While many burdensome regulations are new, through adoption of laws such as the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act and the Affordable Care Act, still many more have been on the books for years without review. In an evolving and dynamic economy, regulators should, at the very least, review their regulations on a periodic basis, allow for public input, and eliminate any rules that are either obsolete or unnecessary.

Oftentimes, regulation has unintended consequences on Montana's small businesses. In discussions about the harmful impacts of regulations with Montanans, Vicki Bertelsen, who is the President of K&K Trucking in Great Falls, said, “Burdensome reporting requirements eat up too many business hours every month. I would rather be growing my business than sending redundant [and] antiquated paperwork to the government.”

With nearly 175,000 pages in the Code of Federal Regulations, it is easy to understand how regulations are keeping people from getting back to work.

That is why today I am introducing the Regulatory Examination Vital for Improving and Evaluating Working Solutions, REVIEWS, Act. While this bill recognizes that many regulations serve a noble purpose in protecting consumers and natural resources, it also seeks to address a structural deficiency in government agencies which allow obsolete and unnecessary regulations to remain in the Code of Federal Regulations. Because agencies operate on limited resources, they focus their efforts on drafting new regulatory rules, rather than monitoring the rules that already exist. While most agency employees are well-intentioned, this structural deficiency places a greater emphasis on creating rules, rather than monitoring the application and effectiveness of existing rules, only to the detriment of Americans.

The REVIEWS Act will require agencies to periodically review each regulation every ten years using the Notice and Comment process. This requirement will ensure that obsolete regulations are recognized and eliminated and that regulatory cost considerations are properly evaluated. If a rule is not reviewed at least every 10 years, it cannot be enforced in court. This requirement will provide public accountability and force regulators to periodically examine existing rules.

It is my hope that this common sense bill will ultimately reduce the regulatory burden on Americans and allow them to freely pursue their ends, independently of government intervention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 826

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the “Regulatory Examination Vital for Improving and Evaluating Working Solutions Act of 2015” or the “REVIEWS Act”.

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act, the terms “agency” and “rule” have the meanings given those terms in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

**SEC. 3. REGULATORY SUNSET.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) EFFECTIVE DATE OF RULES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any rule required to be promulgated in accordance with this section shall cease to be effective on the date that is 10 years after the date on which the agency promulgates the rule.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The effective period of a rule described in paragraph (1) may be extended for additional periods of not more than 10 years if, before the date on which the rule ceases to be effective, the agency that promulgated the rule complies with the procedures under this section as if the rule were a new rule to be issued by the agency.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made under subsection (a) shall apply to a rule promulgated by an agency after the date of enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RULES.**

(a) ACTIONS REVIEWABLE.—Section 704 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “Agency action” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Agency action”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) CLARIFICATION OF FINAL AGENCY ACTION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘final agency action’ includes interpretative rules, general statements of policy, and rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice issued by an agency.”.

(b) REVIEW IN COURT OF APPEALS.—Section 2342 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following new paragraph:

“(8) all rules of an agency (as defined under section 551 of title 5) that—

“(A) ceased to be effective under section 553(f) of such title; and

“(B) the agency continues to enforce.”.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 105—RECOGNIZING THE 194TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 105

Whereas the people of ancient Greece developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the founding fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek language, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming the representative democracy of the United States;

Whereas Petros Mavromichalis, the former Commander in Chief of Greece and a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821, “It is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and . . . in imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you.”;

Whereas the Greek national anthem, the “Hymn to Liberty”, includes the words, “most heartily was gladdened George Washington’s brave land”;

Whereas the people of the United States generously offered humanitarian assistance to the people of Greece during their struggle for independence;

Whereas Greece heroically resisted Axis forces at a crucial moment in World War II, forcing Adolf Hitler to change his timeline and delaying the attack on Russia;

Whereas Winston Churchill said, “if there had not been the virtue and courage of the Greeks, we do not know which the outcome of World War II would have been” and “no longer will we say that Greeks fight like heroes, but that heroes fight like Greeks”;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of the people of Greece were killed during World War II;

Whereas Greece consistently allied with the United States in major international conflicts throughout the 20th century;

Whereas Greece is a strategic partner and ally of the United States in bringing political stability and economic development to the volatile Balkan region, having invested billions of dollars in the countries of the region and having contributed more than \$750,000,000 in development aid for the region;

Whereas the government and people of Greece actively participate in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations, including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and have more recently provided critical support to the operation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Libya;

Whereas Greece received worldwide praise for its extraordinary handling during the 2004 Olympic Games of more than 14,000 athletes and more than 2,000,000 spectators and journalists, a feat the government and people of Greece handled efficiently, securely, and with hospitality;

Whereas Greece, located in a region where Christianity meets Islam and Judaism, maintains excellent relations with Muslim countries and Israel;

Whereas the Government of Greece has taken important steps in recent years to further cross-cultural understanding, rapprochement, and cooperation in various fields with Turkey, and has also improved its relations with other countries in the region, including Israel, thus enhancing the stability of the wider region;

Whereas the governments and people of Greece and the United States are at the forefront of efforts to advance freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those efforts and similar ideals have forged a close bond between the people of Greece and the United States; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate March 25, 2015,

Greek Independence Day, with the people of Greece and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which those two great countries were founded: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) extends warm congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 194th anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed; and

(3) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 194 years ago.

### SENATE RESOLUTION 106—DESIGNATING MARCH 22, 2015, AS “NATIONAL REHABILITATION COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY”

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 106

Whereas rehabilitation counselors conduct assessments, provide counseling, support families, and plan and implement rehabilitation programs for individuals in need of rehabilitation;

Whereas the purpose of professional organizations for rehabilitation counseling and education is to promote the improvement of rehabilitation services available to individuals with disabilities through quality education for counselors and rehabilitation research;

Whereas various professional organizations have vigorously advocated up-to-date education and training and the maintenance of professional standards in the field of rehabilitation counseling and education, including—

(1) the National Rehabilitation Association;

(2) the Rehabilitation Counselors and Educators Association;

(3) the National Council on Rehabilitation Education;

(4) the National Rehabilitation Counseling Association;

(5) the American Rehabilitation Counseling Association;

(6) the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification;

(7) the Council of State Administrators of Vocational Rehabilitation; and

(8) the Council on Rehabilitation Education;

Whereas, on March 22, 1983, the president of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education, testified before the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, and was instrumental in bringing the need for qualified rehabilitation counselors to the attention of Congress; and

Whereas the efforts of the National Council on Rehabilitation Education led to the enactment of laws that require rehabilitation counselors to have proper credentials, in order to provide a higher quality of service to those in need of rehabilitation: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 22, 2015, as “National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day”; and

(2) commends—

(A) rehabilitation counselors, for the dedication and hard work rehabilitation counselors provide to individuals in need of rehabilitation; and

(B) professional organizations, for the efforts professional organizations have made to assist those who require rehabilitation.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 320. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 320.** Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 178, to provide justice for the victims of trafficking; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 48, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 63, line 2 and insert the following:

#### **SEC. 101. DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### **“§ 3014. Additional special assessment**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning on the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 and ending on September, 30 2019, in addition to the assessment imposed under section 3013, the court shall assess an amount of \$5,000 on any non-indigent person or entity convicted of an offense under—

“(1) chapter 77 (relating to peonage, slavery, and trafficking in persons);

“(2) chapter 109A (relating to sexual abuse);

“(3) chapter 110 (relating to sexual exploitation and other abuse of children);

“(4) chapter 117 (relating to transportation for illegal sexual activity and related crimes); or

“(5) section 274 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324) (relating to human smuggling), unless the person induced, assisted, abetted, or aided only an individual who at the time of such action was the alien's spouse, parent, son, or daughter (and no other individual) to enter the United States in violation of law.

“(b) SATISFACTION OF OTHER COURT-ORDERED OBLIGATIONS.—An assessment under subsection (a) shall not be payable until the person subject to the assessment has satisfied all outstanding court-ordered fines and orders of restitution arising from the criminal convictions on which the special assessment is based.

“(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC TRAFFICKING VICTIMS' FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ‘Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Fund’).

“(d) DEPOSITS.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, or any other law regarding the crediting of money received for the Government, there shall be deposited in the Fund an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended.

“(e) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for obligation or expenditure only when specified in appropriations Acts for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

“(2) EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Fund made available for obligation or expenditure pursuant to paragraph (1) may only be used to award grants or enhance victims' programming under—

“(A) sections 202, 203, and 204 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044a, 14044b, and 14044c);

“(B) subsections (b)(2) and (f) of section 107 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105); and

“(C) section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)).

“(3) GRANTS.—Of the amounts in the Fund made available for obligation or expenditure pursuant to paragraph (1), not less than \$2,000,000, if such amounts are made available in the Fund during the relevant fiscal year, shall be available for grants to provide services for child pornography victims under section 214(b) of the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 13002(b)), as provided in appropriations Acts.

“(4) LIMITATIONS.—Amounts in the Fund, or otherwise transferred from the Fund, shall be subject to the limitations on the use or expending as provided in appropriations Acts.

“(f) TRANSFERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the day after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, on September 30 of each fiscal year, all unobligated balances in the Fund shall be transferred to the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

“(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts transferred under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be available for any authorized purpose of the Crime Victims Fund; and

“(B) shall remain available until expended.

“(g) COLLECTION METHOD.—The amount assessed under subsection (a) shall, subject to subsection (b), be collected in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases.

“(h) DURATION OF OBLIGATION.—Subject to section 3613(b), the obligation to pay an assessment imposed on or after the date of enactment of the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 shall not cease until the assessment is paid in full.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3013 the following:

“3014. Additional special assessment.”

#### **SEC. 102. CLARIFYING THE BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS OFFERED TO DOMESTIC VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**

Section 107(b)(1) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7105(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (F) and (G) as subparagraphs (G) and (H), respectively;

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following:

“(F) NO REQUIREMENT OF OFFICIAL CERTIFICATION FOR UNITED STATES CITIZENS AND LAWFUL PERMANENT RESIDENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to require United States citizens or lawful permanent residents who are victims of severe forms of trafficking to obtain an official certification from the Secretary of Health and Human

Services in order to access any of the specialized services described in this subsection or any other Federal benefits and protections to which they are otherwise entitled.”; and

(3) in subparagraph (H), as redesignated, by striking “subparagraph (F)” and inserting “subparagraph (G)”.

#### **SEC. 103. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 14044b) is amended to read as follows:

#### **“SEC. 203. VICTIM-CENTERED CHILD HUMAN TRAFFICKING DETERRENCE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM.**

“(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may award block grants to an eligible entity to develop, improve, or expand domestic child human trafficking deterrence programs that assist law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judicial officials, and qualified victims' services organizations in collaborating to rescue and restore the lives of victims, while investigating and prosecuting offenses involving child human trafficking.

“(b) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—Grants awarded under subsection (a) may be used for—

“(1) the establishment or enhancement of specialized training programs for law enforcement officers, first responders, health care officials, child welfare officials, juvenile justice personnel, prosecutors, and judicial personnel to—

“(A) identify victims and acts of child human trafficking;

“(B) address the unique needs of child victims of human trafficking;

“(C) facilitate the rescue of child victims of human trafficking;

“(D) investigate and prosecute acts of human trafficking, including the soliciting, patronizing, or purchasing of commercial sex acts from children, as well as training to build cases against complex criminal networks involved in child human trafficking; and

“(E) utilize, implement, and provide education on safe harbor laws enacted by States, aimed at preventing the criminalization and prosecution of child sex trafficking victims for prostitution offenses, and other laws aimed at the investigation and prosecution of child human trafficking;

“(2) the establishment or enhancement of dedicated anti-trafficking law enforcement units and task forces to investigate child human trafficking offenses and to rescue victims, including—

“(A) funding salaries, in whole or in part, for law enforcement officers, including patrol officers, detectives, and investigators, except that the percentage of the salary of the law enforcement officer paid for by funds from a grant awarded under this section shall not be more than the percentage of the officer's time on duty that is dedicated to working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(B) investigation expenses for cases involving child human trafficking, including—

“(i) wire taps;

“(ii) consultants with expertise specific to cases involving child human trafficking;

“(iii) travel; and

“(iv) other technical assistance expenditures;

“(C) dedicated anti-trafficking prosecution units, including the funding of salaries for State and local prosecutors, including assisting in paying trial expenses for prosecution

of child human trafficking offenders, except that the percentage of the total salary of a State or local prosecutor that is paid using an award under this section shall be not more than the percentage of the total number of hours worked by the prosecutor that is spent working on cases involving child human trafficking;

“(D) the establishment of child human trafficking victim witness safety, assistance, and relocation programs that encourage cooperation with law enforcement investigations of crimes of child human trafficking by leveraging existing resources and delivering child human trafficking victims’ services through coordination with—

“(i) child advocacy centers;  
“(ii) social service agencies;  
“(iii) State governmental health service agencies;

“(iv) housing agencies;

“(v) legal services agencies; and

“(vi) nongovernmental organizations and shelter service providers with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking; and

“(E) the establishment or enhancement of other necessary victim assistance programs or personnel, such as victim or child advocates, child-protective services, child forensic interviews, or other necessary service providers; and

“(3) the establishment or enhancement of problem solving court programs for trafficking victims that include—

“(A) mandatory and regular training requirements for judicial officials involved in the administration or operation of the court program described under this paragraph;

“(B) continuing judicial supervision of victims of child human trafficking, including case worker or child welfare supervision in collaboration with judicial officers, who have been identified by a law enforcement or judicial officer as a potential victim of child human trafficking, regardless of whether the victim has been charged with a crime related to human trafficking;

“(C) the development of a specialized and individualized, court-ordered treatment program for identified victims of child human trafficking, including—

“(i) State-administered outpatient treatment;

“(ii) life skills training;

“(iii) housing placement;

“(iv) vocational training;

“(v) education;

“(vi) family support services; and

“(vii) job placement;

“(D) centralized case management involving the consolidation of all of each child human trafficking victim’s cases and offenses, and the coordination of all trafficking victim treatment programs and social services;

“(E) regular and mandatory court appearances by the victim during the duration of the treatment program for purposes of ensuring compliance and effectiveness;

“(F) the ultimate dismissal of relevant non-violent criminal charges against the victim, where such victim successfully complies with the terms of the court-ordered treatment program; and

“(G) collaborative efforts with child advocacy centers, child welfare agencies, shelters, and nongovernmental organizations with substantial experience in delivering wrap-around services to victims of child human trafficking to provide services to victims and encourage cooperation with law enforcement.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity shall submit an application to the Attorney General for a grant under this section in such form and manner as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) REQUIRED INFORMATION.—An application submitted under this subsection shall—

“(A) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

“(B) include a detailed plan for the use of funds awarded under the grant;

“(C) provide such additional information and assurances as the Attorney General determines to be necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section; and

“(D) disclose—

“(i) any other grant funding from the Department of Justice or from any other Federal department or agency for purposes similar to those described in subsection (b) for which the eligible entity has applied, and which application is pending on the date of the submission of an application under this section; and

“(ii) any other such grant funding that the eligible entity has received during the 5-year period ending on the date of the submission of an application under this section.

“(3) PREFERENCE.—In reviewing applications submitted in accordance with paragraphs (1) and (2), the Attorney General shall give preference to grant applications if—

“(A) the application includes a plan to use awarded funds to engage in all activities described under paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (b); or

“(B) the application includes a plan by the State or unit of local government to continue funding of all activities funded by the award after the expiration of the award.

“(d) DURATION AND RENEWAL OF AWARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under this section shall expire 3 years after the date of award of the grant.

“(2) RENEWAL.—A grant under this section shall be renewable not more than 2 times and for a period of not greater than 2 years.

“(e) EVALUATION.—The Attorney General shall—

“(1) enter into a contract with a nongovernmental organization, including an academic or nonprofit organization, that has experience with issues related to child human trafficking and evaluation of grant programs to conduct periodic evaluations of grants made under this section to determine the impact and effectiveness of programs funded with grants awarded under this section;

“(2) instruct the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to review evaluations issued under paragraph (1) to determine the methodological and statistical validity of the evaluations; and

“(3) submit the results of any evaluation conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

“(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

“(f) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—An eligible entity awarded funds under this section that is found to have used grant funds for any unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost shall not be eligible for any grant funds awarded under the block grant for 2 fiscal years following the year in which the unauthorized expenditure or unallowable cost is reported.

“(g) COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT.—An eligible entity shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section if within the 5 fiscal years before submitting an application for a

grant under this section, the grantee has been found to have violated the terms or conditions of a Government grant program by utilizing grant funds for unauthorized expenditures or otherwise unallowable costs.

“(h) ADMINISTRATIVE CAP.—The cost of administering the grants authorized by this section shall not exceed 5 percent of the total amount expended to carry out this section.

“(i) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a program funded by a grant awarded under this section shall be—

“(1) 70 percent in the first year;

“(2) 60 percent in the second year; and

“(3) 50 percent in the third year, and in all subsequent years.

“(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For purposes of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated not more than \$7,000,000 of the funds available in the Domestic Trafficking Victims’ Fund, established under section 3014 of title 18, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining the Regulatory Regime for Regional Banks.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled “Examining the Evolving Cyber Insurance Marketplace.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to



meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The Affordable Care Act at Five Years."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND  
ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Patent Reform: Protecting Innovation and Entrepreneurship."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA AND GLOBAL HEALTH  
POLICY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The U.S.-Africa Leader's Summit Seven Months Later: Progress and Setbacks."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, AGENCY ACTION,  
FEDERAL RIGHTS, AND FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights, and Federal Courts, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on March 19, 2015, at 3:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Reining in Amnesty: Texas v. United States and Its Implications."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND  
FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Govern-

mental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 19, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining Federal Rulemaking Challenges and Areas of Improvement Within the Existing Regulatory Process."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL REHABILITATION  
COUNSELORS APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 106, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 106) designating March 22, 2015, as "National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 106) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

REPORTING AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, on Friday, March 20, between 12 noon and 2 p.m., it be in order for the Budget Committee to report out a concurrent resolution and that it be in order for the Senate to proceed to that resolution on Monday, March 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 23,  
2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon, Monday, March 23; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on Monday at 12 noon, the Senate will proceed to consider the budget resolution. Senators should expect at least one vote on an amendment to the budget at 5:30 p.m. on Monday night.

For the information of all Senators, the budget resolution is privileged and therefore will not displace the pending trafficking legislation. Once the budget resolution has been adopted, the trafficking bill will be the pending business before the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
MARCH 23, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:50 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 23, 2015, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE  
HUMANITIES

FRANCINE BERMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2020, VICE GARY D. GLENN, TERM EXPIRED.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY  
SERVICE

RICHARD CHRISTMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2017. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE  
HUMANITIES

SHELLY COLLEEN LOWE, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018, VICE JANE M. DOGGETT, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JUAN M. GARCIA III, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE JESSICA LYNN WRIGHT, RESIGNED.

STEPHEN P. WELBY, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ZACHARY J. LEMNIOS, RESIGNED.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

ANDREW J. READ, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 13, 2016, VICE DARYL J. BONESS, TERM EXPIRED.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DOUGLAS J. KRAMER, OF KANSAS, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE MARIE COLLINS JOHNS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LAVERNE HORTON COUNCIL, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY), VICE ROGER W. BAKER.

DAVID J. SHULKIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE ROBERT A. PETZEL, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. JOHN N. T. SHANAHAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. JACK WEINSTEIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be lieutenant general*

MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH P. DISALVO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. JOHN W. BAKER  
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER S. BALLARD  
BRIG. GEN. JOHN W. CHARLTON  
BRIG. GEN. ROGER L. CLOUTIER, JR.  
BRIG. GEN. EDWARD M. DALY  
BRIG. GEN. JASON T. EVANS  
BRIG. GEN. JOHN G. FERRARI  
BRIG. GEN. ANTHONY C. FUNKHOUSER  
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM K. GAYLER  
BRIG. GEN. DAVID B. HAIGHT  
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH P. HARRINGTON  
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM B. HICKMAN  
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTIOHER P. HUGHES

BRIG. GEN. CLAYTON M. HUTMACHER  
BRIG. GEN. DONALD E. JACKSON, JR.  
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL L. KARBLER  
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. KRAFT, JR.  
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL E. KURILLA  
BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH M. MARTIN  
BRIG. GEN. PAUL M. NAKASONE  
BRIG. GEN. MARK J. O'NEIL  
BRIG. GEN. ANDREW P. POPPAS  
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. RAINEY  
BRIG. GEN. KENT D. SAVRE  
BRIG. GEN. STEVEN A. SHAPIRO  
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. SIMPSON  
BRIG. GEN. MARK R. STAMMER  
BRIG. GEN. SEAN P. SWINDELL  
BRIG. GEN. LEON N. THURGOOD  
BRIG. GEN. KIRK F. VOLLMECKE  
BRIG. GEN. FLEM B. WALKER, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be brigadier general*

COL. RONALD P. CLARK

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

*To be vice admiral*

REAR ADM. HERMAN A. SHELANSKI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

RACHEL S. THEISEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be colonel*

ROBERT A. BLESSING  
JOHN D. LAING  
PAUL L. MINOR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be colonel*

JOANNE S. MARTINDALE  
ROBERT J. PAMULA  
JAMES A. THOMAS  
CHARLES YOST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be colonel*

JAMES L. BOGGESS

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY AS DEPUTY COMMANDANT FOR MISSION SUPPORT UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 50:

*To be vice admiral*

REAR ADM. SANDRA L. STOSZ

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 19, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TIPTON).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 19, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SCOTT R. TIPTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, thank You for giving us another day.

Send Your Spirit upon the Members of this people's House to encourage them in their official tasks. Especially during this season of budget deliberations, give them wisdom and an accurate understanding of the needs of the citizens of this country, most particularly those with narrow margins in their life options.

Remind us all of the dignity of work, and teach us to use our talents and abilities in ways that are honorable and just and are of benefit to those we serve.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further pro-

ceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*The Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I hereby resign as the representative of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois, effective March 31, 2015.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,  
*Member of Congress.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. BRUCE V. RAUNER,  
*Governor, State of Illinois,*  
*State House, Springfield, IL.*

DEAR GOVERNOR RAUNER: I hereby resign as the representative of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois, effective March 31, 2015.

Respectfully,

AARON SCHOCK,  
*Member of Congress.*

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 5 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### THE CLEAN AIR, STRONG ECONOMIES ACT

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, EPA has proposed a new lower standard for

ozone—smog—before America has finished her work on the current standard. We have made important gains in air quality, but this latest draft is so low that most of America will be out of compliance.

Under current law, EPA can't even consider whether we have the technology to achieve the new low standard. EPA says that half the work to meet this new rule will come from technology that doesn't yet exist. This rule will mean lost jobs and lost opportunities.

This week, the gentleman from Ohio, BOB LATTA, and I reintroduced H.R. 1388, the Clean Air, Strong Economies Act. Our bill requires EPA to protect health and consider whether a rule can be met.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help us balance clean air with a strong economy by supporting H.R. 1388.

### HAPPY 105TH BIRTHDAY TO BERTEL VAN EEK

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, 105 years ago, in a small town in Germany, Bertel Van Eek was born.

Her 105 years on this Earth have been a testament to the greatness of the United States. She has seen so much. Living in Holland during World War II, she saw the capability and bravery of our military and its members.

She personally lived our Nation's immigrant story, coming to America after the war with \$20 and the clothes on her back and eventually becoming an American citizen.

As someone whose spouse died 34 years ago, she has been able to live with dignity because of two of the greatest public policies in the history of this country, Medicare and Social Security.

She has seen the power of the American education system, watching her daughter and son-in-law become teachers and seeing three grandsons, who love her very much, also pursue educational opportunities so they could follow their dreams. Mr. Speaker, she even saw her youngest grandson get the honor of serving his community in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by saying to Bertel Van Eek, my grandma, happy 105th birthday, Oma. We love you very much.

### THE MEDICAL EVALUATION PARITY FOR SERVICEMEMBERS ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, along with the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman TIM RYAN, I am introducing the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act.

This legislation, which has strong bipartisan support and the support of a large number of military and mental health advocacy groups, will help the military identify behavioral health issues and improve suicide prevention by instituting a mental health assessment for all incoming military recruits.

A recent Army study confirmed the need to address mental health issues in a timely manner, finding that “nearly one in five Army soldiers enter the service with a psychiatric disorder, and nearly half of all soldiers who tried suicide first attempted it before enlisting.”

Our military makes sure that every servicemember is physically fit for duty, and this legislation will ensure that they are also mentally fit. Furthermore, it will ensure that we have a better baseline against which to measure any potential mental harm that may have occurred during their duty.

These brave men and women put their lives on the line every day in the service of our Nation, and it is our duty to offer everything in our power to guarantee they return home safely, both physically and mentally.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense, bipartisan legislation.

### TWO ISSUES OF JUSTICE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I speak on two issues of justice. One deals with my alma mater, the University of Virginia. And I would like to thank the young man, the student who experienced an unfortunate incident that caused him to have 10 stitches and to bleed on the streets of Charlottesville by the hands of those who were enforcing the law. I want to join him by saying that we all should be treated with human dignity, and I thank the Governor of the State of Virginia for a full investigation. We have to find a way to balance law and order with the dignity of the treatment of African Americans and all people.

I will also say that the hostage-taking of the Attorney General nominee by those who will not push for her confirmation on the floor of the Senate, of the other body, is not the handling of the Constitution and the advice and

consent that is necessary in the process of government.

She is qualified. She is ready to serve. The Nation needs a chief law enforcement officer. We must come together and find that balance that the Constitution protects, and that is the right of all people to access and freedom of speech. But we must also respect law and order. We have to find a way to walk that pathway together.

### ELECTRICITY FOR RURAL HAITI

(Mr. MASSIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three of my constituents from Owenton, Kentucky: Matthew Everett Greenlee, Mark Allen Greene, and Robert Wayne VonBokern. These three outstanding power linemen from Owen Electric Cooperative recently volunteered for a project in Haiti that, when completed, will provide safe, affordable, and reliable power to 1,600 consumers.

The goal of the project is to build a distribution system that will connect three towns in Haiti and establish its first electric cooperative, the Cooperative Electrique de l'Arrondissement des Coteaux.

My constituents upgraded and installed new lines and service drops in the town of Roche-a-Bateaux. They also trained locally hired linemen in proper construction methods, pole climbing techniques, and proper handline use, and important safety practices.

Electricity is essential to the quality of life for those in Haiti's rural communities. It assists in the provision of clean water, health care, education, and general economic opportunity. Therefore, I salute my constituents for contributing their time and efforts in Haiti on this critical project.

### GOP BUDGET MAKES IT HARDER FOR FAMILIES TO GET AHEAD

(Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this irresponsible and dishonest budget recently proposed by the House Budget Committee Republicans. Under this budget's grossly misguided priorities, people at the top continue to get richer while hardworking American families fall further behind.

Last fall, at election time, congressional Republicans said they understood the pressures that American families were feeling, and they promised to help hardworking Americans. But this Republican budget would squeeze hardworking Americans even harder in

countless ways, making it harder to pay for college, making it harder to pay for their health care, making it harder to ensure a secure retirement.

This budget would eliminate health care coverage for tens of millions of Americans, cut nondefense government programs, from transportation to research to education, and make more than \$1 trillion in unspecified cuts in Federal entitlement programs.

This House Republican budget would make life a lot harder for hardworking American families like the ones I represent in western Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a budget that needs not to pass.

### REPUBLICAN BUDGET

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to speak about values, the values that we have as Americans, the values that we hold dear. The fact that someone can work their entire life and finally make it to retirement and be able to live out their golden years with dignity is something that this budget denies.

The idea that an American child could be born in this great country and have an opportunity to go to a college or university and become whatever they want to be—maybe an astronaut, maybe an engineer, maybe even a politician—but without an education, every single one of those dreams is tougher and harder than ever before.

The budget that has been proposed by the Republicans in this House denies dreams, denies food, denies health care to seniors; and many more disasters are in this budget. This budget denies an opportunity for children to get an education.

If you were born with a silver spoon in your mouth, this budget is for you—extending tax loopholes into perpetuity but denying and condemning children away from education, seniors away from food and health care.

This budget doesn't deserve one vote. This budget deserves to be reworked, to carry the values that we hold dear in this country.

□ 0915

PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S.J. RES. 8, PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 152

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration; and (2) one motion to recommit which may not contain instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures. All points of order against consideration of the joint resolution are waived. The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the joint resolution are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce; and (2) one motion to commit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 152 provides for a closed rule providing for consideration of S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board, and a closed rule for consideration of H. Res. 132, providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the 114th Congress.

Across the Capitol, the United States Senate took positive action on March 4 when it passed a resolution, S.J. Res. 8, invoking the Congressional Review Act to overturn the National Labor Relations Board's recent ambush election

rule. On that same day, my colleagues and I at the Committee on Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions held a hearing on legislation I strongly supported and cosponsored, H.J. Res. 29, which is identical legislation to that which will come before the House today.

The National Labor Relations Board's ambush election rule is just the latest of its outrageous actions taken in defiance of longstanding precedent, jeopardizing employee free choice and privacy and employer free speech. This rule would give workers as few as 11 days to consider a consequential decision before voting for or against joining a union, prevent employers from having adequate time to prepare for union elections, and postpone critical questions over the election, such as voter eligibility, until after the election.

While providing little consideration of the longstanding rights of employees and employers, the rule further violates their privacy by ensuring that workers' personal information such as email addresses, work schedules, phone numbers, and home addresses are provided to union leaders.

There is a myriad of consequences to this harmful regulation, including constraining the rights of workers to make informed decisions, severely hampering employers' rights to speak to their employees during union organizing campaigns, and weakening privacy rights of workers.

These consequences will seriously impact the relationship of workers and employers and upend a carefully crafted process for organizing elections. These precedents have arisen over decades of practice within existing rules and should not be upended by hyperpartisan bureaucrats to the benefit of national unions at the expense of hardworking Americans.

H. Res. 152 also provides for consideration of H. Res. 132, the committee funding resolution for the 114th Congress. Since taking the majority, House Republicans have been careful stewards of taxpayer dollars, streamlining House operations and saving funds wherever possible. In fact, this Congress, the House remains below the amount authorized in 2008.

This bipartisan resolution will allow our committees to continue their vital work on behalf of this institution, including legislative reforms and oversight with additional investigations and field hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying resolutions, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying resolution,

Senate Joint Resolution 8, the resolution to overturn the National Labor Relations Board's election rule.

The other bill I support, H. Res. 132, which provides for the expenses of the committees of the House. The House Committee on Administration's bipartisan work should be commended because, as we all know, committees that we individual Members of the House are members of play a very important role in the work we do every day.

Now, I think it is unfortunate that this bipartisan bill has been packaged with a partisan bill to repeal important, commonsense reforms that were done at the National Labor Relations Board, and they have been wrapped up with a controversial bill.

The NLRB's function, as you know, is both to investigate and prosecute unfair labor practices and to provide a legal framework for employees and employers where employees may be seeking to organize in their workplaces for better wages and working conditions. Both of those functions are required of them by the National Labor Relations Act, which has been in place since 1935.

The work that the NLRB is doing is important. It is precisely what is required by the National Labor Relations Act. Holding a vote on this resolution will get in the way of the NLRB's pursuing its mandate successfully. Instead of focusing on important issues like shrinking the wage gap and growing the middle class, instead, the Republicans are spinning their wheels to score points by going after the National Labor Relations Board and commonsense reforms to make it function more effectively.

The President has already released a statement vowing to veto this resolution, so it is another example of spinning our wheels. It is obvious that neither the Senate nor the House will have enough votes to override this veto, so I ask simply: Why are we wasting our time on this misguided legislation when there are plenty of challenges that our country faces, whether it is balancing the budget, growing the middle class, or dealing with use of force abroad? Instead, we are discussing legislation which won't become law. While we are 3 months into this Congress, I can't even count the amount of hours we have spent on the floor discussing legislation that, as everybody knows, won't become law because we have a President in the White House who said he will veto it.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation uses the Congressional Review Act, which is a rare legislative tool that allows the majority to rush through legislation with little debate. In the Senate, normal rules of debate and cloture are not even required, but it does require the President's signature.

Now, keep in mind, the Congressional Review Act is used to undo rules that

have been promulgated by the executive branch through the Executive Office. So why would a President sign something that undoes his own rules? He simply wouldn't have made those rules in the first place if he didn't want them done.

So here we are, without two-thirds of this body, going through these motions on something that we know isn't going to become law. The Congressional Review Act has only been used once to overturn a rule in the entire history of the United States and is there for emergencies. This bill is far from an emergency. Instead, it is packaged with a closed rule—an extreme and unnecessary procedural action—rather than allowing for amendment and discussion of ideas from both sides of the aisle.

This resolution would overturn the new and improved election rules at the NLRB which are simply modernizing an antiquated system. The current rules were done before email existed, as an example. And we talk about how important privacy is; we are only talking about email addresses that the employer has. So if employers can use them to lobby their employees one way or the other in a vote, the organizing campaign should also be able to use those same email addresses. If neither side has access to them, that is fine; but if one side has access to them in an election, the other side needs to have access under similar terms.

We in this body have a responsibility to protect workers' rights and to provide employers with predictability and an expeditious processing of organizing requests in the workplace. Under the current archaic rules prior to this change, it was far too easy for bad actors to endlessly delay workplace elections.

In our committee that Dr. FOXX and I serve on, we got to hear the testimony of a nurse from California who had engaged in an effort in her workplace to organize the nurses that had been delayed time and time again, more than a year before a vote was finally held. Oftentimes, if a year or 2 or 3 go by, there might be different employees, people come and go, the groups of employees change, and often some of these involved in the organizing are subsequently fired. Employers are able to do this by appealing time and time again on issues that have no bearing on the election simply to delay, delay, delay.

The modest, commonsense reforms of the election rules truly go a long way in balancing the system and making it work more efficiently. They are standardized practices that are already common through many parts of the country to allow workers to make their own decisions without manipulations, threats, or intimidation from either party.

Under current rules, what happens all too often is employers continuously

appeal an election with unwarranted litigation so they have time to threaten, coerce, and, far too often, fire workers. By the time the election occurs, workers have moved on, voluntarily or involuntarily, to other jobs or have been threatened so many times they feel they have been forced to vote "no."

There is a proven direct and causal relationship between the length of time it takes to hold an election and illegal employer conduct. In other words, bad actors stall the election process and use the system they have to do whatever it takes to win the election. There are hundreds of examples of unscrupulous actors using the current system in this way.

The nurse that I mentioned earlier decided that she and her coworkers wanted a better workplace environment and began to organize, but the employer delayed the action multiple times so they had time to threaten the workers via text and email. They even held mandatory meetings with employees to threaten and coerce them into voting against organizing. They even did this under the guise of education. In the end, the nurses were too scared to form a union.

Another unfortunate, but telling, example we talked about in committee is a Mercedes-Benz dealership that delayed and stalled an election at every opportunity. The entire process wound up lasting 428 days. With the new rule, the process would have taken 141 days. What I can't understand is how some people think that 428 days is reasonable and that somehow 141 days is an ambush election. I think 428 days for a union election is inexcusable. It is harmful to our families and the economy and harmful to the businesses, the lack of predictability that that brings.

The average resolution for an election is 38 days. And we are not dealing with the average here; we are dealing with the outliers. One in 10 election cases are still unresolved after 100 days. There is no excuse for that. It is unthinkable. It is these 10 percent of employers and organizing efforts that this election will impact. The other 90 percent work well. The current NLRB processes work well. We don't need to change their methods.

I keep hearing arguments that employees are losing the rights to privacy, but I want to address these points because they are completely false.

The companies have work schedules, email addresses, and phone numbers. They often use these to threaten and coerce employees at all hours of the day and night. Those who are organizing already have access to home addresses, but that is all they have. Without work schedules, they might show up when an employee is sleeping or when they are not home. This new rule provides the same information to em-

ployers and organizers. If you ask me, a home address—which they already have—is far more intrusive than an email or phone number, and I think that these reforms will, therefore, further the privacy of workers.

The rules simply modernize the disclosure requirements, because the last time they were updated people didn't have cell phones and emails. All they had were home addresses, which is why the union organizers currently have access to home addresses.

Employers also indicate that they might be surprised by an election. The timeline the employers are referring to of 11 days is essentially impossible in the real world. Moreover, in essentially every case, the employer is fully aware that organizing is occurring long before the petition is filed. Under the new rule, employers will have plenty of time to make their cases, and employees will have plenty of time to make an informed decision.

It is important to note that if the resolution were to actually pass and somehow be signed by the President—which it won't be—it would forever prohibit the NLRB or any agency from enacting a substantially similar rule.

□ 0930

That means the simple modernization efforts that I hope we could all agree upon, such as allowing parties to file election documents electronically, as this rule does, will be forever off the table, forcing both businesses and workers to use an antiquated and costly system.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleague from Colorado knows very well that the House is doing its work and focusing on the things that are important to hardworking Americans. Just this week, we are holding 81 hearings here in the House in various committees. That is definitely doing our work. We are here on the floor today looking at a very important piece of work and overriding this onerous rule. That is not a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, the National Labor Relations Board has been attempting for years to tip the scales toward union organizers, and last December, it was finally able to accomplish one of its major goals with approval of this ambush election rule.

The two Board members who descended from the decision were clear about the rule's primary purpose: enabling initial union representation elections to occur as soon as possible. This rule will shorten the length of time in which such an election is held from the current median of 38 days to as little as 11 days.

The Board's decision was broad and unprecedented, overturning decades of

practice in labor laws and skewing elections in favor of unions. One of its most outrageous provisions is postponing decisions about who is eligible to participate in an election to after the election.

One of the most fundamental principles of a fair election is ensuring only those eligible to vote to have the ability to vote, maintaining the value of each voter's individual vote. That basic democratic protection would be shattered by this rule. It may also lead to more union representation elections being set aside and new elections being ordered.

Glenn Taubman characterized the consequences of this ambush election rule very fittingly in testimony before our Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, saying:

It is akin to a mayoral election in which it is unknown, either before or after the election, whether up to 20 percent of the potential voters are inside or outside the city limits.

The rule will also require a new mandatory poster be placed in the workplace within 2 business days of receiving a petition for election, the content of which will be determined by the National Labor Relations Board.

Employers are also provided only 8 days to find experienced representation before facing a hearing and must file an in-depth statement of position within only 7 days of receiving a petition for election.

Companies of any size—and, in particular, small businesses—frequently do not have in-house counsel and are not prepared at the drop of a hat to respond to complex, consequential legal situations.

A provision with a serious impact on employee privacy is the access provided to unions of additional contact information, including every employee's name, address, personal phone number, and personal email address, which must be provided within 2 days of an election order without any option to opt out.

Important review procedures would be set aside by this rule as well, including the opportunity for review of decisions made prior to the election by the Board itself. The Board's requirement for review of postelection disputes would be made discretionary for the first time as well, limiting oversight.

This flawed decision is currently facing litigation from the private sector as well, with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other trade associations filing a lawsuit to block its implementation as a violation of the National Labor Relations Act, Administrative Procedure Act, and employers' rights.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Export-Import Bank ensures that American businesses remain com-

petitive in foreign markets, and reauthorizing it would create certainty for business across this country and is fully permissible under WTO rules.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation which would reauthorize the Export-Import Bank for 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, to discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I, indeed, rise to oppose the request for a previous question in order that we might get on with the task of deliberating on reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

Just to remind people, the Export-Import Bank provides loans or loan guarantees to the foreign purchasers of American-made goods and services—American-made goods and services.

This venerated institution has been around for 80-some years, it has been enthusiastically supported by every single President since; Democratic and Republican, liberal and conservative, all have supported reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank.

This federally chartered Bank disappears in 103 days if we do not act. If the House continues to refuse to place it before the committee of jurisdiction for a hearing, refuses to place it before the committee of jurisdiction for a markup, refuses to consider it on this floor, the Bank will disappear in 103 days.

The problem is that is not when the damage is done. The damage is already beginning because of the cloud of uncertainty that hangs over the Export-Import Bank. Air Tractor, a company in Texas, which manufactures airplanes for use in firefighting and agriculture, lost a multimillion dollar order to Africa because they were told: We don't know if the Bank will be around.

Last year, FirmGreen, a California-based firm that was founded by a wounded Vietnam veteran, lost a multimillion dollar deal overseas because they were told there is too much uncertainty, there is too big a cloud of uncertainty hanging over the Export-Import Bank.

Ladies and gentlemen in the House, I don't know what to say, I don't know what to say to Terry and Stacie Cochran, the owners of a business in eastern Washington that have grown their business from one-third based on exports to two-thirds based on exports as a consequence of their relationship with the Export-Import Bank. I don't know what I would say to Terry and Stacie if this cloud of uncertainty continues to hang and the Bank goes away.

I don't know what to say to STAC, a business located in my district in Sum-

ner, Washington, an idea in a gentleman's head—also, by the way, a veteran—who formed a business to sell adhesives into the marketplace that now employs 8 or 10 people with a significant export business. Why? Because of the Export-Import Bank.

I don't know what to say to Manhasset, of all places in Yakima, Washington, one of the world's leading music stand manufacturers. Indeed, 90 percent of the transactions, approximately, of the Export-Import Bank are for small businesses.

The damage is being done now in the absence of action and the failure of this House to take up this issue. The real damage is long term, and it is significant, and it is material.

I talked the other day on the floor about the fact that commercial airlines is basically a manufacturing duopoly. We all know that. One is based in France. It is Airbus.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Colorado.

Airplane manufacturing currently is a duopoly, a French-based business and an American-based business, which I want to remind people is the heart and soul of engineering manufacturing in this country, it is the heart and soul of it.

It is not going to remain the case, in any event, because, as we all know—and if we don't, we should—China is right now in the process of developing a wide-body commercial aircraft for entry into the world marketplace. I think it is tentatively named the C919.

China's export credit authority, which I remind the Chamber every other developed nation on the Earth has, is multiple in size of America's export credit authority, the Export-Import Bank. They are literally—not figuratively—they are literally sitting over there, rubbing their hands in glee, waiting for this Chamber to refuse to act because when their airplane comes online in 2 to 8 years, they are going to jump into this market like there is no tomorrow.

The damage to the heart and soul of our manufacturing sector cannot be exaggerated; indeed, to remind you, every advanced economy on the face of the planet has an export credit authority, and if we allow ours to expire, it is tantamount to unilateral disarmament.

An amazing array of groups support this. Everybody from—yes, believe it or not—the Sierra Club, to the Chamber of Commerce, to the International Association of Machinists, to the National Association of Manufacturers. Everyone supports our bill; yet we dither.

In summary, to repeat, the Export-Import Bank is a job-creating machine,



1.2 million jobs in the last 5 years. The Export-Import Bank is a deficit-reducing machine, \$6.9 billion to reduce our deficit. It doesn't cost us anything. There are no Federal taxpayer dollars involved. It is a superperforming agency. It creates jobs; it reduces our deficit—and significantly—and it goes away in 103 days if this Chamber fails to act.

I oppose the demand for the previous question so that we might get on with the business of strengthening America's economy.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The word "venerated" is usually reserved for clerics and not government agencies. Such an attitude borders on worship of government agencies, and I doubt very seriously that the majority of hardworking Americans agree with that attitude.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I hope you are feeling better soon, also.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of both the rule and Senate Joint Resolution 8, which would overturn the National Labor Relations Board's ambush elections rule. I was proud to join my friend, Chairman JOHN KLINE, in introducing the House version of this resolution.

We are here today because the Obama administration is trying to fix a problem that does not exist, claiming that expediting elections on whether to form a union is needed because of delays in the process and supposed unfair advantages to employers.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I grew up in a union household. My father worked for B.F. Goodrich Company. He was a longtime union member after World War II. I have seen many things that the unions have done that have been good. Unions are legal in America. Employees have a right to hear all the information. They can decide whether they want to be in a union or not be in a union.

There is no big hurry. Look, the National Labor Relations Board—and this is March Madness, so I will use a basketball metaphor. I played basketball, and other people do; you expect the referees to just be a fair arbiter of the game. When you go in someone else's home court, you expect to get a fair call.

□ 0945

That is all we expect the NLRB to do, and that is not what is happening now. Here are the facts.

In reality, under the current procedures, 94 percent of elections are held within 56 days. The median is 38 days from a petition's being filed. Furthermore, unions won 60 percent of those

elections, so they win more than half—or two-thirds, I should say. Given the importance and consequences of the decisionmaking being made by workers, this is an entirely reasonable period of time.

Under the NLRB's radical new policy, union elections could be held, Mr. Speaker, in as little as 11 days after a petition is filed. As an employer myself of not a large business, I don't know if I could find a labor attorney in 11 days to go through this very complicated legal issue. This is not nearly enough time for employers to present their side to employees or for those employees to make an informed decision. Unfortunately, for workers, the NLRB rule doesn't stop here.

Of grave concern to me is the threat posed to workers' privacy. Currently, employers are required to turn over a list of employees and their home addresses to union organizers within 7 days after an election is ordered. So you have a week. The ambush election rule, instead, would open the door for greater harassment and intimidation by requiring employers to turn over each employee's name, address, phone number, email address—all within 2 days of an election order.

It is for this reason that I introduced the Employee Privacy Protection Act in the last Congress. This bill would have required only the names of the employees and one piece of contact information of the employee's choosing. The employee gets to decide how he is contacted and to have that be provided to union organizers. I think that is very reasonable. This will allow communications to happen but on the workers' terms.

Choosing whether to be represented by a union is a big decision with ramifications in the workplace and at home. Instead of ensuring a fair process for unions, employers, and workers, this NLRB is trying to rig the game in favor of union bosses, and that is not fair to workers or to employees.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the resolution.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question because I believe that it is imperative that we have an opportunity to present a piece of legislation that will have a tremendous impact on our economy.

I believe that H.R. 1031, Promoting U.S. Jobs through Exports Act, is an important piece of legislation, and I am in complete agreement with my colleagues who have indicated that this piece of legislation has not received a fair hearing. It has not received a markup in the Financial Services Committee, and it has not been afforded an opportunity to come to the floor.

One of the ways that we can eliminate things here in Congress is by not acting on them at all. It appears that this piece of legislation is destined not to be acted upon; thereby, the elimination of the Export-Import Bank will take place. This is unfortunate.

I believe that, when there are things that you would like to say that are being said better by others, it is better to let them say them. I would like to just quote a few things from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce with reference to the Ex-Im Bank.

The Chamber indicates: "Failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would put at risk more than 150,000 American jobs at 3,000 companies." That is significant.

The Chamber goes on to talk about the spinoffs—the other jobs—that will be impacted by virtue of the 150,000 jobs that will be put at risk: "Tens of thousands of smaller companies that supply goods and services to large exporters also benefit from Ex-Im's activities," meaning that these companies too will suffer, and these are additional workers who will suffer.

The Chamber indicates: "Other countries are providing approximately 18 times more export credit assistance to their exporters than Ex-Im did to U.S. exporters last year."

It goes on to read: "If Congress fails to reauthorize Ex-Im, the United States would become the only major trading nation without such a bank, putting American exporters at a unique disadvantage in tough global markets."

Now, that is the United States Chamber of Commerce. I think this is a source that many of my colleagues on the other side would rely upon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am also here to say that the State of Texas, which is the largest State that deals in exports—the top exporting State, accounting for approximately 18 percent of the national exports—would be hurt. In Texas, we have approximately 1,630 exporters that utilize the Export-Import Bank. In my district, 46 small businesses are using the Export-Import Bank, and 14 of these are minority-owned while five are owned by women. The bank is making a difference.

In Texas, we have a saying: "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." It ain't broke. We are trying to fix it, and we are doing it by eliminating an entity that is making a difference for our economy.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The history of this regulation is as sordid as most of the NLRB's actions have been over the past few years.

The Board initially attempted to promulgate this regulation in 2011 without

a legitimate quorum and saw its decision struck down by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. That court decision was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

After rescinding its initial attempt at imposing an ambush election rule, the Board, now back to its full strength after threats by Senate Democrats to exercise the nuclear option to spark filibuster reform, reintroduced the ambush election rule in February of last year. Today, we face the consequences of that effort.

Those efforts are not the only objectionable actions of the National Labor Relations Board in recent years. Last year, I sent a letter, with several of my colleagues, opposing the NLRB general counsel's efforts to deem franchisers joint employers with their franchisees. That determination could have profound consequences for the over 8 million Americans who go to work at our country's over 750,000 franchise businesses.

The NLRB also purported to be able to instruct private businesses as to where they could invest, telling The Boeing Company in 2011 that it could not operate a factory in South Carolina it had already built. Our Federal Government has far too much power, but, thankfully, it does not yet have the power to tell businesses where they can and can't expand. The Board was forced to withdraw its complaint in that instance.

The NLRB regulation that we will address today on the floor is just another in a long line of objectionable actions that the Board has taken since President Obama's appointees have taken office. There is no reason to believe that their approach to the law will change, but our step today to invoke the Congressional Review Act is merely another sign of our willingness to exercise oversight tirelessly into the Board's actions. We will continue to be vigilant on behalf of workers and their employers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. GREEN's repeated reference to the United States Chamber of Commerce's point of view prompted me to believe that entering their actual words, that of the Chamber's, into the RECORD would be a constructive addition to this debate. So I read from their letter:

"Failure to reauthorize Ex-Im would put at risk more than 150,000 American jobs at 3,000 companies that depend on the Bank to be able to compete in global markets. Ex-Im is especially important to small- and medium-size businesses, which account for more than 85 percent of Ex-Im's transactions. Tens

of thousands of smaller companies that supply goods and services to large exporters also benefit from Ex-Im's activities.

"Other countries are providing approximately 18 times more export credit assistance to their exporters than Ex-Im did to U.S. exporters last year."

Further, the "reauthorization of Ex-Im would benefit taxpayers by reducing the deficit by hundreds of millions of dollars. Far from being a subsidy, Ex-Im has generated \$2.7 billion for taxpayers in the last six years, mostly through fees collected from foreign customers. Eliminating Ex-Im would increase the U.S. budget deficit."

I am going to repeat that. "Eliminating Ex-Im would increase the U.S. budget deficit."

"Ex-Im's overall active default rate hovers below one-quarter of one percent, a default rate lower than commercial banks.

"The U.S. Chamber, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, urges the House to pass long-term Ex-Im reauthorization as expeditiously as possible."

Those are verbatim words from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's position on the long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Why? Because they know that the failure to do so 103 days from now will materially damage the U.S. economy and will reduce the numbers of jobs. I urge you to support the long-term reauthorization of the Ex-Im.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close if my colleague from Colorado is also prepared.

Mr. POLIS. If somebody else shows up, I might yield to him; but with that understanding, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the Export-Import Bank and what they do and why it is so important.

First of all, there are a lot of forms of subsidization that are not permitted under trade rules or the WTO. However, there are certain safe harbors for things that are allowed, and all of our major trading partners have something like an Export-Import Bank.

What it does is it helps to effectively finance our exports. When we have somebody who wants to buy products from an American company in another country, rather than have that company, itself, have to collect that overseas debt, effectively, that debt is transferred to this pseudopublic entity, the Export-Import Bank, and that, effectively, becomes the collection agent overseas for that debt. It, effectively, allows our exporters to get their pay-

ments up front to outsource any risk of no payment occurring. In fact, the U.S. Export Agency is in a better position to collect those debts because people will see them abroad as an entity of the U.S. Government. It works out well, as it is profitable; it is supported by the business community; and it is fully permissible under trade rules.

If we fail to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, we are, effectively, stabbing ourselves in the foot. We are hurting our own export economy. Do we think for 1 minute that other countries are going to stop engaging in similar allowable trade practices that benefit their own manufacturing industries? No, of course not. People across the world are going to scratch their heads just as they do when our own Congress shuts down our government, just as they do when Members of our own Congress undermine our own President diplomatically. They ask: What are the Americans doing? They are doing this to themselves. They are hurting their own exports, and they are hurting their own manufacturing.

That is exactly why I hope that we do defeat the previous question and come forward with a clean Export-Import Bank reauthorization, which I am confident would overwhelmingly pass here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, what this discussion really comes down to with regard to the NLRB is whether or not bad actors should continue to get away with abusing an antiquated system for their own advantage.

I truly believe—and I hope my colleagues do, too—that employers and employees should have a level playing field with an updated and expeditious processing mechanism. Employers should not be able to endlessly delay and appeal elections and abuse a process that was put in place just as much for them as it was for employees.

Organizing has a long and important history in America. Unions and collective bargaining have made sure we have a weekend to spend with our families, a 40-hour workweek, and made sure women are paid fair wages.

□ 1000

Organizing has made sure workers are safe from all types and forms of workplace dangers. Countless studies show that the proportion of workers in labor organizations tracks very closely with income for middle class Americans.

Critics of this rule don't want a level playing field for labor organizations to

fight for the middle class. They want a process that is open to delay and manipulation. Rather than letting workers choose for themselves whether or not they want to join a union, bad actors would prefer to delay or prevent the choice from ever being made at all. This new rule reduces the opportunity for bad actors to play games with the process and applies new technological updates to the process as well.

The Republicans, time and time again, seem to want to waste time on grandstanding instead of legislating. This is a perfect example of another bill that won't become law. The Republicans want to tilt the economy toward the wealthy, toward big business, toward CEOs.

We were sent here to do the people's work. The new rule for the NLRB is entirely consistent with the legislative intent of the creation of that agency, and it is for the advantage of people who live in our towns and cities. It improves the economy, raises up the middle class, helps give everybody a fair shot at the American Dream.

When we talk about the pathway to the American Dream, the pathway to success in our country, the organized labor movement has and continues to make enormous contributions toward making sure that Americans are earning livable wages, that they can support their families and live the American Dream. It is not only the weekends and 40-hour workweeks that they have given us. The organized labor movement continues to fight for the middle class and to fight to grow the middle class and to address some of the increasing trend of income disparities that are threatening our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, and then we will bring forward the Export-Import Bank clean reauthorization that does create jobs for middle class Americans and in manufacturing. Some of those plants will be union and some won't be. That is the choice of the workers. The NLRB bill facilitates that choice. It doesn't presuppose that every workplace will want to organize nor that no workplaces will want to organize. It simply has a fair set of rules in place—fair to businesses, fair to employees, fair to labor, fair to everybody—that allows a decision to be made regarding organizing in the workplace.

What is even more important about the effort Mr. HECK talked about is it will allow workers and business owners to participate in a bigger pie. That is what we all want. By reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, we are creating jobs in our country and the export sector; and that means that the owners of the companies will do well; it means the employees of the companies will do well; it means the management will do well; it means the line workers will do well.

So let's participate in a growing pie by passing a clean reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank rather than trying to divide the pie to take more away from working families and the middle class and give more to big businesses.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question. I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The proud traditions of this House and its committees are continued by the committee funding resolution this rule will provide for consideration of. Our record of careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars continues with the House authorized funds for the 114th Congress below those in 2008. The funding resolution was favorably reported out of committee by unanimous voice vote. The chair and ranking member of each committee worked together to develop their individual budget priorities, and each committee also reaffirmed its commitment to uphold the equitable two-thirds/one-third allocation between the majority and minority sides.

Our record of careful stewardship of taxpayer dollars continues, with the House authorized funds for the 114th Congress below those in 2008.

Returning to the ambush elections rule, which was, sadly, not crafted in the same bipartisan fashion as our committee funding resolution, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that providing for free and fair elections is one of the most fundamental principles of our democracy.

The National Labor Relations Board's ambush elections rule is an affront to that principle. Without a chance to opt out, it provides the personal contact information of every employee to organizers who may have had no previous interactions with those employees. The rule could lead to union representation elections being held within only 11 days without any certainty over who should be participating in the election or adequate time to consult with legal counsel.

It is not as if existing rules favor one party over another. If anything, they favor unions. Currently, 95 percent of elections occur within 2 months, and unions win more than 60 percent of them. The National Labor Relations Board should be focused on maintaining fair union representation elections backed by longstanding precedent, not upending a longstanding, carefully tailored process for elections that provided fundamental protections to all stakeholders: workers, unions, and employers.

This Congressional Review Act joint resolution is an important step in Congress exercising its oversight role to ensure that independent agencies and

the executive branch do not step on vital protections for hardworking Americans.

I strongly commend this rule and the underlying resolutions to my colleagues for their support.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 152 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a

vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 233, nays 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 126]

YEAS—233

Abraham	Blum	Carter (TX)
Aderholt	Bost	Chabot
Allen	Boustany	Chaffetz
Amash	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Amodei	Brat	Coffman
Babin	Bridenstine	Cole
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Barton	Buchanan	Comstock
Benishek	Buck	Conaway
Bilirakis	Bucshon	Cook
Bishop (MI)	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Bishop (UT)	Byrne	Cramer
Black	Calvert	Crawford
Blackburn	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw

Culberson	Joyce	Renacci
Curbelo (FL)	Katko	Ribble
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Denham	King (IA)	Rigell
Dent	King (NY)	Roby
DeSantis	Kinzing (IL)	Roe (TN)
DesJarlais	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart	Knight	Rohrabacher
Dold	LaMalfa	Rokita
Duffy	Lamborn	Rooney (FL)
Duncan (SC)	Lance	Ros-Lehtinen
Duncan (TN)	Latta	Ross
Ellmers (NC)	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Emmer (MN)	Long	Rouzer
Farenthold	Loudermilk	Royce
Fincher	Love	Russell
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Ryan (WI)
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Fleming	Lummis	Sanford
Flores	MacArthur	Scalise
Forbes	Marchant	Schweikert
Fortenberry	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Fox	Massie	Sessions
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy	Shimkus
Frelinghuysen	McCauley	Shuster
Garrett	McClintock	Simpson
Gibbs	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Gibson	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Gohmert	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Goodlatte	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Gowdy	McSally	Stefanik
Granger	Meadows	Stewart
Graves (GA)	Meehan	Stivers
Graves (LA)	Messer	Stutzman
Griffith	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Grothman	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Guinta	Miller (MI)	Tiberi
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Tipton
Hanna	Mooney (WV)	Trott
Hardy	Mullin	Turner
Harper	Mulvaney	Upton
Harris	Murphy (PA)	Valadao
Hartzler	Neugebauer	Wagner
Heck (NV)	Newhouse	Walberg
Hensarling	Noem	Walden
Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Walker
Hice, Jody B.	Nunes	Walorski
Hill	Olson	Walters, Mimi
Holding	Palazzo	Weber (TX)
Hudson	Palmer	Webster (FL)
Huelskamp	Paulsen	Wenstrup
Huizenga (MI)	Pearce	Westerman
Hultgren	Perry	Westmoreland
Hunter	Pittenger	Whitfield
Hurd (TX)	Pitts	Wilson (SC)
Hurt (VA)	Poe (TX)	Wittman
Issa	Poliquin	Womack
Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo	Woodall
Jenkins (WV)	Posey	Yoder
Johnson (OH)	Price, Tom	Yoho
Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe	Young (IA)
Jolly	Reed	Zeldin
Jones	Reichert	Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams	Clay	Farr
Aguilar	Cleaver	Fattah
Ashford	Clyburn	Foster
Bass	Cohen	Frankel (FL)
Beatty	Connolly	Fudge
Becerra	Conyers	Gabbard
Bera	Cooper	Galleo
Beyer	Costa	Graham
Bishop (GA)	Courtney	Green, Al
Blumenauer	Crowley	Green, Gene
Bonamici	Cuellar	Grijalva
Boyle, Brendan	Cummings	Gutiérrez
F.	Davis (CA)	Hahn
Brady (PA)	Davis, Danny	Hastings
Brown (FL)	DeFazio	Heck (WA)
Brownley (CA)	DeGette	Higgins
Bustos	Delaney	Himes
Butterfield	DeLauro	Honda
Capps	DeBene	Hoyer
Capuano	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Cárdenas	Deutsch	Israel
Carney	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Carson (IN)	Doggett	Jeffries
Cartwright	Doyle, Michael	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	F.	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Duckworth	Keating
Chu, Judy	Edwards	Kelly (IL)
Ciulline	Engel	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Eshoo	Kildee
Clarke (NY)	Esty	Kilmer

Kind	Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)
Kirkpatrick	Nadler	Scott, David
Kuster	Napolitano	Serrano
Langevin	Neal	Sewell (AL)
Larsen (WA)	Nolan	Sherman
Larson (CT)	Norcross	Sinema
Lawrence	O'Rourke	Sires
Lee	Pallone	Slaughter
Levin	Pascarell	Speier
Lewis	Pelosi	Swalwell (CA)
Lieu, Ted	Perlmutter	Takai
Lipinski	Peters	Takano
Loeback	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
Louderthal	Pocan	Titus
Lowe	Polis	Tonko
Lujan Grisham	Price (NC)	Torres
(NM)	Quigley	Tsongas
Luján, Ben Ray	Rangel	Van Hollen
(NM)	Rice (NY)	Vargas
Lynch	Richmond	Veasey
Maloney,	Roybal-Allard	Vela
Carolyn	Ruiz	Velázquez
Maloney, Sean	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Matsui	Rush	Walz
McCollum	Ryan (OH)	Wasserman
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Schultz
McGovern	T.	Sanchez, Loretta
McNerney	Sanchez, Loretta	Watson Coleman
Meeks	Sarbanes	Welch
Meng	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Moore	Schiff	Yarmuth
Moulton	Schrader	

NOT VOTING—18

□ 1033

Mr. CARNEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Messrs. RUSH and BUTTERFIELD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. MICA, BURGESS, and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 233, noes 181, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

AYES—233

Abraham	Brady (TX)	Collins (NY)
Aderholt	Brat	Comstock
Allen	Bridenstine	Conaway
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Cook
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Costello (PA)
Babin	Buchanan	Cramer
Barletta	Buck	Crawford
Barr	Burgess	Crenshaw
Barton	Byrne	Culberson
Benishek	Calvert	Curbelo (FL)
Bilirakis	Carter (GA)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (MI)	Carter (TX)	Denham
Bishop (UT)	Chabot	Dent
Black	Chaffetz	DeSantis
Blackburn	Clawson (FL)	DesJarlais
Blum	Coffman	Diaz-Balart
Bost	Cole	Dold
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Duffy

Duncan (SC) Knight  
Duncan (TN) LaMalfa  
Ellmers (NC) Lamborn  
Emmer (MN) Lance  
Farenthold Latta  
Fincher LoBiondo  
Fitzpatrick Long  
Fleischmann Loudermilk  
Fleming Love  
Flores Lucas  
Forbes Luetkemeyer  
Fortenberry Lummis  
Foxy MacArthur  
Franks (AZ) Marchant  
Frelinghuysen Marino  
Garrett Massie  
Gibbs McCarthy  
Gibson McCaul  
Gohmert McClintock  
Goodlatte McHenry  
Gowdy McKinley  
Granger McMorris  
Graves (GA) Rodgers  
Graves (LA) McNerney  
Griffith McSally  
Grothman Meadows  
Guinta Meehan  
Guthrie Messer  
Hanna Mica  
Hardy Miller (FL)  
Harper Miller (MI)  
Harris Moolenaar  
Hartzler Mooney (WV)  
Heck (NV) Mullin  
Hensarling Mulvaney  
Herrera Beutler Murphy (PA)  
Hice, Jody B. Neugebauer  
Hill Newhouse  
Holding Noem  
Hudson Nugent  
Huelskamp Nunes  
Huizenga (MI) Olson  
Hultgren Palazzo  
Hunter Palmer  
Hurd (TX) Paulsen  
Hurt (VA) Pearce  
Issa Perry  
Jenkins (KS) Pittenger  
Jenkins (WV) Pitts  
Johnson (OH) Poe (TX)  
Johnson, Sam Poliquin  
Jolly Pompeo  
Jones Posey  
Joyce Price, Tom  
Katko Ratcliffe  
Kelly (PA) Reed  
King (IA) Reichert  
King (NY) Renacci  
Kinzinger (IL) Ribble  
Kline Rice (SC)

## NOES—181

Adams Cohen  
Aguilar Connolly  
Ashford Conyers  
Bass Cooper  
Beatty Costa  
Becerra Courtney  
Bera Crowley  
Beyer Cuellar  
Bishop (GA) Cummings  
Blumenauer Davis (CA)  
Bonamici Davis, Danny  
Boyle, Brendan DeFazio  
F. DeGette  
Brady (PA) Delaney  
Brown (FL) DeLauro  
Brownley (CA) DelBene  
Bustos DeSaulnier  
Butterfield Deutch  
Capps Dingell  
Capuano Doggett  
Cárdenas Doyle, Michael  
Carney F.  
Carson (IN) Duckworth  
Cartwright Edwards  
Castor (FL) Ellison  
Castro (TX) Engel  
Chu, Judy Eshoo  
Ciilline Esty  
Clark (MA) Farr  
Clarke (NY) Fattah  
Clay Foster  
Cleaver Frankel (FL)  
Clyburn Fudge

Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan

Bucshon  
Garamendi  
Gosar  
Graves (MO)  
Grayson  
Hinojosa  
Jordan  
Labrador  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Roskam  
Ryan (WI)

## NOT VOTING—18

## □ 1040

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 127 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Stated against:

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 127 I was unavoidably detained and missed voting of rollcall No. 127. Had I been present, when the vote was called, I would have voted "no."

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 2015, the House voted on H. Res. 152, to provide consideration of H. Res. 132. I accidentally voted "aye" on rollcall vote No. 127; I do not support H. Res. 152 or H. Res. 132; I intended to vote "no" on rollcall vote No. 127. I would like the record to accurately reflect my stance on this issue.

# PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF A RULE SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 152, I call up the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 8) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Pursuant to House Resolu-

tion 152, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

## S.J. RES. 8

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures (published at 79 Fed. Reg. 74308 (December 15, 2014)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

## □ 1045

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 8.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in strong support of S.J. Res. 8.

In just a few short weeks, a regulatory scheme that many Americans never heard of will become a reality in almost every private workplace across the country.

Today, workers and employers rely on a fair process for union elections. Under the current process, employers have time to raise concerns and, more importantly, time to speak with their employees about union representation.

Under the current system, workers have an opportunity to gather the information they need to make the best decision for their families. But unless Congress acts, Mr. Speaker, that will all change.

Under the guise of streamlining union elections, the National Labor Relations Board is imposing draconian changes that will undermine the rights workers, employers, and unions have long enjoyed.

The Board's rule arbitrarily limits the amount of time employers have to legally prepare for the election, and it denies workers a reasonable opportunity to make informed decisions about joining a union.

The rule also delays answers to important questions—including voter eligibility—until after the election, which means the integrity of the election results will be compromised before a single ballot is cast.

To add insult to injury, the Board's rule will also force employers to provide union organizers with their employees' personal information, including email addresses, phone numbers,

work schedules, and home addresses. Instead of advancing a plan to help stop union intimidation and coercion, the Board is actually making it easier for labor bosses to harass employees and their families.

Are there times when delays occur under the current system? Of course. But delay is the exception, not the rule. In fact, right now, the median time between the filing of an election petition and the election is 38 days. Yet under the Board's new rule, a union election could take place in as little as 11 days. Eleven days.

This is a radical rewrite of labor policies that have served our Nation's best interests for decades. Unfortunately, this is what we have come to expect from the National Labor Relations Board.

Let's not forget, this is the same Federal agency that tried dictating where a private employer had to run its business. This is the same agency restricting workers' rights to secret ballot elections. This is the same agency ignoring the law by asserting its jurisdiction over religious institutions. This is the same agency tying employers in union red tape and empowering labor leaders to gerrymander our Nation's workplaces. This is a Federal agency that is simply out of control, and it is our responsibility to do something about it.

This resolution, which I am proud to sponsor along with Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER of Tennessee, invokes Congress' authority under the Congressional Review Act to block the NLRB's ambush election rule and anything substantially like it.

If the Board or my Democrat colleagues want to pursue responsible reforms to improve the union election process, then I stand ready to work together on that effort.

But if you believe employers should be free to speak to their employees during a union organizing campaign, then support this resolution. If you believe workers should be free to make an informed decision about whether to join a union, then support this resolution. If you believe we should protect—rather than threaten—employee privacy, then support this resolution. Finally, if you believe workers, employers, and union leaders deserve a fair election process, then reject the Board's ambush election rule by supporting this resolution.

I encourage my colleagues to stand with America's workers and job creators by voting "yes" on S.J. Res. 8.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to S.J. Res. 8.

The Congressional Review Act resolution of disapproval that we are considering today would undo the NLRB's

election rule. The National Labor Relations Board election rule was promulgated to make the election process more efficient and fair.

The current process to hold an election on whether to form a union is badly broken. After workers have filed a petition to hold an election, bad actors can use frivolous litigation to stall an election for months, even years. Election delays can provide opportunities for unscrupulous employers to engage in threats, coercion, and intimidation of workers. These delays can be exploited to violate workers' rights, including firing pro-union workers or threatening to close the plant if the workers choose to vote a certain way.

We all know that the sanctions against violations are insufficient to deter the unscrupulous activities, including firing pro-union employees.

Researchers from the Center for Labor Research and Education at Berkeley found that the longer the delay before the union election, the more likely the employer was to engage in illegal conduct that violates its employees' rights. The NLRB election rule would help prevent the illegal intimidation and coercion of workers.

Mr. Speaker, this regulation provides targeted solutions to discrete, specifically identifiable problems. The rule brings into the 21st century the updating of rules involving the transmission of documents and communications, allowing you to use email and electronic communication rather than paper. It will enable the Board to better fulfill its responsibility to protect employees' rights by fairly, accurately, and quickly resolving issues of representation.

In many cases, the rule just simplifies and standardizes practices that have been common in regions all over the country already, or reflects existing practices used in civil actions. The rule does not change substantive law involving elections. It just makes sure that you can have a timely election.

These modest updates provide workers and employees with reasonable time to consider unionization while preventing unreasonable delay by bad actors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution isn't going to go very far. The administration has already issued a Statement of Administration Policy that I would like to quote from. It says that:

"The Board's modest reforms will help simplify and streamline private sector union elections, thereby reducing delays before workers can have a free and fair vote on whether or not to form or join a union."

It goes on to say that:

"Giving workers greater voice can help ensure that the link is restored between hard work and opportunity and that the benefits of the current economic recovery are more broadly shared."

"The National Labor Relations Board's representation case procedures

rule helps to level the playing field for workers so they can more freely choose to make their voice heard. In doing so, it will help us build an economy that gives greater economic opportunities and security for middle-class families and those working to join the middle class."

It concludes, Mr. Speaker, that:

"If the President were presented with S.J. Res. 8, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the Resolution."

Mr. Speaker, instead of wasting time on this resolution, we should be addressing job creation, stagnating wages, economic inequality, and working to improve opportunities for Americans, rather than considering this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, somehow I am not surprised that the Obama administration supports the administration's National Labor Relations Board's actions.

At this time, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Mr. WALBERG. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to say it this way, but the fact of the matter is that the NLRB is creating a solution to a problem that does not exist by wholly changing the union election process through their new ambush election rule. This rule, if left unchecked, restricts the right of employers to speak to their employees during their organizing campaign. It cripples—it cripples—the rights of workers to make an informed decision. It denies all stakeholders access to a fair process. And isn't that what we are about?

This change is meant to weaken employers and employees who simply want a fair and just process that gives ample time for a deliberative review, discussion, and decisionmaking. Furthermore, the ambush election rule completely disregards the promise of neutrality that NLRB is mandated to uphold.

The NLRB should serve as an impartial arbiter of labor disputes, and I urge my colleagues to join the Senate in passing S.J. Res. 8, which will stop these harmful and unjust actions committed by the NLRB and preserve fair election policies which have been in place for decades.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in very strong opposition to this resolution, and I urge every one of my Members to oppose this resolution.

We considered a Paycheck Fairness Act, a card check bill which said that if the unions got the signatures of a certain percentage, that they could move ahead and be organized, subject to an election.

There was a hue and cry about, that was undemocratic, that there ought to be a requirement for an election. A number of people came into my office, and I said, Well, I think we can accommodate that. We will make sure there is a requirement that—as every one of us can do—you can get the names of the voters, you can get their addresses, you can even get their history of voting, and you can perhaps call them on the phone. We can all do that in elections.

But the fact of the matter is—and everybody on this House floor knows it—procedurally, so many employers who do not believe that they are going to prevail take the steps of delaying and delaying and delaying. They want elections tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, what the NLRB is trying to do with this rule is to make sure that there is an election, that it is fair, and that it will be held in a timely fashion.

I hope this House defeats this resolution.

This resolution would prevent the National Labor Relations Board from implementing the rule it promulgated in December to modernize worker representation elections.

But there is a fear of elections, and the fear of elections is that the majority of employees will say, yes, I want to have a better voice.

This is a case, once again, of the Republican majority seeking to roll back the hard-earned rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively for better wages and benefits. And that is not an assertion. That is demonstrably proved in State after State after State over the last few years in which Republicans have taken control, and their first item of the agenda has been to undermine workers' rights.

When workers organize for higher wages and benefits—like health insurance, retirement savings, and affordable child care—it opens the doors of opportunity for workers and their families to secure a place in our middle class. We know our middle class is shrinking. We know the middle class is having a very tough time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

According to a 2013 report by the Center for American Progress, the decline of union membership between the 1960s and today correlates to a decline of the middle class.

When we have strong unions and workers' rights protections, the middle

class does better. And workers who are not unionized benefit from the ripple effect of rising wages.

Let's defeat this bill.

I think the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), the chairman of this committee, has said that he would sit down with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) to come up with a bipartisan bill—which this is not—which will do what all of us say we think is fair, to have elections, to have elections where both sides—and of course the employer always has access to the voter in this case—and do something for the American worker and for business which will put us on a steady path to growing the middle class and making sure that workers are treated as they ought to be, with the dignity and respect and the ability to support their families that they need.

□ 1100

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I always find it to be of interest listening to this debate. Do you know what is most ironic about this bill? It is about elections. Everybody in this body has an election. But do you know what is different? Everyone in this body knows when their next election is going to be held and knows how much time they have to campaign, so much so that we have rules on this floor when we cut off communication months in advance so you can campaign.

I listened with interest to the minority whip speak on this floor his support for something different from what this bill does. I wonder, if he cared so much about what the NLRB is doing, would he apply those exact same rules to his own election? Would he care to not know when it is going to be and then when it gets called he has 11 days to campaign? I think his speech would be different. So why are we asking the rules for us to be different from every other worker across this country?

The root of representation is to work for the interests of those you represent. Everyone in the House knows that. And unions, as representative bodies, should exist for the benefit of the workers. But I don't think anyone disagrees that it is the workers, not the unions, who know what is best for themselves. Workers are the best judges of whether they want to support union political activity or even if they want to join a union at all. Joining a union is a big choice. To make an informed decision, workers need time to decide what is best for them and their families, and they shouldn't be pressured or rushed.

So if unions really care about workers, and if they are confident that the

benefits of their union outweigh the costs, they will give the workers as much time as they need. That is the irony of the recent decision by the National Labor Relations Board, to allow unions to call rush elections, to ambush employees and employers. Ambush elections don't help workers; instead, they bully workers to accept unionization as fast as possible. That is not pro-worker; that is pro-union—and there is a big difference.

What makes the situation worse is that ambush elections will soon be forced on workers not by an act of Congress, but by unelected bureaucrats in the NLRB. That is an affront to the separation of powers that this country was based upon.

So here in Congress, Mr. Speaker, we are taking action. As our Senate colleagues have already voted to do, we are going to use the Congressional Review Act to send a resolution straight to the President's desk that blocks this antiworker and antibusiness rule.

Now, I know the President has already threatened to veto this resolution, but I actually hope he will change his mind, because what does the President want to fight for? Does he want to fight for the workers? Does he want to fight for small businesses and jobs?

Ambush elections don't help workers. They don't help employers. They only help unions. And no public official, not any Member of this House, and especially not the President, should ever support rules that allow special interests to strong-arm the hardworking American people.

Mr. Speaker, nobody in this House should support a rule about an election they wouldn't put upon themselves, and I don't know one Member of this House that would sit back and say somebody can call an election and you only have 11 days to campaign. I would like to hear somebody vote for that on this floor and ask to be held to the same standards they are trying to hold every other worker to in this Nation.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, where to begin? In hearing the majority leader's remarks and in talking about fair elections, how is it fair if only one side has access to the phone numbers and email addresses and not the other side? Can any of us imagine running in our campaigns where only we or only our opponent can call or write emails to the voters? That doesn't make any sense.

Talking about 11 days, again, that is fictitious. This rule is about the 1 in 10 cases that take over 100 days. Mr. Speaker, we heard testimony in committee about organizing that lingered on hundreds and hundreds of days. And as our ranking member pointed out,



the longer it takes, there is a direct and causal relationship to illegal behavior.

The election rules that the NLRB has implemented will help expedite this process to be sure it is done in accordance with the law. It modernizes our antiquated system to level the playing field for workers. These rules set up a fair system so that bad actors that needlessly delay and abuse the electoral system for the sole purpose of having time to coerce employees through mandatory meetings, threats, and even firings won't be rewarded for their bad behavior. This coercion is not just some far-fetched idea. One in 10 cases take over 100 days.

Now, why would delaying a union election be a bad thing for union workers? Because during that delay, these workers are forced into rooms, receive threats, are bombarded with texts and emails from the employer—again, from one side in the election—but the other side in the election, absent these rules, doesn't even have access to text or phone.

Mr. Speaker, we should be focused on creating new jobs, not destroying them, and growing the middle class, not shrinking it. I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Chairman KLINE, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this important issue, and I am grateful to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

As a member of the House Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, I am concerned with the National Labor Relations Board's latest rule, which is referred to as the ambush election rule, and I stand in strong support of S.J. Res. 8.

The ambush election rule is a tool to force union elections, not to protect workers. Revisions of the list requirements under the rule will compel employers to provide very personal information about their employees, such as names, address, telephone numbers, and email addresses. This will violate the privacy of workers while reducing the informed decision period. To add insult to injury, the rule does not limit or dictate what unions can do with this sensitive information.

I am pleased that South Carolina is a right-to-work State. Union membership is not a requirement of employment in our State. It is based on freedom of choice. I am grateful we have fought as a State to give our employees and job creators the flexibility to choose what is best for them.

South Carolina has successfully opposed the rogue NLRB when the NLRB

tried to block 1,000 jobs at the Boeing facility in Charleston. With the leadership of Governor Nikki Haley, Attorney General Alan Wilson, and Senators LINDSEY GRAHAM and TIM SCOTT, we stopped the NLRB, and now over 7,000 jobs have been created.

S.J. Res. 8 will express our strong disapproval of the National Labor Relations Board rule and ensure a fair elections process.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Thank you, Ranking Member SCOTT.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Review Act is yet another attack on employees' rights to organize and to limit the National Labor Relations Board. The NLRB should have the ability to safeguard those rights and protect our Nation's workers from unfair labor practices.

It is outrageous that the rights of employees are attacked, particularly at a time when we have a jobs deficit, a shrinking middle class, and are still struggling to recover from the Great Recession.

The NLRB has made modest attempts to modernize its election procedures and reduce unnecessary litigation and delay in the election process. These are commonsense fixes that should not be controversial.

The CRA would freeze in place the Board's current flawed election procedure. The Board would be prohibited from adopting rules to utilize new technology or modernize its procedures. The NLRB is an expert agency and should be trusted to determine the appropriate use of electronic voting or rules to safeguard ballot secrecy.

Furthermore, I am not aware of any other government agency that has to seek Congress' permission before modernizing its rules for voting that takes place under its jurisdiction.

Dismantling the NLRB would only serve to weaken, undermine, and jeopardize the economic security of the middle class. It is bad for business, bad for families, and bad for our economy. In fact, the National Labor Relations Board is the last line of defense for workers.

We shouldn't be attacking our Nation's employees; we should be supporting them, investing in them, and protecting them. Let's come together to create jobs, protect the middle class, and make the investments we need to grow our economy.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL), a new member of the committee and someone who has been actively engaged in the major debates since he has walked into this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, labor relations are vital to the smooth operation of business and commerce. In the culture of our Republic, Americans are raised to expect to have their say in everything from schoolroom elections to choosing the President of the United States. It is in our DNA to have a choice. To inform that choice, we expect free speech so we can ask questions, gain information, and make wise decisions. This is why the recently finalized rule by the National Labor Relations Board is so egregious. It is against that American spirit.

Under this rule, longstanding policies that allow employers and employees to guide how they relate through unions has been deeply damaged. Companies could have as little as 11 days, or employees in relating to the companies, as little as 11 days to make a choice that could drastically affect their career and the health of the business that they rely on to put bread on the table.

Employers would only have a 7-day period to obtain counsel, set parameters, and are even restricted in contacting and discussing issues with their employees. They are prohibited from making any changes after that 7-day period based on new information that they may acquire.

Further, the privacy and safety of workers is placed in jeopardy by a swift ambush election process imposed by these rules that could put their employment in jeopardy.

This resolution stops this. It restores policies that have guided labor relations for decades. It upholds the right for American workers to gain information to make choices without draconian, strong-arm pressure tactics that harm the worker and stifle American free enterprise.

This body was founded, Mr. Speaker, on the spirit of promoting the general welfare and ensuring domestic tranquility for our Nation. Passage of S.J. Res. 8 aids this by stopping and blocking the strong-arm tactics of the National Labor Relations Board, and the American people are counting on us to do that job.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 8, an unnecessary partisan attack on hardworking Americans that will interfere with the rights of workers to an expeditious election on union representation.

America's middle class workers should be free to decide if they want an election. Unfortunately, the current process can be mired in litigation, and in some cases, workers waiting for an election have faced interference or intimidation from outside groups. The NLRB's rule safeguards the ability of

workers to choose whether to be represented by a union without confronting unnecessary delays.

It makes little sense why Congress would want to get in the way of middle class Americans—factory line workers, health care workers, and utility workers—who ask for an election on union representation. It is also unreasonable to assume that employers, many of which have sophisticated legal teams, are going to be caught flat-footed. There is no ambush here.

Mr. Speaker, the NLRB had a lengthy rulemaking proceeding with thousands of comments. It is unfair and, in fact, draconian to now use the Congressional Review Act to try to undermine the rights of workers by getting rid of this rule. The resolution is an ill-advised attempt to silence the voice of American workers, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

□ 1115

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN), another new member of the committee and someone who has also been engaged since the day he walked in.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am always interested when we are talking about workers and I hear that people want to talk about what is best for workers.

I will tell you that I am a new Member of Congress, and I have had the privilege the past 30 years of my life to give people the privilege to have a good job. That is one of the greatest privileges of my life.

We all want to do what is best for those folks who are sacrificing for us. We appreciate them; we appreciate their efforts. That is why I rise to support Senate Joint Resolution 8, to demonstrate the disapproval of Congress of the National Labor Relations Board’s “ambush election” rule to protect our workers.

A few weeks ago, the Subcommittee on Health, Employment, Labor, and Pensions, of which I am a member, held a hearing on this very issue. We learned that this NLRB is not only unprecedented, it undermines the rights of both workers and employees and creates for challenges for businesses when our economy can least afford it.

The expert testimony was from those who have been engaged in labor relations for quite a long time with tremendous experience. Their testimony provided comments about just how troubling such a threat to the privacy of workers and their families as employers would be required to disclose the names, addresses, phone numbers, and emails of employees to the NLRB, then to the union.

This rule is misguided, and NLRB has no business in rushing to advance its own agenda. We need to protect fairness in the work place. That is why I

call on my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 8.

I am proud to say that I am from the State of Georgia, a right-to-work State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KLINE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ALLEN. In the State of Georgia, we have created almost 300,000 jobs since 2006. I am proud to say we have got the finest workers in America, and I want those workers to have the freedom to make their decisions and not the NLRB.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, BOBBY SCOTT, for yielding me time.

I am a small business owner, and I am a union member, and I have a union business. The disapproval of the NLRB rule under the Congressional Review Act is an extreme move that would roll back hardworking Americans’ rights to a fair and timely election on union representation.

Let us look at what this rule does, two things: One, it modernizes communications; and, two, it protects workers from dishonest employers.

When this law was written, emails and iPhones didn’t exist, so it simply adds them to the list of what is available to contact people about joining a union.

Second, it creates a fair, modern workplace election process that elections can be done in a timely manner. The current process has long been vulnerable to manipulation, delay, and drawn out legal maneuvering by some unscrupulous employers.

The reality of today’s workplace is employers still hold all the cards. The few bad actor employers can delay a union vote by intimidating or threatening employees. They already have the phone numbers, the emails, and the home addresses. Let’s face it: What is more intimidating, getting an email or saying you know where someone lives?

The bottom line is this isn’t about the NLRB rule; this is about a process that we see across the country attacking hardworking Americans. Whether it is through so-called right-to-work laws or preventing the NLRB from updating the union election process, this is more evidence that the majority party is out to hurt the very hardworking Americans who want the ability to form a union.

This has a substantial impact on their lives. Workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement are paid more on average than those not covered and are more likely to have health care, retirement, and paid leave benefits than nonunion workers.

I would strongly urge us to vote against this political maneuvering message.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from my neighboring State of Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), another new member of the committee. We have got an almost embarrassment of riches of hard-working new Members.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to be here to speak one more time on Senate Joint Resolution 8.

I will make two points again. One of the things we see here is we have new rules which continue a trend, and that is you are fundamentally changing the way things have been for 70 years. In the past, unions have done a good job of organizing.

We have added union representation to things, but one of the things that businesses want and that America wants is consistency. One more time, after having no big problems for 70 years, we are turning things fundamentally around. Now, why is that bad?

The gentlewoman from Oregon just said this is no big deal because businesses all have lawyers on staff or whatever.

Two comments on that: First of all, businesses don’t all have lawyers on staff; and, secondly, I think it shows a fundamental misunderstanding of how business works and why it is so difficult to go into business today and why it particularly targets small businesses when you come up with new regulations.

This would be a problem even for a big company that did have a lawyer on staff and say it is no big deal; but, of course, who is less likely to have a lawyer on staff? A small business who doesn’t have full-time HR representatives and that sort of thing. This is targeting those small businesses.

Again and again and again in this country, one thing that bothers me is the degree to which people don’t have sympathy for small businesses. When you change things, they are the ones who have to go out, hire an outside lawyer, get up to speed on things, pay the big legal bills, and pay the price.

That is one reason why, in certain industries, you do see, over time, big businesses continuing to grow because little businesses can’t keep up with all the little rules.

I will remind people one more time that this invades employee privacy. It is something they are not asking for. There is no reason for outside groups to be able to get somebody’s home address or that sort of thing.

In any event, I will ask the other people present in the room to go back home and ask, particularly their small employers, when they have to run to a lawyer—first of all, to ask their small employers whether or not they have a lawyer on staff because I think the vast majority of businesses in this

country don't have a lawyer on staff; and, secondly, whether they do or don't have a lawyer on staff, if they have to go run to a lawyer, whether they think it's no big deal, because I think it is an awfully big deal.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

I would like to point out that I think the people who promote this piece of legislation and the people who oppose it basically take their positions for the same reason, and that is that labor unions improve wages, make better working conditions, promote job security, and give strength in numbers.

We oppose and support this bill for the same reason. Some people want to see workers get more pay—we have seen stagnant wages—and some people think that when workers make more money, it just hurts corporate profitability—which, by the way, is up and has been increasing.

The point is simply this: The NLRB does its job and modernizes union elections and proposes a rule. The Republican majority comes in and says, We don't like that because that might lead to more union elections, and it may lead to more unionized workers, and we like it how it is, we like flat and declining wages, we want the employers to have all of the power, we want the workers to be alone and on their own and without the strength that the numbers that a union provides. It is just as simple as that.

Americans watching this debate today have yet another opportunity to see who is on their side and who is not. American workers get more money and get paid better when they are in unions.

Collective bargaining strengthens family budgets because it means that workers can say, Do you know what, that is unsafe; do you know what, you are making plenty of money, so should we; do you know what, we need to get some job security in a union contract around here—and that is exactly why we see the opposition to this NLRB rule.

So it is disappointing. I think President Obama was right when he said the number one problem facing the United States today is income inequality. That is the concentration of riches at the top and the stagnation for wages for everybody else.

If that is the problem, then we need to do something about it. That means modernizing the right to collectively bargain.

I will say modernizing union elections is the thing that will help us achieve that equality.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the

gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member.

It is incredible. We are in this great Hall of democracy. The world looks to this very building, for what it seeks is to give people a voice, what our country was founded on. What we are having a vote on today is to clamp down and shut the mouths of those who are seeking to have a voice.

Very recently, there was a poll conducted that said, if given the opportunity, 73 percent of American workers want to have a voice and would vote for a union, but what we are hearing today is shutting down the voice and creating predictability. This is about democracy; this is about what we in America believe in: giving everybody an equal opportunity for a voice.

What the NLRB—and I have dealt with them for over 30 years. We have won some; we have lost some. They have been independent. Sometimes, I haven't been happy with their decisions, but I have always felt they have been fair.

What we are talking about is bringing them into the 21st century, making a voting date that is agreeable to what real people think. You shouldn't have to wait 6 months, 9 months, go through the appeal process.

Let's have a vote because, remember, the employer has had access—unfettered access—to all these employees, and all we are saying is let's make sure that workers have a voice. If they say "no," no harm, no foul, and go home. This is about creating an equal playing field, which certainly isn't there.

That is why I am urging my colleagues to vote against this anti-American, antidemocracy, antiworker resolution.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. SCOTT.

One of the things that made the 20th century known as the American century was that the United States had the largest middle class in the history of the world—the idea that if you worked hard and played by the rules, you would get a fair wage and good benefits and that your children would be even able to do a little bit better than you have been able to do.

It wasn't always that way, though, in the United States. We can thank to a great extent some of the great advances that we had in the 20th century, as far as workers' rights, to that of organized labor. Without labor unions, we would not have the strength of the middle class today.

It is no accident that in the post-World War II period, when you saw av-

erage incomes rise in the fifties, in the sixties, in the seventies, you saw average incomes rise for workers, sure enough, you saw the percentage of the American workforce unionized also increase.

□ 1130

It is also no accident that, as the percentage of the American unionized workforce declined, so, too, did the average wages to the point at which we are today, where we have had a 20-year period in which middle class wages are stagnant, in which the working class has actually fallen behind, and in which—no surprise—we actually have the lowest percentage of the workforce unionized today in over 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, let's stand up for the middle class. Let's stand up for our workers. Let us reject this antilabor, anti-union, antiworker measure, and let's start fighting and working for those who are working for America.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Is the chairman prepared to close?

Mr. KLINE. I am.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The rule that is subject to this resolution creates no substantive change in the law. It just requires that an election be timely. We have heard this 11-day myth. Let me just go through a little about that myth and how you get to the 11 days.

First of all, the regional office would have to issue a notice of a hearing on the same day that the union would have filed the election petition. The hearing would have to be held as soon as possible and last only one day, and the regional director would have to issue an opinion on the same day.

Right now, it currently takes a median of 20 days for the regional director to issue a decision on the hearing, and there is no reason to believe that it would be any shorter under this rule.

The union would have to waive all of its rights to get information in terms of contact lists and things like that, and the region would have to schedule the election on the very first day possible. The chance that all of that is going to happen to get you down to 11 days is just very improbable.

The administration has already indicated that its senior advisers would recommend a veto of this legislation, so it is not going anywhere.

I look forward to working with the chair of the committee to do what we can to create jobs and to increase wages and to create safe workplaces. I would hope that the chair and I will get together on that rather than waste time on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Statement of Administration Policy.

## STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

## S.J. RES. 8—CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD REPRESENTATION CASE PROCEDURES RULE

(Sen. Alexander, R-TN and 51 cosponsors, Mar. 3, 2015)

The Administration strongly opposes Senate passage of S.J. Res. 8, which would overturn the National Labor Relations Board's recently issued "representation case procedures" rule. The Board's modest reforms will help simplify and streamline private sector union elections, thereby reducing delays before workers can have a free and fair vote on whether or not to form or join a union. The rule allows for electronic filing and transmission of documents, ensures that all parties receive timely information necessary to participate in the election process, reduces delays caused by frivolous litigation, unifies procedures across the country, requires additional contact information be included in voter lists, and consolidates appeals to the Board into a single process.

Instead of seeking to undermine a streamlined democratic process for American workers to vote on whether or not they want to be represented, the Congress should join the President in strengthening protections for American workers and giving them more of a voice in the workplace and the economy. Growing and sustaining the middle class requires strong and vital labor unions, which helped to build this Nation's middle class and have been critical to raising workers' wages and putting in place worker protections that we enjoy today. Giving workers greater voice can help ensure that the link is restored between hard work and opportunity and that the benefits of the current economic recovery are more broadly shared.

The National Labor Relations Board's representation case procedures rule helps to level the playing field for workers so they can more freely choose to make their voice heard. In doing so, it will help us build an economy that gives greater economic opportunities and security for middle-class families and those working to join the middle class.

If the President were presented with S.J. Res. 8, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the Resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is always interesting—isn't it, Mr. Speaker?—to listen to the debate and to the claims that are made and to the claims that are refuted. I found it a little bit interesting in listening to some of the comments on the other side of the aisle that, apparently, this Congressional Review Act S.J. Res. 8 action and all of those who support it are anti-union, antilabor, antiworker, and—I was a little shocked to hear—even anti-American.

I am not called "anti-American" very often, Mr. Speaker, and I do resent it a little bit, but that is the way this debate kind of goes. Let's get a couple of things, I think, straight. I know that everybody can have his opinion and not the facts, but there are some things that, I think, are pretty clear.

According to the National Labor Relations Board, itself, more than 94 per-

cent of elections occur in less than 56 days, which is less than 2 months, Mr. Speaker, and the median time is only 38 days. Unions, Mr. Speaker, win over 60 percent of those elections, so there is a voice for union organizers, for workers, and for employers, because there is time. There is not a rush.

Now, we just heard some discussion about whether 11 days is probable—we all agree, I think, it is possible—or maybe it would be 12 or 13 or something like that, but it is not in question that you only have 7 days under this rule. This is the rule, by the way. This is the rule that we are talking about. The law that is affected is many times thicker than this.

My colleague from Wisconsin talked about whether or not you have a labor lawyer on staff. Certainly, if you are a small- or middle-sized company, you don't. You can't afford that. So you have 7 days to go out and find a lawyer who can help you comply with this rule and with the law, the much thicker law. You have 7 days to get your position down in writing, and then you are stuck with it. Then you could have the election 4 days later. That is not an opportunity for informed discussion, debate for either the workers or for the employers.

This is called an "ambush" election because it is, indeed, an ambush. We heard one of the speakers talk about: Would you rather have somebody have your email address or your home address? Under this rule, you get it all. Mr. Speaker, clearly, there are many instances of intimidation during these exercises, and often that intimidation comes from union organizers, not from your fellow workers usually but from outside union organizers, who are trying to push this onto the workforce.

So I am very pleased to be supporting S.J. Res. 8, which is to provide congressional disapproval. I am not surprised, as I mentioned earlier, that the Obama administration supports the Obama National Labor Relations Board's position here, but it doesn't mean it is right, and it doesn't mean we shouldn't be standing up for the voices that we have heard about—for employers and employees—so that they can make informed decisions.

The NLRB's rule, Mr. Speaker, stifles the right of employers to speak to their employees during an organizing campaign. It also cripples the right of workers to have the information they need to make a very important decision about whether or not to join a union or even that union. That is a big decision, and it shouldn't be jammed into 11 days or 2 weeks. You need the time to be informed in order to make such a decision.

A "yes" vote on the resolution will help rein in this activist National Labor Relations Board, and it will ensure workers, employers, and unions can participate in a fair union election

process. I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 8.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my strong support for S.J. Res. 8 and I plan to vote yes today.

Late last year, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) finalized a new rule empowering unions with the ability to hold "ambush elections." Whereas the current median amount of time to prepare for union elections is 38 days, this rule dramatically lowers the time to as few as 11 days. This does a great disservice to both employers and workers, who would have little time to adequately prepare for elections, much less to communicate and understand the pros and cons of such a move.

Even more dangerously, the ambush elections rule also requires employers to hand over workers' personal information without their consent, including cell phone numbers, email and home address, and work schedules. This is a grave breach of privacy, with inadequate protections for how that information is handled, and could subject workers who oppose joining the union to intimidation tactics at all hours of the day, no matter where they are.

I strongly support this joint resolution of disapproval and want that support to be made part of the record. I hope the President realizes the folly of this misguided and dangerous regulation and signs this resolution into law now that it has passed both the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the previous question is ordered on the joint resolution.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage of the joint resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 186, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 128]

YEAS—232

Abraham	Bilirakis	Bridenstine
Aderholt	Bishop (MI)	Brooks (AL)
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (IN)
Amash	Black	Buchanan
Amodei	Blackburn	Buck
Babin	Blum	Bucshon
Barletta	Bost	Burgess
Barr	Boustany	Byrne
Barton	Brady (TX)	Calvert
Benishek	Brat	Carter (GA)

Carter (TX) Hurd (TX)  
 Chabot Hurt (VA)  
 Chaffetz Issa  
 Clawson (FL) Jenkins (KS)  
 Coffman Jenkins (WV)  
 Cole Johnson (OH)  
 Collins (GA) Johnson, Sam  
 Collins (NY) Jolly  
 Comstock Jones  
 Conaway Joyce  
 Cook Katko  
 Costello (PA) Kelly (PA)  
 Cramer King (IA)  
 Crawford Kinzinger (IL)  
 Crenshaw Kline  
 Culberson Knight  
 Curbelo (FL) LaMalfa  
 Davis, Rodney Lamborn  
 Denham Lance  
 Dent Latta  
 DeSantis Long  
 DesJarlais Loudermilk  
 Diaz-Balart Love  
 Dold Lucas  
 Duffy Luetkemeyer  
 Duncan (SC) Lummis  
 Duncan (TN) MacArthur  
 Ellmers (NC) Marchant  
 Emmer (MN) Marino  
 Farenthold Massie  
 Fincher McCarthy  
 Fitzpatrick McCaul  
 Fleischmann McClintock  
 Fleming McHenry  
 Flores McKinley  
 Forbes McMorris  
 Fortenberry Rodgers  
 Foxx McSally  
 Franks (AZ) Meadows  
 Frelinghuysen Meehan  
 Garrett Messer  
 Gibbs Mica  
 Gibson Miller (FL)  
 Gohmert Miller (MI)  
 Goodlatte Moolenaar  
 Gowdy Mooney (WV)  
 Graves (GA) Mullin  
 Graves (LA) Mulvaney  
 Griffith Murphy (PA)  
 Grothman Neugebauer  
 Guinta Newhouse  
 Guthrie Noem  
 Hanna Nugent  
 Hardy Nunes  
 Harper Olson  
 Harris Palazzo  
 Hartzler Palmer  
 Heck (NV) Paulsen  
 Hensarling Pearce  
 Herrera Beutler Perry  
 Hice, Jody B. Pittenger  
 Hill Pitts  
 Holding Poe (TX)  
 Hudson Poliquin  
 Huelskamp Pompeo  
 Huizenga (MI) Posey  
 Hultgren Price, Tom  
 Hunter Ratcliffe

## NAYS—186

Adams Castro (TX)  
 Aguilar Chu, Judy  
 Ashford Cicilline  
 Bass Clark (MA)  
 Beatty Clarke (NY)  
 Becerra Clay  
 Bera Cleaver  
 Beyer Clyburn  
 Bishop (GA) Cohen  
 Blumenauer Connolly  
 Bonamici Conyers  
 Boyle, Brendan Cooper  
 F. Costa  
 Brady (PA) Courtney  
 Brown (FL) Crowley  
 Brownley (CA) Cuellar  
 Bustos Cummings  
 Butterfield Davis (CA)  
 Capps Davis, Danny  
 Capuano DeFazio  
 Cárdenas DeGette  
 Carney Delaney  
 Carson (IN) DeLauro  
 Cartwright DelBene  
 Castor (FL) DeSaulnier

Reed Heck (WA)  
 Reichert Higgins  
 Renacci Himes  
 Ribble Honda  
 Rice (SC) Hoyer  
 Rigell Huffman  
 Roby Israel  
 Roe (TN) Jackson Lee  
 Rogers (AL) Jeffries  
 Rogers (KY) Johnson (GA)  
 Rohrabacher Johnson, E. B.  
 Rokita Kaptur  
 Rooney (FL) Keating  
 Ros-Lehtinen Kelly (IL)  
 Ross Kennedy  
 Rothfus Kildee  
 Rouzer Kilmer  
 Royce Kind  
 Russell King (NY)  
 Ryan (WI) Kirkpatrick  
 Salmon Kuster  
 Sanford Langevin  
 Scalise Larsen (WA)  
 Schweikert Larson (CT)  
 Sensenbrenner Lawrence  
 Sessions Lee  
 Shimkus Levin  
 Shuster Lewis  
 Simpson Lieu, Ted  
 Smith (MO) Lipinski  
 Smith (NE) LeBondo  
 Smith (TX) Loebsack  
 Stefanik Lofgren  
 Stewart Lowenthal  
 Stivers Lowey  
 Stutzman Lujan Grisham  
 Thompson (PA) (NM)  
 Thornberry Luján, Ben Ray  
 Tiberi (NM)  
 Tipton Lynch  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westernman  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin  
 Zinke

Maloney, Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascarelli  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppersberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda  
 T.

## NOT VOTING—14

Garamendi Hinojosa  
 Gosar Jordan  
 Granger Labrador  
 Graves (MO) Payne  
 Grayson Roskam

□ 1208

Mr. CLYBURN changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. STUTZMAN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 159, answered “present” 1, not voting 39, as follows:

Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takai  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Buchanan  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Capps  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Cartwright  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Cole  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comstock  
 Conyers  
 Cook  
 Cooper  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crenshaw  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 DeSaulnier  
 DesJarlais  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dingell  
 Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Emmer (MN)  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Fleischmann  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Franks (AZ)

[Roll No. 129]

## AYES—233

Frelinghuysen  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Goodlatte  
 Graham  
 Granger  
 Graves (LA)  
 Green, Al  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hahn  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Heck (WA)  
 Hensarling  
 Hill  
 Himes  
 Huelskamp  
 Huffman  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurt (VA)  
 Issa  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Jolly  
 Kaptur  
 Katko  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kline  
 Knight  
 Kuster  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Shimkus  
 Larson (CT)  
 Latta  
 Lawrence  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Speier  
 Lofgren  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Lowenthal  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham  
 (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 (NM)  
 Marino  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McHenry  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McNeerney  
 Meadows  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes

## NOES—159

Brady (PA)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Carter (GA)  
 Castor (FL)  
 Chaffetz  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clawson (FL)  
 Clyburn  
 Coffman  
 Cohen  
 Collins (GA)  
 Conaway  
 Connolly  
 Costa  
 Costello (PA)

Cummings	Keating	Price, Tom
DeFazio	Kelly (IL)	Ratcliffe
DeGette	Kilmer	Reed
Denham	Kind	Renacci
Dent	Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble
DeSantis	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
Dold	Lance	Rogers (AL)
Duckworth	Langevin	Ros-Lehtinen
Duffy	Levin	Rouzer
Ellmers (NC)	Lewis	Roybal-Allard
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Rush
Fitzpatrick	Loeb sack	Ryan (OH)
Fleming	Love	Sánchez, Linda
Flores	Lowe y	T.
Forbes	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Fortenberry	MacArthur	Sarbanes
Fox x	Maloney,	Schakowsky
Fudge	Carolyn	Schrader
Garrett	Maloney, Sean	Sewell (AL)
Gibson	Matsui	Shuster
Gowdy	McDermott	Sinema
Green, Gene	McGovern	Slaughter
Griffith	McKinley	Smith (MO)
Hartzler	McSally	Stivers
Hastings	Meehan	Swalwell (CA)
Heck (NV)	Miller (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Herrera Beutler	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Hice, Jody B.	Moulton	Thompson (PA)
Higgins	Mulvaney	Tiberi
Holding	Murphy (FL)	Tipton
Honda	Murphy (PA)	Torres
Hoyer	Neal	Turner
Hudson	Nolan	Valadao
Huizenga (MI)	Norcross	Vargas
Hurd (TX)	Palazzo	Veasey
Israel	Pallone	Vela
Jackson Lee	Palmer	Velázquez
Jeffries	Paulsen	Visclosky
Jenkins (KS)	Pearce	Waters, Maxine
Jenkins (WV)	Peters	Watson Coleman
Johnson (OH)	Peterson	Weber (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Pittenger	Wittman
Jones	Poe (TX)	Woodall
Joyce	Poliquin	Yoder

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Gohmert

## NOT VOTING—39

Barton	Grijalva	Payne
Capuano	Hanna	Perlmutter
Cárdenas	Harris	Perry
Crawford	Hinojosa	Quigley
Davis, Rodney	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Doggett	Jordan	Schock
Fincher	Labrador	Scott, Austin
Garamendi	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Gibbs	Lee	Sires
Gosar	Lummis	Smith (WA)
Graves (GA)	Marchant	Walberg
Graves (MO)	O'Rourke	Wilson (FL)
Grayson	Pascrell	Young (IN)

□ 1215

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 976

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 976.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

## AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCY MOHAMMAD ASHRAF GHANI, PRESIDENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, March 25, 2015, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, the President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, March 24, 2015, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## PROVIDING FOR THE EXPENSES OF CERTAIN COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN THE 114TH CONGRESS

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 152, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for the expenses of certain committees of the House of Representatives in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the amendment printed in House Report 114-45 is adopted, and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 132

Resolved,

## SECTION 1. COMMITTEE EXPENSES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—With respect to the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, there shall be paid out of the applicable accounts of the House of Representatives, in accordance with this primary expense resolution, not more than the amount specified in subsection (b) for the expenses (including the expenses of all staff salaries) of each committee named in such subsection.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in sub-

section (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$10,173,096; Committee on Armed Services, \$14,208,340; Committee on the Budget, \$10,380,424; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$14,044,580; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$19,531,442; Committee on Ethics, \$6,201,326; Committee on Financial Services, \$15,086,852; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$14,923,986; Committee on Homeland Security, \$14,407,846; Committee on House Administration, \$9,293,130; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$9,197,310; Committee on the Judiciary, \$14,395,572; Committee on Natural Resources, \$13,422,774; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$18,059,682; Committee on Rules, \$5,846,964; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$10,671,164; Committee on Small Business, \$6,045,228; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$16,728,260; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$6,958,062; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$17,515,290.

## SEC. 2. FIRST SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2015, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2016.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,086,548; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,104,170; Committee on the Budget, \$5,190,212; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$7,022,290; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,765,721; Committee on Ethics, \$3,100,663; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,543,426; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$7,461,993; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,203,923; Committee on House Administration, \$4,646,565; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,598,655; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,197,786; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,711,387; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$9,029,841; Committee on Rules, \$2,960,982; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,335,582; Committee on Small Business, \$3,022,614; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,364,130; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,479,031; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,757,645.

## SEC. 3. SECOND SESSION LIMITATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Of the amount provided for in section 1 for each committee named in subsection (b), not more than the amount specified in such subsection shall be available for expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2016, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2017.

(b) COMMITTEES AND AMOUNTS.—The committees and amounts referred to in subsection (a) are: Committee on Agriculture, \$5,086,548; Committee on Armed Services, \$7,104,170; Committee on the Budget, \$5,190,212; Committee on Education and the Workforce, \$7,022,290; Committee on Energy and Commerce, \$9,765,721; Committee on Ethics, \$3,100,663; Committee on Financial Services, \$7,543,426; Committee on Foreign Affairs, \$7,461,993; Committee on Homeland Security, \$7,203,923; Committee on House Administration, \$4,646,565; Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, \$4,598,655; Committee on the Judiciary, \$7,197,786; Committee on Natural Resources, \$6,711,387; Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, \$9,029,841; Committee on Rules, \$2,885,982; Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, \$5,335,582; Committee on Small

Business, \$3,022,614; Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, \$8,364,130; Committee on Veterans' Affairs, \$3,479,031; and Committee on Ways and Means, \$8,757,645.

(c) REVIEW OF USE OF FUNDS IN FIRST SESSION.—

(1) REVIEW.—None of the amounts provided for in section 1 for a committee named in subsection (b) may be available for expenses of the committee after March 15, 2016, unless the chair or ranking minority member of the committee appears and presents testimony at a hearing of the Committee on House Administration held prior to such date to review the committee's use of the amounts provided for in section 1 during the first session of the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress and to determine whether the amount specified in subsection (b) with respect to the committee should be updated on the basis of the review.

(2) WAIVER.—The Committee on House Administration may waive the application of paragraph (1) to any or all of the committees named in subsection (b).

#### SEC. 4. VOUCHERS.

Payments under this resolution shall be made on vouchers authorized by the committee involved, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved in the manner directed by the Committee on House Administration.

#### SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Amounts made available under this resolution shall be expended in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Committee on House Administration.

#### SEC. 6. RESERVE FUND FOR UNANTICIPATED EXPENSES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established a reserve fund for unanticipated expenses of committees for the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress.

(b) AMOUNT.—The reserve fund under this section shall have a balance of \$1,000,000, of which—

(1) \$500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2015, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2016; and

(2) \$500,000 shall be available for unanticipated expenses incurred during the period beginning at noon on January 3, 2016, and ending immediately before noon on January 3, 2017.

(c) ALLOCATION TO COMMITTEES.—Amounts in the reserve fund under this section shall be paid to a committee pursuant to an allocation approved by the Committee on House Administration.

#### SEC. 7. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.

The Committee on House Administration shall have authority to make adjustments in amounts under section 1, if necessary to comply with an order of the President issued under section 251A or 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or to conform to any change in appropriations for the purposes of such section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 132.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 132, which is a resolution setting the funding levels for each House committee.

Every Congress, it is the responsibility of the Committee on House Administration to establish funding levels for committees in the House so that they may budget appropriately and prepare their oversight and operational responsibilities for the rest of Congress with a full knowledge of the resources available.

The Committee on House Administration started the consideration process out of this committee funding resolution by holding hearings to receive input from the chair and ranking members of each of our House committees. These were very productive, very informative hearings, and I am certain that my partner in this effort, the ranking member of our committee, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, certainly will share that belief. Each chair and ranking member worked together in the development of their committee's budget requests and in their advocacy for those requests before our committee. It was a true example of bipartisanship.

This funding resolution that is a product of the information developed by our hearings is also a bipartisan product, which was favorably reported out of our committee by unanimous voice vote. I am very pleased that each committee reaffirmed their commitment to uphold the equitable two-thirds/one-third allocation between the majority and the minority sides.

The Committee on House Administration has taken really great care, Mr. Speaker, in examining the funding levels authorized for each committee in this resolution so that the priorities of the House and the priorities of the American people are put front and center.

I think it is important to note that, over the past few Congresses, the House has not only asked for fiscal responsibility across the Federal Government, but has led by example in showing fiscal responsibility by making reductions in our own budgets, both in individual Member office budgets as well as the committee budgets.

Since the 110th Congress, for example, Mr. Speaker, the House has had actually a 15 percent reduction in our committee budgets. At the same time, our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol did not actually reduce the funding for their committees other than what was mandated by "sequestration." In fact, the other body actu-

ally increased their committee spending while the House was reducing spending, until making some modest reductions in the committee budgets recently at the start of the 114th. I just point that out. We were leading by example here.

Additionally, the Executive Office actually had a 30 percent increase in their spending since 2008, and, given that it is the role of the Congress to conduct effective and needed oversight over the entire executive and judicial branches, I think it is very vital that we make certain that our committees have the resources they need to meet this important duty.

So that brings us here today, Mr. Speaker, to the consideration of House Resolution 152.

After hearing from each chair and each ranking member, the committee was able, really, to better ascertain the needs of each committee and to ensure that they did have adequate and proper funding. Many committees, including the Committee on House Administration, received no increase in funding in this resolution from what we were allocated in the 113th Congress. Many committees received flat funding. Because of the increased oversight or legislative priorities, other committees required a very modest or targeted increase in their resources.

The overall proposed increase in authorized funding for the committees is 1.63 percent for 2015 and 1.57 percent for 2016. Again, though, there are about half of the committees that received no increase in funding, got level funding.

The committee funding resolution also takes into account that there might be unforeseen circumstances that will pop up during the course of this Congress that might require some additional resources. For instance, in the case of the Judiciary Committee, it was testified by the chair and the ranking member that there is a possibility of a judicial impeachment proceeding. They may have to conduct that; they may not. So to prepare for that kind of unanticipated need, the Committee on House Administration has actually allocated \$500,000 for each session in the 114th into a reserve fund which could be allocated for something like that or, if there is another committee that demonstrates a real need for it, an emerging priority that perhaps they couldn't see at this point in time.

I just think that that is a very fiscally prudent way to budget, not just giving money on the "if come," but if we really do see that we need it, of course then we can protect that money; if we don't need to spend it, it won't be spent.

Before authorizing any increase in funding, the Committee on House Administration really dove into why the increase was needed, such as a specific new priority, emerging challenges that some of our committees will face this



Congress. Some of the committees requested additional funds for urgent equipment needs.

Part of our responsibilities, of course, are to ensure smooth operations of this institution, because a breakdown of equipment that we rely on every day to assist with the daily function of the House may lead to proceedings being severely delayed or halted, and we thought that was an unacceptable possibility. So, as an example, some of the equipment that, as I say, that some of the committees are looking for, we wanted to make sure we had resources there.

Another example is the need for additional specialized staff members to assist in the oversight functions that the committee is charged with. For instance, the Armed Services Committee, a good example, had great needs for additional staff to help with conducting vigorous oversight in the pursuit of major overdue reforms at the Pentagon which could save the Nation, literally, tens of billions of dollars. We thought that was a fiscally prudent use of additional resources.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee has immense new challenges in conducting their oversight needed to get to the bottom of the scandalous treatment of our veterans at the VA hospitals across the Nation. Again, we thought that that was an appropriate expenditure as we ensure that those who have served the cause of freedom get the care and the benefits that they have earned. Again, not only do we believe that it is a prudent use of additional resources, but an imperative duty.

Other committees have expressed a desire for more field hearings across the country, and our committee was very supportive of this because we really believe that getting out of Washington, if you will, and conducting these field hearings, talking to the American people, really allowing Members and committees to gather firsthand knowledge of how the Federal programs are functioning and their impact on our Nation, was a very important thing.

So I would say this. I think it is important to note that, while there is a very small overall increase in authorized committee spending, this funding resolution does not require any new spending, does not require any new spending within the House's overall budget. This funding resolution only redirects already appropriated resources to new priorities.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, we are proposing modest, targeted increases to meet the House committees' oversight and operational needs, and I would hope that each Member of the House will concur with the priorities that we have set forth in this funding resolution to allow each of our committees to continue with their important work.

Producing this resolution, I think, was important work for our committee, and I certainly want to thank all of our members, both Republican and Democrat, particularly the distinguished ranking member, Mr. BRADY from Pennsylvania, for his cooperation, their participation in the process, and the ideas that everybody brought to the table that helped produce this resolution that we bring to the full House today, which I will note as well, Mr. Speaker, was passed out of our committee unanimously.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 132.

After several days of testimony by committee chairs and ranking members and careful review by the Committee on House Administration, we determined what we believe to be appropriate committee funding levels for the 114th Congress.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and her staff for their diligence throughout this process. We have worked closely and cooperatively. While we would have liked to have done more, I believe that these levels will allow committees to perform their oversight responsibilities. It is my hope that we continue to explore ways to ensure congressional committees are equipped with the proper amount of resources needed to operate fully, while still maximizing the value of their committee funding.

I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would add that, for the 114th Congress—and I think this is a very important point, actually—the House remained below the amount authorized back in 2008. We are below the amount authorized in 2008. So the House has been making significant strides to take a very hard look at the way that we utilize our individual budgets, both in our Member offices as well as in our committees, and we are absolutely committed to being fiscally responsible stewards of the taxpayer dollar.

This funding resolution highlights those priorities to remain guardians of the taxpayer dollar, and as such, each committee must operate responsibly, using their budget to set priorities to carry out their important work.

Even after the adoption of the resolution, the Committee on House Administration will continue to work with each committee to assist them in finding solutions which deliver savings and allow every committee to stretch the valuable resources allocated so that they can continue to carry out their important duties.

At the Committee on House administration, we understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is our responsibility to ensure that the House operates in a fiscally responsible manner, an effective and efficient manner, and that is a responsibility that we take very, very seriously. I believe strongly that we have found the appropriate balance in funding this resolution that will keep in place fiscal responsibility and, at the same time, ensure that the important work of the House is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I would mention to the ranking member that I don't think I have any other speakers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER). It is no secret that she won't be returning in the next Congress, but this will be the last time that I will be with her managing the committees' funding.

I know she is here 21 months more, but I want her to know that every chance I get, with this microphone, I will thank her.

She is, without question, one of the classiest ladies I know in this House. She is fair. I enjoy going to the committee meetings. We smile and we shake hands before the meeting, and we smile and we shake hands after the meeting. She is a pleasure to work with. I wish her well. And again, for the next 21 months, any chance I get, I just hope that I do have the opportunity to keep on thanking her.

I only hope that this House will take note of the way our committee works. We work together. We compromise together. And because of that, things get done.

So, again, I wish her well, and I will have more opportunity to wish her well.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, let me just sincerely, sincerely thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY), my ranking member.

If I am going to miss anything in this House, it is the great friendships that I have made with many people, both Republicans and Democrats. Certainly he has been right at the top of the list. He has been nothing but professional in our committee deliberations, in the way that we handle all of these different challenges that come before our committee.

I do think it is a very good thing that he points out that our committee does operate in a very bipartisan way. We are all about making sure that this institution is able to do what the American people expect from us, and we

both share that passion. So I look forward to working with him for another year and a half here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to support the passage of this resolution so that each committee can plan appropriately with the full knowledge of their available resources.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 152, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### A TRIBUTE TO RUTH ELLEN DAILEY HELM

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Ruth Ellen Dailey Helm, who passed away at the age of 98 recently in Tucson.

Ruth was a pilot during World War II, one of the first female pilots to serve in our military and a trailblazer.

Unlike many of the male pilots who served at the time, Ruth was qualified to fly multiple aircraft as a member of the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or WASPs; and she ferried bomber, transport, and pursuit aircraft all over the country during World War II.

She was inducted into the Arizona Aviation Hall of Fame in 1999 and awarded the Congressional Gold Medal with her WASP colleagues in 2010.

In addition to serving our country, Ruth and the WASPs were pioneers who inspired an entire generation of women to pursue their dreams of serving as pilots in our military, and that includes me.

When I was going through the challenges of becoming a fighter pilot in the first wave, there were no mentors in front of us to see us through. But when I needed encouragement or when I wanted to quit, Ruth and her fellow WASPs, starting 20 years ago, would be there for me, to inspire me and to encourage me and to give me what I needed to fight for another day.

They were more than role models who broke down gender barriers to serve in our military. They were my personal wingmen—or wingwomen, and I will be forever grateful to Ruth and all the WASP women for paving the way for me, for serving as my friends and my mentors, and for proving that women could be exceptional pilots too.

#### SAN DIEGO REGIONAL CLIMATE COLLABORATIVE

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative, which recently won the United States Environmental Protection Agency's Climate Leadership Award for Innovative Partnerships. This award recognizes organizations across the country working on cutting-edge climate initiatives that address greenhouse gas reduction goals, adaptation, and resilience.

As a member-based network that supports public agencies in the San Diego region, the Climate Collaborative works to advance comprehensive solutions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and prepare our region for climate impacts.

In San Diego, climate change is not a partisan issue. While there is debate in Congress about the science of climate change, there is not debate amongst scientists.

As I see every day, San Diegans aren't waiting for Washington to act to address climate change. The collaborative has built partnerships with business, academia, nonprofits, and philanthropic entities to share expertise, leverage resources, and advance actions that benefit San Diego's communities, economy, and natural resources.

The San Diego Regional Climate Collaborative serves as a model for other regions as we seek to address the harmful effects of climate change as a nation and as a planet. I congratulate them.

#### GENDER EQUALITY AT ABBOTT LABORATORIES

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 10th District's very own Abbott Laboratories in North Chicago and their commitment to gender equality.

The National Association for Female Executives recently released their list of the top 50 companies for executive women. For the sixth consecutive year, Abbott Laboratories placed in the top 10. The association recognized Abbott for their commitment to promoting and empowering women.

I am extremely proud of Abbott's commitment and accomplishments. But it is also a sign, Mr. Speaker, of how much progress we still have to make as a country. We must continue to ensure that our young women have all the same opportunities available to them as young men. We must be sure that women are not at a disadvantage simply due to their gender. It is our duty not just as Members of this House but also as human beings to ensure that women and men are equals in the workplace, and increasing the number of female executives is crucial to that goal.

Mr. Speaker, companies like Abbott have made tremendous strides, but there is still work to be done. I applaud their example and urge others to follow.

#### NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise during National Agriculture Week, with yesterday being National Agriculture Day, to recognize the contributions of farmers, ranchers, and producers to our economy and well-being.

Agriculture supports one in four Nebraska jobs and contributes more than \$23 billion to our State's economy. I am very proud to represent Nebraska's Third District, now the number one agriculture district in the Nation.

Our global economy presents great opportunity. Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers live outside the United States, and they all need to eat. As a result, we are seeing growing demand for Nebraska's agriculture products. Our State's beef exports reached a record high, \$1 billion in sales, in 2014.

The efficiency and forward thinking of our ag producers is making it possible to meet demand with fewer inputs and less waste.

As founder and cochairman of the Modern Agriculture Caucus, I am committed to promoting scientifically based innovation and policies.

On this National Agriculture Day and Agriculture Week, please join me in thanking the many producers working tirelessly to support our economy and help feed the world.

#### BOSMA ENTERPRISES AND ABILITYONE

(Mr. ROKITA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exemplary partnership between the AbilityOne Program, an extraordinary initiative that helps people with disabilities, and Indiana's own Bosma Enterprises.

For the past 25 years of Bosma's 100 years in business, their partnership with AbilityOne has helped disabled Hoosiers achieve a greater level of independence and enabled many to gain employment in good-paying jobs.

Nearly 60 percent of all employees there are blind or suffer some degree of visual impairment. One such man is Don Green. Don is totally blind and found it very difficult to reenter the job market. About to give up after almost 200 job rejections, Don applied to Bosma, which, because of its contracts through AbilityOne, was able to hire

him as a material handler. Just 6 years later, Mr. Speaker, Don is a production supervisor, managing 40 people.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize the work that Bosma Enterprises is doing in partnership with the AbilityOne Program. They open doors of opportunity and help make the State of Indiana, my beloved State, a better place to live each and every day.

#### THE AMERICAN PATENT SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from New York (Mr. KATKO).

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ABUSE

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about important issues that face our society, domestic violence and sexual abuse.

As a former Federal prosecutor for the last two decades, I witnessed how violence affects people of all ages, races, religions, and socioeconomic conditions. Domestic violence does not discriminate.

Our country has a moral obligation to stand up against those who exploit their power to commit violence against men, women, and children.

In an effort to raise awareness and to put an end to domestic violence and sexual abuse, my district will be kicking off the White Ribbon Campaign. The White Ribbon Campaign is one of the largest efforts in the world of people working together to prevent and end domestic violence and sexual assault against women, men, and children. The White Ribbon Campaign will begin this Friday, March 20, and run through March 29.

Vera House of Syracuse, New York, is spearheading the local effort in my district. Vera House is a comprehensive domestic and sexual violence service agency that provides shelter, advocacy, and counseling services for women, children, and men. They also provide education and prevention programs and community coordination.

Vera House will be providing white ribbons, such as the one on my lapel here, and white wrist bands, such as the white one on my wrist here today, in an effort to build awareness and put a stop to domestic violence and sexual abuse.

From March 20 to March 29, thousands of my constituents in central New York will be wearing a white ribbon or a white wristband to raise awareness about domestic violence and sexual abuse.

I encourage my House colleagues to join me and New York's 24th Congressional District in wearing a white ribbon to put a spotlight on this very im-

portant issue. Wearing the white ribbon demonstrates a personal pledge to never commit, condone, or remain silent about violence against men, women, or children.

I hope my country can join me today to support survivors of abuse while providing alternatives to this destructive cycle.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone paid attention to that wonderful idea that has just been given to us.

These Special Orders play a role here in that we permit ourselves the opportunity to hear from people for a little bit more than 1 minute to talk about issues that are significant and who would like to bring them to the attention of the American people and, of course, to their colleagues here in Congress.

Today I intend to bring the attention of the American people and my colleagues to a threat to the well-being of the American people, a major threat that has gone unrecognized and could well change our way of life and change the way of life for our children and destroy one of the basic rights that were written into our Constitution in order to protect the prosperity and security of our country.

I am talking about the changes that are being proposed in our fundamental technology law, in our patent system. And I know that sounds very boring to most people. But the fact is, without a strong patent system, the American people would be at the mercy of both competitors, in terms of their labor overseas, but also in terms of the vicious and totalitarian elements in other countries that might want to do us harm.

□ 1245

It is our ability to produce the technology that America needs in order to make our people competitive and to produce the wealth that is necessary for a decent standard of living that has made America the great country that it is. We are a great country not because we have very powerful and wealthy interests here in the United States, which we do. We are a great country because ordinary people are permitted to live decent lives and because our country has not been challenged throughout its history over and over again and had to waste all of our resources and all of our wealth on vast amounts of armaments and drafting all of our people into the military and having a militarized society in order to have us safe from a foreign threat. No. What we have done is we have been able to produce wealth dramatically in our country and had our workers' being competitive with labor from around the world because we have been technologically superior.

Mr. Speaker, there is a threat to that technology superiority, an incredible

threat that is being foisted off on the Congress and the American people. I am here to alert my fellow Members of Congress to this threat.

One needs only to see how important the technology element of our society has been right here in the United States Congress. There is a statue here in the Capitol to Philo Farnsworth. Now, who the heck knows who Philo Farnsworth was? Well, not many. But there is a statue to him here because he represents a very significant part of the American story.

Philo Farnsworth was a farmer in Utah, a man who was educated in engineering, but a man who had very little resources. He set out in between farming to try to find and discover a technological secret that had perplexed some of the most powerful and financial interests in our country.

RCA, at that time under a man named David Sarnoff, was America's premier technology company, a company that had vast resources and was deeply involved in trying to find out how to invent a picture tube, how we would have a tube that showed images rather than just radio waves that had voice on them. This was a huge challenge and a historic challenge. RCA pumped millions of dollars of research into this.

The one who discovered this secret was Philo Farnsworth, an independent inventor, a man who was a farmer in Utah. He discovered the secret and then wrote to RCA very naively believing that this big corporation would honor his discovery and permit him to have the benefit—or at least a benefit—from this discovery.

Yes, then RCA sent Philo Farnsworth a representative from their laboratories. When he described what he had found, the scientist from RCA went away saying, "We will be in touch," and never got in touch. The next thing that Philo knew was that there was an announcement that RCA had made a major breakthrough in discovery—only it was exactly the discovery that Philo Farnsworth had made and had transmitted the information to RCA.

This became one of the great jury and great legal battles of the early 20th century. Philo Farnsworth, an individual person, was up against the most powerful American corporation of the day, RCA, and had one of the strongest and toughest leaders of that corporation, David Sarnoff, who vowed not to give him a penny and not to recognize him because it was RCA that actually came up with this.

Philo Farnsworth was able to mobilize support behind his claim. He was able to have people invest in his lawsuits, and slowly but surely they made their way through our court system all the way to the Supreme Court of the United States. God bless the United States of America. A single man, a poor, individual farmer who had come

up with an important technology secret had his rights respected by our Supreme Court over the power and influence of America's most powerful corporation of the day, RCA.

Philo Farnsworth was recognized as the inventor, the inventor of the picture tube which has transformed our country and transformed the world. All the picture tubes you see, and now the screens that we see on our computers, can be traced back to the discovery of this one individual, Philo Farnsworth, and the tragedy that his life was because, over the years, he lived a very poor life. He was constantly in struggle. He had very little resources. By the time he won the Supreme Court case, it was late in his life, and he did not benefit, as he should have greatly, from that.

We have a statue to this wonderful American, a man who stands for what America stands for, using technology to benefit the people, not just to enrich huge corporate interests. Indeed, Philo Farnsworth has a statue here in the Capitol. But you will never see a statue to David Sarnoff of RCA. That shows you where the heart and soul of America is.

The fact that we had a Supreme Court that decided for the little guy rather than the huge, powerful corporation showed what kind of country we have. That is what makes America great. That is what has created the new technologies that have uplifted our people and made sure that our people were competitive and, thus, had high standards of living and that we were secure from foreign threats because we were technologically superior to those foreign threats.

This is what has made America great, and today it is in jeopardy. The technological edge of our country will be robbed from us by multinational corporations who are powerful and are shifting issues through the Congress that will greatly diminish the patent protection of the American people. Had these same changes in the law that these multinational corporations would now foist upon us been the law in the days of Philo Farnsworth, we would have no picture tube. We would never have had a Philo Farnsworth. We would never have had the recognition of the creative genius of the American people. Instead, we would have had the powerful, rich, multinational corporations running roughshod over America's creative genius.

No. We have that threat today, and I would ask people to pay close attention to what is happening here on the floor of House in the next few months. What has happened is we have to understand that patent protection of the American people is something that was written into our Constitution. It is part of the heart and soul of our country.

Benjamin Franklin is well-known as the man who discovered electricity,

but he was also one of the great Founders of our Declaration of Independence and, yes, one of the people who authored our Constitution—Benjamin Franklin, the great technology hero, the hero of liberty and just for all.

If you go to Monticello and visit Thomas Jefferson's home, it is filled with inventions, small inventions. Thomas Jefferson knew that we were not going to rely on Big Government, we couldn't rely on big corporate interests and rich people, but we would rely on the genius of the American people through technology. Freedom and technology are the two things that would uplift ordinary Americans. Those things are now at stake. They are now in danger.

We, in fact, are now facing basic changes to the concept of intellectual property rights, and especially the rights of our inventors, and it is being foisted upon this body in what I would say is a very deceitful manner by powerful interest groups from the outside. But remember, with the protection that we have had, America has had the inventions. We have uplifted the standard of living of the ordinary American.

We built the reaper, which permitted us to harvest huge crops of food so that Americans were well-fed, and we became the breadbasket of the world; the cotton gin which made sure that people had clothing. There was a Black American who invented the machine that permitted the mass production of shoes. The mass production of shoes was permitted because a Black American whose other rights were not protected, his rights to own the intellectual property, the inventions, the patent rights to his invention, were respected. Because of that, all Americans ended up with being able to have more than just one pair of shoes. Before this man invented his invention of how to mass produce shoes, ordinary people had one pair of shoes and that was it. That was it. When they wore out, your feet wore out.

We had things like the electric light that we know that Thomas Edison was so involved with; telephones, Alexander Graham Bell. All the major inventions that we have were invented by American genius, not of very powerful corporations, but of the American genius of the American people.

What we have always had, however, is a situation where big guys did try to steal the creativity of the little guy, but in our country, they couldn't get away with it. In our country, the Philo Farnsworths knew that they would be protected if they created something that uplifted their fellow man. So Americans and American genius was put to work as never before in any country's history to make sure ordinary people, and especially our working people in our factories and our companies, could be competitive with those factories and companies and the workers overseas.

Our people don't work harder than the people overseas. That is not what made us a great country. The fact is people work really hard all over the world, especially in Third World countries where people live in utter poverty. They work really hard. But it is the technology that is put into play, the technology put into play with that hard work and the profit motive for investing in that technology and creating that technology, that is what has made the difference in an American people that are well-fed, American people with great opportunities, American people who can be proud that they have a decent standard of living and are able to make decisions for themselves and their families, not just live in the abject poverty that existed for so long in so much of the world.

No, it wasn't just our hard work. It wasn't just our natural resources. It was a Constitution that wrote into it the rights of every individual citizen. And paramount to those rights, even before the Bill of Rights in our Constitution, is a provision that guarantees that our inventors and our writers will be given the right to own, to control their invention or their book for a given period of time and profit from it.

Traditionally, our inventors have had ownership rights to what they have invented for 17 years of protection. During that 17 years, they would own it, and when they applied for a patent, once that patent was issued, they would have 17 years to control what they had invented. Also, until that patent was issued, it has always been, in the United States, kept totally secret what that invention is until the inventor has been actually granted the rights to own that invention.

Well, these things have led directly to a genius, a surge of genius in our borders that reflected the fact that our people had freedom and technology available to them. So these are things that we have taken for granted because this is what America is all about.

But today, powerful multinational corporations, especially in the electronics industry, are trying to destroy America's patent system. My colleagues should now understand this, and the American people should understand this and be talking to their Member of Congress and their Senators, because if they succeed in undermining our patent system and destroying the rights of the little guy to own what he has created and give the big guys the power to steal from the little guys, we will see a difference in our country. Within a generation, we will no longer have these advantages that I just spoke about. What we have today is an effort by the big guys to change the rules so they can get away with stealing from the little guys.

Now, obviously, people aren't going to come out and just say: "Please let's vote for a bill that is going to break

down the patent system so that big, multinational corporations can steal from American inventors." Of course they are not going to say that. So what do they say? Well, let me put it this way. 25 years ago when I first noticed—this fight has been going on the entire time that I have been in Congress.

I noticed that what had happened was that some big corporations were trying to put into the GATT implementation—GATT is a trade treaty. They were trying to put into that trade treaty's implementation language a bill that had to go through Congress, changes in our patent system that weren't even required by the treaty. I will get into what they were doing if you really want to see how heinous and sinister this is.

What were those changes 25 years ago that these big corporations wanted to make? Number one was saying that, yes, when you apply for your patent, 20 years after you apply for it, you really have no patent rights after that at all, even if it takes 15 years to get your patent.

□ 1300

The American system was the clock starts ticking when you get your patent, 17 years of protection. These big guys were trying to give our American inventors maybe no protection. After 20 years, they had nothing.

But everybody would know about it because the second provision they were trying to foist off on us was that after 18 months, if a patent had been applied for, after 18 months, even if the patent had not been granted, they were going to publish the patent application, so that every thief in the world would have heard all of the secrets of every American inventor.

They called it the Patent Application Publication Act, they were so blatant about it. After we fingered it and drew America's attention to it, they changed the name, of course.

Then it became an issue of not trying to disclose patents or patent applications, not trying to limit the amount of ownership that our patent people had; it became, instead, a battle against the "submarine patentors." That is what they called it.

That was the bogeyman that was created that day in order to get people here to vote in a way that would destroy the patent rights of the American people, the patent rights that I just outlined.

Both of those were going to be eliminated. You are going to have, instead of no disclosure, you will have full disclosure of your patent application, even before you are granted the patent, and you are not guaranteed any specific time, but your patent was going to run out after 20 years, even if you had never had any time to protect it. That is what they were trying to do, and we managed to stop them.

We put a coalition together, a bipartisan coalition. MARCY KAPTUR of Ohio and myself have been active on this issue for the last 25 years, trying to thwart these huge corporate interests who are trying to neuter the rights of the little guy, of the small inventor, of the independent operator.

How did we stop them that very first time? Well, we added an amendment on that said these changes that are being foisted on us today—or being voted on today—only apply to companies that have over 100 employees.

All of a sudden, those people who were advocating this saying, Oh, this will be good for everybody, especially the small inventor, all of a sudden, they had to withdraw the bill.

Well, if it was so good for the little guy, why would they withdraw the bill? Well, they withdrew the bill because the bill was aimed at helping huge corporate interests to step on the little guy in the United States.

We defeated that, but we have been fighting, fighting, fighting for 20 years; and this year, it looks like we have lost the leverage that we had to defeat these powerful special interests.

That is why it is important for the American people and people involved in technology development to pay attention to proposals that are being made here in the House and in the Senate concerning intellectual property rights, especially concerning the patent rights that our people have enjoyed, as I say, since the founding of our country.

Today, we have a bill that is being presented. Again, it can't be presented on how do we destroy the patent rights of the average American. They have to find something that sounds so sinister that they can set up a straw man. They will say, Look at him, we are going to beat him up. That is what this bill is about.

Just like I said, submarine patents were the reason why they had to eliminate the right of the small inventor to a guaranteed term or to have confidentiality in its patent application like before. That was a submarine patent.

Well, now, they are not saying that. They have had to come up with a better term that is even more frightening and sickening than submarine patent. The cynical nature of this type of debate on an issue was demonstrated by the fact that a corporate leader, who was on the other side of this issue than I am, has now changed his position and come to me with a description of how the words "patent troll" came about because, now, we hear that we have got to change the law, not for submarine patents, but now because patent trolls are preying on the American people, they are draining us of funds and enriching themselves, these patent trolls.

Well, where did that word come from? This gentleman that I am talking about was in a meeting with the

heads of some very powerful corporations. They sat around in a circle to decide what term they should use.

He said to me: Well, I recommended "patent pirate." Well, that wasn't sinister enough, so they came up with patent troll.

By the time everyone heard that: Yes, that is the one.

Well, why is it the one? Because it sounds so sinister that it is going to be able to blind people as to who the real victim is. Now, we are out to get the patent troll, but it is the little guy, it is the small inventor, it is the independent inventors that are going to be damaged severely by an attack on a patent troll.

Now, what is a patent troll, by what they are trying to tell us? Patent troll—we keep hearing the argument that there are people in our society that are using, basically, patents that are not really good patents.

They are patents that really are not legitimate patents, and they are using these to create litigation that will enrich the lawyers—the patent trolls—because the patent trolls just reach out with some illegitimate patent claim, and then they have to get paid off or they have to go to jail.

Well, how much of this is there? There is some of that, but let us note this: There are frivolous lawsuits throughout our entire system; there are frivolous lawsuits in almost every endeavor in the American economy, but there are also legitimate lawsuits. There are people who are really damaged and deserve to have the right to sue somebody.

The law that we are facing now, that is being proposed here in Congress for a patent law, is the equivalent of eliminating the right of people to sue someone who has done damage to them in order to prevent a frivolous lawsuit from happening.

Do we really want to neuter the rights of people? Because some people abuse the system, you are going to take the 90 percent of the cases where it is not being abused or 95 percent of the cases where it is a legitimate suit and eliminate that right in order to handle the frivolous suits? That is what is happening.

Although we are being told that all of the suits are frivolous and that the inventors are being portrayed as money-grubbers, these guys trying to take advantage of these big corporations—yeah, right. The little guy is trying to take advantage of the big guy, and that is why we have got to pass a law that dramatically restricts the rights of the little guy to deal with an infringement by a big corporation.

What this bill is, H.R. 9, and it is waiting to be brought to the floor. It could be brought to the floor in the next week, month, 2 months; we don't know yet. This bill dramatically undercuts the rights of legitimate patentholders to enforce their patents.

The patent troll element comes in with this. Today, if you are a small inventor and a large corporate interest has been infringing on your invention, if you own it for 17 years—after that, by the way, everybody can use it for free—but during that 17 years, you have a right to be compensated for the fact that you are the one who discovered this.

You invested your time and your effort and your scarce resources in order to come up with this new discovery, yes; and they have a right then to try to bring, if a large corporation is using it without paying them royalties, they have a right to bring suit.

But many of them don't have those resources. They don't have any money. They are, indeed, independent small inventors up against corporations that are worth billions of dollars and, I might say, multinational corporations.

These aren't just an American David Sarnoff. A lot of these corporations we are talking about are multinational corporations, and they have nothing to do with the American interests. They have everything to do with the interest of making money for their stockholders and their company, which is multinational, which is global in scope and not an American company necessarily.

We are going to undercut American inventors' rights to try to enforce their patent from being stolen by multinational corporations. That is what this bill does.

This is, to me, in my 25 or 26 years here in Congress, the best example of crony capitalism that I have ever seen. What is crony capitalism? That is when we pass laws and we set up regulations that are aimed at—what—helping the big guy in relationship to the little guy.

Crony capitalism is when the little guys pay and end up having their rights trampled upon, but the big guys are protected by different laws and clauses that we put into law here in Washington in the House and in the Senate.

Well, the bogeyman this time, as I say, is the patent troll. The patent troll is what? The patent troll is someone—although I wouldn't call him a patent troll. I would say there is a person who is willing to join with a small inventor—or independent inventor—to see that his patent is enforced.

We are not talking about phony patents; we are talking about legitimate patents. We are not talking about frivolous claims; we are talking about legitimate claims to patent claims of an inventor, but the inventor does not have the strength to enforce that against a big corporation that has an unlimited budget.

This bill would make it dramatically more difficult for anyone to enlist someone who is not the inventor to help them press their case against the infringement, the stuff that they had.

By the way, if this law, H.R. 9, was passed and would have been law at the time of Philo Farnsworth, Philo Farnsworth would have been beaten up, kicked around, stepped upon, and he would not have had any benefit from his invention of the picture tube.

Do we want a country in which the big guys are able to do that to the small inventors? How long are we going to be on top of things? How long will the standard of living of our people stay high and our businesses competitive and our country safe and secure because of technological advances? How long will that last if we are stepping on the little guy and we fundamentally change the nature of technology law in our country? That is what is happening.

This bill passed last year in the House, and it was stopped in the Senate. Let me note that one of the amendments that I personally had to propose that demonstrate how bad this bill is—although I managed to win the one amendment that we were able to win—was they wanted to take away the rights of an inventor to sue the Patent Office if, indeed, the Patent Office was not legally acting in terms of his patent application.

In other words, if a government agency was doing something illegally, using illegal criteria—maybe because someone else was influencing the decision from the outside, maybe there was just some sort of personality problem, maybe it was corruption from within—but if an independent inventor sees that he is being treated and is being dealt with in a way that is not consistent with the law, the small inventor has always had a right, just like any other American, to sue and take his case to court.

This is how blatant H.R. 9 is. That bill contained a provision that said the small inventor can't take his case to court. They are going to neuter the small inventor of his right to take it to court; and he has to, instead, go to an ombudsman at the Patent Office—oh, my, an ombudsman, how nice.

Eliminating the right of an American citizen and inventor in order to—what—in order to send him to a government bureaucrat and the agency that he thinks has done him wrong, rather than having a day in court.

□ 1315

That exemplifies everything that is in H.R. 9, and it is so cynical because what we have got is, again, the American people saying, "Look at this straw man." It is called "straw man argumentation." Let's build up a straw man—the trolls—and everybody will think that we are aiming at the trolls when, in fact, the real targets are the little guys—the American independent inventors—the little guys who can't afford without some help from the outside to enforce their patents.

There is nothing wrong with someone investing in an inventor who says, "Look, I have got my whole life's savings in this. I have invented this, but this big corporation refuses to give me any royalties from my patent." There is nothing wrong with trying to help that inventor enforce his rights—there is nothing wrong at all—but the straw man is that person who is actually investing in this. Now, he didn't invent it, and he is going to profit by it. Thus, he is a troll. No. That person is fulfilling an important role in not permitting outside people to invest in inventions and with inventors.

By doing that, what we have done is diminish the value of every American patent. That understanding defeated this bill in the Senate last year because our American universities understood that, if that went in, the value of all of these patents that the American universities have been developing would dramatically go down. It diminishes the value of all patents when you eliminate that right of the people to invest in patent enforcement. That makes sense.

So there was an upheaval at almost every American major university and in many other industries that deal directly with long-term research and development, like the pharmaceutical industry, for example. They knew that we could not allow this to happen. That was stopped in the Senate the last time around. People realized that this type of crony capitalist attempt was to the detriment of the American people.

We have some of the most powerful multinational corporations still at play, trying to push this through this session of Congress. People have to know that H.R. 9 is crony capitalism personified. They need to talk to their Congressmen, and my colleagues need to talk to each other about this bill and not just accept what is being handed to them as something that has made its way through the committee process.

This bill destroys the rights of discovery for the little guy. This suit basically doesn't do anything to go up against frivolous lawsuits, but it deems all of the legitimate cases and puts them in the same category as frivolous lawsuits. H.R. 9 causes fees, and fees on defending infringement would be leveled not on the guys who have committed the crime. We are actually leveling fees on the people who are trying to enforce their rights. We are asking people to pay more money in order to enforce their rights.

It destroys, for example, the treble damage awards. Now, what does that mean? If you are a little guy, to get a lawyer to help you, that lawyer has to know he is going to make a profit when getting involved in a suit against a big corporation. Today, they have what they call triple damages. If the corporation knows that it is infringing on

the little guy, there are triple damages. They are trying to get rid of those triple damages and say, "No, only actual damages."

What does that mean? The little guy can never afford to hire a lawyer. The lawyers won't get involved. You can see these big corporations, they certainly have all of the legal help they need. Basically, that provision alone neuters the leverage that a small inventor has to get some legal help in his battle to defend his or her own property rights.

This bill, by the way, fails to identify—and it even sometimes protects—lawyers who are operating on bad faith with frivolous lawsuits, as compared to trying to help—let's deter frivolous lawsuits, but let's not do it by eliminating the rights of people who have legitimate claims against big corporations.

There is another bill now emerging. In the House, it is H.R. 9. It is a disaster. We need to make sure people know that the American people have been tipped off and that we are not going to let this happen by the major, huge corporations like Google, which is one of the main groups behind this trying to rip off these little guys. We are not going to allow that to happen, and they are not going to rip us off either.

This has been recognized in the Senate. Like I said, it was stopped the last time, so there is a bill in the Senate, S. 632. Senator COONS has put this bill in. This bill reasserts the condition of willful infringement. Basically, it reinforces the idea that, if a company is willfully infringing, this is something that someone needs to be paid for and compensated for because someone intentionally stepped on his rights. It gives the PTO the discretion to award damages in these cases when you see that a big company has willfully said, We will ignore the fact that we know this group invented it. Ignore that. Just go ahead, and if they try to sue us, we will step on them, or we will get the rules of the game changed in Congress so that they don't have a chance to sue us.

S. 632, the Coons bill in the Senate, specifically allows higher education and smaller entities to be identified as legitimate owners. Thus, we are protecting the actual little guys and their educational institutions. What we also have in the Senate bill is something that identifies bad faith in these demand letters. There are frivolous lawsuits. It actually gives strength and power to thwart these frivolous lawsuits without damaging the rights of the small inventor and the traditional rights of the American people.

We are up against a major fight, but here we have a good piece of legislation in the Senate, in the Coons bill, S. 632, and in a crony capitalism bill, H.R. 9, here in the House. The American people have to at times get involved or

things will go haywire in our country. We don't have the rights and privileges that every American enjoys simply because they are in the Constitution. Over the years, the American people have stepped up when they have seen that their rights were being trampled upon.

The big guys were always around, trying to steal from the little guys, but as we saw in the case of Philo Farnsworth, we have a commitment to America's little guys. As for the men and women who maybe are not rich but who have a creative genius that will uplift all of us, we have made a commitment to them. H.R. 9 breaks that commitment and destroys their ability to actually benefit from their own creative genius.

I would ask my colleagues to spend time reading H.R. 9 and consider the straw man argument—the trolls. Get beyond the slogan, and see what effect it will have, and ask small inventors— independent inventors—and educators what impact the changes in H.R. 9 will have. Once the legislators here in the House do, and once they understand the damage that this will do to the American people and how the little guy is going to be stepped upon, they will vote against it, but they have to have their attention drawn to this.

People are busy here in Washington. The biggest problem is getting the attention of our colleagues to pay attention to a bill like H.R. 9. That is part of what the citizenry has to do if our process is going to work. They need to be talking to their Congressmen. They need to be talking to their Senators. Whether you are an educator and you deal with patents of your educational institution or whether you are an independent inventor and have an idea that will make Americans more productive and more competitive or make our country safer, you are the treasure house of this country, and they are trying to destroy that treasure right now.

I call on my colleagues to join me in opposition to H.R. 9 and to work with the Senate to try to have the Senate bill intertwined and to come to a compromise so we can have a positive bill here in the House and so we can move forward in a positive way to make sure that Americans remain prosperous, that Americans remain secure, and that Americans remain free. That is what our Constitution was all about. That is what Thomas Jefferson was all about, and that is what Benjamin Franklin was all about. That is what we are supposed to be all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### IN MEMORY OF FIREFIGHTER DANIEL CORRIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from

California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of local Santa Barbara, California, firefighter Daniel Corrigan.

Dan was born and raised in Hayward, California, where he played football and attended Moreau Catholic High School. Dan earned his degree in mechanical engineering from Cal Poly Pomona, and he began his firefighting career with the Fresno Fire Department in 2007. In 2013, Dan joined the Santa Barbara City Fire Department, where he made a tremendous impact not only on his colleagues but on the entire community.

Throughout his career, Dan was recognized by his colleagues for his hard work ethic, his considerable intelligence, and enjoyable sense of humor.

That is why we were all so deeply saddened by the unexpected news when Dan passed away 2 weeks ago. He was just 35. His loss came much too early for a beloved hero who devoted so much of himself to serve his community.

Dan is survived by his pregnant fiancée, Sarah; by his son, Jack; by his sisters Debbie and Rosanne; and by his parents, John and Anne.

Our thoughts and prayers are with them all at this sad time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### WOMEN'S AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS HISTORY MONTH

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, every year during the month of March, we celebrate the contributions to events in history and modern society by women. We call it Women's History Month, but in my district, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, the month of March is also commemorated as Virgin Islands History Month.

So, in keeping with both customs, I would like to take the time to recognize a few Virgin Islanders who have broken the glass ceiling for women in the upper echelons of law in the territory and, indeed, in the United States, and who inspired generations of young women to do the same:

The Honorable Eileen Ramona Peterson, who became the first female judge in the U.S. Virgin Islands in 1971; the Honorable J'ada Finch-Sheen, who later became the first female sworn in as attorney general of the Virgin Islands; and the Honorable Wilma Lewis, who, among a long list of noteworthy accomplishments, was the first African American woman to serve as inspector general to the U.S. Department of the Interior and, later, as the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. Judge



Lewis currently serves as the chief judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands.

Our fight for law and justice and equality comes from our history, and that fight has often been led by women, women such as Queen Mary Thomas, who, along with three other women, led a revolt in the streets of St. Croix to protest unfair labor wages and deplorable working conditions in 1878.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize these women because their work and their contributions have allowed many Virgin Islands women to ascend through the glass ceiling. Their contributions made it possible for a young girl from the Virgin Islands—myself—to become a New York assistant district attorney, to be at the Justice Department and to later serve as the fifth-elected Delegate to Congress from the U.S. Virgin Islands.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, it troubles me to see the political gamesmanship that is delaying the confirmation of Loretta Lynch as the next Attorney General of the United States. By all accounts, she is highly qualified and regarded, and would make a great Attorney General. I am urging my colleagues in the Senate Chamber to bring Ms. Lynch's confirmation to a vote. Place your objections on the record.

□ 1330

#### NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the story out in a number of media, like this from Breitbart, "First Details of Iran Deal: Allows 6,000 Centrifuges, Rolls Back the U.N. Arms Embargo." That story talks about in order to entice Iran to cut back to 6,000 or 6,500 centrifuges, elements of the U.N. arms embargo against Iran could be rolled back.

I think it is important to recall, it hasn't been that long ago that a principal cornerstone of the discussions between the Obama administration and the—I have to be careful of the words I use here on the House floor—America-killing Iran administration was going to require them to dismantle their efforts toward nuclear production, and now they are floating a draft that is going to allow them to have thousands of centrifuges.

Now, I have been advised by people at the IAEA in Vienna that, actually, if they just have 3,000 centrifuges, with all of the uranium that has been enriched to 5 percent, they only need 3,000 to take it up to 90 percent. Once you are at 5 percent, it seems like it would be a long way to get to 90, but actually it is just a matter of weeks.

You could do it easily in a facility that would be easy to hide, because you could take those 3,000 in a facility 30 meters by 70 meters and you could enrich from 5 to 90 percent at weapons grade uranium, have the nukes that at least at one time Ayatollah Khamenei has indicated—I understand still believes—that they can hasten the return of the 12th imam, the Mahdi, to rule over this world caliphate, and they can do so because they believe the prophecy is that he will arise—the 12th imam, as the Mahdi, the head of the caliphate, this world caliphate, he will arise out of chaos, and they believe that could be nuclear chaos.

So, in effect, if this administration agrees to allow even 1,500 centrifuges to continue to spin in Iran, he is hastening the demise of millions of people, ultimately. A new Holocaust. Now, it is one thing when leaders in the United States could say, "Gee, we didn't know that millions of Jews were being killed by Hitler; gee, we just didn't know," but there came a point where it became very clear, and Hitler and his subordinates really tried to hide what they were doing.

Iran has made no bones about what they want to do. They want to wipe Israel off the map. First of all, they are never going to eliminate all of the Jews in the world; it will not happen. As God is my witness, that will not happen. What will happen, as anybody, including this administration, if they are intent on going there, to allow Iran to continue to move toward nuclear weapons under this so-called nuclear agreement, they move there, it will cause judgment to come down on our country for allowing something so horrific to become possible when we had the means to stop it.

This is no time for anyone who is a civilized individual, who believes in the rights of men, the rights of women, the rights of children, to be cutting a deal with these cutthroats in Iran. Nobody seems to want to talk about it, but Iran has drug this thing out for over a year.

Perhaps Valerie Jarrett was working a deal even longer than that. There were reports that she was negotiating with them early on, trying to see if something could be done. Whether that is true or not, clearly what Iran has done is drug out the talks, continued to increase the number of centrifuges it has spinning, continued to move toward the ability to have a tremendous amount of 5 percent enrichment so that it very quickly can move to 90 percent and develop the nukes.

They would likely develop a number of them at the same time, not just do one. They would do a number and then spread them out so that, once they move into nuclear mode, they have several. You try to take them out at that point; you are going to find one or more of them in cities that you care

about. So we should never allow that to even become possible.

When I see this deal, I see all these articles about it, then I see this article "Obama Planning Drastic Shake-Up in Policy Toward Israel." So because the people of Israel, in their election, made clear, "We would prefer not to be wiped out by Iran, and we can tell that the deal that the Obama administration is cutting is bad for Israel and puts us at extreme risk," they gave more seats than were expected to the Likud Party, Netanyahu's party.

What is the response of the Obama administration after they threw everything they possibly could, threw temper tantrums about Prime Minister Netanyahu speaking from right here just to tell us his perspective on the Iranian deal because his country is most at risk? Those that refused to understand—it isn't just Israel at risk—may pay at the cost of thousands or millions of lives. These people have no respect for the lives of people who are not radical Islamists, as they are.

So you might think: Oh, gee, maybe the Obama administration learned a lesson; let's don't try to interfere in the election process in a foreign country. It does make you wonder, you know, there were all those rumors about since the Obama money was never audited in his original campaign in 2008 and there were massive numbers of \$50 contributions with credit cards, where did those come from? Were any of those foreign?

We have seen allegations about money coming in to Hillary Clinton's campaign from foreigners. We know in Bill Clinton's campaign they got caught redhanded with money from monks that was given to Vice President Al Gore, but, you know, foreigners are not supposed to be able to influence our elections. It appears that potentially they have.

If that were true—don't know for certain because there wasn't an audit done, but maybe that would help explain why this administration is so quick to get involved in the election process in Israel to try to destroy Netanyahu, who was more concerned with the preservation of the nation of Israel than he was in getting another Nobel Peace Prize for this administration.

But this, dated today, by Melanie Batley says:

The White House on Wednesday suggested it could reverse its decades-old policy of using its veto in the United Nations Security Council to protect Israel. It could refuse to veto resolutions related to the Palestinians or introduce a measure of its own, The Wall Street Journal reported.

The U.S. could also lend its support to a two-state solution based on Israel's 1967 borders, a senior White House official told The New York Times: "We're currently evaluating our approach," State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said, according to the Journal. "We're not going to prejudice

what we would do if there was a U.N. action."

She should have said "if there were," but she said "if there was."

The article also says:

The Obama administration in the past has shielded Israel at the Security Council, using a veto to strike down a resolution condemning Israeli settlement activity in Palestinian territory.

Now, Obama officials may decide to allow Israel to be exposed to more international pressure in an attempt to force them back into negotiating.

This is what I would call a deal to hasten the attempted demise of Israel.

It is interesting, though, "We're currently evaluating our approach," the State Department said, because we were told by a Muslim Brothers publication in December of 2012 that—yes, I believe it was 2012. It was before the fall of Muslim Brother Morsi as President of Egypt, but it was a Muslim Brothers-approved publication in Egypt that bragged about the six top advisers in the Obama administration who they bragged were Muslim Brothers.

Now, some in the media don't want to do anything but vilify me for pointing out what the Muslim Brothers have pointed out, but for a number of years I tried to advise the Homeland Security Department that you have elevated a man to the top advisory council, given him a secret security clearance, allowed him to access documents, which I was told by people, I believe, including the director of DPS in Texas, that we know that this man downloaded two documents. We know he downloaded them with his personal computer at his home, and then the report from Patrick Poole, the reporter, that he had direct indication from a national media outlet that Mr. Elibiary had shopped those documents to this national media outlet, who happened to refuse.

I asked Secretary Napolitano about it. She said she knew nothing about it. That was interesting, because her chief told the director of Texas Department of Public Safety the night before, who advised me the night before, that she had been totally briefed on what Elibiary had done. When I brought it up the next day, either she lied in front of our committee or her close staff member lied to the Department of Public Safety director in Texas the night before.

But we do know this. Later when I again asked her about it and if it had been investigated, she said that DHS had looked into it and there was nothing to it. Yet, when there was a FOIA request for the documents pertaining to the investigation, there were no documents that supported that there ever was an investigation. So either, again, the Department of Homeland Security Secretary lied, committed a crime, or DHS lied and there were documents about that investigation.

In any event, last September, the Homeland Security Department, after years of being warned about this person they kept elevating, after one of the ISIS videos hit television and showed the Islamic State cutting off the head of an American, this top adviser to our Homeland Security Department tweeted out, basically, the caliphate's inevitable; people just need to get used to the idea. That was the basis of it. So at Homeland Security, they allowed him to go ahead and not be renewed as a top adviser to Homeland Security.

We also know that Imam Magid, who had been head of the Islamic Society of North America, which Islamic Society of North America was aimed as a co-conspirator in the largest prosecution for supporting terrorism in the history of the United States in going after the Holy Land Foundation in Dallas, Texas, Federal Court. The Islamic Society of North America was named as a co-conspirator, as was the Council of American Islamic Relations, CAIR.

□ 1345

Although, we saw a story last year where they were thinking about changing their name to—I forget what the words were—but instead of CAIR, it would be WTF. I guess they thought better of having WTF be their symbolic letters representing who they are.

In any event, CAIR, ISNA, they were named coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial. When an effort was made to remove their names from being listed as coconspirators, the judge in the Federal court there in Dallas reviewed the evidence and said, No, there is evidence that supports having their names as coconspirators.

They appealed to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals for the United States and all those judges looked at it and said, No, there is plenty of evidence here to support that these groups are coconspirators with the Holy Land Foundation—whose principals were convicted of supporting terrorism and sent to prison.

This administration gets sworn in within 2 months of the conviction, and instead of being careful about these groups that U.S. Federal courts had said we had plenty of evidence to show that they support terrorism, this administration neglected—refused—to consider that because they thought they knew better.

They brought the leaders of CAIR and ISNA into the realm of their close advisers; so is it any mystery that when Prime Minister Netanyahu was coming to Washington in May of 2011, the President sought advice—got advice—from the leader of this named co-conspirator supporting terrorism, Imam Magid?

When the President gave this speech in the State Department itself, Imam Magid was there. This administration

had obviously given him credentials to allow him not only in the White House, but in the inner sanctum of the State Department.

When I read, "We are currently evaluating our approach," from the State Department, I can't help but wonder: Have you got Imam Magid in there—which this Egyptian Muslim Brother-approved article said was a Muslim Brother, a top adviser—have you got him in there helping advise you on how to go after Netanyahu and how to put Israel more at risk than you already have?

"We are evaluating our approach" scares me—should scare others—when you know the kind of people that are giving this administration advice.

This article says:

The Obama administration in the past has shielded Israel at the Security Council, using a veto to strike down a resolution condemning Israeli settlement activity in Palestinian territory. Now, Obama officials may decide to allow Israel to be exposed to more international pressure in an attempt to force them back into negotiating a peace deal.

Well, Israel has eyes wide open as Iran continues to spin centrifuges and enrich uranium. They understand that their very existence is at risk; yet we have people here in Washington—this administration—that apparently are hearing from people saying, Oh, no, it's no problem. Israel is the real problem here.

Never mind the people that are advising this administration are more upset with Israel wanting to continue to exist than they are with Iran for wanting to wipe out Israel and the United States.

This should scare people in the United States because, as Prime Minister Netanyahu pointed out—though he didn't have to—he cares about the United States. He was educated here. He would like to see us continue to exist and be friends with Israel.

He pointed out, Look, they are developing intercontinental ballistic missiles. Those are not to hit us in Israel, he says, they are coming after us, but they really don't even need intercontinental ballistic missiles.

They can put them on a cargo ship and bring them right into our ports, bring them right up the Potomac River, into the Houston Ship Channel, into New Orleans. In between New Orleans and Houston, they can wipe out 70 percent of our refined gasoline, so we could be in a world of hurt in a real hurry.

The President's job is to help provide for the common defense, and it seems that his initiative is more to be opposed to anything Israel knows in its collective heart will keep them protected.

Unfortunately, that is not all the news. We look here and find this article from Newsmax:

Islamic State jihadists may have committed genocide in trying to wipe out the

Yazidi minority in Iraq, the U.N. said Thursday in a report laying out a litany of atrocities. The Islamic State “may have committed all three of the most serious international crimes—namely, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide,” the United Nations human rights office said in a statement.

The agency published a horrifying report detailing killings, torture, rape, sexual slavery, and the use of child soldiers by the extremists. All of these crimes, it said, were violations of international human rights and humanitarian law, and some may amount to “crimes against humanity” and “war crimes.”

Further down, it says:

In numerous Yazidi villages, men and boys over the age of 14 were rounded up and shot, while the women and girls were abducted as the “spoils of war.” The report, which was ordered by the U.N. Human Rights Council last September, following a request from the Iraqi Government, pointed out that some villages “were entirely emptied of their Yazidi population.”

Many Yazidi women and girls were sold into sexual slavery or handed over to Islamic State members as “gifts,” the report said, adding that witnesses had described hearing girls as young as 6 screaming for help as they were raped in a house used by Islamic State fighters.

A pregnant 19-year-old had told the investigators she had been repeatedly raped by a Islamic State “doctor” over a period of 2½ months and that he deliberately sat on her stomach, saying, “This baby should die because it is an infidel. I can make a Muslim baby.”

We had the report in the last few weeks from a Catholic source in Nigeria where they have begged the United States for any help that it will give to try to stop Boko Haram and their efforts to wipe out Christians in Nigeria.

This source indicated that they had heard from the United States—from the Obama administration—that the Obama administration will only help them against Boko Haram if Nigeria will change its laws to allow same-sex marriage.

Well, apparently, once this administration got through ObamaCare, it promised the Catholic leaders, Christian leaders: Hey, we will never, ever refuse to allow you to practice your religious beliefs.

Well, that turned out to be a lie because, of course, they went after Catholic nuns, they went after the Catholic Church—well, at least those who actually practice what they hear preached in the Catholic Church—and any other Christian who believes that abortion is religiously wrong.

I guess after the administration broke its promise and went after and used the full force of the government to prevent people from practicing their religious beliefs and being able to conform their conduct to their religious beliefs, it was a no-brainer that they would then try to impose their religious beliefs—or lack thereof—upon countries like Nigeria or others in Africa or around the world.

There will be a price for the United States as a country to pay when we

know about Jews being wiped out, when we know about Christians being wiped out, and God has blessed us with the ability to protect ourselves and to stop such genocide; not only do we do nothing to stop it, we demand that they abandon their Christian beliefs before we will offer any help.

There will be a price to pay for the United States of America for being so callous as Christians and Jews around the world are suffering in numbers like never before.

I applaud my friend BRAD SHERMAN. This article from Pam Key today quotes SHERMAN as saying:

I fear that you have misled this committee in telling us that once Iran has the rights of a nonnuclear state subject to additional protocol, that you'll be able to stop sneak-out, because you've said first that, well, they can't develop a nuclear weapon because that would be illegal. That's a preposterous argument. Obviously, they're willing to break the law.

My friend Mr. SHERMAN and I disagree on so much, but I know him to be an honorable man, and he understands Iran doesn't care about breaking deals. Any deal with Iran is like a deal with Hitler. The Soviet Union thought they could cut a deal with Hitler. The thing that their leaders were most mad about was that Hitler reached the agreement before they did because they had intentions, apparently, of breaching it.

We are somewhere between Neville Chamberlain and Stalin in trying to reach a deal with a modern-day Hitler, except Hitler didn't have some crazy religious idea that he should wipe out everybody in the world that didn't have the exact same religious beliefs that he did.

Look, we are on the side of right. President al-Sisi in Egypt is on the side of right. Saudi Arabia, the UAE, all over the Middle East, they are becoming afraid because this administration is on the verge of cutting a deal that will allow Iran to continue moving forward to not just one nuke, but many nukes, and a breakout could be a matter of weeks.

I know people are talking about it could be years, but when you hear from people that know that you could have a facility 30 meters by 70 meters and that you could sneak that 5 percent into a secret facility without people knowing and you could enrich it to 90 and have nuclear weapons, we ought to take notice.

We have been blessed with much, and to whom much is given, of them much is required. The world deserves better with what we have been blessed with in the way of power, and they deserve to have us stand up against Iran. It is time for us to bomb Iran's nuclear facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY,  
MARCH 23, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday, March 23, 2015, when it shall convene at noon for morning hour-debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for March 18 and today on account of a family medical emergency.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 23, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. CAPPAS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms.

KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 12. A bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Science, Space, and Technology, Veterans' Affairs, Oversight and Government Reform, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H.R. 1457. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide for direct payment of statutory sound recording performance royalties to record producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1458. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide bundled payments for post-acute care services under parts A and B of Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1459. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SIREs, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mrs. DAVIS of California):

H.R. 1460. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study with respect to stormwater runoff from oil and gas operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1461. A bill to repeal certain provisions of titles 23 and 49, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (for herself and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 1462. A bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1463. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for a one-year employment restriction for ex-employees of the Securities and Exchange Commission seeking to work for companies against which the Commission brought enforcement actions that were participated on by such ex-employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. POCAN):

H.R. 1464. A bill to impose a tax on certain trading transactions to invest in our families and communities, improve our infrastructure and our environment, strengthen our financial security, expand opportunity and reduce market volatility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1465. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health screening before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1466. A bill to repeal the USA PATRIOT Act and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), Financial Services, Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, Education and the Workforce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CRAWFORD (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HILL, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 1467. A bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for pre-employment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 1468. A bill to galvanize United States Government programs in support of brain health for global victims of autism, hydrocephalus and Alzheimer's and other forms of dementia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1469. A bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BOUTSTANY):

H.R. 1470. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and improve Medicare payments for physicians and other professionals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1471. A bill to reauthorize the programs and activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 1472. A bill to establish a modernized national Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H.R. 1473. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 1474. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the reissuance of Social Security account numbers to children in cases in which the confidentiality of the number has been compromised; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 1475. A bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund that Wall of Remembrance; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BABIN (for himself and Mr. MCCLINTOCK):

H.R. 1476. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from providing bailouts or other financial assistance to a pension plan of a State or political subdivision thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. YODER, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1477. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 1478. A bill to provide for notice to, and input by, State insurance commissioners when requiring an insurance company to serve as a source of financial strength or when the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation places a lien against an insurance company's assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1479. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply budget neutrality on a State-specific basis in the calculation of the Medicare hospital wage index floor for non-rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLD (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 1480. A bill to ensure access to certain information for financial services industry regulators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1481. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the small business industrial base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself and Mr. GIBSON):

H.R. 1482. A bill to repeal the exemption for hydraulic fracturing in the Safe Drinking Water Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1483. A bill to amend titles 23 and 49, United States Code, to repeal wage requirements applicable to laborers and mechanics employed on Federal-aid highway and public transportation construction projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1484. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain Federal lands to the State of Nevada in fulfillment of the Nevada Statehood Enabling Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1485. A bill to improve the control and management of invasive species that threaten and harm Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. HULTGREN):

H.R. 1486. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to bring the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection into the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE (for himself, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. JORDAN):

H.R. 1487. A bill to free the private sector to harness domestic energy resources to create jobs and generate economic growth by removing statutory and administrative barriers; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Agriculture, the Judiciary, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLLINS of New York (for himself, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. JONES, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 1488. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to include firearms in the types of property allowable under the alternative provision for exempting property from the estate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H.R. 1489. A bill to seek the establishment of and contributions to an International

Fund for Israeli-Palestinian Peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 1490. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HIMES, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1491. A bill to reform the housing finance system of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. EDWARDS (for herself, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 1492. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and improve the credit for dependent care expenses and to provide a credit for education of employees of child care centers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 1493. A bill to protect and preserve international cultural property at risk due to political instability, armed conflict, or natural or other disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit rollovers from retirement plans to health savings accounts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 1495. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for limitations on expenditures in elections for the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 1496. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the access to child care for certain veterans receiving health care at a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 1497. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require reporting by the Secretary of the Treasury of reduction measures being used to avoid defaulting on Government obligations in the event that the debt limit is reached, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. COOK, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 1498. A bill to direct the President to designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States citizens who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 1499. A bill to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. LATTA, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1500. A bill to ensure that certain TRICARE program beneficiaries may enroll in TRICARE Prime regardless of the location of their residence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1501. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the United States Postal Service may not close, consolidate, or sell any historic postal facility without prior congressional approval, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1502. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years payment parity with Medicare for primary care services furnished under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SABLON, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. HAHN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1503. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, to establish a program to provide for workforce training and education, at community colleges, in sustainable energy; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WOMACK, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. JONES, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BARR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 1504. A bill to prohibit regulations establishing certain limits for the school lunch program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1505. A bill to make the National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Pass available at a discount to certain veterans; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1506. A bill to direct the Federal Communications Commission to promulgate rules in an open proceeding with respect to updating its competitive bidding rules; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself and Mr. CASTRO of Texas):

H.R. 1507. A bill to incentivize State support for postsecondary education and to promote increased access and affordability for higher education for students, including Dreamer students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 1508. A bill to promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry and to increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1509. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to require the reinstatement of the draft whenever an authorization on the use of military force or declaration of war is in effect and to provide for the registration of women with the Selective Service System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1510. A bill to require that overseas contingency operations be paid for; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROKITA (for himself and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 1511. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for qualified elementary and secondary education tuition; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROUZER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 1512. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate at least one city in the United States each year as an "American World War II City", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr.

DESJARLAIS, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 1513. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to provide whistleblower protection for union employees; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1514. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide protections for active duty military consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1515. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require testing of underground sources of drinking water in connection with hydraulic fracturing operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 1516. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HONDA, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1517. A bill to provide greater clarity in the regulation of electronic nicotine delivery systems, including electronic cigarettes, cigars, cigarillos, pipes, and hookahs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1518. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide for a limitation on the time for the use of contributions or donations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. TAKANO):

H.R. 1519. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1520. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a Social Security Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Social Security surplus and a Medicare Surplus Protection Account in the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund to hold the Medicare



surplus, to provide for suspension of investment of amounts held in such Accounts until enactment of legislation providing for investment of the Trust Funds in investment vehicles other than obligations of the United States, and to establish a Social Security and Medicare Part A Investment Commission to make recommendations for alternative forms of investment of the Social Security and Medicare surpluses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 1521. A bill to rename the Captain William Wylie Galt Great Falls Armed Forces Readiness Center in honor of Captain John E. Moran, a recipient of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 1522. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and improve the Indian coal production tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARLETTA (for himself and Mr. CARSON of Indiana):

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SALMON, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JONES, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BRIDENSTINE):

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution effectuating the Compact for a Balanced Budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 160. A resolution welcoming the Seventh Summit of the Americas, to be held in Panama City, Panama, April 10, 2015, and April 11, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. HANNA, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. POLIS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Res. 161. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 18 as "National Innovation in Education Day"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 12.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 8: "The Congress shall have Power [. . .] To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries. . . ."

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 1459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

1) Article I, Section 4, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution. This provision permits Congress to make or alter the regulations pertaining to Federal elections;

2) Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision grants Congress the authority to enact appropriate laws protecting the civil rights of all Americans; and

3) The Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This provision prohibits excessive bail, excessive fines and cruel and unusual punishment.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 1461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3, Clause 7, and Clause 18.

By Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 1462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 1463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 8 Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1 and Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 1466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to establish post offices and post roads, as enumerated in Article I, Section, 8, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H.R. 1467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

the enumerated powers listed in Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (relating to interstate compacts).

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 1473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress) and clause 17 (relating to authority over the district as the seat of government), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 1474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, related to providing for the general welfare. Additionally, it is enacted under the authority provided in Article I, Section 8 related to Congress' ability to "[carry] into Execution the foregoing powers."

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1475.



Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BABIN:

H.R. 1476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, clause 7, which states that, "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by the law."

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Power vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. DOLD:

H.R. 1480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 1481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Ms. DEGETTE:

H.R. 1482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 1483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because the legislation would change the formula for government contracts on federal-aid highway and public construction transportation projects, it is authorized under clause 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution which states" [t]he Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 1485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7: No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law; and a regular Statement and Account of the Receipts and Expenditures of all public Money shall be published from time to time

By Mr. BRIDENSTINE:

H.R. 1487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 gives Congress the power to "make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper" to execute the enumerated power of regulating "Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes." The titles of the American Energy Renaissance Act deal with existing laws affecting the production and transportation of energy among the states and Indian tribes and the export of energy to

By Mr. COLLINS of New York:

H.R. 1488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 1489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 1491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. EDWARDS:

H.R. 1492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section I.

All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY:

H.R. 1494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 1495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1

By Mr. HIGGINS:

H.R. 1496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.R. 1497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 gives Congress the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 1498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Artical I Section VIII, Clause XVIII: to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this Constitution and the Government of the United States or in any Department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8:

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 1500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation ensures that the Secretary of Defense provides retired military veteran beneficiaries who live beyond 100 miles of a Military Treatment Facility, an opportunity to retain access to TRICARE Prime. Specific authority is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico:

H.R. 1503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 1505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 1, 12, 13, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; raise and support Armies; to provide and maintain a Navy; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power of Congress to provide for the general welfare of the United States) and Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Congress is given the power under the Constitution "To raise and support Armies," "To provide and maintain a Navy," and "To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces." Art.I, §8, cls. 12- 14. See also: ROSTKER V. GOLDBERG, 453 U. S. 57 (1981)

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 1510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article XVI of the Constitution—Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes...

By Mr. ROKITA:

H.R. 1511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 1512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8.

"This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, of the US Constitution

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 1513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One of the United States Constitution, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have Power—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof,

Or

Article One of the United States Constitution, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have Power—To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 1520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1—The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 1521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ZINKE:

H.R. 1522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 27: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 154: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 170: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 173: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 188: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 232: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 244: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 271: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 283: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 303: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 317: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 353: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 358: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 366: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 383: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 415: Mr. SCHIFF and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 420: Mr. OLSON and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 430: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 448: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 456: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 465: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 484: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 509: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 531: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 546: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 571: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 577: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 581: Mr. GIBSON and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 592: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 599: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 601: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 605: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 606: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 625: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 628: Mr. WALDEN.

H.R. 649: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 650: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 685: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 696: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 706: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 711: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 721: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. NEAL, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. BLACK, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 727: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 742: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 745: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 751: Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 766: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 775: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 784: Mr. KILMER and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 814: Mr. ROSS and Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 815: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 835: Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. CAPPS.

- H.R. 843: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
 H.R. 845: Mr. WELCH and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 855: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 868: Mr. BABIN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. BOUSTANY.  
 H.R. 869: Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 879: Mr. POSEY, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BARR, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. REED.  
 H.R. 880: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.  
 H.R. 893: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLINE, Ms. EDWARDS, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 913: Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 918: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.  
 H.R. 919: Mr. COHEN, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.  
 H.R. 923: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H.R. 928: Mr. MICA.  
 H.R. 938: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 955: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 969: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. BERA, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
 H.R. 973: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. WHITFIELD.  
 H.R. 985: Ms. SINEMA.  
 H.R. 989: Mr. TONKO, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. TAKAI.  
 H.R. 1022: Mr. KATKO.  
 H.R. 1062: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. SCHRAEDER.  
 H.R. 1078: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
 H.R. 1088: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. YARMUTH, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H.R. 1096: Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1103: Ms. BASS, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 1105: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1112: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 1117: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 1132: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. SPEIER.  
 H.R. 1142: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mr. HULTGREN.  
 H.R. 1147: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. KNIGHT.  
 H.R. 1148: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1149: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1170: Mr. HASTINGS.  
 H.R. 1192: Mr. GOWDY, Mr. WALZ, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Ms. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 1195: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. BARR, and Mr. MEADOWS.  
 H.R. 1197: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. KING of Iowa.  
 H.R. 1210: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
 H.R. 1218: Mr. LEWIS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. ABRAHAM.  
 H.R. 1220: Mr. LANCE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. VARGAS.  
 H.R. 1247: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1258: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NOLAN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
 H.R. 1267: Mr. BOST.  
 H.R. 1269: Mr. WITTMAN.  
 H.R. 1274: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIRES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. WALZ, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. MOORE.  
 H.R. 1282: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
 H.R. 1294: Mr. VEASEY.  
 H.R. 1299: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BARTON, and Mr. WESTERMAN.  
 H.R. 1300: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
 H.R. 1301: Mrs. WALORSKI.  
 H.R. 1312: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.  
 H.R. 1320: Mr. BURGESS.  
 H.R. 1342: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. LANGEVIN.  
 H.R. 1349: Mr. LAMBORN.  
 H.R. 1354: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H.R. 1358: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 1365: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 1369: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1384: Mr. PETERSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.  
 H.R. 1389: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HILL, and Mrs. WAGNER.  
 H.R. 1404: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. KILMER.  
 H.R. 1411: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 1413: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. CRAWFORD.  
 H.R. 1425: Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 1433: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1434: Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. VARGAS.  
 H. J. Res. 22: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. WALBERG.  
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. JONES.  
 H. Con. Res. 23: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. POCAN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FARR, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mrs. TORRES.  
 H. Res. 11: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H. Res. 12: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.  
 H. Res. 28: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
 H. Res. 54: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FARR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
 H. Res. 139: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H. Res. 151: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H. Res. 154: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CONYERS.  
 H. Res. 157: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

#### DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 976: Mr. BOUSTANY.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## HONORING THE LIFE OF RANDY M. HITI

## HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Randy M. Hiti of Rice Lake, Minnesota.

Mr. Hiti died suddenly on Wednesday while responding to a fire call as a member of the Rice Lake Volunteer Fire Department. During his 26 years of service, I am told that it was a very rare occasion that you would not see him show up when the Fire Department called. He was awarded the Firefighter of the Year Award and taught fire prevention to the Homecroft Elementary School third graders for over ten years.

He wasn't just a firefighter. He was a friend to many in all his volunteer activities, which included the Rice Lake Halloween Carnival and Rice Lake Day. Randy also was an eager volunteer for the Grandma's Marathon each year. He was the kind of guy who would drop anything for a family member, friend in need or anyone he saw outside of his driving hours to provide roadside assistance or help with day-to-day tasks. It was only recently that his daughter, Katherine Hiti, was inducted into the Volunteer Fire Department and I am sure it was a very proud moment.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Laura, his daughters Anne and Katherine, his mother Millie, and his brothers Brian and Leon.

He will be missed in his community as he touched so many lives with his spirit of generosity and time.

## RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MATTHEW EVERETT GREENLEE, MARK ALLEN GREENE, AND ROBERT WAYNE VON BOKERN

## HON. THOMAS MASSIE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three of my constituents from Owenton, Kentucky: Matthew Everett Greenlee, Mark Allen Greene, and Robert Wayne Von Bokern. These three outstanding power linemen from Owen Electric Cooperative recently volunteered for a project in Haiti that, when completed, will provide safe, affordable, and reliable power to 1600 consumers.

The goal of the project is to build a distribution system that will connect three towns in Haiti and establish its first electric cooperative, the Cooperative Electrique de l'Arrondissement des Côteaux. Upon completion, this diesel-

solar hybrid electricity distribution system will provide safe, affordable, and reliable power to rural consumers.

Tragically, less than 15 percent of Haiti has regular access to electricity. So, Mr. Greenlee, Mr. Greene, and Mr. Von Bokern generously gave of their time for two weeks in the town of Roche-à-Bateaux to help solve this terrible problem. My constituents upgraded and installed new lines and service drops. They also trained locally hired linemen in proper construction methods, pole climbing techniques, proper handline use, and important safety practices.

Electricity is essential to the quality of life for those in Haiti's rural communities. It assists in the provision of clean water, healthcare, education, and general economic opportunity. Therefore, I salute my constituents for contributing their time and efforts in Haiti on this critical project. Their selfless service for others truly helps make this world a better place.

## HONORING WILLIAM 'ZEKE' GRADER, JR.

## HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, MIKE THOMPSON, to recognize the incredible legacy of William 'Zeke' Grader, Jr., who has tirelessly served California's fishermen and coastal communities and as an environmental champion and community leader for many decades. Always willing to share his vast knowledge and expertise with others, Zeke has helped fishermen to define their interest in battles over offshore oil and gas development, land-use, timber harvesting, water allocation, and other issues of social equity and sustainability.

From an early age, Zeke Grader grew up in the coastal fishing community. His father founded Grader Fish, Co., in Fort Bragg, California, to buy, process, and broker fresh, local fish. Zeke spent much of his childhood on the family dock, helping fishermen to unload their catch. He graduated from Fort Bragg High School and moved south to attend Sonoma State University, where he studied political science and graduated in 1970.

Zeke Grader served his country in the United States Marine Corps before obtaining a law degree from the University of San Francisco and passing the California State Bar in 1975. At that time, Congress was deliberating how to assert our national sovereignty over a two-hundred mile wide economic zone in order to curb foreign overfishing in U.S. waters, allow depleted stocks to recover, and conserve fishery resources. Amidst such explosive public interest in natural resource protection, some in the fishing industry felt threat-

ened by the burgeoning environmental movement. Zeke Grader was asked to serve as the executive officer of the newly formed Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations (PCFFA), and he led the organization in a more productive and effective direction by embracing efforts to protect the coastal environment.

With Zeke at the helm, the PCFFA took a leading role in crafting important state and federal legislation to preserve the coastal fishing industry. Zeke lobbied strongly for California's 1988 Salmon, Steelhead Trout, and Anadromous Fisheries Program Act, which called for a statewide salmon conservation plan to double the present numbers of wild salmon. He pushed for modernization of the federal Fishery Conservation and Management Act, litigated to expedite water quality restoration under the federal Clean Water Act, and fought for protections of fishing grounds by organizing for the prevention and clean-up of petroleum spills.

In 1988, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration honored Zeke Grader with its prominent Environmental Hero award. For many Zeke has been a hero over many decades and his tireless efforts to protect the wild California Coast have ensured the present vitality of our fishing communities.

Our friend and former colleague George Miller is one of those who counts Zeke as an inspiration. He passed along this message to us to include in the RECORD: "Zeke Grader has been my friend almost my entire time in the Congress. During that time Zeke has been a leader in our state, on the Pacific Coast and in our nation to give voice and rights to the men and women of our vital and historic commercial fishing industry. The Pacific coast fisheries from time to time are threatened with droughts, economic downturns, high fuel prices, habitat destruction, and bad public policy. Through it all, Zeke Grader has led this magnificent group of fishers to maintain and grow our fisheries. So many people in California's diverse economy are dependent on their success. The commercial fishers of the Pacific coast must both catch and protect this magnificent species. Zeke Grader for so many years has successfully advocated for both the fish and the fishers. All of us owe him great thanks."

Today, Zeke continues his strong advocacy by working with and advising leaders at every level of industry and government. His legacy shows us the lasting positive impact that one man can have on countless others and he has shown that you can build a thriving and sustainable economy without depleting natural resources for future generations. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that we honor Zeke today for his work in representing the fishing community, and we express our deepest appreciation for his friendship and his service.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

# RECOGNIZING THE SKANEATELES HIGH SCHOOL BOYS HOCKEY TEAM

## HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the victory of the Skaneateles High School Boys Hockey team in the New York State Championship game on Sunday, March 15th. The Skaneateles Lakers defeated Williamsville East High School by a score of 5–2 for its first title in 26 years.

The Lakers fought back from a 2–0 deficit, working as a cohesive team to score 3 goals in under 6 minutes. Sophomore Raymond Falso received the tournament's Most Valuable Player Award, after having missed six weeks of the regular season due to an injury. Senior Captain Owen Kuhns, sophomores Raymond Falso, Reggie Buell, and Patrick Major were named to the All-Tournament team. The Lakers finished their season with a 22–3–1 record due to the hard work of seniors: Briggs Carter, Owen Kuhns, Jarrett McDonald, Cullen McGlynn, James Motyl, Brett Singler, and Trey Wirth; juniors: Karl Adams, Devin Callahan, Sam Clymer, Reece Eddy, Erik Huba, Bennett Morse, Kyle Ochsner, Jacob Patalino, and Benn Russell; sophomores: Matt Benson, Reggie Buell, Dimitris Christou, Ray Falso, Adam Lupo, Patrick Major, and Nick Rottger; freshmen: Matt Leveroni and Marc Welch; and eighth-grader: Luke Lynn. The team was coached by Mitch Major, a former captain of the 1989 Skaneateles Lakers team.

The Lakers have played with dedication and respect throughout the entire season. I commend the hard work, commitment, and teamwork these players have displayed throughout the season and the example they have set for youth throughout the 24th District. Excellence on the ice translates into excellence off the ice and the practice of sacrificing for the common goal, builds character in our children. I could not be more proud to congratulate these young men on their tremendous season.

# CONGRATULATING NATHAN ECKERT ON RECEIVING THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE RACHEL CARSON INDIVIDUAL AWARD

## HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to honor Nathan Eckert, the recipient of the 2014 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Rachel Carson Individual Award. This award is bestowed upon employees of the Service whose outstanding contributions improve the Service's knowledge and management of fish and wildlife resources. Nathan is a mussel biologist at the Genoa National Fish Hatchery in Genoa, Wisconsin, and this recognition—considered one of the highest honorary awards in the Service—is well deserved for his extraor-

dinary work in freshwater mussel conservation.

At the Genoa Fish Hatchery, Nathan has been researching and implementing new techniques and rearing systems for imperiled freshwater mussels. As an expert in mussel identification, Nathan has helped the Genoa facility produce nearly 15 million mussels of 17 species, and his endeavors have directly resulted in the release of more than 50,000 threatened or endangered mussels into waterways in the Upper Mississippi River Basin. Nathan's work also includes assisting various mitigation efforts involving projects that impact freshwater mussel populations, providing rare mussel species to partners such as the U.S. Geological Survey and many toxicology labs to study the effects of pesticides and contaminants on mussel survival.

Nathan's dedication and leadership has proved critical to protecting and sustaining the rich biodiversity of the Mississippi River. It is with great pride today that I rise to congratulate Nathan for receiving the Rachel Carson Individual Award and to sincerely thank him and the Genoa Fish Hatchery for building a legacy of conservation for generations to come.

# IN RECOGNITION OF EL CENTRO STUDENTS THIRD PLACE PRIZE IN C-SPAN'S VIDEO DOCUMENTARY COMPETITION

## HON. JUAN VARGAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Andrea Vallejo, Shelby Verbrugh, and Kennet Sandoval, seniors at Southwest High School in El Centro, California, for their outstanding achievement in winning Third Prize at C-SPAN's National 2015 StudentCam Competition. StudentCam offers students across the nation an opportunity to showcase their talents in a friendly national competition.

All aspects of the video production, including the research and planning in their documentary, "Salton Sea Restoration," demonstrated the highest level of critical thinking, initiative, and ingenuity. The "Salton Sea Restoration" placed third out of the 2,280 videos submitted, by more than 5,000 students around the country.

This competition is one of our nation's best platforms for our youth to express their opinions on national issues, provide eye-opening and inspiring views of the country, and contribute to the construction of a beloved community.

I want to congratulate these award recipients and encourage more youth involvement in the greater discourse about our communities.

# IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH PASTORAL ANNIVERSARY OF REV. DR. RONALD L. OWENS

## HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rev. Dr. Ronald L. Owens as he celebrates his 25th Pastoral Anniversary as Senior Pastor of New Hope Baptist Church in Metuchen, New Jersey. Pastor Owens continues to provide outstanding spiritual leadership to the Metuchen community.

Dr. Owens attended New Hope Baptist Church as a child and in 1990 was called back to serve as its pastor. Under his leadership, the membership of New Hope Baptist Church has grown immensely. He has encouraged his congregants to practice faith in action, serving the needs of people through several worship and outreach ministries.

In addition to his service to New Hope Baptist Church, Dr. Owens is also a leader in the Baptist church and an active member of the community. He has served as General Secretary of the General Baptist State Convention of New Jersey, Moderator of the Middlesex Central Baptist Association, Inc. and past president of the Metuchen/Edison Clergy Association. He is also the first Chaplain of the Metuchen Police and Fire Departments, where he continues to counsel, former Vice-Chairman of the Middlesex County Democratic Party and is a member of The Prince Hall Masons of New Jersey, among others.

Dr. Owens is married to Sister Cheryl Owens, formerly Cheryl Jones, and together they are blessed with two daughters and four grandsons. An active member of her faith, Sister Cheryl Owens is also celebrating her 25th anniversary of First Lady of New Hope Baptist Church and I would like to join with the church and community in thanking her for her service.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in celebrating the 25th Pastoral Anniversary of Rev. Dr. Ronald L. Owens. His leadership, service and dedication to the church and community are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

# CONGRATULATING ELLIE CAMPBELL FOR HONOR ORCHESTRA OF AMERICA SELECTION

## HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ellie Campbell from Richmond, Texas for her selection to the Honor Orchestra of America. She is one of only two Harpists who performed at the Orchestra America National Festival in Indianapolis.

Ellie performs with Virtuosi, a Houston-area orchestra, and the Region 13 Philharmonic Orchestra. With Virtuosi, she had the opportunity to perform the prelude music for Violinist Itzhak Perlman's performance with the Houston Symphony in Jones Hall. Music plays an

important role in our lives and talented musicians like Ellie contribute to our ability to appreciate the beauty of classical music.

I commend Ellie for all of her musical accomplishments in Houston and beyond. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again Ellie Campbell for her achievements.

HONORING MS. GAYE LEBARON,  
SONOMA COUNTY WOMAN OF  
THE YEAR

### HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gaye LeBaron as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district, and I am proud to recognize Gaye as one of them.

Ms. LeBaron is a renowned columnist for the Press Democrat newspaper, the best known historian of Sonoma County, and has been prolifically telling the story of our county, with over eight thousand articles published. Ms. LeBaron possesses a rare gift: a genuine interest in people and their stories. In even the smallest stories, she saw the larger truth. Her influence and acclaim have grown over the years because of this focus and the level of trust she has built with the general public through her constancy.

As one of Ms. LeBaron's colleagues at the Press Democrat put it: "Readers trust her to tell them the truth about what is going on in their community. The depth of her commitment is palpable and readers respond to that."

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. LeBaron not only for her commitment to telling the story of Sonoma County, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. LeBaron's unyielding dedication to the people and places that make our region unique is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her continued success.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 4, 2015, I was unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"no" on roll call vote No. 110 (on agreeing to the McClintock amendment to H.R. 749),

"yes" on roll call vote No. 111 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 749, with instructions), and

"yes" on roll call vote No. 112 (on passage of H.R. 749).

EXEMPLARY VOLUNTEERISM: PAM  
KLEINSCHMIDT AND JERRY  
LAWSON

### HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two citizen volunteers from the Lincoln Park neighborhood in Duluth. They have used their talents to give back to the community by assisting with policing efforts.

Pam Kleinschmidt regularly staffs the Lincoln Park and West Duluth police stations by answering phones and assisting with walk-in traffic. Pam, who is often referred to as the "Mayor of Lincoln Park," goes out of her way often at her own expense to take phone calls from concerned citizens at all hours of the day and night. In addition to helping the police build relationships with residents and small business owners in the neighborhood, she organizes monthly meetings for citizens and makes sure their concerns are addressed. Pam has been instrumental each week in keeping an eye on problem areas in the neighborhood and works with the police to help find solutions.

When the police department found itself needing help with managing seized cars used to commit crimes, they were fortunate to find a multi-faceted volunteer in Jerry Lawson. They needed a mechanic, an accountant and a customer service representative. He fulfills all these tasks and the police department frankly says they couldn't manage the im-pound lot without him. Jerry's volunteer efforts as he helped establish the "Vial of Life" program, which provides medical information to first responders as well as helping expand and improve the citizen patrol program.

They were recently honored by receiving the Police Chief's Citizen Partnerships Awards by Duluth's Police Chief Gordon Ramsay. I stand today to salute these exceptional volunteers who are making a true difference in their community.

### DEMOCRACY RESTORATION ACT OF 2015

### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Democracy Restoration Act of 2015. This legislation will serve to clarify and expand voting rights, as well as assist former felons with their reintegration into our democracy.

The Sentencing Project reports that, since 1997, 23 states have amended felony disenfranchisement policies in an effort to reduce their restrictiveness and expand voter eligibility. These reforms have resulted in an estimate of 800,000 citizens regaining their voting rights. Yet, despite these reforms, an estimated 5.85 million people continue to be ineligible to vote in Federal elections, including more than 4 million who reside in the 35

states that still prohibit some combination of persons on probation, parole, and/or people who have completed their sentence from voting.

I believe that there are three grave discrepancies in State laws regarding felony convictions that lead to unfairness in Federal elections. First, there is no uniform standard for voting in Federal elections, which leads to an egregious disparity and unequal participation in Federal elections based solely on where a person lives. Second, laws governing the restoration of voting rights after a felony conviction are unequal throughout the country and persons in some States can easily regain their voting rights while in other States persons effectively lose their right to vote permanently. Third, State disenfranchisement laws disproportionately impact ethnic minorities, thus adversely infringing upon citizens of these communities constitutional right to vote.

These concerns about ex-offender disenfranchisement are not rhetorical. In the past two election cycles, flawed voter purges have deprived thousands of legitimate voters of their rights. For example, an erroneous interpretation of state law by the Ohio Secretary of State deprived thousands of ex-felons in that state of even the right to register. Only Federal law can conclusively resolve the ambiguities in this area plaguing our voting system.

Like the States, Congress has recognized the need to address the barriers to full citizenship faced by ex-offenders. This voting legislation is the next step in restoring the ex-felon community to full citizenship. Denying voting rights to ex-offenders robs them of the opportunity to fully participate and contribute to their society. Disenfranchisement laws isolate and alienate ex-offenders, and have been shown to serve as one more obstacle in their attempt to successfully reintegrate into society. Moreover, these obstacles adversely impact the voting participation of their families, further undermining the effectiveness of our voting system.

This legislation is a narrowly crafted effort to expand voting rights for ex-felons, while protecting State prerogatives to generally establish voting qualifications. This legislation would only apply to persons who have been released from prison, and it would only apply to federal elections. Consequently, the bill is fully consistent with Constitutional requirements established by the Supreme Court in a series of decisions upholding Federal voting rights laws.

In past Congresses, voting restoration legislation has been supported by a broad coalition of groups interested in voting and civil rights, including the NAACP, ACLU, the National Council of Churches (National and Washington Office), the National Urban League, the Human Rights Watch and the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, among many others.

The practice of many states denying voting rights to former felons represents a vestige from a time when suffrage was denied to whole classes of our population based on race, gender, religion, national origin, and property. Ex-felons who have been lawfully released from prisons have paid their debts to society. To continue denying them the ability to reclaim rights as citizens resurrects historic unenlightened practices of our society. Ultimately, I believe that we fail not only ex-offenders by denying them the right to vote, but

the rest of a society that has struggled throughout its history to be legitimate and inclusive. Just like poll taxes and literacy tests, it is long past time that these restrictions be relegated to unenlightened history.

#### EXCEPTIONAL SERVICE

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Rotary Club of Katy for receiving the Katy Area Chamber of Commerce Award for Exceptional Service. Formed in 1946, the Rotary Club has served Katy for nearly sixty years.

The Katy Area Chamber of Commerce selected the Rotary Club of Katy because of their dedication to our community. Every year they hold two large fundraisers. To date, they have raised and donated over \$110,000 to local schools and charities in Katy. I thank the Rotary Club of Katy for their selfless dedication and focus on giving back to our community. With an emphasis on community service, Rotary Clubs across America play a vital role in strengthening our local communities.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Rotary Club of Katy for being presented the Katy Area Chamber of Commerce Exceptional Service Award. We look forward to their continued success in Katy, TX.

#### HONORING THE LIFE, ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF MINNIE MINOSO TO AMERICAN BASEBALL

### HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great baseball player and human being who passed away on March 1, 2015, Saturnino Orestes Armas Arrieta who was better known as Minnie Minoso, the Cuban Comet and Mr. White Sox.

Minnie Minoso was born November 29, 1925 in Cuba. He played baseball there and had the opportunity to play baseball here in the U.S. in the Negro Leagues, for, being a Black Cuban, he wasn't allowed to play in the Major Leagues. He played three years with the New York Cubans and then because of Bill Veeck, who was one of the leaders in integrating baseball—the American League's Branch Rickey, Minoso had the opportunity to play in the Major Leagues. He was originally signed to the Cleveland Indians but was traded to the Chicago White Sox in 1951, where, because of his unlimited exuberance and effort, he became known as the "Cuban Comet."

Minoso was a great White Sox player, one of the greatest players of the 1950s and a great emissary of Latin American baseball

players. He was the first Black Latin American player and superstar, the first black White Sox player and the third American League player of African descent.

Minnie Minoso had a great career. He did everything in baseball. He hit for average, he hit for power, he had speed, he was a great fielder, and a great competitor. In his career, Minoso batted .300 eight times, had a career batting average of .298 with 1023 RBIs and hit 186 home runs. He was a seven-time major league All-Star, a three-time Gold Glove Award winner and was one of only two players to play in the Major Leagues for five decades. In 1990, the White Sox wanted him to play in his sixth decade, which would have placed him in a league of his own. At the time, I placed a call to MLB Commissioner Fay Vincent and argued for Minnie being allowed to play in just one game and accordingly have six decades under his belt. Unfortunately Commissioner Vincent respectfully declined.

In addition to Minnie being one of the greatest baseball players of the 1950s, he was simply a great human being. In 1955, I lived in Memphis, Tennessee and was recovering from childhood polio. I went to an exhibition baseball game at Russwood Park where the White Sox were playing the Cardinals. I had a White Sox cap kind of like this one—this is a Minnie Minoso cap—and I had a White Sox t-shirt. I was on crutches and getting autographs when a player came and gave me a baseball. I went to my dad and told him about it; we went down to thank the player. He was a white pitcher for the Cardinals named Tom Poholsky. He said, "Don't thank me. Thank that player over there." That was number nine for the White Sox, Minnie Minoso. In the entire baseball field of 50 players or more, one cared about a young boy with polio who was a White Sox fan and wanted to do something for him. But in segregated Memphis, a black player didn't feel comfortable doing that, so he did it through a white player. The experience taught me at a very early age about the horrors of discrimination, prejudice and racism.

After that, Minnie became my friend. I visited him in Chicago and went into the White Sox locker room where he gave me his bat and cap. When he came to Memphis in 1960, I visited him at the Lorraine Motel, which was where the black players stayed while the white players were at the Peabody—another lesson in discrimination that taught me well and has taught me to this day to be vigilant against all forms of racism and discrimination. The Lorraine was where Dr. King was killed and now is a great Civil Rights museum in Memphis.

I followed Minnie my whole life. He was like a part of my family. We moved to Los Angeles and we went and visited him at Chavez Ravine. He came up to my dad, and he said "Doc, how's the kid's leg, how's he doing?" He always was concerned.

Minnie was denied one of his life's goals of being voted into the Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum. I tried to help him with that. Baseball made a mistake; they should have put Minnie in the Hall of Fame for his Sporting News Rookie of the Year season in 1951 and for all his great years on the diamond where he was unquestionably one of the premiere players of the game through 1961, in addition to being the first Black Latin American Major

Leaguer and the first Latin American star. While he was not afforded this honor during his lifetime, Minoso's achievements were recognized through his induction into the Cuban Baseball Hall of Fame in 1983, the Hispanic Heritage Baseball Hall of Fame in 2002, the Latino Baseball Hall of Fame in 2010, and having had his number nine retired by the White Sox, his statue placed at U.S. Cellular Field as he was "Mr. White Sox," and over 35 years of being the White Sox ambassador to Chicago. It is my hope that Minnie will soon be inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum as it needs Minnie to remember this groundbreaking and popular diamond star.

Minnie Minoso died Sunday, March 1, 2015. Visitation was Friday, March 6th at Holy Family Church in Chicago and the funeral was that Saturday. I'll miss Minnie Minoso. He is a lesson in why sports are bigger than runs, hits and errors. It is about human beings and humanity and young kids. Thank you, Minnie. Yours was a life well-lived.

#### HONORING FRANK DEAN

### HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Frank Dean who will be retiring from the National Park Service after nearly forty years of dedicated service. Since 1976 when he first joined the National Park Service as a Ranger at Alcatraz Island, Frank Dean has remained committed to preserving the natural beauty and strong cultural heritage of America's National Parks for this and future generations.

Over the past four decades, Mr. Dean has served the American public at parks across the United States, and he will retire in March 2015 as the General Superintendent of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). Since 2009, Frank Dean has taken on the monumental task of managing the GGNRA, which is the nation's largest urban park and is currently visited by an estimated twenty million people each year. As General Superintendent, Mr. Dean has been responsible for overseeing a staff of nearly three hundred federal employees and tens of thousands of volunteers, in partnership with over twenty-five affiliated nonprofit and commercial organizations. Frank Dean's ability to balance the diverse and competing interests of those who enjoy the park has allowed the GGNRA to continue to flourish and expand its appeal while keeping pace with America's changing demographics.

Under Mr. Dean's visionary leadership, world-class art has been incorporated to enhance the park through unique installations, such as Mark di Suvero at Crissy Field and @Large: Ai Weiwei on Alcatraz Island. Frank Dean has pursued the park service's proud tradition of providing youth engagement and educational opportunities through the Park Youth Collaborative. He has overseen critical improvements of park land, notably the restoration of natural ecosystems at Muir Beach to benefit endangered Coho salmon populations. Frank Dean also played a leading role



in forging the Tamalpais Lands Collaborative, a groundbreaking five-way partnership to secure a better future for Mt. Tamalpais.

Frank Dean's effective leadership has benefited all who enjoy the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. While he may be retiring from the National Park Service, his outstanding commitment to our parks will continue as Mr. Dean works to preserve and protect Yosemite National Park as the new President and CEO at Yosemite Conservancy. Please join me in recognizing Frank Dean and expressing deep appreciation to him for his long and impressive career, and exceptional record of service to our great nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SUPER  
STATE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
SCHOLASTIC STATE CHESS  
CHAMPIONSHIP

**HON. JUAN VARGAS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the Southwest High School Chess Club for their outstanding achievement in winning First Place at the 2015 Super States Southern California Scholastic State Chess Championship for the K-12 Under 1200 rating section. This championship offers students across the state an opportunity to showcase their chess skills through friendly competition.

I would like to recognize the Southwest High School Chess Club for providing instructors, equipment and curricula to after-school programs. These programs are designed to promote problem-solving, higher-level thinking skills, and improved self-esteem, which are crucial to developing the young minds of our children.

Once again, I would like to congratulate the Southwest High School Chess team for a job well done!

IN RECOGNITION OF MS. DAWN  
HOBBY

**HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my personal congratulations and best wishes to a great friend and Emmy award-winning journalist, Ms. Dawn Hobby. Dawn has worked at WALB-TV in Albany, Georgia for more than 20 years and currently serves as the News Director. She will be retiring on March 20, 2015.

For many years, Dawn was a familiar face on the evening news in Albany, Georgia. Indeed, she has built quite an impressive career which began when she worked as a producer at WALB. She later became a reporter and then an anchor. She launched the news operation for Albany station WFXL, before returning to WALB five years later.

A prominent investigative reporter, Dawn has received numerous honors and awards for

her work. In 2011, she won an Emmy Award from the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences Southeast for her work on the "Gulf Oil Crisis" special report. In 2007 and 2009, Dawn was awarded the Gabby Award for "Best TV On-Air Personality" by the Georgia Association of Broadcasters. She also holds three prestigious Golden Viddy Awards from the National Academy of Television Journalists for "Best Female Anchor" and "Best Investigative Reporting." She has been honored by the Associated Press Broadcasters Association, the Green Eyeshade Awards for Excellence in Journalism from the Society of Professional Journalists, Georgia Trend magazine, and numerous other organizations and publications.

Dawn is a 2011 graduate of the Raycom Media Leadership program and a 2012 graduate of the Poynter Leadership Academy at the Poynter Institute in St. Petersburg, Florida. She serves on the Board of Directors for the Georgia Associated Press and was appointed to the Raycom Media News Directors Advisory Board in April 2014.

Dawn's work at WALB, the NBC- and ABC-affiliated television station for Southwest Georgia, has made her a household name in Albany and the surrounding areas. She anchored WALB News 10 alongside Ben Roberts for more than 20 years, covering many of Southwest Georgia's most memorable events. I have had the pleasure of working with her throughout the years and I know she will truly be missed on the air and at WALB.

Dr. Benjamin E. Mays often said: "You make your living by what you get, you make your life by what you give." We are so grateful that Dawn has given her time and talents to keeping the residents of Southwest Georgia informed about current events taking place throughout the state of Georgia, our great nation, and the world. A woman of great integrity, her efforts, her dedication, and her expertise are unparalleled. Albany, Georgia shined a little brighter because of Dawn Hobby.

Dawn has accomplished much in her life but none of it would be possible without the love and support of husband, Russell, and her son.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our sincerest appreciation and best wishes to Ms. Dawn Hobby upon the occasion of her retirement from an outstanding career in journalism.

HONORING STEVE BROWN

**HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Steve Brown, an extraordinary community leader, an accomplished businessman, and a friend, whose life was tragically taken when he was killed riding his bicycle last April.

Steve was a man who lived his life the right way every day. He grew up in Illinois and moved to Florida in 1978 to start his career. Steve was a master salesman, who built Brown's Furniture in Boca Raton and Jupiter, Florida into landmark furniture and design stores. Steve believed his business should be

built on the hallmarks of honesty, integrity, hard work and devoted service. He would do anything for his customers, even loaning them furniture until they had chosen what they wanted, so that their homes wouldn't be empty in the interim. Steve was extraordinarily loyal to those who worked with him; the average employee of Brown's has been with the company for more than twenty years.

Steve was a dedicated member of his community. He was very active on the board of the Florence Fuller Child Development Center and helped to manage their thrift shop. He served on the board of Temple Beth El of Boca Raton for many years and chaired the membership committee. Steve was active in helping resettle Jewish refugees from the former Soviet Union when they came to South Florida, and he would regularly loan his company's trucks to needy or vulnerable families if they needed help with a move. He was active with the Jewish Federation of South Palm Beach County and an ardent supporter of America's bond with the State of Israel through Israel Bonds.

Most important to Steve was the love he shared for his family. He was a loyal son to his father and mother Carol and Murray Brown, a dedicated brother to David and Pam, and a loving and devoted husband to his wife Dana, the love of his life. Most important to Steve were his children: his daughter Susie and her husband Micha, his son Andrew, his wife Jennifer, and his youngest son Jordan. If only he could have lived to see the birth of his granddaughter Sara, born last August.

I am glad to take this opportunity to celebrate Steve's life and legacy, and I join with my friends at Spanish River Community High School in my district who will be honoring Steve's memory on March 28, 2015. For all of us who were privileged to know Steve or were touched by his vibrant life that was all too short, Steve's memory truly is a blessing.

HONORING JOHN THOMAS DODSON

**HON. TIM WALBERG**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Thomas Dodson, Music Director of the Adrian Symphony Orchestra, and to thank him for his impact on the musical life of the Adrian community over the past 14 years.

Many years ago, I served on the Board of Directors which brought John Dodson to the symphony, which he has energetically overseen since 2001. During that time, he elevated the artistic level of the orchestra while collaborating with artists of the highest quality. His authority at the podium and willingness to engage new formats and audiences will certainly be missed when he steps down from his position next month.

His talents have been recognized beyond the walls of the Dawson Auditorium, as Mr. Dodson was awarded the 2008 Lenawee Arts Award from the Croswell Opera House. He also earned the Ross Newsom Award for Outstanding Teaching in 2009 by Adrian College where he taught from 2001-2013.

On April 19, 2015, he will direct Symphony No. 9 in D Minor, the final complete symphony of Ludwig van Beethoven, and fittingly, Mr. Dodson's final classical concert performance with the Adrian Symphony Orchestra. I know the Adrian community looks forward to one last inspiring performance and wishes Mr. Dodson the best in his future endeavors.

HONORING MS. CYNTHIA ORTIZ  
GUZMAN

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Cynthia Ortiz Guzman as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district, and I am proud to recognize Cynthia as one of them.

When meeting Ms. Guzman for the first time, you are immediately taken in by her personal warmth, keen sense of humor, friendly smile and her enthusiasm for life. In 2011, Ms. Guzman was diagnosed on her 63rd birthday with younger-onset Alzheimer's disease. Not one to accept her challenges without a fight, Ms. Guzman moved to Napa to be closer to her family, and began raising awareness and advocating for increased research funding for this terrible disease. She has been an active member of the Alzheimer's Association and has been spreading her personal story throughout the region.

Ms. Guzman's story has been published in multiple books, magazine, and newspapers. She has come to my office in Washington, D.C. as a part of the Alzheimer's Association Advocacy Forum and I'm proud to have participated multiple times in her Walk to End Alzheimer's.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Guzman not only for her commitment to fighting this terrible disease, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. Guzman's unyielding dedication to raising funds and awareness and guiding our policymakers in Napa County is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her continued success.

HONORING MARGARET HARFIELD

**HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Margaret Harfield, who is celebrating her 105th birthday this month. Margaret is a remarkable woman who has made significant contributions to the film industry, where she established herself as one of the first female professionals in a field once dominated by men.

Margaret grew up in New Jersey, where she had the special privilege of working with the

world-renowned escape-artist Harry Houdini as his projectionist and assistant film editor. At a time when few women were able to enter the film industry, Harfield's unprecedented work for Mr. Houdini and beyond demonstrated her extraordinary talent, hard work and dedication to her profession. Margaret continued to break barriers with her work on movie tone newsreels and national commercials, later joining the film technicians union where she continued to thrive as an editor. Later, she became one of the founders of the National Film Editors Guild. In 1944, Margaret became an assistant editor for Paramount News and was quickly promoted to be an editor for the Life Stories Divisions, where she worked on film biographies used in newscasts and movie theatre reels. Margaret married the love of her life and late husband Harry Harfield in 1933, and lived together with him in Florida for more than 50 years.

Today, Harfield still lives in South Florida where she is a proud mother, grandmother and great grandmother. 105 years young, she is still an active member of her community and can be found at the local Bingo hall every Tuesday night and at many other functions across town.

It is a privilege, Mr. Speaker, to represent a district with citizens like Margaret Harfield. Harfield is a woman of great accomplishment, and I am incredibly pleased she is continuing to enrich the lives of those around her. On behalf of my entire district and the United States Congress, Happy Birthday, Margaret!

RECOGNIZING FREDRICK "WILL"  
WILLIAMS

**HON. RALPH LEE ABRAHAM**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Fredrick "Will" Williams on the occasion of his retirement from the SourceAmerica Board of Directors, through which he has helped identify and create work opportunities for individuals with significant disabilities in Louisiana and in communities across America.

Mr. Williams served in the U.S. Army from February 1983 to March 2006. He is an Iraq War Veteran and two time Purple Heart recipient. He was acting as a convoy escort managing a team of 14 soldiers escorting dignitaries through the war zone when there was a suicide bomb attack resulting in injuries leading to his retirement from the Army. He later became employed by Training, Rehabilitation and Development Institute (TRDI) where he worked as a security monitor. While at TRDI he became a knowledgeable and vocal advocate for people with disabilities and the AbilityOne Program and received recognition for his efforts through the SourceAmerica 2007 William M. Usdane Award.

Mr. Williams is also a mentor in the Boys and Girls Club of Monroe and works with young adults who have disabilities and are struggling to find their purpose. Mr. Williams is a deacon of True Vine Baptist Church and has served on the Finance Committee. He is also

a member of the AbilityOne Speakers Bureau and has spoken to groups around the nation about the difference employment makes in an individual's life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Mr. Williams for his heartfelt commitment to improving the lives of those with disabilities, and wish him well as he departs from the SourceAmerica Board of Directors.

IN RECOGNITION OF RUTH HYMAN

**HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Ruth Hyman as she is honored by the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group at their Ruth Hyman Spiritual Support in the Jewish Tradition Hospice Program Tree of Life Donor Wall Dedication.

A lifelong resident of Long Branch, New Jersey, Ruth Hyman continues her philanthropic endeavors to improve the well-being of New Jersey's residents. As the recipient of a generous donation by Ms. Hyman, the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group has named its hospice program's special services for Judaic pastoral care in her honor. The Ruth Hyman Spiritual Support in the Jewish Tradition program will continue to provide important spiritual and pastoral care and comfort to individuals and their families. The Visiting Nurse Association Health Group's mission to make the community a better place reflects Ms. Hyman's passion for helping others.

The largest non-profit visiting nurse association in New Jersey, the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group provides an invaluable service to our communities through compassionate home health care and support services. Its skilled health aides continue to meet the needs of over 120,000 individuals in the comfort and security of their homes each year.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in thanking Ruth Hyman and the Visiting Nurse Association Health Group for their immeasurable contributions to our community.

VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Douglas Gorman of Katy, TX for being named the Katy Area Chamber of Commerce Volunteer of the Year. He selflessly donates his time to serve the people of TX-22.

Mr. Gorman has been a strong volunteer since he moved to Katy in 2008. He serves on the advisory board for the Fussell Senior Citizen Center and volunteers weekly at Katy Prairie Conservancy and St. Paul's Episcopal Church. He is also a board member of the Katy Home Savers Association, and an advocate to preserve safe home environments for the elderly. We are lucky to have such a committed civil servant living in Katy. His selfless

dedication to community service strengthens our community.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Douglas Gorman for being selected as the Katy Area Chamber of Commerce Volunteer of the Year. We appreciate your service and continued successes.

RECOGNIZING HILARIO "LALO"  
RODRIGUEZ

**HON. HENRY CUELLAR**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Hilario "Lalo" Rodriguez of Laredo, Texas on the occasion of his retirement. For the last 42 years, Mr. Rodriguez has become a renowned and respected member of both the Laredo and HEB communities.

Lalo Rodriguez began his career with HEB in 1972 as a carryout at the original Laredo 3 store. From there, he rose in the ranks, serving as a department manager in Carrizo Springs, Hondo, and Eagle Pass and then as top store leader in Crystal City in 1984. Most recently, Mr. Rodriguez served as a Unit Director in Laredo stores 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. As a result, he has emerged as a tenet of the HEB organization in Laredo.

Over the last 42 years, Mr. Rodriguez has developed a reputation as an exemplary leader and role model at HEB. His colleagues describe him as "one of Laredo's most iconic top store leaders" and credit him with helping to position HEB as "the retailer of choice" in Laredo. During his 42-year tenure, Mr. Rodriguez has been a "positive role model," helping to empower the next generation of leaders in Southwest area stores.

Mr. Rodriguez is celebrated for his business acumen and love of the job. Many have attributed the rise of HEB in Laredo to his leadership and hard work. Overall, he will be remembered as being an effective business owner and merchant, as well as an exceptional developer of people.

In addition to his 42 years of exemplary service to HEB, Mr. Rodriguez is a devoted husband and father of four daughters.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Hilario "Lalo" Rodriguez for his 42 years of service to HEB and the people of Laredo.

TRIBUTE TO ABILITYONE AND  
BOSMA ENTERPRISES

**HON. TODD ROKITA**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an exemplary partnership between the AbilityOne Program and Indiana's own Bosma Enterprises.

AbilityOne is an extraordinary initiative that helps people with disabilities. It is the largest single provider of employment for people who

are blind or face other significant disabilities. The Program puts more than 47,000 Americans to work by providing products and services to both federal government and commercial customers.

For twenty five of the past 100 years that Bosma Enterprises has been in business it has partnered with the AbilityOne Program to serve hundreds of Hoosiers each year through Community and Center-Based Services; services that have helped disabled Hoosiers achieve a greater level of independence and self-esteem. Their partnership has also enabled many people to gain employment in good paying Indiana jobs. Nearly 60 percent of all employees at Bosma Enterprises are blind or suffer some degree of visual impairment. But Bosma's partnership with AbilityOne is about more than just the number of people. It is about the individuals that are being assisted.

One such man was stay-at-home dad Don Green. Retinitis pigmentosa left Don totally blind making it very difficult for him to reenter the job market after taking time off to care for his twins. On more than one occasion he was asked why potential employers "should have to make accommodations for someone who is blind." Almost 200 applications later, Don was disenchanted, dismayed and about to give up when a friend encouraged him to check into the opportunities provided by Bosma Enterprises. That application changed his life as Bosma hired Don as a material handler in its warehouse.

Bosma Enterprises was able to offer Don a job because of its contracts through the AbilityOne Program. Through this important program, Bosma provides exam and surgical gloves to VA hospitals across the country and has created nearly 100 jobs for people who are blind or visually impaired in Indiana. Today, just six years later, Don is the Production Supervisor managing 40 people working on the exam glove lines.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work Bosma Enterprises is doing in partnership with the AbilityOne Program and ask all Hoosiers to join me in recognizing the life altering work they do each and every day. They open doors of opportunity and help make the state of Indiana a better place to live. In the words of Don Green, "It means everything to be able to have a job. I am so glad that I am able to take care of my family and give them a better life."

STRONG COMMITMENT TO  
SERVICE

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate two members of the Brazos Valley Community-Girl Scout Troop 28028—Sarah-Leanne Sherman and Katie Stone. These young women received the Silver Award, the second highest Girl Scout award and the highest award at the middle school level.

Sarah-Leanne and Katie have continually showed their commitment to changing society

and helping their community. They were awarded the Silver Award after running a cheer and dance camp for the children staying at the Fort Bend Women's Shelter over the Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays. At the end of the camp, the children were able to perform their routine for their mothers.

I am proud to represent two young leaders who possess a strong commitment to service. On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Sarah-Leanne and Katie for earning this distinguished award. I look forward to seeing what Sarah-Leanne and Katie do in the future.

HONORING MS. KAREN TAYLOR,  
SOLANO COUNTY'S WOMAN OF  
THE YEAR

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Karen Taylor as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district and I am proud to recognize Karen as one of them.

Ms. Taylor is a considerate woman with a loving and giving heart, and is always seeking to help the less fortunate in our community, especially youth, homeless, and elders. From block parties that she put on as a teenager to field trips to take kids to Lake Tahoe to see snow for the first time, she has been a fixture in her neighborhood and the Vallejo community. Forming activity groups, such as Karen's Tiny Tots and Karen's Girls Clubs for kids and teenagers, she has helped young people in Vallejo experience and see the best in themselves.

Ms. Taylor has strived to improve our community for more than thirty years. She has worked with kids to perform plays, has hosted meetings on pregnancy prevention for teenage girls, and has devoted countless hours of work to the Solano AIDS Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Taylor not only for her commitment to bettering the lives of the less fortunate around her, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. Taylor's unyielding dedication to the people that make region unique is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her continued success.

BRAIN AWARENESS WEEK

**HON. JACKIE SPEIER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I stand today in celebration of the 20th anniversary of Brain Awareness Week and the importance of educating students and the general public on brain science in the United States and around the world. I'd like to highlight an issue that's

important to me and the people of California's 14th District. Traumatic brain injury, known as TBI, affects over 1.7 million people in the United States each year and costs Americans almost \$77 billion annually in direct and indirect medical costs. The effects of TBI on the brain vary greatly. TBI includes concussions, which may not show brain damage on an MRI, but can lead to headaches, fatigue, behavioral changes, and long-term effects on cognition or personality. More severe TBIs may lead to loss of consciousness for over 30 minutes, and can result in severe headaches, seizures, loss of motor coordination, and agitation. TBI can result from falls, car accidents, or due to combat trauma or athletics.

TBI has been called the signature wound of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, and many of the TBI cases from these wars are due to injury from Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs). The DoD states that since 2000, more than 287,000 U.S. service members have sustained a TBI. Research indicates that TBIs are related to development of PTSD or major depression in veterans, and being able to accurately diagnose and treat TBI is an important step in caring for the mental and physical health of our veterans.

TBI is also an issue in athletes of all levels, ranging from high school sports to professional sports. It is estimated that 300,000 sports-related concussions occur each year. In recent years, repeated concussions in athletes have been shown to be related to chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE) that leads to increased irritability, and eventually dementia. Many people with traumatic brain injury never get diagnosed, and there are not reliable treatments available for those who do get diagnosed. Being able to accurately identify and then treat TBI is important for the health and long-term well-being of high school athletes, professional athletes, service members, and veterans.

In an effort to improve diagnosis and treatment of TBI, the University of California, San Francisco is leading several federally-funded research initiatives. UCSF will be directing an \$18.8 million award from NIH that will support research on how to improve diagnosis and treatment for TBIs, which are frequently undiagnosed, misdiagnosed, and undertreated. UCSF has also received a \$17 million Department of Defense award that aims to improve clinical trials for TBI which may lead to better treatments. Researchers will use data from thousands of patients to identify effective measures of brain injury and recovery using brain imaging, biomarkers, and other tools. This may lead to the first successful treatment of TBI.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Brain Awareness Week and the contributions that thousands of dedicated scientists are making to unlock the mysteries behind the human brain.

HONORING MALCOLM JAMES  
"JIMMY" KEEP FOR HIS SERVICE  
AND BRAVERY AS A MARINE  
WITH THE FOURTH MARINE DIVI-  
SION DURING THE PACIFIC CAM-  
PAIGNS OF WORLD WAR II

**HON. STEVE COHEN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Malcolm James "Jimmy" Keep, a life-long Memphian and a veteran of World War II who fought bravely against Japanese forces on Guam, Saipan and Iwo Jima. Keep, now 88 years of age and one of two surviving veterans in the Memphis area who fought on Iwo Jima, served with the Fourth Marine Division after joining the Marines in 1943 at just 17 years old. On March 17, Mr. Keep and his son, Mickey, will travel to Iwo Jima with the help of Memphis-based nonprofit organization Forever Young Senior Veterans to join 70 other Marine veterans for a 70th anniversary gathering.

Assigned to reconnaissance duty early in his career along with his partner from training, Charlie Ciulla of Massachusetts, Keep experienced the brutality of war that many people can only imagine through Hollywood films. Keep remembers fighting on Saipan as the bloodiest thing he had ever seen as Japanese soldiers employed Banzai charges, or human wave assaults, on Marines who were firing 50-caliber machine guns—essentially guaranteeing their own deaths. Even though Keep was trained in fighting and all too familiar with death, he took no satisfaction from the number of Japanese lives lost to his gun fire. On Iwo Jima, Keep and Ciulla found themselves exposed to enemy fire from all sides when their amphibious tank was disabled near Mount Suribachi, causing them to evacuate on foot. The two Marines then ran across the island without injury, earning them both the nickname "rain-walkers." It was believed that if they could survive that kind of heavy fire without being hit, then they could walk through rain without getting wet. Their mission was not in vain as they saw the American flag raised on Suribachi.

Also on Iwo Jima, the American Marines fell under fire from seemingly ghost bullets, which were claiming the lives of many. It was discovered that Japanese fighters were using huge tunnels from which they launch their attacks. As a recon man, Keep was responsible for clearing out the tunnel, and in doing so, he found himself fighting a squad of roughly 15. He performed this task every other day for two weeks. In addition to helping his fellow Marines depart the island safely; Keep was photographed helping a wounded Marine back to the beach. He recalled telling the Marine, "You're getting off this rock. I'll trade places with you." Jimmy Keep is a true hero.

After returning to Memphis, Tennessee, Jimmy became an electrician and started a family. Today, he still resides in Memphis and is an ardent fan of the Memphis Grizzlies. When Jimmy and his son travel to Iwo Jima, Jimmy will no doubt be filled with emotions as he is united with other Marines who also

fought valiantly during World War II. While there, Keep plans to visit Japanese Shinto shrines to ask Japanese gods for forgiveness for the lives that he took as a result of war. This show of sorrow and respect is to be commended. It is my hope, however, that he also remain mindful of the countless lives that were saved because of his selfless decision at such a young age to fight for his country against those forces that sought to do harm to America and the American way of life. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring Malcolm James "Jimmy" Keep for his service and bravery as a Marine with the Fourth Marine Division during the Pacific campaigns of World War II.

HONORING MS. PAMELA PHILLIPS,  
LAKE COUNTY WOMAN OF THE  
YEAR

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Pamela Phillips as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district, and I am proud to recognize Pamela as one of them.

Over her exemplary five decade career as a public servant, Ms. Phillips worked her way up from receptionist to Field Manager of the Lakeport Social Security Office. I've worked with Ms. Phillips for the past sixteen years and her work ethic and dedication to our mutual constituents was outstanding. She always did her upmost to alleviate the immediate personal need in every dire situation and to see that every question was answered and every beneficiary was well-served.

Employees such as Ms. Phillips are often underappreciated, overworked and their important work sometimes goes unrecognized, but she has always been patient, compassionate and understanding.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Phillips not only for her commitment to public service, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. Phillips' unyielding dedication to every recipient of Social Security benefits in Lake County is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her a most enjoyable retirement.

CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENT  
OF THE BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB  
OF GREATER WATERBURY

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the unveiling of the newly renovated Boys & Girls Club of Greater Waterbury.

On March 19, 2015, the Boys & Girls Club of Greater Waterbury opens its doors to our

community, unveiling recently completed upgrades. I was proud to help secure the \$750,000 in state bonding funds for improvements to enhance the overall structure and amenities of the facility.

For over 125 years, the Boys & Girls Club of Greater Waterbury has shaped successful members by fostering leadership skills, developing educational enrichment programs, and designing activities focused on health and wellbeing. The club continues to demonstrate its commitment to our children through a variety of invaluable programming from promoting a healthy lifestyle to achieving academic success.

Thank you to the Boys & Girls Club for the countless hours you serve as youth advocates for children from all backgrounds. Your sense of purpose and passion creates an environment where boys and girls are welcomed for their diversity and encouraged to build strong character and responsible citizenship.

The Boys & Girls Club of Greater Waterbury transforms lives by expanding opportunities and empowering youth. I offer my congratulations and sincere thanks to the Boys and Girls

Club for all of these contributions to our community. I wish them many more years of continued success.

HONORING MS. MAUREEN TOMS,  
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY WOMAN  
OF THE YEAR

**HON. MIKE THOMPSON**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 19, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Maureen Toms as one of the Fifth District of California's Women of the Year as we celebrate Women's History Month. I regularly have the privilege to work with extraordinary women across our district, and I am proud to recognize Maureen as one of them.

Ms. Toms has been a strong supporter of the Special Olympics; as a parent of a child with Down Syndrome, she has been a tireless advocate for children with disabilities. She has

also donated hundreds of hours as a volunteer on numerous planning committees that have led to improving the quality of life for the families and residents in the City of Pinole and West Contra Costa County.

Ms. Toms grew up in a family that believed in serving their community, and that philosophy became a lifelong passion. From helping children with intellectual disabilities overcome barriers through sports and shatter stereotypes with the Special Olympics to helping beautify her local neighborhood by obtaining grants to plant trees in a local park, she has been a tireless advocate for the people and places that make our community special.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate at this time that we honor and thank Ms. Toms not only for her commitment to improving the lives of children with disabilities, but also for her commitment to our community. Ms. Toms' unyielding dedication to the people that make our region unique is greatly appreciated by our entire community and we wish her continued success.

**SENATE—Monday, March 23, 2015**

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign God, Your kingdom cannot be shaken, for You are King of kings and Lord of lords. Thank You for inviting us to ask and receive, to seek and find, and to knock for doors to open. Lord, forgive us when we have forfeited Your blessings because of our failure to ask.

Today, empower our Senators to seek Your wisdom and guidance. May they not depend only on their gifts and abilities, but remember that without Your involvement they labor in vain. May they strive to be Your ambassadors of renewal and reconciliation. Steady their hands to grasp freedom's torch and illuminate the darkness of our Nation and world.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). The majority leader is recognized.

**A BALANCED BUDGET**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we begin this week by remembering a failed idea from the past—ObamaCare—and we will end by passing balanced budget legislation about the future.

Five years ago today, a partisan ObamaCare bill was signed into law over the objections of the American people. It was rushed through in defiance of the experts who warned it would result in higher costs, fewer choices, and broken promises for the middle class. And, tragically, that is just what we have seen.

Millions of Americans lost health plans they were promised they could keep, premiums spiked, deductibles skyrocketed, tax time became even more of a burden, and often a costlier

one as well, and for too many, family doctors and trusted hospitals fell out of network.

All we have to do is listen to letters such as Karen's from Louisville to know that Americans deserve better than what ObamaCare has given them.

Karen was paying \$325 a month for her health insurance. But now, she says her premium has spiked to almost \$550 a month with a deductible well in excess of \$6,000. "I cannot afford this," Karen wrote, "but I do not have a choice. It scares me to think what will happen if I do get sick."

That is Karen's story, and it is hardly unique.

Every Member in this body should be striving for something better—something better—than the pain of ObamaCare. And we can. By passing a balanced budget that is about the future, we can leave ObamaCare's higher costs and broken promises where they belong—in the past—and start fresh with real health reform. That is just one of the many reasons for Senators who support the balanced budget now before us. It is a budget that recognizes serious fiscal and economic challenges that are facing our country and works to address them in a commonsense way.

Americans know that Washington can't tax away the challenges confronting us, and Americans know Washington can't ignore away the problems confronting us, either. Americans also know that every dollar spent on interest for the growing national debt is essentially wasted. Every dollar spent on interest is one less dollar for Social Security or for helping those who truly need it or for tax relief.

That is why the balanced budget before us is premised on a simple truth—that Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem. I know this can be hard for some to acknowledge, but politicians have a duty to the American people to simply admit it. They owe it to the American people to explain why the kind of budget blueprints we have seen from the White House are just so totally unserious. President Obama's budgets skip the tough choices, keep spending more money we don't have, contain massive tax increases, and never balance—ever. They never balance—ever.

Contrast that to the budget before the Senate today. It balances, it does so without raising taxes, and it is the result of open and transparent committee work led by Chairman MIKE ENZI.

This budget is another example of the new Senate getting back to work

for the American people. It is another example of the new Senate moving past failed ideas from the past, such as ObamaCare, and positioning America for the future instead.

This balanced budget is all about growing an economy that can work better for the middle class of today and leaving a more prosperous future to the middle class of tomorrow. It will also provide the procedural tools, via the budget reconciliation process, to bring an end to the nightmare of ObamaCare. That is something all of us should want.

So since our friends across the aisle have decided not to offer a budget of their own, I would invite them to join us—to join us in supporting the growth-oriented and balanced budget that is before us now.

**CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016—MOTION TO PROCEED**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. Con. Res. 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 31, S. Con. Res. 11, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

**CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time used for my opening statement not count against the budget resolution time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**AFFORDABLE CARE ACT**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the Republican leader mentioned, it is hard to believe that 5 years have gone by since

we passed the Affordable Care Act—but it is true. It has been 5 years. We recall back to that cold winter day when we were able finally to get it done.

But to me it doesn't seem that long ago. The memories of what took place to get where we did to pass that are very fresh in my mind. It wasn't an easy feat. Presidents going back to Truman and Eisenhower had tried to pass legislation dealing with health care, and they were all unable to do it. So it was really a great accomplishment that Congress could pass this legislation.

It wouldn't be a stretch to say that President Obama risked his Presidency by pushing for health care reform. It was really a defining moment for many people.

Republican opposition at the time was overwhelming. No matter what we as Democrats did or tried to do, there was nothing we could do to get Republicans to join us in giving health care to the American people, even though the original health care bill we passed was patterned after Republican proposals. So we worked hard, and we got it done. We pled for help, and we got none. Republicans simply were not interested in working with us to fix our Nation's health care system.

Outside the Capitol, a sophisticated and dishonest public relations campaign costing huge amounts of money was being waged against ObamaCare by political operatives, lobbyists, insurance companies, and many others. We pressed on, and we did the very best we could, and it was pretty good. Was it perfect? Of course not. No legislation is. But what we eventually passed was and still is good for America.

I was very surprised to hear my friend, the senior Senator from Kentucky, talk about a woman from Kentucky. That is very unusual, since 400,000 people in Kentucky today have insurance because of ObamaCare that they didn't have before.

Five years later, I am very proud of the work we did. I am just as proud today as I was when President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law. ObamaCare is reducing costs, expanding access, and protecting individuals with preexisting disabilities.

Look at just a few of the things it has done.

Some 16.4 million Americans now have quality health care coverage—16.4 million.

The United States has seen the largest decline in the uninsured rate—probably ever, but we will use just for purposes of illustration—in decades.

In the last 18 months, the uninsured rate for nonelderly adults has fallen by 35 percent. That is stunning.

Health care costs have grown at their slowest level in some 50 years.

Now listen to this. Patient safety initiatives are keeping Americans safe. Since we passed this legislation, the

number of preventable deaths at hospitals and care centers has dropped by 50,000 people. That is 50,000 people who are alive today who wouldn't have been had it not been for ObamaCare. That is just one aspect of the people who are alive today because of ObamaCare who would not have been otherwise.

But for all of the incredible national statistics that are available, the best evidence that the Affordable Care Act is working can be found in our homes, our neighborhoods, and our communities.

This year in Nevada, ObamaCare is making a real difference in the lives of about 73,000 people who signed up for coverage through the health care insurance marketplace. Frankly, Nevada got off to a really slow start because they had a contract in the State with Xerox and they did such an awful job. The Republican Governor of the State of Nevada—I have applauded him in the past and I will do it again—was very courageous. He stepped forward and has made a huge difference in Nevada. Not only are Nevadans getting covered, but they are getting tax breaks, also. Some 65,000 Nevadans who selected a plan on the marketplace qualified for an average tax credit of \$242 per month. No matter what standard we use, that is real money in the pockets of Nevadans who are still recovering from the economic downturn because of what happened on Wall Street. There are stories just like this all across America.

After 5 years, it is as clear as ever that the Affordable Care Act is working. Americans are benefiting from increased health coverage, lower costs, and improved efficiency.

Again, 16.4 million Americans have quality health coverage. Since 2013, the United States has seen the largest decline in the uninsured rate in decades. In the last 18 months, the uninsured rate for nonelderly adults has fallen by 35 percent. Health care costs have grown at their slowest rate in 50 years. Patient safety initiatives are keeping Americans safe. Since 2011, the number of preventable deaths at hospitals and care centers has dropped by 50,000.

The ranking member of the Budget Committee is on the floor today. One of the great things we do not talk much about in the Affordable Care Act is community health centers. The good man from Vermont, the junior Senator from Vermont, came to me and talked to me about community health centers. As a result of his advocacy, we put lots of money—about \$11 billion—in the Affordable Care Act for community health centers. It has changed the health care delivery system in America significantly. We must continue that program.

The Affordable Care Act, for all the reasons we have mentioned, is something that is really important. It is important that everyone understand how

absolutely fantastic it was for the people of this country. After 5 years, it is clear it is working. Americans are benefitting from increased coverage, lower costs, and improved efficiency.

I invite my Republican colleagues to accept that ObamaCare is the law of the land. Put aside the unrealistic notions of repealing a law of which 16.4 million people now have health care. Are we going to just drop them, because the Republican plans would just basically drop them all?

Instead, Republicans should join with us to help even more Americans get the help they need. Perhaps, then, 5 years from now Democrats and Republicans can look back with pride, knowing that together we helped make a good law even better for all Americans.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I will begin by propounding some unanimous consent requests. I think these have been agreed to on both sides.

First, I ask unanimous consent that, for the duration of the Senate's consideration of S. Con. Res. 11, the majority and Democratic managers of the concurrent resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desks, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal digital assistant devices and tablet devices. I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. For the information of Senators, this UC does not alter the existing traditions that prohibit the use of such devices in the Chamber by Senators in general, officers, and staff. It also does not allow the use of videos or pictures, the transmitting of sound, even through earpieces, for any purposes, the use of telephones or other devices for voice communications, any laptop computers, any detachable keyboards, the use of desktop computers, or any other larger devices.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that the initial debate time on the budget resolution be allocated as follows: time until 1 p.m. equally divided between the managers or their designees; 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. under the control of the majority; 2 p.m. to 3 p.m. under the control of the minority; 3 p.m. to 4 p.m. under the control of the majority; 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. under the control of the minority; 5 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time spent in



quorum calls requested during the budget resolution be equally divided and come off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, last week, the Senate Budget Committee took an important first step in helping to change the way we do business here in Washington—by reporting out a balanced budget.

This week, we take the next step as the Senate begins debating how best to make the government live within its means and set spending limits for our Nation. But we are running out of time, and unless we do something soon, our Nation will be overspending nearly \$1 trillion a year. Now, that is actually \$1,000 billion a year. A trillion dollars makes it sound rather trivial. It is \$1,000 billion a year of overspending.

Hard-working taxpayers are paying attention. In fact, 24 States have already passed a constitutional balanced budget amendment, and there are 10 more that are working on it. If all of these States pass similar measures, we will have 34 States needed for a constitutional convention on a balanced budget and we will be forced to act as they desire. “If it isn’t all of you,” they are saying, “it will be all of us.”

Well, we are elected to represent our constituents. In the face of such demands, we should act or someday it will be out of our hands.

One of the best ways to balance our budget is to make our government more efficient, effective, and accountable. If Congress does its job, we can have some flexibility and eliminate what is not working, starting with the worst first. Then we can eliminate waste and streamline what is left.

But to do this, first Congress must do something it has not done in the past 8 years; that is, scrutinize every dollar for which they have responsibility. Actually, with the billions of dollars we spend every single year, they will be lucky to scrutinize every million dollars.

If government programs are not delivering results, they should be improved; and if they are not needed, they should be eliminated. It is time to prioritize and demand results from our government programs.

Through the process of getting the budget together, I discovered that we had 260 programs that have not been authorized. What is an authorization? Well, the committees are the people who are kind of experts or at least have a very concentrated concern over that particular area. They pass the new programs—the details of the new programs: the amount that can be spent on those programs, the way we can measure whether they are getting things done.

I discovered that 260 of those programs that we are still funding have expired. Their authorization ran out.

One thing that is in those authorizations is some kind of a sunset date; and we have passed the sunset date on 260 programs. So what? We are only overspending, according to the authorization, \$293 billion a year on expired programs.

Yes, some of those programs are absolutely essential. What we need to do, though, is have those committees that have the expertise go back and review them and reauthorize them and set the new limits and the new matrix for what they are supposed to be doing so we can tell if they are doing their job. Mr. President, 260 programs—one of them expired in 1983; a whole bunch of them expired before this century. So we know this will be a challenge for every single Member of Congress. But I believe we are up to the task because the American people are counting on us.

This week hard-working taxpayers will also get to see something they have been waiting to see; and that is an open and transparent legislative process that will see Members from both sides of the aisle offering, debating, and ultimately voting on amendments to this resolution.

Senate Republicans will offer amendments that will enhance fiscal discipline, build a strong national defense, boost our economic growth, tackle ObamaCare, protect education, and help make our government more efficient, effective, and accountable to hard-working taxpayers.

What this budget does do. We will also hear people say what this budget does and what it does not do. But here is what this budget does do: It balances the budget in 10 years with no tax hikes. It protects our most vulnerable citizens. It strengthens the national defense. It improves economic growth and opportunity for hard-working families. It slows the rate of spending growth.

It preserves Social Security by reducing spending in other areas to fully offset Social Security’s rising deficits and encourages our Nation’s leaders to begin a bipartisan, bicameral discussion on how to protect and save Social Security and avoid the across-the-board Social Security benefit cuts that could occur under current law. It protects our seniors by safeguarding Medicare from insolvency and extending the life of the Medicare trust fund by 5 years. It ensures Medicare savings in the President’s health care law are dedicated to Medicare, instead of seeing those changes go to other programs and more overspending.

It continues funding for the Children’s Health Insurance Program, CHIP, and creates a new program based on CHIP to serve low-income, working-age, able-bodied adults and children who are eligible for Medicaid. It increases State flexibility in designing benefits and administering Medicaid

programs to ensure efficiency and reduce wasteful spending and provides stable and predictable funding so long-term services and supports are sustainable both for the Federal Government and the States.

So as we begin this debate this week, it is worth noting that the strong economic growth a balanced budget can provide will serve as the foundation for helping all Americans grow and prosper. A balanced budget allows Americans to spend more time working hard to grow their businesses or advance their jobs, instead of worrying about taxes and inefficient and ineffective regulations. Most importantly, it means every American who wants to find a good-paying job and a fulfilling career has the opportunity to do just that.

There are problems, however, with the family budget. Family income is not growing as it should, and this has dire consequences for our future. If family income does not grow, it becomes very difficult for parents to pay for their children’s education and for their own training needs. Likewise, slow family income growth means less money set aside for retirement, health care, a downpayment on a house, and money to get the next generation started.

Because job growth has been so slow since the beginning of the recovery, it is not surprising that income growth has been slow too. A lot of people fail to note that when jobs and incomes slow down together, the real victims are your hopes, your dreams, and your aspirations. Moreover, these trends of slow growth in jobs and incomes are relatively related and recent.

Hardly anyone listening to me today would be confused by the term “family income.” It clearly means the cash that families receive from their jobs and their investments. It is the stuff that goes into a savings account, into a retirement plan, into education for the kids, into the household rainy day fund. You can count it, and it is tangible.

One of the other things I discovered as I was going through this process is we have some things we call trust funds. I have discovered that you better not trust them. There is no cash in the trust funds. Normally that would be investments that can be withdrawn and the bills paid. I think if we really were doing a financial statement for the Federal Government, we would have to move those trust funds over to accounts payable because what is backing them is the full faith and credit of the Federal Government. I hope we can make it so that is full faith and credit. That is why we need to change some of the things we are doing right now.

Last year, we spent \$231 billion on interest. That is on an \$18 trillion debt. In the President’s budget, that is proposed to go to \$780 billion. That is more

than we are spending on defense, more than we are spending on education, more than we are spending on almost any other function the Federal Government does. If \$230 billion is 1 percent, what happens if we go to the normal rate of 5 percent? Oh, goodness, we only get to make choices here on \$1,100 billion. So virtually all the money we have would go to interest—no national defense, no education, no other function that the Federal Government is involved in.

Our overspending is killing us. Yes, there are two ways you can reduce overspending. One is to cut spending; the other one is to raise taxes. We are already collecting more money than we ever have in the history of the United States. So how are we going to solve this problem of the interest itself from bankrupting us? This budget is designed to put us on a path to do that. It will not solve everything. We have only had about 8 weeks to do what has not been done in the budget for 6 years. So I hope you will bear with us during the course of this process.

I am an accountant. I am also chair of the Senate Budget Committee, and we have started the monumental task of confronting America's chronic overspending, tackling our Nation's surging debt, and balancing our Nation's budget.

Incidentally, under the President's budget, the overspending this year is \$468 billion. Remember when we used to make decisions on \$1,100 billion? If the Constitutional Convention that I talked about that the States are putting together were in place—there are 24 already; another 10 makes it mandatory—we would have to cut 50 percent. We are not able to do that. It was tough enough to balance the budget over a 10-year period. That is a tremendous task we have ahead of us if we are going to take care of balancing our Nation's debt and bringing it down to where it is a manageable level, where we can afford the interest on it.

Before coming to Congress, I ran a small business in Wyoming for many years. I served as a mayor in my hometown and then served in the legislature. One of the most important roles I had was to ensure that my budgets were balanced every year. In time, we were even able to build some rainy-day accounts in Wyoming. So far, there has never been a crisis so bad that it has rained. It is time to begin this responsible accounting in Washington because while we can lie about the numbers, the numbers never lie.

The worst kept secret in America is that this administration is spending more than ever and taxing more than ever. The President's budget increases taxes dramatically and still doesn't get us to a balanced budget. In fact, that \$468 billion in overspending this year—in the 10th year, he projects \$1 trillion, which is \$1,000 billion overspent. It

never goes down. It keeps going up. We have to reverse that trend.

The Federal Government should spend your tax dollars wisely and responsibly and give you the freedom and control to pursue your future in the way you choose. Hard-working taxpayers deserve a government that is more efficient, more effective, and more accountable. That should be something on which both parties can agree because I never heard anybody say they wanted a more inefficient, ineffective, and unaccountable government.

Runaway spending habits over the past 6 years have created a dangerously growing debt because the habit of spending now and paying later is deeply ingrained. Actually, under the President's budget, it isn't even paying later that is included. Federal deficits have hit record highs. We have overspent nearly \$1 trillion a year—that is \$1,000 billion. The more Washington spends, the more debt we owe and the more is added to what future generations would have to pay.

Today, America's debt totals \$18 trillion. In fact, every man, woman, and child now owes more than \$56,000 on that debt. The number is expected to grow to more than \$75,000 over the next decade unless we make important changes. Yes, that is every man, woman, and child. That means somebody born this morning owes \$56,000 on that debt.

Every dollar spent on interest on our debt is another dollar we won't be able to use for government services, for individuals in need, or another dollar that won't be available to taxpayers for their own needs.

It is time to stop talking and start acting. Washington has to live within its means, just as hard-working families do every day. We have to deliver a more effective and accountable government to the American people that supports them when it must and gets out of the way when it should. We didn't get here overnight, and we won't be able to fix it overnight, but we can begin to solve this crisis if we act now.

The Republicans put forward a responsible plan that balances the budget in 10 years with no tax hikes. It protects our most vulnerable citizens, strengthens our national defense, and improves economic growth and opportunity for hard-working families. A balanced budget means real accountability in Washington and ensures that programs actually accomplish what they set out to deliver—which goes back to my statement about 260 programs that have expired that we are still funding to the tune of \$293 billion. A balanced budget supports economic growth for hard-working families and creates real opportunity for all Americans to grow and prosper. A balanced budget allows Americans to spend more time working hard to grow their busi-

nesses or to advance their jobs instead of worrying about taxes and inefficient, ineffective regulations that drive down their opportunities. It also means our job creators can find new opportunities to expand our economy. Most importantly, it means every American who wants to have a good-paying job and a fulfilling career has the opportunity to do that. That is what a balanced budget means for our Nation, and it is what the American people deserve.

Congress is under new management, and by working together to find shared ground with commonsense solutions, we can deliver real results and have real progress.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Thank you, Madam President. Let me begin by commenting on a few of the thoughts raised by my good friend Senator ENZI.

Senator ENZI says the economy today is not where it should be, and he is right. I don't think anybody thinks the economy is where it should be in terms of low unemployment and high wages—no debate about that. But I ask the American people to think back 6½ years ago, at the end of President Bush's term, to what the economy was like. At that point, we were not gaining the 200,000 jobs a month we are gaining now; we were losing 800,000 jobs a month. At that point, the deficit was not at \$480 billion, where it is today; it was at \$1.4 trillion. At that point, the stock market was not soaring, as it is today; the American and world financial system was on the verge of collapse. So let's begin by putting issues into perspective.

No, nobody I know thinks we are where we should be economically in America today, but anybody who does not understand that despite enormous Republican obstructionism, we have made significant gains over the last 6½ years would, I believe, be very mistaken.

As we all know, the Federal budget we are working on now is not an appropriations bill. It does not provide explicit funding for this or that agency. What it does do is lay the foundation for that process, the total amount of money the appropriations committees have to spend. In other words, this budget is more than just a very long list of numbers. The Federal budget is about our national priorities and our values. It is about who we are as a nation and what we stand for. It is about how we analyze and assess the problems we face and how we go forward in resolving those problems. That is the task the Senate is now about to undertake, and it is a very serious responsibility.

Let's be very clear. No family, no business, no local or State government can responsibly write a budget without

first understanding the problems and the challenges it faces. That is even more true when we deal with a Federal budget of some \$4 trillion.

As I examine the budgets brought forth by the Republicans in the House and here in the Senate, this is how I see their analysis of the problems facing our country. At a time of massive wealth and income inequality, perhaps the most important issue facing this country—a huge transfer of wealth from the middle class to the top one-tenth of 1 percent. My Republican colleagues apparently believe the richest people in America need to be made even richer.

It is apparently not good enough for my Republican colleagues that 99 percent of all new income today is going to the top 1 percent—not good enough.

It is apparently not good enough that the top one-tenth of 1 percent today own almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. Clearly, in the eyes of my Republican colleagues, the wealthy and the powerful and the big campaign contributors need even more help. Not only should they not be asked to pay more in taxes, not only should we not eliminate huge loopholes that benefit the wealthy and large corporations, some of my Republican friends believe we should protect these loopholes, not change them at all or maybe even make them wider.

It is apparently not good enough that corporate America is enjoying record-breaking profits and that the CEOs of large corporations earn some 290 times what their average employees make—290 times more.

It is apparently not good enough that since 1985, the top one-tenth of 1 percent has seen a more than \$8 trillion increase in its wealth than it would have if wealth and equality had remained the same as it was in 1985—an \$8 trillion dollar increase in wealth going to the top one-tenth of 1 percent. But apparently my Republican colleagues not only do not talk about this issue, they will do nothing to address the massive wealth inequality this country faces.

It is apparently not good enough for my Republican colleagues that the wealthiest 14 people in this country—14 people—have seen their wealth go up by more than \$157 billion over the past 2 years alone. Fourteen people saw an increase in their wealth of \$157 billion, and the Republican budget talks about cutting food stamps and education and nutrition, because we are presumably a poor nation. Well, we are not a poor nation. We just have massive wealth and income inequality, so that the vast majority of people are becoming poorer but the people on top are predominantly wealthy. That is the reality we must address.

As manifested in the House and Senate budgets, my Republican colleagues are ignoring a very significant reality,

and that is that millions of middle-class and working families are people who are often working longer hours for lower wages and have seen significant declines in their standard of living over the past 40 years. My Republican colleagues say those people who are struggling, those people who are trying to feed their families, those people who are trying to send their kids to college—those are not the people we should be helping; rather, we have to worry about the top 1 percent.

At a time when over 45 million Americans are living in poverty, which is more than at almost any time in the modern history of our country—and many of these people are working people, people who are working 40 or 50 hours a week at substandard wages—my Republican colleagues think we should increase poverty by ending the Affordable Care Act, by slashing Medicaid, and by cutting food stamps and the earned-income tax credit.

At a time when almost 20 percent of our kids live in poverty—the highest rate of childhood poverty in the industrialized world—my Republican colleagues think that maybe we should even raise that poverty rate a little bit among our children by cutting childcare, by cutting Head Start, by cutting the refundable child tax credit, and maybe let's even go after nutrition programs for hungry children.

To summarize, the rich get much richer and the Republicans think they need more help. The middle-class and working families of this country become poorer and the Republicans think we need to cut programs they desperately need. Frankly, those may be the priorities of some of my Republican colleagues, but I do not believe those are the priorities of the American people.

Today, the United States safely remains the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee health care to all people as a right. Today, despite the modest gains in the Affordable Care Act, we still have about 40 million Americans who lack health insurance and millions more who are underinsured.

What is the Republican response to the health care crisis? They want to abolish—do away with completely—the Affordable Care Act and take away the health insurance that 16 million Americans have gained through that program.

Here we have 40 million people who have no health insurance and the Republican response is: Well, let's make it 56 million people. And if you add the massive cuts they proposed to Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program, even millions more would lose their health insurance.

Does anybody, for 1 second, think this vaguely makes any sense in the real world? People are struggling to try to find health insurance and the re-

sponse is: Oh, let's cut 16 million people off of the Affordable Care Act and millions more off of Medicaid.

While the Senate budget resolution does not end Medicare as we know it, unlike the House budget last year, it does make significant cuts. Further, when you make massive cuts to Medicaid, it is not only low-income people who suffer, you are also cutting the nursing home care for seniors. These are elderly people—80, 90 years of age—in a nursing home, and one might argue these people are the most vulnerable people in this country, the most helpless people, fragile people, and we are going to cut programs for them.

I have talked a little bit about the devastating impact the House and Senate Republican budgets would have on the American people, but I think it is equally important, when we look at a budget, to talk about not only what a budget does but talk about what a budget does not do, the serious problems it does not address.

Poll after poll tells us the American people, when asked what their major concerns are, almost always respond: It is jobs, wages, and the economy. That is, generally speaking, what Democrats, Republicans, and Independents respond. It is the economy, jobs, and wages.

Despite a significant improvement in the economy over the last 6 years, real employment today is not 5.5 percent, it is 11 percent, counting those people who have given up looking for work and those people who are working part time. Youth employment, an issue we almost never discuss, is at 17 percent, and African-American youth employment is much higher than that.

What the American people want—and what the Republican budget completely ignores—is the need to create millions of decent-paying jobs. I think if you go to Maine, to Vermont, to Wyoming, to California and ask people what they want, they would say: We need more jobs, and those jobs should be paying us a living wage.

In my view—and in the view of many economists—if we are serious about creating jobs in this country, the fastest way to do it is to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure, our roads, bridges, water systems, wastewater plants, airports, rail, dams, levees, broadband in rural areas.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, we need to invest over \$3 trillion by the year 2020 just to get our Nation's infrastructure in good repair. When we make a significant investment in an infrastructure, we create millions of decent-paying jobs, which is exactly what we should be doing and what our side of the aisle will fight for, but it is an issue virtually ignored by the Republican majority. Crumbling infrastructure, need to create jobs—they don't talk about it.

At a time when millions of Americans are working for starvation wages and when the Federal minimum wage is at an abysmal \$7.25 an hour, we need a budget that substantially increases wages for low-income and middle-income workers. In the year 2015, no one who works in this country for 40 hours a week should be living in poverty. I would hope that is a tenet all of us can agree on. No one should be making the totally inadequate Federal minimum wage of \$7.25 an hour.

Raising the minimum wage to at least \$10.10 an hour—I personally would go higher than that—would not only be good for low-wage workers, it would reduce spending on Medicaid, public housing, food stamps, and other Federal programs by some \$7 billion a year.

Sadly, when I offered an amendment in committee that called for a substantial increase in the minimum wage, not one of my Republican colleagues voted for it.

Well, we are going to give them an opportunity to rethink the error of their ways. We are going to bring an amendment onto the floor to do exactly what the American people want; that is, significantly increase the minimum wage in this country, so no one who works 40 hours a week lives in poverty.

We also need pay equity in this country so women do not make 78 cents on the dollar compared to what a man makes for doing the same work. Further, we need to address the overtime scandal in this country in which many of our people are working 50 or 60 hours a week but fail to get time and a half for their efforts.

I haven't heard—I sat through all of the committee meetings, Budget Committee meetings, I was at the markup on Thursday—I didn't hear one Republican word about the need for pay equity for women workers, about the need to address the overtime scandal, and about the need to address the minimum wage. These are the issues the American people want addressed, but look high and low in that long Republican budget, you will not find one word addressing these issues.

I can say in Vermont, and I suspect every State in this country, young people and their families are enormously frustrated by the high cost of college education and the horrendously oppressive student debt that many of them leave school with. In fact, student debt today at \$1.2 trillion is the second-largest category of debt in this country, more than credit card debt and auto loan debt.

Does the Republican budget do anything to lower interest rates on student debt? No. In fact, their budget would make a bad situation even worse by eliminating subsidized student loans and increasing the cost of a college education by about \$3,000 for some of the lowest income students in America.

Does the Republican budget support or comment on President Obama's initiative to make 2 years of community college free or do they provide any other initiative to make college affordable? Sadly, they don't. But what they do is cut \$90 billion in Pell grants over a 10-year period, which would make college even more expensive for about 8 million low-income college students.

My Republican colleagues say they are concerned about the deficit—which, by the way, has been reduced by more than two-thirds since President Obama has been in office, and we should be clear this side of the aisle is concerned about the deficit.

My Republican colleagues are concerned about an \$18 trillion national debt, which has skyrocketed in recent years. One of the reasons it has skyrocketed is that we went to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the experts tell us that by the time we take care of the last veteran, those wars may cost over \$5 trillion, and my deficit hawk friends on the Republican side, how did they pay for those wars? What taxes did they raise? What programs did they cut? They didn't. They put it on the credit card. That is how they paid for it.

What concerns me very much is that, unfortunately, two wars unpaid for is not enough for my Republican colleagues. In the committee markup they put another \$38 billion into defense spending on the credit card—off-budget.

So I think we should ask ourselves how does it happen that the move toward their balanced budget approach—they want to cut nutrition, education, health care, virtually every program that working families need—but when it comes to defense spending, another \$38 billion. That is not chump change, even in Washington. That is off-budget—no problem, just add it to the deficit.

When we talk about sensible ways of addressing our deficit or sensible ways of addressing our national debt, we cannot ignore the reality that major corporation after major corporation, in a given year, pays what in taxes—20 percent, 5 percent, 10 percent, zero percent. Profitable corporations such as General Electric, Verizon, Boeing, and many others have not only paid nothing in Federal income taxes in some recent years, they actually get rebates from the IRS.

Can we talk about that issue or is the only way toward a balanced budget to cut programs for the elderly, the children, and the sick and the poor?

A report from the Congressional Research Service: Each and every year profitable corporations are avoiding about \$100 billion in taxes by stashing their profits in the Cayman islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ENZI. If the Senator needs a few more minutes—

Mr. SANDERS. I would be pleased to split the time.

I thank my colleague. I will take a few more minutes, and if he has more, he could take the rest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. The point I was making is if we are serious about reducing the deficit, it is inconceivable that one does not look at the fact that corporation after corporation is paying zero in Federal income taxes. It is inconceivable that we do not recognize that in 1952 corporations contributed about 32 percent of all Federal tax revenue. Today, they contribute about 11 percent. It is inconceivable that we do not understand that according to the CRS, each and every year profitable corporations are avoiding \$100 billion in taxes.

How can we not look at that issue? How could your only approach be to make it harder for kids to go to college or for little children to be in the Head Start Program?

I look forward to the debate we will be having over the next several days. I suspect there will be a lot of amendments being offered. I think it is fair to say, on this side of the aisle, what the amendments will be saying is that we need to create millions of jobs. We need to raise wages in America. We need a tax system that is fair and does not contain loopholes that allow the wealthy and large corporations to avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

We need a budget that says women workers should earn the same as male workers. We need a budget that says we have to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure.

I think there will be a lot of very serious debates. I think the differences between the two sides will become very apparent, and I hope the American people pay strong attention to this discussion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the ranking member for his comments.

Madam President, I appreciate the civility with which we went through the committee process and look forward to having that same civility on the floor.

Yes, there are some very important things for us to talk about. I have to agree, we need to do some things. The areas that were mentioned were taxes, wages, health insurance, infrastructure, and student debt. We just have a little bit different direction on how to achieve those things, but I am hoping we can find the common ground on those.

The budget itself didn't get into specificity on how to do these things because our Budget Committee—while we

have people who represent a lot of those different committees—don't have the range of expertise that the committees themselves do. So what we tried to do in the budget was set the parameters for them to work in and to find the solutions that would work best within those parameters.

We are trying to get this budget done by April 15. That is actually a statutory deadline—it is seldom ever met—and I intend to meet that deadline. That is so the appropriators, the people doing the spending bills, can actually get started, so that for once maybe we can have all 12 spending bills debated on the floor, unlimited amendments, so we can get as many of the 100 opinions that we have—it is 300 or 400 opinions actually—involved in the decisions on how to best to spend the money the United States spends.

The Finance Committee that I am also on is actually dedicated to getting some tax reform done. I think they will do it in a bipartisan way. That should eliminate some of the loopholes that have been talked about and also clear up some of the misconceptions there are about some of the things.

I will conclude by talking a little about deficit, because I keep hearing the other side say they have reduced the deficit in half. Yes, but the word "deficit" is so misleading. It is not the debt, it is the deficit. That is the amount of overspending in any given year. So they have reduced the amount of overspending by one-half, but it is still overspent by one-half. Every time it is overspent, that adds to the debt. That is how the \$18 trillion gets to \$25 trillion in the next 10 years. We have to stop doing that. So I would appreciate it if they would use a different word. Somebody said it is the fiscal gap. Well, maybe "fiscal gap" is a better word, but it is overspending.

Now overspending can be changed in two different ways: We can either increase taxes or we can reduce our spending on things or we can do a combination of those things. Until we start talking to each other, we won't be doing any combinations of anything, probably.

So I am hoping we can have the civility we had in the committee here on the floor and come up with solutions for America and Americans and the hard-working taxpayers of this country, who are really interested in all of these topics and feel we ought to do something about it and that we shouldn't just be taking a lot of latitude and putting in details that maybe aren't there in the other's provisions. So I look forward to the debate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, 5 years ago today, President Obama signed his health care bill into law. Since then Americans have watched their paychecks shrink because of the law. Hard-working American taxpayers have paid billions of dollars in higher taxes because of the law. They have had less health care choice because of the law.

So what does the President say about all of this? What does the President say to the millions of Americans who have had to suffer—suffer—through a long list of costly and appalling side effects of the President's health care law? Well, last week he gave a speech in Cleveland and he said, "It's working even better than I expected." He repeated the same thing this weekend, saying, "It's working even better than I expected."

Has the President not seen what has happened to workers' paychecks over the last 5 years? Maybe the President missed an article by the Associated Press last Wednesday. The headline was: "Health care law paperwork costs small businesses thousands." The article said, "Complying with the health care law is costing small businesses thousands of dollars that they didn't have to spend before the new regulations went into effect."

The article gives the example of Mike Patton, who has a flooring company in the San Francisco Bay area. All of the extra ObamaCare paperwork is costing him about \$25,000 a year. To pay for it, the article said, Mike had to "cut back on workers' bonuses and raises." He told the Associated Press, "They understand it didn't emanate from us . . . They're just disappointed that \$25,000 could have gone into a bonus pool."

Mike Patton's employees will get less money in their paychecks because of all the complex and costly redtape of ObamaCare. Is that even better than the President expected?

People are getting smaller paychecks and they are also paying higher taxes because of this health care law. According to the latest estimate by the Congressional Budget Office, ObamaCare will increase Washington's spending on health care by \$1.7 trillion over the next decade. About half of that is for subsidies in the ObamaCare exchanges and about half is to pay for all of the people who have been dumped onto a broken Medicaid system. The \$1.7 trillion has to come from somewhere, and a lot of it is coming from hard-working American taxpayers.

ObamaCare included more than 20 tax increases on things such as medical devices, prescription drugs, and even on the very insurance policies that Washington Democrats said everyone has to buy. Why so many taxes? Why is

ObamaCare so expensive? Well, an outrageous amount of the money has been wasted over the last 5 years.

Just the other day there was another example that came out of Massachusetts. There was a Boston Herald article last Wednesday, March 18. The headline was: "Health Connector officials spent \$170G on perks." The article talks about Federal taxpayer money—Federal taxpayer money—that was given to Massachusetts to set up the State's ObamaCare exchange. The article says:

Massachusetts Health Connector officials behind the state's failed health care website—

Now, remember, the health care Web site in Massachusetts completely failed.

Massachusetts Health Connector officials behind the state's failed health care website have racked up more than \$170,000 in taxpayer-funded expenses, including a Boston Harbor summertime boat cruise, luxury hotel stays, "appreciation" meals for staffers and contractors—and a \$285 ObamaCare cake commemorating the launch of the Affordable Care Act. . . .

According to the article, "the Connector's staff and board members scored numerous perks even as they spent hundreds of millions [of dollars] to fix the state portal during its botched ObamaCare rollout."

What does the State have to say about this—about the kind of waste and misuse of taxpayer money? Well, the article actually quotes a spokesman for the exchange saying "we were happy to do it." Does President Obama think that kind of waste is even better than he expected?

It seems as though the American people see headlines like this every day and every day they see more ways the President's health care law has failed us over the last 5 years.

Let me cite one more example, and this one concerns one of the ways ObamaCare has meant less choice for Americans when it comes to their own health care. President Obama promised you could keep your doctor. Millions of Americans over the past 5 years have lost access to their doctor because insurance plans have had to limit the network of doctors those patients can see. That can generate and create real problems for people trying to use their coverage to actually get medical care.

This is about a woman by the name of Pam Durocher from Roseville, CA. An article by Kaiser Health News on February 18 told her story. The headline was: "Even Insured Consumers Get Hit With Unexpectedly Large Medical Bills." And she is insured. The article continued: "After Pam Durocher was diagnosed with breast cancer, she searched her insurer's website for a participating surgeon to do the reconstructive surgery." The article said she did her homework, so "she was stunned to get a \$10,000 bill from the surgeon. 'I panicked when I got the bill'—no surprise that she panicked when she got

the bill—"said the 60-year-old retired civil servant. . . ."

It turns out the surgeon had two offices and only one of those was in the very narrow network of the insurance plan. The office Pam went to wasn't in the network so she got a bill for \$10,000. According to this article: "Consumer advocates say that the sheer scope of such problems undermine promises"—undermine promises—"made by proponents of the Affordable Care Act that the law would protect against medical bankruptcy." It says that, "Advocates believe a growing number of consumers are vulnerable."

Let me repeat that: Advocates of the health care law, people who voted for it, believe a growing number—now with the fifth anniversary of the health care law—are vulnerable. And President Obama said that was exactly the type of situation his law was supposed to prevent. Instead, it is exactly the kind of situation his devastating health care law has created.

The Obama administration is bragging—bragging—about the number of people covered by ObamaCare. Is this what those people have to look forward to? Does President Obama really think that making people such as Pam panic means his law is working even better than he expected? It may be better than he expected, but it is a lot worse than what the American people expected. It is also a lot worse than what they were promised.

As a doctor who has practiced medicine for 25 years, I know Americans have always wanted affordable care instead of expensive Washington-mandated coverage. The American people expected health care reform to give them the care they need, from a doctor they choose, at lower cost. Five years ago too many Americans were paying higher premiums. Here we are 5 years later and Americans are paying even higher premiums and finding it harder to see their doctor. This isn't what President Obama promised and it is not what the American people deserve.

In the coming months the Supreme Court will rule on whether the President violated his own law with an unauthorized spending and taxing scheme. This will be a major blow to a law that has failed Americans for more than 5 years and will be an opportunity to finally focus on affordable health care. Republicans are committed to helping the millions of Americans who have been hurt by this law. We are working on a plan that will deliver freedom, flexibility, and choice to Americans.

Five years later, the law has been bad for patients, it has been bad for providers, and it has been terrible for the American taxpayers. This anniversary today is not a cause for celebration. It is a call for action.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD

the following articles from the Boston Herald, the Associated Press, and Kaiser Health News.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, March 18, 2015]  
HEALTH CONNECTOR OFFICIALS SPENT \$170G  
ON PERKS

(By Chris Cassidy, Erin Smith and Matt Stout)

Massachusetts Health Connector officials behind the state's failed health care website have racked up more than \$170,000 in taxpayer-funded expenses, including a Boston Harbor summertime boat cruise, luxury hotel stays, "appreciation" meals for staffers and contractors—and a \$285 Obamacare cake commemorating the launch of the Affordable Care Act, a Herald review has found.

Under the Patrick administration, the Connector's staff and board members scored numerous perks even as they spent hundreds of millions to fix the state portal during its botched Obamacare rollout. Among them:

\$553 for a harbor cruise for an employee celebration in September 2013, part of a \$1,495 total expense item that also covered costs for Sam LaGrassa's sandwiches and Lizzy's Ice Cream.

A \$236 one-night stay at the Palms Hotel in Miami, which bills itself as a beachside oasis with "spa-inspired" bathrooms, an on-site spa and "impressive views of the ocean," plus \$944 in stays at Nine Zero and Millennium Bostonian, and \$352 at the Omni Parker House.

A \$285 Obamacare cake in October 2013, and thousands for employee "appreciation" desserts and catered meals for staffers and contractors, including a \$236 "cookie tray" from Metro Catering, \$298 for Lizzy's Homemade Ice Cream, \$134 for pastries from Fratelli's Pastry Shop and an unspecified amount from Dandy Donuts for call-center employees in Illinois.

About \$20,400 in parking costs that officials say the state's taxpayer-funded Medicaid program will ultimately cover.

All told, Connector officials ran up \$171,030 in expenses in the 19 months from July 2013 through January 2015, the review found.

Connector spokesman Jason Lefferts defended the expenses, noting they also include trips to Maryland and Washington, D.C., to meet with Obama administration officials at an important time in the relaunch of the website.

"We found the right path and we got a website that worked," said Lefferts. "In terms of the food and the appreciation, obviously not just for staff here, but for the vendors that worked for us and the navigators that were helpful to us. If we bought them a bagel or a sandwich in appreciation, we were happy to do it."

From the start, the Connector's Obamacare portal was plagued by embarrassing glitches that, among other things, blocked people with hyphenated last names from signing up for plans, and forced others to falsely claim to be prison inmates or mental patients before they could finish their applications. Others complained about frequent computer crashes and long waits on the phone.

Travel costs for board members to attend meetings also ran high, the review found. Former board member Ian Duncan—a University of California at Santa Barbara professor—was reimbursed \$16,584 for travel.

Board member Lou Malzone, who lives on Cape Cod, expensed \$11,196 for travel and ho-

tels. Malzone chalked up the costs to times he stays overnight ahead of a board meeting, instead of making the 75-mile, one-way trip to and from the Cape.

"You tell me if you can find (a hotel) for under \$200 or \$300 a night in Boston," Malzone said.

Other larger expense reports, he said—including at least four that topped \$1,000—are from times he was out of town on business or vacation and flew back for a board meeting.

"I have a pretty good attendance record," he said, estimating he's missed just four meetings over nine years. "If you're out of town and there's a business meeting, I go back, rather than do conference calls."

[From the Associated Press, March 18, 2015]

HEALTH CARE LAW PAPERWORK COSTS SMALL  
BUSINESSES THOUSANDS

(By Joyce M. Rosenberg)

NEW YORK.—Complying with the health care law is costing small businesses thousands of dollars that they didn't have to spend before the new regulations went into effect.

Brad Mete estimates his staffing company, Affinity Resources, will spend \$100,000 this year on record-keeping and filing documents with the government. He's hired two extra staffers and is spending more on services from its human resources provider.

The Affordable Care Act, which as of next Jan. 1 applies to all companies with 50 or more workers, requires owners to track staffers' hours, absences and how much they spend on health insurance. Many small businesses don't have the human resources departments or computer systems that large companies have, making it harder to handle the paperwork. On average, complying with the law costs small businesses more than \$15,000 a year, according to a survey released a year ago by the National Small Business Association.

"It's a horrible hassle," says Mete, managing partner of the Miami-based company.

But there are some winners. Some companies are hiring people to take on the extra work and human resources providers and some software developers are experiencing a bump in business.

Companies must track workers' hours according to rules created by the IRS to determine whether a business is required to offer health insurance to workers averaging 30 hours a week, and their dependents. Companies may be penalized if they're subject to the law and don't offer insurance.

Businesses must also track the months an employee is covered by insurance, and the cost of premiums so the government can decide if the coverage is affordable under the law.

Many companies have separate software for payroll, attendance and benefits management and no easy way to combine data from all of them, says John Haslinger, a vice president at ADP Benefits Outsourcing Consulting. And early next year, employers must complete IRS forms using information from these different sources. The process is more complex for businesses with operations in different states.

Mike Patton's health insurance broker is handling the extra administrative chores for his San Francisco Bay-area flooring company DSB Plus, but he's paying for it through higher premiums—about \$25,000 a year.

To pay for the extra services the business is getting from his broker, Patton cut back on workers' bonuses and raises.

"They understand it didn't emanate from us," Patton says. "They're just disappointed



that \$25,000 could have gone into a bonus pool."

That kind of spending has led to a surge in business for payroll providers, human resources consultants and health insurance brokers that track hours and keep records for small businesses, and even file documents with the government.

Sales have more than doubled in the last year at human resources provider Engage PEO. Many of its clients are small companies.

"They want to comply with the law and don't want to be subject to an unintended penalty," says Dorothy Miraglia King, executive vice president of the St. Petersburg, Florida-based company.

Businessolver, a company whose primary business is creating software to help companies administer benefits, also reports an uptick in demand. In 2013, when clients started becoming aware of the law's paperwork requirements, they asked for software that could take care of all their needs, says Rae Shanahan, a human resources executive at the West Des Moines, Iowa, company.

"The traditional systems that people have can't handle it," she says.

[From Kaiser Health News, Feb. 18, 2015]  
EVEN INSURED CONSUMERS GET HIT WITH  
UNEXPECTEDLY LARGE MEDICAL BILLS  
(By Julie Appleby)

After Pam Durocher was diagnosed with breast cancer, she searched her insurer's website for a participating surgeon to do the reconstructive surgery.

Having done her homework, she was stunned to get a \$10,000 bill from the surgeon.

"I panicked when I got that bill," said the 60-year-old retired civil servant who lives near Roseville, Calif.

Like Durocher, many consumers who take pains to research which doctors and hospitals participate in their plans can still end up with huge bills.

Sometimes, that's because they got incorrect or incomplete information from their insurer or health-care provider. Sometimes, it's because a physician has multiple offices, and not all are in network, as in Durocher's case. Sometimes, it's because a participating hospital relies on out-of-network doctors, including emergency room physicians, anesthesiologists and radiologists.

Consumer advocates say the sheer scope of such problems undermine promises made by proponents of the Affordable Care Act that the law would protect against medical bankruptcy.

"It's not fair and probably not legal that consumers be left holding the bag when an out-of-network doctor treats them," said Timothy Jost, a law professor at Washington and Lee University. Jost said it's a different matter if a consumer knowingly chooses an out-of-network doctor.

Durocher learned only after getting her surgeon's bill that just one of his two offices participated in her plan and she had chosen the wrong one. She said the doctor's staff later insisted that they had raised the issue during her initial consultation, but she doesn't recall that, possibly because she was distracted by her cancer diagnosis.

Adding insult to injury, insurers are not required to count out-of-network charges toward the federal health law's annual limit on how much of their medical costs patients can be asked to pay out of their own pockets.

Efforts by doctors, hospitals and other health providers to charge patients for bills not covered by their insurers are called "bal-

ance billing." The problem pre-dates the federal health law and has long been among the top complaints filed with state insurance regulators.

Because the issue is complex and pits powerful rivals against one another—among them, hospitals, doctors and insurers—relatively few states have addressed it. What laws do exist are generally limited to specific situations, such as emergency room care, or certain types of insurance plans, such as HMOs.

The federal health law largely sidesteps the issue as well. It says insurers must include coverage for emergency care and not charge policyholders higher copayments for ER services at non-network hospitals, because patients can't always choose where they go. While the insurer will pay a portion of the bill, in such cases, doctors or hospitals may still bill patients for the difference between that payment and their own charges.

That means that in spite of having insurance, a consumer involved in a car wreck and taken to a non-network hospital might receive additional bills, not just from the hospital, but from the radiologist who read his X-rays, the surgeon who repaired his broken leg and the laboratory that processed his blood tests.

#### NETWORKS GET NARROWER

Advocates believe a growing number of consumers are vulnerable to balance billing as insurance networks grow smaller in the bid to hold down costs.

For example, there were no in-network emergency room physicians or anesthesiologists in some of the hospitals participating in plans offered by three large insurers in Texas in 2013 and 2014, according to a survey of state data by the Center for Public Policy Priorities, a Texas advocacy group.

Smaller networks are also becoming more common in employer-based insurance: About 23 percent of job-based plans had so-called "narrow networks" in 2012, up from 15 percent in 2007, according to a May report from the Urban Institute and Georgetown University Center on Health Insurance Reforms.

To protect consumers, advocacy groups, including Consumers Union and the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, want regulators to strictly limit balance billing when an insured person gets care in a medical facility that is part of an insurer's network.

"Without protection from balance billing, the cost of out-of-network care can be overwhelming," wrote Consumers Union in a recent letter to the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC), which is updating a model law that states could adopt to regulate insurance networks.

NAIC's current draft does not directly address the issue of balance billing and consumer efforts have drawn sharp opposition from insurers, hospitals and doctors.

Some states have taken other steps to protect consumers:

Earlier this month, California set out new rules requiring some insurers to provide accurate lists of medical providers in their networks.

New Jersey specifies that insurers guarantee that certain providers be available "within 20 miles or 30 minutes average driving time."

Colorado insurers must pay non-network medical providers their full charges, not discounted network rates, for care at in-network hospitals.

In Maryland, insurers must pay for "covered services," which includes emergency care, but the state sets standardized payment rates.

Starting in April, New Yorkers won't face extra bills for out-of-network emergency care, when an in-network provider is unavailable or when they aren't told ahead of time that they may be treated by a non-participating provider. Instead, the bills must be settled in arbitration between the providers and the insurance companies.

#### COST TRADE-OFFS

Insurers defend the move to smaller networks of doctors and hospitals as a way to provide the low-cost plans that consumers say they want. Since insurers can no longer reject enrollees with health problems or charge them more, the plans are using the tools left to them to reduce costs.

If regulators required them to fully cover charges by out-of-network doctors, that could reduce "incentives for providers to participate in networks" and make it harder to have adequate networks, America's Health Insurance Plans, the insurers' trade group, and the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association wrote in a joint letter to the NAIC.

It would also raise premiums.

Instead, AHIP says, states could require out-of-network doctors to accept a benchmark payment from insurers, perhaps what Medicare pays, rather than balance billing patients.

Physicians, meanwhile, blame insurers for inadequate networks.

"It is the limited coverage, not the physician bill, which is the cause of the unfairness," the Texas Medical Association wrote to the NAIC.

At the very least, doctors and hospitals say insurers need to do a better job of educating policyholders that their plans may not cover care provided by some doctors and hospitals.

"There's no 'free' anywhere," said Lee Spangler, vice president of medical economics with the Texas Medical Association. "You either pay for the coverage through premiums, or you pay for service when you receive it."

Doctors choose whether to balance bill, he added—and some don't.

But he noted that patients "have received professional services in the expectation that they will get alleviation of what ailed them, and the physicians provided it in the expectation they would be paid. There's no in between," Spangler said.

For patients like Durocher, who got billed even after doing everything she was told, the only recourse is to negotiate with the physician or hospital to ask them to lower or drop the charges.

"Fortunately for me," Durocher said, "this doctor was very nice and wrote off almost \$7,000 of the bill."

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, today marks the fifth anniversary of the signing of the so-called Affordable Care Act. Of course, few people are actually celebrating.

Five years—that is a long time, more than long enough for us to evaluate the



impact of the law to determine if it is working. On that question, I think the answer is clear: The President's health care law is not working—not even close.

Most Americans recognize this. They have seen how the law has failed to deliver on the many promises that were made at the time it was passed, and they want a change. I will have more to say on the change in just a few minutes. For now, I would like to take some time to talk about the lessons we have learned over the last 5 years.

If we think back to 2009 and early 2010, when ObamaCare was being debated in Congress, we will remember a number of promises that the law would actually reduce the cost of health care in this country. Those were big promises. After all, costs represent the biggest barrier to health care in the United States and are, by almost all accounts, the top concern for health care consumers. We simply cannot adequately reform health care without reducing costs, and on that count alone ObamaCare is a miserable failure.

For example, under the law, we have seen premium hikes. Studies have shown the health care law increased costs in the individual insurance market by as much as 50 percent in 2014 alone. This year, we have already seen a 4-percent increase for benchmark plans in the health insurance exchanges. Moreover, a recent report by Avalere Health found premiums in the most popular exchange plans increased by an average of 10 percent in 2015.

In addition to these spikes, which some might try to write off as isolated, premiums have increased faster overall under ObamaCare. According to a recent report by the National Bureau of Economic Research, 2014 premiums in the nongroup health insurance market grew by 24.4 percent, on average, compared to what they would have been had the law never been passed.

Looking to the future, costs are projected to continue going up. According to the Congressional Budget Office, premiums will increase by about 6 percent per year over the next 10 years. This increase can be attributed to a number of factors, including high demand for expensive medical care, higher provider rates as enrollment increases, uncertainty created by haphazard regulatory changes under ObamaCare, and the failure of the plans to attract enough young and healthy consumers.

Of course, none of these increased costs are surprising. Despite the promises made by the President and his allies in Congress that ObamaCare would actually reduce costs, numerous studies and projections indicated that costs would be on the rise after the law was implemented. Indeed, those of us who opposed the law have been noting this almost nonstop for the last 5 years.

As we can see, the President's health care law is a failure on its own terms.

The law is named the "Affordable Care Act." The promise to reduce the cost of health care is right there in the name, and, by any measure, the law has failed to live up to this promise.

Of course, the failure to bring down costs isn't the only problem we have seen with regard to ObamaCare. Another major problem is the lack of security and failed oversight of the on-line marketplace, which has put consumers' personal information at risk of fraud or theft.

It started with a lack of preparation. Two government watchdogs—the GAO and HHS Office of Inspector General—found that [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov) was given a green light to launch, even though it was not adequately secure. It continued with weak security.

Shortly after the launch of the exchanges, GAO found security problems in State computer systems that link to the Federal network and warned "increased and unnecessary risks remain of unauthorized access, disclosure, or modification of information collected and maintained by [HealthCare.gov](http://HealthCare.gov)."

CMS did take action to lower those risks, but even with those changes in place, the HHS OIG—Office of Inspector General—remained concerned about security issues, including the use of encryption technology that did not meet government standards.

I was one of the first Members of Congress to note these security problems, and I introduced legislation to address some of them. Sadly, with the Democrats in charge of the Senate, the legislation did not go anywhere, and the results were predictable.

In late 2013 and early 2014, cyber security experts warned the [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov) Web site was vulnerable to hacking, and, sure enough, in July of last year, the site was hacked, resulting in the upload of malicious code.

These security problems are a prime example of how careless and haphazard the Obama administration has been as it has tried to implement the Affordable Care Act. Sadly, there are even more examples, many of which directly impact the lives and livelihoods of the American people.

As this tax session has commenced, we have seen how the health care law—and the administration's poor management of it—has resulted in frustration and delay for hard-working taxpayers. Let's talk about that frustration.

According to H&R Block, in the first 6 weeks of this tax-filing season, 52 percent of customers who enrolled in insurance through the State or Federal exchanges had to repay a portion of the advanced premium tax credit they received under ObamaCare. That same report found that individuals, on average, are having to repay about \$530, which is decreasing their tax refunds by an average of roughly 17 percent.

Now let's talk about delay.

On February 20, 2015, the Obama administration announced that due to an

error in the health care law, they sent out about 800,000 incorrect tax statements relating to form 1095-A, meaning that hundreds of thousands of Americans may be seeing delays in their tax refunds this year.

These are just some of the problems hard-working taxpayers are facing as they try to deal with ObamaCare during this tax season.

While the ramifications to taxpayers are significant, the overall impact on America's budget is even greater. The total overall cost of ObamaCare so far has numbered in the tens of billions of dollars, and we are barely through the first phases of implementation.

In numerous areas, taxpayers have been left on the hook for funds that were doled out for ObamaCare to States, corporations, and contractors with little or no accountability. Unfortunately, a significant portion of that money resulted in no benefit whatsoever to the taxpayers.

Last week, the Finance Committee held a hearing on the anniversary of ObamaCare, where I noted five specific misuses of taxpayer funds that have resulted from ObamaCare. In just these five areas, roughly \$5.7 billion went to projects that added absolutely no value. Those examples of wasteful spending bear repeating.

No. 1, failed State exchanges. According to CRS—the bipartisan Congressional Research Service—\$1.3 billion in taxpayer funds have been spent on State exchanges that failed and were never operational.

No. 2, consumer-oriented and operated plans or co-ops. CMS has loaned \$2.4 billion to 24 co-ops, one of which failed before it enrolled anyone. When all is said and done, nearly half of this money will be lost due to defaults or artificially low interest rates, and CMS has no plans to recoup any of these funds, meaning a total cost to taxpayers of around \$1 billion.

No. 3, [healthcare.gov](http://healthcare.gov) Web site. The failures of the Federal insurance marketplace are well documented. Despite fixes that eventually came to the Web site, the total cost of the failed enrollment system surpassed \$2 billion.

No. 4, Serco. This contractor was awarded \$1.2 billion to manage paper applications during the first enrollment period of the health care law. Of course, very few of the applications received were on paper, and Serco employees had little to do. One former employee felt ashamed after leaving the company and reached out to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, saying:

I feel guilty for working there as long as I did. It was like I was stealing money from people.

No. 5, marketplace navigators. The administration has spent over \$120 million on the Navigator Program for the 2014 and 2015 open enrollment periods. With enrollment in the exchanges surpassing 11 million individuals, the efficacy of the Navigator Program has yet

to be determined. The overall value of the Navigator Program is, at best, inconclusive, and, at worst, it represents more wasted taxpayer dollars.

These are just five examples of the misguided, poorly defined, and improperly managed aspects of the health care law. There are, of course, many others.

Finally, there are the unilateral changes the administration has made to delay, extend or modify elements of the Affordable Care Act without action or even input from Congress. I have been on the floor a number of times to talk about the overreach on the part of the administration when it comes to implementing ObamaCare, so I will not go into excruciating detail today.

We all know those abuses have taken place. It is no secret. Without statutory authority, the administration twice delayed the employer mandate. They created a transition period out of thin air so the President could pretend that his promise that "if you like your health care plan, you can keep it" was not a lie. There have been numerous other exemptions and special enrollment periods created to help the administration avoid negative fallout from patients and the business community—and it wasn't true that "if you like your health care plan, you can keep it."

All told, the Obama administration has made literally dozens of unilateral changes to the health care law, apparently recognizing that, as drafted, the law is as problematic as its critics have said.

I could go on, but I think I have sufficiently made some of the points that need to be made. The so-called Affordable Care Act is, by any objective measure, a dismal failure. While its proponents continue to cherry-pick favorable data points in order to fool the American people into thinking the law works, the majority of us know the truth: It is time for a change.

It is no secret that I support a complete repeal of the President's health care law, but a simple repeal isn't good enough. We need to replace ObamaCare with health care reforms that will actually work.

That is why I have joined my colleagues Senator BURR and Chairman UPTON of the House Energy and Commerce Committee in unveiling the Patient CARE Act, a legislative proposal that will actually reduce the costs of health care in this country, while giving people more rights to choose what kind of health care for which they want to pay money.

Our proposal is a serious, workable solution to the problems caused by the Affordable Care Act. It is out there for everyone to see. I, once again, encourage all of my colleagues to look it over and provide us with your thoughts and input on our ideas. We would be interested in hearing from you. If those

ideas can be improved, we are certainly interested in improving them.

Once again, the 5-year anniversary of the Affordable Care Act is hardly cause for celebration, but it should be a time for all of us—particularly those who supported the law at the outset—to reflect on the last 5 years and decide how we want to move forward when it comes to the Nation's health care system. I hope our colleagues will think about that. This bill was passed through both bodies on a totally partisan vote, with 100 percent of the Democrats voting in each body.

I think I have made a pretty compelling case for why the current law isn't working and why we need to go in a different direction. I hope eventually my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will reach this same conclusion so we can work together to come up with a health care system and health care set of laws that will work, do good for the American people, and give us some element of respectability in the Congress that I think the Congress needs at this particular time.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

**MR. COTTON.** Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized.

#### NEGOTIATIONS WITH IRAN

**MR. COTTON.** Madam President, this week we will debate the budget. The key part is the military budget, one part of our government where the strategy and threats must drive the budget, not vice versa. The greatest threat to our national security is a nuclear-armed Iran, and this man, Ayatollah Khomeini, the Supreme Leader of Iran.

Last week marked Nowruz, the beginning of the Persian New Year. On the occasion we were treated to speeches by President Obama and Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khomeini. I have to say, President Obama's speech was ill-advised. He spoke to the Iranian people directly, asking them to press their leaders and speak up in support of a nuclear agreement.

Let's be clear about one thing: Iranians who speak up tend to disappear into secret prisons or wind up hanging from cranes by the neck. Worse, by acting as if public opinion matters to the Ayatollahs, President Obama is treating Iran as if it were a legitimate democracy, not a brutal theocratic dictatorship. No President should legitimize such a regime, which emboldens the dictator and undermines the Iranian people struggling under his yoke.

But today I want to focus on the speech of this man, Ayatollah Kho-

meini, the Supreme Leader of Iran. The Ayatollah gave his speech on Saturday, just 2 days ago. It may have escaped your attention, but it was not exactly a New Year's message filled with blessings of hope and peace.

Ayatollah Khomeini has never been a great admirer of America, of course. He sometimes likes to refer to us as the "Great Satan." During his Nowruz speech, he whipped the crowd into frenzied chants of "death to America." What was his response to that chant? He said, "Yes, certainly, death to America." Death to America. That was just 2 days ago.

Remember, this is the leader with whom the United States is negotiating today, a theocratic tyrant who, in the middle of nuclear negotiations, chants "death to America." I suggest that we rethink the wisdom of granting nuclear concessions to such a man.

Unfortunately, Ayatollah Khomeini may know his negotiating partners somewhat better than they know themselves, for the Ayatollah also observed, "Iran's enemies, particularly America, are moving forward with prudence and diplomacy. I understand them. They know what they are doing. They need these negotiations. America needs the nuclear negotiations."

Regrettably, he is right when he says he understands his enemies, since the West, especially the President, acts as if we need these negotiations more than Iran does. After all, we had Iran on its knees in 2013 when President Obama gave Iran billions of dollars in sanctions relief for merely starting negotiations. The West has extended negotiations twice in exchange for nothing. The President has also made a series of one-sided concessions from Iran's uranium enrichment capabilities to the length of a nuclear agreement. So, yes, unfortunately, Ayatollah Khomeini is correct when he says he understands his enemies.

Let's consider what he said about the negotiations in this light. This past weekend, the Ayatollah emphasized, "We are absolutely not negotiating or holding discussions with the Americans over regional or domestic issues and neither over weapons capabilities." Again, he is absolutely right. Iran has a ballistic missile program, which it only needs if it wants to strike the United States or our European allies, because it already has missiles capable of striking Israel or anywhere else in the Middle East. Yet we have removed its missile program from the negotiating table, just as we have removed the possible military dimensions of its nuclear program from the table, even though that is critical to understanding how far they have progressed toward a bomb.

It is not just their weapons capabilities. Note that the Ayatollah also said Iran is not negotiating over regional issues. He made this point repeatedly,

saying also, “We are not negotiating with the Americans over regional issues. U.S. goals in the region are in complete contrast with our goals,” and, “Negotiations with the U.S. are only over the nuclear issue, and nothing else. Everyone should be aware of this.”

By “regional issues” and “our goals,” to be clear, Ayatollah Khomeini means Iran’s drive for regional hegemony. The outlaw Assad regime in Syria is more beholden to Iran than ever. Iranian-aligned militants have seized the capital of Yemen, causing the American Embassy to close and our troops to evacuate. Iranian-backed and Iranian-led Shiite militias are slowly taking over Iraq, and Lebanon remains subject to Hezbollah, Iran’s terrorist proxy.

Despite this multifront aggression, President Obama is compartmentalizing the nuclear negotiations as if Iran’s drive for hegemony and its pursuit of nuclear weapons are distinguishable and unrelated rather than springing from the regime’s revolutionary nature. In fact, President Obama reportedly wrote a private letter to Ayatollah Khomeini—his fourth private letter to the Ayatollah—in part reassuring him that the United States would not undermine Assad’s regime in Syria. Is it any wonder then that the Ayatollah boasts the negotiations are so limited? Is it any wonder what Ayatollah Khomeini said this weekend about sanctions relief? President Obama and Secretary Kerry keep insisting that sanctions can only be lifted gradually as Iran demonstrates compliance with any deal. The Ayatollah is having none of that. He said this past weekend: “The lifting of the sanctions is part of the issues being negotiated and not the outcome of the negotiations.” In other words, in exchange for the Ayatollah’s ephemeral and easily reversed promises, “sanctions must be lifted immediately following an agreement.” That is not a splittable difference. And let’s just say our side’s history of one-sided concessions in these negotiations does not inspire confidence that we will preserve a sanctions regime that we took decades to assemble fully.

Finally, Ayatollah Khomeini wants the world to know that Iran will not be bound in perpetuity by any deal, no matter its terms. He said: “The Americans keep saying that there should be irreversibility in the terms Iran accepts and the decisions it makes. We do not accept that.” The Ayatollah is happy to pocket concessions now for billions of dollars in sanctions relief and international legitimacy while preserving the option of going nuclear in the future, much as North Korea did after the 1994 Agreed Framework. I understand why Ayatollah Khomeini would want that deal, but why would we?

This is the man with whom we are negotiating. Evil men rarely cloak their wicked intent, and I urge my fellow Senators and all Americans to pay careful attention to Ayatollah Khomeini’s words both this past weekend and more generally. When someone chants, “Yes, certainly, death to America,” we should take him at his word and we should not put him on a path to a nuclear bomb. Those words are appalling enough. Let’s not give him the ability to act on them.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I was in the House of Representatives for 16 years, and I have been in the Senate now for 8 years. During all of that time, this country faced and still faces a major health care crisis.

As the Presiding Officer knows, the United States is the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee health care to all of our people. Today, despite the modest gains of the Affordable Care Act, which I will discuss in a moment, we still have about 40 million Americans without any health insurance. By the way, despite so many uninsured and so many underinsured, we end up paying, by far, per capita the highest costs of any country.

How does it happen? Millions of people are uninsured, millions more are underinsured, and we end up paying per capita almost double what any other Nation faces.

Now, I was in the Congress during the years of the Bush administration, and I waited eagerly to hear what my Republican colleagues had to say about tens of millions of people without any health insurance and about the cost of health care being so expensive. I waited and I waited, and my Republican colleagues had nothing to say. Apparently, the private insurance companies were doing just great under that system. Drug companies were charging our people the highest prices in the world under that system. What is there to complain about? What is there to worry about? So 40 million, 50 million people have no health insurance and people can’t afford health care, but it is no problem for my Republican colleagues.

Five years ago, the Congress, with no Republican support, passed the Affordable Care Act. Let me be very clear. I voted for the Affordable Care Act. I will be the first to say that the Affordable Care Act has many problems and, in fact, in many ways, it did not go

anywhere near as far as it should have gone. By far, it is not a perfect piece of legislation. Yet I still wait to hear what my Republican colleagues have to say about how we address the health care crisis, other than doing what they are doing in this budget, which is to repeal the Affordable Care Act completely.

Let’s take a look at what the Affordable Care Act—ObamaCare—has accomplished, which they want to end completely. After 5 years of the Affordable Care Act, more than 16 million Americans have gained health coverage. Many of those people never had health insurance in their entire lives. Many of those people were getting their health care through the emergency room at outrageously high costs. Since 2013, we have seen the largest decline in the uninsured rate in decades, and the Nation’s uninsured rate is now at the lowest level ever recorded.

Just since October 2013, the uninsured rate for nonelderly adults has fallen by 35 percent, and 16 million more Americans have health insurance.

Republican response: Get rid of the ACA; throw 16 million Americans off of health insurance.

Since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, health care prices have risen at the slowest rate in nearly 50 years. All of us can remember 7, 8, 10 years ago health care insurance rates with increases of 20, 30 percent. Since the Affordable Care Act was enacted, health prices have risen at the slowest rate in nearly 50 years. Are they going up? Yes, they are, but at the slowest rate in nearly 50 years.

Thanks to exceptionally slow growth in per-person costs throughout our health care system, national health care expenditures grew at the slowest rate on record—on record—from 2010 through 2013. Are we making progress in controlling the growth in health care costs? Yes, we are.

Republican response: Throw it out.

Ten million low-income Americans are now able to get health insurance through Medicaid. And if one is a low-income American struggling to make ends meet and not able to afford health care, in many instances, this is health insurance that saves one’s life. It saves one’s life because they now have the opportunity—maybe for the first time in years—to be able to go into a doctor’s office because they have Medicaid.

Republican response: Throw it out; 10 million low-income Americans no longer have health insurance.

All of us remember not so many years ago, before the ACA. You have health insurance for your family, and when your child reaches the age of 21, that child is now off of your health insurance plan. So we have huge uninsured numbers for young people in this country who are no longer able to be on their parents’ health insurance plan.

Under the Affordable Care Act, some 5.7 million young adults have been able to stay on their parents' policies. The uninsured rate for young adults has dropped by 40 percent. I would like to see it drop even more than that, but 40 percent is nothing to sneeze at.

The Republican response: Let's make sure all of these young people from 21 to 26 rejoin the ranks of the uninsured.

One of the great scandals that existed in this country before we had the Affordable Care Act—when we think back on it, people find it hard to believe—somebody was diagnosed with diabetes, with cancer, with heart disease, with AIDS, or whatever it may be, and that person walked into an insurance company and said: I need some insurance. They filled out forms. The insurance company said: Oh, you had breast cancer 3 years ago; we are not going to insure you. You had diabetes; you are not going to get insurance. So the people who needed insurance the most were the people least likely to be able to get insurance. Can we imagine that—for people who had a history of heart disease, a history of cancer, scared to death it may reoccur, in absolute need of insurance, insurance companies said: No. We can discriminate against you. You are sick, you may get sick again, and we will have to pay out money. We don't want your business. Well, the ACA did something about that. It should have never been allowed to happen in the first place. It provides protections for people with preexisting conditions.

Republicans want to end the ACA. That is in this budget. They want to get rid of it. So for those people who have serious illnesses, understand that if the Republicans succeed, people may not be able to get health insurance, because we will go back to a time when companies could discriminate against people with serious illnesses.

Before the ACA, many individuals couldn't gain access to health insurance for a variety of "illnesses," including pregnancy. I guess pregnancy is an illness for which a person doesn't deserve insurance. It doesn't make a lot of sense to most Americans, but that is what will reoccur if the Republicans are successful.

Millions of seniors in this country are struggling in terms of how to pay for their medicines. The cost of medicine in America is very high—the highest of any country on Earth. The Affordable Care Act moves to close the doughnut hole, which means money that has to come out of seniors' own pockets. If the Republican budget gets passed and if that gets implemented into law, seniors will now be paying significantly more for their prescription drugs. The Affordable Care Act includes important health care for seniors in the doughnut hole, including 45-percent discounts on the cost of their drugs, but allowing the full price of the

drug to be counted toward the amount they need to spend to get out of the hole.

The Affordable Care Act gives people access to free preventive care that keeps them healthy and out of the hospital.

The Affordable Care Act ends discrimination against women by health insurance companies so that they don't have to pay more for health insurance simply because they are a woman. Are we going to go back to the days when because a patient was a woman, she had to pay more for health insurance than a man? I certainly hope not. But that is what happens if we end the Affordable Care Act.

The Affordable Care Act protects against a practice by insurance companies of including lifetime limits in their policies. Prior to the ACA, many insurance plans included lifetime limits—a limit on the amount of coverage that plan would provide an individual or a family in their lifetime. So, in other words, if somebody was racking up large claims because they were seriously ill, the insurance company said: Sorry, that is it. We are not going to pay any more. Are those the days we want to go back to?

I think we can all agree the Affordable Care Act is far from perfect. In my own view, we should provide health care to every person in this country as a right, and I would do it through a Medicare-for-all program. Other people have different ideas. But it is hard for me to imagine anyone thinking that the solution to America's health care problems today is simply to eliminate the Affordable Care Act.

Let me change topics and take a broader look at the Republican budget going beyond the Affordable Care Act, which they want to abolish.

The question we have to ask ourselves is whether we are such a poor country that we should move toward a Republican budget which forces more and more people to have no health insurance; which makes it harder for working families to send their kids to college; which makes it harder for low-income families to send their kids to Head Start; which cuts back on nutrition programs, whether it is the Food Stamp Program, the Meals on Wheels program, the WIC Program; which helps people who are struggling, literally, to try to come up with the income to adequately feed themselves. We have many people in this country who are actually hungry, and the Republican budget cuts those programs. Are we such a poor country that those are the choices that stand before us? I think not. I think the facts are quite the opposite. I think the facts tell us that the United States of America is, in fact, the wealthiest country on this planet. In fact, we have never been a more wealthy country. We are not a poor country. We are an extremely wealthy country.

The problem we face is that we have a grotesque level of income and wealth inequality such that tens of millions of families are struggling economically and many are hungry, while at the other side, people on top are doing phenomenally well. But when you add it all together, it turns out that we are a very wealthy country. And the idea that people would come forward and say: We are going to make it harder for low-income families to feed their kids, we are going to make it harder for working-class families to send their kids to college, and we are going to make it harder for working families to get their kids into childcare is a totally absurd argument. We are not a poor country.

Let me demonstrate how we are not a poor country. When some of us talk about the rich getting richer, that is a general statement. Let me be more specific. From the year 2013 to the year 2015, the wealthiest 14 Americans—14 people—increased their net wealth by more than \$157 billion over the last 2 years. The wealthiest 14 billionaires in America saw their net wealth increase by more than \$157 billion from 2013 to 2015.

Let me be even more specific, and tell me whether this is a poor nation that cuts kids off of health insurance, a poor nation that denies nutrition to families who need it, a poor nation that cuts back on Meals on Wheels for elderly, low-income seniors. Here is what is going on in this "poor nation." From March of 2013 to March of 2015, Bill Gates, the wealthiest person in America, saw his wealth increase by \$12.2 billion, going from \$67 billion to \$79 billion in 2015. During that period, Warren Buffett saw his wealth increase by \$19 billion—one guy in 2 years. Larry Ellison saw his wealth increase by \$11 billion. The Koch brothers saw their wealth increase by almost \$18 billion in a 2-year period. The Waltons saw huge increases in their wealth—they are the wealthiest family in America—Christy Walton by \$13.5 billion, Jim Walton by \$13.9 billion, and S. Robson Walton by \$13 billion. Michael Bloomberg saw his wealth increase by \$8.5 billion. Jeff Bezos's wealth went up by \$9.6 billion. Mark Zuckerberg's wealth went up by \$20 billion, Sheldon Adelson's by \$9.5 billion, Larry Page's by \$7.6 billion, and Sergey Brin's by \$6.4 billion. These are just the top 14. Added together, their wealth increased by \$157 billion.

This is a reality my Republican friends don't want to deal with. They do not want to ask the wealthiest people in this country—many of whom are paying an effective tax rate lower than that paid by truckdrivers and nurses—to start paying their fair share of taxes. Their solution to the deficit problem is to cut programs for working families, the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor.

Despite the fact that the billionaires of this country are doing phenomenally well, their view is, oh no, we can't go to those guys. They may be potential campaign contributors. We are going to go after the elderly—they don't contribute a whole lot. Elderly people on the Meals on Wheels program, elderly people making \$14,000 a year—they have no political power here in Washington. They have no lobbyists out there. We will just go after the working families, the poor, the elderly, the children, the sick. They are easy. They are not actively involved. Many of them don't even vote. We can go after them, but we have to protect the interests of the wealthy and the powerful.

At a time when the richest 400 Americans paid a tax rate of just 16.7 percent in 2012—the second lowest on record—the Republican budget does nothing to ask the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share of taxes to create jobs or reduce the deficit. They are immune. The rich get richer, but leave them alone. No problem. Working families pay a higher effective tax rate than billionaires—not a problem because we are going to cut the deficit by going after the most vulnerable people in this country, the people who don't have a lot of political power.

While the effective tax rate of large, profitable corporations was just 12.6 percent in 2010 and corporate profits are at an alltime high, the Republican budget does nothing to end the outrageous loopholes that allow major corporations to avoid \$100 billion a year in taxes by shifting their profits to the Cayman Islands and other offshore tax havens.

Now, why would you ask large, profitable corporations that in some cases pay zero in Federal income taxes to start paying their fair share of taxes? These are powerful people. These are people who have lobbyists all over Capitol Hill. These are people who make campaign contributions. Why would we ask them to start paying their fair share of taxes?

At a time when billionaire hedge fund managers on Wall Street pay a lower effective tax rate than a truck-driver or a nurse, the Republican budget does not eliminate the carried interest loophole that will cost the Federal Government \$16 billion in lost revenue over the next 10 years. The Republican budget protects over \$40 billion in unnecessary and expensive tax breaks and subsidies for oil and gas companies even as the five largest oil companies alone made more than \$1 trillion in profits over the last decade. Ask large, profitable oil companies to pay more in taxes? Don't be ridiculous—not when you can cut programs for hungry kids or cut Head Start or cut Pell grants for working-class young people.

Let me tell you what this budget does do. At a time when millions of Americans are working longer hours

for lower wages, the Republican budget paves the way for a tax hike averaging over \$900 per person for 13 million families—\$900 apiece for more than 13 million families with 25 million children—by allowing the expansions of the earned-income tax credit and the child tax credit to expire.

So we can't ask billionaires who are doing phenomenally well to pay more in taxes. That we don't do. We can't ask corporations that stash their money in tax havens in the Cayman Islands to start paying their fair share of taxes. We can't do that. But what we can do is impact the lives of millions of working families by allowing the earned-income tax credit and the child tax credit to expire. In other words, we raise taxes for low-income Americans and working-class Americans and the middle class, but we do not ask the wealthy and large corporations to pay a nickel more in taxes.

Further, the Republican budget paves the way for a tax hike of about \$1,100 for 12 million families and students paying for college by allowing the American opportunity tax credit to expire. So if you are a family trying to send your kid to college, you are going to have to pay more because our Republican colleagues are allowing the American opportunity tax credit to expire.

The Republican Senate budget would balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, the children, the sick, and the most vulnerable people in our society. It would slash investments in education, health care, nutrition, and affordable housing, while paving the way for another unpaid war by significantly increasing defense spending. It also would not ask millionaires, billionaires, and profitable corporations to contribute one penny for deficit reduction. No, it is only working families, the middle class, and low-income people who have to help us with deficit reduction, not billionaires or large corporations.

As we all know, the budget we are debating today is not an appropriations bill; it is a budget bill, which, by the way, is filled with magic asterisks—those little asterisks which tell us nothing about how Republicans are going to be moving toward a balanced budget. But by making over \$5 trillion in budget cuts over the next decade—\$5 trillion—reasonable estimates have been made about the harm those cuts would do to the American people.

At a time when the cost of college education is becoming out of reach for millions of Americans, the Republican budget would eliminate mandatory Pell grants, cutting this program by nearly \$90 billion over 10 years, which would increase the cost of a college education to more than 8 million Americans.

Take a deep breath and think about this. Young people all over this coun-

try—and I know this because at a lot of Vermont high schools, when you talk to kids, they are wondering how they are going to be able to afford to go to college. They are worried about the high cost of college. The Republican solution is to cut—eliminate mandatory Pell grants, cutting this program by over \$90 billion during a 10-year period. So what they are doing is making a very difficult situation even more difficult in terms of enabling the middle-class and working families in this country to be able to send their kids to college.

I think everybody who has children or grandchildren understands that we have a major preschool and childcare crisis in this country, and in Vermont and all over this Nation, it is very difficult for middle-income Americans to find decent, quality, affordable childcare or preschool education for their kids. Within that context of a crisis in childcare, the Republican solution is to give us a budget that would mean that 110,000 fewer young people, young children, would be able to enroll in Head Start over the next 10 years.

So we have a crisis in terms of higher education, and what they do is cut back on Pell grants, making it harder for families to send their kids to college. We have a crisis in childcare, and what the Republicans do is cut back on Head Start, meaning that 110,000 fewer young children would be able to get into the Head Start Program. Under the Republican budget, 1.9 million fewer students would receive the academic help they need to succeed in school because of some \$12 billion in cuts to the title I education program. The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act would be cut by \$10 billion over the next decade, which would shift the cost to States and local school districts and could lead to increased property taxes for millions of Americans.

At a time when there are more than 20 million hungry Americans, people who in the course of the week are not quite sure how they are going to get the food they need to survive, when many working families are running to emergency food shelters in order to get the help they need to feed their families, the Republican budget would take some 1.2 million women, infants, and young people from the WIC Program, or the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children, which goes to pregnant women and new mothers. They would cut that by \$10 billion over a 10-year period, impacting some 1.2 million women, infants, and young children.

Once again, we do not ask billionaires to start paying their fair share of taxes, but we tell the pregnant mother or the mother of a young child that the nutrition programs she has been receiving to make sure her kids are eating well are going to be cut by \$10 billion over a 10-year period.

I come from a cold-weather State, and we have had a very rough February. Only yesterday, the weather in my hometown was about 10 degrees.

Under the Republican budget, up to 900,000 families would be denied the help they need to stay warm in the winter and cool in the summer by cuts to the LIHEAP program, or the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program—a \$5 billion cut over the next decade impacting some 900,000 families. Many of the people on LIHEAP are seniors—a good percentage of them. These are elderly people without a lot of money in cold-weather States trying to keep warm in the wintertime. We are going to see a \$5 billion cut in that program over the next decade.

In Vermont, and I think in many parts of this country, we have a real housing problem for low-income people. The cost of rent in many cases is much more than people can afford. People are spending 40, 50 percent of their limited incomes on rent.

To address that problem, the Republican budget would kick nearly half a million families off the section 8 affordable housing program and out of their homes by cutting section 8 by \$46 billion over a 10-year period.

So you have low-income people all over this country—and I see it every day in Vermont—paying 40, 50, 60 percent of their income for rents, and what the Republican budget does is it cuts \$46 billion over 10 years from section 8 housing, again, making a bad situation worse.

At a time when real unemployment is 11 percent, the Republican budget cuts job training and employment services for more than 2 million Americans.

So what we have is a budget which in many ways is a Robin Hood budget in reverse. At a time when the rich are getting richer and the middle class is getting poorer, the Republicans take from the middle class and working families to give more to the rich and large corporations.

The Republican budget has a set of priorities that are way, way, way out of touch with where the American people are.

During the next week, there are going to be a number of amendments being offered by Members on our side which will create jobs for the unemployed, raise wages for low-income workers, address the overtime crisis facing millions of Americans who are not getting time and a half when they should, provide pay equity for women workers, address this issue of tax breaks for the rich and large corporations, which are unconscionable and unsustainable. That is what we will be doing. I look forward to that debate and those amendments.

I note that Senator MARKEY is on the floor and has asked for 10 minutes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish to follow on the comments that were being articulated by the Senator from Vermont. He has done an excellent job laying out these issues for the American people to deliberate upon this week as we debate the budget of the United States of America.

Right now, millions of Americans are gripped by March Madness and the Final Four showdown, but for our Nation's seniors and the middle class, the real March madness is happening in Congress with the proposed Republican budget.

Our country isn't like the big dance. Our country was not built on a zero-sum game, where one side wins and the other side loses. But that is exactly what this Republican budget does. It picks winners, and it picks losers.

Let's take a look at the GOP's budget brackets. The Republican final four features their perennial favorites. In the first game, they have seniors versus special interests.

Well, in this Republican budget, it removes 11 million families from Medicaid, including 400,000 seniors in my State of Massachusetts alone. It turns Medicare into a voucher program. It forces millions of seniors, including 80,000 in Massachusetts who receive Medicare, to pay \$1,000 more for their prescription drugs next year. It does all of this while preserving tax breaks for special interests, such as the deductions for corporate jets and for shipping jobs overseas.

The budget preserves billions for atomic bombs of the past—supported by the defense industry—which is why I introduced legislation today to cut \$100 billion over 10 years from our bloated nuclear weapons program.

So there are no surprises yet in the GOP budget bracket. Special interests advance and seniors lose. That is the first match. Seniors lose. It is not unexpected.

In the next game, it is a battle of generations. It is the old guard of Wall Street against the new blood of our Nation, our students. So what does the GOP budget do?

Well, it cuts 8 million Pell grants for college students by almost one-third, making college less affordable for millions of young people and their families. It yanks 100,000 children from the Head Start Program over the next 10 years. It does all that while not meeting the needs of the Wall Street cops on the beat at the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and it puts Americans at risk from predatory lenders and credit card scams by continuing the GOP effort to kill the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. So in the battle between the Wall Street boardrooms and America's classrooms, it is the big money over the little guy yet again.

In the next David versus Goliath matchup, it is America's working fami-

lies against billionaires. Surely the spirit and character of America's working families is deserving of a win. But there is no Cinderella story with the Republican budget. That is because it kicks nearly 900,000 families off of low-income energy assistance. So families will need to decide between heating and eating.

This budget includes \$660 billion in cuts over the next decade to Federal programs that lift up our most vulnerable, such as food stamps, school lunches, school nutrition programs—slashed, slashed, slashed. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 69 percent of nondefense cuts included in the House and Senate budget resolutions come from these programs that serve the poor, the sick, and the needy in our society.

This budget sticks to the Republican policy of not increasing the minimum wage, keeping millions of Americans who want to get into the middle class out of the game. Are the billionaires asked to do more with less? Do they have any tax breaks taken away? Do they pay a little more to make sure the less fortunate are better off?

No, the Republican refs make sure that the Republican playing field remains tilted in their favor. It is another win for the rich.

Now, the matchup we have all been waiting for is the Big Oil juggernaut against clean energy and climate change. In a Republican Senate, Big Oil is undefeated, but can upstart American clean energy companies pull out a win? Well, the Republican budget protects billions of dollars in subsidies to the oil companies while killing the wind energy tax credit. The Republican unwillingness to extend the tax credit has already cost us 30,000 American jobs in the last few years.

Republicans continue to deny the existence of climate change by stopping funding to protect communities against sea level rise and stronger storms, even though 2014 was the warmest year on record and extreme weather impacted every part of the country. It does all of this while handing over more of our public land to Big Oil and to coal companies instead of preserving it for all Americans.

So, who is the winner? No surprise, Big Oil. They keep all of their tax breaks, even as we are taking money away from seniors, from students, from working families, and from a clean energy future in our country. It is no surprise, because when you have the Republican budget final four—special interests, Wall Street, billionaires, and Big Oil—the fix was in from the start.

Unlike the March Madness games we love to watch each year, there are never any upsets in the Republicans' bracket. There are no budget buzzer beaters. In fact, the only ones upset here are grandma, grandpa, students, clean energy workers, and hardworking Americans.



Senate Republicans, once again, are trotting out their well-worn playbook to pick the winners and losers in our society and in our economy, because in this budget, there are clear winners and there are clear losers. Special interests score huge on big tax breaks. Wall Street gets to block legislation. Billionaires take a bigger share of the winnings, and Big Oil remains undefeated.

Meanwhile, American families and industries lose. Seniors pay more for health care. Working families pay more for energy. Students pay more for college. Clean energy companies cut more workers, stopping this incredible clean energy revolution in our country.

This is the real March madness, the Republican budget that makes winners out of Big Oil and billionaires, while the clock runs out on seniors and hard-working Americans, who are left to fend for themselves.

I implore my colleagues to reject this scheme and to create a plan that does not bust the budgets of families across this Nation. I call upon my colleagues to reject this completely and totally distorted sense of priorities for our country.

I call for my colleagues to put together a budget for the future of our country that invests in students, invests in clean energy, invests in research, and invests in what the 21st century should be all about, while we pay the proper respect to the seniors in our country.

We cannot leave behind the poor, the sick, and the elderly. We have obligations in this country. We understand that this country has been made the great country that it is—the greatest in the history of the world—by remembering our obligations to all of those who built our country—not just those in the upper 1 percentile, who have been the primary beneficiaries, but the other 99 percent who got up every single morning and went to work as well, the other 99 percent who built this country and its values from the ground up. We have an obligation to them as well. This Republican budget does not reflect that.

I urge a “no” vote on the Republican budget. I again thank my colleague from the State of Vermont for being an articulate, passionate, and moral voice that ensures that this debate is heard by every single person in our country.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I just want to reiterate what I think is the key point in this entire debate, and that point is whether we develop a budget that works for the vast majority of our families—working families, middle-class families who, in many instances, are working longer hours for lower wages—whether it works for our children at a time when we are experiencing the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country; whether it works for our elderly citizens who often have to make the choice about whether to heat their homes, buy the medicines they need or buy the food they need—and there are millions of people in that position—or do we have a budget that works for the top 1 percent of people who are doing phenomenally well or maybe even the top one-tenth of 1 percent.

I want to get back to this chart, which I think is real interesting. I want everybody to take a deep breath and think about this. At a time when the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent, when the people on top, the very wealthiest Americans, are doing well almost beyond imagination, do we really want to cut food stamps and nutrition programs for hungry kids? Do we really want to make college education less affordable for working families? Do we really want to ask seniors to pay more for prescription drugs—those people trying to live on \$13,000, \$14,000 a year.

So here is the chart. This comes from Forbes magazine, not notably a left-wing publication. They simply give us the facts, and here are the facts. The top 14 wealthiest people in this country have seen their net worth increase by \$157 billion over the last 2 years—14 people.

Do my Republican colleagues go to these people and say: You know what, you are Americans. We have a lot of problems here. Our middle class is disappearing. We have an infrastructure which is crumbling. We have millions of families who can't afford to send their kids to college. You, the top one-tenth of 1 percent, are doing phenomenally well. Is it so hard for my Republican colleagues to say to these people: Maybe you will have to pay a little more in taxes.

Let me list them. Bill Gates, in that 2-year period from 2013 to 2015, saw his wealth increase by \$12 billion; Warren Buffet, \$19 billion; Larry Ellison, \$11 billion; Charles Koch, almost \$9 billion; David Koch, almost \$9 billion; Christy Walton, over \$13 billion; Jim Walton, almost \$14 billion; S. Robson Walton, \$13 billion; Michael Bloomberg, \$8.5 billion; Jeff Bezos, \$9.6 billion; Mark Zuckerberg, \$20 billion; Sheldon Adelson, \$4.9 billion; Larry Page, \$6.7 billion; and Sergey Brin, over \$6 billion.

That is just the increase in their net worth in a 2-year period. Who can deny

the very richest people in this country are doing phenomenally well? How do you ignore that reality? How do you not say to those people: You are going to have to help us with our infrastructure, with education, with our deficit.

But my Republican colleagues have a different approach. Their approach is to say to working families: Well, we are going to make it harder for your kids to get into Head Start. We are going to make it harder for you to get the nutrition programs you need to keep your family from going hungry. We are going to make it harder for seniors to get the prescription drugs they need.

So I think, with this budget, the choices are pretty clear. It is laid right out there. Republicans want to balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, the children, the sick and the poor, and protect all of these guys—not ask them to pay one nickel more in taxes. I think that is wrong from a moral perspective, from an economic perspective, and I think this is a budget that should be defeated.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that reserved time is now available for the Joint Economic Committee, particularly in regard to presenting the report which is part of the budgetary process, so I will go forward with that.

It is an honor for me to serve as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee. One of the main roles of that committee is to report to the Senate Budget Committee and to my colleagues in the Senate on the state of the economy, and that is why I am here today.

Just last week, Dr. Jason Furman, the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, appeared before the Joint Economic Committee to discuss this topic as well as to discuss the findings of the annual Economic Report of the President. Our committee is tasked with evaluating and responding to that President's Economic Report. Last week our committee released our findings and recommendations, and I am here today to present some of those findings.

We found that despite improvements in economic conditions over the past year, our economy remains stuck in second gear. Let me discuss why we have concluded that.



I often hear back home from Hoosiers—and I know my colleagues hear back home from people they represent—that we need to take action to grow the economy. I think it is safe to say that of course all of us in the Senate think the same way. But the age-old question in economics is this: How does a nation best create an environment for economic growth and raise living standards for its citizens?

We are now nearly 6 years into this recovery. While there are many encouraging signs of economic improvement, particularly in the last several months, the recovery has been modest and there still are many Americans in need of and still seeking meaningful job opportunities.

Since 1960, our Nation has experienced seven recessions and recoveries. The recoveries of the past 50 years provide comparative data to measure the progress of our current recovery. On the measures of GDP, jobs, and income growth, our current recovery ranks either dead last or second to last in all of those seven recoveries. Let me restate that.

In the last 50 years we have had 7 major recessions. Following those recessions has been an economic recovery. As things get sorted out, the economy kicks back in. If we take all those seven and we average them out in terms of what the results were following the recession, we get certain numbers. What we have seen now in this last recession is performance far under the average—in fact, dead last—of those seven. I will give a couple of metrics here.

Annual gross domestic product—the total of everything produced—has a value and grew 4 percent in the average post-1960 recovery, while this recovery has averaged just 2.3 percent of gross domestic product growth. So we are growing about half of the average of the previous recessions.

Personal income rose an average of 15.3 percent in the past recoveries. During this recovery, personal income has reached only 7.1 percent growth—less than half of what the average is for the previous seven recoveries.

At the same time, median household income has collapsed by \$2,100 in real terms per family during this current recovery.

And while the pace of job creation has picked up recently, there are still 5.5 million fewer private sector jobs in this recovery than the average of past recoveries.

In addition, the labor force participation rate—the percentage of working-age Americans who have a job or are looking for a job—has fallen to 35-year lows. What this means is reduction in the unemployment rate over the past year is at least partially the result of many Americans giving up on looking for work. This, contrary to what our President said in his State of the Union

Address, is not something to be proud of.

So we must ask ourselves: Why is this recovery so different? What does the future economic situation look like for the average American family?

In our Republican Joint Economic Committee Response, we find that these questions are addressed partly by the historic factors identified in the President's report.

For instance, there is mutual concern about the labor market scars that remain in the aftermath of the recent recession, as well as the challenges to restoring a more productive and participatory workforce. Where we differ with the President is on how to best address these problems and what policies we can offer that will return us to, at a minimum, the average of past recoveries. We are not asking for the Moon here. Although we would like to see growth exceed the average of the past, we are simply saying: What policies do we need to enact just to get back to the average recovery? And we are half of that, as I said.

We differ with the President on how best to address these problems and what policies we can offer that will return us, at a minimum, to the average of past recoveries. Unfortunately, we have found that many of the recommendations put forth in the President's report would not deliver the benefits the administration projects. For instance, the administration's proposal to increase the minimum wage would result in reduced job opportunities. That has been documented over and over in testimony before our committee by analysts and economists who have looked at this. It freezes out those seeking entry-level jobs—a start, a foot in the door, the ability to show you can come to work and do a good day's work, arrive on time and don't leave before your time ends. You could be a productive person, and up the ladder they go. That entry level is killed when we raise the minimum wage beyond what the market calls for. We end up losing a lot of small businesses that provide those entry-level jobs, or end up hiring on a part-time basis to avoid that result.

Additionally, the economic report of the President insufficiently addresses the challenges we face in terms of improving the American economy, improving economic mobility, preparing students in the workforce, enacting progrowth policies, and addressing our long-term fiscal challenges. Allow me, if I could, to discuss these items in greater detail.

Let's look at economic mobility. For example, the Obama administration continues to press income inequality as an issue, when it would be better to focus on policies that improve economic mobility. Economic mobility is far more important for Americans as they move through different stages of

life—from making less income after graduation, to starting the process of building a career, building a resume, to building up earnings through a career experience, and establishing families, to accumulate savings for retirement, and other goals that all of us have gone through and many are going through and many hope to go through as they look forward to meaningful work in the future.

Despite good intentions, President Obama continues to pursue policies that impede job growth and real income growth. This restrains economic mobility.

Nearly 6 years now into the current recovery, Americans are only just beginning to see signs of significant income growth—and income growth feeds into upward economic mobility. My hope and our hope is this growth will continue to strengthen in the coming years. But we need a change of policies from this administration if this is going to happen.

Let's look at education reform. We also differ with the President in the area of education reform. It is becoming increasingly clear that traditional solutions no longer work in today's labor market. The connection between education and jobs is fractured, and repairing this connection requires collaboration with employers who know what skills their workers need.

Education remains an area ripe for reform, yet the Obama administration has preferred to promote the idea of making community college free rather than focus on the existing education deficits experienced by so many students across the country. Many low-income Americans are already able to receive a community college education for free if they are eligible for Pell grants. But the real question here is: What kind of curriculum will they be taking as they enter the education process? To simply go into a system that is not coordinating and cooperating with the private industry in terms of the skills needed for them to grow and to join that particular means of production is sadly lacking in the President's proposals.

Today, many of the classes offered at community colleges are remedial. They are compensating for deficits in education at the high school level. Many students find themselves unprepared for even the most basic postsecondary courses at the community college and university levels, let alone for skilled jobs that offer good pay. Until we address this fundamental foundational underpinning in terms of how to receive the right education, we have to address these questions rather than just simply say: Everybody go; don't worry, the taxpayer will pay for your tuition; take whatever courses you want. That simply is not the model.

In Indiana, we have a consolidated model now, working with private industry and our 2-year colleges, which is

producing terrific results because we are matching the skills needed with the curriculum and teaching that provides those needs.

For these students, finding a good job remains a challenge, as does our ability to address those in this category who have given up looking for a job. That takes us to the labor participation rate.

The labor force participation rate for those age 20 to 29 is more than 4 percent lower now than in 2007. And the lower that goes, the easier it is to achieve an unemployment number that sounds good but really is false because the factor of labor participation is skewing the results.

Furthermore, for those who find a job in that 20-to-29 category, the Federal Reserve board survey of young workers reveals that only 42 percent of those surveyed reported having a job that is closely related to their field of study. Students' time and resources need to be better invested so they can enter the workforce truly equipped, and without needless delay and countless dollars spent on a degree that leaves them unemployed or jobless. This is a major challenge to our education system, and the President's education proposals fall far short of the reforms needed to address these challenges.

Let's look at growth and productivity—absolutely essential if we are going to have a growing economy and provide more jobs for more people. As it stands, the United States remains one of the most productive economies in the world. We can treasure that. We can celebrate that. However, much concern remains about whether America will be able to sustain that productivity of which it proved capable over the last half century, but there is a real question today as to whether that can be sustained.

Business creation, entrepreneurship, and technological innovations have slowed over the past decade, alarmingly. If these trends prove to be more than temporary, then they will have negative consequences for America's standard of living.

Productivity and labor force participation growth alone cannot address the Federal spending problems that have been years in the making. It appears the administration has not stopped to consider the effects of existing regulations and government policies.

ObamaCare's effects on labor force participation and hours worked continue to drive down productivity. Economist Casey Mulligan estimates that, if fully implemented, by 2017 ObamaCare's long-term effect will translate to roughly 3 percent less in weekly employment—3 percent fewer total hours worked, and 2 percent less in labor income. That is not how to boost productivity. That is a killer of increase in productivity.

Nonetheless, the Obama administration prefers to add more spending pro-

grams to the existing structure in an attempt to counterbalance the current disincentives to work.

In contrast, we—Republicans on the committee—believe aggressive action on progrowth policies will improve the future economic situation of American families.

As we detail our report to Congress, there are three areas where immediate opportunity to kick-start our economy and provide for the sustained growth needed to address the current fiscal and economic growth challenges we face that need to be implemented—one, comprehensive tax reform; two, implementation of foreign trade agreements; and three, regulatory relief. Let's take those three in a little deeper discussion.

Tax reform. The need for comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform could not be clearer. There is admission on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber—the Republicans and the Democrats—that we have gone far too long in terms of dealing with tax reform of our current taxation system. The Administration and Members of Congress in both parties agreed that it's broken. It is loaded with so many exemptions, exclusions, subsidies, credits, special interest provisions, rules and regulations, it is incomprehensible to fathom the complexity of this current system. It is hurting our economy.

For example, the U.S. corporate tax rate is the highest in the developed world. If American businesses are going to be able to compete in a global market, it has to be significantly lower. There is consent on this. The President has acknowledged that this is needed and that this is the case. Yet we see little if any policy coming forward—direct policy—from the White House and from our Democratic friends as to whether we should go forward.

I am hopeful that the Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Finance Committee in the Senate, of which I am a Member, will take this seriously and will address this issue in a comprehensive way. Unfortunately, the President's framework may not lead to the desired goals of productivity and other economic gains because with a tax code of 4 million words and compliance costs to American families and businesses equaling \$168 billion a year, it is not surprising that 9 out of 10 Americans turn to a paid preparer or computer software to calculate their tax burden. Six billion hours are spent every year by Americans simply trying to figure out their tax return or get their tax return taken care of, and an extraordinary amount of money is spent on having someone else prepare that return because it is simply incomprehensible for most Americans to address.

Progrowth tax reform would simplify the Tax Code for individuals and families, reduce the corporate rate, lower

individual rates paid by small businesses, and make our individual tax system more competitive in the global market. By comparison, the Administration's suggested 28 percent corporate tax rate and hybrid territorial and worldwide tax system would still place the United States among the highest global tax rates and would still continue to put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage.

Let's look at trade. Another area of agreement between Congress and the administration, so-called, is the pursuit of more trade opportunities. President Obama's National Export Initiative aimed to increase the level of exports to \$3.14 trillion before 2015 in order to support up to 2 million jobs, but it fell far short of that goal.

The opportunity to improve GDP growth is available now, pending the administration's efforts to secure trade promotion authority to finalize new trade agreements. During the State of the Union Address, one of the few topics that brought Republicans to their feet, cheering in support, was the President's call for trade promotion authority. Yet, it appears—and I remain concerned—that the President and the administration are not really working hard enough and putting the pressure on their own party Members to secure the necessary support of Congress to achieve this much needed result.

The President should fully engage with Congress to ensure passage of trade promotion authority. This is a necessary policy if we are to get the kind of economic growth we need. With these trade agreements, we can expand market access for American goods and services and improve the economic well-being of Americans and of citizens in our trade partner countries.

Regulatory burden. We have to stem the rising tide of regulatory redtape. According to the U.S. Small Business Administration, the cost of complying with Federal regulations exceeds \$1.75 trillion every year for U.S. businesses, and it disproportionately affects small businesses. This amounts to more than \$10,500 per American worker.

Furthermore, the administration has launched an aggressive assault on fossil fuels and the low-cost electricity they provide. In addition to the EPA's harmful carbon regulations, the administration has unleashed more than a dozen rules aimed at eliminating coal-fired plants in the United States.

We cannot neglect the costs and effects of new major regulations under ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank that continue to subdue business investment and job growth.

Taken individually, each burdensome regulation increases costs to American families and slows economic growth. Taken collectively, these regulations hang as a giant albatross around the necks of working people and American

businesses, both large and small. To reduce excessive regulations, Federal agencies need to review and remove outdated and ineffective rules and should more fully evaluate the costs and benefits of any proposed rule.

I would like to turn now to the long-term effects and fiscal health that is a challenge to all, each and every one of us. I have spoken at some length about this recent recovery and our report's findings. In addition to working to improve the recovery in the short term, we must also address the greatest threat to a successful economic America—our long-term fiscal health.

Earlier this year, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office issued its updated budget and economic outlook for the next decade. The report warned that under current law, if we just stay where we are and don't make adjustments, "large and growing federal debt would have serious negative consequences, including increasing federal spending for interest payments; restraining economic growth in the long term; giving policymakers less flexibility to respond to unexpected challenges; and eventually heightening the risk of a fiscal crisis."

Federal Reserve Chairman Yellen said essentially the same thing when she appeared last year before the Joint Economic Committee. Her answer highlighted why the long-term deficits Washington currently is projected to run must be addressed. I put that question to Chairman Yellen, Chairman of the Fed, and this was her answer:

There is more work to do to put fiscal policy on a sustainable course... Progress has been made over the last several years in bringing down deficits in the short term, but [through] a combination of demographics, the structure of entitlement programs, and historic trends in health-care costs, we can see that, over the long term, deficits will rise to unsustainable levels relative to the economy.

With these comments, the Fed Chairwoman joined a long list of academics, economists, and business leaders who have all stated the obvious: Unless the United States makes politically difficult but absolutely necessary spending choices in the near term, eventually we are going to face a debt-induced crisis in the future. It is only a matter of time. The clock is running down. We continue to postpone the ever-more-necessary policy changes that will help us avoid the coming fiscal crisis. It is there for everybody to see. That clock has been running now for tens of years. Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents have watched this grow, the deficit spending and national debt—plunge into national debt at a staggering rate. The consequences will come home to roost, and they will affect not only our own generation but in particular our children's generation and our grandchildren's generation and generations to come if we don't address this.

In fact, if interest rates were not artificially held down by the Fed at historically low levels, we might already be facing our day of reckoning. According to the Congressional Budget Office, even a 1 percentage point increase in interest rates would add \$1.7 trillion to the deficits of the United States over a 10-year period of time. That is just a 1-percent increase in interest rates. If we go back to average, we will be looking at a 3-percent or 4-percent or maybe even a 5-percent interest rate level. Each one would cost us \$1.7 trillion over a 10-year period of time. That new debt would occur without any changes in spending or taxing; interest rates alone would simply drive our debt out of control. It is a ticking time bomb, a fiscal ticking time bomb that must be addressed.

While the administration has taken credit for the current reduction in our annual deficit, overall debt has increased dramatically under President Obama—from \$10.6 trillion to almost \$18.2 trillion just during his term of office. And they brag about making progress? Yes, the deficit is smaller than it was in the early years of the Obama administration, but it is still a deficit of half a trillion dollars a year, and it is going to spike dramatically within 2 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. What a bag of misery turned over to the next President.

In addition, the reduction in our budget deficits is only temporary, as I just said, because the conclusion of the Congressional Budget Office is that this will spike in 2017 and publicly held debt as a percent of GDP will continue to rise in the second half of the coming decade. Yet, the CBO's projections of deficits and publicly held debt over the next decade does not tell the whole story. The debt will continue to climb to unsustainable levels over the next three decades—30 years of climbing into even more debt. By the end of that time, we will owe our creditors more than our entire economy produces in 1 year. Let me say that again. At the end of that period—the next three decades—we will owe our creditors more than our entire economy is worth. What a gift to our children. Thanks a lot.

Thanks for ignoring doing what you needed to do. You saw it coming. You talked about it on the floor of the Senate. Everybody saw what was happening, and no one had the will to stand up or too few had the will to stand up and do something about it.

It is reckless policy. It is dangerous. We have an obligation to the American people. We have a moral obligation to our future children and grandchildren to address this and to act responsibly.

There have been several bipartisan attempts, both in Congress and by outside groups, to address this ticking time bomb. Groups such as Fix the

Debt, the Business Roundtable, the Domenici-Rivlin effort at the Bipartisan Policy Center—all tried to develop solutions and present them. They did present them to us, and it is clear for everyone to see. Official government efforts were undertaken—Simpson-Bowles, the Gang of 6, the supercommittee that resulted from the Budget Control Act, and the dinner club of Senators, which I participated in, that met directly with the President and his senior advisers. Unfortunately, all of these efforts, all of the effort put into this, all of the alarms that were ringing—all of this failed to reach agreement.

I am particularly disappointed with the failure of the final effort, which began with Senators and the White House seeking to go big and ultimately got to the point where it was hardly worth putting anything in place. Even when we took the President's own recommendations and sent them to him for approval, they were rejected.

Despite the inability to reach agreements in the past, we must not give up, my colleagues. We must not give up. We must continue to focus on this greatest fiscal threat perhaps in the history of our country. It is something we have a moral responsibility to tackle, a moral responsibility to put our future careers in jeopardy by making the right choices. You know what, I think if we did that, the American people are wise enough to know now that that would be rewarded rather than condemned, that we would receive support for our future interest in elected office rather than rejection. The country understands maybe more—or at least reacts to maybe more than we in this body do because year after year after year we continue to fail to do what we all know we need to do.

Despite the inability to reach agreements in the past, as I said, we should not give up. The administration and the Congress must make tough fiscal choices now so future generations will have an opportunity to reach their potential and not be saddled with an even higher burden of debt.

We must make reforms to our mandatory spending programs to tackle out-of-control Federal spending. Congress should also pass sensible policies that will help create jobs and grow the economy. This is our priority and this is what need to do.

I will conclude by talking about the Republican budget plan that we have begun to debate and will be debating this week and offering amendments and ultimately voting by the end of the week.

We know that job creators and future entrepreneurs see today's large debt levels as tomorrow's likely tax hikes, interest rate increases, and inflationary pressures. So we must lift the cloud of uncertainty that is hanging over our economy. This is the first

budget we have debated on the Senate floor in 2 years. This is a budget plan that is so vital to the future of our economy and the future of America. We have lacked such focused direction in the form of a budget over the past several years and that has hurt Americans. Americans need to know what is coming and what to expect. We need to move off of the word “certainty” so that business owners, American families, and everyone engaged in this economy knows what the rules are, knows what is coming, and has a clear picture of where we stand even if there are some areas that they are in disagreement with.

They need to know the Federal Government is carefully managing its spending and revenues. Every American family and business must have a budget and live within their means, and it is about time Washington does the same.

I am pleased to be here talking about this Republican budget resolution that was led by the Senator from Wyoming, and many of us participated. I am not on that committee, but I commend them for the work they have done in bringing forth a budget for us to talk about, debate, amend, pass, and then live by. Certainly no budget is perfect. This budget takes several important steps to putting our country back on the right fiscal track.

Most importantly, this budget resolution balances the budget over 10 years. We must stop spending more than we take in. We must move toward a balanced budget. I have long been a proponent of a constitutional amendment to require us to do this, as is done in many of our States. We have to live up to the responsibilities of our oath to the Constitution and to not spend more than we take in. We do that in Indiana, and we have a successful economy and a successful legislature that has made that the case, but it is severely and sorely lacking here in Washington.

In contrast to the Republican budget, the President's budget does not come close to balancing the budget. In fact, for all of the administration's praise of the short-term reductions in the annual deficit, the President's budget predicts increases in deficits starting in 2018—yes, it is going to be dumped in somebody else's lap—and an \$800 billion deficit in 2025.

Our Republican budget helps address the issue of underfunding the Department of Defense. It boosts defense spending by a necessary amount of money above the President's request because, along with the debt bomb, we have a terrorist bomb—potentially marrying terrorists with weapons of mass destruction—and a strong America and strong military are absolutely necessary to address the threats we see burgeoning all over the world today. Our budget addresses this specific ques-

tion and strengthens our national defense.

It helps preserve our safety net programs. It does not change Social Security, yet it will benefit Social Security by shoring up our broader finances and achieving stronger economic growth and increased employment.

In addition, the budget extends the solvency of the Medicare trust fund by calling for the same level of Medicare savings as called for by the President. Let me be clear. Our budget does not call for the same policies as the President. We would instead achieve these savings through policies based on free-market principles.

The budget also seeks to improve the Medicaid Program by increasing State flexibility, and it seeks to help economic growth by promoting several progrowth policies, including tax reform, reducing the impact of Federal regulations, promoting free trade, investing in infrastructure, and enhancing U.S. energy security.

Finally, the Republican budget provides the means for addressing the flawed, confusing, distorted, tax-laden policy of ObamaCare. The repeal of ObamaCare provides flexibility to replace this disastrous law with health care solutions that bring down the cost of care and protect the vulnerable.

I will conclude by saying and reiterating what this Senate Republican budget resolution accomplishes. It balances the budget in 10 years, ensures flexibility for funding national defense, provides repeal and replacement of ObamaCare, protects Americans from new tax hikes, preserves Social Security, extends Medicare trust fund solvency, improves Medicaid, supports stronger economic growth, and enhances U.S. energy security.

I am proud my Senate colleagues have drafted a plan to return our spending to a sustainable path toward a balanced budget, and I am hopeful this is the beginning of responsible action and look forward to debating and passing the Republican budget this week.

Again, I commend the chairman and his committee for bringing forth a budget that is sorely needed and will give Americans a clear picture of a different path than this administration has proposed.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 23, at 5:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, Calendar No. 19; that the Senate then vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, that no further motions

be in order, that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, writing and passing a budget is one of the most fundamental responsibilities of any legislative body. Unfortunately, it is something we have not done in the U.S. Congress since 2009. It is outrageous. It should be considered a scandal.

Today I will take a few minutes to discuss the budget we have before us today and how we intend to discharge our responsibilities to the American people in the 114th Congress. Of course, one of the most important parts of a budget is that you have to determine what your priorities are—things you have to have, things you want but maybe need to defer, and things you want but maybe cannot afford.

When it comes to the budget Chairman ENZI and the Senate Budget Committee have produced, our priority is clear. Our priority is to protect the hard-working taxpayers of this country. Where do we start and how does the Senate Republican budget get America on the right track, boosting economic growth and job creation?

To start with, this budget actually balances and puts us on the path so we can begin to pay down our national debt, and it is important to say that it does so without raising taxes. Those seem like pretty straightforward goals for any budget, but unfortunately that has not been the case in recent years.

Throughout his 6 years in office and in the budgets he has sent to Congress, President Obama seems to be committed to the notion that the only way Washington can revive strong economic growth is by steadily growing the government. Unfortunately, at the same time you end up adding to deficits and debt in the process.

Yes, it is true that we have had an experiment in the size and role of government over the last 6 years, and I must say we are no longer talking about esoteric theories that were debated in the Federalist Papers or during the founding of our country. We now actually have hard evidence. We have things we can point to that show this has been a failed experiment.

Under this administration, our national debt—and the bills, not that I will have to pay, but these young people and my children will have to pay—has gone from \$10.6 trillion to more than \$18 trillion. I know those numbers are almost meaningless to most of us because we simply cannot conceive of numbers that big.

The latest budget from the President adds another trillion in tax increases

and never balances—ever, while, in fact, the budget which was voted out of the Budget Committee and is now before us on the floor of the Senate actually brings us a surplus, and the President's budget would leave our country with a massive deficit of over \$800 billion in its final year.

The last budget proposed by our friends across the aisle, Senate Democrats in 2013, would have hit the economy with another \$1 trillion in taxes and added more than \$7 trillion to our national debt.

I believe, based on the failed experiment of the last few years, we should conclude that just taxing and spending is not going to allow us to achieve the kind of prosperity and economic growth we all so badly want. America's debt is a real danger, and one that apparently the President chooses to ignore, and our friends across the aisle, in their budget proposals, seem to ignore it as well.

The reason our debt is so dangerous is because it makes us vulnerable to fiscal shocks and shocks to our national security and makes it much harder for us to respond to them, and our debt obviously costs money to service. We need to pay interest to the people who buy our bonds, our national debt, and when interest rates go back up from where they are now, which is a historically low rate, more and more of the hard-earned tax dollars the American people will be paying to the Federal Government will be used not to pay down the debt but will be used to pay interest on the debt to the people who own it, countries such as China and other sovereign entities that purchase that debt. We will be paying interest on that debt in a way that makes us dangerously vulnerable not only to fiscal shock, but also crowds out our ability to deal with other priorities, such as law enforcement, education, national security, and the like.

Last year the Congressional Budget Office pointed out that in the past few years debt held by the public will be significantly greater relative to the gross domestic product than at any time just after World War II. Our debt will be higher relative to our economy than at any time since World War II.

What does that mean to my fellow Texans? The CBO goes on to say that with a debt so large, Federal spending on interest payments will increase substantially as interest rates rise to more typical levels. That is what I was just referring to. The other thing that happens is that as the Federal Government's debt goes up, we basically reduce national savings and capital stock at the same time and wages will be smaller. In other words, our national massive debt is hurting economic growth today. It is hurting our economy, and it virtually assures that it will get worse in the days ahead.

The good news is it doesn't have to be that way, and this budget puts us on

a path to balance and one that begins to pay down the debt, not adding to the debt with more taxing and spending along the way. And the good news is we don't have to start from scratch and reinvent the wheel.

There are better options, many of which are reflected in the budget we have proposed and will be voting on this week. There are policies and programs in the budget that we have borrowed which have proven to be successful around the country in States such as Texas and others.

My State, in particular, has experienced an economic surge that has seen a boom in job creation and exports and it has been named the best State in the Nation in business 10 years running. Some people have actually called this the Texas miracle, but I take issue with that characterization. There is nothing miraculous about what has happened in Texas when we talk about the economy because you cannot explain a miracle, but it is no secret why Texas has been one of the leading job creation engines over the last several years. If we ask business leaders, they will tell us what makes Texas such an attractive place to do business.

In Texas, we know we should not punish job creators with taxes that discourage investment and overregulation, which make it hard to make the bottom line balance. We are not ashamed of our abundance of natural resources, nor are we apologetic about encouraging its development. The results have been extraordinary.

For example, Texas added nearly 460,000 jobs in 2014 alone—460,000 jobs in 2014—more than any other State. Despite being home to about 8.5 percent of the total U.S. population, Texas accounted for nearly one-third of all new job gains during the last 10 years for the Nation. Simply put, what we have shown is what can be accomplished with sound public policy that allows for job creation and economic prosperity, and that is the good news. It is not a fluke. It is not a miracle. It is about good policies actually working to benefit the people of my State and that could also be put to work for the American people.

We can take strategies that have worked in the States and lessons we have learned in these laboratories of democracy and apply them here in Washington on a greater scale for the benefit of the entire Nation. Simply put, it boils down to lower taxes, sensible regulations, and a lower level of per capita government spending.

What happens under those conditions is that the private sector is willing to invest, and when they invest, they create jobs and grow the economy, and we all benefit, including the government, by increased tax revenue. The government doesn't benefit, nor do the people benefit, when government policies discourage investment and job creation

and economic growth, which is what has been happening over the last few years.

In the budget before us, which balances without tax hikes, we can protect taxpayers and foster an economic environment that allows jobs and opportunity to blossom.

Gallup released a survey earlier this month that talked about the biggest concerns facing the American people. The top concern was government. They are concerned about their government. The second was the economy, and the third was jobs. All three of those concerns actually tie neatly together because many Americans now feel they don't have the same opportunities they once had. Maybe they have been laid off or had a tough time finding a new job that is as rewarding for them personally and financially. Maybe they are actually working as hard as they ever did, but they are actually making less money than they did 10 years ago.

If people are deeply concerned, as I am, about the availability of good jobs and the state of our economy, it only makes sense that people would not be satisfied with the government as well. These concerns transcend geographic, partisan, and demographic boundaries, and they are shared by Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike.

Sadly, one of the statistics that hasn't gotten better over the last few years, even though the unemployment rate has crept down, is the percentage of the American people—the workforce—who have actually left the job market and given up looking for a job, and that remains at a near historical high—about a 30-year high—the so-called labor participation rate. So when the unemployment rate goes down and we say, Oh, that is a good thing, a lot of the reason it is going down is because fewer and fewer people are actually looking for work and they have dropped out altogether. That is a bad thing.

Most people don't see themselves as future business owners; they simply hope to find a good job doing something that provides them the ability to put food on the table and to take care of their families, and that gives them a sense of satisfaction for a job well done. Yet, as we know, small businesses are the lifeblood of the economy, and it is the small businesses that actually help create the jobs that most hard-working taxpayers are occupied in. So if we are making it harder for small businesses to create jobs, we are also making it harder on workers to find jobs.

As I travel my State and talk to small business men and women, they tell me one of the biggest challenges they have had is something the President trumpets here in Washington as a grand success; that is, ObamaCare because ObamaCare has been a job killer. This budget assumes full repeal of

ObamaCare, and it gives us the opportunity to make good on our promises and finally remove one of the biggest roadblocks to job growth. Is that because we don't care about health care? Well, no; exactly the opposite. What we intend to do as a replacement is to replace ObamaCare with affordable health care that provides people access to the kind of quality care they want for themselves and their families.

The irony of ObamaCare is that it spends and taxes so much, and yet still 30 million people are uninsured. Many people find the health insurance they purchased—even on the exchanges—has high premiums, which basically render them uninsured to the extent that they can't even afford it, and it has raised their premium costs by adding mandates for coverage they don't want and they don't need.

We can do much better.

Now, I have heard the President and some of his allies say, Well, we have to have ObamaCare because we need to cover young adults up to the age of 26 who can be covered under their parents' policy or we need ObamaCare because we need to cover people with pre-existing conditions. The fact is we can do both of those things. We will do both of those things, and we don't need everything else that comes with it.

We also need to capitalize on an energy boom that is taking place across the United States. This budget boosts development of American-made energy. Unfortunately, the President decided to put his party and his politics ahead of American job seekers recently when he vetoed a bipartisan bill to construct the Keystone XL Pipeline that the State Department said would create 42,000 jobs—construction jobs to start with—and a number of other jobs thereafter. It would also provide an alternative means to transport oil from a friendly ally, Canada, and we wouldn't have to ship so much of it in railcars over the surface, which is admittedly a much more dangerous and volatile situation.

The President, when he vetoed the Keystone XL Pipeline, took basically the opposite approach to what we have taken in my State and other States around the country, where we have seen our natural resources and the development of those natural resources as a way to grow jobs and grow the economy.

In Texas, we have produced 94 percent more oil between September 2008 and September 2012. That has been primarily due to the innovation of the oil and gas industry and the so-called shale oil and gas revolution, which transformed States such as North Dakota and Texas, and in places such as Pennsylvania where the Marcellus shale exists. The Eagle Ford, the Barnett, and the Haynesville shale plays in Texas have been economic boons in my State and created thou-

sands of jobs and added hundreds of thousands of dollars to the tax rolls.

As my friends along the border of Texas and Mexico remind me, those natural resources do not stop at the international border. Indeed, I was recently in Mexico City with our colleague, Senator Kaine from Virginia, where we met with a number of oil and gas company representatives at the American Chamber of Commerce in Mexico City, talking about the change in the Mexican law which now will encourage private investment in developing their natural resources in Mexico. Of course, the better the Mexican economy does, the better our economy does, and the fewer people who feel as though they have to immigrate to the United States in order to provide for their family.

This budget is a responsible budget. It balances in 10 years, it doesn't raise taxes, and it begins a downpayment on our national debt. It sends a very important message that the 114th Congress and the new majority are very serious about discharging the most basic responsibilities of governance—something that hasn't been done since 2009, since the last time we had a budget, but we also learn from the States when it comes to protecting taxpayers and removing barriers to growth and how that helps not only the small businesses but the people who work at the jobs created by those small businesses.

In conclusion, there is one other thing this budget does. We know that since the Budget Control Act of 2011 and the sequestration that occurred—the automatic caps on spending that occurred as a result of the failure of the supercommittee to come up with a grand bargain—our Nation has spent less and less on our national security. That has given rise not only to deep concerns by many of us, including the Presiding Officer, about America's role in the world and the message we are sending to our adversaries, but it also raises the question of what is the primary purpose—what should be the No. 1 priority of the Federal Government? I believe, and I think many of us believe, that national security is the most important priority of the Federal Government. We have kind of lost sight of that in recent years with the budget caps and sequestration. We have tried to be responsible about spending. Unfortunately, with an unhelpful partner in the White House, sequestration seemed to be the only way we could keep a cap on runaway discretionary spending, higher deficits, and greater debt. But I think now is the time for this Congress to step up and say that national security is our No. 1 priority. This budget does just that, and it provides additional resources necessary for the Department of Defense to make sure we not only maintain our status as the preeminent military power in the world but also keep our commit-

ment to our military families and those who have chosen to make the armed services a career.

We also send a very important message to our adversaries that America will not shrink or retreat from its leadership role on the world stage. Unfortunately, I think as a result of not only our budgetary decisions but also a number of missteps and missed signals by the administration, some of our adversaries have gotten the idea we are in retreat and that we are somehow pulling back and going to be rendered a spectator rather than a leader on the world stage. Perhaps the single most important thing this budget does is it says, America is back as the leader of the free world and we will not shrink and we will not turn our back on our responsibility not only to ourselves and our people but to our friends and allies across the world.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, in a moment I am going to yield for Senator Kaine, but before I do that, I just want to make a few points based on the remarks from my friend, the Senator from Texas, Mr. Cornyn.

When Senator Cornyn talked about military spending—and how much we should spend on the military is a very important debate. We now spend more money than the next nine countries combined. But as we talk about the deficit and the debt, I would remind my colleagues and the American people that one of the reasons our national debt is at \$18 trillion and one of the reasons our deficit is as high as it is is because under President Bush, we went to war in Iraq and we went to war in Afghanistan, and we put those wars on the credit card. We didn't pay for them.

On Thursday, at the Senate Budget Committee meeting, an amendment was passed to add another \$38 billion of defense spending to the deficit. So I have a little bit of a problem understanding all of my Republican friends coming down here and saying: We are really concerned about the deficit and the debt. We are going to have to cut back on Head Start. We are going to have to cut back on health care. We are going to have to cut back on the Meals On Wheels programs for seniors. We are going to have to cut back on Pell grants, making it harder for young people to go to college. We just can't afford those things anymore because the deficit is so high. But, when it comes to military spending, we don't have to worry about the deficit at all.

I have a real problem with that, and I suspect that within the next couple of days there will be an amendment on the floor which makes it very clear that if people want to go into another war—and I certainly hope we do not go into another war; I think two wars is quite enough—but if people want to vote for another war, they are going to have to pay for that war and not pass that debt on to our kids and our grandchildren.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor for the Senator from Virginia, Mr. Kaine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Thank you, Madam President. I thank my colleague from Vermont who has done an able job as the ranking member on the Budget Committee.

I rise today to talk about the budget resolution that we are considering on the floor of the Senate this week.

I came to the Senate in 2013 with a background as a mayor and a Governor. I believe in getting budgets done and getting them done on time. Doing budgets under regular order is an important priority, and I have enjoyed and look forward to more work with colleagues on budgeting matters.

Quickly, we have been in a budget crisis of our own making in Congress. It is not someone else's fault. It is not the President's fault. The budget crisis we have been in has been of Congress's making. In August of 2011, when one House pushed the country to the verge of defaulting on our debt for the first time in our history, in order not to default we came up with the idea of the sequester. This was before I was in the Senate, but the basic idea was this: Let's impose punishing across-the-board cuts on all of these Federal spending levels to begin in March of 2013 to force us to try to come up with a better deal. I call that "let's try to do something good, and if we don't, then let's do something really stupid." I don't know that this is a principle you should ever apply.

When I came to the Senate on the verge of sequester going into effect, my first floor speech as a Senator and one of my first votes was this: OK, we didn't find the budget deal that some wanted, but let's not do something stupid. Let's not embrace the sequester and hurt priorities that matter to people every day. Sadly, we couldn't get the 60 votes to cut off the sequester in the Senate. So since March of 2013, we have been in sequester mode. I said in committee and I will say again: The sequester violates every good principle of budgeting I have learned as either a public sector budgeter as a mayor and a Governor or as a private sector budgeter managing a multinational law firm with lawyers on three continents. Nobody would do budgeting this way. The United States, because of Con-

gress, is doing budgeting this way, and I think we need to come up with a better solution.

During the last Congress we did find a better solution. It wasn't a perfect solution, but the Murray-Ryan budget act did a 2-year budgetary framework that eliminated half of these punishing sequester cuts and gave a significant lift to the economy.

The economy has generally been pretty strong, cutting deficits but also avoiding some of the mindless austerity that full sequester means.

A good budget for the country—and I am sad to say that the budget we will be debating on the floor this week is not a good budget for the country—but a good budget for the country would do a couple of things. It would put the promotion of growth and jobs first. The best antideficit strategy—if that is what you are interested in—is promoting a strong economy, and job growth would be the first priority. Second, we would replace a mindless across-the-board sequester with a more targeted approach. If we did that, we could credibly reduce deficits rather than reducing deficits in a way that hurts the economy and punishes programs that matter to people.

The economy and jobs side, we will grow the economy and grow jobs if we do things such as moving away from unnecessary austerity and promoting infrastructure. My colleague from Vermont has a strong proposal about infrastructure that we debated in committee and we will be debating this week. If you did infrastructure and other investments in human capital, you could credibly reduce sequester and increase jobs. We could also increase jobs if we had a tax code that didn't punish work, that didn't punish labor, wages, and salary the way this one does.

The second way would be to restore key spending priorities and replace sequester with a targeted approach. We should be focusing on a budget that maintains a strong national defense; that keeps our promises to veterans; that invests in education, especially important programs such as Head Start, pre-K, and college affordability. We can protect Federal employees, we can protect programs for people of low and moderate incomes, such as SNAP or Pell grants, and we could ensure the environment is protected if we followed targeted strategies. That would be better.

Finally, growing the economy and pursuing targeted budget strategies would enable us to credibly reduce the deficit. It is important to note that the deficit has been coming down since the Murray-Ryan budget deal was done, and that is important. But that is not the budget that will be on the floor this week.

Last Thursday we voted a budget out of committee. It was a long day of de-

bating and voting. I was able to support a number of amendments, and I had some of my own and others that were passed, and I appreciate them. But I ultimately voted against the budget, and unless there will be dramatic changes on the floor of the Senate, I will, in all likelihood, be voting against the budget for the following reasons:

First, the budget before us proposes cuts to nondefense discretionary programs—education, infrastructure, research—the nondefense, noninterest, nonentitlement programs that are about 14 to 15 percent of the Federal budget. It proposes not just cutting those to full sequester levels but cutting them by an additional \$236 billion over 10 years. Even the sequester levels are untenable, slashing these programs even further to make college more expensive, to spend less on infrastructure, and to spend less on research. It is foolish for the Nation.

The budget proposes \$4 trillion in unspecified cuts to programs such as Medicare and Medicaid, but it only includes a budget reconciliation instruction totaling \$2 billion, which leaves a very unusual gap in the terms of how we are going to find magically the \$4 trillion in cuts. The budget depends on gimmicks and sort of magic tricks to achieve balance, when we are not really achieving balance.

It uses outdated baseline proposals by the CBO. We just had CBO numbers come in this March from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, showing that the country, because of an improving economy, is poised to collect more revenue and poised to spend less on some key programs. Instead of using that baseline data—the March data—the budget we worked on in committee used worse January data to make the situation seem more dire than it is. I don't know why we would do this. We should use the most updated numbers.

Finally, I voted against the budget because it contained a critical dishonesty. It proposed to do two things simultaneously that violate the basic laws of physics. The two measures are this: First we are going to entirely repeal the Affordable Care Act. However, all the taxes we are collecting from companies and people to pay for the Affordable Care Act—we are going to keep all of those in the budget. So we will repeal all of the benefits, all of the coverage, all of the protection that tens of millions of Americans get under the Affordable Care Act, but we will keep taxing people and companies and keep all that tax revenue in the budget. Clearly, both of those things are not going to happen. So the budget has this air of unreality about it.

But to me, the unreality of the numbers is even dwarfed in importance by just the flat statement that we are going to repeal the Affordable Care



Act. There are many things I can say about the Affordable Care Act. Why don't I just pick one? That is that 16.4 million Americans are receiving insurance coverage under the Affordable Care Act. What does this budget say will happen to those 16.4 million Americans? The budget doesn't say. It has no plan for providing that they will be able to have health insurance.

Taking away health insurance from 16.4 million Americans, many of whom have it for the first time in their lives, is no small issue. That number is a big number. Sometimes big numbers just sound like big numbers. Let me put it in context. How many Americans are 16.4 million people? Well, 16.4 million people with health insurance is the entire combined population of Wyoming, the District of Columbia, Vermont, North Dakota, Alaska, South Dakota, Delaware, Montana, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Maine, Hawaii, Idaho, Nebraska, and West Virginia. That is 14 States and the District of Columbia. The entire combined population from birth to death in those 15 jurisdictions is what 16.4 million American people are. What this budget proposes is to reach in and strip away health insurance from every last one of those 16.4 million people without a proposal, without a plan, without even any indication of how we would tackle this problem.

I refuse to be a part of that. I refuse to contemplate voting for that. I have had too much experience with people who don't have health insurance to push willingly people back into the shadows when they have had health insurance for the first time in their life.

I know the Presiding Officer understands this. We all do. Health insurance is about two things. It is about health, but it is also about assurance. So if you are sick, if you are in an accident, if your wife is in an accident, if your kids are sick, you have to have this so that you can receive health care, so that you can receive treatment. But when you are not sick and when you haven't been in an accident, you still go to bed worrying about what will happen to your children if they get into an accident, what will happen to your wife if she gets ill. Even when you are healthy, the absence of health insurance imposes an anxiety—especially on parents—that is very, very severe.

So I will not be part of a budget that tells 16.4 million people—the combined population of 14 States and the District of Columbia—that while you may have had this health insurance for the first time in your life, we are now going to take it away from you without a plan to help you have the assurance and the peace of mind and the protection of your health that you have under existing law.

We should not step backward. We should always step forward. Can we find improvements? Of course we can.

But we shouldn't step backward. That is why I voted against the budget in committee, and that is why I am likely, absent major change, to vote against it on the floor.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator KAINE for his outstanding work on the committee and for his very cogent remarks.

In the Republican budget, we don't have to talk about protecting absurd loopholes for large corporations and for the wealthiest people in this country. We don't have to talk about significant cuts in Head Start, making it harder for working families to send their kids to that very important program. We don't have to talk about cuts in the Pell grant program, some \$90 billion in mandatory funding, making it harder for working families to send their kids to college. We don't have to talk about raising taxes on working families by allowing the earned-income tax credit and the children's tax credit to expire. We don't even have to talk about that. All we have to do is to hear what Senator KAINE just said.

Does anybody in America think it makes sense to tell 16 million men, women, and children—who today have health insurance, some for the first time in their lives—that they are going to lose that health insurance, but, by the way, we will continue to collect the taxes from the Affordable Care Act?

Does anyone take that proposal seriously—throwing 16 million people off of health insurance, the equivalent of, what was it, the 15 smallest States in America—and having no plan with what to do with these people?

On the surface, I think the Republican budget makes no sense at all and has a very warped sense of priorities in terms of protecting the wealthiest people in this country—the largest corporations—but sticking it to the middle-class and working families.

Senator KAINE mentioned that one of the areas that we, in fact, are going to focus on is the need to create jobs. I think all of us who are not particularly partisan are aware of the fact that the economy today is a lot better than it was when President Bush left office and we were hemorrhaging 800,000 jobs a month. Is the economy where we would like it to be today? I don't think anyone believes that. But have we made some significant progress in the last 6, 6½ years? Yes, I think we have.

But having said that, let's be clear. If you look at the unemployment rates, unemployment in this country is not 5½ percent. Real unemployment is close to 11 percent. Youth unemployment, which we never talk about at all, is somewhere around 17 percent, and African-American youth unemployment is off the charts.

In addition to that, we have another major problem. That is, our infrastructure is crumbling. So what many of us think we should be doing is that at a time when our roads, bridges, rail systems, water plants, wastewater plants, dams, levees, and airports need a huge amount of work, and at a time when real unemployment is much higher than it should be—well, what about a commonsense approach which says: Let's start rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure and let us put Americans back to work?

Do you know what, that is what the American people want. On every poll I have seen, the top priority of the American people—Democrats, Republicans, Independents—is the economy, create jobs, raise wages, and that is what we should be doing.

In about 1 hour or so I will officially offer an amendment which will, in fact, rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and create many millions of decent-paying jobs.

In terms of infrastructure, which is a fancy word for roads, bridges, water systems, rail, and so forth, I don't think you have to be a Ph.D. in infrastructure to know our infrastructure is really in quite bad shape. Every day somebody gets into a car—whether it is in Vermont or Washington, DC—and you see that pothole that takes away half of your axle, that is what infrastructure is about.

When you are in a traffic jam because the road is inadequate to deal with traffic, that is called infrastructure.

When your water pipes in your town are bursting and flooding downtown, that is called infrastructure.

The truth is that for too many years Congress has dramatically underfunded the maintenance and improvement of the physical infrastructure our economy depends upon. That has to change, and that is why I will be introducing an amendment to invest \$478 billion over 6 years to modernize our infrastructure.

How will we pay for that? Will we pay for it by throwing children off of Head Start? Will we pay for it by throwing people off of the Affordable Care Act? No. We are going to pay for it in the right way, and that is to close tax loopholes that allow corporations and billionaires to shift their profits to the Cayman Islands, Bermuda, and other tax havens. So instead of having these corporations putting their money in tax havens—paying zero in Federal income tax—and at a time when we are losing about \$100 billion a year without reason, we are going to ask these corporations to start paying their fair share of taxes, and then we are going to use that money to repair our crumbling infrastructure and put millions of people back to work.

This amendment—by the way, I will tell you personally I have introduced legislation that is more expansive than this, but because I want all of the

Members of the Senate to be supporting this, I have tailored it down a little bit, and we are talking about \$478 billion over 6 years. This amendment will support more than 9 million good-paying jobs over 6 years, more than 1.5 million jobs a year. This is money that not only creates jobs and rebuilds our infrastructure, it makes the country more productive, more efficient, and safer.

Right now, Larry Summers, the former Treasury Secretary, makes the point that if we take into account the impact of depreciation, our net investment in infrastructure is actually closer to zero of GDP, zero percent. In other words, what we are spending our money on is not rebuilding new infrastructure but replacing and patching old infrastructure.

The sad truth is that as a nation we are falling further and further behind. Throughout China, multibillion-dollar projects are underway to build new bridges, airports, tunnels, an \$80 billion water project, and high-speed rail lines—in China, not in the United States.

This past November, China approved nearly \$115 billion for 21 additional major infrastructure projects. While we are debating, while we refuse to invest in our crumbling infrastructure, China is doing just that—in spades.

It is no surprise that the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report now ranks our overall infrastructure at 12th in the world—12th in the world. That is down from seventh place a decade ago. There was once a time when the United States had an infrastructure that was the envy of the world. Now we are in 12th place.

Let's take a look at some of the problems we face and why we need to invest in infrastructure.

One out of every nine bridges in this country is structurally deficient, and nearly one-quarter are functionally obsolete. We need to rebuild crumbling bridges.

Almost one-third of our roads are in poor or mediocre condition, and nearly 42 percent of all urban highways are congested. We need to rebuild crumbling roads.

Transit systems across the country are struggling to address deferred maintenance, even as ridership steadily increases. People want to take advantage of transit, to get to work on transit, and yet the transit authorities are deferring maintenance because of limited funds.

Meanwhile, nearly 45 percent of American households lack any meaningful access to transit, which is a huge problem in rural areas across the country, including the State of Vermont. In Vermont, in most cases you have one way to get to work and only one way: That is in your automobile.

The amendment I would be offering also creates a national infrastructure

bank. This idea, championed in the past by Senators on both sides of the aisle, will leverage private capital to finance more than \$250 billion in transportation, energy, environmental, and telecommunications projects.

My amendment will also greatly expand credit assistance to projects of national and regional significance through the TIFIA Program, long championed by my good friend from California, Senator BARBARA BOXER.

It will boost funding for the highly competitive TIGER Program that funds locally sponsored transportation projects across the country that increase economic competitiveness and promote economic innovations.

But we all know our infrastructure problems are not just limited to roads, bridges, and transit. Much of our Nation's rail system is obsolete, even though our energy-efficient railroads move more freight than ever and Amtrak's ridership has never been higher.

While we debate the merits of high-speed rail in Congress, countries across Europe and Asia have gone ahead and built vast high-speed networks. Guess what. They work. High-speed rail trains relieve congestion on roads, airports, and whisk people around quickly and efficiently.

China has already 12,000 miles of track with trains that run at least 125 miles per hour and several thousand miles with trains that can travel at 200 miles per hour. Meanwhile, the Acela, Amtrak's fastest train, travels at an average speed of just 65 miles per hour.

This amendment will invest \$12 billion to make much-needed investments to upgrade our passenger and freight rail lines, and to move people and goods more quickly and efficiently.

It is time for America to catch up with the rest of the world. There was once a time when we were No. 1 in infrastructure. Today we are No. 12.

I hear my friends on the other side talking about the debt we are going to be leaving our kids and our grandchildren, while we are going to be leaving them a crumbling infrastructure which at some point somebody is going to have to pay for unless we get our act together now.

America's airports are bursting at the seams as the number of passengers and cargo grows. The Airports Council International—North America says America needs \$76 billion over the next 5 years to accommodate growth in passengers and cargo activity and to rehabilitate existing facilities.

Moreover, and rather incredibly, our airports still rely on antiquated 1960s radar technology because Congress chronically underfunds deployment of a new satellite-based air traffic control system.

This amendment will invest \$6 billion to improve airports across the country. It will invest another \$6 billion to bring our air traffic control system

into the 21st century by accelerating deployment of NextGen technology that will make our skies safer and our airports more efficient. Anyone, as many of us do, who travels, who flies a lot, knows our airports need to be more efficient than they are.

Bottlenecks at our marine seaports, which handle 95 percent of all overseas imports and exports, cause delays that prevent goods from getting to their destinations on time. The same is true—perhaps even more so—for our inland waterways, which carry the equivalent of 50 million truck trips of goods each year.

My amendment will invest an additional \$1 billion a year to clear the backlog of projects needed to improve inland waterways, coastal harbors, and shipping channels. Our businesses simply can't compete in the global economy if they can't move their goods and supplies to, from, and within our country more efficiently.

Right now, more than 4,000 of the Nation's 84,000 dams are considered deficient—not in need of a few repairs, but deficient—serious problems.

Even worse, one of every 11 levees has been rated as likely to fail during a major flood. I will talk a little more about this issue in a few minutes as this is something that could concern everyone in the Senate.

My amendment will invest \$5 billion a year to repair and improve the high hazard dams that provide flood control, drinking water, irrigation, hydropower, and recreation across the country, and the flood levees that protect our cities and our farms.

Much of our drinking water infrastructure is nearing the end of its useful life. I like to tell the story of Rutland, VT. A few years ago that city—one of the largest in Vermont—had water pipes that were built before the Civil War—before the Civil War—and I think that is not all that uncommon. Cities and towns all over this country, in many instances, have pipes that go way, way, way back and are constantly breaking and causing serious leaks.

Each year, there are nearly one-quarter million water main breaks with the loss of 7 billion gallons of freshwater. Let me repeat that: Each year, there are nearly one-quarter million water main breaks with the loss of 7 billion gallons of freshwater. But that is nothing compared to the amount of water we lose through leaky pipes and faulty meters. In all, the American Water Works Association estimates that we lose 2.1 trillion gallons of treated drinking water every year—2.1 trillion gallons. Clearly, this is an issue that cannot continue to be delayed. We have to address that.

Our wastewater treatment plants aren't in much better shape than our freshwater pipes are. Almost 10 billion gallons of raw sewage is dumped into our Nation's waterways every year

when plants fail or pipes burst, often during heavy rains. My amendment would invest \$2 billion a year so States can improve the drinking water systems that provide Americans with clean, safe water.

The amendment would similarly invest \$2 billion a year to improve the wastewater and storm water infrastructure that protects water quality in our Nation's rivers and lakes.

America's aging electrical grid consists of a patchwork system of interconnected power generation transmission and distribution facilities, some of which date back to the early 1900s. Not surprisingly, the grid suffers from hundreds of major power failures every year, many of which are avoidable. Our grid is simply not up to the 21st century challenges it faces, including resiliency to cyber attacks. It is no wonder the World Economic Forum ranks our electric grid at just 24th in the world, in terms of reliability, just behind Barbados.

My amendment will invest \$3 billion a year for power transmission and distribution modernization projects to improve the reliability and resiliency of our ever more complex electric power grid. This investment will also position our grid to accept new sources of locally generated renewable energy and will address critical vulnerabilities to cyber attacks, an issue of great concern to many of us.

Another area where we are falling behind is Internet access and speed, and this is especially important to rural States such as Vermont. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the OECD, ranks the United States 16th in the world in terms of broadband access—16th in the world in terms of broadband success—not something we should be terribly proud of. We are only marginally better in terms of average broadband speed—12th in the world, according to Akamai's 2014 annual report.

How can it be that businesses, schools and families in Bucharest, Romania, have access to much faster Internet than most of the United States of America?

My amendment will invest \$2 billion a year to expand high-speed broadband networks in underserved and unserved areas and to boost speeds and capacity all across this country. Let us be clear: Internet access is no longer a luxury, it is essential for 21st century commerce, for education, for telemedicine, and for public safety. We cannot continue to lag behind many of our global competitors in terms of broadband quality and access.

That is a brief summary of what my amendment does. It addresses a chronic funding shortfall. It addresses the need to start the kinds of investments we need to bring our physical infrastructure into the 21st century. If \$478 billion over 6 years sounds like a lot of

money, please consider this: The American Society of Civil Engineers—the people who actually know the most about the state of America's infrastructure—says we need to invest \$3.6 trillion by 2020 just to get our Nation's infrastructure to a state of good repairs. So this amendment is a good start, but that is all it is. It is a good start. Much more has to be done.

Let me conclude by asking my fellow Americans to imagine an America where millions of people in our 50 States are hard at work earning good wages rebuilding our crumbling bridges, making our roads much better, dealing with wastewater plants, dealing with water systems, and dealing with our rail system. Think about what America looks like when we create an infrastructure that is 21st century.

Our job right now is to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. As a former mayor, I can absolutely assure you infrastructure does not get better all by itself. You can't turn around and ignore it and think it gets better. Quite the contrary, it gets worse. If you have a bridge right now which is in serious disrepair, it does not get better by ignoring it. It only gets worse, and in fact it ends up costing more money to rebuild it as it deteriorates.

So we have an opportunity right now. We have an opportunity to make our country more efficient, more productive, and safer by creating a 21st century infrastructure, and at the same time we have an opportunity to create millions of decent-paying jobs. In many respects, this is a no-brainer. This amendment is paid for by ending outrageous corporate loopholes that allow large profitable corporations from paying any Federal income tax. So I hope we will have wide bipartisan support for this amendment, which, as I understand it, will be voted on tomorrow, and I will officially bring it up in about half an hour.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I am going to talk about the fifth annual celebration of Congress Week, sponsored by the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress. It is a national commemoration which coincides with the week in which Congress achieved its first quorums in the year 1789.

Before I do so, let me make a couple of observations on other items of business in front of the Senate. First of all, we are about to embark on the annual process of adopting a budget. This Sen-

ator had the privilege as a young Congressman in my first year in the House of being assigned to the House Budget Committee. That was not long after the whole apparatus of the Budget Committees were set up requiring Congress to adopt an annual budget. The original reason for requiring it, and requiring a process called reconciliation, was so a majority vote—instead of what used to be the Senate cutting off debate at two-thirds, now it is 60 votes to cut off debate—would be required to pass a budget because of the tough decisions that needed to be made in lowering a deficit by cutting spending and raising tax revenue.

But along come the administrations in the early part of the last decade, and they reversed the process, using reconciliation not to require the hard votes for Senators and House Members in raising tax revenue but to do exactly the opposite with a majority vote, instead of having to reach the 60-vote threshold to cut off debate in the Senate.

So as the decade started, after the administration in 2000 transferred over to the new administration in 2001, with a healthy surplus, lo and behold the budget, in the course of the next almost decade, went completely out of whack. Instead of revenues being up and spending being here on a bar graph—the difference being the surplus of more coming in each year—it went in exactly the opposite direction. The tax revenues fell off so significantly because of the tax policies adopted through that budgetary reconciliation process in about the year 2001. The tax revenues fell off, the spending increased, and we went to huge annual deficits.

I don't know what the majority is going to try to use reconciliation for this time, but this Senator is looking for balance and common sense and taking care of the needs that government needs to provide—provide for the national security; provide for those who are the least fortunate among us; provide for what a society with a big heart like in America, reflected by the people who are elected in its representative government—to reflect the American people with a big heart and to keep our fiscal house in order.

So as we start this process, I think we ought to be listening to Senator SANDERS, the ranking member of the Budget Committee. We ought to be listening to the members of the Budget Committee. I have served on that committee up through this last Congress for 14 years. It is an important process, and it can be effective if it is not misused. That process was misused when it took us from a position of huge surpluses in the 1990s, up through 2000, to exactly the opposite, huge annual deficits.

## AIRPORT SECURITY

Madam President, I wish to mention another item I had occasion to be involved in over the weekend. If we go back to the latter part of last year, there was a 6-month period—if you can believe this—that guns were being smuggled onto commercial aircraft flying from Atlanta Hartsfield to New York City, where they were then sold on the streets in Brooklyn.

We might say: Well, if this criminal ring is selling guns in a State that does not allow the possession of guns—New York—why wouldn't they just run them up I-95 in a car or a truck? Because law enforcement was on to that. So they devised this ingenious scheme where instead they were bringing the guns into the passenger cabin of a commercial airliner—not once but over a 6-month period—and hundreds of guns were transported right in the passenger cabin.

Here is how the scheme worked: One perpetrator would go through TSA security with an empty knapsack, a backpack. Another perpetrator would go through security—because there was not an actual check of whether that airport employee at the Atlanta airport in fact had any contraband, he could get into the area underneath the aircraft, go up into the secure area for passengers, go into the men's room, and transfer the guns to the fellow with the empty backpack who had already come through security with TSA. They transferred—if you can believe it—an AK-47. At the time they finally picked up this fellow in December of last year, he had 16 handguns in his backpack.

Naturally, in our responsibility and as the ranking member of the commerce committee, I wanted to get into this. What I found is that they weren't doing those secure checks—like we do when we go through TSA as a passenger—in the perimeter of the airport for the thousands of employees who work at the airport. That is how they got the guns in and then did this scheme of transferring the guns. It is a good thing the perpetrator was a criminal, not a terrorist, because we can imagine what it would be like had he been a terrorist.

So what are the airports going to do about it? I would suggest they ought to take a look at the Orlando airport and also the Miami airport. This Senator visited the Orlando airport over the weekend. They took hundreds of entry points at the airport for their employees and boiled them down to a handful—specifically, 7 entry points for about 6,000 employees at the Orlando airport. They put up the metal detection devices, the conveyor belt that takes backpacks through the machine, that looks at their backpacks to see if there is any contraband, et cetera. So it was not financially prohibitive when they boiled down the number of entry

points for their employees to a manageable number. A similar thing was done at the Miami airport.

As a result, it has at first blush the appearance that this is a way of solving the problem. Now, sooner or later, if this kind of scheme happens in another airport, it is going to be absolutely unacceptable and intolerable as to what happened in the Atlanta airport.

The question is, What about employees losing their badges and somebody grabbing the badge and utilizing it? Well, at these screening points, they swipe their badge, but the officers in that reduced number of entry points for airport employees are checking the badge, looking at the picture on the badge and the person with the badge, and then having the holder of the badge go over and enter a personal identification number—a PIN number—as another safeguard before going into the secure area of the airport.

We are going to have to do this. There is no excuse for what happened in Atlanta.

## CONGRESS WEEK

Madam President, now I would like to speak about this great fifth annual celebration of Congress Week, and it goes back to when Congress first started in 1789, the very first quorums this Congress had. The birth of the Congress was not on a single day or an event, but it was a process of deliberation in the Federal Government that met in the spring and summer of 1787. They hashed out the Constitution, which provided for Congress to convene on March 4, 1789. On that date in New York City, which was the temporary capital at the time, the first meeting place of the Congress, cannons fired and church bells rang to announce the birth of the new Congress, but only a few Members of Congress had arrived by that date. Weeks passed before the House achieved its first quorum on April 1, with the Senate not getting a quorum until 5 days later on April 6. The House and Senate met jointly on April 6 in the Senate Chamber to count the ballots of the Presidential electors.

So Congress Week's theme, "The People's Branch," reflects and emphasizes that Congress is the part of the government designed to be closest to the people and the most likely to reflect the sentiment of the people—because it is those of us in the Halls of the House and the Senate who go back home and are directly reflective and responsible to our constituencies.

We try to keep historical records of all of this. Our congressional papers are some of the richest sources for the study of national affairs, local history, regional issues, and, of course, for American history. They document the legislative branch, and they document the history and foreign affairs of the country. It is imperative that we manage and preserve our own papers for fu-

ture historical research and study of democracy.

The Association of Centers for the Study of Congress, founded in 2003, is an independent, nonpartisan alliance of more than 40 organizations and institutions that preserve the papers of Members of Congress and promote a wide range of programs and research opportunities related to Congress. James Madison said that an informed citizenry was the best guarantee that this Nation's great experiment in representative democracy would work and survive for future generations.

So I want to call Congress Week to the attention of the Senate and to the Nation's public—awareness of the rich and colorful history of representative democracy through the institution of the United States Congress. I encourage our colleagues to preserve their records and the history of the individuals who make up this great institution.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan, Ms. STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his advocacy, passion, and hard work in laying out what this is all about.

I also appreciate the work of the distinguished chair, even though we have disagreements on the budget, because this is really an opportunity we have to create a serious budget—a serious budget that gives every American a fair shot to work hard and to get ahead and the opportunity to strengthen the middle class of our country. But that is not what is happening here.

What America needs is a middle-class budget. Unfortunately, instead, what we have is a budget that continues to rig the system on behalf of the wealthy and the well-connected. This budget does not close corporate tax loopholes or end practices such as inversions that take our jobs overseas. It doesn't even address the folks who pack up and leave the country and let taxpayers and workers pay the tab for the move.

This budget does not help us address our crumbling infrastructure, which is a burden on our workers and a drag on the economy. Frankly, if we address that, as our ranking Member has urged, we will create a lot of good-paying jobs, millions of middle-class jobs.

This budget does not invest in a meaningful way in education and opportunity for the future, which is the key to equipping our workers to excel in the global economy we all face, nor does it help make college tuition more affordable or help the millions of Americans who are struggling to pay back college loans. Too many young

people today, too many young professionals come out of college and get a job and have loans that are more than a mortgage would be. They can't afford to even buy a house as a result of it. This budget needs to address that.

This budget does nothing to address what is happening in terms of wages for tens of millions of Americans who are working hard every day trying to hold it together. It does not raise the minimum wage, nor does it help the millions of working women who are living in poverty. By the way, half of the women living in poverty could be lifted out of poverty if we really had equal pay for equal work. That is stunning. We could address that in this budget resolution.

This budget does not protect our seniors who have worked hard to earn the security that comes from Medicare and Social Security. We are talking about a situation where the House, in fact, outrageously is suggesting doing away with the Affordable Care Act that has a group of exchanges through which insurance companies have to compete to lower prices—a whole process of the Affordable Care Act that they want to eliminate. At the same time, they are proposing to put the same thing in place for Medicare—take away the universal structure of Medicare and create a situation that will be unstable and more costly for millions of seniors.

Finally, this budget calls for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, but it does some very interesting things. First of all, it would take health care coverage, medical care, away from 16.4 million families and raise taxes on millions of middle-class families right now. At the same time they are taking away medical care, health coverage, they turn around and exclude the Affordable Care Act from the process of points of order that are in this bill that say if there is a point of order—there can be a point of order against anything that increases the deficit except for the Affordable Care Act. We are going to exclude that. Why? Because the Affordable Care Act actually reduces the deficit, and they admit it in the resolution because they exclude that from points of order.

So we have a very interesting situation where, on the one hand, this budget takes away medical care, health care, extra help with closing what is called the doughnut hole for our seniors under medical, all the provisions, all the protections for people who already have insurance who now can't get dropped if they get sick and if they are sick can get insurance even if they have a preexisting condition, all of the folks who have their children on their insurance up to age 26, all of the other protections—gone under this budget. However, they admit that to do that actually increases the deficit, so they exempt the Affordable Care Act from that provision.

On top of that, we are talking about millions of Americans who would have increased costs. So people are going to get increased costs, increased taxes, increased deficit, and less medical care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator has used 5 minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. I ask if I may have 1 more minute.

Mr. SANDERS. The Senator may have 2 more minutes.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank my colleague and leader of the Budget Committee.

We are in this crazy situation where this bill would eliminate health care for 16.4 million Americans right now, most of whom have not had the ability to find affordable health care. It would raise their cost, raise their taxes, raise the deficit, and then at the same time this bill keeps the revenue and the cost savings from the Affordable Care Act. This is a pretty nifty trick, I have to tell you. So you lose your health care, but the revenue that is generated to pay for health services stays in the baseline. They are counting the revenue, they are counting the cost savings in this budget. They are counting the savings and taking away your health care. Not a good deal. I would suggest that is a very, very bad deal.

This is not honest budgeting. It certainly is not a budget that puts middle-class families first or those who are working very hard—one job, two jobs, three jobs—trying to lift themselves up to get into the middle class for themselves and their families.

It is not just irresponsible budgeting; it is irresponsible governing to create a document that hurts so many people in the priorities that are set—low-income people, middle-income people, those struggling hard and working hard to get into the middle class—but protects the interests of privileged Americans. This is a budget rigged for the wealthy and well-connected of the country, and I would urge a “no” vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator STABENOW not only for her remarks this evening but for the great work she has done on the Budget Committee, and I certainly concur with the thrust of what she is saying. Our middle class is struggling, and the wealthiest people are doing phenomenally well. Corporations are enjoying recordbreaking profits. CEOs make 270 times more than their average worker.

We don't need a budget that protects the top one-tenth of 1 percent and the CEOs of major corporations. We need a budget that protects working families and the middle class. I know that is something Senator STABENOW has been fighting for throughout this entire process, and I thank the Senator very much for that.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 323

(Purpose: To create millions of middle class jobs by investing in our nation's infrastructure paid for by raising revenue through closing loopholes in the corporate and international tax system)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 323, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 323.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me just reiterate what I said a moment ago. The wealthiest people in this country are doing phenomenally well. Ninety-nine percent of all new income created in America today is going to the top 1 percent. Those people are doing great. They don't need the help of the Senate. They are doing just fine. The top one-tenth of 1 percent own almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. Those people are doing extraordinarily well. They do not need the help of the Senate.

The people who do need the help are the working families and the middle class of this country, many of whom are working longer hours for lower wages. They, in fact, need our help. Seniors who are having to make the difficult choice of whether they heat their homes in the winter, buy the medicines they need, or buy the food they need, need our help. Young people in this country who would love to go to college but don't know how they can afford to go to college need our help. People graduating college with \$50,000, \$60,000, \$100,000 of debt and don't know how to pay off that debt need our help.

We have to get our priorities right. We have to know whose side we are on.

The amendment I am offering, which I suspect will be voted on tomorrow, is very significant in that it addresses two major issues. At a time when real unemployment in this country is not 5.5 percent—if we count those who have given up looking for work—and I believe the Presiding Officer touched on that issue during her remarks—if we count those who have given up looking for work or those who are working part time when they want to work full time, real unemployment is 11 percent. We need to create millions of jobs. Youth unemployment is at 17 percent. African-American youth unemployment is off the charts. Right now, when we talk to people all over this country, they say: Help us. Create decent-paying jobs.

That is what this amendment does. This amendment creates 9 million decent-paying jobs over a 6-year period, and it does it in a very sensible way.

Mr. President, I think you know, I know, and every Member of this body knows and virtually every American knows our infrastructure is crumbling. Our roads, our bridges, our water systems, our wastewater plants, our levies, our dams, our airports, and our rail system are in need of significant improvements. We cannot be a first-rate economy when we have a third-rate infrastructure. Everybody knows that.

Let me be very clear. If we don't invest in infrastructure today, it is not going to get better all by itself. It will only deteriorate. We keep pushing it off, and we keep pushing it off, and the roads get worse, the bridges get worse, and the water systems get worse. Now is the time to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure, and when we do that, we will create or maintain some 9 million good-paying jobs. I would hope that maybe once around here we can have bipartisan support for a piece of legislation that I believe in their hearts every Member of this body knows makes sense.

How are we going to pay for this? We are not going to pay for it by cutting Medicare. We are not going to pay for it by cutting Pell grants. We are not going to pay for it by cutting Head Start. We are not going to pay for it by asking low-income seniors to pay more for their prescription drugs. We are going to pay for it by an eminently fair way; that is, by undoing huge tax loopholes that enable large, profitable corporations in some cases to pay zero in Federal income taxes. It is time to end those loopholes. It is time to invest in our crumbling infrastructure. It is time to create millions of decent-paying jobs.

I would hope very much that we would have strong bipartisan support for this amendment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we have now had our first amendment offered, one to add more infrastructure. I doubt there is anybody in the Chamber—even when we are all here—who would doubt that we need to do things with infrastructure. My infrastructure time actually goes back to when I was elected mayor of Gillette, WY. It was a boom town. We didn't know how big it was going to increase. We knew we were already short of sewer, water, electricity, streets, sidewalks, not to mention po-

lice, garbage, and all the other things that come with it. The infrastructure was sorely lacking. In fact, one of the first calls I got was from a person who said: What are you going to do when your substation blows up? I had to ask what a substation was, and then I would have to ask why it would blow up. When it gets to 110 percent of capacity—or the first warm day—it ought to blow up. If that happened, the consequence of that was the people at Gillette would have been without electricity for about 6 weeks. I think in this day and age if a company went without electricity for 6 weeks, a person would be tarred and feathered. So I understand infrastructure and the need for it.

The Federal Government never once offered to do any infrastructure for me, and we didn't need them to either. But there are things the Federal Government has taken the responsibility for and that we need to make sure are funded and taken care of and repaired, and I am sure both sides of the aisle want to do that.

The title of this amendment sounds great, but when you get down into the details, there are some problems. The budget resolution has a deficit-neutral reserve fund for infrastructure and envisions that Congress will fully fund transportation priorities to strengthen our crumbling infrastructure with a new highway bill in May.

I have been here long enough to know we always do that. It is not very difficult to get the votes together to pass a highway bill. The difficulty, of course, is coming up with the money, but there is a deficit-neutral reserve fund established to allow the flexibility to get that to happen. It provides a mechanism so a bill can move. It allows authorizers to find new revenue or offsets to extend the life of the highway trust fund.

The Senate budget resolution strives to maintain a well-functioning national transportation system, a core element of the U.S. economy, which helps hard-working Americans while reducing lower priority items that do not contribute to a national transportation network and should be handled in a local way.

Our Nation's system of roads and bridges has deteriorated and is in desperate need of repair. Everyone here is fired up about the issue because we have all experienced these infrastructure deficiencies. We have seen bridges collapse. We have seen some of the deterioration of the roads. We have all been frustrated with traffic, bottlenecks and potholes.

Today, there are more than 1 million miles of roads eligible for Federal aid and more than 60,000 bridges are structurally deficient. However, the highway trust fund is bankrupt. Each year trust fund spending outpaces the revenues from the gas tax by about \$14 bil-

lion and that gap is growing. To compensate for funding shortfalls, the trust fund has required large transfers totaling \$65 billion since 2008, \$62 billion of which came from the general fund of the Treasury. We didn't use to have to do that. Usually the gas tax provided a big enough fund that we were able to increase the number of dollars spent on infrastructure.

When the Bowles-Simpson group met, their suggestion was that the gas tax—the user fee for cars using the highways—needed to be raised a nickel a gallon for each of three consecutive years. Unfortunately, that was about 5 years ago, and they predicted the money would run out before now if we didn't make that kind of a raise. There have been several things that have been proposed, but we never had a vote on any of them.

A one-time cash infusion from a corporate tax increase does not do anything to take care of the discrepancy between spending and revenues that results in the highway trust fund insolvency. We do need a long-term highway trust fund solution rather than another short-term fix that kicks the can down the road. A corporate tax increase is not a long-term solution for the problems of the highway trust fund.

I have been interested in the international tax piece, and that is the part the President hung his hat on for the infrastructure piece. The way that works is to mandate a 14-percent tax on all of the money that is overseas. I didn't really see any clause in there that allowed that to be paid over any kind of a period of time. We didn't need all of that revenue right in the first year.

I did an international tax piece that had a much lower repatriation fee on it and it was not mandatory. The difficulty of making it not mandatory is it doesn't score so it does not show any money coming back because nobody has to bring it back. They have to declare everything upfront and agree to pay the tax over a period of 5 years if they were going to bring it back. There would be 5 years of revenue from this repatriation of funds, even at a lower rate, which could fund what we are talking about here, or it could fund the other needs that have to be done in tax reform.

The way the budget is written, that is left up to the individual committees to come up with the solutions they need. It is not up to us here on the floor doing a budget where we have a mixture of people from all of the committees, but not the kind of structure we have in the specific committees to come up with the final solution for it. There has to be a solution, and I know it can be made, but it can't be done so that it bankrupts the companies. If we take the tax that is overseas and impose a 14-percent tax on it that has to be paid this year, we will bankrupt almost every company that is out there,

and the reason is they don't just have that money sitting over there; it is being used over there. They have to be able to sell off or reclaim whatever money they have in order to be able to pay any taxes on the money they have overseas. And that needs to be done, because if we can find a way for companies to bring their money back to the United States, they will invest it in the United States and it will grow the economy and we will have more jobs.

Incidentally, the best way to take care of most of these problems is to grow the economy, which is the opposite of what this administration is doing. It fascinated me that in the President's budget he said if we could grow the economy by just 1 percent, it would result in \$4 trillion in taxes. But everything I saw in there were ways to change that back so we didn't grow the economy the 1 percent to raise \$4 trillion.

I had the Congressional Budget Office look at it, and they said a 1-percent increase in the economy would raise \$3 trillion, so we have a small deficit difference, but that is a lot of money any way you look at it, whether it is the CBO's estimate or the President's estimate.

Some of Senator SANDERS' tax reform ideas have merit, but it should be dealt with within the context of the comprehensive tax reform and the highway bill. These tax policies have nothing to do with infrastructure and will force transportation spending even further away from the user-pays principle we have always had until recently when we started tapping some of the other trust funds.

The U.S. tax code is overly complicated, inefficient, and archaic. I think we all agree it needs to be fixed, and I believe Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN are on a path to do that. Both have taken a look at it very extensively and have been working on it for quite a while. Senator HATCH was working on it with Senator Baucus before Senator WYDEN became the chairman. I think the two of them are still working on it, and that is how it needs to be done. It is complicated, it is inefficient, it is archaic, it is too big, and it is not fair.

The current structure hurts economic growth, it frustrates working Americans, and it pushes American businesses overseas. Any discussion of international or corporate tax reform should be dealt with in the context of a comprehensive tax reform to simplify the entire system. We should not drag tax reform into the highway funding debate. One of the tendencies we have around here is to come up with some very simple solutions that, as a solution, sound like a really good idea, but when we get into the details, there are a whole bunch of complexities that result in unintended consequences that can foul up the whole system, and that

is one of the things that something as complex as our tax system can do if we try to write that as a budget resolution.

The budget resolution assumes the tax-writing committees will adopt a tax reform proposal that reduces marginal rates but broadens the tax base to create a fairer, efficient, competitive, progrowth tax regime that is revenue neutral, and I look forward to their work. I am on that committee so I will get to be a part of that work. One of the areas I am particularly interested in is, of course, small business.

I was in small business for a long time. My wife and I had shoe stores. If you have a small business corporation, you pay the taxes on the money you make in that given year, even though you still need to keep it invested in the business if you are going to keep the business going. Those are called the passthrough businesses, so we have to be careful that when we fix the corporate tax structure, we don't ruin the small business tax structure at the same time. That is a major complication, but when you get into the details of that, it gets even more complicated.

I am hoping we do both corporate and individual at the same time. I have listened to Senator SANDERS talk about and mention a number of corporations that didn't pay taxes and even got some money back, and my first reaction to that is that is terrible; it should not happen in America. But after I looked at it, I thought if they had really violated the law, they would be in jail. They didn't violate the law. They used the tax laws we have now, which shows why we need to have tax reform.

I am in favor of tax reform and eliminating loopholes. I had an opportunity to look at a number of the tax expenditures. I know some of the businesses that were listed as tax expenditures actually wound up getting a different name for the same thing they get to write off that every other business gets to write off, and so we have to be careful that when we eliminate those that we are not moving into another category because one of the tax breaks I looked at, if we eliminated it, it would allow them to write their expenses off much faster than how they agreed to write them off. So it is more complicated than it seems on the surface.

I am hoping we can eliminate some of that complication and eliminate some of those loopholes. I hope we can use some of the money for infrastructure and the rest for the simplification and fairness of it. Fairness is very important, and that is why we have the committee structures the way we do too so we can have people looking at the issues from both sides to make sure there is fairness in the eyes of as many people as possible. When we start tinkering with the tax code in very small ways, that is how we wind up with

these unfairness issues that appear in there. Helping out one sector can sometimes be adverse to another sector, but we don't realize it until the actual action takes place.

I am looking forward to the debate on infrastructure. It is my understanding we will vote on that sometime tomorrow around noon and that gives us an opportunity to have more debate on it.

In the meantime, I think we can probably come up with some common-sense solutions that could be worked through the committee, which was what was always envisioned in our budget.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of the time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### NOMINATION OF WILLIAM P. DOYLE TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William P. Doyle, of Pennsylvania, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for a term expiring June 30, 2018.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William P. Doyle, of Pennsylvania, to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner for a term expiring June 30, 2018?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.



The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 77 Ex.]

#### YEAS—89

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Ayotte	Fischer	Murray
Baldwin	Flake	Nelson
Barraso	Franken	Paul
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Blunt	Graham	Reed
Booker	Grassley	Reid
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Boxer	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Heitkamp	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Sanders
Cantwell	Hirono	Sasse
Capito	Hoeven	Schatz
Cardin	Inhofe	Schumer
Carper	Isakson	Scott
Casey	Johnson	Sessions
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Coats	King	Shelby
Cochran	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Collins	Lankford	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Markey	Tillis
Cornyn	McCaskill	Udall
Cotton	McConnell	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	Wyden
Ernst	Murkowski	

#### NOT VOTING—11

Crapo	Manchin	Sullivan
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Kirk	Portman	Vitter
Lee	Risch	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, Sanders amendment No. 323 is pending, and Senators should expect a vote in relation to that amendment at 12 noon tomorrow, with at least one additional rollcall vote in the stack before lunch.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes consideration of S. Con. Res. 11 tomorrow morning, there be 38 hours of debate time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with

Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Carolina.

#### ISRAEL

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I raise an issue before the body. I don't know how accurate the press reports are, but apparently the Chief of Staff of President Obama, Mr. McDonough, today spoke in town to a group called J Street, which is an organization supportive of the United States-Israel relationship, apparently. Here is what he allegedly said. He basically said that an occupation that has lasted more than 50 years must end.

So the Chief of Staff of the President of the United States, speaking in Washington today, called the Israeli presence in the West Bank an occupation. The Chief of Staff of the President of the United States is looking at a world completely different than the one I am viewing.

I ask Mr. McDonough and President Obama: Don't you realize the last time Israel withdrew in the Mideast—a Palestinian-controlled territory—was the withdrawal from Gaza and that when Israel voluntarily left Gaza, Hamas took over Gaza?

They are a terrorist organization and they fired up to 10,000 rockets from Gaza into Israel. Today, Israel has a presence in the West Bank. Today, Israel is surrounded by radical Islamists, unlike at any time I can remember.

The language used by the Chief of Staff of the President of the United States is exactly what Hamas uses. So now our administration is taking up the language of a terrorist organization to describe our friends in Israel.

Here is a question to the American people: Would you withdraw from the West Bank, given the situation that exists today on the ground between the Israelis and the rest of the region? Would you at this moment in Israel's history completely withdraw from the West Bank, given the experience in Gaza?

Does anybody on the left think that is a good idea? Does anybody in Israeli politics agree with the characterization of the Chief of Staff of President Obama? Does Mr. Herzog or anyone else in opposition to Prime Minister Netanyahu agree with this characterization? Is your country occupying the West Bank or are you there to make sure the West Bank doesn't turn into Gaza?

I talked with the Prime Minister Saturday and I congratulated him on a decisive victory and I look forward to working with him. He told me very clearly that he believes a two-state solution is not possible as long as the Palestinian Authority embraces

Hamas, which controls the Gaza strip and is a terrorist organization by any reasonable definition.

With whom do you make peace, Mr. President? What kind of deal can you make when almost half the Palestinian people are in the hands of a terrorist organization who vow to destroy you every day? What kind of deal is that?

So do I want a two-state solution? Yes, I would like a two-state solution, where the Palestinians recognize the right of Israel to exist and they have the ability to chart their own destiny. They are not anywhere near there. The Palestinian community is broken into two parts. The Hamas terrorist organization controls the essential part of the Palestinian community. They will not recognize Israel's right to exist. They are using the territory they hold as a launching pad for attacks against Israel routinely. These are the people who launch rockets from schoolyards and apartment buildings trying to blame Israel for being the bad guy when they respond.

All I can say is when I thought it couldn't get worse, it has. When I thought we couldn't reach a new low in terms of this White House's view of the Mideast, we found a way to reach a new low. Today, the Chief of Staff of the President of the United States used language to describe Israel that has been reserved for terrorist organizations up until now.

So, Mr. McDonough, President Obama, you are completely delusional about the world as it is. You are negotiating with an Iranian regime, and in the President's New Year's greeting he called on the Iranian people to speak out in support of a nuclear deal. Mr. President, don't you understand that in Iran you can't speak out; that if you do speak out and petition your government you can get shot or put in jail? You don't understand that? You are talking to people as if they have a voice. You are talking about the regime as if they are some kind of rational actor.

In that same New Year's greeting, the President complimented the regime, headed up by the Ayatollahs, as being cooperative in terms of their nuclear negotiations with the P5+1. What the President didn't mention is that this very regime that is spreading terror, unlike at any time in recent memory, is involved in the toppling of four Arab capitals. They are wreaking havoc on the neighborhood. As we are negotiating on their nuclear deal, they are still the largest state sponsor of terrorism. They called for death to America 2 days ago.

So I say to the Obama administration: Wake up and change your policies before you set the whole world on fire. Please watch your language because our best ally in the region, the State of Israel, does not deserve the label of "occupier," given the facts on the

ground, and they do not deserve to hear from the Chief of Staff of the President of the United States language that is usually reserved for a terrorist organization.

So when I thought it couldn't get any worse, it has. Let me put the Obama administration on notice. You may not like the fact that Prime Minister Netanyahu won, but he did, and here is what you need to understand. If you are recalculating the administration's support for Israel in terms of how you handle resolutions in the United Nations, you need to understand that Congress will recalculate how we relate to the United Nations if you stand on the sidelines and let the U.N. take over the peace process.

There will be a bipartisan, violent backlash in this body if the Obama administration does not veto a U.N. resolution defining the peace process in the Security Council, avoiding direct negotiations between the parties. I am here to say that one of the casualties of a haphazard foreign policy could be the relationship between the United Nations and the Congress. I promise there is bipartisan support in this body for two things: to stand firmly with Israel and not to allow the U.N. Security Council to take over the peace process in defining the terms of a deal.

Secondly, if there is a deal with the Iranians over their nuclear program, if this administration takes that deal to the U.N. Security Council, bypassing Congress and not coming to us first, there will become a great backlash regarding that move.

So I say to the Obama administration: Israel is not the problem. The Israeli people have not killed one American soldier. The Israeli people are in a dispute about their survival with the Palestinian people. The Israeli people gave land to the Palestinians, and in return they got 10,000 rockets, and you want them to do it again. Can't you understand why Israel may not want to withdraw from the West Bank given the history of Gaza? If you can't, you are completely blind to the world as it is, and your hatred and your disgust and your disdain for the Prime Minister has clouded your judgment.

So to our friends in Israel I say: There can only be one Commander in Chief, and that is the way it should be. But there are 535 of us in the House and the Senate and we do have your back. We will not sit on the sidelines and watch this rhetoric enacted in a manner that would put you at risk beyond what you already are in terms of risk.

This is a low point for me; that an administration, the Chief of Staff of an American President, would use this language, but it fits into an overall pattern that I think is very destructive. So I say to President Obama and Mr. McDonough: Your foreign policy is not working. If you don't get that, then God help us all because what you are

doing in the Mideast is not working. You are making everything worse, and now you have added fuel to the fire.

I hope there will be some self-correction at the White House; that we will not take this rhetoric any further than we have today; that there will be a re-evaluation of whether it is appropriate to call the Israeli people occupiers, given the facts on the ground. Only time will tell.

I do understand this, without any hesitation. There are many of us in this body who will not put up with this. We will push back. Israel has not killed one U.S. soldier. Israel hasn't toppled any of their neighbors. Israel doesn't chant "Death to America." You may not like the outcome of the Israeli election, but it was up to the Israeli people to decide, and they have decided.

All of us got into this body the same way—people at home voted for us. Under our Constitution, we have an equal voice to that of the President in terms of checks and balances. Even though he is the leader of America's foreign policy and the Commander in Chief, we do have the right to speak on such matters. So here is my voice, and I think I speak for many on both sides of the aisle when I say to the Israeli people: Do what you have to do to defend the Jewish State. To the President of the United States and Mr. McDonough: The language you used today is very unhelpful and, quite frankly, disconnected from reality.

I will end with this. Would any Member of this body, if they were in Israeli leadership, withdraw from the West Bank, given what is going on in the region? Would any Member of this body be as restrained in responding to a rocket attack coming from a neighbor as Israel has been restrained? What would we do if some terrorist organization next door to us launched a rocket trying to kill our children? Would we be as restrained as our Israeli friends? I doubt it.

I am asking this body to walk a mile in the shoes of the Israeli people and understand why this statement is so offensive and has usually been reserved by the leader of the free world to describe terrorist organizations.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. ERNST pertaining to the introduction of S. 841 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### CONGRATULATING SENATOR ERNST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the new Senator from Iowa, not only for her service in America's military for all of these years, but also for her service now in the Senate. She is obviously bringing to the Senate real expertise about the needs she addressed in her first piece of legislation. I expect it will enjoy broad bipartisan support, particularly with the sponsor having such firsthand knowledge of the needs of these returning veterans.

So on behalf of all Members of the Senate, I congratulate the Senator from Iowa for her new bill and for her first remarks.

#### LYNCH NOMINATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Loretta Lynch, the nominee to be our next Attorney General, has now been awaiting a vote on the Senate floor for 25 days. I have spoken many times about her historic nomination, her inspiring family, and her passion for the highest callings of public service.

Last week, a distinguished group of bipartisan law enforcement officials came together to call for the confirmation of Loretta Lynch. These individuals have dedicated the better part of their careers to protecting the American people, and they conveyed how important it is to have the Senate confirm the chief law enforcement officer in the country.

One of those individuals is my friend, Louis Freeh, former Director of the FBI and a Federal judge. Director Freeh wrote to the committee in support of Loretta Lynch that "[i]n my twenty-five years of public service—23 in the Department of Justice—I cannot think of a more qualified nominee to be America's chief law enforcement officer." He has further stated that "Ms. Lynch is an atypically non-political appointment for that office, a career professional without any political party ties or activity."

Loretta Lynch is also supported by the current New York police commissioner, who was appointed by a Democrat, and a former New York police commissioner, who was appointed by a Republican. She has earned the support of former U.S. attorneys from both Republican and Democratic administrations. She has the support of the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Major County Sheriffs' Association, and many, many others.

There is a very obvious reason for the bipartisan support Ms. Lynch has received—her qualifications are simply beyond reproach. She has been confirmed by the Senate twice before to

serve as the top Federal prosecutor based in Brooklyn, NY. Those who have worked with her over the course of her 30-year career described her as “even-handed,” “apolitical,” and believe she “will be a strong independent voice at the helm of the Department of Justice.”

Under her leadership, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of New York has brought terrorists to justice, obtained convictions against both Republicans and Democrats in public corruption cases, and fought tirelessly against violent crime and financial fraud. Her record shows that as Attorney General, Ms. Lynch will effectively, fairly, and independently enforce the law.

Many Americans are starting to wonder why she is being held up so long in light of her sterling record and in light of the very serious law enforcement challenges that we face in communities across the country. Unfortunately, the Republican Senate leadership is holding Ms. Lynch's nomination hostage to their political agenda and that does not reflect well on the Senate or their leadership.

President Obama announced the nomination of Ms. Lynch more than 4 months ago. The Judiciary Committee reported her nomination with bipartisan support 25 days ago. As of today, her nomination has been pending on the Senate floor longer than all of the past seven Attorneys General combined: Richard Thornburgh, 1 day; Bob Barr, 5 days; Janet Reno, 1 day; John Ashcroft, 2 days; Alberto Gonzales, 8 days; Michael Mukasey, 2 days; and Eric Holder, 5 days. This delay is an embarrassment for the Senate.

The excuses for holding up her nomination continue to mount and each excuse rings hollow given the importance of the position to which she is nominated.

First, the President and Senate Democrats were warned last November that we should not move Ms. Lynch's nomination during the lame-duck period last Congress. Senate Republicans claimed that she would be treated fairly if we waited. In fact, the current majority leader issued a statement last November, proclaiming that “Ms. Lynch will receive fair consideration by the Senate. And her nomination should be considered in the new Congress through regular order.” As a result, we acceded to their request. However, treatment of her nomination has not been fair when compared to her predecessors.

Despite Senate Republicans' request that we not move her nomination in the few weeks remaining in the lame-duck session, they now assert in the press that if this nomination was so important, then the President and Senate Democrats should have processed it during that very time of transition. Sometimes you can only shake your

head at what is said to excuse their delay. This nomination is for the top law enforcement officer in the Nation. It should not just be important to Democrats. It should be important to Republicans as well. It is important to all Americans.

I can remember when Judge Mukasey was nominated by President Bush to be Attorney General. From the date of announcement to confirmation, it took 53 days. Judge Mukasey received a floor vote just 2 days after he was reported from committee. And these were some of the remarks made by Senate Republicans at that time: “We should stop playing partisan political games with this nomination. The Justice Department is too important for this type of stuff.” “Forty days into the partisan wilderness is more than enough. We should confirm Judge Michael Mukasey without further delay.” There were expressions of outrage against Democrats after just 40 days. Contrast that to Ms. Lynch, who has now been waiting 135 days. Her nomination has been pending on the floor for 25 days whereas Judge Mukasey received a vote in 2 days. Where is the outrage from my fellow Senators on the other side of the aisle now?

Second, the majority leader announced 2 weeks ago that he would finally schedule a vote on Ms. Lynch's nomination last week. However, instead of doing so, the majority leader changed his mind and acted as if the Senate could not consider legislation and executive nominees at the same time. Now he has announced that she will not have a confirmation vote until after the Senate has concluded its debate on the human trafficking bill. The Senate often debates legislation and votes on nominations at the same time. Over the last week and a half, we voted on six other executive nominations while we were on the human trafficking bill. None of those executive nominations is more important than this one. The top law enforcement officer in the land is not a negotiating chip that any party should use for leverage. That is not how we respect the role that law enforcement officials play in our system of government.

What made the delay announced last Sunday more confounding is the fact that Loretta Lynch has a proven track record of prosecuting human trafficking and child rape crimes. Over the course of the last decade, her office has indicted over 55 defendants in sex trafficking cases and rescued over 110 victims of sex trafficking.

Ms. Lynch and her office have used the tools that Congress has provided them to bring traffickers to justice. In *United States v. Rivera*, the prosecutors in her office utilized the Trafficking Victims Protection Act to help them obtain a conviction against an owner of several New York bars for his role in a sex trafficking and forced

labor ring. The evidence at trial established that the defendants recruited and harbored scores of undocumented Latin American immigrants, and forced them to work as waitresses at the owner's bars. The owner and his accomplices used violence, including rapes and beatings, as well as fraud and threats of deportation, to compel the victims to work and prevent them from reporting the illegal activity to police. Because of the leadership Ms. Lynch showed in making such cases a priority, the bar owner was sentenced to 60 years in prison.

I am proud of the Senate's work to get the Trafficking Victims Protection Act reauthorized 2 years ago as part of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. We passed those laws with strong bipartisan support because we avoided unnecessary political fights, listened to the survivors, and responded to what they said they needed. I wish the Republican leadership would do the same on Senator CORNYN's trafficking bill. Unfortunately, it is many of the same Senators who voted against the reauthorization of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act and the Violence Against Women Act who have injected a divisive partisan fight here—over the objection of the very survivors they wish to help. It is this unnecessary fight that has stopped an otherwise bipartisan bill. And now, many of those same Senators are using this unnecessary conflict—a conflict they created—as an excuse not to move Loretta Lynch's nomination. So instead of working together to confirm a nominee with a proven commitment to stopping human trafficking, and instead of passing antitrafficking legislation that will help the survivors of this terrible crime, Senate Republicans have refused to do either one this month.

Loretta Lynch was recently named one of “New York's New Abolitionists” by the New York State Anti-Trafficking Coalition for her leadership in combating human trafficking. She has told members of the Judiciary Committee that human trafficking would be one of her top priorities if confirmed as Attorney General. And now, in the name of supporting human trafficking victims, Senate Republicans are blocking her nomination. That makes no sense. If we want to show our commitment to ending human trafficking, we should remove the unnecessary, partisan language from the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act—language that is not in the House-passed bill—and confirm Loretta Lynch without further delay.

It is time to stop delaying and making excuses. It is time to stop playing politics with our law enforcement and national security. There is only one holdup to Ms. Lynch's nomination to be Attorney General, and that is the party that the American public has entrusted to govern the Senate. I ask

that she receive a confirmation vote this week so that she can get to the peoples' work as our next Attorney General of the United States.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### CONGRATULATING JOHN DONATO

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate John Donato of Smithfield, ME, for his achievements in coaching over the past 45 years. His hard work for girls' basketball teams across the State led to an impressive 500th win this past December, placing him in an exclusive club of extraordinary coaches. The season finished on a high note for his Lawrence High School team with a State championship win, marking his fifth State championship title over the course of his career.

Mr. Donato's coaching record is stunning. While he passed the 500 mark for basketball wins in December and now has 514, he has a grand total of 1,247 wins across all sports. His longest winning streak with a basketball team was an incredible 88 games. Mr. Donato has a long history of excellence in sports, from playing at the Boston Garden in semifinals games as a shooting guard in high school to bringing teams to wins as a coach at Houlton, Messalonskee, Mount View, Hall-Dale, and Lawrence High Schools. After attending Ricker College, Mr. Donato spent an impressive 18 years coaching basketball and 25 years coaching baseball at Houlton alone.

While he was coach, the Houlton girls' basketball team won nine Eastern Maine Class B titles in 11 years and four State championships in 6 years. They had 261 wins overall. On top of that, his baseball team won two Eastern Maine titles, with 324 wins overall, and the golf team won two State championships. Mr. Donato then moved to central Maine, and after a year coaching at Hall-Dale High School, he began coaching at Messalonskee High School. There his team went 17-1 during his first season, a major turnaround from their 5-13 run the previous year. He would spend 8 years at Messalonskee, followed by 4 years at Mount View High School, and then began coaching girls' basketball at Lawrence in 2010. The girls' State championship victory this year marks Lawrence's first in 21 years.

I am not the first to recognize Mr. Donato's great achievements. He was the McDonald's All-Star Coach of the Year 12 times, Eastern Maine Class B Coach of the Year 8 times, Kennebec Valley Athletic Conference Coach of the Year 4 times, and State of Maine Girls' Basketball Coach of the Year 5 times.

Mr. Donato is not only a coach, but also a teacher and former business

owner, now in his 14th year teaching science at Lawrence High School. In each respect, he has proven a strong commitment to his community. Whether in the gym or the classroom, Mr. Donato brings knowledge of leadership and team building that is invaluable for our students. I am proud to represent people such as Coach Donato, an outstanding citizen of Maine, in the U.S. Senate. On the occasion of his 500th win and fifth State championship title, I extend my congratulations to him and the teams he has coached over the years.●

##### KENNEBUNK ROTARY CLUB 90TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to honor the many years of service provided by the Kennebunk Rotary Club, which is now entering its 90th year as an integral part of the Kennebunk community. The Kennebunk Rotary Club is an organization founded on a steadfast dedication to "Service Above Self", a motto that I believe we should all strive to fulfill.

I have had the privilege of speaking with rotary members on multiple occasions and I value their insight as important members of their local communities. I have also attended a number of rotary club meetings in Maine and as the son of a rotarian I have seen firsthand the positive impact that Rotary International has on communities in Maine and across the country.

For generations, local students, families, seniors, and people around the world have benefited from the Kennebunk Rotary Club and the many charitable events that it hosts annually. Indeed, some of these events have been a source of Kennebunk pride for years. These include cyber-crime awareness trainings for seniors, a 5K every summer, and a Christmas party to provide gifts for children who otherwise wouldn't have any under the tree.

In addition to these community events, the Kennebunk Rotary Club sponsors philanthropic programs such as the club's annual scholarship fund, which provides several local high school seniors with up to a \$1,500 to cover some college expenses. Scholarship programs such as the Kennebunk Rotary Club's open the door to success for Kennebunk graduates. The first recipient of this scholarship, Thomas Putnam, demonstrates the success of the program. Several years after he received his scholarship funds, he joined the Kennebunk Rotary Club and is today the director of the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library in Massachusetts.

Finally, the Kennebunk Rotary Club has been able to extend their love of community beyond the bounds of their scenic hometown, crossing international borders to help those in need. After a train carrying crude oil ex-

ploded in the small town of Lac-Mégantic, Quebec, the Kennebunk Rotary Club and the rest of Rotary International District 7780 sprang into action. They helped raise over \$25,000 in donations, which was used to provide 400 children with Christmas presents. It was my pleasure to work with Rotary International and U.S. Customs to ensure that those gifts arrived safely in Lac-Mégantic. Through collaboration and a little hard work, the Kennebunk Rotary Club was able to make a huge impact on the lives of many.

I would like to again thank the Kennebunk Rotary Club, and congratulate them on their 90 years of dedication to "Service Above Self." Their investment in Kennebunk, the great State of Maine, and communities across the globe has had a great effect on students, families, and seniors and will continue to open the doors of opportunity for years to come.●

##### RECOGNIZING RxIMPACT DAY

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I recognize the seventh annual RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill. This is a special day where we recognize pharmacies' contribution to the American healthcare system. This year's event organized by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, takes place on March 25-26. Nearly 400 individuals from the pharmacy community—including practicing pharmacists, pharmacy school faculty and students, State pharmacy leaders and pharmacy company executives—will visit Capitol Hill. They will share their views with Congress about the importance of supporting legislation that protects access to community and neighborhood pharmacies and that utilizes pharmacists to improve the quality and reduce the costs of providing health care.

Advocates from 45 States have traveled to Washington to talk about the pharmacy community's contributions in over 40,000 community pharmacies nationwide. These important health care providers are here to educate Congress about the value of pharmacists and protect access to the essential services they provide as part of our health care delivery system. And just as these providers traveled to meet with us, Members of Congress and their staff have toured retail chain pharmacies in our own communities more than 325 times since 2009.

As cochair of the Senate Community Pharmacy Caucus, I recognize that the local pharmacist is a trusted, highly accessible health care provider deeply committed to providing the highest quality care in the most efficient manner possible. Patients have always relied on their local pharmacist to meet their health care needs.

As demand for health care services continues to grow, pharmacists have expanded their role in health care delivery, partnering with physicians,

nurses and other health care providers to meet their patients' needs. Innovative services provided by pharmacists do even more to improve patient health care. Pharmacists are highly valued by those that rely on them most—those in rural and underserved areas, as well as older Americans, and those struggling to manage chronic diseases. Pharmacy services improve patients' quality of life as well as health care affordability. By helping patients take their medications effectively and providing preventive services, pharmacists help avoid more costly forms of care. Pharmacists also help patients identify strategies to save money, such as through better understanding of their pharmacy benefits, using generic medications, and obtaining 90-day supplies of prescription drugs from local pharmacies.

Pharmacists are the Nation's most accessible health care providers. In many communities, especially in rural areas, the local pharmacist is a patient's most direct link to health care. Eighty-nine percent of Americans reside within a 5-mile radius of a community pharmacy. Pharmacists are one of our Nation's most trusted health care professionals. Utilizing their specialized education, pharmacists play a major role in medication therapy management, disease-state management, immunizations, health care screenings, and other health care services designed to improve patient health and reduce overall health care costs. Pharmacists are also expanding their role into new models of care based on quality of services and outcomes, such as accountable care organizations, ACOs, and medical homes.

As we refine health care reform and seek new strategies to improve patient care, pharmacists will play a critical role. I believe Congress should look at every opportunity to make sure that pharmacists are allowed to utilize their training to the fullest to provide the services that can improve care and lower costs. In recognition of the seventh annual RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill, I would like to congratulate pharmacy leaders, pharmacists, students, executives, and the entire pharmacy community, for their contributions to the good health of the American people.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

#### PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2015 BUDGET AND FINANCIAL PLAN, RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE ON MARCH 20, 2015—PM 11

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to my constitutional authority and as contemplated by section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act as amended in 1989, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's fiscal year (FY) 2015 Budget and Financial Plan. This transmittal does not represent an endorsement of the contents of the D.C. government's requests.

The proposed FY 2015 Budget and Financial Plan reflects the major programmatic objectives of the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia. For FY 2015, the District estimates total revenues and expenditures of \$12.6 billion.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2015.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of March 19, 2015, the following reports of committees were submitted on March 20, 2015:

By Mr. ENZI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 11. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

On March 20, 2015, under the authority of the order of the Senate of March 19, 2015, the following concurrent reso-

lutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ENZI:

S. Con. Res. 11. An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; from the Committee on the Budget; placed on the calendar.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 829. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to refine how Medicare pays for orthotics and prosthetics and to improve beneficiary experience and outcomes with orthotic and prosthetic care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 830. A bill to increase the maximum percentage of funds available to the Department of Energy for laboratory directed research and development; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 831. A bill to reduce the number of nuclear-armed submarines operated by the Navy, to prohibit the development of a new long-range penetrating bomber aircraft, to prohibit the procurement of new intercontinental ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 832. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the provision of behavioral health readiness services to certain members of the Selected Reserve of the Armed Forces based on need, to expand eligibility to such members for readjustment counseling from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 833. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations were made for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 834. A bill to amend the law relating to sport fish restoration and recreational boating safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 835. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BURR, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 837. A bill to modify the criteria used by the Corps of Engineers to dredge small ports; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 838. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 839. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the rural add-on payment in the Medicare home health benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 840. A bill to require certain protections for student loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 841. A bill to expand eligibility for health care under the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to include certain veterans seeking mental health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. Res. 107. A resolution recognizing the 70th anniversary of White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico and commemorating the unique place in history, and national security importance, of the range; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 142

At the request of Mr. UDALL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 142, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 149

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Da-

kota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 149, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 150

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 150, a bill to provide for a biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes.

S. 183

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 301

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 301, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

S. 332

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 332, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 335

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 335, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 375

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 375, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a reduced rate of excise tax on beer produced domestically by certain qualifying producers.

S. 398

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 398, a bill to amend the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Programs Enhancement Act of 2001 and title 38, United States Code, to require the provision of chiropractic care and services to veterans at all Department of Veterans Affairs medical centers and to expand access to such care and services, and for other purposes.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to terminate Operation Choke Point.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 568

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 568, a bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, *supra*.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 655

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 655, a bill to prohibit the use of funds by the Secretary of the Interior to make a final determination on the listing of the northern long-eared bat

under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

S. 679

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 679, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to Medicare data.

S. 725

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 725, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 780

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 780, a bill to permit the televising of Supreme Court proceedings.

S. 793

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to incentivize State support for postsecondary education and to promote increased access and affordability for higher education for students, including Dreamer students.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 802, a bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 806

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to amend section 31306 of title 49, United States Code, to recognize hair as an alternative specimen for preemployment and random controlled substances testing of commercial motor vehicle drivers and for other purposes.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 824

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 824, a bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 833. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations were made for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I speak today regarding the introduction of a bill, cosponsored by Senator BOXER, to provide the Department of Veterans Affairs with the authority to obligate and expend previously appropriated funds in order to begin construction on critical projects in Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego, CA, as well as in Canandaigua, NY.

In December of 2014, Congress passed the Consolidated and Continuing Appropriations Act of 2015, which provided \$446,800,000 for major construction projects at these Veterans Affairs Medical Centers. However, the Department of Veterans Affairs cannot spend the money that has already been appropriated and begin construction on these projects because it lacks a separate authorization, which is required by law.

The funding provided for the three California projects will be used to make critical, time-sensitive seismic safety corrections to structures in West Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego. These buildings, which include a spinal cord injury clinic, a mental health care facility, and a community living center, are at exception-

ally high risk of collapse or suffering severe damage during an earthquake. If a major earthquake struck in proximity to one of these Medical Centers while it was in use by veterans and the Department's employees, there could be numerous injuries and deaths. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates there is a greater than 99 percent chance that a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake will strike California in the next 30 years.

It is important to note that even less severe earthquakes can cause damage to seismically unsafe buildings that result in injuries and deaths. The California Governor's Office of Emergency Services believes that the damage to seismically unfit buildings caused by the magnitude 6.0 earthquake that hit Napa, CA, on August 24, 2014 at 3:20 a.m. would likely have resulted in many more deaths and injuries if it had struck during business hours when these structures were in use. As it was, the earthquake caused over 200 injuries and one fatality. In fact, the U.S. Geological Survey estimates that a 6.0 magnitude earthquake hits California every 1.2 years on average. This is a terrifying figure, and it is why I strongly believe that Congress must enact this legislation without delay.

I appreciate that the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee worked extremely hard to pass important legislation last year to address the veterans' health care access crisis and that it, therefore, did not report a construction authorization bill. However, in the case of these four projects, the money has already been appropriated and is available for expenditure as soon as an authorization is forthcoming from Congress.

More hearings and delays are unnecessary to determine whether the Senate should pass this legislation. The Senate Appropriations Committee held hearings with the Department on these projects in 2014 as it reviewed the President's fiscal year 2015 Budget Request. The Committee marked up and reported the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies appropriations bill in a bipartisan fashion. Congress voted in a bipartisan fashion to pass this bill and approve funding for these projects as part of the Consolidated and Continuing Appropriations Act of 2015.

I want to reiterate that Congress appropriated funding for these four major medical projects in 2014, and the Department is ready to start construction today. However, due only to the lack of a separate authorization, the Department cannot start this vital work to protect our veterans and Federal employees. This is exactly why Americans believe that the Federal Government does not work. How does Congress explain this unnecessary delay to veterans who go to medical appointments in the buildings at risk of collapse or



major damage? There is no reason to delay authorizing these projects when the money has already been appropriated.

I urge my colleagues to join me in quickly approving this legislation so that the Department can begin modification of buildings that currently leave veterans and the Department's employees in harm's way before the next earthquake strikes California. Congress must act before the next earthquake strikes.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 838. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 838

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Consumers from Unreasonable Credit Rates Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) attempts have been made to prohibit usurious interest rates in America since colonial times;

(2) at the Federal level, in 2006, Congress enacted a Federal 36 percent annualized usury cap for servicemembers and their families for covered credit products, as defined by the Department of Defense, which curbed payday, car title, and tax refund lending around military bases;

(3) notwithstanding such attempts to curb predatory lending, high-cost lending persists in all 50 States due to loopholes in State laws, safe harbor laws for specific forms of credit, and the exportation of unregulated interest rates permitted by preemption;

(4) due to the lack of a comprehensive Federal usury cap, consumers annually pay approximately \$17,000,000,000 for high-cost overdraft loans, as much as \$7,000,000,000 for storefront and online payday loans, and additional amounts in unreported revenues from bank direct deposit advance loans and high-cost online installment loans;

(5) cash-strapped consumers pay on average 400 percent annual interest for payday loans, 300 percent annual interest for car title loans, up to 3,500 percent for bank overdraft loans, and triple-digit rates for online installment loans;

(6) a national maximum interest rate that includes all forms of fees and closes all loopholes is necessary to eliminate such predatory lending; and

(7) alternatives to predatory lending that encourage small dollar loans with minimal or no fees, installment payment schedules, and affordable repayment periods should be encouraged.

#### SEC. 3. NATIONAL MAXIMUM INTEREST RATE.

Chapter 2 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1631 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### "SEC. 140B. MAXIMUM RATES OF INTEREST.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no creditor may make an extension of credit to a consumer with respect to which the fee and interest rate, as defined in subsection (b), exceeds 36 percent.

"(b) FEE AND INTEREST RATE DEFINED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the fee and interest rate includes all charges payable, directly or indirectly, incident to, ancillary to, or as a condition of the extension of credit, including—

"(A) any payment compensating a creditor or prospective creditor for—

"(i) an extension of credit or making available a line of credit, such as fees connected with credit extension or availability such as numerical periodic rates, annual fees, cash advance fees, and membership fees; or

"(ii) any fees for default or breach by a borrower of a condition upon which credit was extended, such as late fees, creditor-imposed not sufficient funds fees charged when a borrower tenders payment on a debt with a check drawn on insufficient funds, overdraft fees, and over limit fees;

"(B) all fees which constitute a finance charge, as defined by rules of the Bureau in accordance with this title;

"(C) credit insurance premiums, whether optional or required; and

"(D) all charges and costs for ancillary products sold in connection with or incidental to the credit transaction.

"(2) TOLERANCES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to a credit obligation that is payable in at least 3 fully amortizing installments over at least 90 days, the term 'fee and interest rate' does not include—

"(i) application or participation fees that in total do not exceed the greater of \$30 or, if there is a limit to the credit line, 5 percent of the credit limit, up to \$120, if—

"(I) such fees are excludable from the finance charge pursuant to section 106 and regulations issued thereunder;

"(II) such fees cover all credit extended or renewed by the creditor for 12 months; and

"(III) the minimum amount of credit extended or available on a credit line is equal to \$300 or more;

"(ii) a late fee charged as authorized by State law and by the agreement that does not exceed either \$20 per late payment or \$20 per month; or

"(iii) a creditor-imposed not sufficient funds fee charged when a borrower tenders payment on a debt with a check drawn on insufficient funds that does not exceed \$15.

"(B) ADJUSTMENTS FOR INFLATION.—The Bureau may adjust the amounts of the tolerances established under this paragraph for inflation over time, consistent with the primary goals of protecting consumers and ensuring that the 36 percent fee and interest rate limitation is not circumvented.

"(C) CALCULATIONS.—

"(1) OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.—For an open end credit plan—

"(A) the fee and interest rate shall be calculated each month, based upon the sum of all fees and finance charges described in subsection (b) charged by the creditor during the preceding 1-year period, divided by the average daily balance; and

"(B) if the credit account has been open less than 1 year, the fee and interest rate shall be calculated based upon the total of all fees and finance charges described in sub-

section (b)(1) charged by the creditor since the plan was opened, divided by the average daily balance, and multiplied by the quotient of 12 divided by the number of full months that the credit plan has been in existence.

"(2) OTHER CREDIT PLANS.—For purposes of this section, in calculating the fee and interest rate, the Bureau shall require the method of calculation of annual percentage rate specified in section 107(a)(1), except that the amount referred to in that section 107(a)(1) as the 'finance charge' shall include all fees, charges, and payments described in subsection (b)(1) of this section.

"(3) ADJUSTMENTS AUTHORIZED.—The Bureau may make adjustments to the calculations in paragraphs (1) and (2), but the primary goals of such adjustment shall be to protect consumers and to ensure that the 36 percent fee and interest rate limitation is not circumvented.

"(d) DEFINITION OF CREDITOR.—As used in this section, the term 'creditor' has the same meaning as in section 702(e) of the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (15 U.S.C. 1691a(e)).

"(e) NO EXEMPTIONS PERMITTED.—The exemption authority of the Bureau under section 105 shall not apply to the rates established under this section or the disclosure requirements under section 127(b)(6).

"(f) DISCLOSURE OF FEE AND INTEREST RATE FOR CREDIT OTHER THAN OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.—In addition to the disclosure requirements under section 127(b)(6), the Bureau may prescribe regulations requiring disclosure of the fee and interest rate established under this section.

"(g) RELATION TO STATE LAW.—Nothing in this section may be construed to preempt any provision of State law that provides greater protection to consumers than is provided in this section.

"(h) CIVIL LIABILITY AND ENFORCEMENT.—In addition to remedies available to the consumer under section 130(a), any payment compensating a creditor or prospective creditor, to the extent that such payment is a transaction made in violation of this section, shall be null and void, and not enforceable by any party in any court or alternative dispute resolution forum, and the creditor or any subsequent holder of the obligation shall promptly return to the consumer any principal, interest, charges, and fees, and any security interest associated with such transaction. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or repose, a violation of this section may be raised as a matter of defense by recoupment or setoff to an action to collect such debt or repossess related security at any time.

"(i) VIOLATIONS.—Any person that violates this section, or seeks to enforce an agreement made in violation of this section, shall be subject to, for each such violation, 1 year in prison and a fine in an amount equal to the greater of—

"(1) 3 times the amount of the total accrued debt associated with the subject transaction; or

"(2) \$50,000.

"(j) STATE ATTORNEYS GENERAL.—An action to enforce this section may be brought by the appropriate State attorney general in any United States district court or any other court of competent jurisdiction within 3 years from the date of the violation, and such attorney general may obtain injunctive relief."

#### SEC. 4. DISCLOSURE OF FEE AND INTEREST RATE FOR OPEN END CREDIT PLANS.

Section 127(b)(6) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1637(b)(6)) is amended by striking "the total finance charge expressed" and

all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting "the fee and interest rate, displayed as 'FAIR', established under section 141.".

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 839. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the rural add-on payment in the Medicare home health benefit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleague from Washington to introduce the Preserve Access to Rural Home Health Services Act of 2015 to extend the modest increase in payments for home health services in rural areas that otherwise will expire on January 1 of next year.

Home health has become an increasingly important part of our health care system. The kinds of highly skilled—and often technically complex—services that our Nation's home health caregivers provide have enabled millions of our most frail and vulnerable older and disabled citizens to avoid hospitals and nursing homes and stay just where they want to be—in the comfort, privacy, and security of their own homes. I have accompanied several of Maine's caring home health nurses on their visits to patients and have seen first hand the difference that they are making for patients and their families.

Surveys have shown that the delivery of home health services in rural areas can be as much as 12 to 15 percent more costly because of the extra travel time required to cover long distances between patients, higher transportation expenses, and other factors. Because of the longer travel times, rural caregivers are unable to make as many visits in a day as their urban counterparts. For example, home health care agencies in Aroostook County in Northern Maine, where I am from, cover almost 6,700 square miles, with an average population of less than 11 persons per square mile. These agencies' costs are understandably much higher than other agencies located in more urban areas due to the long distances the staff must drive to see clients. Moreover, the staff is not able to see as many patients due to time on the road.

Agencies serving rural areas are also frequently smaller than their urban counterparts, which means that their relative costs are higher. Smaller agencies with fewer patients and fewer visits mean that fixed costs, particularly those associated with meeting regulatory requirements, are spread over a much smaller number of patients and visits, increasing overall per-patient and per-visit costs.

Moreover, in many rural areas, home health agencies are the primary caregivers for homebound beneficiaries with limited access to transportation. These rural patients often require more

time and care than their urban counterparts and are understandably more expensive for agencies to serve. If the extra three percent rural payment is not extended, agencies may be forced to make decisions not to accept rural patients with greater care needs. That could translate into less access to health care for ill, homebound seniors. The result would likely be that these seniors would be hospitalized more frequently and would have to seek care in nursing homes, adding considerable cost to the system.

Failure to extend the rural add-on payment would only put more pressure on rural home health agencies that are already operating on very narrow margins and could force some of the agencies to close their doors altogether. If any of these agencies were forced to close, the Medicare patients in that region could lose all of their access to home care.

The legislation we are introducing today will extend the rural add-on for 5 years and help to ensure that Medicare patients in rural areas continue to have access to the home health services they need. Moreover, we would offset costs of the bill by reducing the home health outlier fund by .25 percent over the same 5 years. I urge our colleagues to join us as cosponsors.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 840. A bill to require certain protections for student loan borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 840

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights".

#### SEC. 2. TRUTH IN LENDING ACT AMENDMENTS.

The Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 128 (15 U.S.C. 1638)—

(A) in subsection (e)—

(i) in the subsection heading, by striking "PRIVATE";

(ii) in paragraph (1)(O), by striking "paragraph (6)" and inserting "paragraph (9)";

(iii) in paragraph (2)(L), by striking "paragraph (6)" and inserting "paragraph (9)";

(iv) in paragraph (4)(C), by striking "paragraph (7)" and inserting "paragraph (10)";

(v) by redesignating paragraphs (5) through (11) as paragraphs (8) through (14), respectively;

(vi) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

"(5) DISCLOSURES BEFORE FIRST FULLY AMORTIZED PAYMENT.—Not fewer than 30 days and not more than 150 days before the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due from the borrower, the

postsecondary educational lender shall disclose to the borrower, clearly and conspicuously—

"(A) the information described in—

"(i) paragraph (2)(A) (adjusted, as necessary, for the rate of interest in effect on the date the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due);

"(ii) subparagraphs (B) through (G) of paragraph (2);

"(iii) paragraph (2)(H) (adjusted, as necessary, for the rate of interest in effect on the date the first fully amortized payment on a postsecondary education loan is due);

"(iv) paragraph (2)(K); and

"(v) subparagraphs (O) and (P) of paragraph (2);

"(B) the scheduled date upon which the first fully amortized payment is due;

"(C) the name of the lender and servicer, and the address to which communications and payments should be sent including a telephone number and website where the borrower may obtain additional information;

"(D) a description of alternative repayment plans, including loan consolidation or refinancing, and servicemember or veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) or other Federal or State law related to postsecondary education loans; and

"(E) a statement that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under paragraph (15)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (15)(I).

"(6) DISCLOSURES WHEN BORROWER IS 30 DAYS DELINQUENT.—Not fewer than 5 days after a borrower becomes 30 days delinquent on a postsecondary education loan, the postsecondary educational lender shall disclose to the borrower, clearly and conspicuously—

"(A) the date on which the loan will be charged-off (as defined in paragraph (15)(A)) or assigned to collections, including the consequences of such charge-off or assignment to collections, if no payment is made;

"(B) the minimum payment that the borrower must make to avoid the loan being charged off (as defined in paragraph (15)(A)) or assigned to collection, and the minimum payment that the borrower must make to bring the loan current;

"(C) a statement informing the borrower that a payment of less than the minimum payment described in subparagraph (B) could result in the loan being charged off (as defined in paragraph (15)(A)) or assigned to collection; and

"(D) a statement that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under paragraph (15)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (15)(I).

"(7) DISCLOSURES WHEN BORROWER IS HAVING DIFFICULTY MAKING PAYMENT OR IS 60 DAYS DELINQUENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Not fewer than 5 days after a borrower notifies a postsecondary educational lender that the borrower is having difficulty making payment or a borrower becomes 60 days delinquent on a postsecondary education loan, the postsecondary educational lender shall—

"(i) complete a full review of the borrower's postsecondary education loan and make a reasonable effort to obtain the information necessary to determine—

“(I) if the borrower is eligible for an alternative repayment plan, including loan consolidation or refinancing; and

“(II) if the borrower is eligible for servicemember or veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) or other Federal or State law related to postsecondary education loans;

“(ii) provide the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about alternative repayment plans and benefits for which the borrower is eligible, including all terms, conditions, and fees or costs associated with such repayment plan, pursuant to paragraph (8)(D);

“(iii) allow the borrower not less than 30 days to apply for an alternative repayment plan or benefits, if eligible; and

“(iv) notify the borrower that a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison Designated under paragraph (15)(I) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits related to postsecondary education loans, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to paragraph (15)(I).

“(B) FORBEARANCE OR DEFERMENT.—If a borrower notifies the postsecondary educational lender that a long-term alternative repayment plan is not appropriate, the postsecondary educational lender may comply with this paragraph by providing the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about short-term options to address an anticipated short-term difficulty in making payments, such as forbearance or deferment options, including all terms, conditions, and fees or costs associated with such options pursuant to paragraph (8)(D).

“(C) NOTIFICATION PROCESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Each postsecondary educational lender shall establish a process, in accordance subparagraph (A), for a borrower to notify the lender that—

“(I) the borrower is having difficulty making payments on a postsecondary education loan; and

“(II) a long-term alternative repayment plan is not needed.

“(ii) CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU REQUIREMENTS.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall promulgate rules establishing minimum standards for postsecondary educational lenders in carrying out the requirements of this paragraph and a model form for borrowers to notify postsecondary educational lenders of the information under this paragraph.”;

(vii) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by clause (v), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) MODEL DISCLOSURE FORM FOR ALTERNATIVE REPAYMENT PLANS, FORBEARANCE, AND DEFERMENT OPTIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall develop and issue model forms to allow borrowers to compare alternative repayment plans, forbearance, and deferment options with the borrower's existing repayment plan with respect to a postsecondary education loan. Such forms shall include the following:

“(i) The total amount to be paid over the life of the loan.

“(ii) The total amount in interest to be paid over the life of the loan.

“(iii) The monthly payment amount.

“(iv) The expected pay-off date.

“(v) Related fees and costs.

“(vi) Eligibility requirements, and how the borrower can apply for the alternative repayment plan, forbearance, or deferment option.

“(vii) Any relevant consequences due to action or inaction, such as default, including any actions that would result in the loss of eligibility for alternative repayment plans, forbearance, or deferment options.”;

(viii) in paragraph (11), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking “paragraph (7)” and inserting “paragraph (10)”;

(ix) by striking paragraph (13), as redesignated by clause (v), and inserting the following:

“(13) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

“(A) the terms ‘covered educational institution’, ‘private educational lender’, and ‘private education loan’ have the same meanings as in section 140; and

“(B) the term ‘postsecondary education loan’ means

“(i) a private education loan; or

“(ii) a loan made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq., 1087a et seq., and 1087aa et seq.)”;

(x) in paragraph (14), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking “paragraph (5)” and inserting “paragraph (8)”;

(xi) by adding at the end the following:

“(15) STUDENT LOAN BORROWER BILL OF RIGHTS.—

“(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(i) BORROWER.—The term ‘borrower’ means the person to whom a postsecondary education loan is extended.

“(ii) CHARGE OFF.—The term ‘charge off’ means charge to profit and loss, or subject to any similar action.

“(iii) QUALIFIED WRITTEN REQUEST.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified written request’ means a written correspondence of a borrower (other than notice on a payment medium supplied by the student loan servicer) transmitted by mail, facsimile, or electronically through an email address or website designated by the student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers that—

“(aa) includes, or otherwise enables the student loan servicer to identify, the name and account of the borrower; and

“(bb) includes, to the extent applicable—

“(AA) sufficient detail regarding the information sought by the borrower; or

“(BB) a statement of the reasons for the belief of the borrower that there is an error regarding the account of the borrower.

“(II) CORRESPONDENCE DELIVERED TO OTHER ADDRESSES.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—A written correspondence of a borrower is a qualified written request if the written correspondence is transmitted to and received by a student loan servicer at a mailing address, facsimile number, email address, or website address other than the address or number designated by that student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers but the written correspondence meets the requirements under items (aa) and (bb) of subclause (I).

“(bb) DUTY TO TRANSFER.—A student loan servicer shall, within a reasonable period of time, transfer a written correspondence of a borrower received by the student loan servicer at a mailing address, facsimile number, email address, or website address other than the address or number designated by that student loan servicer to receive communications from borrowers to the correct address or appropriate office or other unit of the student loan servicer.

“(cc) DATE OF RECEIPT.—A written correspondence of a borrower transferred in accordance with item (bb) shall be deemed to be received by the student loan servicer on the date on which the written correspondence is transferred to the correct address or appropriate office or other unit of the student loan servicer.

“(iv) SERVICER.—The term ‘servicer’ means the person responsible for the servicing of a postsecondary education loan, including any agent of such person or the person who makes, owns, or holds a loan if such person also services the loan.

“(v) SERVICING.—The term ‘servicing’ means—

“(I) receiving any scheduled periodic payments from a borrower pursuant to the terms of a postsecondary education loan;

“(II) making the payments of principal and interest and such other payments with respect to the amounts received from the borrower, as may be required pursuant to the terms of the loan; and

“(III) performing other administrative services with respect to the loan.

“(B) SALE, TRANSFER, OR ASSIGNMENT.—If the sale, other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations of a postsecondary education loan results in a change in the identity of the party to whom the borrower must send subsequent payments or direct any communications concerning the loan—

“(i) the transferor shall—

“(I) notify the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, not fewer than 45 days before transferring a legally enforceable right to receive payment from the borrower on such loan, of—

“(aa) the sale or other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(bb) the identity of the transferee;

“(cc) the name and address of the party to whom subsequent payments or communications must be sent;

“(dd) the telephone numbers and websites of both the transferor and the transferee;

“(ee) the effective date of the sale, transfer, or assignment;

“(ff) the date on which the transferor will stop accepting payment; and

“(gg) the date on which the transferee will begin accepting payment; and

“(II) forward any payment from a borrower with respect to such postsecondary education loan to the transferee, immediately upon receiving such payment, during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the transferor stops accepting payment of such postsecondary education loan; and

“(ii) the transferee shall—

“(I) notify the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, not fewer than 45 days before acquiring a legally enforceable right to receive payment from the borrower on such loan, of—

“(aa) the sale or other transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(bb) the identity of the transferor;

“(cc) the name and address of the party to whom subsequent payments or communications must be sent;

“(dd) the telephone numbers and websites of both the transferor and the transferee;

“(ee) the effective date of the sale, transfer, assignment, or transfer of servicing obligations;

“(ff) the date on which the transferor will stop accepting payment; and

“(gg) the date on which the transferee will begin accepting payment;

“(II) accept as on-time and may not impose any late fee or finance charge for any payment from a borrower with respect to such

postsecondary education loan that is forwarded from the transferor during the 60-day period beginning on the date on which the transferor stops accepting payment, if the transferor receives such payment on or before the applicable due date, including any grace period;

“(III) provide borrowers a simple, online process for transferring existing electronic fund transfer authority; and

“(IV) honor any promotion or benefit offered to the borrower or advertised by the previous owner or transferor of such postsecondary education loan.

“(C) MATERIAL CHANGE IN MAILING ADDRESS OR PROCEDURE FOR HANDLING PAYMENTS.—If a servicer makes a change in the mailing address, office, or procedures for handling payments with respect to any postsecondary education loan, and such change causes a delay in the crediting of the account of the borrower made during the 60-day period following the date on which such change took effect, the servicer may not impose any late fee or finance charge for a late payment on such postsecondary education loan.

“(D) APPLICATION OF PAYMENTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, upon receipt of a payment, the servicer shall apply amounts first to the interest and fees owed on the payment due date, and then to the principal balance of the postsecondary education loan bearing the highest annual percentage rate, and then to each successive interest and fees and then principal balance bearing the next highest annual percentage rate, until the payment is exhausted. A borrower may instruct or expressly authorize the servicer to apply payments in a different manner.

“(ii) APPLICATION OF EXCESS AMOUNTS.—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, upon receipt of a payment, the servicer shall apply amounts in excess of the minimum payment amount first to the interest and fees owed on the payment due date, and then to the principal balance of the postsecondary education loan bearing the highest annual percentage rate, and then to each successive interest and fees and principal balance bearing the next highest annual percentage rate, until the payment is exhausted. A borrower may instruct or expressly authorize the servicer to apply such excess payments in a different manner. A borrower may also voluntarily increase the periodic payment amount, including by increasing their recurring electronic payment, with the right to return to their original amortization schedule at any time. Servicers shall provide a simple, online method to allow borrowers to make voluntary one-time additional payments, voluntarily increase the amount of their periodic payment, and return to their original amortization schedule.

“(iii) APPLY PAYMENT ON DATE RECEIVED.—Unless otherwise directed by the borrower of a postsecondary education loan, a servicer shall apply payments to a borrower's account on the date the payment is received.

“(iv) PROMULGATION OF RULES.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, may promulgate rules for the application of postsecondary education loan payments that—

“(I) implements the requirements in this section;

“(II) minimizes the amount of fees and interest incurred by the borrower and the total loan amount paid by the borrower;

“(III) minimizes delinquencies, assignments to collection, and charge-offs;

“(IV) requires servicers to apply payments on the date received; and

“(V) allows the borrower to instruct the servicer to apply payments in a manner preferred by the borrower, including excess payments.

“(v) METHOD THAT BEST BENEFITS BORROWER.—In promulgating the rules under clause (iv), the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall choose the application method that best benefits the borrower and is compatible with existing repayment options.

“(E) LATE FEES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A late fee may not be charged to a borrower for a postsecondary education loan under any of the following circumstances, either individually or in combination:

“(I) On a per-loan basis when a borrower has multiple postsecondary education loans in a billing group.

“(II) In an amount greater than 4 percent of the amount of the payment past due.

“(III) Before the end of the 15-day period beginning on the date the payment is due.

“(IV) More than once with respect to a single late payment.

“(V) The borrower fails to make a singular, non-successive regularly-scheduled payment on the postsecondary education loan.

“(ii) COORDINATION WITH SUBSEQUENT LATE FEES.—No late fee may be charged to a borrower for a postsecondary education loan relating to an insufficient payment if the payment is made on or before the due date of the payment, or within any applicable grace period for the payment, if the insufficiency is attributable only to a late fee relating to an earlier payment, and the payment is otherwise a full payment for the applicable period.

“(F) REHABILITATION OF LOANS.—If a borrower of a private education loan successfully and voluntarily makes 9 payments within 20 days of the due date during 10 consecutive months of amounts owed on the private education loan, or otherwise brings the private education loan current after the loan is charged-off, the loan shall be considered rehabilitated, and the lender or servicer shall request that any consumer reporting agency to which the charge-off was reported remove the delinquency that led to the charge-off and the charge-off from the borrower's credit history.

“(G) BORROWER INQUIRIES.—

“(i) DUTY OF STUDENT LOAN SERVICERS TO RESPOND TO BORROWER INQUIRIES.—

“(I) NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF REQUEST.—If a borrower of a postsecondary education loan submits a qualified written request to the student loan servicer for information relating to the student loan servicing of the postsecondary education loan, the student loan servicer shall provide a written response acknowledging receipt of the qualified written request within 5 business days unless any action requested by the borrower is taken within such period.

“(II) ACTION WITH RESPECT TO INQUIRY.—Not later than 30 business days after the receipt from a borrower of a qualified written request under subclause (I) and, if applicable, before taking any action with respect to the qualified written request of the borrower, the student loan servicer shall—

“(aa) make appropriate corrections in the account of the borrower, including the crediting of any late fees, and transmit to the borrower a written notification of such correction (which shall include the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of a representative of the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower);

“(bb) after conducting an investigation, provide the borrower with a written explanation or clarification that includes—

“(AA) to the extent applicable, a statement of the reasons for which the student loan servicer believes the account of the borrower is correct as determined by the student loan servicer; and

“(BB) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of an individual employed by, or the office or department of, the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower; or

“(cc) after conducting an investigation, provide the borrower with a written explanation or clarification that includes—

“(AA) information requested by the borrower or explanation of why the information requested is unavailable or cannot be obtained by the student loan servicer; and

“(BB) the name and toll-free or collect-call telephone number of an individual employed by, or the office or department of, the student loan servicer who can provide assistance to the borrower.

“(III) LIMITED EXTENSION OF RESPONSE TIME.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—There may be 1 extension of the 30-day period described in subclause (II) of not more than 15 days if, before the end of such 30-day period, the student loan servicer notifies the borrower of the extension and the reasons for the delay in responding.

“(bb) REPORTS TO BUREAU.—Each student loan servicer shall, on an annual basis, report to the Bureau the aggregate number of extensions sought by the student loan servicer under item (aa).

“(ii) PROTECTION OF CREDIT INFORMATION.—During the 60-day period beginning on the date on which a student loan servicer receives a qualified written request from a borrower relating to a dispute regarding payments by the borrower, a student loan servicer may not provide negative credit information to any consumer reporting agency (as defined in section 603 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681a)) relating to the subject of the qualified written request or to such period, including any information relating to a late payment or payment owed by the borrower on the borrower's postsecondary education loan.

“(H) SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT FOR CERTAIN BORROWERS.—A student loan servicer shall designate an office or other unit of the student loan servicer to act as a point of contact regarding postsecondary education loans for—

“(i) a borrower who is not less than 60 days delinquent under the postsecondary education loan;

“(ii) a borrower who seeks information regarding, seeks to enter an agreement for, or seeks to resolve an issue under a repayment option that requires subsequent submission of supporting documentation; and

“(iii) a borrower who seeks to modify the terms of the repayment of the postsecondary education loan because of hardship.

“(I) SERVICEMEMBERS, VETERANS, AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION LOANS.—

“(i) SERVICEMEMBER AND VETERANS LIAISON.—Each servicer shall designate an employee to act as the servicemember and veterans liaison who is responsible for answering inquiries from servicemembers and veterans, and is specially trained on servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws related to postsecondary education loans.

“(ii) TOLL-FREE TELEPHONE NUMBER.—Each servicer shall maintain a toll-free telephone number that shall—

“(I) connect directly to the servicemember and veterans liaison designated under clause (i); and

“(II) be made available on the primary internet website of the servicer and on monthly billing statements.

“(iii) PROHIBITION ON CHARGE OFFS AND DEFAULT.—A lender or servicer may not charge off or report a postsecondary education loan as delinquent, assigned to collection (internally or by referral to a third party), in default, or charged-off to a credit reporting agency if the borrower is on active duty in the Armed Forces (as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10, United States Code) serving in a combat zone (as designated by the President under section 112(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

“(iv) ADDITIONAL LIAISONS.—The Secretary shall determine additional entities with whom borrowers interact, including guaranty agencies, that shall designate an employee to act as the servicemember and veterans liaison who is responsible for answering inquiries from servicemembers and veterans and is specially trained on servicemembers and veteran benefits and option under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.).

“(J) BORROWER’S LOAN HISTORY.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—A servicer shall make available through a secure website, or in writing upon request, the loan history of each borrower for each postsecondary education loan, separately designating—

“(I) payment history;

“(II) loan history, including any forbearances, deferrals, delinquencies, assignment to collection, and charge offs;

“(III) annual percentage rate history; and

“(IV) key loan terms, including application of payments to interest, principal, and fees, origination date, principal, capitalized interest, annual percentage rate, including any cap, loan term, and any contractual incentives.

“(ii) ORIGINAL DOCUMENTATION.—A servicer shall make available to the borrower, if requested, at no charge, copies of the original loan documents and the promissory note for each postsecondary education loan.

“(K) ERROR RESOLUTION.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall promulgate rules requiring servicers to establish error resolution procedures to allow borrowers to inquire about errors related to their postsecondary education loans and obtain timely resolution of such errors.

“(L) ADDITIONAL SERVICING STANDARDS.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, may establish additional servicing standards to reduce delinquencies, assignment to collections, defaults, and charge-offs, and to ensure borrowers understand their rights and obligations related to their postsecondary education loans.

“(M) ARBITRATION.—

“(i) WAIVER OF RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—Any rights and remedies available to borrowers against servicers may not be waived by any agreement, policy, or form, including by a predispute arbitration agreement.

“(ii) PREDISPUTE ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS.—No predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable by a servicer, including as a third-party beneficiary or by estoppel, if the agreement re-

quires arbitration of a dispute with respect to a postsecondary education loan. This subparagraph applies to predispute arbitration agreements entered into before the date of enactment of the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights, as well as on and after such date of enactment, if the violation that is the subject of the dispute occurred on or after such date of enactment.

“(N) ENFORCEMENT.—The provisions of this paragraph shall be enforced by the agencies specified in subsections (a) through (d) of section 108, in the manner set forth in that section or under any other applicable authorities available to such agencies by law.

“(O) PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to preempt any provision of State law regarding postsecondary education loans where the State law provides stronger consumer protections.

“(P) CIVIL LIABILITY.—A servicer that fails to comply with any requirement imposed under this paragraph shall be deemed a creditor that has failed to comply with a requirement under this chapter for purposes of liability under section 130 and such servicer shall be subject to the liability provisions under such section, including the provisions under paragraphs (1), (2)(A)(i), (2)(B), and (3) of section 130(a).

“(Q) ELIGIBILITY FOR DISCHARGE.—The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall promulgate rules requiring lenders and servicers of loans described in paragraph (13)(B)(ii) to—

“(i) identify and contact borrowers who may be eligible for student loan discharge by the Secretary;

“(ii) provide the borrower, in writing, in simple and understandable terms, information about obtaining such discharge; and

“(iii) create a streamlined process for eligible borrowers to apply for and receive such discharge.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(g) INFORMATION TO BE AVAILABLE AT NO CHARGE.—The information required to be disclosed under this section shall be made available at no charge to the borrower.”; and

(2) in section 130(a)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking “128(e)(7)”

and inserting “128(e)(10)”;

(B) in the flush matter at the end, by striking “or paragraph (4)(C), (6), (7), or (8) of section 128(e),” and inserting “or paragraph (4)(C), (9), (10), or (11) of section 128(e).”.

### SEC. 3. STUDENT LOAN INFORMATION BY ELIGIBLE LENDERS.

Section 433 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1083) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (12), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) a statement that—

“(A) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(B) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(15)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(15)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) A statement that—

“(i) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(ii) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(15)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(15)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(F) A statement that—

“(i) the borrower may be entitled to servicemember and veteran benefits under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. App. 501 et seq.) and other Federal or State laws; and

“(ii) a Servicemember and Veterans Liaison designated under section 128(e)(15)(I)(i) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(15)(I)(i)) is available to answer inquiries about servicemember and veteran benefits, including the toll-free telephone number to contact the Liaison pursuant to such section.”.

### SEC. 4. KNOW BEFORE YOU OWE.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by section 2, is further amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), before a creditor may issue any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall obtain from the relevant institution of higher education where such loan is to be used for a student, such institution’s certification of—

“(i) the enrollment status of the student;

“(ii) the student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined by the institution under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

“(iii) the difference between—

“(I) such cost of attendance; and

“(II) the student’s estimated financial assistance, including such assistance received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other financial assistance known to the institution, as applicable.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a creditor may issue funds, not to exceed the amount described in subparagraph (A)(iii), with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection without obtaining from the relevant institution of higher education such institution’s certification if such institution fails to provide within 15 business days of the creditor’s request for such certification—

“(i) notification of the institution’s refusal to certify the request; or

“(ii) notification that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request.

“(C) LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—If a creditor issues funds without obtaining a certification, as described in subparagraph (B), such creditor shall report the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(16) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—

“(A) PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS.—

“(i) LOAN STATEMENT.—A creditor that issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall send loan statements, where such loan is to be used for a student, to borrowers of such funds not less than once every 3 months during the time that such student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

“(ii) CONTENTS OF LOAN STATEMENT.—Each statement described in clause (i) shall—

“(I) report the borrower’s total remaining debt to the creditor, including accrued but unpaid interest and capitalized interest;

“(II) report any debt increases since the last statement; and

“(III) list the current interest rate for each loan.

“(B) NOTIFICATION OF LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.—On or before the date a creditor issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall notify the relevant institution of higher education, in writing, of the amount of the extension of credit and the student on whose behalf credit is extended. The form of such written notification shall be subject to the regulations of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

“(C) ANNUAL REPORT.—A creditor that issues funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection containing the required information about private student loans to be determined by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.”.

(2) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.—Section 140(a)(7)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(7)(A)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);

(B) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(C) by adding after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and”.

(3) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall issue regulations in final form to implement paragraphs (3) and (16) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by paragraph (1). Such regulations shall become effective not later than 6 months after their date of issuance.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—

(1) PROGRAM PARTICIPATION AGREEMENTS.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) and inserting the following:

“(28)(A) Upon the request of a private educational lender, acting in connection with an application initiated by a borrower for a private education loan in accordance with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(3)), the institution shall within 15 days of receipt of a certification request—

“(i) provide such certification to such private educational lender—

“(I) that the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, is enrolled or is scheduled to enroll at the institution;

“(II) of such student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

“(III) of the difference between—

“(aa) the cost of attendance at the institution; and

“(bb) the student’s estimated financial assistance received under this title and other assistance known to the institution, as applicable;

“(ii) notify the creditor that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request; or

“(iii) provide notice to the private educational lender of the institution’s refusal to certify the private education loan under subparagraph (D).

“(B) With respect to a certification request described in subparagraph (A), and prior to providing such certification under subparagraph (A)(i) or providing notice of the refusal to provide certification under subparagraph (A)(iii), the institution shall—

“(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, has applied for and exhausted the Federal financial assistance available to such student under this title and inform the student accordingly; and

“(ii) provide the borrower whose loan application has prompted the certification request by a private education lender, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), with the following information and disclosures:

“(I) The availability of, and the borrower’s potential eligibility for, Federal financial assistance under this title, including disclosing the terms, conditions, interest rates, and repayment options and programs of Federal student loans.

“(II) The borrower’s ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower’s choice.

“(III) The impact of a proposed private education loan on the borrower’s potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.

“(IV) The borrower’s right to accept or reject a private education loan within the 30-day period following a private educational lender’s approval of a borrower’s application and about a borrower’s 3-day right to cancel period.

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms ‘private educational lender’ and ‘private education loan’ have the meanings given such terms in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).

“(D)(i) An institution shall not provide a certification with respect to a private education loan under this paragraph unless the private education loan includes terms that provide—

“(I) the borrower alternative repayment plans, including loan consolidation or refinancing; and

“(II) that the liability to repay the loan shall be cancelled upon the death or disability of the borrower or co-borrower.

“(ii) In this paragraph, the term ‘disability’ means a permanent and total disability, as determined in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary of Education, or a determination by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that the borrower is unemployable due to a service connected disability.”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the effective date of the regulations described in subsection (a)(3).

(3) PREFERRED LENDER ARRANGEMENT.—Section 151(8)(A)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1019(8)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting “certifying,” after “promoting.”.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 24 months after the issuance of regulations under subsection (a)(3), the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection and the Secretary of Education shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the compliance of institutions of higher education and private educational lenders with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by subsection (a), and section 487(a)(28) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)), as amended by subsection (b). Such report shall include information about the degree to which specific institutions utilize certifications in effectively encouraging the exhaustion of Federal student loan eligibility and lowering student private education loan debt.

#### SEC. 5. MARKETING LIMITATION.

Section 456 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) LIMITATION ON CONTRACTS FOR THE SERVICING OF LOANS.—A servicer may not market to the borrower of a student loan made, insured, or guaranteed under this title which the servicer services, a financial product or service using data obtained through the servicing relationship, or otherwise during the servicing process.”.

#### SEC. 6. SERVICER CHOICE.

Section 456 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087f), as amended by section 5, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SWITCHING SERVICERS.—The Secretary shall establish a program that allows a borrower of a loan made under this part after the date of enactment of the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights to switch from the assigned servicer of such loan to a new servicer based on a random reassignment by the Secretary.”.

#### SEC. 7. CENTRALIZED POINT OF ACCESS.

Part G of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “SEC. 493E. CENTRALIZED POINT OF ACCESS.

“Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the Student Loan Borrower Bill of Rights, the Secretary shall establish a centralized point of access for all borrowers of loans that are made, insured, or guaranteed under this title that are in repayment, including a central location for account information and payment processing for such loan servicing, regardless of the specific servicer.”.

#### SEC. 8. REPORT ON STUDENT LOAN SERVICERS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall submit a report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives on private and Federal student loan servicers, including—

(1) any legislative recommendations to improve student loan servicing standards; and

(2) information on proactive early intervention methods by servicers to help distressed student loan borrowers enroll in any eligible repayment plans.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 841. A bill to expand eligibility for health care under the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to include certain veterans seeking mental health care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, as we begin this week with the serious and necessary discussions about the budget, I rise today to talk about something that is very personal to me, something that is incredibly close to my heart—the service and sacrifice of our Nation's finest men and women, those who serve in our Armed Forces.

As the budget process moves forward, we must ensure that our national security needs are met and that our veterans can receive the much-needed care and assistance they deserve.

Growing up on a farm in rural southwest Iowa, my parents instilled in my sister, my brother, and me the importance of hard work, service, and sacrifice.

In the summer between my freshman and sophomore years at Iowa State University, I was very fortunate to attend an agricultural exchange in Ukraine, when it was still part of the former Soviet Union. The Iowa students and I lived on a collective farm for a number of weeks. In the evening, when the community members came together, we did not talk about agricultural practices, like I anticipated. What we talked about was what it was like to be free, what it was like to be an American. Those were the things the Ukrainians wanted to know. They wanted to know about freedom, our Republic, and democracy. Just a few short years later, they became an independent nation. They are a sovereign nation.

It was then that I better understood what it meant to have freedom and how much people elsewhere truly desire it. I wanted to do my part to ensure our country always remained free.

That realization led me to make a decision when I was 19 years old—to join the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps, commonly known as ROTC.

For over two decades, I have had the great honor of wearing our Nation's uniform. Today, I serve as a lieutenant colonel in the Iowa Army National Guard, and I have been privileged to have led and commanded at many levels, from platoon to battalion. From 2003 to 2004, I served as a company commander in Operation Iraqi Freedom. My unit was tasked with running convoys through Kuwait and southern Iraq.

As a soldier, I learned firsthand the vital role that our citizen soldiers play. Citizen soldiers are folks who train for military duty so they are prepared to defend in the face of an emergency.

These men and women take on this task voluntarily and can be called upon to serve at any time.

While overseas, I had the opportunity to serve alongside some of America's finest, our bravest men and women. I saw firsthand how dangerous threats against our Nation can be.

It is becoming increasingly important that our military—Active Duty, National Guard, and Reserve—are always working together as one cohesive unit. We are strongest in numbers when working together to build one another up and support one another. Our mission is clear and we come from all corners of the country united on the same goal—to defend our freedom.

I continue to remain focused on strengthening our national security, both in my role in the Iowa National Guard and on the Armed Services Committee, where we discuss ways to support our exceptional military and develop bipartisan strategies to confront terrorism and destroy Al Qaeda, ISIS, and those who are radicalized by them.

Here in the Senate, we also have an incredible responsibility not only to make sure our country is protected but also to ensure we live up to the promises made to our veterans. These men and women are trained and have selflessly sacrificed in defense of our freedoms and our way of life. However, we must ensure that our veterans are prepared to transition back to civilian life. They deserve nothing less than the benefits they were promised and a quality of care we can all be proud of.

Unfortunately, that has not been the case. According to the VA, there are approximately 22 veteran suicides per day. We hear this number from time to time. But think about it—22 veteran suicides per day.

In November 2014 testimony before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, the VA's chief consultant for mental health said the average wait time for a mental health appointment at the VA is 36 days. We can, and must, do better for our veterans.

If a non-VA mental health care professional can reach a veteran 1 day, 1 week or even 2 weeks earlier than 36 days, Congress nor the VA should be an obstacle to affording a veteran potentially lifesaving mental health treatment.

Veterans themselves are the only ones who know their mental health limit, and a veteran should receive the benefit of the doubt about where that limit is—not the VA.

This is an issue that impacts all eras of veterans. Since coming to Washington, I have heard from many veterans on this very issue. One veteran in particular from the Vietnam war era admitted that he had twice attempted suicide. This veteran felt like he didn't have anywhere to go. We have to do better.

Today, as my first piece of legislation in the Senate, I am introducing

the Prioritizing Veterans Access to Mental Health Care Act.

This legislation provides an option for our veterans to receive mental health treatment until they can receive comprehensive mental health care at the VA. This authorization for mental health care provides a backstop—other than the emergency room—for our veterans. Ultimately, the ER should not be considered a backstop for delayed mental health care at the VA. Most veterans who seek mental health treatment at emergency rooms do so when they have reached the limits of their suffering.

There is no acceptable VA wait time for mental health care for our veterans. The limits to how much suffering a veteran can endure simply cannot be accurately measured by the VA or by any medical professional.

Specifically, this legislation puts veterans mental health care first and foremost, provides a backstop to VA mental health care, and prioritizes incentives to hire more mental health care professionals at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Prioritizing Veterans Access to Mental Health Care Act does several things.

First, it amends the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to where a veteran is instantly authorized non-VA care if the veteran provides an electronic or hard-copy statement in writing that he or she is not receiving adequate or timely mental health care at the VA. This eliminates the 40-mile and VA wait-time triggers for mental health care under the choice act.

Second, it prioritizes incentives for the hiring of mental health care professionals at the VA.

And third, it provides the VA 90 days to enact the program.

I hope this legislation will receive broad bipartisan support because ensuring our veterans have access to the mental health care they deserve is not a conservative or liberal concept. It is not a Republican or Democrat idea. It is an American value.

If we do not stand up for America's tenacious survivors, who will? Thanks to these brave men and women, we are able to stand on this floor and fight for our beliefs and ideals. These veterans fought for us and defended us tirelessly. They endured more than some of us can ever imagine. The invisible wounds of war can no longer go unnoticed. Now, it is our duty to do all we can to thank them and ensure they have access to the quality mental health care they deserve.

God bless these men and women, and let us strive to do better for them.



SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS DURING  
ADJOURNMENTSENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION  
11—SETTING FORTH THE  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR  
THE UNITED STATES GOVERN-  
MENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016  
AND SETTING FORTH THE AP-  
PROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS  
FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017  
THROUGH 2025

Mr. ENZI from the Committee on the Budget; submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. CON. RES. 11

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE  
BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND  
AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 102. Social Security.

Sec. 103. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 104. Major functional categories.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the Senate.

## TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 301. Spending-neutral reserve fund to increase the pace of economic growth and private sector job creation in the United States.

Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen America's priorities.

Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable healthcare choices for all.

Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for improving access to the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for other health reforms.

Sec. 306. Spending-neutral reserve fund for child welfare.

Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and servicemembers.

Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax reform and administration.

Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to invest in the infrastructure in America.

Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for air transportation.

Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote jobs in the United States through international trade.

Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase employment opportunities for disabled workers.

Sec. 313. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Higher Education Act reform.

Sec. 314. Spending-neutral reserve fund for energy legislation.

Sec. 315. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reform environmental statutes.

Sec. 316. Spending-neutral reserve fund for water resources legislation.

Sec. 317. Spending-neutral reserve fund on mineral security and mineral rights.

Sec. 318. Spending-neutral reserve fund to reform the abandoned mine lands program.

Sec. 319. Spending-neutral reserve fund to improve forest health.

Sec. 320. Spending-neutral reserve fund to reauthorize funding for payments in lieu of taxes to counties and other units of local government.

Sec. 321. Spending-neutral reserve fund for financial regulatory system reform.

Sec. 322. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve Federal program administration.

Sec. 323. Spending-neutral reserve fund to implement agreements with freely associated states.

Sec. 324. Spending-neutral reserve fund to protect payments to rural hospitals and create sustainable access for rural communities.

Sec. 325. Spending-neutral reserve fund to encourage State Medicaid demonstration programs to promote independent living and integrated work for the disabled.

Sec. 326. Spending-neutral reserve fund to allow pharmacists to be paid for the provision of services under Medicare.

Sec. 327. Spending-neutral reserve fund to improve our Nation's community health centers.

Sec. 328. Spending-neutral reserve fund relating to the funding of independent agencies, which may include subjecting the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to the regular appropriations process.

Sec. 329. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for export promotion.

Sec. 330. Spending-neutral reserve fund to reform, improve, and enhance 529 college savings plans.

Sec. 331. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to securing overseas diplomatic facilities of the United States.

Sec. 332. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to achieve savings by helping struggling Americans on the road to personal and financial independence.

Sec. 333. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to conserving Federal land, enhancing access to Federal land for recreational opportunities, and making investments in counties and schools.

Sec. 334. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect taxpayers from identity fraud.

Sec. 335. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to career and technical education.

Sec. 336. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to FEMA preparedness.

Sec. 337. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to expanding, enhancing, or otherwise improving science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Sec. 338. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote the next generation of NIH researchers in the United States.

Sec. 339. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to promoting manufacturing in the United States.

Sec. 340. Spending-neutral reserve fund to prohibit aliens without legal status in the United States from qualifying for a refundable tax credit.

Sec. 341. Deficit-reduction reserve fund for report elimination or modification.

Sec. 342. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to address heroin and prescription opioid abuse.

Sec. 343. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen our Department of Defense civilian workforce.

Sec. 344. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Department of Defense reform.

Sec. 345. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs.

Sec. 346. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide energy assistance and invest in energy efficiency and conservation.

Sec. 347. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to enable greater collaboration between the Department of Veterans Affairs and law school clinics serving veterans.

Sec. 348. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase funding for Department of Energy nuclear waste clean-up.

Sec. 349. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to Department of Defense initiatives to bolster resilience of mission-critical department infrastructure to impacts from climate change and associated events.

Sec. 350. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to end Operation Choke Point and protect the Second Amendment.

Sec. 351. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the use of Federal funds for the bailout of improvident State and local governments.

## TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

## Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 401. Extension of enforcement of budgetary points of order in the Senate.

Sec. 402. Senate point of order against legislation increasing long-term deficits.

Sec. 403. Point of order against advance appropriations.

Sec. 404. Supermajority enforcement of unfunded mandates.

Sec. 405. Repeal of Senate point of order against certain reconciliation legislation.

Sec. 406. Point of order against changes in mandatory programs.

Sec. 407. Prohibition on agreeing to legislation without a score.

Sec. 408. Protecting the savings in reported reconciliation bills.

Sec. 409. Point of order against exceeding funds designated for overseas contingency operations.

Sec. 410. Senate point of order against provisions of appropriations legislation that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.

Sec. 411. Accuracy in budget enforcement.

Sec. 412. Fair value estimates.

Sec. 413. Honest accounting estimates.

Sec. 414. Currency modernization.

Sec. 415. Certain energy contracts.

- Sec. 416. Long-term scoring.
- Sec. 417. Requiring clearer reporting of projected Federal spending and deficits.
- Sec. 418. Reporting on tax expenditures.
- Sec. 419. Congressional Budget Office estimates.
- Sec. 420. To require transparent reporting on the ongoing costs and savings to taxpayers of Obamacare.
- Sec. 421. Prohibiting the use of guarantee fees as an offset.
- Subtitle B—Other Provisions
- Sec. 431. Oversight of Government performance.
- Sec. 432. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
- Sec. 433. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
- Sec. 434. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
- Sec. 435. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,003,274,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,894,221,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,958,672,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,107,799,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,228,534,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,337,729,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,455,558,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,525,594,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,624,025,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,646,263,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,037,267,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,928,317,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,945,067,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,080,929,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,185,512,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,308,296,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,449,532,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,497,247,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,576,890,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,614,976,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$370,512,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$164,989,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$86,936,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$106,782,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$86,102,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$66,333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$60,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$53,141,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$145,254,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$290,672,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,009,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$19,396,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$19,718,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$20,055,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$20,375,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$20,676,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$21,008,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$21,195,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$21,254,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$21,207,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,799,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$14,042,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$14,222,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$14,445,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$14,674,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$14,912,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$15,230,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$15,419,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$15,500,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$15,538,000,000,000.

(7) FEDERAL TAX EXPENDITURES.—The levels of Federal tax expenditures are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$1,481,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$1,593,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$1,670,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$1,738,019,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$1,810,158,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$1,890,648,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$1,973,922,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$2,064,520,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$2,160,235,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$2,261,769,000,000.

##### SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$792,776,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$824,342,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$857,154,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$890,609,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$925,760,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$962,188,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$1,000,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$1,040,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$1,081,476,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,123,748,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$778,032,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$825,829,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$882,521,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$941,034,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$1,005,632,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$1,073,227,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$1,145,188,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$1,222,754,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$1,305,622,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,394,327,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,026,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,089,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,175,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,190,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,345,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,518,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,487,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,699,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,668,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,881,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,849,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,072,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,039,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,266,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,462,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,428,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,665,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,630,000,000.

##### SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$267,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$266,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$277,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$288,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$288,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$299,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$298,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$310,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$310,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$321,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$320,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$334,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$346,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$345,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$358,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$371,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$370,000,000.

##### SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

- (1) National Defense (050):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$620,263,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$605,189,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$544,506,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$576,934,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$557,744,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$558,049,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$571,019,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$564,685,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$585,310,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$573,614,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$599,627,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$586,038,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$600,634,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$596,103,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$615,997,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$603,051,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$631,771,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$611,920,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$648,836,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$632,992,000,000.  
(2) International Affairs (150):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,791,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$48,227,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,839,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,656,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,802,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,642,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,749,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,565,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,754,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,437,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,276,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,795,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,553,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,424,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,593,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,153,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,681,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,023,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,786,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,943,000,000.  
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,007,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,007,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,596,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,286,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,165,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,981,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,706,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,433,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,022,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,192,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,756,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,953,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,512,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$35,745,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$35,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,545,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,084,000,000.  
(4) Energy (270):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,947,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,365,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$2,483,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,112,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$731,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$90,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$753,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$128,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$668,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$97,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$543,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$465,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$393,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$2,869,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,521,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$2,963,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,655,000,000.  
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,277,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,983,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,685,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,866,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,680,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,719,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,125,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,486,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,066,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,098,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,951,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,232,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,844,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,992,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,240,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,467,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,125,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,663,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,522,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,966,000,000.  
(6) Agriculture (350):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,628,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,585,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,247,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,696,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,204,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,471,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,083,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,401,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,974,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,498,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,078,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,613,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,914,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,476,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,506,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,051,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,620,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,125,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,834,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,416,000,000.  
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$2,260,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$11,365,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$3,959,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$18,302,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,264,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$16,095,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,316,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$21,170,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$20,567,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$75,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$15,388,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,341,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$15,789,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$2,452,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$15,942,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$3,648,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$16,051,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$4,520,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$16,011,000,000.  
(8) Transportation (400):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$71,528,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$88,436,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,392,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$83,756,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$73,286,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$80,329,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,077,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,437,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,826,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,935,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$75,549,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,708,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,221,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,973,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,840,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,228,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$77,506,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,123,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$78,208,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,426,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

<p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$17,388,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,325,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$18,263,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$21,002,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$18,606,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$21,457,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$18,862,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,314,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$18,870,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,547,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$18,771,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$22,474,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$18,782,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$21,323,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$18,861,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,747,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$18,975,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,313,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$19,140,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$19,384,000,000.</p> <p>(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):</p> <p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$86,251,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$95,717,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$87,848,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$92,889,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$90,703,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$90,534,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$89,535,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$88,889,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$91,991,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$91,556,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$93,353,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$93,315,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$94,970,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$94,734,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$96,575,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$96,383,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$98,439,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$98,178,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$100,362,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$100,129,000,000.</p> <p>(11) Health (550):</p> <p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$414,326,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$424,711,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$385,565,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$389,710,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$388,629,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$390,503,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$402,511,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$403,324,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$425,526,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$415,791,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$433,351,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$433,395,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$452,426,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$452,523,000,000.</p>	<p>Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$471,644,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$471,719,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$489,491,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$489,587,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$512,965,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$513,163,000,000.</p> <p>(12) Medicare (570):</p> <p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$567,213,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$567,122,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$562,941,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$562,881,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$562,143,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$562,102,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$619,228,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$619,148,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$657,658,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$657,564,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$698,284,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$698,188,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$776,034,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$775,930,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$787,879,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$787,681,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$797,075,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$796,964,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$902,467,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$902,349,000,000.</p> <p>(13) Income Security (600):</p> <p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$529,494,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$528,778,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$458,455,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$455,293,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$466,015,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$458,848,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$460,943,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$457,388,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$471,826,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$467,468,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$481,804,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$477,132,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$493,877,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$493,223,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$502,550,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$498,468,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$512,932,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$504,310,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$521,641,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$517,044,000,000.</p> <p>(14) Social Security (650):</p> <p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$33,878,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.</p>	<p>Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.</p> <p>(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):</p> <p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$166,708,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$170,152,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$164,905,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$164,449,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$163,101,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$162,477,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$174,989,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$174,175,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$179,899,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$178,942,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$184,172,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$183,222,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$196,530,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$195,502,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$193,156,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$192,124,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$189,999,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$188,884,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$203,895,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$202,761,000,000.</p> <p>(16) Administration of Justice (750):</p> <p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$52,543,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$56,757,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2017: (A) New budget authority, \$57,030,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$58,576,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2018: (A) New budget authority, \$56,787,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$57,929,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2019: (A) New budget authority, \$58,512,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$57,973,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2020: (A) New budget authority, \$60,284,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$59,888,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2021: (A) New budget authority, \$62,239,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$61,690,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2022: (A) New budget authority, \$64,815,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$64,224,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2023: (A) New budget authority, \$66,745,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$66,238,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2024: (A) New budget authority, \$68,717,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$68,091,000,000.</p> <p>Fiscal year 2025: (A) New budget authority, \$70,550,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$69,922,000,000.</p> <p>(17) General Government (800):</p> <p>Fiscal year 2016: (A) New budget authority, \$23,755,000,000. (B) Outlays, \$23,708,000,000.</p>
---	---	--

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,046,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,958,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,755,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,573,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,485,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,089,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,202,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,782,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,958,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,551,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,766,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$28,493,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,114,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,022,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,671,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,809,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,399,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$366,579,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$366,579,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$415,132,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$415,132,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$478,693,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$478,693,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$532,670,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$532,670,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$580,522,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$580,522,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$614,725,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$614,725,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$645,841,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$645,841,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$671,301,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$671,301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$690,987,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$690,987,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$703,419,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$703,419,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$12,271,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$5,520,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,975,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,923,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$10,750,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$14,755,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$15,199,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$16,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$46,590,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$44,799,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$54,803,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$51,787,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$98,454,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$80,798,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$112,036,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$101,438,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$90,119,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, -\$83,225,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$250,580,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, -\$234,419,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$69,397,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$69,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$78,263,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$78,278,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$84,231,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$84,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$83,179,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$83,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$83,577,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$83,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$86,773,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$86,798,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$92,337,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$92,362,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$99,646,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$99,672,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$109,004,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$109,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$121,370,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$121,397,000,000.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

### SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(b) COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS.—The Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than July 31, 2015, the Senate Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving all such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

## TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

### SEC. 301. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE THE PACE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND PRIVATE SECTOR JOB CREATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) growing the economy;
- (2) creating more private sector jobs and enhancing worker rights such as Davis-Bacon reform and card check;
- (3) lowering the after-tax costs of investment, savings, and work;
- (4) reducing the costs to business and individuals from the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;
- (5) reducing the costs borne by economic activity in the United States stemming from

Federal regulations, including the costs incurred by individuals in complying with Federal law when starting a business;

(6) reducing the costs of frivolous lawsuits;

(7) creating a more competitive financial sector to support economic growth and job creation while enhancing the credit worthiness of lending institutions; or

(8) improving the ability of policy makers to estimate the economic effects of policy change through the enhanced use of economic models and data in scoring legislation; without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

### SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICA'S PRIORITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhanced funding for national security or domestic discretionary programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

### SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTHCARE CHOICES FOR ALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) the full repeal of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029); or

(2) the replacing or reforming the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) or the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029); by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

### SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROVING ACCESS TO THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving access to affordable health care for low-income children, including the Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OTHER HEALTH REFORMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the requirement to individually purchase, or jointly provide, health insurance;
- (2) increasing payments under, or permanently reforming or replacing, Medicare payments for providers;
- (3) extending expiring health care provisions;
- (4) the health care needs of first responders to domestic acts of terror;
- (5) improvements in medical research, innovation and safety; or
- (6) strengthening program integrity initiatives to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse in Federal health care programs;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 306. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHILD WELFARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) child nutrition programs;
- (2) replacing ineffective policies and programs with evidence-based alternative that improve the welfare of vulnerable children; or
- (3) policies that protect children from sexual predators in our schools or communities; without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the improvement of the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and servicemembers, including:

- (1) eligibility for both military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation (concurrent receipt);
- (2) the reduction or elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and Veterans' Dependency and Indemnity Compensation;
- (3) the improvement of disability benefits or the process of evaluating and adjudicating benefit claims for members of the Armed Forces or veterans;
- (4) the infrastructure needs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including constructing or leasing space, to include leases of major medical facilities, and maintenance of Department facilities;
- (5) supporting the transition of servicemembers to the civilian workforce,

including by expanding or improving education, job training, and workforce development benefits, or other programs for servicemembers or veterans, which may include streamlining the process associated with Federal and State credentialing requirements;

(6) improving access to and reducing wait times for Department of Veterans Affairs health care, including through hiring medical providers, and improving the quality of such care; or

(7) providing or improving specialty services, including mental health care, homeless services, gender specific health care, fertility treatment, and support for caregivers; by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TAX REFORM AND ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;
  - (2) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring tax relief provisions;
  - (3) innovation and high quality manufacturing jobs, including the repeal of the 2.3 percent excise tax on medical device manufacturers; or
  - (4) operations and administration of the Department of the Treasury,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INVEST IN THE INFRASTRUCTURE IN AMERICA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation shall not include transfers from other trust funds but may include transfers from the general fund of the Treasury that are offset, provided further that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AIR TRANSPORTATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal spending on civil air traffic control services, which may include air traffic management at airport towers across the United States or at facilities of the Fed-

eral Aviation Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES THROUGH INTERNATIONAL TRADE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) suspending or reducing tariffs on miscellaneous imports;
- (2) reauthorization of trade related Federal agencies;
- (3) implementing international trade agreements;
- (4) reauthorizing preference programs; or
- (5) enhancing the protection of United States intellectual property rights at the border and abroad;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR DISABLED WORKERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the administration of disability benefits and the improved employment of disabled workers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ACT REFORM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 314. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENERGY LEGISLATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) reform of the management of civilian and defense nuclear waste;

(2) reform and reauthorization of programs at the Department of Energy related to research and development of alternative or renewable forms of energy, fossil fuel exploration and use, nuclear energy, or the electricity grid;

(3) expansion of North American energy production; or

(4) reform of the permitting and siting processes for energy infrastructure; without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM ENVIRONMENTAL STATUTES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reform of environmental statutes to promote job growth by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 316. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR WATER RESOURCES LEGISLATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving flood control, expanding opportunities for commercial navigation, and improving the environmental restoration of the nation's waterways without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 317. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND ON MINERAL SECURITY AND MINERAL RIGHTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) reducing reliance on mineral imports; or

(2) the authority to deduct certain amounts from mineral revenues payable to States; without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 318. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE ABANDONED MINE LANDS PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1201 et seq.) without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 319. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE FOREST HEALTH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) increasing timber production from Federal lands and providing bridge funding to counties and other units of local government until timber production levels increase;

(2) decreasing forest hazardous fuel loads;

(3) improving stewardship contracting; or

(4) reform of the process of budgeting for wildfire suppression operations; without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 320. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REAUTHORIZE FUNDING FOR PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES TO COUNTIES AND OTHER UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 321. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FINANCIAL REGULATORY SYSTEM REFORM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to regulatory relief for small financial firms, improvements in the effectiveness of the financial regulatory framework, enhancements in oversight and accountability of the Federal Reserve System, and expansions in access to capital markets without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 322. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE FEDERAL PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations

of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the processing of earnings reports for the Supplemental Security Income and Social Security Disability Insurance programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 323. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPLEMENT AGREEMENTS WITH FREELY ASSOCIATED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the implementation of agreements between the United States and nations with whom it maintains a Compact of Free Association without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 324. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT PAYMENTS TO RURAL HOSPITALS AND CREATE SUSTAINABLE ACCESS FOR RURAL COMMUNITIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting payments to rural hospitals and creating sustainable access for rural communities, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 325. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENCOURAGE STATE MEDICAID DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS TO PROMOTE INDEPENDENT LIVING AND INTEGRATED WORK FOR THE DISABLED.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging State Medicaid demonstration programs to promote independent living and integrated work for the disabled, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 326. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW PHARMACISTS TO BE PAID FOR THE PROVISION OF SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this



resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to payments to pharmacists for the provision of services under Medicare, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 327. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE OUR NATION'S COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting and improving community health centers, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 328. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE FUNDING OF INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, WHICH MAY INCLUDE SUBJECTING THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU TO THE REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the funding of independent agencies, which may include subjecting the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to the regular appropriations process without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 329. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXPORT PROMOTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting exports, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase total deficits over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 330. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM, IMPROVE, AND ENHANCE 529 COLLEGE SAVINGS PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforms, improvements, and enhancements of 529 college savings plans, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not in-

crease the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 331. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECURING OVERSEAS DIPLOMATIC FACILITIES OF THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the security of the overseas diplomatic facilities of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ACHIEVE SAVINGS BY HELPING STRUGGLING AMERICANS ON THE ROAD TO PERSONAL AND FINANCIAL INDEPENDENCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to welfare legislation to help struggling Americans on the road to personal and financial independence, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 333. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSERVING FEDERAL LAND, ENHANCING ACCESS TO FEDERAL LAND FOR RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, AND MAKING INVESTMENTS IN COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal programs for land and water conservation and acquisition or the preservation, restoration, or protection of public land, oceans, coastal areas, or aquatic ecosystems, making changes to or providing for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), making changes to or providing for the reauthorization of the payments in lieu of taxes program under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, or making changes to or providing for the reauthorization of both laws, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 334. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT TAXPAYERS FROM IDENTITY FRAUD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to changes at the Internal Revenue Service, which may include establishing a process by which taxpayers may (1) receive notification of tax scams and (2) determine whether a return may have been filed using their personal information, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 335. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to career and technical education, which may include work- or skills-based learning opportunities or which creates rigorous career and technical education curricula in schools, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 336. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEMA PREPAREDNESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing the preparedness of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to respond to disasters, which may include those on land and in the oceans caused or exacerbated by human-induced climate change, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 337. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING, ENHANCING, OR OTHERWISE IMPROVING SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MATHEMATICS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding, enhancing, or otherwise improving science, technology, engineering, and mathematics by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 338. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE THE NEXT GENERATION OF NIH RESEARCHERS IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to policies and programs that improve opportunities for new biomedical researchers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 339. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING MANUFACTURING IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to investment in the manufacturing sector in the United States, which may include educational or research and development initiatives, public-private partnerships, or other programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 340. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT ALIENS WITHOUT LEGAL STATUS IN THE UNITED STATES FROM QUALIFYING FOR A REFUNDABLE TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to benefits for aliens without legal status in the United States, which may include prohibiting qualification for certain tax benefits without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 341. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR REPORT ELIMINATION OR MODIFICATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating that achieve savings through the elimination, modification, or the reduction in frequency of congressionally mandated reports from Federal agencies, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

**SEC. 342. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS HEROIN AND PRESCRIPTION OPIOID ABUSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to addressing heroin and prescription opioid abuse, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 343. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN OUR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN WORKFORCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening our civilian workforce, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of either the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 344. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REFORM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving Department of Defense financial management, which may include achieving full auditability or eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 345. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE FEDERAL WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT, JOB TRAINING, AND REEMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing inefficient overlap, improving access, and enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase total deficits over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 346. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE ENERGY ASSISTANCE AND INVEST IN ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND CONSERVATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) energy efficiency;
  - (2) the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program; or
  - (3) Federal programs for land and water conservation, including the Land and Water Conservation Fund;
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legis-

lation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 347. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENABLE GREATER COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND LAW SCHOOL CLINICS SERVING VETERANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs collaboration with law school clinics serving veterans, which may include legislation that supports law school clinics that provide veterans with pro-bono legal support and assistance assembling benefits claims, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2021 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 to 2025.

**SEC. 348. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NUCLEAR WASTE CLEANUP.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to Federal investments in the Office of Environmental Management, which may include measures to meet the Federal Government's legacy responsibilities for cleanup of liquid radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel, transuranic and mixed/low-level waste, or contaminated soil and water, and which may also include measures deactivating and decommissioning excess facilities at 16 nuclear waste sites created by the Manhattan Project and Cold War programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 349. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INITIATIVES TO BOLSTER RESILIENCE OF MISSION-CRITICAL DEPARTMENT INFRASTRUCTURE TO IMPACTS FROM CLIMATE CHANGE AND ASSOCIATED EVENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Department of Defense initiatives to bolster resilience of mission-critical Department infrastructure to impacts from climate change and associated events, including sea-level rise, flooding, and increased storm surge, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 350. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO END OPERATION CHOKE POINT AND PROTECT THE SECOND AMENDMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Department of Justice, which may include ending of the Operation Choke Point program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 351. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR THE BAILOUT OF IMPROVIDENT STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a prohibition, except in the case of Federal assistance provided in response to a natural disaster, on any entity of the Federal Government from providing funds to State and local governments to prevent receivership or to facilitate exit from receivership or to prevent default on its obligations by a State government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS**

**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

**SEC. 401. EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF BUDGETARY POINTS OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **EXTENSION OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT OF 1974 POINTS OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), subsections (c)(2) and (d)(3) of section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 note) shall remain in effect for purposes of Senate enforcement through September 30, 2025.

(2) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 205 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

(b) **OTHER POINTS OF ORDER.**—

(1) **PAY-AS-YOU-GO.**—Section 201(d) of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, is repealed.

(2) **INCREASING SHORT-TERM DEFICIT.**—Section 404(e) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, is repealed.

**SEC. 402. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION INCREASING LONG-TERM DEFICITS.**

(a) **CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill and joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), and amendments thereto, amendments between the Houses in relation thereto, and con-

ference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in on-budget deficits in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-year periods beginning with the first fiscal year that is 10 years after the budget year provided for in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cause a net increase in on-budget deficits in excess of \$5,000,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-year periods described in subsection (a).

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(d) **LIMITATION.**—The provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, amendment between the Houses, or conference reports for which the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has made adjustments to the allocations, levels, or limits contained in this resolution pursuant to section 303(1).

(e) **DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of net deficit increases shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(f) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 311 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall no longer apply.

**SEC. 403. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **POINT OF ORDER.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(2) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2016 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2016, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2017.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2017 and 2018 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) **FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

**SEC. 404. SUPERMAJORITY ENFORCEMENT OF UNFUNDED MANDATES.**

Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 425(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 658d(a)) shall be subject to the waiver and appeal requirements of subsections (c)(2) and (d)(3), respectively, of section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 note).

**SEC. 405. REPEAL OF SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.**

Section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply in the Senate.

**SEC. 406. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.**

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “CHIMP” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than an appropriations bill or joint resolution; and

(2) does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an appropriations bill or joint resolution, or an amendment to, conference report on, or amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, that contains a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2016, \$19,000,000,000;  
 (B) for fiscal year 2017, \$16,000,000,000;  
 (C) for fiscal year 2018, \$12,000,000,000;  
 (D) for fiscal year 2019, \$8,000,000,000;  
 (E) for fiscal year 2020, \$4,000,000,000; and  
 (F) for fiscal year 2021, and each fiscal year thereafter, \$0.

(c) DETERMINATION.—The determination of whether a provision is subject to a point of order under subsection (b) shall be made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(e) REPEAL.—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall no longer apply.

#### **SEC. 407. PROHIBITION ON AGREEING TO LEGISLATION WITHOUT A SCORE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to vote on passage of matter that requires an estimate described in section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653), unless such estimate was made publicly available on the website of the Congressional Budget Office not later than 28 hours before the time the vote commences.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

#### **SEC. 408. PROTECTING THE SAVINGS IN REPORTED RECONCILIATION BILLS.**

In the Senate, section 310(d)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 641(d)(1)) shall apply and may be waived in accordance with the procedures applicable to a point of order raised under section 310(d)(2) of such Act.

#### **SEC. 409. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST EXCEEDING FUNDS DESIGNATED FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a provision in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that designates for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), funds that would cause the total amount of funds designated for overseas contingency operations—

(1) for fiscal year 2016, to be more than \$57,997,000,000; or

(2) for fiscal year 2017, to be more than \$59,500,000,000.

(b) DETERMINATION.—The determination of whether a provision is subject to a point of order under this section shall be made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal

of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator under this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

#### **SEC. 410. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider any appropriations legislation, including any amendment thereto, motion in relation thereto, or conference report thereon, that includes any provision or provisions affecting the Crime Victims Fund, as defined by section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601), which constitutes a change in a mandatory program that would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) were they included in legislation other than appropriations legislation. A point of order pursuant to this section shall be raised against such provision or provisions as described in subsections (d) and (e).

(b) DETERMINATION.—The determination of whether a provision is subject to a point of order pursuant to this section shall be made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) GENERAL POINT OF ORDER.—It shall be in order for a Senator to raise a single point of order that several provisions of a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report violate this section. The Presiding Officer may sustain the point of order as to some or all of the provisions against which the Senator raised the point of order. If the Presiding Officer so sustains the point of order as to some of the provisions (including provisions of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against which the Senator raised the point of order, then only those provisions (including provision of an amendment, motion, or conference report) against

which the Presiding Officer sustains the point of order shall be deemed stricken pursuant to this section. Before the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may move to waive such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions against which the point of order was raised. Such a motion to waive is amendable in accordance with rules and precedents of the Senate. After the Presiding Officer rules on such a point of order, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on such a point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

#### **SEC. 411. ACCURACY IN BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.**

(a) TIMING SHIFTS.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “timing shift” means—

(A) a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from 1 fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from 1 fiscal year to the previous fiscal year.

(2) SCORING.—In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not count timing shifts in estimating the budgetary effects of a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report for purposes of enforcing—

(A) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.);

(B) any allocation, aggregate, or level under a concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(C) any written statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate that establishes allocations, aggregates, and levels for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) PROHIBITION OF RESCISSIONS THAT DON'T SAVE MONEY.—In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not count any rescission of budget authority or contract authority that does not have an effect on outlays in estimating the changes in budget authority, outlays, or revenues of a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report for purposes of enforcing—

(1) the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.);

(2) any allocation, aggregate, or level under a concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(3) any written statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the

Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate that establishes allocations, aggregates, and levels for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

#### SEC. 412. FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.

Any estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office for a bill, joint, resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), shall include, when practicable, an additional estimate of the cost, measured on a fair value basis, of changes that would affect the amount or terms of new Federal loans or loan guarantees or of modifications to existing Federal loans or loan guarantees arising from the bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report.

#### SEC. 413. HONEST ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BUDGET.—The term “budget” means—

(A) a concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) a written statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate that establishes allocations, aggregates, and levels for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

(3) MAJOR LEGISLATION.—

(A) DEFINITION.—The term “major legislation” means any bill, resolution, conference report, or treaty—

(i) for which an estimate is prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) that indicates that not less than 1 of the amounts described in subparagraph (B), before incorporating macroeconomic effects, is greater than \$15,000,000,000 in any fiscal year of the estimate; or

(ii) designated as major legislation by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate or the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(B) AMOUNTS.—The amounts described in this subparagraph are—

(i) the sum of the individual positive changes in budgetary effects, not including timing shifts, resulting from such measure; and

(ii) the sum of the absolute value of the individual negative budgetary effects, not including timing shifts, resulting from such measure.

(4) TIMING SHIFTS.—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR CBO ESTIMATES.—An estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) for any major legislation shall provide, in addition to the estimate of budgetary effects without macroeconomic effects, an estimate of the budgetary effects from changes in economic output, employment, interest rates, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from the major legislation. The total budgetary effects shall delineate between revenue and outlay effects.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR JCT ESTIMATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for any major legislation shall provide an estimate of the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(2) DELINEATION.—The total budgetary effects shall delineate between revenue and outlay effects.

(d) CONTENTS OF ESTIMATES.—An estimate required to be provided under subsection (b) or (c) shall include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (b) and (c)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently adopted budget that sets forth appropriate levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the assumptions and the source of data underlying the estimate.

#### SEC. 414. CURRENCY MODERNIZATION.

In the Senate, for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), any allocation, aggregate, or level under a concurrent resolution on the budget, or any written statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate that establishes allocations, aggregates, and levels for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, any estimate of the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues of a provision in a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report relating to a transition from the \$1 note to a \$1 coin shall—

(1) record the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues of the provision in the first year in which the provision takes effect;

(2) determine the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues of the provision based on a net present value estimate of the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues of the provision over a 30-year period; and

(3) incorporate the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues of the provision due to behavioral changes.

#### SEC. 415. CERTAIN ENERGY CONTRACTS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8287); and

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal use of energy savings performance contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal use of energy saving performance contracts and utility energy service contracts, dated September 28, 2012 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(b) ESTIMATES.—In the Senate, for purposes of enforcing any point of order established under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) or any concurrent resolution on the budget, any estimate by the Congressional Budget Office of the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues of a provision in a bill, joint resolution, amendment, conference report, or amendment between the Houses modifying the authority to enter, the scope or terms of, or the use of covered energy savings contracts shall—

(1) record in the first year in which the authority would become effective, the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues (as estimated in accordance with paragraph (2)) of any modifications to the authority to enter the covered energy savings contracts;

(2) in estimating the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues of the legislation, calculate the costs and savings arising from covered contracts on a net present value basis by adding market risk over the useful life of the services or product to the discount rate in section 502(5)(E) of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a(5)(E)); and

(3) classify the effects of the provision to be changes in spending subject to the availability of appropriations.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed to modify the methodology for estimating the changes in budget authority, outlays, and revenues of a provision that does not relate to covered energy savings contracts in a bill, joint resolution, amendment, conference report, or amendment between the Houses that contains a provision described in subsection (b).

#### SEC. 416. LONG-TERM SCORING.

(a) SCORING OF LEGISLATION INCREASING THE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.—An estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) for any bill, resolution, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that increases the discretionary spending limits under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)) shall provide, in addition to the estimate under that section, an estimate of the changes in budget authority, outlays, or revenues under the legislation over the period of fiscal year 2016 through fiscal year 2045.

(b) SCORING OF LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—An estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) for any bill, resolution, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that transfers amounts from the General Fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall provide, in addition to the estimate under that section, an estimate of the changes in budget authority, outlays, or revenues under the legislation over the period of fiscal year 2016 through fiscal year 2045.

#### SEC. 417. REQUIRING CLEARER REPORTING OF PROJECTED FEDERAL SPENDING AND DEFICITS.

When the Congressional Budget Office releases its annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook, the Congressional Budget Office shall provide a projection of Federal revenues, outlays, and deficits for the 30-year period beginning with the budget year, expressed in terms of dollars and as a percent of gross domestic product, as part of its annual update required by Public Law 93-344.

#### SEC. 418. REPORTING ON TAX EXPENDITURES.

The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall include in the report submitted under section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 the following:

(1) An estimate of the cost of tax expenditures as a share of gross domestic product for the budget year and the 9 years following the budget year.

(2) Historical data on the cost of tax expenditures as a share of gross domestic product for each fiscal year beginning with fiscal year 1965 and ending with the budget year.

**SEC. 419. CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.**

(a) **REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES.**—In the case of any legislative provision to which this section applies, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare, to the extent practicable, an estimate of the outlay changes during the second and third decade of enactment.

(b) **LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS TO WHICH THIS SECTION APPLIES.**—This section shall apply to any spending legislative provision—

(1) which proposes a change or changes to law that the Congressional Budget Office determines has an outlay impact in excess of 0.25 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States during the first decade or in the tenth year; or

(2) with respect to which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of either the Senate or the House of Representatives has requested an estimate described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 420. TO REQUIRE TRANSPARENT REPORTING ON THE ONGOING COSTS AND SAVINGS TO TAXPAYERS OF OBAMACARE.**

When the Congressional Budget Office releases its annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook, the Congressional Budget Office shall report changes in direct spending and revenue associated with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152), including the net impact on deficits, including both on-budget and off-budget effects, in its annual update required by Public Law 93-344. The information shall be presented in a format similar to that of table 2 of the Congressional Budget Office's March 20, 2010 estimate of the budgetary effects of the Health Care and Educational Reconciliation Act of 2010, in combination with the effects of H.R. 3590, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), as passed by the Senate.

**SEC. 421. PROHIBITING THE USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.**

In the Senate, for purposes of determining budgetary impacts to evaluate points of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this resolution, any previous budget resolution, and any subsequent budget resolution, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that increases or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

**Subtitle B—Other Provisions****SEC. 431. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.**

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

**SEC. 432. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

**SEC. 433. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

**SEC. 434. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.**

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

**SEC. 435. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

**SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS****SENATE RESOLUTION 107—RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE IN NEW MEXICO AND COMMEMORATING THE UNIQUE PLACE IN HISTORY, AND NATIONAL SECURITY IMPORTANCE, OF THE RANGE**

Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following resolu-

tion; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 107

Whereas on September 26, 1945, White Sands Missile Range (at that time, known as "White Sands Proving Ground") launched its first rocket, a Tiny Tim Boomer, setting in motion 7 decades of world-renowned development, testing, and launches at White Sands Missile Range;

Whereas White Sands Missile Range exists as the premier research, development, test, and evaluation facility for the United States and excels in supporting missile development and a diversity of other test programs for the Army, Navy, Air Force, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, other government agencies, and private industry;

Whereas White Sands Missile Range employs more than 13,000 civilians and honorable members of the Armed Forces, representing the Army, Navy, and Air Force;

Whereas White Sands Missile Range is recognized as the "Birthplace of America's Missile and Space Activity" and holds a unique place in history as the site of the first atomic bomb testing, a site that later became known as the "Trinity Site National Historic Landmark";

Whereas White Sands Missile Range remains the largest overland military test range in the United States, occupying 3,200 square miles of southern New Mexico, and the largest airspace controlled by the Department of Defense, comprising 9,600 square miles above ground, where the range conducts unparalleled military testing;

Whereas White Sands Missile Range is increasingly partnering with Holloman Air Force Base and Fort Bliss to ensure that the unique assets of the region are used to the utmost extent to contribute to national security, including support of testing and training that is realistic, large-scale, and joint or combined;

Whereas White Sands Missile Range is a home site of the Network Integration Evaluation, which is a series of semiannual evaluations led by members of the Armed Forces that are designed to further integrate and rapidly progress the tactical network of the Army;

Whereas the most recent iteration of the Network Integration Evaluation occurred in October and November of 2014 and involved 3,900 members of the Armed Forces, allowing the Army to stay on the cutting edge of technology and providing an invaluable resource to national defense;

Whereas the Southern New Mexico—El Paso Joint Land Use Study demonstrates the strong relationship that White Sands Missile Range shares with Holloman Air Force Base and Fort Bliss in western Texas and indicates that the range has an annual economic impact of \$1,717,289 on the region;

Whereas White Sands Missile Range has the distinguished honor of hosting the annual Bataan Memorial Death March, which commemorates members of the Armed Forces, and forces from the Philippines, who fought and died defending the Philippines only hours after the start of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, and who, after a valiant defense of the Philippines, were captured by the Japanese and forced to march 65 miles without any food, water, or medical care, while the Japanese systematically abused them, leading to the deaths of many of them; and

Whereas the mission of White Sands Missile Range remains as pertinent to national security in 2015 as it was in 1945, and the range should be preserved and strengthened



presently and for future generations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 70th anniversary of White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico; (2) expresses gratitude and appreciation to the commanders, members of the Armed Forces, civilians, and other individuals who have contributed to the mission and community of White Sands Missile Range throughout its 70-year history;

(3) recognizes the great impact that White Sands Missile Range has made on national security in the United States, particularly its contributions in missile defense and space technology;

(4) memorializes the sacrifice made by brave members of the Armed Forces, and forces from the Philippines, who defended the Philippines and endured the Bataan Death March; and

(5) encourages the preservation and strengthening of White Sands Missile Range presently and for future generations.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 321. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 322. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. HATCH)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McConnell to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 323. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 324. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 325. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 326. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 327. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 328. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 329. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 330. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 331. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 332. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 333. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 334. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 335. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 336. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 337. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 338. Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 339. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 340. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 341. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 342. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 343. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 344. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 345. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 346. Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 347. Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COATS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 348. Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 321. Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A BIENNIAL BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a biennial budget and appropriations process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 322. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. HATCH)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McConnell to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EMPOWERMENT OF STATES TO PROTECT CITIZENS OF THE STATE FROM DAMAGING REGULATIONS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY PURSUANT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing any State the option of opting out of the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)) if a Governor or legislative body of a State determines that the requirements of that section would increase retail electricity prices with a disproportionate impact on low-income or fixed-income households, present a risk to electric reliability, impair investments in existing electric generating capacity, impair manufacturing and other important sectors of the economy of the State, decrease employment, or decrease State and local revenues, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

SA 323. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:



On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$25,001,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$51,201,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$65,879,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$71,784,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$72,916,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$73,405,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$48,535,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$22,338,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$7,660,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,755,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$25,001,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$51,201,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$65,879,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$71,784,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$72,916,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$73,405,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$48,535,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$22,338,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,660,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$1,755,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$25,001,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$51,201,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$65,879,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$71,784,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$72,916,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$73,405,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$48,535,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$22,338,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$7,660,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,755,000,000.

On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by \$30,000,000.

On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by \$480,000,000.

On page 19, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,530,000,000.

On page 19, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 14, increase the amount by \$2,580,000,000.

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,880,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by \$2,970,000,000.

On page 20, line 1, increase the amount by \$2,520,000,000.

On page 20, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,470,000,000.

On page 20, line 9, increase the amount by \$420,000,000.

On page 20, line 13, increase the amount by \$114,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by \$7,570,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by \$114,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by \$9,760,000,000.

On page 20, line 21, increase the amount by \$114,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$10,380,000,000.

On page 20, line 25, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 1, increase the amount by \$10,650,000,000.

On page 21, line 4, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 5, increase the amount by \$10,660,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 9, increase the amount by \$10,660,000,000.

On page 21, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,090,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by \$900,000,000.

On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by \$280,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by \$17,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by \$177,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by \$360,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by \$627,000,000.

On page 24, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by \$885,000,000.

On page 24, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 14, increase the amount by \$968,000,000.

On page 24, line 18, increase the amount by \$983,000,000.

On page 24, line 22, increase the amount by \$823,000,000.

On page 25, line 1, increase the amount by \$640,000,000.

On page 25, line 5, increase the amount by \$373,000,000.

On page 25, line 9, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by \$14,494,000,000.

On page 25, line 13, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by \$37,754,000,000.

On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by \$50,344,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by \$54,432,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 26, line 1, increase the amount by \$54,806,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 26, line 5, increase the amount by \$54,962,000,000.

On page 26, line 9, increase the amount by \$40,517,000,000.

On page 26, line 13, increase the amount by \$17,260,000,000.

On page 26, line 17, increase the amount by \$4,670,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, increase the amount by \$582,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,890,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,030,000,000.

On page 27, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by \$3,265,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,495,000,000.

On page 27, line 18, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,685,000,000.

On page 27, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,815,000,000.

On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by \$975,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by \$835,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by \$600,000,000.

On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by \$370,000,000.

**SA 324.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE STRENGTHENING OF PATENT RIGHTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the strengthening of patent rights, which is a critical component of the American innovation economy, including our ability to find cures to terrible diseases and create breakthroughs in science and technology by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 325.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A STRONG CIVIL COURTS SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a strong civil courts system, including appropriate civil discovery and the right of trial by jury, which are indispensable constitutional safeguards of personal liberty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 326.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT CHANGES TO VOTING LAWS AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL DO NOT DISPROPORTIONATELY BURDEN THE RIGHT OF RACIAL AND LANGUAGE MINORITIES TO VOTE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that changes to voting laws at the State and local level do not disproportionately burden the right of racial and language minorities to vote by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 327.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR FUNDING TO IMPROVE VOTER REGISTRATION AND THE VOTING EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that provides sufficient funding to improve voter registration and the voting experience in Federal elections, by the amounts provided by such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 328.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COST SHARING REQUIREMENTS OF HOLLINGS MANUFACTURING EXTENSION PARTNERSHIP.**

It is the sense of Congress that the cost sharing requirements of Hollings Manufacturing Extension Centers under the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership program after their third year of operation under such program should be reduced to 50 percent of the costs incurred by the centers under the program.

**SA 329.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE USE OF EARLY COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL AND DUAL AND CONCURRENT ENROLLMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the widespread use of early college high schools and dual and concurrent enrollment, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 330.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCENTIVES FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES TO HAVE AND MAINTAIN AN ADVANCE CARE PLAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to incentives for Medicare beneficiaries to have and maintain an advance care plan by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 331.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST HIV PATIENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to eliminating laws that discriminate against HIV patients without scientific merit because such laws are harmful and perpetuate dangerous stigmas, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 332.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . STATUTORY LIMIT ON PUBLIC DEBT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.**

(a) INCREASE IN STATUTORY LIMIT ON PUBLIC DEBT.—If this resolution sets forth, as the appropriate level of the public debt for fiscal year 2016, an amount that is different from the amount of the statutory limit on the public debt that otherwise would be in effect for fiscal year 2016, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall each introduce a joint resolution increasing or decreasing, as the case may be, the statutory limit on public debt in the form prescribed in subsection (c) and move to proceed to such joint resolution. The motion is highly privileged in the House of Representatives and is privileged in the Senate and is not debatable. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. If the Chairman makes such a motion to proceed to the joint resolution, the motion to proceed shall be agreed to without intervening action or debate.

(b) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Immediately after the Senate or House of Representatives proceeds to a joint resolution under subsection (a), a vote on passage of the joint resolution shall occur without any intervening action or debate. An affirmative vote of a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, as the case may be, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required for adoption of the joint resolution.

(2) AMENDMENTS.—No amendment to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be in order in the Senate or the House of Representatives.

(3) TRANSMITTAL TO OTHER HOUSE OF CONGRESS.—If a joint resolution is adopted under paragraph (1), the engrossed copy shall be signed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, and transmitted to the other House of Congress for further legislative action.

(4) COORDINATION WITH ACTION BY OTHER HOUSE.—If before adopting a joint resolution under paragraph (1), one House receives from the other a joint resolution described in subsection (a)—

(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

(c) JOINT RESOLUTION.—The matter after the resolving clause in a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be as follows: “That subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting ‘\$ \_\_\_\_\_’, with the blank being filled with a dollar limitation equal to the appropriate level of the public debt set forth pursuant to this resolution.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “statutory limit on the public debt” means the maximum face amount of obligations issued under authority of chapter 31 of title 31, United States Code, and obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States (except such guaranteed obligations as may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury) that may be outstanding at any one time, as determined under section 3101(b) of such title after the application of section 3101(a) of such title, and as adjusted under section 3101A of such title, section 2 of the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013 (31 U.S.C. 3101 note), the Default Prevention Act of 2013 (31 U.S.C. 3101 note), and any other Act providing for the adjustment of such amount.

**SA 333.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT FINANCE INSTITUTIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to United States Government development finance institutions, which may include an entity that mobilizes private capital to help solve critical development challenges or works with the United States private sector to help United States businesses gain footholds in emerging markets to catalyze revenues, jobs, and growth opportunities at home and abroad, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 334.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO IMPROVE CALL RESPONSE TIME AT THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting efforts to improve call

response time at the Internal Revenue Service by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 335.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FULFILLING THE OBLIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the United States fulfills all of the obligations of the United States and does not default on the debt of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 336.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SENSE OF THE SENATE.**

It is the sense of the Senate that the United States should fulfill all of the obligations of the United States and that the United States should not default on the debt of the United States.

**SA 337.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal cybersecurity standards, which may include Federal cyber supply chain management or transparency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 338.** Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investments in biomedical research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 339.** Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING MORTGAGE LENDING TO RURAL AREAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing mortgage lending to rural areas by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 340.** Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 54, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

(1) extending eligibility for concurrent receipt of military retirement pay and veterans' disability compensation or expanding eligibility for Combat-Related Special Compensation to permit additional disabled retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay;

**SA 341.** Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROMOTION OF UNITED STATES OFFSHORE ENERGY PRODUCTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the expansion of United States offshore energy production that would result in American job growth, lower energy prices, economic growth, and stronger national security by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 342.** Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving theatre security cooperation goals, which may include funding for the National Guard State Partnership Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 343.** Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESERVING MANDATORY APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the importance of preserving mandatory appropriations for agricultural conservation programs, which may include financial and technical assistance, conservation easements, and working land management assistance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 344.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPORTANCE OF FULLY UTILIZING AVAILABLE FEDERAL FUNDING FOR WATER RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT TO MEET NEEDS OF UNITED STATES PORTS AND HARBOR MAINTENANCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the importance of fully utilizing available Federal funding for water resources and development to meet the needs of United States ports and harbor maintenance, which may include funding available through trust fund accounts by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 345.** Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN BIOMEDICAL AND BASIC SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for Federal investments in scientific research, which may include helping find cures for life-threatening and chronic illnesses, increasing our national security, supporting new energy technologies, or supporting innovative solutions that advance private sector efforts to grow the economy and create millions of middle jobs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 346.** Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 58, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

(4) reauthorizing or extending trade adjustment assistance programs;

**SA 347.** Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COATS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO KEEPING THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT FOCUSED ON THE PROTECTION OF WATER QUALITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal jurisdiction under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) is focused on water quality, which may include limiting jurisdiction based on the movement of birds, mammals, or insects through the air or over the land, the movement of water through the ground, or the movement of rainwater or snowmelt over the land, or limiting jurisdiction over puddles, isolated ponds, roadside

ditches, irrigation ditches, stormwater systems, wastewater systems, or water delivery, reuse, or reclamation systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 348.** Mr. BOOZMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING OFFICES OF INSPECTORS GENERAL AND PREVENTING EXTENDED VACANCIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening and reforming Federal Offices of Inspectors General, reducing vacancies in such Offices, and providing for improvements in the overall economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of Inspectors General by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dan Kowalski and Greg Dean from my staff and Mike Jones and Josh Smith from the Democratic staff be given all-access floor passes for the Senate floor during consideration of the budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that David Ditch and Hannah Oh be granted the privileges of the floor during the consideration of S. Con. Res. 11 and votes that may occur in relation thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator SANDERS, I ask unanimous consent that Claire Mahoney and Keri Rice, OMB detailees to the Budget Committee, be granted floor privileges during the consideration of S. Con. Res. 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator WYDEN, I ask unanimous consent that the following fellows be granted floor privileges for the

first session of the 114th Congress: Rebecca Farr, Elizabeth Rigby, and Patrick Bussard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**APPOINTMENTS**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Section 301 of Public Law 104-1, as amended by Public Law 108-349, and as further amended by Public Law 114-6, announces the joint reappointment of the following individuals as members of the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Alan V. Friedman of California, Susan S. Robfogel of New York, and Barbara Childs Wallace of Mississippi.

**ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 24, 2015**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 24; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 11; finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings and that all time during the recess count against the time remaining on the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**PROGRAM**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Senators should expect a rollcall vote in relation to the pending Sanders amendment at around 12 noon tomorrow.

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

**PILOT'S BILL OF RIGHTS 2**

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I would like to make a comment about some legislation that we introduced last week that is going to be of supreme interest to a relatively small number of

people—those people in America who are general aviation pilots. It actually affects other people too. This is something which is very significant, and I want to talk about it for a minute.

It is important to pilots and aviation enthusiasts all over the Nation. But over the course of my time, I can recall when there were so few of us who were active commercial pilots, and those individuals who had problems—particularly in our State of Oklahoma—would all come to me because they knew I had understanding of this. So people have come in for help.

One such person was Bob Hoover. Bob Hoover arguably may have been the best pilot of his time. He is still flying today. I guess he is in his nineties by now. But about 10, 15 years ago, one inspector didn't like something he did, and he took away his license.

There are literally thousands of people who make their living as airline pilots. In the case of Bob Hoover, he is the guy who would go up in a Shrike—Chris, do you know what a Shrike is? A Shrike is a twin-engine airplane. I used to own a Shrike. It is made by Aero Commander. He would put a glass of water up here on the top of the dash. He would do a barrel roll, and the water would not tip over. This guy was just incredible.

Anyway, it took an act of Congress that I introduced and passed to get him back into the air. That is why this is so important to a lot of people.

I never realized, even though I personally helped a lot of people who were having problems with their regulations and with an alleged offense by the FAA until it happened to me—when it happened to me, all of a sudden I realized just how frustrating and drawn-out the process could be.

In 2011, I introduced the Pilot's Bill of Rights. I did that to address some serious deficiencies in the relationship between pilots and the FAA. There are a lot of really great people, certainly, in the FAA. The occupier of the chair right now and I both are aware of this. In Oklahoma City, we have several hundred such people. They are easy to get along with and are not overbearing. But any bureaucracy can have a few people who merely want to create problems and say no.

So we introduced the Pilot's Bill of Rights—this was in August of 2012—to ensure that pilots, like everyone else, would be treated fairly and equitably in our justice system. I think pilots are the last group of people who fall into that category we see so prominently in other countries where you are guilty until proven innocent.

Anyway, we passed the Pilot's Bill of Rights, and there are a few things in there that did not get the congressional intent that was originally meant to be. To remedy this, we introduced S. 571. It is the Pilot's Bill of Rights 2. It is bipartisan. Right now, we are sitting

on 12 Republicans and 12 Democrats who will be cosponsors of this bill. There are eight sections in the bill, three general subject areas.

First, the legislation reforms FAA's overly burdensome medical certification process by expanding an existing exemption for light sport aircraft pilots to include more qualified, trained pilots.

Let me speak for a moment on the safety concerns. There is a small minority of people who think that expanding an exemption like this automatically decreases safety. That is not true of this bill. I have the numbers to show it.

In 2004, the FAA issued a medical exemption for pilots of light sport aircraft. These are aircraft which weigh less than 1,320 pounds and only have two seats. They had several restrictions. In the entire country, there are about 9,500 of them. It has been over 10 years since the FAA issued this exemption, and since then, not a single accident by a light sport aircraft has occurred that was related to a medical deficiency.

A joint study was done by the AOPA, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, and the EAA, the Experimental Aircraft Association, on the 46,000 aviation accidents that occurred from 2008 to 2012. Of those, only 99 had a medical cause as a factor. That is less than one-quarter of 1 percent of all accidents. Of those 99, none would have been prevented by the current third-class medical screening exemption that was in the process at that time.

Extending that medical exemption for light sport aircraft to include planes weighing up to 6,000 pounds with up to six total passengers, including the pilot, would add airman and aircraft to an existing FAA-approved medical standard—without degrading or creating substandard safety. This approach has been endorsed by the Flying Physicians Association and the AOPA Medical Advisory Board. Both organizations are made up of pilots who are also medical doctors.

This bill does not change the certification standards to obtain a pilot's certificate, and all pilots still have to possess a pilot certificate and pass the required practical test in flying. The bill does create consistency for aviators across the country, where inconsistency has been felt.

The second thing is—in fact, I would say this: We have documented cases where you have two people who have the same medical problem—one in Detroit and one in Tulsa, OK—and they are treated completely differently by the medical doctors where they are examined.

The second thing it does is it extends the due process rights preserved in the original Pilot's Bill of Rights to all FAA certificate holders. This would be other people who are holding FAA cer-

tificates, and it is not necessarily a pilot's certificate.

When Congress passed the original Pilot's Bill of Rights, we intended to allow pilots to appeal a decision by the FAA to the National Transportation Safety Board, the NTSB, and then pilots could appeal to a Federal court. We did this because the review by the Federal district court is a *de novo*. That means they start with the pilot getting a whole new trial, not using the same evidence as was used before the FAA or the NTSB.

In two separate cases, Federal district courts ruled that my original bill did not require a full hearing of the facts. This legislation explicitly spells out the option to appeal an FAA enforcement action to Federal district court for a guaranteed *de novo* trial, meaning a new and independent review of the facts is guaranteed for these individuals.

This legislation also increases transparency for all FAA certificate holders subject to an investigation or enforcement action by holding FAA accountable for communicating with certificate holders. The FAA is now required to articulate a specific description of an accident or incidents under investigation to parties involved in the investigation and provide specific documentation relevant to the investigation.

While this is something that has happened in many cases, it has not happened in all of them. This bill ensures that certificate holders—these are pilots who are under investigation—are afforded basic fairness. They know why they are being investigated. They have the appropriate documentation to prepare a proper defense and can respond to the FAA from a position of knowledge and certainty in all cases.

I speak from personal experience. This happened to me when I was trying to land in South Texas. They claimed I was not cleared to land. It took me 4 months to get a recording of the particular person who happened to be at the approach control and cleared me to land.

I am a U.S. Senator, and it took 4 months for me to get it, so I figured others might not ever be able to wait this out, and they would have lost their certificate. As I say, it is not a big deal to the general public, but it is to anyone who is a pilot.

I am expanding the original Pilot's Bill of Rights to increase transparency for pilots and certificate holders so they have information and resources to defend themselves should it be necessary.

The third thing it does is it expedites the updates of the notice to airmen—a NOTAM. A NOTAM is a notice to an airman, and it is something that has historically been the responsibility of the FAA. If there is a problem on a runway where we are going to land—if

it is going to be closed or they are doing repairs or something like that—they have to publish a NOTAM, in theory. However, in practice, it doesn't work that way.

In my case they claimed there was a NOTAM indicating that the runway I had to land on was closed. However, there was never a NOTAM. They said there was a NOTAM, and you just have to take their word for it.

The Pilot's Bill of Rights No. 1 was supposed to force the FAA to publish NOTAMs in a common place where people would know where they are, and they just have not done it. Now we have strengthened that to say if a NOTAM action is not placed where it can be found, then they cannot use that as an enforcement action against a pilot. So that should resolve the problem.

Fourth, the Pilot's Bill of Rights 2 extends liability protection to individuals designated by the FAA, such as aviation medical examiners, pilot examiners, and other individuals. That was the intent of the original one, but it was not specific. This has given a lot of individuals willing to serve as designees a disincentive. My bill removes the disincentive, ensuring increased access to medical professionals and designees to sign off on check rides and flightworthiness of experimental aircraft and all of that. So they would get the same protection.

It is kind of the Good Samaritan law. There are a lot of times when pilots are notified and asked to use their aircraft to help some worthy cause. I can remember one time down on the island just off of Caracas, Venezuela, it had been wiped out by a tornado. This was many years ago. So I took 14 airplanes down there to help those people out. If something happened to one of the airplanes and caused someone's injury or something, then they would not be protected. They didn't have a Good Samaritan law. A lot of people will not do this. People have actually lost their lives because they didn't get the help they needed because people would not volunteer their equipment to help people. So we have a Good Samaritan law and that should take care of that problem.

Many times I have seen when people are inspired as a volunteer—I have done the same thing myself—but there is a disincentive to do that. So the Pilot's Bill of Rights 2 is sensitive to the needs of pilots, airmen, and the general aviation community, and they have worked closely with me on it.

I have to say that the OPA and the EAA have worked all the way through this thing and they are fully supportive, as are all their individuals. In fact, I don't know of anyone in the aviation community who is not fully supportive of this.

We have introduced this bill. It is bipartisan. It is something that Senators

MANCHIN and BOOZMAN—they are the cochairs of the Senate General Aviation Caucus, and they are cosponsors of this bill.

I encourage Members—hopefully this will go to the commerce committee and we will be able to get a hearing on it very soon.

The House Members are waiting for it to come over, and we are anxious to get this bill passed. I know this is something that is not of concern to an awful lot of people in this country, but I can tell you it is a big concern to people who are pilots.

I yield the floor.

---

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m.

---

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 23, 2015:

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

WILLIAM P. DOYLE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSIONER FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2018.



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 23, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 23, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

### DON'T ALLOW USTR HALF-TRUTHS ON KOREA FTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFazio. Mr. Speaker, last week in an unprecedented new transparency, the Obama administration sent up Special Trade Ambassador Froman and Secretary Lew to talk about his proposed Trans-Pacific Partnership. Now, you might remember that until now, if a Member of Congress wished to see this secret agreement, they would have to go to a special secure room, were not allowed to take notes, and couldn't talk about it. At the same time, it is shared in realtime with 500 multinational corporations who don't have to go to a secure room and are involved in the negotiations. But they came forward and they gave us some facts, figures, and statistics. Unfortunately, the statistics were not accurate.

Special Trade Representative Froman said that we are running a trade surplus with our free trade agreement countries. Wrong. False. Actually, in 2013 we had \$180 billion goods deficit; and, yeah, we had a \$75 billion

services deficit. The aggregate means \$105 billion deficit.

Now, they kind of turned a little trick here. They pretend that something made entirely in China, shipped to Los Angeles, and then shipped over the border to Mexico is a U.S. export. Well, yeah, it created one trucking job and maybe one longshoreman job, but the manufacturing jobs are all in China. This is a new trick, and it still doesn't get them to balance, but they like to pretend.

Then we were treated to some half-truths. I said: "Well, isn't this substantially based on the Korea Free Trade Agreement."

"Yes, it is."

"Is that a success?"

"Oh, yes, it is. Well, look. In fact, look here. Isn't this incredible? \$100.5 billion of exports from the U.S. to Korea."

Oh, well, wait a minute. That is half the truth. Here is the other half. Actually, \$14.7 billion in goods from Korea to here. So we ran a massive and growing trade deficit since we entered into this agreement.

I have tried to get specific with them. I said: "How about autos? We were going to open up the auto market."

And they have something to tout. Our auto exports are up 140 percent. Wow. That sounds pretty darn good. And Koreans' are only up by 50 percent. Wow. That means we are winning. Well, no, because U.S. auto exports went from 14,000 to 34,000; Korean auto exports went from 827,000 to 1.3 million. That means we ran a deficit of 461,402 more autos created in Korea and exported here since we entered into this trade agreement. Yet that is what they are modeling this new agreement on.

They are saying the tremendous success of NAFTA and Korea is what we want to duplicate in this Trans-Pacific Partnership which will include such honest actors as Vietnam, where they can use prison and child labor, and a number of other countries. Japan has engaged in currency manipulation distortion for decades to advantage their goods against ours, and then when asked about currency manipulation, they say: "Absolutely not. We can't have that discussion here. It would be to our disadvantage."

No. It would be to the disadvantage of some multinational corporations who take advantage of currency manipulation, like China and Japan, to make their goods cheaper, to put people out of work here and capture more manu-

facturing over there. Oh, yes, there is one big winner in currency manipulation who is worried about any restrictions on currency and capital flows. That would be Wall Street.

Mr. Speaker, the two big winners for the U.S. in these agreements are the pharmaceutical industry—oh, what a wonderful, good friend to Americans. How many people does that employ here other than sales reps? It is almost all manufactured overseas now—and Wall Street. That is the way all these trade agreements have worked: a few very selected winners in the U.S.; the big losers are U.S. workers and U.S. manufacturing.

The question I have been asking since I opposed NAFTA more than 20 years ago is: How can you be a great nation if you don't make things anymore?

### THE HYPOCRISY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the United Nations and what can only be described as its increasingly outrageous actions on the world stage. How else would you describe planning a conference on gender equality, feminism, and sexual violence that invited only men to participate? or telling the Catholic Church that its pro-life stance equals psychological torture?

Well, last week, the United Nations really went off the deep end when its Commission on the Status of Women adopted a resolution that singles out and condemns Israel for violating the rights of women. That's right. This Commission condemned a country that has guaranteed women equality in work, education, health, and social welfare for more than 60 years. It denounced a country where rape, including spousal rape, is a felony punishable by 16 years in prison, whose Ministry of Social Affairs operates battered women's shelters and a hotline for reporting abuse and whose parliament passed nearly 50 initiatives to promote gender equality and empower women over the past 4 years. It accused the only country in the Middle East that fully respects the rights of women with violating the rights of women.

To say I wholeheartedly disagree with this fiction the U.N. has concocted would be an understatement. Let's look at the facts.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

On its Web site, the Commission lists selected grim statistics for the status of women in the world: They inform us that one in three women have experienced physical or sexual violence; they let us know that 120 million girls have been forced into intercourse or other sexual acts at some point in their lives; and they tell us 133 million women and girls have undergone female genital mutilation.

When you consider those numbers, it is mind-boggling that the Commission believes that Israel is the only one of the 193 U.N. member states worthy of condemnation for its record on women's rights. How is that even possible? Israel's entire population is less than 10 million.

According to the World Health Organization, nearly 40 percent of all murders of women worldwide are carried out by an intimate partner. Yet dozens of countries around the world do not have specific laws against domestic violence. Where is the Commission's condemnation of Russia and Kenya? of Burkina Faso and Pakistan? of Congo and Lesotho? of Niger?

Why didn't the Commission cite Sudan, where the legal age of marriage for girls is 10 years old and 88 percent of women under 50 have undergone female genital mutilation?

Why didn't the Commission condemn Iran, where a woman's testimony is only worth half of a man's in court, and rape within marriage is not recognized as a criminal offense?

Where is the censure of India, where statistics show a rape occurs every 22 minutes? Why didn't the Commission want to talk about the victims in that country, who include a nun in her seventies who was gang-raped by a group of bandits when she tried to prevent them from committing a robbery in a Christian missionary school, as well as two teenaged cousins from a low caste who didn't have a toilet in their home and were raped, strangled, and found hanging from a tree because they went outside to relieve themselves during the night.

Why aren't these countries worthy of the same denunciation? You might be surprised to learn they all sit on the Commission on the Status of Women. That's right. Some of the world worst violators of women's rights sit on a commission that calls itself "the principal global intergovernmental body exclusively dedicated to the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women."

It is clear from the facts that this single-minded attack is just the latest salvo in the U.N.'s never-ending anti-Israeli agenda, and it is time we stand up for our friend and ally.

As a founding member of the U.N. and a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, United States has a duty to insist on a higher standard. The status quo is simply unacceptable.

#### HONORING GRETCHEN MILLER KAFOURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Gretchen Miller Kafoury passed away 2 weeks ago in Portland. She left us at age 72, far too soon, only recently retired from her amazing career. It was my honor to have served with Gretchen in the Oregon Legislature in the seventies, on the Multnomah County Commission in the eighties, and the Portland City Council in the nineties.

She fulfilled responsibilities in each office with a passion, a dedication to the underprivileged, a hardheaded realism; plainspoken, down-to-earth, warm and generous in spirit personally and professionally.

She started her career as a Peace Corps volunteer in Iran. She loved that country and its people. Throughout her life, that experience informed her views of the Middle East, her knowledge of the warmth and support by the Iranian people for Americans.

Gretchen offered a voice in our community for a more thoughtful approach to that country, including at least attempting diplomatic efforts. It is too bad she couldn't have talked to some people in Congress who were either too afraid or distracted to try diplomacy.

Despite her well-earned reputation as a liberal firebrand, she was always supportive of thoughtful and diplomatic efforts of cooperation, negotiation, and listening.

She was extraordinarily effective in advancing the interests of her constituents. Her legacy includes a facility for the homeless with her name on it and countless projects and programs that she helped conceive and advance. She helped shape policies in human services, land use, and the arts.

Her legacy also includes her daughters, Katharine and Deborah. Part of that political legacy is a daughter, Deborah, who served in the leadership of the Oregon Legislature, following in her mother's footsteps, and is currently chair of the Multnomah County Commission on which Gretchen so honorably served.

She was an educator, having taught for more than 10 years, most recently at the Portland State University Hatfield School of Government.

She was a pioneer in women's rights, having famously helped lead the efforts to integrate the previously all-male Portland City Club. In our community, it was very significant in and of itself as a powerful signal of the acceptance of women, not just rhetorically. It was part of a cause for which she devoted her entire life. Women, gay rights, minorities, Gretchen was a tireless champion for people who needed a tireless champion.

For all the joys of working with Gretchen, I will remember her best as a

friend. Highlights include spending time with her at her lovely beach retreat on the Oregon coast or a fabulous trip to New York with our then-spouses that included running the New York Marathon, theater, good food, and fabulous company.

Over four decades, Gretchen Kafoury helped make our community more liveable and more humane, and we are grateful.

#### PORT OF KENNEWICK'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary this month of the Port of Kennewick, located in my congressional district in Benton County.

For 100 years, the port has been a driver of economic development, transportation improvement, job creation, and opportunities for the mid-Columbia region. Voters approved the creation of the port in 1915, after the construction of the Dalles-Celilo Canal, which allowed boats to navigate from the Pacific to the upper stretches of the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

Looking back on its industrial legacy, the port has entered an exciting new phase of redevelopment in recent years. The revitalized port, which is Washington State's fifth oldest, promises to create tourism and recreational opportunities in the Tri-Cities, drawing visitors to our area with projects that include the Clover Island Marina, Columbia Drive, and Vista Field.

This month we celebrate 100 years of economic opportunity and look forward to continued progress at the Port of Kennewick.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Elias Correa-Torres, Belmont Abbey, Belmont, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Loving God, source of all wisdom, You lead us in discovering what is true and good, so that human society may come to reflect Your loving order.

Bless the work of the people's House, inspire all those who labor in it with Your wisdom and truth. Give them a spirit of enthusiasm and joy in their worthy efforts, and may they find fulfillment in their service. As they seek to advance the common good, guide them in making right decisions and carrying them out with true justice, helping them to be particularly attentive to the needs of those who cannot fend for themselves, or who struggle with little hope.

May the work of this House help advance a peaceful society in our Nation and foster unity in mutual goodwill, so that in all things, You may be glorified.

We ask all this in Your most holy name.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTENGER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### BUDGET

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, President Reagan once told us that the nine most terrifying words in the English language are: "I'm from the government, and I'm here to help."

Well, the kind of help we have received, Mr. Speaker, has been more regulations, a greater tax burden, a bigger bureaucracy, and no growth for the American family, for American business.

This week, we have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to change this course by passing the House 2016 budget, which cuts \$5.5 trillion in spending while strengthening vital programs; calls for a fairer, simpler Tax Code to promote good-paying jobs and an opportunity economy; completely repeals ObamaCare; and puts a premium on accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness in all areas of the Federal Government.

Now is the time to restore common sense and fiscal sanity to Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the House 2016 budget.

### PRESIDENT'S NEW REGULATIONS ON HYDRAULIC FRACTURING

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, President Obama released new regulations for hydraulic fracturing and once again turned his back on job creation in an attempt to appease a small but vocal group of environmental extremists.

These new regulations are unnecessary and threaten the potential growth of jobs on Federal lands and across the Nation.

Production of shale resources has grown by leaps and bounds in recent years, and much of this growth has been due to private sector innovation, coupled with sensible regulations at the State and local levels.

As one of the top producers of natural gas, Pennsylvania continues to help drive record-breaking oil and natural gas production here at home.

Since 2006, Marcellus producers have contributed over \$1 billion in State taxes, along with half a billion dollars in road construction.

Communities in Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District have greatly benefited from the technology and safety advancements that make natural gas readily available.

This success has been made possible due to regulations administered at the State level, not by adding the bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I will work with my colleagues in Congress and do all that I can to stop top-down policies such as this that undermine economic progress and energy security.

### HOUSE BUDGET PROPOSAL

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, last month, President Obama released his budget proposal. It, as expected, increases taxes and spending without balancing the budget and allows Social Security and Medicare to go bankrupt. The President's refusal to address the compounding national debt emphasizes his disinterest in being a leader.

Fortunately, we in the House are leading. Our budget offers a stark contrast. We implement commonsense reforms, balance the budget, eliminate wasteful government spending, repeal ObamaCare in full, and preserve Social Security and Medicare for current beneficiaries and future generations.

Our budget restores the principle of federalism—the foundation of our Con-

stitution—empowering States, local communities, and the real drivers of opportunity and prosperity, the American people.

I look forward to the debate this week in the House and working to ensure the proper balance between our national security interests and our long-term deficit reduction.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 20, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, The Capitol,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 20, 2015, at 2:24 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the District of Columbia's Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request Act.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk of the House.*

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET AND FINANCIAL PLAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-19)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Pursuant to my constitutional authority and as contemplated by section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act as amended in 1989, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's fiscal year (FY) 2015 Budget and Financial Plan. This transmittal does not represent an endorsement of the contents of the D.C. government's requests.

The proposed FY 2015 Budget and Financial Plan reflects the major programmatic objectives of the Mayor and the Council of the District of Columbia. For FY 2015, the District estimates total revenues and expenditures of \$12.6 billion.

BARACK OBAMA.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 20, 2015.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia) at 4 p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### TENANT INCOME VERIFICATION RELIEF ACT OF 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 233) to allow reviews of certain families' incomes every 3 years for purposes of determining eligibility for certain Federal assisted housing programs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 233

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. REVIEWS OF FAMILY INCOMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 3(a) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437a(a)(1)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: " ; except that, in the case of any family with a fixed income, as defined by the Secretary, after the initial review of the family's income, the public housing agency or owner shall not be required to conduct a review of the family's income for any year for which such family certifies, in accordance with such requirements as the Secretary shall establish, which shall include policies to adjust for inflation-based income changes, that 90 percent or more of the income of the family consists of fixed income, and that the sources of such income have not changed since the previous year, except that the public housing agency or owner shall conduct a review of each such family's income not less than once every 3 years".

(b) HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Subparagraph (A) of section 8(o)(5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(5)(A)) is amended by striking "not less than annually" and inserting "as required by section 3(a)(1) of this Act".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 233, the Tenant Income Verification Relief Act, and I am proud to cosponsor it with my colleague from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

This is a very simple bill that helps relieve stressful burdens of fixed-income tenants who participate in the housing choice voucher and project-based housing programs all across the country. Additionally, it is a responsible reform bill that will allow housing authorities to work more efficiently and effectively at less cost to the taxpayers.

I have heard from housing authorities from Columbus, Ohio, from Circleville, Ohio, from other parts of my district, and throughout the country about how burdensome this requirement is on elderly tenants as well as on the housing authorities.

Current law requires tenant verification of income at move-in and recertification annually. This legislation allows for the recertification of residents' incomes every 3 years rather than annually for individuals and families on fixed incomes.

It will permit housing authorities to verify these tenants' incomes when they change as well as annually. Based on a recent U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development study of these 2 million residents on fixed incomes, about half of them are on very fixed incomes that are not changing. Most of them are using Social Security as their main source of income.

This bill is a great first step toward ensuring our Nation's low-income families have safe places to live, while also reducing administrative burdens on families and on these housing authorities and toward saving taxpayer resources. I ask my colleagues to join me and Mr. PERLMUTTER in supporting this commonsense legislation.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership and for his commonsense approach on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Mr. STIVERS for joining me in H.R. 233, and I want to thank

the chairman of the committee, Mr. HENSARLING, and the ranking member, Ms. WATERS, for their support of this bill as well.

Mr. STIVERS has described it well, but I think we should go through it one more time, just so the record is clear for future generations.

H.R. 233, the Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015, represents a bipartisan effort to aid our most vulnerable constituents and to provide marginal regulatory relief to public housing authorities and to those who have privately owned rental properties who wish to service housing vouchers.

Currently, private property owners and State and local housing agencies must review income annually for all rental assistance recipients. That includes recipients who receive most or all of their income from fixed sources—such as from Social Security or other pensions—and, therefore, see little income change from year to year.

Our legislation reduces administrative burdens by allowing for the recertification of rent and income to occur every 3 years rather than annually for those on fixed incomes. In other words, housing authorities and those who accept vouchers would be allowed to conduct triennial income recertifications for households of which 90 percent or more of their income is fixed.

The annual review requirement also places burdens on those within fixed income households themselves, who must gather and submit information needed to verify income and deductions and who, in some cases, must go to agencies for in-person reviews.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, which wrote in support of H.R. 233, said that this change would substantially reduce paperwork burdens for low-income seniors and for people with disabilities and administrative costs for agencies and owners.

More than half of rental assistance recipients are elderly or disabled, who often rely on fixed incomes, and income reviews are the single largest source of rental assistance administrative costs.

Due to ongoing budget pressures, our public housing authorities are struggling to manage their Section 8 housing programs. In fact, it is estimated the amount Congress appropriates to fund the housing choice voucher program is only 74 percent of what is actually required to run the program.

The Public Housing Authorities Directors Association wrote to me, saying:

Both in principle and in practice, your bill is a commonsense approach to streamlining Federal rental assistance programs at a time when scarce financial resources are straining housing authorities' program delivery.

Since continued budget pressures are precluding Congress from funding the cost of administering this program 100 percent, we must look at solutions to

control expenses or the cost of running the program.

This provision or concept is not new. In fact, it has been included in several comprehensive Section 8 reform bills by both Democrats and Republicans. In fact, the administration included language similar to H.R. 233 in the 2016 budget proposal.

I stand here today with my friend, Mr. STIVERS from Ohio, with a reasonable and commonsense proposal, making our public housing programs more efficient, and we all want to find ways to make our government run more efficiently.

I have a number of letters to include for the RECORD.

PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITIES  
DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, DC, January 12, 2015.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PERLMUTTER: On behalf of the Public Housing Authorities Directors Association (PHADA), I would like to thank you for introducing the Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015 (HR 233) as an original co-sponsor. If enacted, this bill would allow Housing Authorities (HAs) to conduct triennial recertifications for households where 90 percent or more their income is fixed.

Passage of the Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015 would benefit millions of low-income elderly and disabled households with fixed incomes in the Section 8 Tenant-Based Voucher and Public Housing programs. Fixed-income households, who are served by Housing Authorities, would benefit if they could be spared from having to go through the burdensome, confusing and stressful recertification process annually but to do so every three years instead.

Many households who receive Federal rental assistance live on fixed incomes. According to HUD's Resident Characteristics Report August 2013 through November 2014, approximately 20 percent of voucher-assisted households have a disabled head of household and approximately 22 percent have an elderly head of household. Approximately 17 percent of Public Housing-assisted households have a disabled head of household and approximately 31 percent have an elderly head of household. Although HUD's national data reflects a degree of overlap in households' types of income, approximately 55 percent of households receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Social Security and/or a pension for all or some of their annual income, in both Section 8 tenant-based and Public Housing programs.

Your legislation would also produce cost-savings for Housing Authorities, which struggle each year from downward funding pro-rations in Section 8 voucher program administrative fees and/or the Public Housing Operating Fund. Taken together, the above figures illustrate the scope and scale of relief that would benefit applicable low-income households and the Housing Authorities that serve them.

Legislation regarding triennial recertifications for fixed-income households has been a feature of both House and Senate authorizing rental assistance reform bills for several years, but has not been enacted into law yet. PHADA has demonstrated the adverse impacts of downward funding pro-rations, in terms of Housing Authorities' operations to

serve low-income households, participating property owners and the communities in which they live. Introduction of the bill is an important step for future action that could not come a moment too soon.

Both in principle and practice your bill is a common sense approach to streamlining Federal rental assistance programs at a time when scarce financial resources are straining Housing Authorities' program delivery. Given the urgent need for relief to low-income households and Housing Authorities, we believe that the bill can and should be enacted either as an amendment or a stand-alone bill as soon as possible.

Thank you and your staff for working on issues important to HAs and the low-income people they serve. PHADA and its members look forward to working with you and your colleagues to secure passage of the bill.

If you need any information or have questions, please feel free to call me at 202-546-5445.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY G. KAISER,  
Executive Director.

MARCH 20, 2015.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The real estate industry is pleased that Congress supports efforts to streamline rental assistance programs. Our industry believes it is imperative for Congress to pass legislation that will improve the federally assisted housing rental programs for both residents and owners alike: doing so saves taxpayer dollars and eliminates inefficiencies. We support H.R. 233, the "Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015" introduced by Congressman Perlmutter (D-CO) and Congressman Stivers (R-OH).

Our organizations represent owners, management companies, lenders, builders, developers, and housing cooperatives. We have long-supported these programs. The Housing Choice Voucher program provides rental subsidies to approximately two million low income households who obtain housing in the private rental market. This program broadens the range of housing choices for families seeking affordable housing, has a high success rate and serves as the cornerstone for public federal housing policy. The Project-Based Rental Assistance programs house nearly 1.3 million families and elderly households in privately owned housing—representing successful public and private partnerships that not only provide quality housing but often connect residents with services. This is particularly important for elderly residents, who may otherwise be forced to move to nursing homes. These programs are essential tools that also preserve and expand the supply of quality affordable housing, a necessity in today's tight rental markets.

However, in spite of the overall success, the programs suffer under the weight of too many inefficient and duplicative requirements. The myriad overlapping and redundant procedures make the programs difficult to administer and, with respect to the voucher program, deter many professional landlords from participating. As such, we have worked diligently with Congress for several years to formulate common sense legislation that would streamline the sometimes burdensome procedures associated with operating and maintaining an assisted housing portfolio.

H.R. 233 significantly reduces administrative burdens by allowing for the recertification of residents' income to occur every three years rather than annually for those

residents on fixed incomes, permitting verification review efforts to focus on those whose incomes change.

We urge you to support efforts to streamline the assisted housing programs and urge Congress to pass H.R. 233, the "Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015."

Sincerely,

Council for Affordable and Rural Housing (CARH); Institute of Real Estate Management (IREM); Leading Age; National Apartment Association (NAA); National Affordable Housing Management Association (NAHMA); National Association of Home Builders (NAHB); National Association of Housing Cooperatives (NAHC); National Association of Realtors (NAR); National Leased Housing Association (NLHA); National Multifamily Housing Council (NMHC).

CENTER ON BUDGET  
AND POLICY PRIORITIES,

Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman,  
Hon. MAXINE WATERS, Ranking Member,  
Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: The Tenant Income Verification Relief Act of 2015 (H.R. 233) is a well-designed, common sense measure to ease administrative burdens in federal rental assistance programs while maintaining key protections for low-income program participants. We strongly recommend that Congress move promptly to enact the bill.

Currently, owners and state and local housing agencies must review income annually for all rental assistance recipients. That includes recipients who receive most or all of their income from fixed sources such as Social Security or SSI and therefore see little income change from year to year. This requirement imposes sizable administrative costs. More than half of rental assistance recipients are elderly or disabled households that often rely on fixed incomes, and income reviews are the single largest source of rental assistance administrative costs. The annual review requirement also places burdens on the fixed-income households themselves, who must gather and submit information needed to verify income and deductions and in some cases must go to agency offices for in-person reviews.

HUD has eased burdens modestly by administratively streamlining review requirements for fixed-income households (and has proposed regulations to codify the change), but HUD lacks authority to allow less frequent reviews because the annual income review requirement is statutory. H.R. 233 would reduce the frequency of required reviews for fixed-income families to once every three years and direct HUD to establish procedures to adjust income for inflation in the intervening years. This change would substantially reduce paperwork burdens for low-income seniors and people with disabilities and administrative costs for agencies and owners. The need for the administrative savings is particularly acute now, since both the Public Housing Operating Fund and Housing Choice Voucher administrative fees have been deeply underfunded in recent years.

The changes in H.R. 233 have been proposed in a series of bills that received strong bipartisan support. For example, provisions similar to H.R. 233 were included in both the Affordable Housing and Self-Sufficiency Improvement Act (AHSSIA), which a subcommittee of the House Financial Services

Committee approved by a voice vote in January 2012, and the Section 8 Voucher Reform Act (SEVRA), which the House passed 333-83 in July 2007.

Congress should enact this important, timely, well-vetted proposal without further delay.

Sincerely,

BARBARA SARD,  
Vice President for Housing Policy.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING  
AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS,  
Washington, DC, March 19, 2015.

Hon. ED PERLMUTTER,  
Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. STEVE STIVERS,  
Longworth Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REP. PERLMUTTER AND REP. STIVERS: On behalf of the over 22,000 members of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO), I am writing today to underscore our strong support for the expeditious approval of the Tenant Income Verification Act of 2015 (HR 233) that you are both sponsoring.

This common-sense legislation would amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to allow PHAs to reduce the frequency of re-examinations for families that receive at least 90 percent of their income from fixed sources. PHAs would not be required to review a public housing or Section 8 family's income for any year for which the family certifies that it has a fixed income and the source of the income has not changed since the previous year. PHAs would be required to conduct a review of the family's income not less than once every three years; in any year in which a PHA does not conduct a review of income, a family's prior year income determination would be adjusted by applying an inflationary factor.

NAHRO strongly supports the bill's focus on reducing unnecessary administrative burdens. We also believe this legislation properly balances the need to maintain responsible government protections; the legislation does not adversely impact residents and provides long-overdue administrative relief that will increase local PHA's ability to address other pressing needs. Responsible reform legislation such as this ultimately enables PHAs to work more efficiently and effectively at less cost to the federal government.

NAHRO has been working with both HUD and members of Congress to bring about responsible programmatic and regulatory reforms. This legislation is a strong and necessary step forward. In this regard, we were pleased to see that the Administration included language similar to HR 233 in the FY 2016 budget proposal. We urge the House to approve this legislation under suspension of the rules so that it can be promptly sent to the Senate for adoption.

We stand ready to continue to work with members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to approve properly balanced programmatic reforms that sustain the ability of PHAs to provide decent, safe and affordable housing for vulnerable families.

Respectfully,

SAUL N. RAMIREZ JR.,  
Chief Executive Officer, NAHRO.

NATIONAL LOW INCOME  
HOUSING COALITION,  
Washington, DC, March 18, 2015.

Hon. JEB HENSARLING,  
Chair, House Committee on Financial Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,  
Ranking Member, House Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HENSARLING AND RANKING MEMBER WATERS: On behalf of the National Low Income Housing Coalition, I am pleased to support H.R. 233, legislation that would allow public housing agencies to reduce the frequency of income recertifications for HUD rent assisted households whose income is at least 90% from fixed-income sources. Income recertifications for fixed-income households would be only every three years, instead of annually.

NLIHC members include non-profit housing providers, homeless service providers, fair housing organizations, state and local housing coalitions, public housing agencies, private developers and property owners, housing researchers, local and state government agencies, faith-based organizations, residents of public and assisted housing and their organizations, and concerned citizens. We do not represent any sector of the housing industry. Rather, NLIHC works only on behalf of and with low income people who need safe, decent, and affordable homes, especially those with the most serious housing problems, including people who are homeless. NLIHC is funded entirely with private contributions.

Because a tenant's share of rent is based on income, recertifications are done to make sure tenants are paying the correct amount of rent. The Department of Housing and Urban Development estimates that fixed-income families are about 50% of all public housing, housing choice voucher, and project-based rental assistance tenants. If implemented, this policy change could substantially reduce administrative duties for public housing agencies and owners, as well as recertification time for tenants.

This is an idea whose time has come. One of the suggestions resulting from the 2005 National Housing Voucher Summit, which NLIHC convened, was to implement rent simplification policies, including reducing the income recertification period for people whose income is largely from fixed sources, such as Social Security and SSI, to three years. In the years when recertifications are not required, Summit participants recommended, tenant incomes could be adjusted based on the cost-of-living adjustment in any income maintenance program in which the household participates.

We applaud Representatives Ed Perlmutter and Steve Stivers for introducing this important legislation and hope that Congress acts swiftly toward its enactment.

Sincerely,

SHEILA CROWLEY,  
President and CEO.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we pass this today here on the floor of the House and that the Senate passes it quickly and sends it to the President's desk.

I thank my friend, Mr. STIVERS, for joining me on this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just want to ask all of my colleagues to support this legislation. It is common sense, and it simplifies an

administrative burden. It saves money for taxpayers, and it allows people on fixed incomes, whether they be senior citizens or disabled, to have less onerous burdens. This is a commonsense bill.

I thank the gentleman from Colorado for his leadership, and I urge everyone to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 233.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 360) to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 360

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2015".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. References.

#### TITLE I—BLOCK GRANTS AND GRANT REQUIREMENTS

Sec. 101. Block grants.

Sec. 102. Recommendations regarding exceptions to annual Indian housing plan requirement.

Sec. 103. Environmental review.

Sec. 104. Deadline for action on request for approval regarding exceeding TDC maximum cost for project.

#### TITLE II—AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACTIVITIES

Sec. 201. National objectives and eligible families.

Sec. 202. Program requirements.

Sec. 203. Homeownership or lease-to-own low-income requirement and income targeting.

Sec. 204. Lease requirements and tenant selection.

Sec. 205. Tribal coordination of agency funding.

#### TITLE III—ALLOCATION OF GRANT AMOUNTS

Sec. 301. Authorization of appropriations.

Sec. 302. Effect of undisbursed block grant amounts on annual allocations.

#### TITLE IV—AUDITS AND REPORTS

Sec. 401. Review and audit by Secretary.

Sec. 402. Reports to Congress.

# TITLE V—OTHER HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICANS

Sec. 501. HUD-Veterans Affairs supportive housing program for Native American veterans.

Sec. 502. Loan guarantees for Indian housing.

## TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 601. Lands Title Report Commission.

Sec. 602. Limitation on use of funds for Cherokee Nation.

Sec. 603. Leasehold interest in trust or restricted lands for housing purposes.

Sec. 604. Clerical amendment.

# TITLE VII—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING

Sec. 701. Demonstration program.

Sec. 702. Clerical amendments.

## TITLE VIII—HOUSING FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

Sec. 801. Reauthorization of Native Hawaiian Homeownership Act.

Sec. 802. Reauthorization of loan guarantees for Native Hawaiian housing.

## SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.).

## TITLE I—BLOCK GRANTS AND GRANT REQUIREMENTS

### SEC. 101. BLOCK GRANTS.

Section 101 (25 U.S.C. 4111) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by adding after the period at the end the following: “The Secretary shall act upon a waiver request submitted under this subsection by a recipient within 60 days after receipt of such request.”; and

(2) in subsection (k), by striking “1” and inserting “an”.

### SEC. 102. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING EXCEPTIONS TO ANNUAL INDIAN HOUSING PLAN REQUIREMENT.

Not later than the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and after consultation with Indian tribes, tribally designated housing entities, and other interested parties, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to the Congress recommendations for standards and procedures for waiver of, or alternative requirements (which may include multi-year housing plans) for, the requirement under section 102(a) of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4112(a)) for annual submission of one-year housing plans for an Indian tribe. Such recommendations shall include a description of any legislative and regulatory changes necessary to implement such recommendations.

### SEC. 103. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.

Section 105 (25 U.S.C. 4115) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by adding after and below paragraph (4) the following:

“The Secretary shall act upon a waiver request submitted under this subsection by a recipient within 60 days after receipt of such request.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) CONSOLIDATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW REQUIREMENTS.—If a recipient is using one or more sources of Federal funds in addition to grant amounts under this Act in carrying out a project that qualifies as an affordable housing activity under section 202, such other sources of Federal funds do not exceed 49 percent of the total cost of the project, and the recipient's tribe has assumed all of the responsibilities for environmental review, decisionmaking, and action pursuant to this section, the tribe's compliance with the review requirements under this section and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 with regard to such project shall be deemed to fully comply with and discharge any applicable environmental review requirements that might apply to Federal agencies with respect to the use of such additional Federal funding sources for that project.”.

### SEC. 104. DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON REQUEST FOR APPROVAL REGARDING EXCEEDING TDC MAXIMUM COST FOR PROJECT.

(a) APPROVAL.—Section 103 (25 U.S.C. 4113) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) DEADLINE FOR ACTION ON REQUEST TO EXCEED TDC MAXIMUM.—A request for approval by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to exceed by more than 10 percent the total development cost maximum cost for a project shall be approved or denied during the 60-day period that begins on the date that the Secretary receives the request.”.

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 4 (25 U.S.C. 4103) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (22) as paragraph (23); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (21) the following new paragraph:

“(22) TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST.—The term ‘total development cost’ means, with respect to a housing project, the sum of all costs for the project, including all undertakings necessary for administration, planning, site acquisition, demolition, construction or equipment and financing (including payment of carrying charges), and for otherwise carrying out the development of the project, excluding off-site water and sewer. The total development cost amounts shall be based on a moderately designed house and determined by averaging the current construction costs as listed in not less than two nationally recognized residential construction cost indices.”.

## TITLE II—AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACTIVITIES

### SEC. 201. NATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND ELIGIBLE FAMILIES.

The second paragraph (6) of section 201(b) (25 U.S.C. 4131(b)(6); relating to exemption) is amended—

(1) by striking “1964 and” and inserting “1964.”; and

(2) by inserting after “1968” the following: “, and section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968”.

### SEC. 202. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.

Section 203(a) (25 U.S.C. 4133(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “paragraph (2)” and inserting “paragraphs (2) and (3)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) APPLICATION OF TRIBAL POLICIES.—Paragraph (2) shall not apply if the recipient has a written policy governing rents and

homebuyer payments charged for dwelling units and such policy includes a provision governing maximum rents or homebuyer payments.”.

### SEC. 203. HOMEOWNERSHIP OR LEASE-TO-OWN LOW-INCOME REQUIREMENT AND INCOME TARGETING.

Section 205 (25 U.S.C. 4135) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, in the case of rental housing that is made available to a current rental family for conversion to a homebuyer or a lease-purchase unit, that the current rental family can purchase through a contract of sale, lease-purchase agreement, or any other sales agreement, is made available for purchase only by the current rental family, if the rental family was a low-income family at the time of their initial occupancy of such unit; and”;

(2) in subsection (c), by adding after the period at the end the following: “The provisions of such paragraph regarding binding commitments for the remaining useful life of the property shall not apply to improvements of privately owned homes if the cost of such improvements do not exceed 10 percent of the maximum total development cost for such home.”.

### SEC. 204. LEASE REQUIREMENTS AND TENANT SELECTION.

Section 207 (25 U.S.C. 4137) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) NOTICE OF TERMINATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the owner or manager of rental housing that is assisted in part with amounts provided under this Act and in part with one or more other sources of Federal funds shall only utilize leases that require a notice period for the termination of the lease pursuant to subsection (a)(3).”.

### SEC. 205. TRIBAL COORDINATION OF AGENCY FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title II (25 U.S.C. 4131 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### “SEC. 211. TRIBAL COORDINATION OF AGENCY FUNDING.

“Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a recipient authorized to receive funding under this Act may, in its discretion, use funding from the Indian Health Service of the Department of Health and Human Services for construction of sanitation facilities for housing construction and renovation projects that are funded in part by funds provided under this Act.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 210 the following new item:

“Sec. 211. Tribal coordination of agency funding.”.

## TITLE III—ALLOCATION OF GRANT AMOUNTS

### SEC. 301. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The first sentence of section 108 (25 U.S.C. 4117) is amended by striking “such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013” and inserting “\$650,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019”.

### SEC. 302. EFFECT OF UNDISBURSED BLOCK GRANT AMOUNTS ON ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III (25 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:



**“SEC. 303. EFFECT OF UNDISBURSED GRANT AMOUNTS ON ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS.**

“(a) NOTIFICATION OF OBLIGATED, UNDISBURSED GRANT AMOUNTS.—Subject to subsection (d) of this section, if as of January 1 of 2016 or any year thereafter a recipient's total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system is greater than three times the formula allocation such recipient would otherwise receive under this Act for the fiscal year during which such January 1 occurs, the Secretary shall—

“(1) before January 31 of such year, notify the Indian tribe allocated the grant amounts and any tribally designated housing entity for the tribe of the undisbursed funds; and

“(2) require the recipient for the tribe to, not later than 30 days after the Secretary provides notification pursuant to paragraph (1)—

“(A) notify the Secretary in writing of the reasons why the recipient has not requested the disbursement of such amounts; and

“(B) demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the recipient has the capacity to spend Federal funds in an effective manner, which demonstration may include evidence of the timely expenditure of amounts previously distributed under this Act to the recipient.

“(b) ALLOCATION AMOUNT.—Notwithstanding sections 301 and 302, the allocation for such fiscal year for a recipient described in subsection (a) shall be the amount initially calculated according to the formula minus the difference between the recipient's total amount of undisbursed block grants in the Department's line of credit control system on such January 1 and three times the initial formula amount for such fiscal year.

“(c) REALLOCATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any grant amounts not allocated to a recipient pursuant to subsection (b) shall be allocated under the need component of the formula proportionately amount all other Indian tribes not subject to such an adjustment.

“(d) INAPPLICABILITY.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to an Indian tribe with respect to any fiscal year for which the amount allocated for the tribe for block grants under this Act is less than \$5,000,000.

“(e) EFFECTIVENESS.—This section shall not require the issuance of any regulation to take effect and shall not be construed to confer hearing rights under this or any other section of this Act.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 302 the following new item:

“Sec. 303. Effect of undisbursed grant amounts on annual allocations.”

**TITLE IV—AUDITS AND REPORTS**

**SEC. 401. REVIEW AND AUDIT BY SECRETARY.**

Section 405(c) (25 U.S.C. 4165(c)) is amended, by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) ISSUANCE OF FINAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall issue a final report within 60 days after receiving comments under paragraph (1) from a recipient.”

**SEC. 402. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**

Section 407 (25 U.S.C. 4167) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Congress” and inserting “Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, to the Committee on Indian Affairs and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate, and to any subcommit-

tees of such committees having jurisdiction with respect to Native American and Alaska Native affairs,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY TO RECIPIENTS.—Each report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made publicly available to recipients.”

**TITLE V—OTHER HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICANS**

**SEC. 501. HUD-VETERANS AFFAIRS SUPPORTIVE HOUSING PROGRAM FOR NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS.**

Paragraph (19) of section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) NATIVE AMERICAN VETERANS.—

“(i) AUTHORITY.—Of the funds made available for rental assistance under this subsection for fiscal year 2015 and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary shall set aside 5 percent for a supported housing and rental assistance program modeled on the HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing (HUD-VASH) program, to be administered in conjunction with the Department of Veterans Affairs, for the benefit of homeless Native American veterans and veterans at risk of homelessness.

“(ii) RECIPIENTS.—Such rental assistance shall be made available to recipients eligible to receive block grants under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.).

“(iii) FUNDING CRITERIA.—Funds shall be awarded based on need, administrative capacity, and any other funding criteria established by the Secretary in a notice published in the Federal Register, after consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, by a date sufficient to provide for implementation of the program under this subparagraph in accordance with clause (i).

“(iv) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—Such funds shall be administered by block grant recipients in accordance with program requirements under Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 in lieu of program requirements under this Act.

“(v) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive, or specify alternative requirements for any provision of any statute or regulation that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of funds made available under this subparagraph, but only upon a finding by the Secretary that such waiver or alternative requirement is necessary to promote administrative efficiency, eliminate delay, consolidate or eliminate duplicative or ineffective requirements or criteria, or otherwise provide for the effective delivery and administration of such supportive housing assistance to Native American veterans.

“(vi) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly consult with block grant recipients and any other appropriate tribal organizations to—

“(I) ensure that block grant recipients administering funds made available under the program under this subparagraph are able to effectively coordinate with providers of supportive services provided in connection with such program; and

“(II) ensure the effective delivery of supportive services to Native American veterans that are homeless or at risk of homelessness eligible to receive assistance under this subparagraph.

Consultation pursuant to this clause shall be completed by a date sufficient to provide for implementation of the program under this subparagraph in accordance with clause (i).

“(vii) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall establish the requirements and criteria for the supported housing and rental assistance program under this subparagraph by notice published in the Federal Register, but shall provide Indian tribes and tribally designated housing agencies an opportunity for comment and consultation before publication of a final notice pursuant to this clause.”

**SEC. 502. LOAN GUARANTEES FOR INDIAN HOUSING.**

Section 184(i)(5) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z–13a(i)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after the period at the end of the first sentence the following: “There are authorized to be appropriated for such costs \$12,200,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019.”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “2008 through 2012” and inserting “2015 through 2019”; and

(B) by striking “such amount as may be provided in appropriation Acts for” and inserting “\$976,000,000 for each”.

**TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS**

**SEC. 601. LANDS TITLE REPORT COMMISSION.**

Section 501 of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4043 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “Subject to sums being provided in advance in appropriations Acts, there” and inserting “There”; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1) by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

**SEC. 602. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CHEROKEE NATION.**

Section 801 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–411) is amended by striking “Temporary Order and Temporary Injunction issued on May 14, 2007, by the District Court of the Cherokee Nation” and inserting “Order issued September 21, 2011, by the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia”.

**SEC. 603. LEASEHOLD INTEREST IN TRUST OR RESTRICTED LANDS FOR HOUSING PURPOSES.**

Section 702 (25 U.S.C. 4211) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting “, whether enacted before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this section” after “law”; and

(2) by striking “50 years” each place such term appears and inserting “99 years”.

**SEC. 604. CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**

The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by striking the item relating to section 206 (treatment of funds).

**TITLE VII—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING**

**SEC. 701. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.**

Add at the end of the Act the following new title:

**“TITLE IX—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING**

**“SEC. 901. AUTHORITY.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other authority provided in this Act for the construction, development, maintenance, and

operation of housing for Indian families, the Secretary shall provide the participating tribes having final plans approved pursuant to section 905 with the authority to exercise the activities provided under this title and such plan for the acquisition and development of housing to meet the needs of tribal members.

“(b) INAPPLICABILITY OF NAHASDA PROVISIONS.—Except as specifically provided otherwise in this title, titles I through IV, VI, and VII shall not apply to a participating tribe's use of funds during any period that the tribe is participating in the demonstration program under this title.

“(c) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN NAHASDA PROVISIONS.—The following provisions of titles I through VIII shall apply to the demonstration program under this title and amounts made available under the demonstration program under this title:

“(1) Subsections (d) and (e) of section 101 (relating to tax exemption).

“(2) Section 101(j) (relating to Federal supply sources).

“(3) Section 101(k) (relating to tribal preference in employment and contracting).

“(4) Section 104 (relating to treatment of program income and labor standards).

“(5) Section 105 (relating to environmental review).

“(6) Section 201(b) (relating to eligible families), except as otherwise provided in this title.

“(7) Section 203(g) (relating to a de minimis exemption for procurement of goods and services).

“(8) Section 702 (relating to 99-year leasehold interests in trust or restricted lands for housing purposes).

#### “SEC. 902. PARTICIPATING TRIBES.

“(a) REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE.—To be eligible to participate in the demonstration program under this title, an Indian tribe shall submit to the Secretary a notice of intention to participate during the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, in such form and such manner as the Secretary shall provide.

“(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—Upon approval under section 905 of the final plan of an Indian tribe for participation in the demonstration program under this title, the Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the participating tribe that provides such tribe with the authority to carry out activities under the demonstration program.

“(c) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not approve more than 20 Indian tribes for participation in the demonstration program under this title.

#### “SEC. 903. REQUEST FOR QUOTES AND SELECTION OF INVESTOR PARTNER.

“(a) REQUEST FOR QUOTES.—Not later than the expiration of the 180-day period beginning upon notification to the Secretary by an Indian tribe of intention to participate in the demonstration program under this title, the Indian tribe shall—

“(1) obtain assistance from a qualified entity in assessing the housing needs, including the affordable housing needs, of the tribe; and

“(2) release a request for quotations from entities interested in partnering with the tribe in designing and carrying out housing activities sufficient to meet the tribe's housing needs as identified pursuant to paragraph (1).

“(b) SELECTION OF INVESTOR PARTNER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date

of the enactment of this title, an Indian tribe requesting to participate in the demonstration program under this title shall—

“(A) select an investor partner from among the entities that have responded to the tribe's request for quotations; and

“(B) together with such investor partner, establish and submit to the Secretary a final plan that meets the requirements under section 904.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The Secretary may extend the period under paragraph (1) for any tribe that—

“(A) has not received any satisfactory quotation in response to its request released pursuant to subsection (a)(2); or

“(B) has any other satisfactory reason, as determined by the Secretary, for failure to select an investor partner.

#### “SEC. 904. FINAL PLAN.

“A final plan under this section shall—

“(1) be developed by the participating tribe and the investor partner for the tribe selected pursuant to section 903(b)(1)(A);

“(2) identify the qualified entity that assisted the tribe in assessing the housing needs of the tribe;

“(3) set forth a detailed description of such projected housing needs, including affordable housing needs, of the tribe, which shall include—

“(A) a description of such need over the ensuing 24 months and thereafter until the expiration of the ensuing 5-year period or until the affordable housing need is met, whichever occurs sooner; and

“(B) the same information that would be required under section 102 to be included in an Indian housing plan for the tribe, as such requirements may be modified by the Secretary to take consideration of the requirements of the demonstration program under this title;

“(4) provide for specific housing activities sufficient to meet the tribe's housing needs, including affordable housing needs, as identified pursuant to paragraph (3) within the periods referred to such paragraph, which shall include—

“(A) development of affordable housing (as such term is defined in section 4 of this Act (25 U.S.C. 4103));

“(B) development of conventional homes for rental, lease-to-own, or sale, which may be combined with affordable housing developed pursuant to subparagraph (A);

“(C) development of housing infrastructure, including housing infrastructure sufficient to serve affordable housing developed under the plan; and

“(D) investments by the investor partner for the tribe, the participating tribe, members of the participating tribe, and financial institutions and other outside investors necessary to provide financing for the development of housing under the plan and for mortgages for tribal members purchasing such housing;

“(5) provide that the participating tribe will agree to provide long-term leases to tribal members sufficient for lease-to-own arrangements for, and sale of, the housing developed pursuant to paragraph (4);

“(6) provide that the participating tribe—

“(A) will be liable for delinquencies under mortgage agreements for housing developed under the plan that are financed under the plan and entered into by tribal members; and

“(B) shall, upon foreclosure under such mortgages, take possession of such housing and have the responsibility for making such housing available to other tribal members;

“(7) provide for sufficient protections, in the determination of the Secretary, to en-

sure that the tribe and the Federal Government are not liable for the acts of the investor partner or of any contractors;

“(8) provide that the participating tribe shall have sole final approval of design and location of housing developed under the plan;

“(9) set forth specific deadlines and schedules for activities to be undertaken under the plan and set forth the responsibilities of the participating tribe and the investor partner;

“(10) set forth specific terms and conditions of return on investment by the investor partner and other investors under the plan, and provide that the participating tribe shall pledge grant amounts allocated for the tribe pursuant to title III for such return on investment;

“(11) set forth the terms of a cooperative agreement on the operation and management of the current assistance housing stock and current housing stock for the tribe assisted under the preceding titles of this Act;

“(12) set forth any plans for sale of affordable housing of the participating tribe under section 907 and, if included, plans sufficient to meet the requirements of section 907 regarding meeting future affordable housing needs of the tribe;

“(13) set forth terms for enforcement of the plan, including an agreement regarding jurisdiction of any actions under or to enforce the plan, including a waiver of immunity; and

“(14) include such other information as the participating tribe and investor partner consider appropriate.

#### “SEC. 905. HUD REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF PLAN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the expiration of the 90-day period beginning upon a submission by an Indian tribe of a final plan under section 904 to the Secretary, the Secretary shall—

“(1) review the plan and the process by which the tribe solicited requests for quotations from investors and selected the investor partner; and

“(2)(A) approve the plan, unless the Secretary determines that—

“(i) the assessment of the tribe's housing needs by the qualified entity, or as set forth in the plan pursuant to section 904(3), is inaccurate or insufficient;

“(ii) the process established by the tribe to solicit requests for quotations and select an investor partner was insufficient or negligent; or

“(iii) the plan is insufficient to meet the housing needs of the tribe, as identified in the plan pursuant to section 904(3);

“(B) approve the plan, on the condition that the participating tribe and the investor make such revisions to the plan as the Secretary may specify as appropriate to meet the needs of the tribe for affordable housing; or

“(C) disapprove the plan, only if the Secretary determines that the plan fails to meet the minimal housing standards and requirements set forth in this Act and the Secretary notifies the tribe of the elements requiring the disapproval.

“(b) ACTION UPON DISAPPROVAL.—

“(1) RE-SUBMISSION OF PLAN.—Subject to paragraph (2), in the case of any disapproval of a final plan of an Indian tribe pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the Secretary shall allow the tribe a period of 180 days from notification to the tribe of such disapproval to resubmit a revised plan for approval.

“(2) LIMITATION.—If the final plan for an Indian tribe is disapproved twice and resubmitted twice pursuant to the authority under paragraph (1) and, upon such second

re-submission of the plan the Secretary disapproves the plan, the tribe may not re-submit the plan again and shall be ineligible to participate in the demonstration program under this title.

“(c) **TRIBE AUTHORITY OF HOUSING DESIGN AND LOCATION.**—The Secretary may not disapprove a final plan under section 904, or condition approval of such a plan, based on the design or location of any housing to be developed or assisted under the plan.

“(d) **FAILURE TO NOTIFY.**—If the Secretary does not notify a participating tribe submitting a final plan of approval, conditional approval, or disapproval of the plan before the expiration of the period referred to in paragraph (1), the plan shall be considered as approved for all purposes of this title.

**“SEC. 906. TREATMENT OF NAHASDA ALLOCATION.**

“Amounts otherwise allocated for a participating tribe under title III of this Act (25 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) shall not be made available to the tribe under titles I through VIII, but shall only be available for the tribe, upon request by the tribe and approval by the Secretary, for the following purposes:

“(1) **RETURN ON INVESTMENT.**—Such amounts as are pledged by a participating tribe pursuant to section 904(10) for return on the investment made by the investor partner or other investors may be used by the Secretary to ensure such full return on investment.

“(2) **ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—The Secretary may provide to a participating tribe, upon the request of a tribe, not more than 10 percent of any annual allocation made under title III for the tribe during such period for administrative costs of the tribe in completing the processes to carry out sections 903 and 904.

“(3) **HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS.**—A participating tribe may use such amounts for housing infrastructure costs associated with providing affordable housing for the tribe under the final plan.

“(4) **MAINTENANCE; TENANT SERVICES.**—A participating tribe may use such amounts for maintenance of affordable housing for the tribe and for housing services, housing management services, and crime prevention and safety activities described in paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively, of section 202.

**“SEC. 907. RESALE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING.**

“Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a participating tribe may, in accordance with the provisions of the final plan of the tribe approved pursuant to section 905, resell any affordable housing developed with assistance made available under this Act for use other than as affordable housing, but only if the tribe provides such assurances as the Secretary determines are appropriate to ensure that—

“(1) the tribe is meeting its need for affordable housing;

“(2) will provide affordable housing in the future sufficient to meet future affordable housing needs; and

“(3) will use any proceeds only to meet such future affordable housing needs or as provided in section 906.

**“SEC. 908. REPORTS, AUDITS, AND COMPLIANCE.**

“(a) **ANNUAL REPORTS BY TRIBE.**—Each participating tribe shall submit a report to the Secretary annually regarding the progress of the tribe in complying with, and meeting the deadlines and schedules set forth under the approved final plan for the tribe. Such reports shall contain such information as the Secretary shall require.

“(b) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress annu-

ally describing the activities and progress of the demonstration program under this title, which shall—

“(1) summarize the information in the reports submitted by participating tribes pursuant to subsection (a);

“(2) identify the number of tribes that have selected an investor partner pursuant to a request for quotations;

“(3) include, for each tribe applying for participating in the demonstration program whose final plan was disapproved under section 905(a)(2)(C), a detailed description and explanation of the reasons for disapproval and all actions taken by the tribe to eliminate the reasons for disapproval, and identify whether the tribe has re-submitted a final plan;

“(4) identify, by participating tribe, any amounts requested and approved for use under section 906; and

“(5) identify any participating tribes that have terminated participation in the demonstration program and the circumstances of such terminations.

“(c) **AUDITS.**—The Secretary shall provide for audits among participating tribes to ensure that the final plans for such tribes are being implemented and complied with. Such audits shall include on-site visits with participating tribes and requests for documentation appropriate to ensure such compliance.

**“SEC. 909. TERMINATION OF TRIBAL PARTICIPATION.**

“(a) **TERMINATION OF PARTICIPATION.**—A participating tribe may terminate participation in the demonstration program under this title at any time, subject to this section.

“(b) **EFFECT ON EXISTING OBLIGATIONS.**—

“(1) **NO AUTOMATIC TERMINATION.**—Termination by a participating tribe in the demonstration program under this section shall not terminate any obligations of the tribe under agreements entered into under the demonstration program with the investor partner for the tribe or any other investors or contractors.

“(2) **AUTHORITY TO MUTUALLY TERMINATE AGREEMENTS.**—Nothing in this title may be construed to prevent a tribe that terminates participation in the demonstration program under this section and any party with which the tribe has entered into an agreement from mutually agreeing to terminate such agreement.

“(c) **RECEIPT OF REMAINING GRANT AMOUNTS.**—The Secretary shall provide for grants to be made in accordance with, and subject to the requirements of, this Act for any amounts remaining after use pursuant to section 906 from the allocation under title III for a participating tribe that terminates participation in the demonstration program.

“(d) **COSTS AND OBLIGATIONS.**—The Secretary shall not be liable for any obligations or costs incurred by an Indian tribe during its participation in the demonstration program under this title.

**“SEC. 910. FINAL REPORT.**

“Not later than the expiration of the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this title, the Secretary shall submit a final report to the Congress regarding the effectiveness of the demonstration program, which shall include—

“(1) an assessment of the success, under the demonstration program, of participating tribes in meeting their housing needs, including affordable housing needs, on tribal land;

“(2) recommendations for any improvements in the demonstration program; and

“(3) a determination of whether the demonstration should be expanded into a perma-

nent program available for Indian tribes to opt into at any time and, if so, recommendations for such expansion, including any legislative actions necessary to expand the program.

**“SEC. 911. DEFINITIONS.**

“For purposes of this title, the following definitions shall apply:

“(1) **AFFORDABLE HOUSING.**—The term ‘affordable housing’ has the meaning given such term in section 4 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

“(2) **HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The term ‘housing infrastructure’ means basic facilities, services, systems, and installations necessary or appropriate for the functioning of a housing community, including facilities, services, systems, and installations for water, sewage, power, communications, and transportation.

“(3) **LONG-TERM LEASE.**—The term ‘long-term lease’ means an agreement between a participating tribe and a tribal member that authorizes the tribal member to occupy a specific plot of tribal lands for 50 or more years and to request renewal of the agreement at least once.

“(4) **PARTICIPATING TRIBES.**—The term ‘participating tribe’ means an Indian tribe for which a final plan under section 904 for participation in the demonstration program under this title has been approved by the Secretary under section 905.

**“SEC. 912. NOTICE.**

“The Secretary shall establish any requirements and criteria as may be necessary to carry out the demonstration program under this title by notice published in the Federal Register.”

**SEC. 702. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**

The table of contents in section 1(b) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 705 the following:

**“TITLE VIII—HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS**

“Sec. 801. Definitions.

“Sec. 802. Block grants for affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 803. Housing plan.

“Sec. 804. Review of plans.

“Sec. 805. Treatment of program income and labor standards.

“Sec. 806. Environmental review.

“Sec. 807. Regulations.

“Sec. 808. Effective date.

“Sec. 809. Affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 810. Eligible affordable housing activities.

“Sec. 811. Program requirements.

“Sec. 812. Types of investments.

“Sec. 813. Low-income requirement and income targeting.

“Sec. 814. Lease requirements and tenant selection.

“Sec. 815. Repayment.

“Sec. 816. Annual allocation.

“Sec. 817. Allocation formula.

“Sec. 818. Remedies for noncompliance.

“Sec. 819. Monitoring of compliance.

“Sec. 820. Performance reports.

“Sec. 821. Review and audit by Secretary.

“Sec. 822. General Accounting Office audits.

“Sec. 823. Reports to Congress.

“Sec. 824. Authorization of appropriations.

**“TITLE IX—DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM FOR ALTERNATIVE PRIVATIZATION AUTHORITY FOR NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING**

“Sec. 901. Authority.

“Sec. 902. Participating tribes.

“Sec. 903. Request for quotes and selection of investor partner.

“Sec. 904. Final plan.

“Sec. 905. HUD review and approval of plan.

"Sec. 906. Treatment of NAHASDA allocation.

"Sec. 907. Resale of affordable housing.

"Sec. 908. Reports, audits, and compliance.

"Sec. 909. Termination of tribal participation.

"Sec. 910. Final report.

"Sec. 911. Definitions.

"Sec. 912. Notice."

#### TITLE VIII—HOUSING FOR NATIVE HAWAIIANS

##### SEC. 801. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOMEOWNERSHIP ACT.

Section 824 (25 U.S.C. 4243) is amended by striking "such sums as may be necessary" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "\$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019."

##### SEC. 802. REAUTHORIZATION OF LOAN GUARANTEES FOR NATIVE HAWAIIAN HOUSING.

Section 184A(j)(5) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z–13b(j)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after the period at the end of the first sentence the following: "There are authorized to be appropriated for such costs \$386,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019."; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking "for each of fiscal years" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019 with an aggregate outstanding principal amount not exceeding \$41,504,000 for each such fiscal year."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to add extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We are here today to support H.R. 360, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act.

This is truly a bipartisan bill. It has been over 2 years in the making. Beginning in early 2013, DON YOUNG and TOM COLE, who are both Republicans, joined with me and Democrats GWEN MOORE, DENNY HECK, DAN KILDEE, TULSI GABBARD, and a host of others from the Democrat side to make a bill that truly works across both aisles and that is widely supported by tribes.

Transformational in its opportunities for Native Americans, it has been widely recognized by those tribes. Most importantly, it is a bill for which we can come together and all be proud of cosponsoring. The legislation before us is just that; it shows that colleagues, regardless of political affiliation, can come together and get the job done.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have said so many times that this has taken a tremendous amount of work and team effort and good will to get us to the place at which we are today. I want to thank all of our cosponsors. It really has been a heavy lift, and I can tell you how appreciative I am.

It has been so wonderful working with Mr. PEARCE. He has just been levelheaded and calm all the way. Of course, with regard to Mr. COLE, Mr. HECK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. YOUNG, we have all worked so closely together for 2 years to craft this bipartisan legislation.

I need to also recognize the leadership role of our ranking member, Ms. WATERS. She has had a few concerns, but she has been engaging and constructive.

The National Congress of American Indians, the National American Indian Housing Council, and many individual tribes from all across the country have provided comments, education, and energy every step of the way.

I think that this legislation, Mr. Speaker, honors the trust relationship of the United States Government, and it respects tribal sovereignty of the nations of the First People, but I don't want to make short shrift of the concerns that have been raised.

For example, I wish we could have provided more funding, given the dire need. However, this legislation is the product of a truly bipartisan process. It is not that all of us agree 100 percent on every provision, but we keep talking, and we keep working, and we have done that until we have come up with a bill that may not be perfect but that serves the people for whom it is intended, and it is very good for tribal communities.

The need for affordable housing in Indian Country just cannot be understated. Some of the poorest and most remote communities in this country are Native American communities.

In fact, the three poorest communities in the United States of America are Native American. NAHASDA provides tribal governments the ability to provide safe and affordable housing to tribal communities that is consistent with their status as sovereigns.

A few improvements that I would like to highlight are that it expedites certain Federal approvals. It makes all native people eligible for NAHASDA funds. It preserves provisions protecting Cherokee Freedmen.

Expediting approval ends administrative duplication and delays, approval which is essential due to unique timing and building challenges on reservations.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with Ms. MOORE in recognizing the actions of Ms. WATERS, the ranking member, truly, truly asking the questions that needed to be asked, but then finally reconciling on some of those issues. Also, the chairman, Chairman HENSARLING, has been in the same position, and Leader MCCARTHY bringing this bill to the floor as he has, I would like to express that.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is very important when we look at this extremely significant piece of legislation to recognize, as my good friend from Wisconsin said, this is a trust obligation of the United States Government. This isn't a housing handout. This isn't some special deal. This is something, an obligation that we assumed in negotiation with tribes over many decades, many different situations. If people are living in Indian Country, particularly on reservations, and don't have adequate housing, the Federal Government has a responsibility to do something about it, something we have recognized since the 1960s, something, as my friend Mr. PEARCE said, we institutionalized in 1996.

This has been a good program for a long time. It has been a block grant program, which has empowered tribes. One of the things I love about this legislation is, in a bipartisan sense, we continue to do that. We provide a lot more flexibility for tribes to actually control their own affairs, meet their own needs.

As Ms. MOORE suggests, we all wish the sum could be more. \$650 million is a lot of money, but spread across a population of almost three million individuals and over 57 million acres, an area of land about the size of Wyoming, it is maybe not as much as we would like, particularly given the severe needs, but it is a good faith effort, and it is appropriate given the difficult financial times we are in.

Again, we have had tremendous support across Indian Country. As both speakers previously mentioned, National Congress of American Indians, particularly the National American Indian Housing Council, has worked hand-in-glove with Members on both sides of the aisle to build this program.

My friends were very fulsome in their praise for various Members, and I wouldn't disagree with anybody they mentioned, but I have got to hold, particularly, Mr. PEARCE up not only for his tremendous work on this, Ms. MOORE as well, but for their persistence in this. They brought this legislation to the floor in the last Congress, having worked out the difficulties, formed a bipartisan compromise and

coalition and, frankly, brought their leaders along with them, I think, educating their respective leaders in the process. We got that through the House last time on a bipartisan basis. The Senate wasn't able to act, and I am very pleased to see that they have come back again this quickly in the session. Hopefully we will have a little bit better response on the other side. I don't think there was any opposition; they just didn't get it done in the press of business toward the end of the year. They are going to have plenty of time to do that.

This is an excellent piece of legislation. As my friends have both suggested, it is an example of how well we can work together when we focus on the problems instead of sometimes the partisan and philosophical divisions that separate us. I reflect, as I am looking here on the floor, that I usually like to think of myself as a right-wing conservative Republican, but I can't get to the right of my friend Mr. PEARCE, as hard as I try; and my friend Ms. MOORE—we have worked together on TRIO programs, on violence against women, now on this—is certainly well to the left of me on a lot of issues. So anything that can bring the three of us together is pretty inclusive in this body, and you won't have much excuse.

I am particularly pleased to see my friend Mr. KILDEE on the floor, who continues a family tradition of working in the forefront of Native American issues.

It is a good piece of legislation. It has been worked on hard by people that really know what they are doing. They brought the body along. So I certainly urge its passage and again want to congratulate, particularly, Mr. PEARCE and Ms. MOORE for their absolutely stellar work in this case. It would not have happened without their efforts.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, it is so wonderful always to work with Mr. COLE.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend Ms. MOORE for yielding and for her leadership on this very important issue. I also thank Mr. PEARCE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COLE on the other side, as well as Ms. GABBARD, whom I have worked with on this legislation, along with Mr. HECK and, now, Mr. TAKAI.

I think what this legislation proves is that when we set out to solve a problem and focus on the things that we can agree upon, we can get a lot done. This is a good bill. It is not the bill that any one of us individually would have written had we been left alone to produce this legislation with only our own perspectives and our own interests. It is a bill that is a result of compromise.

There are elements of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, that I would prefer

not have been included; and I am sure Mr. PEARCE and others are aware that I would have preferred that the pilot program that allows for a form of privatization, a direct grant to private developers, not be included. I would prefer that the entirety of the funds be used specifically to empower tribes, and tribes alone, to determine the use of the dollars. After all, they have had the ability to make those decisions and enter into agreements with private individuals as well.

I only say that to make sure that the RECORD is clear and that I state my objection to that particular portion, but to help point out a larger, I think, more important point. I am sure Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COLE, and Mr. YOUNG could find sections, provisions, of this legislation that they would prefer to excise or maybe something that they would have preferred to have included that they were not able to get in the bill; but because the focus here, from the very beginning, in the last Congress and again in this one, as Mr. COLE said, is that we have an obligation to live up to our trust responsibilities to this Nation's first people, that trust responsibility comes ahead of whatever differences we might have on specific policy approaches.

Since we took that approach—and Mr. PEARCE and Ms. MOORE both deserve great credit for being able to put aside the differences that they had—we were able to get this legislation to the floor with what I think is enormous support within the House of Representatives. It is a testament to our recognition of that trust obligation, and it is something that I am very pleased to carry on. As was stated, my uncle worked on these issues, and I know that he would be proud to see us working together to continue to live up to that important trust obligation.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting this legislation. I thank all my colleagues for their work on this.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 15 minutes remaining.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to let Mr. PEARCE know I have two more speakers, and then I will be prepared to close.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ms. WATERS and especially the chairman, Mr. PEARCE, for this legislation. It is something that we have worked on together with TOM COLE, many in this room. I would like to thank the Hawaiian delegation. It has always been an honor and a pleasure to work with the Hawaiian delegation with Alaska. They are two noncontiguous States, and we work well together and we will continue to do that.

Mr. KILDEE, I thank you for your uncle; he and I were dear friends and worked together on a lot of issues. I always respected that. I would like to thank the staff. Let's all not kid ourselves; the staffs of all our offices really put this together with our little bit of advice. Alex has worked very hard on my side, and I know your side has worked really well. That is a classic example, when staffs are willing to work together with the Members, Members are willing to work together, we can accomplish these goals.

This is just not a bipartisan piece of legislation. This is legislation that is needed by American Indians, Alaska Natives. It has worked well, and I am hoping—I have talked to the Senators on the other side—that in reality we will get this legislation passed very quickly. This is a win-win situation for all of us, so I think we should take great honor and recognize what has been, will be done here today, and accomplish a goal that many times is not achieved.

So again, I, with great feelings, thank each Member that has been involved in this, especially for the first people of America.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that Mr. YOUNG from Alaska has really made a very important point to have thanked our staffs. I was remiss in not doing that. So I would like to add my voice to those Members who really, really appreciate the hard work that our staffs provide.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I am rising in strong support of H.R. 360 today.

Since 1996, this legislation has been authorized twice, both times with broad bipartisan support in both Chambers of Congress. Since its enactment, this legislation has strengthened indigenous self-determination by empowering Native nations, by assisting with affordable housing needs.

In my home State of Hawaii, it has increased home ownership among Native Hawaiians by more than 2 percent, bringing hope to many people who are living paycheck to paycheck. At the same time, we are seeing poverty and public assistance have decreased. Today more Native Hawaiians are likely to be employed in professional or managerial occupations than in the past, and life expectancy has increased by almost 3 years. This legislation makes a difference to real families.

One of these families is Francis Paaluhi and her sisters who live in Nanakuli. They inherited a home from their parents, who passed away, which was built in the 1940s and was in dire need of repairs. There were large holes in the roof and floors; bedroom walls were buckling; broken windows covered with tarps. The Paaluhi sisters did not

have the means to pay for the needed repairs, and they couldn't afford a new home. They also didn't qualify for an FHA loan or any other loan. The Department of Hawaiian Homelands made a grant available because of this legislation for \$15,000. Just \$15,000 gave this family the ability to make a down payment with assistance from a low-interest USDA construction loan. They were able to build a structurally safe and comfortable home for them and their children to live.

This is just one example of the many families whose lives have been directly impacted and changed because of this legislation. It is an important step toward removing roadblocks to economic success, not only in Hawaii but in Native communities across the country, and it reaffirms the House's longstanding commitment to tribal sovereignty and self-determination.

Like all those who spoke before me, I would like to thank my colleague Representative PEARCE for introducing this bill, for his persistence and leadership continuously in bringing this about; Representative MOORE for leading the charge courageously on our side of the aisle; Ranking Member WATERS for continuing to move this bill forward; also, my long-time colleague and friend from Alaska, Representative YOUNG; and my colleague DAN KILDEE, all of whom worked very hard on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join this bipartisan coalition in supporting the passage of H.R. 360.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I go through my district, there are many who wonder why do we have a bill like this. Frankly, it is a treaty responsibility. The responsibility has been signed between the Native Americans and the Federal Government saying that we have a trust responsibility to them.

As I travelled around the reservations in my district, I began to be aware of a circumstance that I had not previously been aware of: houses that were maybe several hundred years old, people still living in those. There is one area with no sewer at all. There are cardboard shacks, people living in situations that they should not be living in today.

□ 1630

Those things exist. The legislation in front of us today doesn't change the responsibility of the government. It doesn't increase the amount of the dollars flowing to it. It simply tries to make the process a little more streamlined.

I would like to acknowledge that HUD, at one point, was rigorously opposing the transparency, rigorously opposing those reforms that we were putting into their systems. They had duplications of processes that would literally take years in order to get ap-

proval to build houses, and we simply said it does not have to be that way.

A second thing struck me. I watched my family grow out of abject poverty into a home ownership culture. Our first home that we purchased was \$800, and then we moved up to a \$1,500 home. Finally, we thought we really had arrived when we got to the \$2,500 home, and then a \$15,000, 5-acre property.

And so the pilot project that Mr. KILDEE—and he has had great discussions with me—but the pilot project is inserted into the bill in order to facilitate allowing Native Americans to own their own homes on the reservations. It has been very difficult up to now. We addressed those problems which have created a culture of poverty through the years.

So, even though we might have a different view on how to get there, we do not, as Democrats and Republicans, disagree on the fact that prosperity will begin with home ownership. And this pilot project in here—completely voluntary—allows people to move directly into home ownership. It allows the Native American tribes to start to encourage home ownership on the reservations in order to preserve the cultures there.

The reforms that we have put in for the Native Americans themselves were extremely important. Some of the processes have worked very badly. I have had extraordinarily frank conversations with Native Americans across the country, talking about the need to move to more transparent processes—to processes that make sure the money gets into the homes where they are building them.

And so that is the purpose of this legislation. I, again, commend Congresswoman MOORE because she and I really started the process. And then DENNY HECK, DAN KILDEE, DON YOUNG, and TOM COLE were all sitting there, and we chipped away at it from each side. We got the reforms in. We got the wording in that would allow Indian tribes across the country to feel like they are participating in this.

It is a very difficult process—again, a 3-year process—and I am proud of the legislation we are bringing to the floor today and proud of the efforts on behalf of each one of the people who have been involved here.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to my good friend from Hawaii (Mr. TAKAI).

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, today, I stand in support of H.R. 360, the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2015.

This legislation reaffirms the United States trust responsibility to American Indian and Alaska Native nations and provides necessary tools to the native people of our country for sustainable

solutions to poverty that often plague their communities.

I would also like to thank Chairman PEARCE; Ranking Member WATERS; Mr. YOUNG; Ms. MOORE; Mr. KILDEE; the senior Member from Hawaii, Ms. GABBARD; and the numerous other congressional Members who have fought for years to reauthorize NAHASDA, and thank them for also including support to Native Hawaiian housing organizations, which provide adequate housing to descendants of Hawaii's indigenous people.

NAHASDA's reauthorization does not merely provide funding for adequate housing programs, it also provides vital resources to foster the indigenous cultures of our great Nation, which faced near extinction during the atrocities committed to expand our Nation and the Federal assimilation policies of the 20th century.

For some indigenous people, living on their aboriginal lands is a vital part of preserving and living their culture. Unfortunately, Hawaii has one of the highest costs of living in the Nation, so support through NAHASDA is essential to Native Hawaiian families who wish to remain on their ancestral lands but face the ever growing price of homes, land, utilities, and food. So many families who have lived in Hawaii for generations upon generations are now moving out of our State because of the cost of living.

I hope my colleagues understand not only the vital importance of adequate housing for the less fortunate among Native communities, but also its vital importance for fostering the indigenous cultures of our democracy. This diversity of culture is what makes our Nation great.

So, please join me in supporting this measure.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am so happy that the Hawaiian and Alaskan contingencies have commented on this. I think it is important that this bill include all native people.

I am so happy that the Senate is now working on a version of NAHASDA that is similar, and I hope that we will all be able to quickly reconcile our differences and get a reauthorization to the President's desk. I look forward to him signing H.R. 360 into law.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

At one point, Chairman HENSARLING earlier in the process said he was not wildly ecstatic about the bill coming before his committee if 100 years from now Native Americans were going to be in the same circumstance they were in today. So, again, that was one of the elements of trying to find and facilitate home ownership among Native Americans so they could begin their growth towards prosperity.



When Indian tribes see this bill, they say: If you can actually get that through, if you can actually get both sides to agree on it, it will be transformational. Well, that is what I came here to do. I came here to be a part of things that transform the way that we approach different programs, not to just drift along and reauthorize. And so it is with that backdrop that we began to construct the bill.

Again, I would like to thank Ranking Member WATERS for her support. I would like to thank Chairman HEN-SARLING and Leader MCCARTHY for their support. I especially would like to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle for working through the very difficult discussions so that we are able to find a bill that does reach market efficiencies, does make the government more effective and efficient, that does do things that both political parties want to achieve.

We all want to achieve the same things. We approach it from a different point of view. So I can't say enough to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Thank you very much for your hard work and dedication.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I recommend and request that everyone support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, this bill will provide an important and long overdue reauthorization of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self Determination Act or NAHASDA.

Through NAHASDA, the federal government provides housing assistance to Native Americans and Native Hawaiians in a way that is tailored to address their unique housing needs, while respecting their right to self-determination. These groups experience some of the poorest housing conditions in our country so it is very important that we reauthorize the programs within NAHASDA.

As a supporter of the reauthorization of NAHASDA, I did not object to the bill before us today moving forward under suspension.

However, as I have pointed out in the past, this bill fails to ensure certain basic protections for the communities that rely on NAHASDA—and as a result—I will oppose this measure.

Despite my repeated objections, Republicans have refused to include a provision in this bill that offers protections for the Cherokee Freedmen. As many people know, the Cherokee Freedmen are the descendants of former African American slaves of the Cherokee, who are facing possible expulsion by the Cherokee nation.

For the past several years, under the leadership of former Members including Carolyn Kilpatrick and Mel Watt, the Congressional Black Caucus has stood up for the rights of the Cherokee Freedmen. But Republicans have consistently refused to acknowledge this tragic history and do something to bring justice to this situation. And this bill is no exception. During the Committee markup, they rejected my amendment, which would have made NAHASDA funding to the Cherokee contingent on full recognition of the Freedmen as citizens of the Cherokee Nation.

My position on this issue remains steadfast, and I cannot support continued silence in the face of such injustice. That is why I will not support this bill unless it grants the Freedmen the justice they deserve.

I am also withholding my support from this bill because it contains a provision that would seriously undercut the central goal of providing affordable housing for low-income Native Americans. This bill would waive a long-standing tenet of affordable housing known as the "Brooke Rule," which states that the maximum rent paid by assisted households must be no more than 30 percent of their income.

The Brooke Rule is a basic safeguard that exists in the public housing and Section 8 programs. It ensures that federally subsidized housing is affordable for the lowest-income households. By stripping away this basic safeguard, this bill would make low-income Native Americans vulnerable to unlimited increases in rent without any kind of hardship exemptions in place.

This is simply unacceptable. It is a basic purpose of NAHASDA to provide housing for low-income Native Americans, and this provision would seriously undermine that purpose. Republicans may not be concerned about the plight of the lowest-income Native Americans who rely on NAHASDA programs, but they are at the top of my concerns when it comes to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to sincerely thank Ms. MOORE, Mr. HECK and Mr. KILDEE for their efforts to reach a bipartisan agreement on this bill. However, I cannot support this reauthorization bill in its current form for all of the reasons I have stated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 360, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET PLANNING REFORM ACT OF 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 216) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 216

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Planning Reform Act of 2015".

#### SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF STRATEGIC PLANS TO IMPROVE PROGRAMS AND BENEFITS FOR VETERANS.

(a) FUTURE-YEARS VETERANS PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

##### "§ 119. Future-Years Veterans Program

"(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress each year, at or about the time that the President's budget is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, a Future-Years Veterans Program reflecting the estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in that budget. Any such Future-Years Veterans Program shall cover the fiscal year with respect to which the budget is submitted and at least the four succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) CONSISTENCY.—(1) The Secretary shall ensure that amounts described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) for any fiscal year are consistent with amounts described in subparagraph (B) of such paragraph for that fiscal year.

"(2) Amounts referred to in paragraph (1) are the following:

"(A) The amounts specified in program and budget information submitted to Congress by the Secretary in support of expenditure estimates and proposed appropriations in the budget submitted to Congress by the President under section 1105(a) of title 31 for any fiscal year, as shown in the Future-Years Veterans Program submitted pursuant to subsection (a).

"(B) The total amounts of estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations necessary to support the programs, projects, and activities of the Department of Veterans Affairs included pursuant to paragraph (5) of section 1105(a) of title 31 in the budget submitted to Congress under that section for any fiscal year.

"(c) CONTENTS.—The Future-Years Veterans Program under subsection (a) shall set forth the five-year plan of the Department to address the commitment of the United States to veterans and the resources necessary to meet that commitment and shall be developed and updated, as appropriate, annually by the Secretary. Each Future-Years Veterans Program shall include an explanation of—

"(1) the information that was used to develop program planning guidance for the Future-Years Veterans Program; and

"(2) how the resource allocations included in the Future-Years Veterans Program correlate to such five-year strategy.

"(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish on a publically accessible Internet website of the Department each Future-Years Veterans Program submitted pursuant to subsection (a)."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 118 the following new item:

"119. Future-Years Veterans Program."

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 119 of title 38, United States Code, as added by paragraph (1), shall apply with respect to the preparation and submission of the budget request for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2020 and fiscal years thereafter.

(b) QUADRENNIAL VETERANS REVIEW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such chapter is further amended by adding after section 119, as



added by subsection (a)(1), the following new section:

**“§ 120. Quadrennial veterans review**

“(a) REQUIREMENT.—(1) Not later than fiscal year 2019, and every fourth year thereafter, the Secretary shall conduct a review of the strategy for meeting the commitment of the United States to veterans and the resources necessary to meet that commitment (in this section referred to as a ‘quadrennial veterans review’).

“(2) Each quadrennial veterans review shall include a comprehensive examination of the policies and strategies of the United States with respect to veterans, including recommendations regarding the long-term strategy and priorities for programs, services, benefits, and outcomes regarding veterans and guidance on the programs, assets, capabilities, budget, policies, and authorities of the Department.

“(3) The Secretary shall conduct each quadrennial veterans review in consultation with key officials of the Department, the heads of other Federal agencies, and other relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities, including State, local, and tribal government officials, members of Congress, veterans service organizations, private sector representatives, academics, and other policy experts.

“(4) The Secretary shall ensure that each quadrennial veterans review is coordinated with the Future-Years Veterans Program required under section 119 of this title.

“(b) CONTENTS OF REVIEW.—In each quadrennial veterans review, the Secretary shall—

“(1) delineate a veterans strategy consistent with the commitment of the United States to veterans and refine a strategy for the types of, and provision of, programs, services, benefits, and outcomes consistent with current authorities and requirements;

“(2) outline and prioritize the full range of programs and capabilities regarding veterans provided by the Federal Government;

“(3) identify the budget plan required to provide sufficient resources to successfully execute the full range of such programs and capabilities;

“(4) include an assessment of the organizational alignment of the Department with respect to the strategy referred to in paragraph (1) and the programs and capabilities referred to in paragraph (2);

“(5) review and assess the effectiveness of the mechanisms of the Department for executing the process of turning the requirements identified in the quadrennial veterans review into a plan to meet such requirements, including an expenditure plan for the Department; and

“(6) identify emerging trends, problems, opportunities, and issues that could affect veterans or the Department during the ten-year period following the period covered by the review.

“(c) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—(1) The Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report regarding each quadrennial veterans review. The Secretary shall submit the report in the year following the year in which the review is conducted, but not later than the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget for the next fiscal year under section 1105 of title 31.

“(2) Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) the results of the quadrennial veterans review;

“(B) a description of the challenges to, and opportunities for, the assumed or defined

veterans-related interests of the Nation that were examined for the purposes of that review;

“(C) the strategy for meeting the Nation’s commitment to veterans, including a prioritized list of the missions of the Department;

“(D) a description of the interagency cooperation, preparedness of Federal assets, infrastructure, budget plan, and other elements of the programs and policies of the Nation associated with the strategy referred to in subsection (b)(1) that are required to execute successfully the full range of programs and capabilities identified in such strategy and the programs and capabilities outlined under subsection (b)(2);

“(E) an assessment of the organizational alignment of the Department with the strategy referred to in subsection (b)(1) and the programs and capabilities outlined under subsection (b)(2), including the Department’s organizational structure, management systems, budget and accounting systems, human resources systems, procurement systems, and physical and technical infrastructure;

“(F) a discussion of the status of cooperation among Federal agencies in the effort to promote national support for veterans;

“(G) a discussion of the status of cooperation between the Federal Government and State, local, and tribal governments in supporting veterans and providing programs, services, benefits, and outcomes to assist veterans;

“(H) an explanation of any underlying assumptions used in conducting the review; and

“(I) any other matter the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(d) PUBLICATION.—The Secretary shall publish on a publically accessible Internet website of the Department each quadrennial veterans review submitted pursuant to subsection (c).

“(e) INDEPENDENT VETERANS REVIEW PANEL.—(1) Not later than February 1 of a year in which a quadrennial veterans review is conducted under this section, the Secretary shall establish an independent panel to be known as the Independent Veterans Review Panel (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Panel’). The Panel shall have the duties set forth in this subsection.

“(2) The Panel shall be composed of 10 members who are recognized experts in matters relating to veterans. The members shall be appointed as follows:

“(A) Two by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(B) Two by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

“(C) Two by the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(D) Two by the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate.

“(E) Two by the Secretary, who shall serve as co-chairs of the panel.

“(3) Members shall be appointed for the life of the Panel. Any vacancy in the Panel shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

“(4) The Panel shall have the following duties with respect to a quadrennial veterans review:

“(A) While the review is being conducted, the Panel shall review the updates from the Secretary required under paragraph (7) on the progress of the conduct of the review.

“(B) The Panel shall—

“(i) review the Secretary’s terms of reference and any other materials providing the basis for, or substantial inputs to, the work of the Department of Veterans Affairs on the quadrennial veterans review;

“(ii) conduct an assessment of the assumptions, strategy, findings, and risks included in the report on the quadrennial veterans review required in subsection (c);

“(iii) conduct an independent assessment of a variety of strategies for delivering services and support to veterans;

“(iv) review the resource requirements identified pursuant to subsection (b)(3) and, to the extent practicable, make a general comparison to the resource requirements to support the strategies assessed under this subparagraph; and

“(v) provide to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Secretary, through the report under paragraph (7), any recommendations the Panel determines appropriate.

“(5) If the Secretary has not appointed members to the Panel under paragraph (2)(E) by February 1 of a year in which a quadrennial veterans review is conducted under this section, the Panel shall convene for its first meeting with the remaining members.

“(6) Not later than three months after the date on which the report on a quadrennial veterans review is submitted under subsection (c) to the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Panel shall submit to such committees a report containing an assessment of the quadrennial veterans review, including a description of the items addressed under paragraph (4) with respect to that quadrennial veterans review.

“(7) Periodically, but not less often than every 60 days during the life of the panel, or at the request of the co-chairs, the Secretary shall brief the Panel on the progress of the conduct of the quadrennial veterans review.

“(8)(A) The Panel may request directly from the Department such information as the Panel considers necessary to carry out its duties under this subsection. The Secretary shall cooperate with the Panel to ensure that information requested by the Panel under this subparagraph is promptly provided to the maximum extent practical.

“(B) Upon the request of the co-chairs, the Secretary shall make available to the Panel the services of any federally funded research and development center that is covered by a sponsoring agreement of the Department.

“(C) The Panel shall have the authorities provided in section 3161 of title 5 and shall be subject to the conditions set forth in such section.

“(D) Funds for activities of the Panel shall be provided from amounts available to the Department.

“(9) The Panel shall terminate 45 days after the date on which the Panel submits the report on the quadrennial veterans review under paragraph (6).”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 119, as added by subsection (a)(2), the following new item:

“120. Quadrennial veterans review.”.

(c) POLICY GUIDANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Such chapter is further amended by adding after section 120, as added by subsection (b)(1), the following new section:

**“§ 121. Policy guidance**

“The Secretary shall provide annually to the appropriate officials of the Department

written policy guidance for the preparation and review of the planning and program recommendations and budget proposals of the elements of the Department of such officials. Such guidance shall include guidance on the objectives of the Department in accordance with Future-Years Veterans Program under section 119 of this title and the quadrennial veterans review under section 120 and the resource levels projected to be available for the period of time for which such recommendations and proposals are to be effective.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 120, as added by subsection (b)(2), the following new item:

“121. Policy guidance.”.

### SEC. 3. CHIEF STRATEGY OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

#### “§ 323. Chief Strategy Officer

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate the Assistant Secretary whose functions include planning, studies, and evaluations as the Chief Strategy Officer of the Department. The Chief Strategy Officer shall advise the Secretary on long-range strategy and implications.

“(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Chief Strategy Officer is the principal advisor to the Secretary and other senior officials of the Department, and shall provide independent analysis and advice to the Secretary and such officials. The Chief Strategy Officer shall carry out the following responsibilities:

“(1) Conducting cost estimation and cost analysis for the programs of the Department.

“(2) Establishing policies for, and overseeing the integration of, the planning, programming, budgeting and execution process for the Department.

“(3) Providing analysis and advice on matters relating to the planning and programming phase of the planning, programming, budgeting and execution process, and the preparation of materials and guidance for such process, as directed by the Secretary, working in coordination with the Assistant Secretary for Management.

“(4) Developing and executing the Future-Years Veterans Program of the Department, as specified under section 119 of this title.

“(5) Developing resource discussions relating to requirements under consideration in the quadrennial veterans review under section 120 of this title.

“(6) Formulating study guidance for analysis of alternatives for programs and initiatives, including any necessary acquisitions, development, or procurement commensurate with such alternatives, and performance of such analysis as directed by the Secretary.

“(7) Reviewing, analyzing, and evaluating programs for executing approved strategies and policies, ensuring that information on programs and expected outcomes is presented accurately and completely.

“(8) Ensuring that the costs of programs and alternatives are presented accurately and completely by assisting in establishing standards, policies, and procedures for the conduct of cost estimation and cost analysis throughout the Department, including guidance relating to the proper selection of confidence levels in cost estimates generally and for specific programs of the Department.

“(9) Conducting studies at the request of the Secretary regarding costs, policy assumptions, and strategic implications of current policies and possible alternatives.

“(10) Communicating directly to the Secretary and the Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs about matters for which the Chief Strategy Officer is responsible without obtaining the approval or concurrence of any other official within the Department.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 322 the following new item:

“323. Chief Strategy Officer.”.

### SEC. 4. PROHIBITION ON NEW APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act. This Act and such amendments shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 216, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 216, as amended, would revise the process by which the Department of Veterans Affairs prepares its annual budget as a means to provide Congress with greater transparency regarding VA's alignment of resource requirements with its strategic goals.

The bill directs the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annually to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program reflecting estimated expenditures and proposed appropriations included in the budget for that fiscal year and the subsequent 4 fiscal years.

The bill would also require the Secretary, in 2019 and every 4 years thereafter, to conduct a review of the strategy for meeting the Nation's commitment to veterans and the resources needed to implement the strategy. To assist the Secretary in carrying out the 5-year plan and the quadrennial review, the bill would require the Secretary to designate a chief strategy officer to advise the Secretary on long-range VA strategy and implications.

Finally, the bill puts in place a 10-member panel to study the quadrennial review and report back to the Congress on the panel's opinions of the review's findings. The combination of the 5-year budget look-ahead, the quadrennial review, and the panel is intended to increase our ability to determine VA's future needs in a manner that provides checks and balances that currently do not exist.

Mr. Speaker, this really is a commonsense bill. No longer would VA be able to announce ambitious goals such as ending homelessness or eliminating the claims backlog without Members of Congress and the public having insight into the estimated long-range resources that are going to be needed to meet those goals.

With a \$168 billion budget, veterans and taxpayers deserve full transparency when it comes to how scarce resources are planned to be allocated.

I must also add that this bill makes no additional fund available and would require VA to accomplish this bill's requirements within its existing resources.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 216, as amended, the Department of Veterans Affairs Budget Planning Reform Act of 2015.

This bill represents a bipartisan effort of the Veterans Affairs' Committee, building on the work of former Ranking Member Michael Michaud and current Ranking Member CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

I also want to thank Chairman JEFF MILLER, Mr. DOUG LAMBORN of Colorado, and all of the members of the committee for their efforts on behalf of this bill.

H.R. 216 would codify and strengthen efforts by the VA to improve the manner in which it matches resources with requirements. H.R. 216 will improve transparency and give us in Congress, veterans, and the American people a better sense of where the VA is going and how it intends to get there.

It is often said that the journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. Far too often, it seems that, in terms of budget planning, the VA is focused on the single step and not the thousand-mile journey.

Currently, the majority of the VA's programs are provided funding under what is called “advance appropriations.” This means that the VA budget is put in place well before the start of the fiscal year in which it will be needed.

□ 1645

This also means that the VA is attempting to estimate the demands it will face many, many months down the road. H.R. 216 will assist the VA in ensuring that these estimates are as reliable as possible.

H.R. 216 will provide the necessary framework for the VA to strategically determine how best to meet the needs of veterans, while ensuring that this framework and these decisions are transparent and justified. This will assist our work here in Congress and give veterans the peace of mind that the VA is looking to the future and not caught in the past.

H.R. 216 would require the VA to lay out a 5-year budget plan beginning in fiscal year 2020. This budget plan would be informed by a quadrennial review, initially required in fiscal year 2019, and then upgraded every 4 years. This would give the VA plenty of time to ensure that its internal processes can support these requirements.

H.R. 216 would also require the Secretary to provide annual policy guidance to ensure that near-term budgets are aligned with the VA's longer-term strategic outlook.

Many of the challenges the VA is facing today are remarkably similar to the problems it was facing when I served on the committee two decades ago. There is always a challenge to fit the available resources to the immediate needs and to focus on what will be required in the months ahead. It is easy to lose focus on where we are going while meeting the emergencies and crises of today.

I believe that H.R. 216 will assist all of us in keeping the entire journey in mind and not the single step. It will provide the information we need to look ahead, enable veterans and the American people to have the information they need to be assured that we are on the right track, and better enable the VA to get the resources it truly needs to meet the challenges it faces.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers, so if the gentleman is prepared to close, I am also prepared to close.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 216.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank my good friend, Mr. CLYBURN, for helping manage this bill for Ms. BROWN and also to say thank you to our former colleague, Mr. Michaud, who did, in fact, work long and hard to get this piece of legislation brought to the floor.

Once again, I encourage all Members to support H.R. 216, as amended.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 216, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## PROVIDING MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 162) calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

### H. RES. 162

Whereas the existence of an independent, democratic, and prosperous Ukraine is in the national interest of the United States;

Whereas the Russian Federation under President Vladimir Putin has engaged in relentless political, economic, and military aggression to subvert the independence and violate the territorial integrity of Ukraine;

Whereas this aggression includes the illegal and forcible occupation of Crimea by Russian military and security forces;

Whereas this Russian aggression includes the establishment and control of violent separatist proxies in other areas of Ukraine, including arming them with lethal weapons and other materiel including tanks, artillery, and rockets that have enabled separatist militias to launch and sustain an insurrection that has resulted in over 6,000 dead, 15,000 wounded, and more than a million displaced persons;

Whereas military and security forces of the Russian Federation have been infiltrated into these areas of Ukraine and continue to provide direct combat support to the separatist groups in this conflict;

Whereas failure to stop this aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine, especially its unprovoked and armed intervention in a sovereign country, illegal and forcible occupation of its territory, and unilateral efforts to redraw the internationally-recognized borders of Ukraine undermines the foundation of the international order that was established and has been defended at great cost by the United States and its allies in the aftermath of World War II;

Whereas Russian aggression against Ukraine is but the most visible and recent manifestation of a revisionist Kremlin strategy to redraw international borders and impose its will on its neighbors, including NATO allies;

Whereas on September 18, 2014, President Petro Poroshenko addressed a Joint Meeting of Congress at which he thanked the United States for the military assistance it has provided to defend the freedom and territorial integrity of his country and asked for "both non-lethal and lethal" military assistance, stating that "one cannot win a war with blankets";

Whereas the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey stated on March 3, 2015, that "we should absolutely consider providing lethal aid" to Ukraine;

Whereas Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter stated on February 4, 2015, during his confirmation hearing that he is "very much inclined" toward providing Ukraine with weapons to defend itself;

Whereas Congress provided the President with the authorization and budgetary resources to provide Ukraine with military assistance to enhance its ability to defend its sovereign territory from the unprovoked and continuing aggression of the Russian Federation, including in the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014, which was signed into law on December 18, 2014;

Whereas the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 specifically authorizes the provision of anti-armor weapons, crew-served weapons and ammunition, counter-artillery radars, fire control, range finder, and optical and guidance and control equipment, tactical troop-operated surveillance drones, and secure command and communications equipment;

Whereas even as it faces a massive military assault, Ukraine is confronting an economic crisis that requires both long-term financial and technical assistance by the United States and the international community, especially the countries of the European Union and the International Monetary Fund, as well as fundamental economic and political reforms by the government of Ukraine;

Whereas the United States and its allies should provide assistance to support energy diversification and efficiency initiatives in Ukraine to lessen its vulnerability to coercion by the Russian Federation;

Whereas the United States and its allies should continue to work with Ukrainian officials to develop plans to increase energy production and efficiency in order to increase energy security beyond the short-term;

Whereas the United States, in close cooperation with international donors, has provided Ukraine with macro-economic assistance to boost Ukraine's economy; and

Whereas the United States and its allies need a long-term strategy to expose and challenge Vladimir Putin's corruption and repression at home and his aggression abroad: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives strongly urges the President to fully and immediately exercise the authorities provided by Congress to provide Ukraine with lethal defensive weapon systems to enhance the ability of the people of Ukraine to defend their sovereign territory from the unprovoked and continuing aggression of the Russian Federation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as always, Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, appreciates Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of New York's leadership in support of the people of Ukraine.

Last week, March 18, Mr. Speaker, marked the 1-year anniversary of Russian President Vladimir Putin's invasion and occupation of Crimea.

During the past year, Russia has strengthened its hold over the peninsula, expanded its military presence,

and increased its oppression of the minority Tatar population and others who refuse to bend to its occupation.

Putin's success in Crimea emboldened him to expand his aggression into eastern Ukraine. Last April, Chairman ED ROYCE of California, chairman of our committee, led a delegation to Ukraine and traveled to the Russian-speaking east.

The many Ukrainians that Ranking Member ENGEL and Mr. ROYCE met with wanted to be Ukrainians, not separatists; yet Moscow moved from forcibly seizing Crimea to aggressively supporting militant separatists in eastern Ukraine.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the conflict in the east has resulted in over 6,000 deaths, at least 15,000 wounded, and more than 1 million displaced persons.

This carnage is the work of the separatist forces controlled by Moscow, which has supplied them with massive amounts of weapons and has even sent in Russian military forces in combat-supporting roles.

As Assistant Secretary Victoria Nuland testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee this month, Russia "has thousands and thousands" of soldiers operating in Ukraine. As she summed up:

This is a manufactured conflict controlled by the Kremlin, fueled by Russian tanks and heavy weapons, financed at Russian taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Speaker, the administration's response to this crisis has been tepid at best. Six months ago, the President of Ukraine stood in this very Chamber and, while thanking the United States for our assistance so far, asked for defensive weapons to enable Ukraine to defend itself against superior forces. Pointedly, he told both Houses of Congress, "One cannot win a war with blankets," which is what we are providing.

Earlier this month, Members met with the First Deputy Speaker of the Ukrainian parliament, who said that his country urgently needs antitank weapons, such as the Javelin; radar to pinpoint enemy fire; and communications equipment to overcome Russian jamming.

Ukrainian forces cannot match the advanced equipment that Russia is pouring into eastern Ukraine. There is no shortage of the will to fight, only a shortage of defensive weapons.

Legal authority for such assistance was made crystal clear by the Congress in December by passing the Ukraine Freedom Support Act. Top administration officials, including Secretary of Defense Carter and Chairman Dempsey of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have indicated support; indeed, this weekend, NATO's top military commander asked: Is inaction an appropriate action? We know his answer is "no."

Unfortunately, for Ukrainians and for international security, President

Obama has chosen inaction in the guise of endless deliberation; but there is far more at stake here than the fate of Ukraine, Mr. Speaker.

This unprovoked attack on a peaceful country, the forcible occupation of its territory, and an effort to unilaterally redraw its internationally recognized borders will undermine the foundation of the international order that was established and has been defended at great cost by the United States and our allies.

The world is closely watching what we will do to help Ukraine defend itself from outright assault. If it is too little, too late, those with designs on a neighboring country will feel all that more emboldened.

The people of Ukraine are not asking for us to fight for them. They are only asking for the weapons they need to defend themselves.

I ask our colleagues to vote for this bipartisan resolution urging the administration to provide this critical assistance to Ukraine before it is, indeed, too late.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I want to, again, thank our chairman emeritus of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my dear friend from Florida ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, who is very eloquent. I want to stand by every word she uttered. I agree with her 100 percent.

I want to also thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, who also has been steadfast in fighting for the freedom for the people of Ukraine, and it has been a pleasure to work with him on a bipartisan basis.

This is a bipartisan issue. Policy like this should not be partisan, and that is why we are rising today, as Democrats and Republicans—really, as Americans—to say enough is enough in Ukraine.

As I have been saying for months, we cannot view the crisis in Ukraine as just some faraway conflict or someone else's problem. This war has left thousands dead, tens of thousands wounded, a million displaced, and has begun to threaten the post-cold war stability of Europe. In fact, Mr. Putin is knocking us back into the cold war, the bad old days of the cold war.

The battle is being waged in the haze of a massive, Kremlin-backed propaganda campaign aimed at eroding confidence in the West and democratic institutions, the same propaganda permeating allied countries on the Russian frontier that we are treaty-bound to defend.

Under the corrupt and repressive rule of Vladimir Putin, Russia has become a clear threat to a half century of American commitment to and investment in

a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace, a Europe where borders are not changed by force.

What Putin is doing is he is changing borders by force on the continent of Europe for the first time since World War II. This cannot stand. The United States cannot turn a blind eye to it. The United States cannot put its head in the sand and act like any other country and pretend that maybe this will go away.

In 1938, another dictator named Adolf Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia and said he was going into the Sudetenland to protect ethnic Germans. Mr. Putin said the same thing about Crimea. He was going into Crimea to prevent the hurt of ethnic Russians—same nonsense.

Hitler got away with it in 1938, and there were people who said: Well, you know, if we just give him the Sudetenland, he will be happy. He will be content. He will leave us alone. His aggression will stop.

Some people today are saying the same thing: Just give Putin Crimea. Just give Putin a little bit of the eastern part of Ukraine, and he will be happy. He will go away. He won't threaten anything else.

□ 1700

You don't satiate a bully by giving him what he wants early on because it only whets his appetite for worse things to come; and at the point later on when you have to go at the bully, it will be much, much harder to defeat him, to stop him than it was if you had simply stood up to him when he started his aggression. This is what is happening now in Ukraine.

This war poses the greatest threat to European security since World War II, and we shouldn't take it lightly. We shouldn't be idle; we shouldn't sit back, and we shouldn't let other countries tell us what to do.

Last year, Ukraine President Poroshenko stood in this very Chamber at a joint session of Congress and related the challenges facing the people of Ukraine. They desire to reclaim their dignity and rebuild their country's future. He asked that we help the men and women fighting a war against a neighbor that they had once looked to as a friend. He told us they needed defensive weapons. They needed weapons. He said that the blankets that we are sending do not win a war.

Last month, I saw President Poroshenko again, in Europe. And he again pled for military assistance—not to attack Moscow, not to defeat the Russian army, not even to push the Russians out of Ukrainian territory, but simply to hold the line, to slow Russia's advance, and to give his government breathing room to focus on other threats, such as keeping the Ukrainian economy afloat.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow Europe's border lands to once again become Europe's blood lands. Fortunately, there is still time for the

United States to act in a moderate but decisive fashion to help Ukraine defend itself, to limit Russia's ability to further destabilize our friends and allies and our friends in Ukraine, in particular, and to safeguard our interests and defend our values across this region.

All the countries—and some of them NATO members, some of them not; some of them part of the former Soviet Union, some of them not; some of them former Eastern Bloc nations, some of them not—all of the ones that border on Russia are all worrying because they think that if Putin can get away with what he wants to get away with in Ukraine, will they be next.

The United States is not being asked to send ground troops to Ukraine. The United States is not being asked to get itself involved in another war. We are simply being asked to give the Ukrainians methods to defend themselves, the weapons to defend themselves. I can't think of anything more reasonable.

We have held hearings on Ukraine. We have passed resolutions of support. We have sent legislation to the President's desk. It was the last thing we passed in the last Congress. The President signed it into law, authorizing an array of assistance, including the defensive arms Ukraine so desperately needs. And here we are again to renew this call, to remind the people of Ukraine that they are not alone, and to send an unambiguous message to the administration, to the President, and to our allies in Europe that the time has come to do more. We must meet this threat together because we all have a stake in how this ends.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Chairman ROYCE.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as my good friend ELIOT ENGEL from New York explained, last April, we took a delegation to Ukraine, not just to the western part of the country, but, most importantly, we went to the east. We went to Dnipropetrovsk. We went as far east as we could go, up against the border there of Donetsk and Luhansk.

We had an opportunity to have a dialogue with the Ukrainian people. We reached out to civil society. We set up meetings with women's groups and lawyers' groups. And across the spectrum in eastern Ukraine, speaking to Russian-speaking Ukrainians, we got, I believe, a good idea of what was on their minds—I think there were about

eight members of our delegation—and they were sharing with us these words:

What Putin is doing, what the Russians are doing right now is going out on the Internet and recruiting every skinhead and malcontent in the Russian-speaking region that they can find. And then they train these young men, and then they send them over the border to create mayhem. And what we are trying to do here—this was the explanation from the Ukrainians—we are trying to catch them. They speak with a different accent than we do, so we can catch them, and we try to hold them until this war is over. But increasingly, we find that what is happening is that the Russians are sending their own troops over. They are sending their own armor. They are sending over military equipment that we cannot defend against.

And what they said to us is: We are not asking you for your assistance in this fight. All we are asking is that we might have the defensive weapons to check this assault so that we can defend ourselves in this city. We need antitank weapons.

You and I know, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that when those tanks come, those are not going to be Ukrainian separatists driving those tanks. Those are going to be Russian tankers in those tanks.

So this is what they are asking us for, and they have asked for month after month after month in order to set up a strategy that would cause the Russians to believe there were some kind of credible deterrence. But instead, we now see that Russia may try to secure a land bridge to Crimea. In other words, this conflict might escalate because of additional Russian aggression. Or they might seize strategic ports along the Black Sea, additional ports.

You have 6,000 people so far that have lost their lives—that I know of in the conflict, from the reports I have read. You have 1 million Ukrainians that have been made refugees, that have pulled west out of the area. And obviously, to date, the actions taken by the U.S. and our EU allies, including economic sanctions and aid and diplomatic isolation—all of the talk, none of that has checked Russian aggression—or, I should say, Putin's aggression here. And over the past year, he has clearly become bolder, even menacing NATO countries, as he seeks to divide the alliance.

Now, the Obama administration and our European allies have put hope in diplomatic and cease-fire arrangements, but, frankly, that is not working. So we come back to the request.

And this month, we met with the first deputy speaker of the Ukrainian Parliament, as ELIOT ENGEL shared here today on the floor, who said that his country urgently needs antitank weapons, such as the Javelin, and radar

to pinpoint enemy artillery fire that is coming into their towns and communications equipment to overcome Russian jamming. That is the request. Ukrainian forces cannot match the advanced equipment that Russia is pouring into eastern Ukraine.

And there is no shortage of the will here on the part of the Ukrainians. We saw many volunteers in their local militia there in Dnipropetrovsk taking up their position, but what they have is a shortage of defensive weapons.

At this committee's hearing last month, Secretary Kerry said that the Obama administration has still not made a decision on whether to send defensive lethal military aid to Ukraine 6 months—this is 6 months—after President Poroshenko told us, as we sat here in this joint session of Congress to hear his remarks, that one cannot win the war with blankets.

So we are at a turning point, and I think I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) on this. It is one of historic importance. If we allow aggression against Ukraine to stand without us at least offering the Ukrainians the ability to defend themselves, we will signal to the world that our willingness to defend the post-World War II international order is crumbling. The semblance of rules the world has abided by will be severely weakened. The result could usher in an era of instability and conflict in many regions, with consequences no one can predict. Or we can allow the Ukrainians to defend themselves, and that is what we do with this legislation.

The Ukrainian people are asking for our help to stop Russia's efforts to sever their country. They are not asking us to do any of the fighting for them. They are only asking us for the defensive weapons that they need to defend themselves. And by passing this bipartisan resolution overwhelmingly, the House will send a strong message to the administration that it must act quickly and decisively if the U.S. is to help the Ukrainian people save their country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to my good friend from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution offered by my friend, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and supported strongly by the chairman of the committee and the former chair of the committee, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

This resolution is bipartisan and reflects the will of Congress that the nation of Ukraine deserves every opportunity to chart a future based on democracy, territorial integrity, and freedom from Russian aggression.

I am the former chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, signed in Helsinki in

August of 1975. In that agreement, the then-Soviet Union and 34 other nations signed a document which said that you could not change borders by other than peaceful means.

Vladimir Putin has broken that agreement, but he has also broken the agreement that, in 1994, we entered into with Ukraine in consideration of their giving up their nuclear weapons. Vladimir Putin has sent Russian troops into another nation. He has tried to mask it. He has tried the pretense that this is simply separatists who are active; but, very frankly, those troops in Ukraine have admitted to the press that they are from Russia.

Vladimir Putin's support for violent separatists has destabilized a large region in eastern Ukraine and has led to the illegal—illegal—Russian occupation of Crimea. And the world hasn't done much to discourage not only the actions of Mr. Putin, but others who would learn the lessons of his actions.

The sanctions that the United States and its allies have imposed against Putin and his closest supporters, as well as measures to isolate Russian businesses that have enabled this aggression, are having serious effects, but not yet the effect that we want.

I believe that our Nation also has a responsibility to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the people of Ukraine and their democratically elected government by sending them the tools they need to defend themselves. This is not a new position for me. When the Serbs effected a genocide in Bosnia Herzegovina, we had an arms embargo on the people of Bosnia while arms were flowing in from other parts of the world to Serbia. I thought that was wrong.

I think today the unwillingness or inability to create a consensus for giving to a people the ability to defend themselves is not good policy. If we continue to do so, there is no doubt in my mind that Mr. Putin will continue on his path of aggression and acquisition.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to support Ukraine on its march towards greater democracy, stronger human rights, and a brighter future for its people. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution.

□ 1715

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding and for his sponsorship of this resolution with Mr. ENGEL and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. Speaker, ISIL is on the march. Civil war appears imminent in Yemen. Libya has now become a full-fledged terrorist training center threatening all of north Africa. And Iran moves closer to nuclear capacity every day. So it is understandable that the attention of the media and the American

people seem to be focused elsewhere other than on Ukraine.

But I just returned a week ago from leading a bipartisan delegation of the Defense Appropriations Committee to Ukraine, and I am here to report that the situation there is downright alarming.

Today, weeks after agreeing to a cease-fire, Vladimir Putin is using Ukraine as a test bed for a new type of warfare by using proxy insurgents and Russian special forces, army troops, to carry out his campaign to reclaim Ukraine as part of the old Russian empire. After annexing Crimea a year ago, he is transforming that peninsula into a heavily armed Russian camp—a platform indeed.

Mr. Speaker, blankets, night-vision goggles, and meals that are ready to eat are not enough. Ukraine needs non-NATO ally military support, and it needs it now.

Ukraine's courageous President, Petro Poroshenko, appealed to us again to provide lethal weaponry—antitank weapons, small arms, and antiaircraft systems—to help them defend their territory from the Russian onslaught. It is all about preserving and protecting Ukraine's independence. That is what this is all about: the largest country in Europe. He knows he cannot win a war against Russia, but he believes that the lethal support will at least raise the price of aggression for Russia.

I think our committee tends to agree. Our delegation left Kiev believing that the future of Ukraine is a matter of significant importance to the national security of these United States.

My colleagues, Western and Eastern Europeans are watching intensely with apprehension how our President responds. They are looking closely, as are our adversaries and the Russian leadership. What future steps will they take if we do not act now?

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to show the leadership, our President, and this administration that this resolution makes sense. They need to give Ukraine this non-NATO ally support, and they need to do it now.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVID SCOTT), my good friend.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. Ladies and gentlemen, on the bleached bones of many past great nations are written those pathetic words: Too late. Too late. We moved too late to save them.

History is cluttered with them. We are almost at that point with Ukraine. Anyone who has followed the Russian model under Putin knows full well what his aim is to reclaim that territory, that empire, of the old Soviet Union. Now, if Ukraine goes, what happens to Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia? And just today in the news we hear where Russia has threatened a nuclear response, I believe it is, to Denmark.

Now, what is happening in the world? The world now is a very dark, a very dangerous, and a very evil place. And when those three things get together, there must be that shining light on the hill that shows the way out of the darkness. Throughout history, that light has been the United States of America.

We must act here. Let us hope that President Obama will hear our plea as Democrats and as Republicans. We have got to help save Ukraine from Russia.

I serve on the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. For 12 years I have served on NATO. I have served as the chairman of the Science and Technology Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia. I am here to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, if we don't act here, there will be a devastation on the European continent the likes of which we have not seen since World War II. We don't need to repeat that. Let us rise to this occasion. Let us do the right thing. Let us be that shining light on the hill that shows the way out of this darkness.

Mr. Speaker, there are some times in life you have just got to stand up to the bully. The United States must stand up to Putin and let him know that there is a light in this world, and the United States is going to show the way. The best way to do that today is to pass this resolution, and let's send Ukraine the military help that they need to protect themselves and the legacy of this fine country.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I will close now, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say that by passing this resolution, the House sends a clear message of support and solidarity to the people of Ukraine. It is past time that our government does more to help these true friends of liberty defend their land and deter aggression. I know that if the United States shows leadership here, others will follow.

I am very pleased to be the primary sponsor of this important resolution. I thank Chairman ROYCE for working with me on this. The two of us have worked very, very closely together, particularly on Ukraine, and we both feel very, very strongly. I agree with every comment that was uttered today by all the people speaking on this resolution.

We are the United States of America. We are a beacon of freedom to the world, and if we don't act now, who will? Again, let me reiterate: the people of Ukraine are not looking for American troops, and they are not looking for American boots on the



ground. There is no slippery slope here. They are just looking for the weapons to defend themselves. They don't have those weapons. We do. If we care about freedom and we care about fighting aggression, we need to give the people of Ukraine the right and the means to defend themselves. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very important resolution.

I again thank Chairman ROYCE, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just go to the words that Mr. DAVID SCOTT reminded us that echo down through history: Too late. Too late.

We have given the authority to the administration many months ago to transfer defensive weapons to Ukraine that can be used to check further aggression. That has not happened. This bipartisan resolution will direct the administration to take that step so that Ukrainians can defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote for this bipartisan resolution urging the administration to provide this crucial assistance to Ukraine before it is, in fact, too late for the Ukrainians to defend themselves.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 162, a resolution which urges the President to utilize his authority, granted by Congress in December of last year, to begin providing military aid to the government of Ukraine.

Since the February 2014 Revolution in which the corrupt then-Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich fled the country, the Russian Federation has made every effort through political, economic, and military means to subvert both the independence and the democratic aspirations of the Ukrainian people.

I strongly support the current policy of the United States not to recognize the absorption of Crimea into Russia through referendum—a referendum that took place against the backdrop of masked gunmen, widely believed to be unmarked Russian special forces, commandeering Crimean government buildings and intimidating voters.

In a recently aired Russian television documentary, President Putin acknowledges that plans were already in place to reabsorb Crimea into Russian territory weeks before the March 2014 referendum was held.

Russia has covertly infiltrated sovereign Ukrainian territory repeatedly, providing tanks, artillery, and rockets to separatist militias, which has resulted in a conflict leaving over 6,000 dead, 15,000 wounded, and more than a million displaced persons.

Mr. Speaker, Russia is openly breeding opposition to Ukrainian democracy through its veiled support of separatists, who on July 17, 2014, destroyed Malaysia Airlines Flight 17, a civilian airliner, utilizing a Russian-made missile which took the lives of all 298 innocent persons on board.

The United States has already made available to Ukraine economic and non-lethal equipment meant to shore up the country from Russian-backed rebels.

However, it is clear now that Russia has no intention of ceasing aggression against the democratic government of Ukraine.

The time has come for the United States to provide military aid to Ukraine to shore up its military, a military under assault by these Russian-backed separatists who have repeatedly broken their promises for a ceasefire against the democratic nation of Ukraine.

This military aid was requested by Ukraine's democratically elected president Petro Poroshenko, in a joint meeting of Congress on September 14, 2014, and is endorsed by both Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Martin Dempsey and Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has no intention of allowing Russia to redraw international borders as it pleases and subverting the democracy of our Ukrainian ally.

That is why I strongly support this resolution giving President Obama explicit authorization to provide military aid to the Ukrainian government.

With this aid, the United States is affirming its continued support of the Government of Ukrainian in its struggle to resist this heinous aggression from Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all Members to join me in voting for this resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bipartisan resolution urging the President to provide defensive weapons to Ukraine.

This week marks the one-year anniversary of Russia's annexation of Crimea and it has been almost a year-and-a-half since the protests in Maidan where the Ukrainian people stood together demanding a democratic and sovereign state. This past year-and-a-half has been a somber time for all of us, as we learn of the 6,000 deaths, the millions of wounded and displaced, and the enormous suffering endured by the Ukrainian people.

Now more than ever, the United States needs to stand with Ukraine by providing defensive weapons to help Ukraine counter Russian aggression and move past the current crisis. We should provide defense provisions, such as anti-tank weapons, counter-artillery radars, and ammunition to counter Russia-backed separatists. In doing so, we show solidarity with the Ukrainian people who have demonstrated their willingness to do their part, and we make it more difficult for Russia to wage a proxy war against Ukraine while publicly denying it.

To be sure, there is no quick or military solution to the problem. Defensive weapons alone cannot shield Ukraine from Russia's aggression—but they can help the Ukrainian effort in continuing to build a sovereign state, free from Russia's interference. And there is much more we can do. We should provide humanitarian assistance to embattled regions, help train the judiciary and law enforcement, and share our expertise in law and medicine.

I have tremendous hope for Ukraine's future. Its people have shown time and again their determination to build a democratic Ukraine with prosperity shared by all Ukrainians. Let us help them now with the defensive weapons they need.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 162.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MASSIE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### CONDEMNING THE ATTACK ON THE NIGERIAN TOWN OF BAGA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 53) condemning the cowardly attack on innocent men, women, and children in the northeastern Nigerian town of Baga, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 53

Whereas on the night of January 3, 2015, the terrorist group Boko Haram launched a horrific attack on innocent men, women, and children in the northeastern Nigerian town of Baga;

Whereas the terrorists of Boko Haram used assault rifles, grenade launchers, and fire to slaughter innocent civilians and the scope of casualties in this one attack totals in the hundreds and possibly thousands;

Whereas some nongovernmental organizations have described the attack in Baga as the terrorist group's "deadliest massacre" to date;

Whereas Nigerian security forces have been largely unable to prevent Boko Haram's territorial advances in the northeast since July 2014;

Whereas human rights groups have indicated that the Nigerian state security forces should improve efforts to protect civilians during offensive operations against Boko Haram;

Whereas this Islamist terrorist group, designated as a United States Foreign Terrorist Organization in November 2013, has killed over 5,000 people in Nigeria in 2014 alone and displaced over 1,000,000 innocent people;

Whereas Boko Haram has launched attacks in the neighboring countries of Cameroon, Niger, and Chad;

Whereas Boko Haram's leadership has voiced support for and received some funding and training from other Islamist terrorist groups, such as al Qaeda and its affiliates, and has recently embraced propaganda tactics similar to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL);

Whereas Boko Haram's leadership pledged official allegiance to ISIL, which ISIL has publicly accepted;

Whereas Boko Haram has abducted hundreds of civilians, using women and children as slaves, subjecting them to sexual abuse, and deploying them as suicide bombers, and forcibly recruiting boys as child soldiers;

Whereas Boko Haram has threatened to disrupt the Nigerian elections and attacks such as the one in Baga may result in many Nigerians being unable to vote in the upcoming national elections;



Whereas election-related violence in Nigeria has occurred in successive elections, including in 2011, when nearly 800 people died and some 65,000 were displaced in clashes following the presidential election;

Whereas President Goodluck Jonathan, Major General (retired) Muhammadu Buhari, and other presidential candidates signed the “Abuja Accord” on January 14, 2015, committing themselves and their campaigns to refrain from public statements that incite violence, to run on issue-based platforms that do not seek to divide citizens along religious or ethnic lines, and to support the impartial conduct of the electoral commission and the security services;

Whereas Secretary of State John Kerry traveled to Nigeria on January 25, 2015, to emphasize the importance of ensuring the upcoming elections are peaceful, nonviolent, and credible;

Whereas Nigeria was scheduled to hold national elections on February 14, 2015, but the elections were postponed for 6 weeks and are now scheduled for March 28, 2015;

Whereas political tensions in the country are high, and either electoral fraud or violence could undermine the credibility of the upcoming election;

Whereas Nigeria is Africa’s largest economy, biggest oil producer, and most populous nation, making it an influential country in the region; and

Whereas Nigeria is an important partner of the United States and it is in the best interest of the United States to maintain close ties with Nigeria: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) expresses its strong support for the people of Nigeria, especially the men, women, and children in northeastern Nigeria, including the town of Baga, who have been terrorized, abducted, trafficked, and murdered by the terrorist group Boko Haram;

(2) condemns Boko Haram for its violent attacks on civilian targets, including schools, mosques, churches, villages, and markets in Nigeria;

(3) expresses concern about the possibility of an expanded relationship between Boko Haram and ISIL in light of Boko Haram’s pledge of allegiance to ISIL;

(4) encourages the Government of Nigeria to strengthen efforts to protect civilians from the terrorists of Boko Haram, including through cooperation with neighboring countries and other international actors;

(5) urges all political candidates to uphold the commitments outlined in the “Abuja Accord” and the Government of Nigeria to hold their elections without further delay on March 28, 2015;

(6) remains committed to protecting democratic principles and universal human rights worldwide;

(7) supports United States assistance to the Government of Nigeria to combat Boko Haram and search for those who have been abducted by Boko Haram; and

(8) applauds the countries of the region and the African Union for their efforts to establish a regional security force, which will include Chad, Niger, Nigeria, Cameroon, and Benin, to combat Boko Haram and supports offers of robust security assistance to strengthen the force’s capacity.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as always, I very much appreciate the assistance of Mr. ENGEL in moving this resolution today to the House floor, and I commend Ms. KELLY, a new member of the committee, for her focus on this important issue. The Africa Subcommittee chairman, CHRIS SMITH, and the ranking member of that committee, KAREN BASS, have also done in-depth work on Nigeria, and on Boko Haram in particular. I appreciate their travels to Nigeria.

Mr. Speaker, Nigeria holds a critical presidential election this weekend. It is expected to be the continent’s most consequential political event in years. Africa’s most populous nation has over 70 million registered voters who will report to more than 100,000 polling stations.

I had the opportunity, with DON PAYNE, to lead a delegation years ago with election observer responsibility there for one of these national elections in Nigeria, along with General Colin Powell at the time.

Let me tell you, the political environment is always tense, but it is especially tense now. The leading candidates are neck and neck, as was the case then.

I just have to say that we have seen Nigeria transition from military rule to democracy in the election that General Powell and I witnessed, and that was a very peaceful—very peaceful—time. But recent elections in Nigeria have seen political violence, and we are right to be concerned.

This resolution urges all political candidates to respect their pledges of nonviolence and insist that the government hold a free, fair, and credible election, and that they do so on time. This election date has already been postponed once.

Meanwhile, Nigeria continues to face grave insecurity in the north at the hands of Boko Haram, which loosely translates to “Western education is sin.” This Islamist terrorist organization indiscriminately kills in mass and pillages villages in their quest to establish a sharia state. Satellite images document that after Boko Haram comes through, villages are literally wiped off the map.

The group is responsible for 5,000 deaths last year, in 2014, and displacing over 1 million people last year, making this organization, by the way, one of the world’s most deadly. But this weekend, forces fighting Boko Haram

reported discovering another hundred bodies in a shallow mass grave. We don’t really know how many they have killed out there in total, but we know that the killing continues.

Mr. Speaker, after watching Boko Haram’s violence, I wasn’t surprised to see that that group pledges allegiance to ISIS. ISIS publicly accepted the overture claiming this new relationship expands their self-declared caliphate to west Africa. At the same time, we have seen Boko Haram’s propaganda increase in quality, mimicking the production of ISIS videos sweeping what we call the virtual caliphate on the Internet.

So the good news, Mr. Speaker, is that Nigeria’s neighbors, Chad, Niger, and Cameroon, have all been making progress in the fight against Boko Haram under a newly established African Union regional force.

□ 1730

They have rescued more than 30 northern Nigerian towns to date from Boko Haram and from that harsh rule. This is a good beginning, but this African Union regional force lacks equipment and it lacks training. This resolution expresses the House’s support for robust security assistance to these troops in their fight against Boko Haram.

Nevertheless, we cannot rely solely on other countries in the region. Nigeria’s security forces should have the lead role to play. If dismantling Boko Haram is the goal, we need a well-trained, well-equipped Nigerian military. We must make sure there are no impediments, legislative or otherwise, to providing this much-needed assistance.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H. Res. 53.

I would like to begin by commending our colleague ROBIN KELLY, our colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee. She is a new member of the committee. We are delighted to have her. I want to commend her for introducing this important resolution, which condemns the brutal terrorist group Boko Haram and calls for free, fair, and on-time elections in Nigeria.

I also want to commend our colleague FREDERICA WILSON of Florida, who has raised this issue more than anyone else time and time and time again with resolutions on the House floor and just in general. So I want to thank Ms. WILSON of Florida.

I want to thank CHRIS SMITH and KAREN BASS of our committee, the Africa Subcommittee, who have also together pushed for a resolution of importance as this.

For 5 years, Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram has torn a path of violence and destruction across northeastern Nigeria, ruthlessly killing civilians, kidnapping children, and looting and destroying towns. In the last year, they

have started to swallow up territory and, just a few weeks ago, they pledged allegiance to ISIS, the Islamic State.

The Nigerian Government has a responsibility to protect its citizens, but, obviously, it hasn't done nearly enough to confront this horrific group. Only in the past month, with Presidential elections looming, has Nigeria seemed to get more serious about turning back the tide of Boko Haram.

In recent weeks, neighboring countries, including Chad, Niger, and Cameroon, have stepped up their efforts to combat the group, and we have seen real results. In some cases, troops in those nations have had to occupy towns they have liberated inside Nigeria because Nigerian forces simply aren't showing up to do their part. That is, obviously, disgraceful.

Instead of providing professional security forces and long-term economic investment into a long neglected region of the country, what I see are last minute political stunts to persuade Nigerian voters to reelect President Jonathan.

That brings me to the second subject of this resolution: Nigeria's upcoming elections. Presidential elections were supposed to take place on February 14, but were delayed until March 28 because of concerns about Boko Haram. Many believe this delay was politically motivated. Elections lacking legitimacy in Nigeria, which is Africa's most populous nation, could, obviously, send a destabilizing shock wave across the continent.

This resolution urges the Government of Nigeria to hold elections on March 28, without further delay, and for all parties to refrain from violence.

Mr. Speaker, Nigeria is a huge nation. It is the largest nation populationwise in Africa. What happens in Nigeria is very important. What happens in Nigeria counts. Nigeria needs to set a strong example for the region and for the continent by holding credible elections and by getting serious about Boko Haram. Nigeria needs to send a very strong message about that.

I strongly support this resolution and urge all my colleagues to support it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), chairman of the Information Technology Subcommittee of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I had the honor of serving my country for almost a decade as an undercover officer in the CIA. I was in the back alleys and bazaars of South Asia and the Middle East. I was the guy recruiting spies and stealing secrets and collecting intelligence on threats to our homeland, so I know a little some-

thing about dealing with bad guys. I looked our enemies in their eyes and I know what they were capable of.

Those who are committed to spreading terror, murdering and destroying the lives of the innocent, such as Boko Haram, cannot be reasoned with because they are not reasonable. They cannot be bargained with because they do not value the lives of others. They have nothing to lose. Only their destruction will stop their reign of terror over the men, women, and children of northeastern Nigeria.

So I encourage the United States to help. Let's help Nigeria and other nations, such as Chad, Niger, and Cameroon, to help their citizens. When terrorists such as Boko Haram are allowed to operate unchecked, our world is less safe and less free.

As the greatest and the freest Nation in the world, let's extend a hand to our friends in Nigeria and let them know that we stand with them in this war on terror.

I want to thank the chairman for this resolution. And I want to thank my colleague from Illinois, Congressman ROBIN KELLY, for her hard work and leadership on this resolution.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON LEE, my friend.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me, with enthusiasm, thank the chairman of the full committee, Mr. ROYCE, and the ranking member, both my friends, and my friend from New York (Mr. ENGEL). We have worked together on a number of issues.

I am both a student of Nigeria and a Member of Congress who has one of the largest—I am being polite. I believe I have the largest population of Nigerian Americans in my congressional area, which is in Houston, Texas. And we are very proud of the contributions that Africans from the continent but, in particular, in this instance, Nigerian Americans have made over the years.

I am also privileged to chair with Congressman CHABOT the Nigerian Caucus. I invite my colleagues to join because Nigeria is the largest population and I think the largest economy. I know that South Africa has been touted as such, but the numbers go up and down. There are many good people in Nigeria who want a better education for their children and for that economy to help develop all of Nigeria.

I represent a number of energy companies who have been in Nigeria for at least half a century. But, more importantly, we have seen Nigeria do some very positive things. And might I first make sure that I mention Congresswoman ROBIN KELLY, who I know is en route. I want to thank her for her leadership on this legislation. I am delighted to cosponsor. I had likewise in-

troduced legislation that was legislation sponsored by myself and Congressman CHABOT. But I am delighted to have the opportunity to support this legislation, which is, in essence, a combination of our points about Nigeria. And also to acknowledge Congresswoman CAROLYN MALONEY and Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON, whom we have been working together with on Boko Haram.

My point is that Nigeria has had some positive successes. It is one of the only and first states on the continent to fight and successfully overcome Ebola, to have the kind of medical care and science to make sure that they eliminated Ebola in Nigeria, even though one of the first cases was in Nigeria by way of someone traveling to Nigeria.

Of course, we have faced a crisis not of the making of the Nigerian people but in a northern state, unfortunately through the misunderstandings and the horrors of believing—not only believing but evidence—that the resources of Nigeria did not reach northern state, Bono state. ISIS was able to root its evilness. And, of course, it has been in Nigeria for a period of time.

However, the acts of Boko Haram came to our attention with the taking of 165-plus girls and boys that we all know in terms of the tragedy of taking the girls.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 2 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

And we began this campaign of "bring the girls back."

In the spring of 2014, I led a bipartisan delegation to Bono state and met with families whose girls had been taken and whose girls were still taken. I met with Jubilee, an organization that had saved some of the girls and were educating them here.

This resolution is particularly important because it tracks the legislation I authored, H. Res. 143, and condemns the cowardly acts of what has occurred through Boko Haram, particularly in the town of Baga, where it is alleged that thousands were killed. It also focuses on the Nigerian election, where we are asking that the elections pending this weekend will be held expeditiously and safely.

I want to mention that we understand that Boko Haram is a heinous evil group that kills children and men and women and innocent persons and burns down villages and intimidates people who just want democracy and an opportunity to live. That means these elections are crucial. And those who stand for election, they must stand for democracy and the ending of the siege of Boko Haram in whatever way it can be.

Let me express my gratefulness to the African Union, of which I raised a

question with them, led by Chad and Nigeria and other countries to fight off the siege of Boko Haram. But let me be very clear that Boko Haram wants to be associated with ISIS. They want to continue to be heinous and evil and dangerous. They must be weeded out, and the continent of Africa must stand with them.

I do want to acknowledge that there has been a victims fund set up. It is important for the Government of Nigeria to fund that victims fund and use that victims fund for the broken families and broken children. We know that Boko Haram has caused the death of over 9,000 persons.

This resolution asks for the recognition of the dangers of Boko Haram and the elimination of Boko Haram and the safety and security of a strong election.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, let me simply say that I urge the candidates to stand for peaceful elections. I urge the people to exercise their right to vote. I urge the international community to continue to support and promote a safe and free and fair election. And I urge the winner to bring people together and to stop this horrible siege.

I ask my colleagues to support the resolution, H. Res. 53.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of H. Res. 53, a resolution condemning the cowardly attack on innocent men, women and children in the Northeastern Nigerian town of Baga.

This resolution also urges the Government of Nigeria to hold a safe, free, and fair election on March 28, 2015.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their commitment to peace, security, stability, justice and democracy around the world in general and in Nigeria in particular, and for shepherding this important resolution to the floor.

I also thank the gentlelady from Illinois, Congresswoman KELLY, for introducing this resolution which I am proud to co-sponsor.

Also I want to thank the Ranking member KAREN BARR and Chairman SMITH of the African Sub-Committee.

Mr. Speaker, many of us are very passionate about this very important issue of peace, security, stability and democracy in Nigeria.

Nigeria, a regional giant and one of Africa's largest economies, possesses abundant natural resources and a historically capable military force which has provided regional stability and humanitarian support to its African neighbors and other countries around the world.

We also recognize that peace, security and a stable economy in Nigeria have a great bearing on global peace, security and stability because of its posture in the African continent.

Mr. Speaker, since I have been in Congress, I have worked to promote peace, security, stability, democracy and economic empowerment in Nigeria.

Indeed, earlier this year, I authored H. Res. 143, a resolution urging the government of Nigeria to move forward expeditiously with national general elections.

Also, last year in response to the devastating kidnapping of the Chibok school girls, I led a bipartisan congressional delegation to Nigeria, along with my colleagues FREDERICA WILSON, Steve Stockman and LOIS FRANKEL.

While we were in Nigeria, we met with key stakeholders for peace in Nigeria: political, community and civil society leaders.

During our meeting with these leaders on the ground in Nigeria, we called for the creation of a Nigerian fund to compensate the victims of the Boko Haram attacks, starting with the families of the kidnapped schoolgirls.

Thus, H. Res. 53, the resolution offered by Congresswoman KELLY, is a continuation of prior concerted efforts to catalyze peace, security, stability, and free and fair elections in Nigeria.

Mr. Speaker, Nigeria's efforts to adhere to democratic political processes, including safe, free, and fair elections are under direct attack by the terrorist group Boko Haram.

Boko Haram's terroristic activities are intended to wreak havoc on and incite fear on the part of the Nigerian people in order that they stay away from the polls.

These violent threats by Boko Haram are in direct derogation of the constitutionally protected rights of the Nigerian people to exercise their right to vote.

For instance, Boko Haram has caused the death of over 9,000 persons, according to a report by the Council on Foreign Relations and over 1.5 million persons have been displaced in Nigeria and regionally as reported by Amnesty International.

In addition to the kidnapping of children such as the school girls from the Government Girls Secondary School in the Northeastern province of Chibok, Boko Haram has become more brazen with children now being used as bomb shields as recent news reports inform us.

Boko Haram is decapitating and slicing the throats of women, leaving them for dead.

These terrorists have taken over villages, raping, pillaging and stealing the resources of innocent villagers who are not able to defend themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Boko Haram is a rogue bully and terrorist organization that needs to be dismantled and defeated.

Nigeria's success in combatting national and regional extremism is critical to the security not only the Nigerian and African people but of the United States and the global community.

Our commitment to promoting democracy and security in Nigeria and Africa continues to be underscored by each and every cowardly brutal act by Boko Haram.

It is critically important that we remain steadfast in our resolve to defeat Boko Haram in view of the fact that this band of cowards and terrorists has now cast its lot with ISIS.

Today, by this resolution, the United States stands in solidarity with the Nigerian people in condemning Boko Haram and supporting a government that promotes peace, security, stability and democracy in Nigeria.

We stand together in promoting the Nigerian people's constitutional right to exercise their right to vote and have their voices heard.

Today, 5 days before March 28, the National elections, a historical day for the country of Nigeria, I have four concluding points to make:

1. I urge Presidential candidates Goodluck Johnathan and Muhammadu Buhari to adhere to the 2015 Abuja Accord to avoid any conduct or behavior that will endanger the political stability and national security of Nigeria and fully abide by all rules and regulations as laid down in the legal framework for elections in Nigeria;

2. I urge the Nigerian people to exercise their right to vote and promote peace as they engage in this sacred act of lending their voices to the political process which will affect their future and the future of Nigerian youth;

3. I urge the international community to continue to support and promote a safe, free and fair election in Nigeria and sustainable democracy to promote economic upward mobility in Nigeria and opportunities for youth; and

4. I urge the winner of the national election, whomever he may be to protect the Nigerian people from the scourge of Boko Haram, and to help find the abducted girls and work with the United States and regional governments in Africa to contain and ultimately defeat Boko Haram.

Mr. Speaker, peace in Nigeria requires democratic elections, the creative weapons of transparency, peace coalition building, addressing grievances, negotiations, the use of social media, infrastructure building and political intellectual capital building.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY), the author of this resolution.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for their bipartisan leadership in helping bring the attention of Congress to the vile acts of the terror group Boko Haram.

This weekend, the international community received the sickening news that a mass grave with beheaded remains was uncovered in formerly Boko Haram-held territory in northern Nigeria.

It still stands that America will never tolerate terrorism, and this Congress will never abide terrorists. Despite their beliefs, a few things about Boko Haram are quite clear to the world.

Abubakar Shekau's acts are cowardly. He remains a man who fears the power of the people of Nigeria, a man afraid of the promise and potential of girls who are educated and whose minds will change the world.

History will not celebrate Boko Haram because they are on the wrong side of it. They have mistaken cowardice for courage, and their crimes against innocent men, women, and children cannot be forgiven.

It has been 10 months since the world demanded that Boko Haram bring back the 200 school girls they kidnapped because they wanted to be educated. They defied these calls.

Boko Haram has murdered scores of innocent Nigerians—an estimated 17,000 since 2011. And this month, we received the news that they have sworn allegiance to ISIS.

I, like so many across the world, was outraged at the brutality and senselessness of Boko Haram's crimes. Victimized innocent men, women, and children for perverse ideological gain will never be tolerated or treated as just by the international community.

With our vote today, this committee and this Congress can affirm that we stand for the human rights, dignity, and security of the Nigerian people; that we will not tolerate a world in which Boko Haram, or any terrorist organization, can slaughter innocent civilians; that we respect the right of women to be educated without the threat of violence; and that we support free and fair elections free of suppression and intimidation.

□ 1745

We say this positively on this House floor, and we stand today with the force and confidence that is much stronger than groups of the likes of Boko Haram.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL, Congresswoman FREDERICA WILSON for her constant leadership on this issue, Congressman WILL HURD of Texas for being the first to come across the aisle and lend his name to this resolution, and I thank all of the other Members who stood up and spoke out against the cowardly acts of Boko Haram and ISIS. I urge my colleagues to pass this important resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In our committee, we heard the testimony of Deborah Peters, a young girl from northern Nigeria. She survived, but she was tied to her father's body and her brothers, who were massacred by Boko Haram.

She came to tell us about what it was like, of her girlfriends or her schoolmates, of course, who have never been returned and of her chilling account of the practices committed as that village was decimated—"decimated" is not the right word—as that village was eliminated.

I mean, we are talking about communities here—villages—in which there are a handful of survivors when Boko Haram comes through, of young people like Deborah who are left with a world shattered, with their families massacred and, in her case, in front of her very eyes.

Now, as this country of Nigeria prepares for elections, this insurgency that is burning in the north is creating a huge problem. U.S. support for the African Union force, which is making some gains in stomping out Boko Haram's violent march, has got to be stepped up. The region's stability depends on it.

In the meantime, I just want to say that the presidential election in Nigeria is going to be critical not just for Nigeria, but for the region. Nigeria has

the largest population and the largest economy. The outcome could have a far-reaching impact.

This resolution puts the House's views on record, and I thank Ms. KELLY for that. It spells out the need for a nonviolent, free, and fair election. Not only do I thank her for drafting this resolution, but I thank her and ELIOT ENGEL and CHRIS SMITH and all of our committee members who have been focused on Nigeria and Boko Haram.

It is a necessity that we devote more time and energy to this mission of trying to figure out how we can bring support to the Nigerian military in their effort to suppress Boko Haram.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I would like to, once again, thank Congresswoman KELLY and, certainly, Chairman ROYCE, along with other Members who have worked on this issue—I mentioned FREDERICA WILSON—for helping to highlight the major challenges facing Nigeria today.

Nigeria is a critical ally of the United States, and Congress must stay strongly engaged on these key issues of democracy and security pertaining to Nigeria.

Lastly, let me thank the leadership for moving this resolution to the floor in a timely manner before the upcoming election in Nigeria. I urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 53, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution condemning the cowardly attacks on innocent men, women, and children in northeastern Nigeria by Boko Haram and urging a peaceful and credible national election".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. HOLDING) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 360, by the yeas and nays,

H. Res. 162, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

#### NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 360) to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 297, nays 98, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—297

Abraham	Cole	Esty
Adams	Collins (NY)	Farr
Aguilar	Comstock	Fattah
Amodeli	Conaway	Fincher
Ashford	Connolly	Fitzpatrick
Bass	Conyers	Forbes
Beatty	Cook	Fortenberry
Becerra	Cooper	Poster
Benishek	Costa	Frankel (FL)
Bera	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Beyer	Courtney	Fudge
Bilirakis	Cramer	Gabbard
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Gallego
Blum	Crenshaw	Garrett
Bonamici	Crowley	Gibbs
Bost	Cuellar	Gibson
Brady (PA)	Cummings	Gowdy
Brady (TX)	Curbelo (FL)	Graham
Brooks (IN)	Davis (CA)	Grayson
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Green, Al
Bustos	DeFazio	Green, Gene
Butterfield	DeGette	Grijalva
Calvert	Delaney	Guinta
Capps	DeLauro	Guthrie
Capuano	DeBene	Hahn
Cárdenas	Denham	Hanna
Carney	Dent	Harper
Carson (IN)	DeSaulnier	Hastings
Cartwright	Deutch	Heck (NV)
Castor (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Heck (WA)
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Hensarling
Chabot	Doggett	Herrera Beutler
Chu, Judy	Dold	Higgins
Cicilline	Duckworth	Hill
Clark (MA)	Duffy	Himes
Clarke (NY)	Edwards	Honda
Clay	Ellison	Hoyer
Cleaver	Ellmers (NC)	Hudson
Clyburn	Engel	Huffman
Coffman	Eshoo	Huizenga (MI)

Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kline  
Kuster  
LaMalfa  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe y  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marino  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley

McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Price, Tom  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Rogers (KY)  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (WI)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff

Schock  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Visclosky  
Walden  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Watson Coleman  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Womack  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NAYS—98

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bishop (MI)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Boustany  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Clawson (FL)  
Collins (GA)  
Culberson  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Duncan (TN)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores

Foxx  
Franks (AZ)  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Hardy  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Holding  
Huelskamp  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly (PA)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Lamborn  
Loudermilk  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCaul  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Mooney (WV)  
Mulvaney

Newhouse  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Ratcliffe  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Stutzman  
Velázquez  
Wagner  
Walker  
Waters, Maxine  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman

Westmoreland  
Williams

Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brown (FL)  
Buchanan  
Chaffetz  
Cohen  
Davis, Danny  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duncan (SC)  
Garamendi

Granger  
Graves (MO)  
Gutiérrez  
Hinojosa  
Hultgren  
King (IA)  
Knight  
Labrador  
Lipinski  
Love  
McClintock  
Payne  
Pompeo

## NOT VOTING—37

□ 1857

Messrs. YOHIO, LAMBORN, JOLLY, WESTERMAN, PALAZZO, KINZINGER of Illinois, SALMON, STUTZMAN, ROYCE, BUCSHON, RENACCI, and MILLER of Florida changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. WELCH, SMITH of Texas, SERRANO, ELLISON, VAN HOLLEN, DENHAM, and SHUSTER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). The Chair would ask all present to rise for the purpose of a moment of silence.

The Chair asks that the House now observe a moment of silence in remembrance of our brave men and women in uniform who have given their lives in the service of our country in Iraq and Afghanistan and their families, and of all who serve in our Armed Forces and their families.

# PROVIDING MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO UKRAINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 162) calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 348, nays 48, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

## YEAS—348

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Emmer (MN)  
Engel  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishak  
Bera  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capps  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cicilline  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold

Duckworth  
Duffy  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Fattah  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graham  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Kuster  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance

Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Levin  
Lieu, Ted  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Price, Tom  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby

Rogers (KY)	Shinkus	Veasey
Rokita	Shuster	Vela
Rooney (FL)	Simpson	Velázquez
Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema	Visclosky
Ross	Sires	Wagner
Rothfus	Slaughter	Walden
Rouzer	Smith (MO)	Walker
Roybal-Allard	Smith (NE)	Walters, Mimi
Royce	Smith (NJ)	Walz
Ruppersberger	Smith (TX)	Wasserman
Russell	Stefanik	Schultz
Ryan (WI)	Stivers	Weber (TX)
Salmon	Stutzman	Webster (FL)
Sánchez, Linda T.	Swalwell (CA)	Wenstrup
Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)	Takal
Sanford	Thompson (MS)	Westmoreland
Sarbanes	Thompson (PA)	Whitfield
Scalise	Thornberry	Williams
Schiff	Tiberi	Wilson (FL)
Schock	Tipton	Wittman
Schweikert	Titus	Womack
Scott (VA)	Tonko	Woodall
Scott, Austin	Torres	Yarmuth
Scott, David	Trott	Yoder
Sensenbrenner	Turner	Yoho
Serrano	Upton	Young (AK)
Sessions	Valadao	Young (IA)
Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen	Young (IN)
Sherman	Vargas	Zeldin
		Zinke

## NAYS—48

Amash	Grijalva	Moore
Beyer	Hahn	Mulvaney
Bonamici	Honda	Nadler
Capuano	Huelskamp	Nolan
Chu, Judy	Huffman	O'Rourke
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Posey
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Rohrabacher
Conyers	Lawrence	Schakowsky
DesJarlais	Lee	Schrader
Duncan (TN)	Lewis	Speier
Edwards	Loebuck	Takano
Ellison	Lowenthal	Tsongas
Farr	Massie	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Meeks	Welch

## NOT VOTING—36

Bishop (UT)	Granger	Richmond
Blumenauer	Graves (MO)	Roe (TN)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gutiérrez	Rogers (AL)
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Roskam
Buchanan	Hultgren	Ruiz
Chaffetz	King (IA)	Rush
Cohen	Knight	Ryan (OH)
Davis, Danny	Labrador	Smith (WA)
Doyle, Michael F.	Lipinski	Stewart
Duncan (SC)	Love	Walberg
Garamendi	McClintock	Walorski
	Payne	Wilson (SC)
	Pompeo	

## □ 1908

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 131 on Calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity, H. Res. 162, I am not recorded because of prior commitments in the Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

## AN AMERICAN BUDGET, A FAMILY BUDGET

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, we have all had hands-on experience balancing a

budget, sitting at the kitchen table long after the kids have gone to bed shuffling through bills and pay stubs. We all know the feeling. In my family, balancing our budget isn't just a priority, it is a requirement. We must view America's budget the same way.

The House Republican Balanced Budget for a Stronger America is not only realistic, but proactive. Our budget not only balances in less than 10 years, it does so without raising taxes. It places our country on a path to pay off the overwhelming mound of debt we face and creates a simpler Tax Code to ensure we continue to flourish.

Mr. Speaker, our kitchen table may be bigger and the voices may be louder, but the same rules apply. Our budget balances and provides American families with the security they deserve.

## BRING OUR GIRLS HOME

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching the 1-year anniversary of the kidnapping of more than 200 Nigerian girls by psychopaths who call themselves Boko Haram. Since their abduction, almost every week has brought fresh reports of outrages and slaughters by the terrorists, but only silence about the girls. There have been some unconfirmed reports that some of the girls have been taken across Nigeria's borders and that some have died of snakebites and illness.

Recently, the Emir of Kano in Nigeria challenged every Muslim leader in the country to speak up and put an end to Boko Haram in their country. That is a good start. But let's also call on all of the leaders of Africa to unite, to rid their government and their continent of Boko Haram, and, as one, to do everything in their power to Bring Back Our Girls. Let's reunite them with their families. Let's end this horror. Let's Bring Back Our Girls.

## HONORING JIM SMITH, ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY BASKETBALL TEAM COACH

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Jim Smith, the longtime coach of St. John's University's basketball team.

Coach Smith just completed his 51st season as the winningest college basketball coach at any level in Minnesota history. Nationwide, he is ranked 14th in the NCAA, with a career record of 786 wins and 556 losses.

His legacy lives beyond the statistics as well. Beloved both on the court and in the greater Collegeville community, Coach Smith is known for being inspir-

ing, competitive, and one of the friendliest people you would have the pleasure of meeting. This legendary coach leaves behind big shoes to fill.

Thank you for everything you have done, Coach Smith. Enjoy your retirement.

## EXTENDING CONDOLENCES TO THE SASSOON FAMILY OF BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, FOR THEIR UNSPEAKABLE LOSS

(Ms. CLARKE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a very heavy heart. This weekend, my district experienced an unspeakable loss. One of our families in the Midwood section of Brooklyn lost seven of its children to a horrific fire. I wanted to come to the floor to just extend our condolences to the Sassoon family, where mother and daughter are currently hospitalized. We are wishing them a speedy and healthy recovery.

To the extended community, we all mourn the loss of these children, and we will do everything we can go forward to impress upon the community, those with large families, the importance of fire safety, and that we make sure that we keep our loved ones safe by having fire detectors on every floor of our homes and fire extinguishers where possible.

## □ 1915

## DO NOT BAN MOM'S BROWNIES FROM SCHOOL

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my mother makes wonderful double-chocolate brownies. As a kid, I would take them to school, and the PTA would sell them in the school bake sale to raise money for projects like uniforms for the school band and cheerleaders.

When our four kids were in school, they would take brownies for school bake sales as well. And now my grandkids can still use their great-grandmother's brownie recipe for school bake sales.

But warning, Mr. Speaker: the Federal school food police are regulating school bake sales. You see, now the government wants to control and, in some cases, prohibit school bake sales in the name of making kids healthier. No more homemade cupcakes, brownies, or baked goods unless they meet government calorie, sugar, and fat standards. Not healthy, sayeth the bake sale police.

The Federal Government is becoming the parent of American kids. What is

next? Are they going to tell schoolkids what they can wear?

Parents and schools should decide whether to have bake sales or not. Uncle Sam doesn't know better. Parents know better.

Let Mom's homemade brownies back in the schools.

And that is just the way it is.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

#### EMPOWERING PATIENTS WITH FSAs AND HSAs

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the fifth anniversary of the President's new health care law, and it is apparent that the law has made it much more difficult for hardworking Americans to have flexibility with their own health care choices.

For instance, health care savings accounts and flexible savings accounts put power in the hands of patients by letting them make their own decisions when it comes to their own care.

But the new health care law actually prohibits someone from using their own money in their own health care savings account or flexible spending account to purchase simple over-the-counter medications like Advil or Claritin unless they first get a doctor's prescription. This makes absolutely no sense.

Today, I am introducing the Family Health Care Flexibility Act that will restore the ability of parents to take control of their own decisions when it comes to the care of their children in purchasing over-the-counter medications without a doctor's prescription.

Mr. Speaker, instead of a top-down, one-size-fits-all centralized health care system, we need solutions that provide patients with greater value, more choices, and lower costs.

#### JOINT REAPPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, their joint reappointment, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended by Public Law 114-6, of the following indi-

viduals on March 23, 2015, each to a 2-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance:

Mr. Alan V. Friedman, Los Angeles, California

Ms. Susan S. Robfogel, Rochester, New York

Ms. Barbara Childs Wallace, Ridgeland, Mississippi

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington, Congresswoman DELBENE.

REMEMBERING THE HIGHWAY 530 MUDSLIDE

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today to honor, recognize, and remember the events from 1 year ago when lives in my district changed in a matter of seconds. Part of a mountain-side slid into the Steelhead Haven neighborhood, claiming 43 lives, numerous homes, and damaging public infrastructure.

The people of Oso, Darrington, Arlington, the Stillaguamish Tribe, and the Sauk-Suiattle Tribe will never be the same, but I have great faith in these communities.

The Highway 530 mudslide was a heartbreaking disaster. It caused unbelievable devastation and tragic loss of life. But even through such a painful tragedy, it has been inspiring to see how the community has come together, people doing everything they can to help each other. Their response in the face of calamity has been incredible.

I joined these communities yesterday to honor the memories of those we lost and recognize everyone's efforts, including the first responders who selflessly risked their lives to save others.

Recovery continues to be a slow, difficult process, but I am confident that through our work together we will continue to get through these difficult times stronger and closer than ever.

Federal, State, and local agencies like the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA, and the State Department of Transportation responded to calls for aid when our communities needed roads rebuilt, an extension for filing taxes, help to get kids to school, or to find new housing.

I will continue to push for resources until these communities are fully restored. But instead of simply sending aid after a disaster, lawmakers need to do more to ensure that we fund programs and research efforts to prevent future natural disasters from becoming national tragedies.

One thing that struck me most while spending time in these communities and with local emergency command

centers was the spirit, courage, and cooperation of everyone who pitched in to help.

FEMA officials even commented that this was the first time they allowed locals to be so heavily involved in rescue efforts. They did so because the people of these communities brought unique skills, experience, and determination. For example, loggers understood how to use heavy machinery in a challenging environment with 40 feet of mud, rocks, and trees. It was the first natural disaster where everyone—Federal and local—worked together so well.

Lawmakers in our Nation's Capital could learn a lot from the people of Oso, Darrington, and Arlington. We too need to work together to ensure our communities are better prepared for natural disasters and landslides, in particular.

During this session of Congress, I plan to introduce legislation that would standardize and share research and mapping methods across the country while increasing funding for research and hazard assessments in high-risk areas. In addition, a primary goal of my bill will be to determine a national strategy to increase public awareness of the risks associated with landslides and identify slide-prone areas. We must also create education programs and increase rapid response efforts because, as we all know too well, disasters strike with little warning.

We will never forget those who were lost in the slide and the incredible community that continues to be "Oso strong."

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we enter the final week of Women's History Month, the Congressional Black Caucus would like to use tonight's Special Order hour to examine the unique challenges that women face in America today. Many of these experiences are shared across the socioeconomic spectrum, and some are more specific to African American women.

The late poet and author Maya Angelou once said:

Each time a woman stands up for herself, without knowing it possibly, without claiming it, she stands up for all women.

There is much truth to these words, and our Nation has been strengthened by women who have taken stands for their rights. But tonight, the Congressional Black Caucus also stands up for millions of women across America.

Tonight, we will examine gender pay gaps, workforce treatment, family issues, health disparities, and a host of other concerns women face in America.

Each Women's History Month we recognize those pioneers who broke glass ceilings and paved the way for women's rights and equality: Abigail Adams; Phillis Wheatley; Lucretia Mott; Sojourner Truth; Harriet Tubman; Ella Baker; Rosa Parks; the Honorable



Shirley Chisholm; Coretta Scott King; Ruth Bader Ginsberg; and the Honorable Loretta Lynch.

Still, we can't lose sight of the challenges that remain for women. We must all continue the work needed to eliminate gender inequalities once and for all.

Fifty years after President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law, women continue to earn less than men. Women make only 78 cents for every dollar earned by men, amounting to a yearly gap of \$11,000 between full-time men and women. That \$11,000 lost could purchase 89 more weeks of food, or more than 3,000 additional gallons of gas, or more than 1 year of rent for a woman's family.

For African American women and Latinas, the pay gap is even larger. African American women on average earn only 64 cents and Latinas on average earn only 55 cents for every dollar earned by White, non-Hispanic men.

Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women. Yet, the minimum wage has not kept up with inflation over the last 45 years. With the minimum wage now, using inflation-adjusted terms, minimum wage women are earning more than 30 percent lower than they were in 1968.

These economic disparities are just a few of the issues facing women that we will address tonight. I want to thank the chairman of the CBC, the Honorable G. K. BUTTERFIELD, for allowing us to address this important topic tonight.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Ohio, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois, for leading us in tonight's Special Order to address the unique challenges Black women face.

It is certainly fitting, Mr. Speaker, that we are discussing the contributions of women in our society during March as we celebrate Women's History Month.

Let us acknowledge those who have sacrificed and led the charge in women's rights, voting rights, civil rights, and rights in this Chamber.

Black women have consistently played a critical role in our Nation's history. In Congress, women like Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, the first African American female to serve in Congress and to run for President of these United States. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, first Black woman in Congress from the deep South.

When I think of Shirley Chisholm, I remember the words that we still hear and say so often when we talk about women: unbought and unbossed.

Women like Carol Moseley Braun, who became the first African American female woman elected to the United States Senate.

Patricia Roberts Harris, the first Black woman to serve in a Presidential

Cabinet and the first woman to hold two Cabinet positions—the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and, later, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

And then from my great State of Ohio, the seventh-largest State in this Nation, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, only to be followed by two women, Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE and myself, representing the Third Congressional District.

Even in the face of grave opposition and unequal treatment throughout our Nation's history, Black women have continued to stand strong and contribute to the well-being of their families and our country as a whole, women like the women who serve in the Congressional Black Caucus, women like the women who serve in this Chamber, women like the only female to serve as Speaker of this House, NANCY PELOSI.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, here we are in 2015, and a Black female leader is waiting to lead the critically important office of the United States Attorney General. No one can say she is unqualified, no one can say she is inexperienced, no one can say she hasn't or didn't perform well, Mr. Speaker. Just a couple weeks ago, 8 hours of testimony, more than 900 questions answered, and yet, she is left waiting, waiting longer than the previous combined times of the seven previous Attorney Generals. For 132 days, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Lynch has been waiting for a vote. Mr. Speaker, that is three seasons.

□ 1930

In the fall, the Senate failed to take up the nomination. In the winter, the Senate dithered on her nomination. Here we are, now in the spring, and we are waiting.

Mr. Speaker, what is the Senate waiting for? Our Nation needs an Attorney General, and holding this nomination hostage is senseless and reckless.

I strongly urge the Senate Republican leadership to stop playing politics with law enforcement and national security and to vote on the confirmation of Loretta Lynch to serve as our next Attorney General.

Ms. Lynch is eminently qualified and is a proven leader with an exemplary record at the Department of Justice. She is a brilliant, well-educated, and experienced lawyer twice before confirmed. It is well past time for the United States Senate to move forward with the nomination of Loretta Lynch, a Black woman and nominee for United States Attorney General and, possibly, another first in our history.

As I always like to say, Mr. Speaker, firsts are never good unless there can be a second and a third and a fourth. If we make this first happen, as we have done in the past, then there can be other women standing here and sitting where you are sitting.

I honor Ms. Lynch and all of the strong Black women who have paved the way for each successive generation, for my granddaughter so that she can know that there are women who can stand up in this Chamber and speak on this floor.

That is what the Congressional Black Caucus' Special Order, in part, is about because, every day, Black women hold their families together as primary caregivers; they support their children and continue to preserve and persevere when our society fails to deliver on equal rights.

Equal rights in pay equity, health care, and education are priorities for me in this Congress and for millions of women across this Nation. The pay gap is startling, but it is real because we know, when women succeed, America succeeds. In Ohio and across the Nation, women make 77 cents to every \$1 a White man makes, and for African American women, it is 66 cents for every \$1 that they make.

Five years ago today, President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law. Our Nation took a giant step forward—a giant leap—in saving lives and making health care a right for all, not just for the privileged few. The Affordable Care Act has important implications for Black women as they face longstanding and persistent disparities in health care and in health in general.

Mr. Speaker, again, I would like to thank my colleague, the Congresswoman from Illinois, for bringing forth this topic. I would also like to thank all of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus for hosting this Special Order hour.

There are countless Black women whose names may not appear prominently in our history books, who may not ever appear on this floor or be recognized in this Congress or in this country, women like my 91-year-old mother in Dayton, Ohio, who reared four daughters and told us and taught us about the value of standing up for what you believe in.

They are women who won't appear in our history books but whose sweat and blood and strength are woven into our national identity. I honor all of these women. They continue to inform me and inform my sense of pride and dignity as an American.

I am going to end with the same quote that my friend and colleague started with, a quote by the late Maya Angelou, "Each time a woman stands up for herself, without knowing it possibly, without claiming it"—Mr. Speaker, as I stand today—"she stands up for all women."

Thank you.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you, my friend from the great State of Ohio, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY. Your points about Loretta Lynch are so pertinent. Despite the gains we have made, we still have a long way to go.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now my great privilege to yield to my friend from the great State of New Jersey, Congresswoman BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I want to thank the gentlewoman, my colleague from Illinois, for providing this opportunity for me to share with you this evening.

I am also honored to join my Congressional Black Caucus colleagues on the floor as we celebrate Women's History Month, and I am particularly grateful to our chairman, Chairman Butterfield.

This year's commemoration of the women who have shaped this Nation is especially important here in this body because, for the first time, more than 100 women hold seats, speaking on behalf of Americans from Alaska to Florida.

This year, the Congressional Black Caucus includes 20 women who are fighting for working families, for better wages, for more funding for better education, and for the many other policies that will make our Nation stronger and our families healthier.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be the very first African American woman to represent the State of New Jersey in Congress and to be the only woman currently serving in this delegation. These are outstanding firsts, and I am thrilled to be one of them, but this is 2015, Mr. Speaker, and we shouldn't still be speaking about "firsts" and "onlys" when it comes to women. There may be 104 of us, but women still make up only 20 percent of Congress while we make up more than half of the population.

Women across this country still earn just 78 cents for every \$1 that is earned by men, and we have heard that women of color, particularly African American women, earn even less than this.

Women still face a culture that questions our ability to excel in science and tech-focused fields, a culture that rushes to blame victims of sexual assault instead of protecting them, a culture that doubts that women are capable of making choices about their own health without the interference from lawmakers, who in the majority are men.

Women's History Month is about celebrating trailblazers, but it is also about honoring the strength of all women and recognizing that we are just as capable as men and are just as ready to bring something to the table.

We just celebrated the 50th anniversary of the marches from Selma to Montgomery, and in the process, we paid tribute to many of the leaders who risked their lives on the Edmund Pettus Bridge that day.

Most people connect these events with Dr. Martin Luther King or our esteemed colleague Congressman JOHN LEWIS, but Amelia Boynton Robinson was among the first to bring the organizers to Selma. Even fewer know Viola Liuzzo, who paid the ultimate price for joining the march as she saw men and women brutalized on that bridge purely because of the color of their skin.

I mention those names, Mr. Speaker, because, when it comes down to it, women have been leading for generations, even if it has been behind the scenes and without recognition.

I join my colleagues in paying homage to a long history of amazing women; but I also ask every Member of this body: What are we doing to make history? What are we doing to build an economy in which women are equals and a society in which women are respected? What are we doing to make the phrase the "first woman of history" an unnecessary question?

When we look at the opportunities before us, we know, Mr. Speaker, it is now that we have the opportunity to make history—right now. We have the opportunity to make history with the first woman, an African American, as the U.S. Attorney General of this great country, and we have an opportunity in the near future to say that there has been a woman elected President of the United States.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Thank you to the great gentlewoman of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, it is during Women's History Month when we recognize the contributions and achievements of women throughout the course of history. Many of these women have had distinguished public service careers, from President Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of Labor—Frances Perkins—to the first female Cabinet Secretary, to current Secretaries Sylvia Mathews Burwell, Sally Jewell, and Penny Pritzker, and National Security Adviser Susan Rice.

Women like them have a proud and established record of providing wise and honest counsel and of leading our government through important and transformational times.

Right now, the Obama administration is awaiting Senate confirmation for a woman who is eminently qualified for the position of U.S. Attorney General, our Nation's chief law enforcement officer. The first woman to hold this position was Janet Reno under President Bill Clinton.

Attorney General Reno strongly defended the Constitution, promoted civil liberties, and captured and convicted domestic and foreign criminals. The

second woman—but not the last woman—to hold the position of Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, will be Loretta Lynch.

Once confirmed by the United States Senate, Ms. Lynch will make history by being the first African American woman to serve as Attorney General. She will join the proud ranks of Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, former Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, former Labor Secretary Alexis Herman, and Patricia Roberts, who was the first female African American Cabinet Secretary who served as both Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Loretta Lynch, as you have heard over and over and as we know, is eminently qualified to be Attorney General, Mr. Speaker. A graduate of Harvard University and of Harvard Law School, Ms. Lynch has had a distinguished legal career. She is universally recognized for her keen analytical skills and her passion for the law.

Ms. Lynch is also uniquely fit to serve the role for our Nation at this critical point in our national discourse. As U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York, Ms. Lynch currently serves as the chief Federal prosecutor for Brooklyn, Queens, Staten Island, and Long Island.

At this time, I yield to my distinguished colleague from New York, HAKEEM JEFFRIES.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank my good friend and colleague, Representative KELLY from the great State of Illinois, for, once again, presiding over this CBC Special Order, this opportunity for members of the Congressional Black Caucus to speak directly to the American people for 60 minutes on matters of great importance.

Mr. Speaker, certainly, members of the Congressional Black Caucus recognize the strength, the vitality, the intelligence, and the importance of African American women to the African American experience in this great country—in fact, to the American experience.

Consistently, it has been Black women who have fought hard to bring American democracy to life, to continue the march to perfect a more perfect Union.

I think often of the role that Harriet Tubman played—a bold, fearless woman who managed to free herself from the horrific bondage of slavery in the South and make it to the North but who then decided, at great sacrifice to her own potential well-being, to go back down South an additional 19 times, freeing more than 200 Black slaves.

I also find it fascinating that, when Harriet Tubman once was asked about her heroics—who spent many of her final years in New York—was dismissive. She said: "I could have

freed more if they only knew that they were slaves."

I think Harriet Tubman gave us some words of wisdom that can serve many communities all across the country today that are still struggling to deal with social and economic injustice. She said: "I could have freed more if they only knew that they were slaves." Sometimes, we have folks who remain trapped in their own circumstances because they have a mindset issue. Harriet Tubman helped to perfect our democracy.

Mentioned earlier by some of my distinguished colleagues were some of the other contributions that were made during the civil rights struggle, and there were many African American women who haven't always gotten the credit for playing a leading role in the civil rights movement—designed, again, to help perfect American democracy—dealing with Jim Crow and racial segregation in the South and in many parts of this country.

I think it was Fannie Lou Hamer who famously said, "I am sick and tired of being sick and tired," when asked why she stepped forward at great sacrifice to herself. I think there are still a lot of Americans in many parts of this country, when it comes to the prison industrial complex, when it comes to the problem of the police's use of excessive force, and when it comes to the issue of income inequality, who still draw inspiration from Fannie Lou Hamer's words of being sick and tired of being sick and tired.

□ 1945

Now, I also stand here today as someone who proudly represents the Eighth Congressional District in New York, a district that in part was once represented by the Honorable Shirley Chisholm. Of course, great women in the Congress today like JOYCE BEATTY and ROBIN KELLY and MARCIA FUDGE and others stand on Shirley Chisholm's shoulders. She was the first African American woman ever elected to the House of Representatives in 1968. I am proud to represent part of the district that she once served. She was one of Brooklyn's gifts to this country and, in fact, to the world.

I am struggling today because, here again, Brooklyn is once again prepared to share some of our tremendous human capital and wealth with this great country in the form of Loretta Lynch, by way of North Carolina. For the life of me, I haven't been able to figure out what the holdup is, why it is so difficult for Senate Republicans and for the majority simply to hold a vote so we can confirm Loretta Lynch as the Nation's chief law enforcement executive.

We have heard every excuse in the book as to why Loretta Lynch is twisting in the wind, and none of them are legitimate. I don't want Loretta Lynch

to be confirmed because she would be the first African American woman to serve as our Nation's Attorney General leading the Department of Justice; I want her confirmed because she is the best qualified person for the job. Don't trust me, HAKEEM JEFFRIES from Brooklyn. Rudolph Giuliani, of all people, the great law and order mayor of New York City, former Federal prosecutor, U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York, and many, many others—Democrats, Republicans, people from the North, the South, the East, and the West—have all said Loretta Lynch is a talented law enforcement professional and the right person for the job at this particular point in time.

What in the world is the holdup? I can't figure it out. Is it a problem with her personal background? Let's see. She is the daughter of a school librarian and a Baptist preacher. That can't be the issue.

What is the holdup? Is there a problem with her legal education? I don't think so. She is a graduate of Harvard Law School.

What is the problem? Does she not have enough law enforcement experience? She is practically a career Federal prosecutor, who clearly has the ability to allow the law and the facts dictate her decisionmaking process.

Is there an issue that she hasn't been adequately vetted? Well, she has actually been unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate, not once but twice, to be the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York. I think she has been vetted.

Well, is it that the Senate doesn't have the ability to walk and chew gum at the same time, as MITCH MCCONNELL indicated? We have got to deal with other matters. Other matters? I don't get it. She has been waiting longer than the five previous Attorney General nominees, combined, since being voted out of the Committee on the Judiciary.

We need all hands on deck. There are terrorists all across the world who want to strike the United States of America, and we are holding up the chief law enforcement officer of this country? Then we hear the excuse: Well, we don't like her position on the President's executive action on immigration. You don't like her position? She is the President's nominee. What position do you expect her to have?

That is not even a legitimate argument because you had no problem confirming Ash Carter to be the Secretary of the Department of Defense, and my good friends on the other side of the aisle on the other side of the Capitol are obsessing about two things: the President's executive action on immigration as well as the President's negotiations with Iran along with, or as part of, the P5+1. Ash Carter presumably supports those negotiations. You

can't stand them so much so that you even wrote to the Iranian mullahs. I mean, that should shock the conscience of the American people. You can't stand the Iranian negotiations, but you didn't hold up Ash Carter's nomination.

So for the life of me, I am trying to go through a process of elimination to figure out what is the reason that you have held up Loretta Lynch's nomination. What is the reason? Why are we waiting so long? You have got to come up with a good answer to the fact that she is being treated like a second-class citizen.

Unfortunately, as we go down the checklist of excuses that you have provided, not a single one of them hold up. So I am just hopeful over the next couple of days, as we bring Women's History Month to a close, that you will have the decency to do what is right for the American people and allow Loretta Lynch to have an up-or-down vote so we can finally allow democracy to flourish in what allegedly is supposed to be the world's greatest deliberative body. Allow democracy to flourish; give Loretta Lynch a vote so we can get back to doing the real business of the American people.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Representative JEFFRIES, thank you for continuing to lift the nomination of Loretta Lynch, and also thank you for highlighting Harriet Tubman, a fine example of someone who helped improve the quality of life for her fellow brothers and sisters.

"I am sick and tired of being sick and tired." Many women can say that in regard to the pay gap, unemployment, and still trying to break the glass ceiling. In the past year, we have seen the greatest economic growth in decades. More and more women have been able to reenter the workforce, reducing the unemployment rate among women to a 6-year low.

Unfortunately, Black women have yet to reap the benefits of the economic rebound. In fact, while the overall unemployment rate for women declined, the Black female unemployment rate has increased over the past 2 months. According to a recent analysis by the National Women's Law Center, the Black women's unemployment rate is more than twice the unemployment rate of White women. In February, the Black women's unemployment rate was 8.9 percent, up from 8.7 percent in January and 8.2 percent in December.

By comparison, the unemployment rate for adult White women was 4.2 percent in February, down from 4.4 percent in January. Despite having comparable levels of education, Black women have the highest unemployment rate of any other group. A possible factor in the stubborn unemployment rate for Black women is that we are disproportionately employed in the public sector, which is experiencing a

much slower recovery than the private sector.

The National Women's Law Center said the stagnant job situation for Black women is a red flag in the employment landscape and urged lawmakers to act to promote a stronger, more widely shared recovery. I couldn't agree more. We need to invest more in job training and retraining programs that help Black women adapt to the changing workforce and prepare for the careers of tomorrow. We must work to promote diversity in hiring and encourage employees to model their work forces on the communities in which they operate. As we look for ways to help women succeed, we must be mindful of the unique challenges Black women face and develop targeted policies that help level the playing field for all women.

In closing, we have heard from many of my colleagues gathered here tonight, and they have mentioned, as we recognize Women's History Month, we are reminded that we are constantly in the midst of new history being made.

Tonight I had the privilege of being joined by my CBC colleagues. One, a member of the freshman class and another person who wasn't here tonight, she is the 100th woman ever elected to Congress, Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS of North Carolina. Jeannette Rankin of Montana was the first woman to serve in this esteemed body, and many more will join the ranks of women in Congress, women like the Honorable Barbara Jordan, Shirley Chisholm, the Honorable MARCIA L. FUDGE, our last Congressional Black Caucus chair and the future of the CBC; women like JOYCE BEATTY, Representative BRENDA LAWRENCE from Michigan, ALMA ADAMS from North Carolina, STACEY PLASKETT of the Virgin Islands, and BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN from New Jersey.

Despite our gains, though, there are only two Black women who serve in statewide offices across the United States: Kamala Harris and Denise Nappier. There are veterans who have come to serve this Congress, like my good friends TULSI GABBARD of Hawaii and TAMMY DUCKWORTH from my home State of Illinois. Many diverse districts across this country are well served by the women they elect to Congress.

When women succeed, America truly does succeed. This is why we must continue to fight for equal pay for equal work. This week, paycheck fairness legislation will be introduced. I urge folks across the country to call their Representative to cosponsor this important legislation.

We must also fight for affordable child care and other economic policies that support working women, allowing us to continue shattering the glass ceiling and reach the greatest heights of all sectors of society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for this wonderful hour of debate. I thank all of

my colleagues for caring enough to get involved and participate.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus, to commemorate Women's History Month, and address some of the unique challenges Black women face. This is an issue of great personal significance to me and many of my CBC colleagues.

It is hard to accept that in 2015, women still earn significantly less than men in the work place. The wage gap for Black women is even greater. Black women earn sixty-four cents on the dollar compared to men, while White women earn seventy-seven cents on the dollar. These numbers are disheartening for all women, but illustrate the even greater challenge that Black women face in the fight for equal pay. Moving forward, the discussion on equal pay in the workplace must move beyond talking points. We must act swiftly to decrease wage inequality. We must also ensure that the obstacles of Black women in the workplace are included in the national discourse.

While the phrase "women's issues" has become popular in academia and the media, it usually does not include many of the unique issues affecting Black women. As poet and Black feminist, Audre Lord, once said, "there is no such thing as a single-issue struggle, because we do not live single issue lives." Black women have never had the luxury of just being women; for Black women, there is an intersection where race and gender meet, making our struggle so much more unique. Black women face a separate set of problems further alienating us from our male counterparts. We must consistently battle with the fact that we are Black in a society that does not value Black life, and women in a society that does not value the female contribution to society.

Though a lot of progress has been made for women in the workplace, we still face so many obstacles as we work to permanently establish ourselves as professionally equal to men. In an effort to change these human injustices, we must increase the discussion on these issues. The end goal is to ensure that all women earn equal pay, regardless of race. Progress toward this goal is our responsibility and we must work tirelessly in achieving it.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the work and accomplishments of Dr. Marcella Maxwell in recognition of Women's History Month. On Sunday, March 22nd, I joined the 369th Harlem Historical Society for their annual awards dinner dance celebrating Women's History Month at the elegant Marina del Rey in Throgs Neck, New York. This annual salute pays special tribute to phenomenal women of color currently serving and those that have served in our Nation's military. I was very proud to present this year's prestigious 369th Historical Society Women's History Month Award to my beloved friend, Dr. Marcella Maxwell.

Under the leadership of retired Major General Nathaniel James, AUS, the 369th Historical Society was established to collect, preserve and maintain artifacts, relics, books, papers, photographs, films and other artifacts touching on the past history of the 369th In-

fantry Regiment (also known as the Harlem Hellfighters who were given their name by same German soldiers they help to defeat in the liberation of France and Europe in World War I), its allies and affiliates and of Soldiers who served in the Military Services of the United States. One of the primary services it provides is to exhibit all gathered data to the public and ensure that the contributions of all African Americans and Minorities in the Military are recognized, preserved and accurately presented to the public.

The Society also recognizes individuals who have contributed their time, effort and support for Women Veterans as they transition back to civilian life. My dear friend Dr. Marcella Maxwell is such a person who through her organization, the Greater New York Link's Incorporated has led the way in this very important effort. On Saturday, March 21, Dr. Marcella and the Link's Inc. joined with The Home Depot Chelsea neighborhood Store in New York City, under the direction of CEO Craig Menear, Al Manigault, Mohammed Bello, Vincent Merlo, Leana Baker, and Naline Hobert to honor women veterans, by providing "Do it Yourself Workshops," a "Career Fair" and a special ceremony, where I presented congressional certificates to 32 women veterans for their service to our Nation. Dr. Maxwell, whose late husband served under retired Brigadier General George A. Jones, has been an amazing advocate and supporter of not only women veterans, but all veterans throughout this entire Nation. Every year at the NAACP National Convention she convenes and presides over the Association's annual Military Dinner, where one of our United States Armed Forces Services Divisions is featured and honored.

The Links, Incorporated is an international, not-for-profit corporation, established in 1946. The membership consists of 12,000 professional women of color in 280 chapters located in 41 states, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of the Bahamas. It is one of the nation's oldest and largest volunteer service organizations of extraordinary women who are committed to enriching, sustaining and ensuring the culture and economic survival of African Americans and other persons of African ancestry.

The members of The Links, Incorporated, such as, Dr. Maxwell, who is the National Eastern Area Chair of the Women's Issues Committee as are influential decision makers and opinion leaders. The Links, Inc. has attracted many distinguished women who are individual achievers and have made a difference in their communities and the world. They are business and civic leaders, role models, mentors, activists and volunteers who work towards a common vision by engaging like-minded organizations and individuals for partnership. Links members contribute more than 500,000 documented hours of community service annually—strengthening their communities and enhancing the nation.

In addition, Dr. Marcella Maxwell has been an Adult Educator for over two decades. She served as a Founding Dean at Medgar Evers College, CUNY where she sponsored and coordinated the first Women's History Month Conference at the College. Her background and experience in helping women to improve their status and empowering them to transform

their lives and the lives of their families lead to her appointment as Chair of Mayor Koch's Commission on the Status of Women and Chair of the City's Human Rights Commission. She subsequently served as the Director of Alternative Education for the New York City Housing Authority where students earned their General Education Diplomas, making them eligible for entering College. Dr. Maxwell earned her Bachelors and Masters Degrees with Honors from Long Island University and her Ed.D Doctorate in Higher Education Administration from Fordham University on a Ford Foundation Scholarship. She retired from the New York City Board of Education and states that one of the best experiences of her teaching career was living and working in Puerto Rico as one of the first 20 teachers to participate in "Operation Understanding", an exchange program, sponsored by the New York City Board of Education and the Puerto Rican Board of Education.

Education was always a priority for Dr. Maxwell and her family. Her grandfather donated the land for the first elementary school for African-Americans in Cleveland, N.C.

Today, she forges partnerships with a wide range of organizations to bring new scholarships and educational programs for New York City youth. Dr. Marcella Maxwell is a clinical supervisor of teaching fellows at Brooklyn College, a part of the City College of New York system. In this role Dr. Maxwell trains teaching fellows to foster their professional development, organizes collaboration between principals, teachers and other faculty, spearheads team building seminars, curriculum design and development and instructional strategies and methods.

In addition to her role as an educator, Dr. Maxwell is a well-known advocate for women's issues, community development, organizational administration, fund development, curriculum development and government relations. Dr. Maxwell is a passionate advocate for Geriatric Education which allows her with several organizational partners to provide information, and education for seniors to help them navigate the challenges of Aging Gracefully.

In the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Dr. Maxwell serves as the Vice Chair of the Special Contributions Fund and on the Committee charged with awarding The Spingarn Medal for outstanding achievement by an African American. Dr. Maxwell's philosophy and mission in life is to use her relationships and resources to help others in their pursuit of Civil Rights and Social Justice. She is truly an Ambassador for the City of New York as she carries out her responsibilities for The Links, Incorporated and as a Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) representative for Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Incorporated at the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing Dr. Marcella Maxwell, and her efforts that have positively impacted the quality of life for countless citizens across this Nation. Her constant dedication, commitment, and spiritual guidance is worthy of our Nation's highest esteem.

#### THIS IS BUDGET WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I sure do appreciate that, and I appreciate you being down here with us. I enjoy this time of the evening. It is a little quieter on Capitol Hill. Folks are coming and going, but I always learn something that I wouldn't have learned otherwise. For all the differences that we have here, when you talk to each other 15, 20 seconds at a time, those differences get accented. When you listen to one another for an hour at a time, it is easier to find those strains that bind us together. I hope that I am able to touch on some of those topics tonight myself, Mr. Speaker.

I have got the House budget on my mind. It is budget week. I don't know if everybody else is as excited about it as I am. This is budget week in Washington, D.C.

I just finished a hearing in the Committee on Rules, and we had folks come up and testify about all of their different budget ideas. What it means for it to be budget week is that we just voted in the Committee on Rules to make every single budget that any Member of this body, whether they be the most liberal Democrat, the most conservative Republican, or anywhere in between, north, south, east, and west, youngest to oldest, any Member of this body that has an idea about how to grapple with the budgetary challenges that face this Nation, Mr. Speaker, their idea is going to get a vote on the floor of the House this week—this week.

Now, it is heavy duty writing a budget, Mr. Speaker. I serve on the House Committee on the Budget. One of the reasons it is so hard, and you can't see it, Mr. Speaker, but I have here a pie chart of the spending in the United States of America. Now, you and I go through bill after bill, day after day, month after month of talking about appropriations bills. But as you know, Mr. Speaker, appropriations bills, they just deal with what I have shown here in the blue areas, the kind of non-defense discretionary spending and defense spending.

Candidly, that is what everybody thinks of as being the budget. They think of transportation, roads, bridges; they think of the environment, parks; they think of the judiciary; they think of law enforcement; they think of all of these components of government. Well, the truth is, all of those things, Mr. Speaker, we have to jam into this little bitty piece of the pie, these two blue pieces of the pie, the things that Congress focuses on every year in the appropriations cycle.

□ 2000

This red piece of the pie is all of that spending that is on autopilot.

Now, I have read the Constitution, just as you have, Mr. Speaker. It says that all spending is going to originate in the U.S. House of Representatives. Well, you have been here 3 months already and you have not gotten a vote on this spending at all. I have been here 4 years, and I haven't gotten a vote on this spending at all.

This is spending—all of this that is represented in red—trillions of dollars a year, because some of our colleagues in the House 10 years ago, 20 years ago, 40 years ago, even 80 years ago, voted "yes" to turn on an autopilot spending bill. That bill is still on autopilot and still spending today. Our opportunity to grapple with this red area, Mr. Speaker—this that they call mandatory spending—is by outlining a strategy in a budget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for 4 years, I have had the voting card of the Seventh District of Georgia. It is an honor to carry that card every day. And for 4 years, we have been doing Budget Committee work in this institution that should make every American proud. It should make every American proud.

But as you know, Mr. Speaker—as I think most Americans know—the Senate has not quite been as fortunate. They have been stymied over there, trying to pass a budget. Now we have a new American Senate that is working side-by-side with the House, because if the House can pass a budget and if the Senate can pass a budget and if we can come together and reconcile those differences, we will have a governing document that begins to allow us to deal not just with the small blue part of the budget, Mr. Speaker, but the entire budget—\$3.5 trillion in FY 2014.

Why is that so important? It is important, Mr. Speaker, because we have borrowed \$18 trillion from our children and our grandchildren. Now, I say it over and over and over again. I am going to say it again tonight. It is immoral. It is immoral, and it is not even intellectually defensible.

If you are from the part of the Congress that doesn't want to raise taxes—and I am in that part of the Congress—don't pretend that borrowing a dollar today so that you don't have to raise taxes is failing to raise taxes. It is not. If you borrow a dollar today, someone is going to have to raise taxes sometime in the future. They are going to have to pay that dollar back, plus interest. A vote to borrow money is a vote to raise taxes. It is just not a vote to raise taxes on you. It is a vote to raise taxes on the next generation.

Conversely, if you are in the part of this Congress that likes to spend money—I am not in the part of this Congress that likes to spend money—I want to shrink the size and scope of government, I want to make it more accountable, more effective, more efficient, but it is hard to do with \$3.5 trillion. I want to shrink the size and

scope of government, but if you are on the side of this Congress that wants to grow spending, a vote to grow spending without paying for it today—a vote to borrow—is a vote to cut spending on someone else years from now.

We have seen it in all of the countries around the planet, Mr. Speaker, that are struggling with economic collapse. When government has to shrink, when austerity measures kick in, the people that pay the price are not the wealthy in society. The people who pay the price are those who are most dependent on government benefits.

A vote to spend money today that we don't have—a vote to borrow today—is a vote to cut the benefits of our children and our grandchildren, who will need it more than we do today.

So, whether you are focusing on balanced budgets from a tax perspective or whether you are focusing on them from a spending perspective, Mr. Speaker, we should be able to come together and decide that grappling with those issues—putting forward a plan to deal with those issues—is better than hiding our head in the sand.

This is why. What I have graphed here, Mr. Speaker, with the red line is traditional revenues. It is tax revenues in this country—take all the taxes that we bring in together. I charted them as a percent of GDP, gross domestic product. What that means, Mr. Speaker, this looks like a level line but, of course, the economy continues to grow. And every time the economy grows, tax revenues grow. And so this is level as a percent of the size of our economy, but it is a growing number of taxes every year—again, up to \$3.5 trillion now and \$3.8 trillion for FY 2016.

Well, these blue lines represent spending on those mandatory spending programs I just talked about: those programs that are on autopilot, those programs that we don't deal with in this institution every year, those programs that escape the collaborative scrutiny of this body.

Here is what you see. This chart goes back to 1965, Mr. Speaker. Back in 1965, interest on the national debt was a small part of our economic pie. Social Security was a large part of our economic pie, but smaller than it is today. Medicare was a very small part. Medicaid was a very small part.

What you see on this chart, Mr. Speaker, is that they grow larger and larger and larger. Now, that is not larger and larger and larger in terms of actual dollars. They are growing larger and larger and larger in terms of actual dollars, but this chart is reflecting them growing larger and larger and larger as a percent of everything the United States produces.

And what you see, Mr. Speaker, is that even though all the tax revenue we have been able to squeeze out of this country, whether it was a Republican as President or a Democrat as

President, whether it was Republicans running the country or Democrats running the country, America was unwilling to contribute more than about 17 to 18 percent of GDP in tax revenues.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if you go out to the end of our budget window here, which is about 2025, you will see that, based on current law, current spending, spending just rising at that rate of inflation as required by current law, the combination of Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and interest on the national debt will consume every penny that the Federal Government raises—every penny.

I showed you on this chart earlier, Mr. Speaker, what Congress deals with here in blue—defense and nondefense—which most people think of as the government. That is only about a third of the pie. Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, interest on the national debt—those mandatory spending programs—is where most of the money is being spent today. That wasn't true 30 years ago.

Back in the 1960s, 40 years ago, Mr. Speaker, I would say about a third of government spending was what we will call these income support programs—these direct spending programs on behalf of citizens. About two-thirds of what we spent was investment in America. We were building things: the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control. We were building things. We were defeating the evil empire.

National security was a larger piece of the pie in those days. Two-thirds of the budget was an investment in America. But today, Mr. Speaker, those numbers have exactly inverted. We spend about one-third on investment in national security and two-thirds on income support programs. By 2025, Mr. Speaker, those programs threaten to consume every penny the Federal Government has.

Look out there at the end of this window, Mr. Speaker. We are not talking about raising taxes a little. We are talking about just to fund these programs—no parks, no courts, no judges, no prisons, no roads, no environmental regulations; nothing except Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, interest on the national debt—we would have to increase taxes almost 50 percent just to pay for those programs.

That is not sustainable. Everyone in this Chamber knows it is not sustainable. And my frustration, Mr. Speaker—and I hope you haven't found the same one quite yet—is that we all know what the truth is, but we don't all want to admit what the truth is.

There is no question that we can't pay for these programs. There is no question that Social Security is headed towards bankruptcy. Who is doing anything to solve it? Social Security Disability is going to go bankrupt 18

months from now in the year 2016. Social Security Disability Insurance—that trust fund that is available for folks who have been stricken with disabilities and can no longer work—runs out of money.

Everyone in this Chamber knows it. That is not ROB WOODALL, conservative Republican, predicting that. That is the Social Security Disability Insurance trustees—the nonpartisan trustees—telling us that we are going to run out of money. The nonpartisan trustees of the Medicare Program are going to tell us it is going to run out of money. The nonpartisan trustees of the Social Security retirement program tell us it is going to run out of money.

Where are the reform proposals from this institution? It is hard, Mr. Speaker. We all know what the truth is, but folks don't want to admit it.

I am going to bring us back to budget week. What I love about this week, Mr. Speaker, is that we focus on those big problems, those big drivers of spending, those social safety net programs that are so essential to so many Americans. This is the week we lay out our plans to save them. This is the week where we talk about doing the heavy lifting that we don't talk about the rest of the year.

I want the courage that we show in this week, Mr. Speaker. I want the ideas that we discuss this week to be the outline by which we live the rest of the year. I always hope for that. I don't always get that. I am hoping for that again this year.

Let's talk about the plan, Mr. Speaker, that came out of the House Budget Committee. Now, the House Budget Committee is a fabulous group of people. If you have not gotten a chance, Mr. Speaker, it is [budget.house.gov](http://budget.house.gov). It is completely transparent. You can see anything you want to see about the House-passed budget and our deliberations.

We just had a markup last week, Mr. Speaker. We started about 10:30 in the morning. We finished just a little after midnight that day. We came back the next day and went for about an hour more. We discussed every single amendment that anyone had to offer, Mr. Speaker. We talked about the big ideas. We talked about unemployment. We talked about job creation. We talked about job training. We talked about national security. We got deep into every single issue that matters to families back home in my district—every single one—and back home in your district, Mr. Speaker. And this is the plan we have laid out.

What I have charted here, Mr. Speaker, is the path of debt. The path of debt runs from back in World War II, where we had to borrow about 100 percent of the size of our economy. Granted, the economy was much smaller then, but as a percentage of the size of our economy—that is the way the economists



take a look at what we do to make sure that we are still on good financial footing—100 percent of the size of our economy to defeat the Nazis to win World War II.

Mr. Speaker, we are almost back at those same high levels today. You see it represented here by the dark blue line. We are almost back there today.

Do we have severe economic challenges today? Of course, we do. Is the world a dangerous place today? Of course, it is. Are we united as a nation and fighting those challenges the way we were fighting World War II? Of course, we are not. Of course, we are not. But by engaging in this degree of borrowing when we are not facing an international challenge of the size of winning World War II, we are trading away our opportunities to face that challenge should it arise in the future.

We are borrowing today, Mr. Speaker, for consumption when we borrowed in 1945 for investment. We are borrowing today to pay the current bills of just running the Nation when we borrowed in 1945 to defeat evil. What are we going to do when we are forced to confront evil of that magnitude again? I am not sure, because we have traded away, through borrowing and spending on today's consumption, the opportunity to spend big to win those global challenges.

So look at beyond the dark blue line, Mr. Speaker. This is what you are going to see there. The red line of debt, which you see rises far above World War II level borrowing—in fact, double World War II level borrowing—that red line is what happens if we close the doors of the Congress today. If we turn out the lights and never pass a new law, if we turn out the lights and never make a new promise, if we turn out the lights and promise not to spend one more penny than that that is already required by the laws on the books—and the White House does the very same thing, turns out the lights—that red line represents the level of borrowing necessary simply to keep today's promises. No new promises. Today's promises.

I laid out the future that we are trading away. I laid out the opportunities to react to crises that we are trading away. I laid out the burden that this is putting on future generations. That is just where we are today. If we do nothing and let current law continue, the problem doesn't just get worst. It gets twice as bad.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am tired of hearing folks complain about what happens here and there. I am tired of hearing folks say, I know what all the problems are, but I don't have any solutions to offer. I just want to tell you who to blame for your woes. I don't want to be responsible for providing solutions.

□ 1915

Nonsense, nonsense—this body is not filled with men and women, Madam

Speaker, who came here to find blame. This body is filled with people who came to solve problems.

Blue line, problem solved—that blue line, that light blue line, Madam Speaker, represents the House Budget Committee mark. If this institution passes the budget for FY16, for the next 10-year window, if they pass the budget that we worked out in that Budget Committee, we don't just avoid the economic catastrophe that is represented by current law, we reverse the trend.

Madam Speaker, it is hard. Golly, I want to be able to tell children and grandchildren across this country that we are balancing the budget tomorrow. We are not. We are not. We can't.

Unless you want to raise taxes right through the roof and crush working American families, unless you want to cut spending right to the floor and crush our opportunities at national security, you can't balance the budget tomorrow. The problem is too big.

We laid out a 10-year glide path. It doesn't put the tough decisions off for 10 years, but it begins making the tough decisions today, begins bending that curve of borrowing today.

Madam Speaker, \$4.7 trillion in interest is what we are projecting to spend in the 10-year window—\$4.7 trillion on interest alone.

Madam Speaker, the budget for the entire United States of America last year was only \$3.5 trillion. We are only proposing, as a budget for next year, \$3.8 trillion. Our interest payments, borrowing at the record-low teaser rates that we are borrowing at today—record-low rates—are going to see us pay \$4.7 trillion in interest over the next 10 years.

It is like taking 18 months off. Think about that. If our budget is about \$3.8 trillion for FY16, \$4.7 trillion, that is about a year and a quarter off. Again, turn out the lights, send everybody home—no more national security, no more schools, no more roads. That is what debt is costing us, a year and a quarter of productivity out of the next 10, and that is when we take these important steps to begin to curb it.

Compare the difference in vision, Madam Speaker. This blue line represents our vision. The light blue line represents our solution to the red line, which represents current law.

Madam Speaker, why is this so hard to do? Because this chart represents the President's vision—leadership is a two-way street. We need folks leading on both sides of the aisle. We need folks leading on both sides of the Congress. We need folks leading on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. Leading often means taking something that you disagree on and selling the other guy on why you are right.

For us, Madam Speaker, we take our balanced budget proposal. We take it to the other side of the aisle. We take it

on the other side of the Capitol. We take it on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, and we try to sell it.

We believe that balancing the budget is the right thing to do. We believe that borrowing from our children and grandchildren is immoral. The President takes a different view, and I don't fault him for taking a different view. I question his math. I question the economic guidance that he is relying on. I don't question his motives.

His view—which is represented by the deficit here in blue, our annual deficits are represented in red—represent the budget the President sent to Capitol Hill this year. Now, this budget is substantially similar to the budgets he has sent to Capitol Hill every year.

If the President was standing here tonight, Madam Speaker, I don't think I would be mischaracterizing him if I say what he would tell you is he wants to freeze our debt as a percent of the size of our economy, and as long as our economy is rising then, he believes we can continue to let our debt rise. He calls that primary balance, when you lock in your debt as a static percent of GDP but continue to borrow forever—forever.

What I am showing you here on this chart, Madam Speaker, is our budget alternative, produced by the Budget Committee, to be voted on in the House tomorrow. What our budget does is take deficits for about \$350 billion next year down to zero.

I don't even know if you know this word down on the end, Madam Speaker. It says "surplus"—no reason you should know it. We haven't seen one in your time on Capitol Hill. I would argue we haven't seen one in my lifetime.

We talked about them happening in the nineties, but as you know, that was a little funny math there, the Social Security trust fund and other issues. It has been a long time since we have seen a surplus in our budget, but that is what our ideas produce. That is what our tough choices produce. That is what our commitment to solving problems produces.

The President, on the other hand, raises taxes over \$1 trillion, new taxes over \$1 trillion, and continues to spend, so much so that in the years that we are balancing, Madam Speaker, the President is borrowing an additional \$1 trillion a year.

He would tell you that the reason he is borrowing it is because investment in America is important, and it is. He would tell you that the reason he is borrowing is because, if we don't invest in challenges today, we are not going to be able to reap the benefits of those challenges tomorrow, and he is right.

We are not arguing in this institution, Madam Speaker, we are not debating in this institution, we are not grappling in this institution about the merit of investing in America. We all believe that we should.



What we are talking about is whether or not we should pay for that investment. If we think it is a good idea, should we find the money for it today? Or do we just think it is enough of a good idea for our children to figure out how to pay for it or our grandchildren to figure out how to pay for it?

But it is not so much of a good idea that you and I would actually burden ourselves with making the tough decision today—nonsense. I reject that vision. I reject the President's growing deficits out. I reject the President's budget that says: Not only am I not going to balance tomorrow, not only am I not going to balance in the next 10 years, I am not going to balance the budget ever.

Now, that is not a small thing we are arguing about. This isn't just some sort of partisan sniping that happens between Republicans and Democrats. There is a fundamental disagreement about who we are as Americans, about what the role of Federal Government is.

The House Budget Committee says: Let's try to balance this budget in the next 10 years. The time to stop burdening our children and our grandchildren with debt is now.

The President says: I have spending priorities for America. Let's grow the amount of money we are borrowing every single year. Let's balance the budget never.

I don't know if you get this in town-hall meetings back home like I do, Madam Speaker, but folks say: ROB, why can't you guys just work this out? Why can't you get together, close the doors, work this out? We have serious problems. You need to solve the serious problems.

Madam Speaker, I have got a President who is prioritizing balancing the budget never, and I have got a House Budget Committee that is prioritizing balancing the budget in the next 10 years. Those aren't small differences. The differences could not get much larger.

I don't expect to sell everyone in this institution on the Budget Committee's ideas for balancing this budget, Madam Speaker. I am not going to get every vote in this Chamber. I am going to keep selling it, but I am not going to get every vote in this Chamber. I recognize that.

What I am going to prioritize is selling folks in this Chamber on the fact that if we choose to borrow money, we are either taking it from the next generation's benefits, or we are taking it from the next generation's tax bill.

The bill is going to come due. These deficits that the President proposes are going to come due. These deficits that we have already run are going to come due. It's either a benefit cut for the next generation or a tax increase for the next generation. There is no free lunch.

Now, I don't purport to have all the answers, Madam Speaker, though we have got a pretty good blueprint here. What I do propose, though, is that we are going to be closer to finding the answers if we bring all of the ideas together.

I see my friends from the Rules Committee sitting here in the corner tonight, Madam Speaker. They have been upstairs grinding through the paperwork. It was a little more complicated rule tonight than it ordinarily is because we took every single idea that any Member of this Chamber had about balancing the budget. If you wanted to write your budget, it is made in order for debate this week, budget week.

I don't know which budget is going to win, Madam Speaker, though I have my preferences. What I do know is that if you are in the solutions business, you had your shot this week. If you are in the solutions business, you had a chance to put your money where your mouth is, literally, your money, all of our money, all taxpayer money, these budgets together, in a document.

We are going to debate some doozies this week. We are going to debate some budgets that purport cutting spending virtually in half, and we are going to debate some budgets that virtually double taxation in this country. We will see where those chips fall.

Madam Speaker, that didn't sound like the exciting thing that it is. That is what is so interesting to me about the work that goes on. Everybody is out in front of the cameras all day long, every day, talking about the issues that the pundits want to talk about.

What our reading clerk just did here, in 15 uneventful seconds, is set into motion the most open, the most comprehensive, the most optimistic week of public policy debate this institution will see in 2015. I am honored to be just a small part of that.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 27, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. WOODALL (during the Special Order of Mr. WOODALL), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-49) on the resolution (H. Res. 163) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, well, here we are, the fifth anniversary of—well, at least this weekend—what many affectionately or disaffectionately call ObamaCare.

It is kind of hard to call it the Affordable Care Act because we—many of us—know exactly how much jeopardy it has put finances for people all over the country. There are some people that are getting back enough in subsidies that they like it.

It is important, I think, as a great followup to my friend from Georgia talking about the budget, to follow up and look at the predictions that were made 5 years ago about the bill that passed without a single Republican vote because we had done our homework.

I did read the bill before I voted against it. I didn't have time to enmesh all of the references, the other bills that were referenced in the changes that would be made in those bills, but I could certainly tell from what was there, what I was reading in the about 2,500-page bill, that it was going to be a disaster for health care.

□ 2030

In any event, here is an article from Sam Baker, "5 Years In, 5 Busted Predictions About Obamacare," March 22, 2015:

When President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law 5 years ago, many Republicans essentially predicted it would grow up to be a serial killer—that seniors, Medicare, private insurance companies, jobs, and the American Dream would die by its hand.

It has turned out to be far more well adjusted.

On the other hand, many Democrats thought the law would quickly make it through its awkward phase and turn into the most popular kid in school—liked by most, respected by all, a sophisticated winner, possessed of all the latest technology but also with unassailable principles.

It has turned out to be a much bigger screwup.

I might add parenthetically here—into the article—that, actually, there were Republicans like me that knew that it was not going to die. We knew that it was going to shrivel up the number of insurance companies, as it has.

We knew that Medicare was going to take a hit because ObamaCare cut \$716 billion from seniors' health care, and even though the President and all the king's horses and all the king's men were promising that, Gee, that \$716 billion in cuts to Medicare, it is not going to affect you seniors, they were told. No, no, that is only going to affect the health care providers.

Well, I don't know about the rest of the country, but the seniors I talked to

around Texas figured out, Wait a minute, if you are not going to reimburse the people that provide us health care, we are going to have a hard time getting health care. They figured it out. That is exactly what has happened.

Mr. Baker, talking about, I guess, the worst of the projection by Republicans—were not what I projected, but there are people that have not gotten the care they need. They have been put in dire physical straits because of ObamaCare. Some have lost their insurance. I had insurance before. I liked my insurance. I liked my doctors. ObamaCare changed all of that.

This article, though, says, “Say what you will about Obamacare, but if nothing else, it’s a survivor.” That is the point, Madam Speaker, that is important to note; any kind of socialized medicine is always a survivor.

Some were saying, Oh, we don’t have to worry about ObamaCare. It will go broke. It will die of its own accord—no, that is what happens to socialism.

But socialized health care, socialized medicine in any form—even in this beginning stage, as the President has once said on video, that he wanted a single payer—in other words, total socialized medicine, where the government gets to tell everybody what they get and pay for it and so people get rationed health care, is what it amounts to.

Socialism dies of its own accord. As Margaret Thatcher once said, it eventually runs out of other people’s money. Socialized medicine in any form does not die of its own volition. It doesn’t happen because what happens when you are dealing with government-run health care, it doesn’t die of its own accord, no.

What happens is people have more and more health care rationed. More and more people have health care they don’t get because they are put in line, like the young man from Canada in my district that said his father died of a heart attack because he had been on the list in Canada for 2 years and he never got the bypass he needed.

Until ObamaCare came along, basically, if you needed bypass surgery—whether it was in east Texas or elsewhere—if you needed it now, you were going to get it now; but over time, as the government takes over health care, now, you get on a list, like my constituent’s father was put on a list.

I said: 2 years, that is incredible.

He said: Well, yes, people kept getting moved in front of him.

I said: Well, my understanding was that it was a crime to do anything to get yourself moved up the list.

He said: Well, that is true, but there is a board, a group that decides who gets moved up the list in priority.

They kept moving people in front of his father until he died.

Anyway, some critics of this article said they didn’t even think they would

need to kill it, just that they could help it along. The law’s opponents argued for years that the law would never work, predictions that reached new intensity when www.healthcare.gov launched in 2013.

That is not true of all of us. Some of us knew it would not die of its own accord. We knew that it is like any government-run health care. You just ration it, and people get less of it.

There is a board—whether anybody wants to acknowledge that Sarah Palin had a great point, she did. Whether you want to call it a death panel or not, it is a panel that will get to decide the parameters for people getting, you know, pacemakers.

One of my staff had a parent who was told the year before ObamaCare kicked in that he could get a pacemaker; after it kicked in, he couldn’t get a pacemaker. Well, that is the power of the government to tell you who lives, who dies.

ObamaCare is not going to die of its own accord. People may die because of the new healthcare laws and the decisions of the death panel—or whatever you want to call the IPAB—but they will make decisions that will affect people’s ability to live.

Anyway, the article further down talks about the prediction that it would get popular:

“I think as people learn about the bill and now that the bill is enacted, it’s going to become more and more popular,” Senator Chuck Schumer said in 2010, just a few days after Obama signed the law. “I predict...by November, those who voted for health care will find it an asset; those who voted against it will find it a liability.”

Schumer was hardly the only one expressing this optimism. The process of getting ObamaCare passed was brutal for Democrats, but many in the party truly thought the heat would die down between 2010 and 2014 when the law’s central provisions kicked in.

The debate got to a point where there was no way to win the rhetorical wars over health care, so Democrats’ plan was largely to get it done, wait it out, and hope people warmed up to the law once it transitioned from a political abstraction to a set of real-world policies, most of which are pretty boring.

It didn’t work.

The Kaiser Family Foundation has been measuring public approval of the healthcare law every month since it was signed, and the bottom line has stayed the same: people are closely divided over the law and lean against it.

This month, Kaiser’s poll found 43 percent disapproval for the law, compared to 41 percent approval, which is within a few points of most months. There have been a few blips, where approval topped disapproval or where one side cleared 50 percent, but they never lasted.

Anyway, the article goes on. I will skip down to the part, “If you like your plan, you can keep it.” It says:

Obama made some predictions he probably shouldn’t have, including his promise that people wouldn’t lose their coverage because of ObamaCare. For starters, policies sold in the individual insurance market were large-

ly 1-year contracts before the Affordable Care Act. In other words, there was never a guarantee that consumers could keep their same policies.

Moreover, though, ObamaCare did cause insurers to cancel millions of individual policies, and it wasn’t an accident or a side effect. The law set new standards for policies in the individual market. They have to cover a set of “essential” benefits, for example, and can’t impose an annual or lifetime caps on benefits.

A lot of plans that existed before ObamaCare didn’t meet those criteria, hence, passing a law to make them. Those policies could technically seek “grandfathered” status, but it was hard to get. They could barely make any changes in their plan designs without losing that status. And it was hard for a reason: the law set new standards for insurance, and it wanted to shift people into plans that met those standards.

All of this was entirely foreseeable in 2010 and was even spelled out in subsequent regulations. The political uproar might not have been as bad if www.healthcare.gov had been working when people started to receive their cancellation notices.

Well, I would submit that it would have been as bad because there were a lot of lies about ObamaCare. Yes, there were some dire predictions, but I knew that ObamaCare was not going to die of its own volition because, when government controls health care, it doesn’t.

As an exchange student in the Soviet Union, when I saw their poor, pitiful health care system in the Soviet Union, I was literally thanking God that we had the health system we did in America.

My family didn’t even have anything like insurance at the time growing up in east Texas. It was just that we knew that we had good doctors. We had a good system. If you got in a bind, you hoped and prayed neighbors would help out.

Then that is where insurance came along, that you could pay a very small monthly, quarterly, semiannually, annual premium to insure against something unforeseeable so that you could take care of the small things; but once the government gets into something, it doesn’t work so well. The more government gets into it, the worse it is.

If we don’t turn this thing around and get some free market competition back in place in health care, allow people to have their own relationship with their own doctor of their own choosing, where people can actually compare the prices and decide if this doctor or this hospital is worth it—one may cost more, one may cost less, but you compare the pros and cons. That is what competition is about. We haven’t had it in health care in many, many years. Why? Because the government got involved.

Now, we do need a safety net, and that is a good thing. That is what caring people do, but when the government takes over everything, as ObamaCare will undoubtedly eventually do—why? Because if they get to

dictate health care, then they are going to get to dictate your life.

An article from John Nolte today points out, number one, "Premiums are 24.4 percent higher than they would have been without ObamaCare."

I guess this comes from the New York Daily News: "'In the Obama administration,' candidate Obama boasted in 2008, 'we'll lower premiums by up to \$2,500 for a typical family in a year.'"

This article says, "Not quite. A recent report from the National Bureau of Economic Research examined the nongroup marketplace, where families and individuals who don't get coverage through work shop for insurance. The report concluded that 2014 premiums were 24.4 percent higher than they would have been without ObamaCare."

Completely wrong—ObamaCare sent the price of insurance dramatically up.

Madam Speaker, I have people ask regularly: Why is my health insurance so much more? My deductible is so high. I will never have enough money to pay my deductible, and I have got a copay on top of that. I don't have as much covered as I did before with my other policy. I don't get to choose my doctor—or the doctor I had before that I liked, I didn't get to keep him. So why is it costing so much more?

Well, the answer is very easily given. You are paying for lots more IRS agents. We knew when ObamaCare passed that there would be 17,000, 18,000 new IRS agents that you would have to pay for.

□ 2045

They are not going to ever help you with a head injury or a skinned knee, nothing. No. No. They are going to come after you. They are going to give you stomachaches and headaches. They are not going to help you with health care. And what about all these navigators? They are never going to help you with a knee injury or a backache. No. They are going to give you backaches because they are going to make it harder and harder to figure out what to do, even though they say, oh, they are there to help you. When the government workers say they are there to help you, you grab your wallet and run for the door.

But you are paying for so many more government workers who will end up being government union workers, and you have to help pay the union wages. We always apparently do that, paying for part of the costs of the union. That is because Republicans are real good at allowing Democrats to have laws that help fund their campaigns. They have done it for years. Mallory Factor has a good book out called "Shadowbosses" that explains the concept.

Well, here is another point from John Nolte's article, number 2, "Less Choice for Patients: From 1,232 Private Market Insurers to 310." Rather dramatic,

but that was very foreseeable. Many of us talked about it. We knew that this would eliminate many of the insurance companies. It would eliminate so much choice. The same way Dodd-Frank promises, gee, we are going to fix the banking industry. No, you are going to make it hard for small banks to compete; and the big banks chew them up, absorb them when they can't make it, and then you have fewer choices. That is what ObamaCare is doing.

This article says: "Prior to ObamaCare, the individual assurance market (non-group, non-employer) offered a wealth of choices in health care options. ObamaCare has devastated that market, and with it the quality of health care. Keep in mind, the cost of premiums and deductibles have increased as choice and competition collapsed."

"Patients may also have fewer doctors to pick from. More than 60 percent of doctors plan to retire earlier than anticipated—by 2016 or sooner, according to Deloitte. The Physicians Foundation reported in the fall that nearly half of the 20,000 doctors who responded to their survey—especially those with more experience—considered ObamaCare's reforms a failure."

Number 3, "Deficit Exploded to \$1.2 Trillion with a 'T'."

"Forget the original lies that ObamaCare would be a deficit neutral, or even cut the deficit. The ObamaCare deficit is now in the trillions."

"This month, CBO estimated the law's 10-year costs will reach \$1.2 trillion—a far cry from the President's initial promise of \$940 billion."

Well, I have to point out, actually, in fairness to CBO, the Congressional Budget Office originally predicted it would be over \$1 trillion; but since the President promised it would be less than \$1 trillion, the Director of CBO was called to the White House and, magically, after he went back, he reformulated things. I know this offends him, but it is still the truth. It is what happened. He went back, recalculated, and it was less than \$1 trillion. The President said: See, there, I told you it would be less than \$1 trillion. Then it passes, and then we found out, oh, do you know what? It really is more than \$1 trillion. How about that?

That is why I think CBO needs competition, and the best thing that could happen is if we started encouraging and even gave rewards to any entity, whether it is universities or private groups that begin scoring bills, if they get within a certain margin. If a bill passes, if they get within a certain margin, it would sure beat the heck out of CBO, and then you pay them. We need competition scoring bills so that we don't have the disasters we had had in the predictions of the cost of ObamaCare.

Number 4, "Media and Government Lying About ObamaCare Expanding Coverage to Millions."

"You keep hearing about how ObamaCare is covering millions, when it really isn't. A huge majority of those in the White House and its media throne-sniffers are advertising as 'newly-insured' are in fact victims of canceled policies who were forced into the ObamaCare exchanges. They already had insurance and are therefore not 'newly insured.'"

"Even some of those 'newly insured' under ObamaCare's expansion of Medicaid were once paying for their own insurance. Now they are on the government dole."

"Further, as many as 89 percent of the Americans who signed up for ObamaCare when the exchanges opened in 2013 already had insurance. In other words, many exchange enrollees simply switched from one plan to another."

So we were told, gee, there are 30 or 40 million people without insurance. We have to insure them. That is why we have got to force so many tens of millions of Americans into losing their insurance because we have 30, 40 million we have to take care of. And what happened? We are told, well, maybe 7 million or so, 8 million, they got insurance when all these millions lost theirs. That was worth the damage that this administration has done and is doing to the best health care system in the world?

Number 5, "ObamaCare's Deductibles Are Killing Families."

"One of the great untold stories about ObamaCare is that while ObamaCare has skyrocketed premium costs in the individual market, deductibles have also increased. ObamaCare is really nothing more than catastrophic insurance priced like regular insurance."

"This year, ObamaCare's lower priced bronze plans have a \$5,181 individual deductible and \$10,545 dollars family deductible. The more expensive silver plan has a \$2,927 individual deductible and \$6,010 family deductible."

"On top of your monthly premiums, the deductible is the amount you have to pay out of pocket before your insurance kicks in. The last time I looked, if I enrolled in ObamaCare, my out-of-pocket expenses (premiums plus deductible) would exceed \$8,000 before insurance started paying anything."

"One result of this has been an increase over the last 5 years of the percentage of people who put off treatment due to cost."

"Unless something catastrophic happens to you, in most cases, you are still paying out of pocket for all of your health care. On top of that, you are paying for premiums that are doing you absolutely no good. It is just free money for the insurance companies."

"Also, when you are insured, your out-of-pocket expenses are usually higher. Most health care outlets offer steep discounts for the uninsured."

"Basically, ObamaCare is nothing more than a massive tax increase disguised as insurance; a massive financial boon to the same big insurance companies Democrats have demonized for years; a massive redistribution of wealth that primarily soaks the middle class while diminishing their quality of health care.

"In summation: The ObamaCare victims vastly outweigh the beneficiaries. It is not even close."

John Nolte, for the Record.

Then from the Weekly Standard, the Feds say that the cost of healthcare.gov is estimated at \$1.7 billion.

Of course, when the disastrous rollout of this government Web site happened, we heard from people who really knew what they were doing that said: Gosh, we could have done this for just \$6 million or so. Well, not if you are close friends with the occupants of the White House. If you are close friends with the occupants of the White House, you are going to run up a billion-dollar bill for a \$6 million, \$7 million Web site that doesn't have the security that is required.

So we are in big trouble here. Health care has not been helped, and we have more and more government workers who are telling people who know how to provide health care what they can or can't do all to the detriment of the patient.

I think about one of my constituents. He is no longer practicing medicine. He was there to help my wife when she first went into labor 8 to 10 weeks prematurely. He was telling me that he had done a surgery, one of the best he had ever done. Because of all his training and his many years of experience, he was good at what he was doing. A couple of days after the surgery, he got a call from somebody, I think he said in Pennsylvania. The guy had no kind of medical degree at all. He is a government worker.

He said: I was looking at your records of your surgery—it was one of the best he had ever done of this type. He said: Well, the average is over 3 hours, and you only took 59 minutes; and normally you lose over 3 to 4 pints of blood, and you only lost 10 CCs, so you are going to either have to change the records or we can't reimburse you.

As this honest, experienced, and excellent physician said: I am not going to change my records for anybody. He said: Well, then we can only reimburse you about one-quarter of what you should have gotten otherwise.

He said: I am not practicing medicine like this. Some idiot doesn't even know what he is doing is going to tell me, one of the best surgeries I have ever done, that I can't be reimbursed—and he is retired. He gave it up. He said: I planned to practice a lot longer, but I am not practicing medicine like this.

So who is hurt? His patients.

So what happens when you socialize medicine, as we are moving into here, well, you have fewer doctors that are as well trained. The best and brightest don't apply. We have already seen a drop in the quality of people and the numbers of people, I am told, for medical school. Good people are still applying, but eventually, as I saw in the Soviet Union when I was there, you have people who are physicians. Some are like Florence Nightingale, they do it out of a sense of service and dedication; but some just because, you know, hey, it is a job.

As people are finding out, if you are not going to get reimbursed, then you are not going to be able to pay back a quarter-million dollars of loans for college, medical school, and getting you through the internship and residency until you are actually out making good money because you are not going to make it as good; therefore, you can't afford to go through as many years. So you end up, over the years you see the college, the medical school, all these years of training and experience squished together.

What is the result? Well, you don't have as good physicians. But you also have wonderful nurse practitioners. You have physician assistants that start taking up the jobs that people went through college and medical school, internship, and residency, they start picking up the slack that you used to have quality, well-trained doctors to do. And they are doing a good job, but it lowers further and further the quality of care any time the government gets involved to the extent that it is now.

It is not too late. It is 5 years in. It has been a disaster. One broken promise after another, after another, after another. I hope and pray that people don't have to continue to suffer the indignity of much too high health insurance and not near the quality they were getting until we get a new President and can finally get a new health care system and have true reform. I hope and pray that this President does not end up being so stubborn that he will not hear the cries of the people across America who are saying: Please, let us have back our cheaper health care, our own doctors, and our better policies. That should be the conclusion after 5 years of this disaster.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2205

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

#### HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. GRANGER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a prior commitment in the district.

Mr. HULTGREN (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of flight cancellations due to the weather.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for March 16 through 19 on account of foot surgery.

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of foot surgery.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 24, 2015, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

825. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Business-Cooperative Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Rural Business Development Grant (RIN: 0570-AA92) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

826. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding the Department's report on the activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Schools for the preceding year, pursuant to Public Law 109-469, section 901(f); to the Committee on Armed Services.

827. A letter from the Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting the Agency's

Biennial Report to Congress for March 2015, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2352, and the DARPA “Breakthrough Technologies for National Security” compilation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

828. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendments to Excepted Benefits (RIN: 1210-AB70) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

829. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department’s direct final rule — Fiduciary Requirements for Disclosure to Participant-Directed Individual Account Plans—Timing of Annual Disclosure (RIN: 1210-AB68) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

830. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Preconstruction Requirements — Nonattainment New Source Review [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0186; FRL-9924-57-Region 3] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

831. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Reporting Emission Data, Emission Fees and Process Information [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0134; FRL-9924-44-Region 7] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

832. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Significant New Use Rule for Pentane, 1,1,1,2,3,3-hexafluoro-4-(1,1,2,3,3,3-hexafluoropropoxy) — [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0941; FRL-9922-30] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

833. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0270; FRL-9924-99-Region 4] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

834. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California; Regional Haze Progress Report [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0586; FRL-9924-64-Region 9] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

835. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — 2-Propenoic acid, polymer with ethenyl acetate, ethenylbenzene, 2-ethylhexyl 2-propenoate and ethyl 2-propenoate; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0847; FRL-9923-63] received March

19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

836. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Revocation of Significant New Uses of Metal Salts of Complex Inorganic Oxyacids [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2014-0702; FRL-9924-09] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

837. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Sodium L-lactate and Sodium DL-lactate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0326; FRL-9924-24] received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

838. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorization in the People’s Republic of China: Samsung China Semiconductor Co. Ltd. [Docket No.: 150206120-5120-01] (RIN: 0694-AG50) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

839. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Netherlands, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act as amended (Transmittal No.: 15-06); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

840. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report by the Department on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2014, through November 30, 2014, pursuant to Sec. 620(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with Sec. 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

841. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department’s determination and certification, pursuant to Sec. 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, that the top five exporting and importing countries of ephedrine and pseudoephedrine have cooperated fully with the United States or have taken adequate steps on their own to achieve full compliance with the goals established by the 1988 United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

842. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

843. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting eleven reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

844. A letter from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration’s annual report for FY 2014, prepared in accordance with Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002

(No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

845. A letter from the Director, Equal Employment Opportunity and Inclusion, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s annual report for FY 2014, prepared in accordance with Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

846. A letter from the General Counsel, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

847. A letter from the President, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting the Foundation’s annual report for FY 2014 prepared in accordance with Title II, Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

848. A letter from the Secretary and Chief Administrative Officer, Postal Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission’s annual report to Congress Fiscal Year 2014, prepared in accordance with Title II, Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

849. A letter from the Chair, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission’s inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities performed for fiscal years 2012 and 2013, pursuant to Public Law 105-270, section 2(c)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

850. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s Chesapeake Bay Office Biennial Report to Congress for Fiscal Years 2013-2014, as required by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1992, as amended by Sec. 401 of Pub. L. 107-372; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

851. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s temporary final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Herring Fishery; Adjustments to 2015 Annual Catch Limits [Docket No.: 141002820-5113-01] (RIN: 0648-XD536) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

852. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, Contract Management Division, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — NASA FAR Supplement, Contractor Whistleblower Protections (RIN: 2700-AE08) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

853. A letter from the Chief, Impact Analyst, Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department’s final rule — Schedule for Rating Disabilities — Mental Disorders and Definition of Psychosis for Certain VA Purposes (RIN:

2900-AO96) received March 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

854. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2014 report of the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office (Medicare-Medicaid Coordination Office), pursuant to Sec. 2602(e) of the Affordable Care Act; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

855. A letter from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting the Commission's March 2015 "Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy"; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

*[Following action occurred on March 20, 2015]*

Mr. PRICE of Georgia: Committee on the Budget. House Concurrent Resolution 27. Resolution establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025 (Rept. 114-47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

*[Submitted March 23, 2015]*

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 216. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODALL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 163. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025 (Rept. 114-49). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1523. A bill to provide relief to community banks and promote their access to capital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANCE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SIRE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 1524. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1525. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to make certain

improvements to form 10-K and regulation S-K, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 1526. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify policies relating to payment under the Medicare program for durable medical equipment, orthotics and prosthetics, and prosthetic devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1527. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Ms. MENG, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ESTY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. LONG, Mr. CLAY, Mr. FARR, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1528. A bill to protect consumers from discriminatory State taxes on motor vehicle rentals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN (for himself and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 1529. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for community financial institutions with respect to certain rules relating to mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 1530. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to refine how Medicare pays for orthotics and prosthetics, to improve beneficiary experience and outcomes with orthotic and prosthetic care, and to streamline the Medicare administrative appeals process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah):

H.R. 1531. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota (for himself, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 1532. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to modify the distance requirements regarding the eligibility of certain veterans to receive medical care and services from non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1533. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. LEE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FARR, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mr. GRIMALVA):

H.R. 1534. A bill to reduce the number of nuclear-armed submarines operated by the Navy, to prohibit the development of a new long-range penetrating bomber aircraft, to prohibit the procurement of new intercontinental ballistic missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PITTSINGER, and Mrs. LUMMIS):

H.R. 1535. A bill to terminate any Federal employee who refuses to answer questions or gives false testimony in a congressional hearing; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1536. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase and make permanent the research credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1537. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize a program of priority review to encourage treatments for rare pediatric diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 1538. A bill to extend the principle of federalism to State drug policy, provide access to medical marijuana, and enable research into the medicinal properties of marijuana; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 1539. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from enforcing any requirement that consumer reporting agencies that serve only as a secure conduit to data from State unemployment compensation agencies obtain and maintain an individual's informed consent agreement when verifying income and employment with such agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1540. A bill to terminate the authority to waive certain provisions of law requiring the imposition of sanctions with respect to Iran, to codify certain sanctions imposed by Executive order, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Oversight and Government Reform, the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.



By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to make Hispanic-serving institutions eligible for technical and financial assistance for the establishment of preservation training and degree programs; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KILMER (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 1542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. ISSA):

H.R. 1543. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations were made for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the estate and gift tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NUGENT (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. COOK, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 1545. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HANNA, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. BYRNE):

H.R. 1546. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for public broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAULSEN (for himself, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. JONES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. HARPER, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. YODER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee):

H.R. 1547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain limitations on health care benefits enacted as part of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LEE,

Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MENG, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1548. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate the exemption for aggregation of emissions from oil and gas sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MICA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. POSEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. GALLEGOS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TITUS, Mr. YODER, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 1549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the 7-year recovery period for motorsports entertainment complexes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. DELANEY):

H.R. 1550. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to improve the transparency of the Financial Stability Oversight Council, to improve the SIFI designation process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the Mass Transit Account; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 1552. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials used in the treatment of human and animal diseases; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BARR):

H.R. 1553. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to specify which smaller institutions may qualify for an 18-month examination cycle; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 1554. A bill to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1555. A bill to stop implementation and enforcement of the Forest Service travel

management rule and require the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to incorporate the needs, uses, and input of affected communities, and to obtain their consent, before taking any travel management action affecting access to National Forest System lands derived from the public domain or public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1556. A bill to secure the Federal voting rights of non-violent persons when released from incarceration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULVANEY:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President's executive amnesty is illegal notwithstanding passage of H.R. 240, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NUNES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. KEATING):

H. Res. 162. A resolution calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MICA, Mr. NUGENT, and Ms. JACKSON LEE):

H. Res. 164. A resolution recognizing Dr. Elmira Mangum as the first female president of Florida Agricultural & Mechanical University; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 ("The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States"), 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"), and 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1524.



Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 (“To establish Post Offices and post Roads”), Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 (“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”).

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 1525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 (“The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States”), 3 (“To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes”), and 18 (“To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof”).

By Mr. MEADOWS:

H.R. 1526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 1527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I and the Sixteenth Amendment of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 1529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3, further,

Article 1, Section 7, clause 2.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and including, but not solely limited to Article I, Section 8, Clause 14.

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 1532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 1533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, which gives Congress the power “to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama:

H.R. 1535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 and the XVI amendment to the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 1537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation is authorized by the United States Constitution under Article I, Section 8, “Congress shall have the power To... provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States” and “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.”

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 1539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 1540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. KILMER:

H.R. 1542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, §8, clause 3: To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

Article I, §8 Clause 11: To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

Article I, §8 Clause 12: To provide and maintain a navy;

Article I, §8 Clause 13: To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

Article I, §8 Clause 14: To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of

the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions;

Article I, §8 Clause 15: To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the states respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 1544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NUGENT:

H.R. 1545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 1546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which states that Congress has the power “to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. PAULSEN:

H.R. 1547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. POLIS:

H.R. 1548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes).

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 1549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have the Power “to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and with the Indian Tribes”

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 1551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 “To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian Tribes.”

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 1552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: “The Congress shall have power . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.”

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: to make rules for the government and regulation of the land.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 1556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 4 clause 1 of The Constitution of the United States

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 93: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.  
H.R. 140: Mr. BABIN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.  
H.R. 146: Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 148: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 154: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 160: Mr. MOULTON.  
H.R. 167: Mr. WALZ.  
H.R. 169: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. BOST.  
H.R. 216: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 224: Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
H.R. 232: Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. WALDEN.  
H.R. 244: Mr. WESTMORELAND.  
H.R. 263: Mr. LEVIN.  
H.R. 282: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H.R. 308: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 333: Mr. WALZ.  
H.R. 348: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. TROTT.  
H.R. 360: Mrs. BUSTOS.  
H.R. 381: Mr. WALZ and Mr. SCHRADER.  
H.R. 402: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 426: Mr. RUSSELL.  
H.R. 427: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
H.R. 430: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 474: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 511: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. PAULSEN.  
H.R. 531: Mr. DESAULNIER.  
H.R. 540: Mr. TROTT.  
H.R. 546: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.  
H.R. 572: Mr. POLIQUIN and Ms. PINGREE.  
H.R. 578: Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
H.R. 592: Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.  
H.R. 595: Mr. FORBES and Mr. KATKO.  
H.R. 601: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. TIBERI.  
H.R. 602: Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
H.R. 606: Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 610: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
H.R. 624: Mr. TROTT.  
H.R. 625: Mr. YOHO.  
H.R. 642: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ZINKE.  
H.R. 650: Mr. HILL, Mr. BUCK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.  
H.R. 662: Mr. CHABOT and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 663: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 672: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 695: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 696: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 702: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 709: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 721: Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 733: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 766: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 767: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MEADOWS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 784: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 793: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 800: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 824: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 835: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 840: Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 842: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 863: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 882: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 884: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 886: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 915: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 920: Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 921: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 927: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 969: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. VALADAO.  
H.R. 970: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 985: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 990: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SIRE.

H.R. 997: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. POSEY, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 1019: Mr. NUNES and Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 1037: Mr. SALMON, Mr. BRAT, Mr. BEYER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1089: Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1092: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. ROSELENTIN.

H.R. 1094: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1104: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1105: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. TROTT, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. BARR, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. BOUTSTANY, Mr. LONG, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. YODER, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1111: Ms. MOORE and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1131: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELAULO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1133: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1147: Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1149: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1150: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. PITTINGER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. TROTT, Mr. POMPEO, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1170: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1172: Mr. NOLAN and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 1174: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1198: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1199: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1202: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1206: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1214: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1215: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1222: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.

H.R. 1233: Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 1247: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1249: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JONES, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1258: Mr. SHUSTER and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1265: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1267: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. LATTI, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1269: Mr. PEARCE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1270: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1271: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1282: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1298: Mr. MARCHANT and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1299: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1300: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1309: Mr. FARENTHOLD and Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1323: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1324: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1336: Mr. ROSS and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1343: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 1346: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1347: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 1350: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1358: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1365: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1369: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.

H.R. 1382: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1384: Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 1386: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1388: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1411: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1421: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1427: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 1429: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1434: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1441: Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 1444: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 1459: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1460: Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1470: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. BARR, Mr. REED, and Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 1480: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1482: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KEATING, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALONE, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 1487: Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. GOHMERT.	H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr.	H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. NOEM, Mr. SHIMKUS,
H.R. 1500: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.	SCHWEIKERT, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr.	and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1508: Mr. KATKO, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr.	BUCHSHON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr.	H. Res. 53: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. COHEN.
MICA, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. BYRNE.	WENSTRUP, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. BUSTOS, and	H. Res. 154: Mr. COFFMAN and Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 1519: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. Judy Chu	Mrs. WALORSKI.	H. Res. 161: Ms. BORDALLO.
of California.		

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### CONGRATULATIONS TO THE LAKOTA WEST GIRLS BASKET- BALL TEAM

#### HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Lakota West Girls Basketball team in West Chester, Ohio.

On March 21, 2015, the Firebirds became the 2015 OHSAA Division I State Basketball Champions, defeating the Toledo Notre Dame Eagles 44–38.

I commend all 14 members of the 2015 Firebird team for their hard-fought journey to capture the school's first women's basketball state title and the team's 21st consecutive victory, setting a new Lakota school district record.

A special congratulations goes to Lakota West's coach, Andy Fishman. Coach Fishman joined Lakota West as head coach when the school first opened in 1997. Thank you Coach Fishman for your dedication to the remarkable athletes of Lakota West and for your leadership to develop a top-notch program, that is now the best in the state.

With my friends and neighbors in West Chester and on behalf of the United States House of Representatives, I applaud our Lady Firebirds and the community of Lakota West for their well-deserved victory.

### HONORING THE CHUCK WAGON GANG OF ODESSA

#### HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Chuck Wagon Gang of Odessa, Texas. This year, the Chuck Wagon Gang of Odessa is celebrating their 75th anniversary!

The group was founded on March 5, 1940, when thirty three local businessman came together to promote the good word and charity of their beloved town with their BBQ. These men modeled their new initiative off the chuck wagon cooks that traveled the open cow trails of Texas.

For 75 years, the Chuck Wagon Gang has served as ambassadors for the Odessa community by dishing out their legendary BBQ to millions of people worldwide with their renowned "feeds". Through the years, the gang has served their amazing meals and love for Odessa with presidents, members of Congress, governors, foreign dignitaries, country music stars, and famous athletes. This unique gang has spent countless hours away from their families, businesses, and homes to help show the world why Odessa is so special.

Aside from promoting their adored city, the Chuck Wagon Gang hosts many charitable initiatives throughout the nation. The gang has hosted numerous "feeds" that have supported programs that assist disabled children, veterans, and many other non-profits.

The Chuck Wagon Gang has been the premier public relations representatives for Odessa. The group has left a lasting impact wherever they have catered. These 250 volunteers of the Chuck Wagon Gang truly capture and spread the essence of West Texas.

It is an honor to stand before the House today to recognize the Chuck Wagon Gang of Odessa for their seventy-five years of service. I am proud to represent individuals who take pride in their communities and promote the qualities we value in West Texas.

#### ALYSSA GOMEZ

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alyssa Gomez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alyssa Gomez is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alyssa Gomez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alyssa Gomez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

### HONORING THE 36TH ANNIVER- SARY OF THE TAIWAN RELA- TIONS ACT

#### HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize an important milestone in the United States relationship with Taiwan.

On April 10, 1979, President Jimmy Carter signed the Taiwan Relations Act. Since that historic date, we have watched Taiwan contribute greatly to international security. As you

know, Taiwan's location makes it a key strategic security partner in the Asia-Pacific region. Relieving cross-strait tensions has been a security priority of the United States, and I am pleased that Taiwan has worked hard to increase economic engagement with China in an effort to ease tensions. These economic engagements have gradually been working, improving security and cooperation in the region. Additionally, Taiwan has been a close partner in the United States counterterrorism strategy, ensuring cargo is screened before shipping to U.S. ports.

Throughout the past 36 years, Taiwan has shown a willingness to cooperate and negotiate with the U.S. to maintain our relationship. Going forward, I hope we can continue this important relationship, which benefits the citizens and businesses in both the United States and Taiwan.

### HONORING U.S. ARMY CAPTAIN JOSEPH GOURYEB

#### HON. THOMAS MacARTHUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable young man from my district, U.S. Army Captain Joseph Gouryeb. Captain Gouryeb is returning home to Cinnaminson, New Jersey to spend time with his family after a recent deployment to Afghanistan, where he earned a Bronze Star. He earned another Bronze Star during his deployment in Iraq.

Captain Gouryeb truly exemplifies the values that make not only a good soldier, but a good citizen and a good man. After helping to rescue four U.S. National Guard Soldiers who fell off a bridge into water, Captain Gouryeb was recognized by the Army and received one of his two Army Medals of Commendation. He certainly deserves these honors.

Welcome home, Captain Gouryeb, and thank you for your service.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. SCOTT H. PETERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 2015 the House voted on final passage of H.R. 1030 and I intended to vote "no" on roll-call vote No. 125. I strongly oppose this bill that undermines the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to use the best science available in carrying out its responsibility to protect public health.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CONGRATULATING PEGGY TROY  
ON BECOMING CHAIR OF THE  
CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL ASSOCIA-  
TION BOARD OF TRUSTEES

**HON. REID J. RIBBLE**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. RIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Peggy Troy, President and CEO of Children's Hospital Wisconsin, and to congratulate her on becoming the chair of the Children's Hospital Association Board of Trustees.

Children's Hospital of Wisconsin is the region's only independent health care system dedicated solely to the health and well-being of children. The hospital, with locations in Milwaukee and Neenah, serves the children of the 8th Congressional District and is recognized as one of the leading pediatric health care centers in the United States. In fact, Children's Hospital is ranked fourth in the nation by Parents magazine and ranked in nine specialty areas in U.S. News & World Report's 2013–14 Best Children's Hospitals report.

The Children's Hospital Association represents more than 220 children's hospitals and is the voice of children's hospitals nationally, as well as the premier resource for pediatric data and analytics driving clinical and operational performance of member hospitals.

Peggy's more than 40 years in health care, including working on the front lines as a bedside nurse and in a variety of hospital leadership positions, make her an ideal person to lead the Association's board. I have had the pleasure of working with Peggy over the years and am always impressed with her commitment to keeping the needs of kids at the center of every action. This is exemplified by the hospital's mission that children deserve the best.

Congress will consider many policies this year to ensure that our health system is structured to provide high quality, cost effective care. I look forward to working with Ms. Troy, and the rest of the children's hospital community, to advance policies to improve the health of our nation's kids.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN RECYCLING,  
INC.

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rocky Mountain Recycling, Inc. for receiving the 2014 Commerce City Pam Downs Lilac Award for Leadership.

The Pam Downs Lilac Award for Leadership honors businesses or individuals that have been a catalyst toward economic vitality in Commerce City through creative leadership, innovation, facilitation, collaboration or through contribution of resources. Rocky Mountain Recycling buys and recycles all scrap metals and ferrous metals. The owners of Rocky Mountain

Recycling have made significant investment into the community in recent years as the business has grown. In addition to investing in the business, the company also invests in the community, annually providing a \$20,000 scholarship for a graduate of Adams City High School.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Rocky Mountain Recycling for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

CONGRATULATING SHERIFF  
THOMAS TEMPLETON

**HON. ADAM KINZINGER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sheriff Thomas J. Templeton who was recently elected President of the Illinois Sheriffs' Association and will be sworn in to his new position on March 30, 2015.

Sheriff Templeton has served his community for decades, beginning his service at the LaSalle County Sheriff's Office as a Deputy in 1973 following his service in the United States Air Force. He was named the Illinois State Bar Association's Law Enforcement Officer of the Year in both 1996 and 2005. Throughout his career, Tom's exemplary service has been recognized by the Ottawa Jaycees, the DEA, and the Police Hall of Fame, among many others. In addition, Sheriff Templeton has taken it upon himself to educate the next generation of Illinois law enforcement, both as an instructor at the Illinois Valley Law Enforcement Commission and Illinois Valley Community College.

It is not surprising given Sheriff Templeton's admirable and dedicated years of service that he would be selected by over one hundred of his peers to serve as the President of the Illinois Sheriffs' Association. Founded in 1928, this non-profit was designed to improve communication and cooperation among Sheriffs, and has since expanded to offer extensive professional training and development for all the Sheriffs and their teams serving throughout Illinois.

Today, I am honored to join with the LaSalle County Sheriff's Department, the Illinois Sheriffs' Association, and all of Tom's family and friends in expressing my sincere thanks for the hard work and dedication Sheriff Templeton has shown throughout his long career in public service. Without question, to be chosen by his equally accomplished and committed peers in the Illinois Sheriffs' Association speaks volumes about Tom's personal character, passion for serving his community, and ability to lead.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 16th District of Illinois, I wish to express our sincere thanks for all of the work Sheriff Templeton and all the members of the Illinois Sheriffs' Association have done to keep our families and communities safe. I congratulate Sheriff Thomas Templeton on his well-deserved leadership position.

COMMEMORATING THE 36TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELA-  
TIONS ACT

**HON. DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mark the 36th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act and recognize the long-standing U.S.-Taiwan relationship. On April 10, 1979, President Jimmy Carter signed TRA and it has served to define the relationship that the United States has shared with Taiwan ever since.

Since the signing of the Taiwan Relations Act, we as a nation have supported the Taiwanese efforts over the last three and a half decades by fostering commercial exchange. Over that time, Taiwan has grown to become a significant security and trading partner to the United States. It is critical that we continue to explore the beneficial connections between our nations and work to promote it at every opportunity.

Taiwan continues to be an economic powerhouse in the Asia Pacific and a beacon of democracy. The United States recognizes Taiwan's unfailing determination to promote a free and fair democratic society. However, because of Taiwan's ambiguous international status they have been left out of many international organizations that the rest of the world uses to make global decisions. I believe that if allowed to participate more fully, Taiwan would be a valuable asset to organizations such as the World Health Organization (WHO).

Taiwan has already contributed significantly to humanitarian relief worldwide. In 2013, they provide shelters and supply to refugees in Jordan and Iraq. In 2014, they donated supplies and money to help treat Ebola in West Africa. Those are just a couple of examples in a long list of humanitarian work by Taiwan, all without being fully allowed to join international organizations.

In the coming years, I hope that Taiwan's hard work and contributions will be rewarded with a place in the global conversation. I hope we can continue to strengthen our unique relationship with Taiwan and its people.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MAIME  
ERNA STRIEBER SHEPPERD

**HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Maime Erna Strieber Shepperd. Maime passed away in January, just weeks after celebrating her ninety-seventh birthday.

Bright from a young age, Maime graduated high school as class valedictorian at the age of fifteen and enrolled in the University of Texas at Austin Journalism School. It was at the University of Texas where she met her husband of 51 years, the late John Ben

Shepperd. They were married shortly after her graduation.

Maime and John raised four children together, living in both Austin and Odessa throughout their marriage. She was first-lady to John's political career, first as Texas Secretary of State and then as Attorney General. When the family moved to Odessa, Maime got involved with many cultural, philanthropic, and political organizations. She served on the board for the West Texas Rehabilitation Center and founded the Crystal Ball, an annual benefit event. She was also involved as a board member for the Midland-Odessa Symphony, and was tapped by the New York Metropolitan Opera to serve as their West Texas representative.

During Lyndon Johnson's campaign for president in 1964, Maime served as the Chairman of the Ladies for Lyndon West Texas committee. She also joined Lady Bird Johnson on the whistle-stop Lady Bird Special train as it toured eight southern states.

Maime's legacy also extends to the University of Texas Permian Basin's library. As the Odessa chairman of the book drive which founded the library in the early 1970s, she helped obtain over 300,000 books to start the collection that students at the University of Texas Permian Basin still use to this day.

Maime's dedication to her many cultural and philanthropic pursuits were admirable, as was the stable and loving home she provided for her family. She is survived by her son and daughter-in-law, Alfred and Honey Shepperd, her daughter and son-in-law, Suzanne and Gary McIntosh, nine grandchildren, and twenty great-grandchildren. Please join me in remembering the extraordinary life of Maime Shepperd.

#### COMMEMORATING THE 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

### HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, later this year, the nation will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the enactment of Medicare, one of the most consequential acts of social justice in American history.

Today, we mark the fifth anniversary of the enactment of the Affordable Care Act, which will surely take its place in the pantheon of America's greatest laws, alongside the Social Security Act, the GI Bill, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Like those great achievements, the Affordable Care Act, or "ObamaCare," was vehemently opposed and derided by its adversaries, who said it was too costly, would not work, was unnecessary, or would change the character of America for the worse.

Like the critics of Social Security, Medicare, and the GI Bill, all of whom are silent now, they are wrong.

The Affordable Care Act has been an unqualified success.

This historic legislation has extended affordable health coverage to tens of millions of

Americans, and has helped to bring peace of mind to many of those for whom relief seemed far out of reach.

The Affordable Care Act was driven by a simple premise: that citizens of the most prosperous nation on earth should not be forced to choose between their health and their financial security.

Since the passage of the ACA in 2010, the number of uninsured Americans has fallen by nearly one third, or roughly 16 million people.

These Americans come from all walks of life.

They are women, who can no longer be denied coverage or be forced to pay exorbitant amounts for coverage simply because of their sex.

They are nine million seniors and people with disabilities, who have saved \$1,600 each on expensive and lifesaving prescription medication.

And they are this country's most at risk citizens; people who are working hard and struggling make ends meet while living in near-poverty, and who have been covered by Medicaid expansion in 27 states and the District of Columbia.

These benefits have been felt across the country, especially in my home state of Texas.

In Texas alone:

10,695,000 individuals with pre-existing conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes—including up to 1,632,000 children—will no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history.

4,889,000 uninsured Texans have new health insurance options through Medicaid or private health plans in the Marketplace.

5,198,000 individuals on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one free preventive health care service such as a mammogram, birth control, or an immunization in 2011 and 2012.

In the first ten months of 2013, 233,100 seniors and people with disabilities saved on average \$866 on prescription medications.

357,000 young adults have gained health insurance because they can now stay on their parents' health plans until age 26.

In addition to the tangible healthcare benefits for millions of families, the ACA has had powerful effects on the financial state of our nation.

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we have extended the solvency of the Medicare Trust fund by more than a decade, and helped save taxpayers \$116 billion through new Medicare efficiencies.

The Department of Health and Human Services has estimated that hospitals saved more than \$5.7 billion in costs that would have normally gone unpaid by patients without insurance.

Contrary to the claims of the law's critics, private insurance companies have leapt at the opportunity to compete for business among the newly insured, and the healthcare industry has boomed.

Through all of these successes, however, House Republicans remain obsessed with destroying this law, and with unraveling the security it provides to millions of Americans.

With 56 votes to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act, Republicans have repeat-

edly ignored the evidence and failed to suggest workable alternatives.

It is time for Republicans to abandon their fixation and join with us in celebrating the health and economic security that this landmark law affords every American.

LOCKHEED MARTIN

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and applaud Lockheed Martin for their leadership and pioneer attitude within Jefferson County and our global economy.

Lockheed Martin is a global security company that employs 112,000 people worldwide and is engaged in research, development, integration and sustainment of advanced technology systems, products and services. Lockheed Martin Space Systems, headquartered in Jefferson County, is one of five Lockheed Martin business areas and has demonstrated significant and sustained growth to Jefferson County and Colorado's economic success.

Most recently, Lockheed Martin and Jefferson County made history with NASA's Orion test launch on December 5, 2014. Orion is the next-generation spacecraft designed to transport humans to destinations beyond low Earth orbit, going 15 times deeper into space than the International Space System at 3,600 miles from Earth.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Lockheed Martin for their well-deserved Pioneer Award. I know we will see great things from them in the future.

#### TRIBUTE TO KELLY D. HICKEY

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Kelly D. Hickey of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for achieving the rank of an Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained over the past century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, as well as completing an Eagle Project to benefit the community. For his project, Kelly planted three Autumn Blaze Maple Trees around the perimeter of the College View Elementary preschool playground. The work ethic Kelly has shown in his Eagle Project and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank speaks volumes about his commitment to serving his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent Kelly

and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating him on obtaining the Eagle Scout ranking, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

HONORING THE SHUBERT THEATER OF NEW HAVEN ON ITS CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to extend my heartfelt congratulations to the Shubert Theater of New Haven as they mark their 100th Anniversary. Nationally renowned and locally beloved, this community treasure has been bringing the magic and beauty of theater to generations of patrons. The "Birthplace of the Nation's Greatest Hits," the Shubert is the heart of New Haven's arts community and its century of success is a reflection of the incredible contributions the Shubert has made—not only in Connecticut but across the country.

Designed by New York architect Albert Swazey and built by New Haven's H.E. Murdock construction company, Lee and JJ Shubert opened the doors of their newest theater Friday, December 11, 1914. Theatergoers and critics alike were not only impressed with the opening show but with the playhouse itself. It quickly became a favorite among the theater community as well, often sought after to try out shows before bringing them to Broadway.

Away We Go, later renamed Oklahomal, Carousel, South Pacific, The King and I, The Sound of Music, and Tennessee Williams' A Streetcar Named Desire all had their world premieres at the Shubert. It is also where countless actors received their first professional acclaim—Marlon Brando, Humphrey Bogart, Katherine Hepburn, Gene Kelly, Robert Redford, Shirley MacLaine, Sidney Poitier, James Earl Jones, Liza Minnelli, and former First Lady Nancy Reagan just to name a few.

While the Shubert has had its share of ups and downs, even threatened with destruction, in 1976, the local community has fought to protect this invaluable piece of our arts community. Today, in addition to Broadway offerings and performances of dance, cabaret, popular music and entertainment, the Shubert also runs comprehensive education and outreach programs. The Shubert is a cornerstone of New Haven's arts community and as such it also seeks to support local artists and organizations. In fact, just recently, the Shubert collaborated with the local theater company, A Broken Umbrella Theatre, to bring *Seen Change!* to stage. Written, directed, produced, and starring a variety of local actors, it was a wonderful celebration of the Shubert, its remarkable history, and the magic and wonder the theater brings to its audiences.

The Shubert Theater of New Haven is a beloved local treasure that has left an indelible mark on our community as well as the world of the performing arts. Today, as it marks its

centennial anniversary, its leadership can be very proud of all that it has accomplished and continues to contribute to our community. I have no doubt that the Shubert will remain a beacon of Broadway for generations to come—its ghost light never darkened. Happy 100th Anniversary and best wishes for another century of success.

CELEBRATING THE WATERBURY REGIONAL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate 125 years of the Waterbury Regional Chamber of Commerce.

Today, we recognize the Waterbury Regional Chamber for its influence in stimulating the economy in Greater Waterbury and helping businesses thrive for well over a century. The Chamber continues to act as a strong advocate for local businesses in the 5th Congressional District. The ever-changing world that we face today requires a Chamber of Commerce that guides local businesses through the opportunities and challenges of an increasingly global economy, and the Waterbury Regional Chamber has demonstrated its capacity to meet these needs.

The City of Waterbury and surrounding region boast a highly-skilled workforce, thriving businesses, a well-renowned history of manufacturing, and a diverse cultural background. I thank the Chamber for working with these strong economic influences to meet the demands of a 21st century economy. This year's celebration of 125 years of community involvement is a true testament to the positive impact and long-term planning of the Waterbury Regional Chamber.

The Waterbury Regional Chamber's current President and CEO, Lynn Ward, has led the organization for over 30 years. She does a tremendous job bringing resources to the businesses of Greater Waterbury and raising the region's profile in our state. I am proud to work with her to advocate for our community's businesses.

Thank you and congratulations to the Board of Directors, staff, and members of the Waterbury Regional Chamber of Commerce. I look forward to many more years of your continued success.

HONORING JEREMY ROMERO

**HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Jeremy Romero, a man of great integrity who has dedicated his life to protecting our communities in New Mexico.

From a young age Jeremy wanted to be a cop; his father and two uncles were police offi-

cers and his younger brother started attending a police academy in North Carolina. It is, and has always been Jeremy's dream to join his family and make it his career to protect the public, and serve our great State of New Mexico. In August, 2011, Jeremy had that opportunity. He was hired into the New Mexico Department of Public Safety's prestigious Special Investigations Division (SID) as an undercover agent.

For Jeremy it was a dream come true, and yet only two months into the job, all that would come to an end. Jeremy witnessed a crime being committed by a fellow officer. He knew the risk of being a whistleblower, but firmly believed in his commitment to upholding and preserving the law.

Jeremy reported the issue to his superiors, and shortly after, lost his job. In an interview with the Albuquerque Journal, Jeremy explained the strain it put on his daily life, and how he applied to more than 20 different law enforcement agencies before eventually being hired at the Laguna Police Department and later the Corrales Police Department.

On January 21, 2014, Jeremy's life would forever change. While on an early-morning patrol, Jeremy noticed two fugitives speeding down the street in a stolen car. Jeremy quickly followed in pursuit, speeding up in an attempt to ascertain the license plate numbers. Before Jeremy could get a reading on the license plate, his car slipped off the road and collided into a guide rail, telephone pole and adobe wall.

The crash was devastating for Jeremy—he burst a vertebra in his lower back that nearly paralyzed him, had to have pastes made to sculpt a new vertebra, and underwent several emergency surgeries. Doctors predicted that Jeremy would never walk again. Jeremy knew they were wrong; he may have broken some bones, but that did not mean his spirit was broken. In an interview, Jeremy explained: "If you tell me I'm not going to do something, I'm going to work twice as hard to prove you wrong." Jeremy did exactly that. In the face of adversity, Jeremy prevailed.

Jeremy is now using revolutionary robotics to help him walk again and continues to break barriers with the technology. Jeremy's story is remarkable; his dedication to safeguarding the public, deep moral character, and persistence and determination will continue to be an inspiration for future generations.

RECOGNIZING LELAND A. STROM

**HON. RANDY HULTGREN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to recognize Leland A. Strom for his completion of a distinguished tenure of service on the Board of the Farm Credit Administration.

Leland Strom was nominated by the President of the United States and confirmed by the U.S. Senate on December of 2006 as a Member of the Board of the Farm Credit Administration (FCA). In May of 2008, President Bush designated Mr. Strom Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, an office



he held until November of 2012. He recently became the longest serving FCA board member since the three board member structure was adopted in the mid 1980's.

Mr. Strom has more than 35 years of professional experience in the agriculture industry, from production and finance to local food systems and agribusiness. Throughout his career he has promoted a strong agriculture industry in his home state of Illinois, the United States, and abroad. He has traveled extensively in a variety of capacities, with a focus on promoting sustainable food production, rural development, and growing markets. He has engaged in discussions with government officials in the United States and abroad, as well as business and finance leaders.

During the period following the financial crisis of 2008, Mr. Strom was frequently engaged in discussions with members of Congress and senior officials of the United States Treasury and Department of Agriculture. His leadership of the oversight of the Farm Credit System, along with his extensive knowledge of the agriculture industry, proved invaluable during the extreme market volatility which occurred during the 2008–2009 financial crisis.

In his various leadership roles, Mr. Strom has been a strong supporter of diversity and inclusion for women and minorities. During his tenure, the Farm Credit Administration issued a proposed rule to identify and broaden diversity and inclusion within the Farm Credit System. Under his leadership at the Agency, FCA earned a top five placing as a "Best Places to Work in the Federal Government" in the small agency category awarded by the Partnership for Public Service for 2011.

In his home state of Illinois. Mr. Strom worked closely with Kane County officials in helping develop a farmland preservation program, with his home farm being the first dedicated to permanent agriculture use. The County's Farmland Protection Program is the first and only funded county-based agricultural conservation easement program in Illinois.

In 2011, for his efforts in protecting and managing the assets of America's agricultural industry, Mr. Strom was awarded an Honorary Doctor of Humane Letters from Northern Illinois University. A lifelong Republican. Lee has developed an excellent reputation as an individual who is willing to work across the aisle to find consensus in resolving difficult issues.

In sum, Leland Strom's contributions to the agriculture industry through his service and leadership of the Farm Credit System, have helped to make today's agriculture, one of the strongest industries in the United States and the world.

ANDREW TAFOYA

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Andrew Tafoya for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Andrew Tafoya is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5–8 and received this award because his de-

termination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Andrew Tafoya is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Andrew Tafoya for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, last week I missed three roll call votes and I wish to state how I would have voted had I been present:

Roll Call No. 113—Yes

Roll Call No. 114—Yes

Roll Call No. 115—Yes

#### RECOGNIZING NACDS RxIMPACT DAY

**HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Seventh Annual NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill. This is a special day where we recognize pharmacy's contribution to the American healthcare system. This year's event, organized by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, takes place on March 25–26. Nearly 400 individuals from the pharmacy community—including practicing pharmacists, pharmacy school faculty and students, state pharmacy leaders and pharmacy company executives—will visit Capitol Hill. They will share their views with Congress about the importance of supporting legislation that protects access to community and neighborhood pharmacies and that utilizes pharmacists to improve the quality and reduce the costs of providing healthcare.

Advocates from 45 states have travelled to Washington to talk about the pharmacy community's contributions in over 40,000 community pharmacies nationwide. These important healthcare providers are here to educate Congress about the value of pharmacists and protect access to the essential services they provide as part of our healthcare delivery system. And just as these providers travelled to meet with us, Members of Congress and their staff have toured retail chain pharmacies in our own communities more than 325 times since 2009.

Patients have always relied on their local pharmacist to meet their healthcare needs. The local pharmacist is a trusted, highly ac-

cessible healthcare provider deeply committed to providing the highest quality care in the most efficient manner possible.

As demand for healthcare services continues to grow, pharmacists have expanded their role in healthcare delivery, partnering with physicians, nurses and other healthcare providers to meet their patients' needs. Innovative services provided by pharmacists do even more to improve patient healthcare. Pharmacists are highly valued by those that rely on them most—those in rural and underserved areas, as well as older Americans, and those struggling to manage chronic diseases. Pharmacy services improve patients' quality of life as well as healthcare affordability. By helping patients take their medications effectively and providing preventive services, pharmacists help avoid more costly forms of care. Pharmacists also help patients identify strategies to save money, such as through better understanding of their pharmacy benefits, using generic medications, and obtaining 90-day supplies of prescription drugs from local pharmacies.

Pharmacists are the nation's most accessible healthcare providers. In many communities, especially in rural areas, the local pharmacist is a patient's most direct link to healthcare. Eighty-nine percent of Americans reside within a five-mile radius of a community pharmacy. Pharmacists are one of our nation's most trusted healthcare professionals. Utilizing their specialized education, pharmacists play a major role in medication therapy management, disease-state management, immunizations, healthcare screenings, and other healthcare services designed to improve patient health and reduce overall healthcare costs. Pharmacists are also expanding their role into new models of care based on quality of services and outcomes, such as accountable care organizations (ACOs) and medical homes.

Mr. Speaker, as we refine healthcare reform and seek new strategies to improve patient care, pharmacists will play a critical role. I believe Congress should look at every opportunity to make sure that pharmacists are allowed to utilize their training to the fullest to provide the services that can improve care and lower costs. In recognition of the Seventh Annual NACDS RxIMPACT Day on Capitol Hill, I would like to congratulate pharmacy leaders, pharmacists, students, executives, and the entire pharmacy community represented by the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, for their contributions to the good health of the American people.

MICHELLE FOKAM OF KATY, TX  
DISTRICT 19-6A MOST VALUABLE  
PLAYER

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Michelle Fokam of Katy, TX for claiming the honor of District 19–6A Most Valuable Player during the 2014–2015 basketball season. Ms. Fokam and the Seven Lakes girls' basketball team continue to lead Katy ISD in excellence and determination.

Ms. Fokam is a junior at Seven Lakes High School, and was voted District 19-6A's MVP thanks to her key contributions as one of the leagues best inside defenders and rebounders, as well as her formidable offensive player skills. This honor comes after an exciting season as the Seven Lakes girls' basketball team won its fourth consecutive district championship and its second undefeated season.

On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Michelle Fokam for being honored as the District 19-6A Most Valuable Player, and to the Seven Lakes girls' basketball team for your continued victories. We look forward to seeing what you will accomplish in the future.

---

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on Roll Call 119, 120, and 121. I would like to indicate that I would have voted "No" on roll call 119, "Aye" on roll call 120, and "No" on roll call 121.

---

#### THANKING JOHN WRIGHT FOR SERVICE TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank John Wright for over thirty-three years of outstanding service to this House in a number of administrative and support roles. He lives in Maryland's Fifth District, and I am proud to represent him here in Congress.

John—or "Turk," as he is known among his friends and colleagues—is retiring after having lent his skills and talents to the House of Representatives for over three decades. He began his career in January 1982 under House Clerk Benjamin Guthrie as an Office Equipment Attendant for Office Equipment Services. After working in the labor room and the House drapery shop, John was promoted to Inventory Control Clerk in 1987, where he was responsible for the delivery, movement, and pickup of equipment for House offices. He also assisted with Congressional transitions, an arduous process entailing the physical movement of inventory and systems for hundreds of Member offices within a one-month timeframe.

Eager to learn and to help with other duties, John was promoted in 2000, to the position of Vendor Management Counselor for Office Systems Management under the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO). His assignments included the payment of purchase orders for equipment, supplies, and furniture for Members, Committees, Officers, and support offices of the House of Representatives. He processed a large volume of payments swiftly

and formed long-lasting friendships with his customers and coworkers. He offered his services and expertise during each Congressional transition by volunteering extra time to assist with office moves.

John's enthusiasm, experience, and resources made him an invaluable asset to the CAO organization, providing excellent customer service to Members and staff. His outgoing personality, positive attitude, and sense of humor have endeared him to many colleagues and friends. John greeted everyone with a big smile and referred to his coworkers as family. He shares his pride in serving the House just as his late mother, Tillie Wright, did during her illustrious forty-one year career in the catering division of the House Restaurant system.

I congratulate John and I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his distinguished service to the House and the nation it serves. I wish him and his family all the best as John begins this new chapter in his life.

---

#### SUNCOR ENERGY

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Suncor Energy for receiving the 2014 Commerce City Business of the Year Award.

The Business of the Year Award is given to a company showing leadership within its industry and the community. Suncor's refinery is the only petroleum refinery in Colorado and one of the largest refineries in the Rocky Mountain region, employing 440 workers. It is a major supplier of gasoline and diesel fuel and is the state's primary producer of asphalt.

This refinery is committed to invigorating the community by volunteering and supporting local organizations in Commerce City and in the Denver metro area. Since 2003, Suncor contributed more than \$2.8 million to numerous organizations directly serving the Commerce City community, including Boys & Girls Clubs of Metro Denver and the Adams 14 Education Foundation.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Suncor Energy for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

---

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE SMARTER APPROACH TO NUCLEAR EXPENDITURES (SANE) ACT OF 2015

### HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Smarter Approach to Nuclear Expenditures (SANE) Act of 2015, a bill that would enable the U.S. to maintain a strong nuclear deterrent without shortchanging combat readiness and operations.

The SANE Act would allow the U.S. to adopt a more practical and stable nuclear de-

terrent, while at the same time reducing costs and risks without compromising our security or that of our allies. This is achieved by strategically sizing our nuclear weapons programs, all while saving approximately \$100 billion over 10 years and staying within the New START Treaty warhead levels.

President Obama has committed to completely rebuilding all three legs of our nuclear triad—strategic bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), and nuclear-armed submarines (SLBMs). The SANE Act does not challenge whether the United States should maintain a triad. It does, however, inject fiscal responsibility and strategic reality into the administration's nuclear weapons planning, which many current and former officials have acknowledged is unaffordable. For instance, in 2013 former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General James Cartwright, said of U.S. nuclear weapons modernization plans, "The challenge here is that we have to recapitalize all three legs [of the nuclear triad] and we don't have the money to do it."

The Pentagon's 2013 "Report on Nuclear Employment Strategy of the United States" declared "that we can ensure the security of the United States and our Allies [and] partners and maintain a strong and credible strategic deterrent while safely pursuing up to a one-third reduction in deployed nuclear weapons from the level established in the New START Treaty." Other experts, including a commission chaired by former, General Cartwright, said the U.S. could go even lower without jeopardizing security.

Despite these facts, U.S. nuclear weapons planning calls for spending \$350 billion over the next decade, according to the Congressional Budget Office, and up to \$1 trillion over the next 30 years, to build a nuclear force that will far exceed what the President, the Pentagon, and security experts have said will be needed to effectively deter a nuclear threat. Such spending is not only problematic for taxpayers concerned about fiscal responsibility, but those deeply committed to strong and capable military.

Choosing to rebuild a nuclear triad with such capacity excesses means choosing not to invest in other areas. The recent National Defense Panel report called these plans "unaffordable" and a threat to "needed improvements in conventional forces." Frank Kendall, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, has echoed similar sentiments, stating in December 2014 that "[w]e've got a big affordability problem out there with those [nuclear modernization] programs."

America must reconcile the facts: our defense budget is already squeezed, a nuclear deterrent is irrelevant to current international security challenges such as ISIS, the Ebola virus in Africa or even Russian aggression in Ukraine, and yet a nuclear deterrent is still a national security imperative nonetheless. It's time for the U.S. to procure what it needs, and what it can afford.

The SANE Act deals with the coming fiscal and strategic reality scaling back and limiting new nuclear weapons programs now rather than waiting for "disarmament by default."

The SANE Act of 2015 is critical to securing a nuclear deterrent without undercutting critical

investments in readiness and other essential programs.

**HONORING NANCY J. DINARDO FOR  
HER OUTSTANDING LEADERSHIP  
AND COMMITMENT TO PUBLIC  
SERVICE**

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep respect and deep admiration that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding leader and my dear friend, Nancy J. DiNardo. Tonight, family, friends, and colleagues gather to express our thanks and appreciation to Nancy as she marks the end of her decade long tenure as Chairman of Connecticut's State Democratic Party. As the first woman to hold the office, Nancy has shattered glass ceilings while her tenacity and commitment has earned her respect from Democratic and Republican political leaders alike.

Nancy's desire to give back to her community led her to public service. She was first elected to public office over forty years ago as a member of the Trumbull Town Council and she went on to serve on several other local boards and commissions by both election and appointment. Nancy has also served as the local Chairperson of the Trumbull Democratic Town Committee for thirty years. She dedicated her professional career to education, serving in the Bridgeport public school system as a teacher, school psychologist, and later Director of Psychological Services.

Central to Democrats ideology is our belief that we, as individuals and as a society, are greater together than we are on our own—that our communities and our nation are most successful when everyone gets a fair shot, when everyone does their fair share, and when everyone plays by the same rules. Nancy's dedication to these values led her to seek a more active role in Connecticut's Democratic Party. She sought and won election to the Connecticut Democratic State Central Committee in 1998 and has been an active member ever since, even serving as Finance Chair from 2002 to 2004.

In January of 2005, Nancy was the first woman to be elected Chair in the history of the Connecticut Democratic Party. She brought a renewed focus to both the position and the Party. She re-engaged local town chairs and committees, created special caucuses under the Party umbrella to ensure a broader voice was being heard, and provided new opportunities for younger people to get involved. As Chair, Nancy supported candidates on the municipal, state, and federal level—often spending a majority of the day crisscrossing the state to attend events and functions. Under her tenure, Democratic candidates enjoyed great success including bringing an entirely Democratic federal delegation to Washington and winning back the Governor's office after more than two decades.

Though Nancy stepped down from the Chairmanship, she continues to remain involved in the Democratic Party on both the

state and national level. Earlier this year, she was unanimously elected Vice Chair of the State Party and continues to serve on the Democratic National Committee where she has been elected twice to serve as Chair of Eastern Regional Caucus and is a member of the Executive Committee.

Nancy J. DiNardo left an indelible mark on the office of State Party Chair and I could not be more proud to stand today to pay tribute to her remarkable dedication and extend my heartfelt thanks for her outstanding public service. I, like so many others, cannot thank her enough for her continued friendship and support. We are more than friends—we are kindred spirits. I know that she will continue to make a difference and wish her the best for continued success in all of her good work.

**HONORING MADELINE HOSKINS-  
CUMBNEY**

**HON. RANDY HULTGREN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and honor a young student from Illinois' 14th Congressional District who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service to the community. Madeline Hoskins-Cumbey of Oswego has been named one of the top honorees in Illinois by The 2015 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia.

Ms. Madeline Hoskins-Cumbey is being recognized for founding a nonprofit organization, along with her younger brother, that seeks to engage young people in promoting healthy eating, accessible clean water, and other essentials for healthy living.

Given the challenges we face today, it is vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contributions that these young citizens have made. Youth volunteers like Madeline are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

This youth program was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example.

Ms. Hoskins-Cumbey should be extremely proud to have been singled out from the thousands of dedicated volunteers who participated in this year's program. I heartily applaud Madeline for her initiative in seeking to make our community a better place to live, and for the positive impact she has had on the lives of others. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. Her actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

**RECOGNIZING DR. SPIRO SPIREAS**

**HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Spiro Spireas, a local resident who serves as the Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Sigmapharm Laboratories. Dr. Spireas founded Sigmapharm Laboratories in 2005. He is the inventor and author of more than 70 international and domestic patents and 200 scientific papers, books, and other publications in the fields of industrial pharmacy, biopharmaceuticals, pharmacokinetics, pharmaceutical technology and analytical chemistry.

He holds Ph.D. and M.S. degrees in Pharmaceutics and Industrial Pharmacy from St. John's University, and a B.S. in Pharmacy from the Hellenic National University of Athens, Greece. Prior to forming Sigmapharm Laboratories, Dr. Spireas served for 6 years as the Vice President of Research and Development for URL Pharma, Inc. At URL Pharma, he developed various unique products including Felodipine extended release tablets, which remained for several years as the only marketed generic equivalent to Astra Zeneca's Plendil ER tablets.

In addition, Dr. Spireas taught several graduate and undergraduate courses of pharmaceutical sciences and conducted extensive research producing more than 20 Ph.D. and M.S. dissertations as a Professor of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Technology at the Arnold & Marie Schwartz College of Pharmacy of Long Island University. Several of his graduate students went on to work with Dr. Spireas at Sigmapharm, and have helped shape the company into what it is today. Dr. Spireas embodies an entrepreneurial and innovative spirit that is unmatched. His contributions to the pharmaceutical industry are greatly admired and appreciated by myself, and my constituents. Dr. Spireas has helped develop products that save lives and keep us healthy, while training a new, young, and eager workforce ready to make contributions to the betterment of society.

It is an honor and privilege to recognize Dr. Spireas today. I wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

**PERSONAL EXPLANATION**

**HON. PETER J. ROSKAM**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 128 due to a death in the family, I was unable to make the vote on S.J. Res. 8. Had I been present, I would have voted Yea.

## ACT UNDERGROUND, LLC

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud ACT Underground, LLC for receiving the 2014 Commerce City Entrepreneurial Spirit Award.

The Entrepreneurial Spirit Award recognizes a company or entrepreneur that demonstrates a pioneer spirit towards new product development, a business start-up, or growth into new markets. ACT Underground, LLC is a franchisee of Badger Daylighting Corporation and has operated in Commerce City since 2007.

ACT Underground has a combined workforce with over 90 years of experience in the hydro-excavation industry. They operate from the northern edge of Wyoming to Breckenridge in the west, New Mexico south and Kansas and Nebraska out east. Through their acquisition of a new facility in 2014 they have expanded their fleet and created 37 new jobs.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the ACT Underground, LLC for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

## HONORING DR. VICKY CAROL PERSONS

**HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life of the late Dr. Vicky Carol Persons who entered into eternal rest Monday, March 2, 2015. Dr. Persons was well known for the joy she got out of helping others, her love for gardening, caring for animals and cooking.

A native of Bainbridge, Georgia, Dr. Persons received her PhD in Special Education from Florida State University and became a devoted educator of 15 years. Dr. Persons previously worked at McIntosh County Academy as a special education teacher, and in 2012, she decided to run for the McIntosh County School Board. In April 2013, Dr. Persons began her career at West Chatham Elementary School as a 5th grade special education teacher where many of the faculty and parents will truly miss her dedication to her school and students. Dr. Persons was also very involved in her community. She was a member of the Darien Rotary Club, Cairo Rotary Club, and the Professional Association of Georgia Educators.

Today, it is my privilege to recognize the life of Dr. Vicky Persons. As a wife, mother and friend, Dr. Persons will forever be remembered.

## INTRODUCING THE A RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING DR. ELMIRA MANGUM AS THE FIRST FEMALE PRESIDENT OF FLORIDA A&amp;M UNIVERSITY

**HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution recognizing Dr. Elmira Mangum as the First Female President of Florida A&M University. A trailblazer in higher education and model of academic success, Dr. Mangum has broken gender barriers by becoming the first permanent female president of one of our nation's most distinguished Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU).

Dr. Elmira Mangum is a born leader. Growing up in North Carolina, she always went above and beyond the call of duty to ensure she excelled academically and socially. She earned her bachelor's degree in geography and education from North Carolina Central University and graduated with honors from the University of Wisconsin-Madison with two master's degrees, one in public policy and public administration and another in urban and regional planning. Dr. Mangum furthered her studies and earned a Ph.D. in educational leadership and policy from the University at Buffalo. It was here that she received distinction for her work on leadership in higher education.

Never one to settle for less, she attended the Harvard Graduate School of Education Management Development Program, was in the inaugural class of the Millennium Leadership Institute, and completed Cornell's Administrative Management Institute. Extremely civically minded, she is a life member of Zeta Phi Beta Sorority, Inc. and the National Council of Negro Women.

Her path to becoming the 11th president of my prestigious alma mater, Florida A&M University, has led her through some very notable positions. She has been Assistant Dean, Associate Provost for Resource Management, a Vice Provost, Senior Associate Provost, and Vice President at other noteworthy institutions, such as Cornell University and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

I am extremely proud of Dr. Mangum's accomplishments and am certain that she will carry out her vision of grandeur for one of the nation's most premier HBCUs. She has already made extraordinary progress in advancing the institution and this is only the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Elmira Mangum is paving the way for women across the country to continue to realize their dreams and achieve greatness. She is a trailblazer who serves as a role model for men and women alike. I urge my colleagues to support the Resolution to Recognize Dr. Elmira Mangum as the First Female President of Florida A&M University.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. SAM GRAVES**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last week, March 16–19, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on #113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 121, 125, 126, 127, and 128. Additionally, I would have voted "NAY" on #120, 122, 123, 124, and 129.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that on March 18, 2014, I missed one roll call vote. Had I been present I would have voted:

NO—Roll Call Vote 125—H.R. 1030—To prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating regulations or assessments based upon science that is not transparent or reproducible.

I would have cast my vote in opposition to this bill because it undermines the scientific integrity of the EPA's Science Advisory Board and hurt the agency's ability to use the best available science to protect the air we breathe and the water we drink when setting public health safeguards.

## ARATI LAMICHHANE

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Arati Lamichhane for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Arati Lamichhane is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5–8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Arati Lamichhane is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Arati Lamichhane for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

**BEN PEREZ OF ROSENBERG, TX,  
HEB EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION  
AWARDS**

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Ben Perez of Rosenberg, TX on being named a finalist in the HEB Excellence in Education Awards Program. Mr. Perez serves as the principal of Ray Elementary School in Rosenberg, TX.

Mr. Perez began his career as a teacher's aide at the age of eighteen while simultaneously taking courses at the University of Houston-Downtown. After serving both as an elementary school teacher at Pink Elementary and as assistant principal at Ray Elementary, Mr. Perez was named principal after years of hard work and commitment to his school and his students. Mr. Perez was selected for this award due to his tireless work ethic, educational accomplishments, and passion for teaching. Both his fellow teachers and students are excited about his nomination, and eagerly await the program's decision.

Mr. Perez is one of five exceptional elementary school principals who were nominated for this award, and the winner will be announced in Austin on May 2. On behalf of the residents of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Mr. Perez for being recognized as an outstanding principal.

**HONORING CHIEF DOUGLAS  
DORTENZIO ON THE OCCASION  
OF HIS RETIREMENT**

**HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest respect and admiration that I rise today to join the Town of Wallingford and particularly its police force in extending my sincere thanks and appreciation to Douglas Dortenzio as he celebrates his retirement after twenty-four years of dedicated service as Police Chief and a forty-two year career in law enforcement. His retirement marks the end of a distinguished career in law enforcement and the Department will simply not be the same without him.

Chief Dortenzio began his career in the New Haven Police Department. During his eighteen year career with the NHPD, he rose through the ranks and was a major when he was selected to serve as Chief of the Wallingford Department. For the last twenty-four years he has served the Department, his officers, and the Wallingford community with honor and distinction.

Throughout his career, Chief Dortenzio dedicated himself to ensuring the protection and safety of the Wallingford community. He is a staunch believer in the concept of community policing and under his tenure he has focused the Department's efforts towards building a

strong relationship between the Department and the community. As head of the Wallingford Police Department, Chief Dortenzio made the men and women of the Department his highest priority—always ensuring that they had access to the most current technologies and equipment. He has always fought for the resources, programs, and services he believes are in the best interest of the members of his Department and would most benefit the community.

Chief Dortenzio's efforts to create a parents' guide for sober teen celebrations have been recognized by Mothers Against Drunk Driving and he has been involved in its Red Ribbon Campaigns and National Sobriety Checkpoint Week. He has served as a member of the State of Connecticut Police Officer Standards and Training Council, the State of Connecticut Emergency Management & Homeland Security Coordinating Council, the U.S. Attorney's Office Anti-Terrorism Advisory Council, and the FBI—Joint Terrorism Task Force. He is a past President of the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association and was a member of the Police Chiefs' delegation invited to Washington, D.C. to watch then President Bill Clinton sign a national crime bill.

With all of his work, at the Department and in the community, Chief Dortenzio still made time to be of great assistance to myself and my staff. He has been an invaluable resource to us all and I want to extend my deepest thanks and sincere appreciation for all of his many years of support and friendship.

Chief Douglas Dortenzio has demonstrated an unparalleled commitment and has left an indelible mark on the Town of Wallingford—he will be missed. As he celebrates his retirement, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to join his wife Pat and daughter, Christine, as well as family, friends, and colleagues in wishing him the very best for many more years of health and happiness.

**RECOGNIZING THE ACCREDITA-  
TION OF THE ST. SIMONS LAND  
TRUST**

**HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the St. Simons Land Trust for becoming accredited by the Land Trust Accreditation Commission, an independent program of the Land Trust Alliance. The St. Simons Land Trust's accreditation status is the result of a rigorous and lengthy process, and I am proud of their efforts to meet such high standards for private, non-profit land conservation.

Since 2001, the St. Simons Land Trust has acquired and permanently preserved close to 776 acres on St. Simons Island in southeast Georgia. Cannon's Point Preserve, which contains 609 acres of maritime forest, salt marshes, and tidal creeks, is one of the many successful preservation projects of the Trust. With its new accredited status, the St. Simons Land Trust may display with pride a special seal that shows it fulfills national standards for excellence in land conservation.

The work of the St. Simons Land Trust helps to permanently protect wildlife habitat, water quality, green space, working farms and ranches, and healthy communities. By achieving accreditation, the Trust has demonstrated its commitment to conservation both today and long into the future.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to commend the St. Simons Land Trust for their latest accomplishment. I am grateful for the hard work and dedication of the St. Simons Land Trust to helping preserve the beauty of St. Simons Island and southeast Georgia. I would like to thank the Trust for their devotion to my district, and wish them the best with their future projects.

**ZIGGI'S COFFEE**

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ziggi's Coffee for receiving the 2014 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses that have brought new employment to Commerce City. Ziggi's Coffee opened its first drive-thru and café combination in December 2014, adding 15 employees at the location.

With their growth in Commerce City, they also have a strong commitment to community involvement. Ziggi's donates to hundreds of causes and supports local schools. Their commitment is year round, raising thousands of dollars through their annual back-to-school fundraiser and donating hundreds of gift cards to local nonprofit organizations throughout the year.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ziggi's Coffee for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

**IN RECOGNITION OF THE CON-  
SISTENT, EXEMPLARY COMMU-  
NITY SERVICE DISPLAYED BY  
CITIZEN SCHOOLS FOR TWENTY  
YEARS**

**HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Citizen Schools for providing twenty years of outstanding community service and educational enrichment programs. Citizen Schools offers extended learning programming for middle school-aged students in urban, at-risk areas by partnering with public middle schools. Citizens Schools offers free educational classes and programs to urban academic institutions, giving students a wealth of choices during the important after school hours.

Citizen Schools was founded in 1995 by Eric Schwarz and Ned Rimer. Since then, the organization has offered educational opportunities for children who cannot otherwise afford

them. The results are impressive. According to Citizen Schools, 71% of students involved in these programs graduate high school and many of those go on to post-secondary institutions. These impressive results are a combination of careful program planning, and the tireless efforts of volunteers who help teach these aspiring students. The volunteers work closely with students to help maximize their experience. Their work is so well received that the organization has expanded beyond Boston to different states around the country like California, Texas, North Carolina, New York, and others. Citizen Schools aims to provide at-risk students with valuable educational experiences that they may not otherwise have access to due to conditions out of their control.

I salute the efforts of Citizen Schools over the past twenty years and thank them for the positive impact they have had on so many students.

CELEBRATING THE ACHIEVEMENT  
OF DENNIS RAYMOND

**HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dennis Raymond of Waterbury, Connecticut.

On March 21, 2015, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters Local #677 honored Mr. Raymond for his achievements and service to Teamsters and the labor movement.

He has been a Teamster for forty-four years, rising through the ranks to become Secretary Treasurer for Teamsters Local 677.

Mr. Raymond began his career in 1970 as a route sales representative for the former Raymond Baking Company. He was soon appointed as Steward representing mechanics, transport drivers and breadmen. Mr. Raymond later served as the Recording Secretary and then the Business Agent for Local 677, a position he held for twenty-eight years. Most recently, he was appointed as Director for the Bakery and Laundry Conference USA & Canada.

For all of these contributions and more, Mr. Raymond will be honored at a retirement dinner. I wish to offer my congratulations to him for his retirement and my many thanks for his dedication and service to Teamsters and the labor movement.

ALEXANDRA ARRIAGA RODRIGUEZ

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alexandra Arriaga Rodriguez for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alexandra Arriaga Rodriguez is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversity.

The dedication demonstrated by Alexandra Arriaga Rodriguez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alexandra Arriaga Rodriguez for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

HONORING BRIANNA CAREY

**HON. RANDY HULTGREN**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and honor a young student from Illinois' 14th Congressional District who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service to the community. Brianna Carey of Geneva has been named a Distinguished Finalist in Illinois by The 2015 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state and the District of Columbia.

Ms. Carey is being recognized for founding a website to help teens all over the world with their emotional struggles called "A Cutter's Guardian Angel," which has grown into an organization that helps those in need via social media, the internet, and community events.

Given the challenges we face today, it is vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contributions that these young citizens have made. Youth volunteers like Brianna are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

This youth program was created by Prudential Financial in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example.

Ms. Carey should be extremely proud to have been singled out from the thousands of dedicated volunteers who participated in this year's program. I heartily applaud Brianna for her initiative in seeking to make our community a better place to live, and for the positive impact she has had on the lives of others. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. Her actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

THE 36TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

**HON. DENNIS A. ROSS**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my warm, personal greetings to the people of Taiwan, to commemorate the 36th anniversary of the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act—which provides the institutional framework and legal basis for our unofficial relations with Taiwan, and to call for greater support for Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations where it cannot be a member, due to its unique political status.

As you know, Taiwan is an important economic and security partner, and as an advanced industrial economy, has much to contribute to the world, from global efforts to fight disease to securing our skies from dangers and threats to safety. As a result of its own efforts, the actions of the Congress and successive administrations, and other World Health Assembly member states, Taiwan has enjoyed observer status at the WHA since 2009. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for Taiwan's participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

This House is on record in support of Taiwan's observer status at the ICAO. While Taiwan was invited to attend the 38th Session of the ICAO Assembly in Montreal by the then-ICAO president in 2013 as his guest, this is not a permanent solution for what is an integral part of the global aviation network. Taiwan, a democracy of 23 million people, is located in the busiest section of airspace in East Asia. Tens of millions of passengers and over a million-and-a-half tons of cargo pass through the Taipei Flight Information Region each year. And yet, Taiwan is excluded from ICAO meetings and activities, and is forced to make extra efforts to adhere to the frequent updates of ICAO's flight safety and security standards to which Taipei is committed.

As we celebrate this 36th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act, let us recommit ourselves to supporting this important friend in the Asia-Pacific, strengthening our unofficial relations, and progressing Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations, which is to the benefit of the safety and security of people everywhere.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 122 I was not present due to being unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

CONGRATULATIONS MR. BILLY M. BOLTON ON 50 YEARS OF SERVICE TO COMMUNITY SPIRIT BANK, THE CITY OF RED BAY, AND THE STATE OF ALABAMA

**HON. ROBERT B. ADERHOLT**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to recognize and honor Mr. Billy M. Bolton for 50 years of service to Community Spirit Bank, the City of Red Bay, and the State of Alabama. I am honored to recognize this individual for his accomplishments.

When looking for model public servants, one need not look any further than Billy Bolton of Red Bay, Alabama. For 50 years he has been involved with and held leadership roles in local, regional, and statewide organizations that have impacted the lives of countless Alabamians. He served on the Red Bay City Council before being elected twice as Mayor of Red Bay, leading the town to some of its most prosperous years. He has served on various regional committees such as the Northwest Alabama Council of Local Governments and the Northwest Community College Scholarship Board. His efforts have also had a statewide impact from his time with the Alabama Bankers Association, the Bear Creek Development Authority, and the Alabama division of the American Heart Association. Arguably though, Mr. Bolton's greatest service is that to his country. He served with honor in the United States Army from 1966–1968, during a period of our Nation's history when military service was not always considered popular.

Professionally, the name Billy Bolton has been synonymous in Northwest Alabama with Community Spirit Bank since 1965. Mr. Bolton, as Chairman, President, and CEO, has played a leading role in the bank's growth and success to become one of the strongest and most recognized financial institutions in the region. Community banks are deeply involved in local affairs, as some of the biggest supporters of schools, civic organizations, and town projects. Through Mr. Bolton, Community Spirit Bank has been a staple in Red Bay and Northwest Alabama, bringing economic stability and promoting the arts and cultural growth to citizens and visitors alike.

Of all his accomplishments though, he would say his greatest has been his strong relationship with God and his devotion to family. Mr. Bolton is a faithful member of First Baptist Church in Red Bay where he serves as a deacon and on various committees. He and his wife Judy have been married for 50 years. They have three children: Tammy Montgomery, Karla Wright, and Brad Bolton; and six grandchildren. Mr. Bolton has instilled in his family the importance of service and they are all respected citizens in the Red Bay area.

Mr. Bolton was honored on March 18, 2015 at the Red Bay Arbor Day Celebration with a Sunset Red Maple tree planted in his honor. This tree will be a visible reminder to all who see it of his contributions and the importance of Mr. Bolton's public service. I am proud to call Mr. Bolton a fellow Alabamian and to rep-

resent him in the United States Congress. He is truly deserving of this recognition.

CELEBRATING THE 80TH  
BIRTHDAY OF MALLORY PEARCE

**HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to commemorate the 80th birthday of the artistic and intellectual Mr. Mallory Pearce of Tybee Island.

Mr. Pearce is a dedicated public servant and environmentalist. He founded the Tybee Land Trust which is dedicated to the preservation of Coastal Georgia's Natural Beauty. Mr. Pearce authored "The Low Country," a guide to the natural history of Coast Georgia. He has served as a member of his local Georgia government for 10 years and has acted as ambassador for the Georgia Coast with this book, bird calls and caricatures. Mr. Pearce has maintained and protected his own unique Maritime Forest. While he is an artist, Mr. Pearce is also an educator having taught 18 years at Armstrong State University. Mr. Pearce continues to strive to make Georgia and the world a better place.

Mr. Speaker, I join his family and friends in wishing Mr. Mallory Pearce a very happy and blessed 80th birthday. We thank him for his generous contributions to his community, the State of Georgia and our nation.

BEN ALVEAR

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ben Alvear for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Ben Alvear is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5–8 and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ben Alvear is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ben Alvear for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE  
ELDER JUSTICE ACT

**HON. PETER T. KING**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, March 23rd, marks the 5th anniversary of the signing into law of the bipartisan Elder Justice Act. I was proud to have been the sponsor of the House version of this bill with my former colleague Rahm Emanuel. I also note the strong leadership of Senator HATCH, former Senator Lincoln, and Senator GRASSLEY on the Senate bill, which ultimately became law.

The Elder Justice Act was passed for an important reason: to allow us to approach the growing problem of elder abuse with a more coordinated and comprehensive federal response. This has been accomplished to a certain degree over the past 5 years through some initiatives including the Elder Justice roadmap and the work of the Elder Justice Coordinating Council. We have a new Office of Elder Justice in the Department of Health and Human Services.

Yet much of the Elder Justice Act remains unfulfilled because of an ongoing struggle for appropriate funding for its provisions. On this occasion I rededicate myself to seeing that the Act is reauthorized and that we invest adequate resources to its work. I am proud to be the author of H.R. 988 to renew the EJA and I commend my colleagues Representatives LUJAN GRISHAM, SWALLOW, SCHAKOWSKY, COHEN, BLUMENAUER, FRANKEL, GRAYSON and HONDA for joining me as co-sponsors.

At this point, I wish to submit a statement issued by the bipartisan, 3,000-member Elder Justice Coalition which has been steadfast in its leadership on behalf of elder justice for more than 10 years. I am pleased to work closely with the Coalition and its national coordinator Robert Blancato and look forward to our continued work to help ameliorate the national outrage of elder abuse.

STATEMENT FROM THE ELDER JUSTICE  
COALITION

(Bob Blancato, National Coordinator)

March 23, 2015 marks the fifth anniversary of the bipartisan Elder Justice Act being signed into law by President Barack Obama.

This law is historic as it represented the most comprehensive legislation ever enacted to address the growing national crisis of elder abuse, neglect and exploitation. Five years later, we still find ourselves in the grip of elder abuse with an estimated one in ten persons over 60 as victims. Elder financial abuse is especially rampant with victims losing a minimum of \$3 billion a year and perhaps as high as \$35 billion per year based on new research.

It is important, however, to mark this fifth anniversary noting that significant progress has been made as a result of the passage of the EJA. This includes:

The Elder Justice Act receiving \$4 million in first-time direct funding in FY 2015.

President Obama's FY 2016 budget request including \$25 million to continue the Elder Justice Initiative and a previous request including \$5 million for the long-term care ombudsman program.

The 2015 White House Conference on Aging including elder justice as one of its four priority issues.



A Global Summit planned for 2015 to observe the tenth anniversary of World Elder Abuse Awareness Day (WEAAD).

The creation of a new Office of Elder Justice and Adult Protective Services (APS) in the Administration for Community Living (ACL).

The renewal of both the National Center on Elder Abuse and the APS Resource Center by the Administration.

A data collection project from ACL with APS.

Increased work of the Social Security Administration to combat elder financial abuse.

Ongoing education and outreach work in the Office of Older Americans in the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

The release of the Elder Justice Roadmap by the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services (HHS).

The recommendations of the Elder Justice Coordinating Council sent to HHS Secretary and later to Congress.

On this fifth anniversary we also reflect on our disappointment in how difficult it has proven to be to secure appropriate funding for this law. To date, less than \$13 million has been directed to elder justice over the past five years and it took until just last year to achieve the first direct Congressional appropriation for the law. The law authorized a total of \$777 million dollars for local grants, training, services, education, to address abuse in the community and long-term care facilities, to help prevent abuse, and to assist victims and prosecute perpetrators. We have not made the progress and the investment that this issue and those that have been victimized deserve.

In this year ahead we must focus attention on reauthorizing the Elder Justice Act. The Coalition commends Representative Peter King for his introduction of H.R. 988 in this Congress and also for being the House author of the original Elder Justice Act. Similarly we salute the leadership of Senator Orrin Hatch, the author of the Elder Justice Act in the Senate. We also acknowledge the critical work that Senator Chuck Grassley did to help pass the Act.

As our nation continues to grow older, we have to recognize that elder abuse will also grow unless we commit resources to help prevent it. This includes providing adequate funding for Adult Protective Services in all our states as well as for the Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program so we are able to investigate elder abuse in nursing homes and assisted living facilities. This is the essence of the Elder Justice Act, a sound investment in a safe future for older Americans.

We also recognize that we need to reauthorize and fund other programs that work hand in hand with the EJA. The Older Americans Act with its important elder abuse provisions and aging network is past due for reauthorization. We must also protect the core funding we currently have for Adult Protective Services through the Social Services Block Grant Program.

Finally, we must also take advantage of an important opportunity provided by the Congress in the FY 2015 omnibus appropriations bill. In this measure, the cap for the Crime Victims' Fund, created by the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA), was more than tripled from \$730 million to a new high of \$2.361 billion. We call on the Justice Department and state VOCA agencies to direct an appropriate amount of these new funds to aid elder abuse crime victims.

Our bipartisan 3,000 member Elder Justice Coalition sees this fifth anniversary as a

turning point in our national effort to prevent elder abuse. We cannot be in denial that the problem exists; instead, we need to put the same commitment into addressing this crisis as we have done with child abuse for more than 40 years and domestic violence over the past 20.

Older adults deserve to live a life free from the reality or even the fear of elder abuse. That is our agenda, pure and simple. Let us build on the work done over these past five years and strive to achieve elder justice which has to mean the prevention of elder abuse, neglect and exploitation.

## INTRODUCTION OF CARERS ACT

**HON. STEVE COHEN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce CARERS Act, a bipartisan House companion to a bipartisan Senate bill that would allow states to set their own policies on medical marijuana, and give Veterans Administration physicians the ability to recommend medical marijuana to their patients.

The consensus on medical marijuana is overwhelming. Last year, a CBS News Poll found 86 percent of Americans thought doctors should be allowed to prescribe small amounts of marijuana for patients suffering from serious illnesses.

86 percent of Americans rarely agree on anything.

Even CNN's Chief Medical Correspondent Dr. Sanjay Gupta, who was once skeptical of medical marijuana, has publicly endorsed it.

Yet, our federal laws continue to treat patients and the doctors and families who care for them like criminals.

It is long overdue for our federal law to reflect the common sense views of 86 percent of Americans and stop adding to the suffering of those with horrible illnesses.

One such patient was my constituent, Chloe Grauer. At 3 years old, Chloe suffered from a rare neurological disease that caused her to have 100 to 200 seizures a day. She tried dozens of medications and underwent surgical procedures but nothing stopped the seizures. Her family tried desperately to treat her with Cannabidiol—also known as “Charlotte’s Web” or “CBD” for short—which has been shown to treat certain diseases that cause seizures, such as the disease from which Chloe suffered. CBD is derived from cannabis plants, and even though it contains just trace amounts of the psychoactive ingredient in marijuana—nowhere near enough to produce a high—it is currently illegal under federal law. Even this tiny amount of the ingredient, THC, was enough for the federal government to keep a potentially life-saving drug away from Chloe.

Late last year, Chloe died without receiving CBD.

This should never have happened. We must ensure that this never happens again.

Just as our children deserve to be treated compassionately, so, too, do our veterans. Federal law currently prohibits VA doctors from prescribing medical marijuana when they

feel it is medically beneficial. Our veterans deserve the best medical advice from their doctors, not arbitrary limits on what their doctors can do to help them. Veterans are tough. They can handle frank advice from their doctors.

Earlier this month, a bipartisan group of Senators introduced a bill that would make vitally necessary, common sense changes to federal law that would allow for greater access to medically necessary marijuana: the Compassionate Access, Research Expansion and Respect States Act. The bill builds upon efforts here in the House of Representatives. I applaud all of these efforts, and am proud to help keep the momentum going by introducing a bipartisan House companion to this bill with my colleague DON YOUNG of Alaska.

I urge the House to pass this bill swiftly, bring a dose of sanity to our federal drug policy, and extend some much needed compassion to those suffering from horrible illnesses.

## RECOGNITION OF DR. C. KERN WILDENTHAL

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 23, 2015*

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pleasure to recognize Dr. C. Kern Wildenthal of Dallas, Texas. Dr. Wildenthal served as president of UT Southwestern for 22 years. He raised more than \$750 million for research and clinical programs at the medical school during 2001 and 2007.

Dr. Wildenthal is a visionary who led the effort to develop the North Campus of UT Southwestern, which is being named in his honor. “The C. Kern Wildenthal Research Building.” He is deserving of this tribute. Because of his leadership, the research and clinical programs at UT Southwestern have made significant contributions to the medical field.

Throughout his career, Dr. Wildenthal undertook world-class research initiatives. He spent more than 38 years building the reputation of UT Southwestern as a faculty member, dean and president. During his tenure, enrollment at the University quintupled in size, and the Medical Center's endowment grew from \$40 million to more than \$1.3 billion.

A stellar academic, Dr. Wildenthal earned his bachelor's degree from Sul Ross State University in Alpine, a medical degree from UT Southwestern and a doctorate from the University of Cambridge in England. Dr. Wildenthal trained at Bellevue Hospital in New York, Parkland Memorial Hospital in Dallas and the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute in Bethesda, Maryland. He led a cardiology research program and has published more than 120 science and medical journal articles.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. C. Kern Wildenthal is truly a phenomenal educator, physician, scientist and leader. A man fueled by dedication and committed to public service, he has set the bar high for his successor. He is the recipient of the 1975 Guggenheim Fellowship. He was elected to the Institute of Medicine in 1999. I

stand today to honor Dr. C. Kern Wildenthal and to thank him for his work in service to the people of Dallas and to everyone within and beyond our borders who benefit from his scientific vision and exemplary medical service.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF MS. SOFIA MENDOZA

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to celebrate the life of Sofia Mendoza, known to me and her other friends as Sophie, and to memorialize her as a passionate community leader whose advocacy will long be remembered in my hometown of San Jose. Throughout her life, Sophie was unwavering in her commitment to end the prejudicial treatment of underrepresented communities, and particularly of the Mexican-American community in East San Jose. Her leadership affected landmark changes across a diversity of city interests, from reform of education and criminal justice, to the manner in which city council members are elected today.

Sophie Mendoza was born in the small agricultural town of Fillmore, California. Her father Tiburcio was a labor organizer, and was a lifelong inspiration to her. Tiburcio had temporarily moved the family to Fillmore where he was organizing citrus and avocado pickers to strike against unjust working conditions. Fillmore would be one of many destinations as Sophie's father moved from one labor battle to the next.

Sophie's mother Margarita was also an active organizer alongside her husband. But Tiburcio initially looked to Sophie's younger brothers to carry the family torch of community activism. He would soon discover that it was his daughter, Sophie, who held the spark inside her. It was in high school that Sophie attempted her first organizing effort. By this time, her family had settled in Campbell. Her school had many clubs, but freshman Sophie was upset to discover it did not have a Spanish club. Her father taught her how to create support through the circulation of petitions and how to build coalitions of teachers and students. Her efforts were rewarded with a new club.

When Sophie married and moved to East San Jose with her husband Gilbert, her new surroundings provided her opportunity to take on one entrenched injustice after another. And these changes have left a lasting imprint on San Jose to this day. It was because of her organizing efforts that the first student walkout in California occurred at Roosevelt Junior High School to protest unequal education funding and discrimination by administrators. It was because of her that 2,000 activists marched to City Hall to speak out against the excessive use of force by the San Jose Police Department, and that 1,000 residents formed the Community Alert Patrol to monitor police activity.

And it was because of her that the first major health clinic was established in East

San Jose. I remember so well the forceful advocacy that made the East Valley Clinic a reality. It stands today as a tribute to Sophie's values.

And an important part of her legacy was working for reform of the system by which the city of San Jose elected city council members. She demanded the city dismantle its at-large election system, which underrepresented minority communities, and replace it with district representation. The newly drawn districts ensured a council seat to East San Jose, and provide a voice today to Vietnamese-American and Latino communities across San Jose.

Throughout her activism, Sophia Mendoza was a strong and proud mother. She pushed strollers as she marched to city hall. She brought crayons to city council meetings. In fact, her passion for justice was largely driven by her role as a mother. It was to protect her children's right to education that she first organized. In her words, "community organizing starts at home." Her two daughters, Linda Ramirez and Sandra Panlasigui, and her son William Mendoza, currently reside in San Jose, in the community their mother fought to make a just home for them.

Her passing was a sudden and immense loss for the San Jose community. She fought for issues that we continue to fight for across our nation: access to education and health care, equal treatment by the police, and workers rights. On behalf of my constituents, I thank her for her unwavering efforts to make San Jose a fair and just home for us all. I have lost a dear friend who made a tremendous difference.

CONGRATULATING GARY WILLIAMS

HON. ADRIAN SMITH

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gary Williams of Mitchell, Nebraska, on his dedication to serving the people of our state. Gary recently retired from the Nebraska Department of Motor Vehicles after more than 35 years of service.

Gary is a dedicated civil servant whose commitment to his work is a true testament to his character. He told me about his love for his job, which allowed him to make a positive impact on many Nebraskans during his years at the Department of Motor Vehicles.

On behalf of the people of Nebraska's Third District, I thank Mr. Williams for his service and congratulate him on the start of this new chapter in his life.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 2015

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote March 16–19 because of the birth of my daughter, Carmen Gabriela. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call 113—Yea  
Roll Call 114—Yea  
Roll Call 115—Yea  
Roll Call 116—Yea  
Roll Call 117—Yea  
Roll Call 118—Yea  
Roll Call 119—Yea  
Roll Call 120—No  
Roll Call 121—Yea  
Roll Call 122—No  
Roll Call 123—No  
Roll Call 124—No  
Roll Call 125—Yea  
Roll Call 126—Yea  
Roll Call 127—Yea  
Roll Call 128—Yea  
Roll Call 129—Yea

WOMEN IN WWII

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 23, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, they were tenacious, they were selfless and they were humble. They were the 350,000 women of the greatest generation who served in the U.S. Armed Forces. For many years their altruistic efforts went without recognition. However, these women were the sustaining fuel and energy in helping the U.S. victory during the great WWII. Not only were they the backbone of the nation, they were the backbones of their families. These women represent the word patriot to its fullest extent. Women joined the war effort in two distinct and important ways:

Some supported America at home in factories, machine shops and businesses while taking care of their families. Others joined the military and fought the war in uniform.

WWII not only changed American history but changed American society.

With over 16 million fighting overseas, typical male roles were left open, creating enormous needs throughout the nation. At the request of First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt, women stepped right in to assume their position in the workforce. The traditional home was forever altered with more women joining the workforce.

America was captivated by the new personas of women. Rosie the Riveter served as a constant reminder that women can absolutely do it too. Women were the concrete foundation in what was a man's world. Women were not only wives and mothers; they were the workforce for the "Arsenal of Democracy". They were truck drivers, air plane mechanics, lab technicians, radio operators, meteorologists, translators, and photograph analysts.

Mr. Speaker, on a personal note, when my mother, Dorrace Hill, was a teenager she was one of the home front warriors who answered the call. She went to school during the day, and worked 40 hours a week as a receptionist at the Kyle Hotel in Temple, Texas.

But she spent a great deal of time as a Red Cross Volunteer and later an employee at McCloskey Army Hospital—later a VA Hospital—caring for wounded GIs. (After Germany surrendered in 1945 my Army Dad, TSGT Virgil Poe, was sent from Europe to nearby Ft.

Hood, TEXAS to be reequipped for the invasion of Japan when WWII ended. He later met and married my mother in Temple, Texas. Now they live in Houston, Texas.)

Other women began serving in America's Armed Forces. These volunteers became members of the U.S. Army, and Navy. As nurses they tended sick and wounded throughout the U.S. and the world. They took care of American warriors worldwide. Texas pioneered these efforts for female warriors.

Texas was home to the Women Air Force Service Pilots (WASP). These women were the first women in history to fly America's military aircrafts. Texas is the only state where these women completed WASP flight training. Sweetwater, Texas became home to Avenger Field—the only base in history to train exclusively women to fly military aircraft. These women flew all types of military aircraft that would later be used by male pilots in combat. Women would also serve in the U.S. Navy as WAVES (Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service).

These would be both in the enlisted and officer ranks. One of the most influential women during the 1940's was Oveta Culp Hobby. It should be no surprise that she was a Texan. Of course!

Oveta was the first director of the Women's Army Corps (WAC) the women's branch of the U.S. Army. Oveta paved the way for women warriors, recognizing that women too could serve their country. She went on to become the first secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare under President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

From Rosie the Riveter, to my mother, to Oveta Hobby and the thousands more women who served in the home land and foreign lands, they were that remarkable breed of Americans who deserve our utmost thanks. They were the very heart behind the cause.

They became role models for future generations. General George S. Patton once remarked that we should thank God that such men as our warriors lived; we should too praise God that such remarkable women lived. And that's just the way it is.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 24, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

##### MARCH 25

- 9 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Department of Defense  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Defense Health Program.  
SD-192
- Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on SeaPower  
To hold hearings to examine Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-222
- 2 p.m.  
Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC) accountability, focusing on nonbank designations.  
SD-538
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine securing the border, focusing on understanding and addressing the root causes of Central American migration to the United States.  
SD-342
- 2:15 p.m.  
Committee on Foreign Relations  
To hold hearings to examine the nominations of Paul A. Folmsbee, of Oklahoma, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Sudan, Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas, and Katherine Simonds Dhanani, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Somalia, all of the Department of State.  
SD-419
- Special Committee on Aging  
To hold hearings to examine the fight against Alzheimer's disease, focusing on a treatment by 2025.  
SD-106
- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Energy.  
SD-124
- Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support  
To hold hearings to examine the current state of readiness of U.S. forces in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.  
SR-232A
- Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.  
SR-253
- 3 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces  
To hold hearings to examine ballistic missile defense programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for

fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

##### MARCH 26

- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. Central Command, U.S. Africa Command and U.S. Special Operations Command programs and budget in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program; with the possibility of a closed session in SVC-217 following the open session.  
SD-G50
- Committee on Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings to examine the Administration's Quadrennial Energy Review.  
SD-366
- 10 a.m.  
Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies  
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Labor.  
SD-138
- Committee on Appropriations  
Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs  
To hold hearings to examine diplomacy, development, and national security.  
SD-192
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine securing the border, focusing on defining the current population living in the shadows and addressing future flows.  
SD-342
- Committee on the Judiciary  
Business meeting to consider S. 665, to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and S. 125, to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020.  
SD-226
- Committee on Veterans' Affairs  
To hold hearings to examine Veterans' Affairs opioid prescription policy, practice and procedures.  
SR-418

##### APRIL 14

- 9:30 a.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
To hold hearings to examine U.S. defense policy issues pertaining to the Asia-Pacific theater.  
SD-G50

##### APRIL 15

- 2:30 p.m.  
Committee on Armed Services  
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces  
To hold hearings to examine the National Nuclear Security Administration plans and programs in review of

the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.		fiscal year 2016 for military construction and military family housing for select combatant commanders and select defense agencies.		POSTPONEMENTS
	SR-222			MARCH 26
APRIL 16				2:30 p.m.
Time to be announced		9:30 a.m.	SD-124	Committee on Armed Services
Committee on Appropriations		Committee on Armed Services		Subcommittee on Airland
Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies		To hold hearings to examine U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.		To hold hearings to examine Army modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for			SD-G50	SR-222

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 24, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. FOXX).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 24, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 1 minute a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1000

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) at 10 a.m.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### AFGHANISTAN: THE GRAVEYARD OF EMPIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, last week in the House Armed Services Committee, we had a hearing on the budget for fiscal year 2016. Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Mar-

tin Dempsey, both testified before the committee, and I have great respect for both of them. I asked them if, after a decade in Afghanistan, keeping troops in Afghanistan for 9 more years would even make a difference.

Last year in his Politico article, "Down the Opium Rathole," Roger Simon argues, "If you spent 13 years pounding money down a rathole with little to show for it, you might wake up one morning and say: 'Hey, I'm going to stop pounding money down this rathole.' . . . Unfortunately, the U.S. Government does not think this way. Even though our combat troops are leaving Afghanistan, our money will continue to flow there, billion after billion."

Mr. Speaker, I submit this Politico article for the RECORD.

[From Politico, Oct. 29, 2014]

DOWN THE OPIUM RATHOLE

(By Roger Simon)

If you spent 13 years pounding money down a rathole with little to show for it, you might wake up one morning and say: "Hey, I'm going to stop pounding money down this rathole."

Unfortunately, the U.S. government does not think this way.

The U.S. government wakes up every morning and says: "The rathole is looking a little empty today. Let's pound a few more billion dollars down there."

And when that rathole is Afghanistan, the billions are essentially without end.

Even though our combat troops are leaving Afghanistan, our money will continue to flow there, billion after billion.

The National Priorities Project says "\$753.3 billion has been allocated for the war in Afghanistan since 2001, including \$89.1 billion in fiscal year 2014."

President Obama hopes to reduce U.S. forces in Afghanistan to just 9,800 troops next year. But the money spigot will not be turned off.

Afghanistan is one of the poorest countries in the world. In Asia, only Bangladesh is poorer. According to the World Food Programme, half the population lives below the poverty line; Afghanistan has one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world; and more than half the children under 5 years old are chronically malnourished.

Yet at one thing Afghanistan succeeds superbly: Afghanistan illegally produces and exports opium, morphine and heroin in such quantities that, according to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Afghanistan is "practically the exclusive supplier of the world's deadliest drug [93% of the global opiates market]. Leaving aside 19th-century China, that had a population at that time 15 times larger than today's Afghanistan, no other country in the world has ever produced narcotics on such a deadly scale."

The United States has spent billions trying to stop this trade, but it has failed utterly. In fact, under U.S. occupation, drug production has increased.

Opiates come from opium poppies, which are planted in profusion in Afghanistan. More than eight years ago, we decided to spray the poppy fields with herbicides, but this was unpopular with the Afghan government, which didn't want its illegal drug profits to stop. And even some counterinsurgency experts feared that killing the opium poppies would drive angry poppy farmers into the arms of the Taliban.

Lots of people get confused between counterinsurgency and counterterrorism, by the way. A military expert once explained it to me this way:

Counterinsurgency is when you try to win the hearts and minds of the people.

Counterterrorism is when you kill the people and then try to win their hearts and minds.

The United States has tried both policies in Afghanistan for years.

And while the Taliban has become adept at fighting counterterrorism, the Afghan government has become adept at exploiting counterinsurgency.

Take narcotics. How does a country that has few and terrible roads, like Afghanistan, get 93 percent of the world's opiates out of its country?

One way is by air. And in January 2013, the U.S. government said it would no longer grant contracts to a private Afghanistan airline because the U.S. military's anti-corruption unit said the airline "was involved in bulk opium smuggling."

But the Afghan government howled, and the U.S. lifted its ban.

There are other examples, but only one conclusion. As Michael Lumpkin, assistant secretary of defense for special operations/low-intensity conflict, said in a letter on Oct. 7: "In our opinion, the failure to reduce poppy cultivation and increase eradication is due to the lack of Afghan government support for the effort."

But over 12 years, the U.S. government pounded \$7.6 billion down the drug eradication rathole in Afghanistan.

In a report last week, John Sopko, the U.S. special inspector general for Afghanistan reconstruction, said: "By every conceivable metric, we've failed. Production and cultivation are up, interdiction and eradication are down, financial support to the insurgency is up, and addiction and abuse are at unprecedented levels in Afghanistan."

To our government, the solution was clear: Pound more money down the rathole.

As The Washington Post recently reported: "The State Department requested \$137.5 million in funding for counter-narcotics efforts in Afghanistan for fiscal year 2014, a \$31 million increase over fiscal year 2012."

Further, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently wrote a report saying we should give Afghanistan "between \$5 billion and \$8 billion annually for at least a decade" even though most U.S. troops will (supposedly) be long gone by then.

So we have spent \$7.6 billion on a drug eradication program that increased drug production. And now we are planning to pour \$50 billion to \$80 billion into that same country over the next 10 years.

And you know what worries me? Pretty soon we are going to be talking about real money.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Mr. JONES. In recent days, the waste of billions of dollars in Afghanistan has been dominating the headlines:

March 20 of this year, "Afghanistan Can't Manage Billions in Aid, U.S. Inspector Finds"; March 14, 2015, "C.I.A. Cash Ended Up in Coffers of Al Qaeda"; May 4, 2013, "Karzai Says He Was Assured C.I.A. Would Continue Delivering Bags of Cash."

Mr. Speaker, the squandering of billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars by the Afghan Government is one small aspect of the rampant waste, fraud, and abuse in Afghanistan.

The House is looking to vote on the budget produced by the Republican majority this week which continues billions of dollars the military deserves, but the billions of dollars going to Afghanistan are a waste. The Republican budget also provides billions of dollars for emergency war funding to get around sequestration. Why do we have sequestration in the first place? Because Congress has not passed an honest budget in years.

A couple of weeks ago, the House Armed Services Committee had a hearing on U.S. policy in Afghanistan, where I asked General John Campbell, U.S. Army, commander of the International Security Assistance Force and United States Forces in Afghanistan, if he will ever have a successor who will be honest with Congress and the American people about the fact that we have done as much as we can do in Afghanistan. He did not give me a direct answer, but his response was this: "For very little continued investment, we can make this a shining light of central Asia."

Mr. Speaker, if I had had more time, I would have asked General Campbell what his definition of "very little continued investment" is when we have already spent billions and billions of dollars and spilled blood in Afghanistan.

There are bridges, roads, educational needs, and veterans benefits to provide here in the United States. Let's focus on their needs rather than on chasing something that will never happen. History has proven Afghanistan will never change. It is a graveyard of empires.

Mr. Speaker, without a debate in Congress, President Obama signed a Bilateral Security Agreement with Afghanistan to keep our United States troops there for 9 more years. Let's cut the 9 years to 3 or 4 years and bring our troops home.

Finally, with an ever-climbing \$18 trillion debt, the American people are frustrated. Congress needs to impose spending controls to save taxpayer money.

Mr. Speaker, may God continue to bless our men and women in uniform, and may God continue to bless America.

#### THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the latest chapter in the drama of Republican control of Congress. This is their first opportunity with complete control of both Chambers to bring into focus what they would do governing, and the results aren't pretty.

We are discussing this week a budget that has been labeled by press accounts that actually give them the benefit of the doubt as being phony or a disaster. It has been condemned by many conservative commentators as a sham.

The purported \$5.5 trillion in budget savings over the next 10 years provides no good explanation about how it can actually be achieved. There is a trillion dollars in unspecified reductions "other mandatory programs." They would abolish the Affordable Care Act, but somehow keep all of the revenues that finance it.

There are a few areas of clarity which are hardly comforting. The ratcheting down support for our low-income college students through Pell grants is hardly a step forward and will be widely condemned the more clearly people understand it.

We are back to the Medicare voucher, which may have a different name but is still toxic. A measure of their understanding of its unpopularity is their refusal to put it into effect for seniors now. Instead they would have people approaching retirement age in their mid-fifties who will be able to enjoy the benefits and uncertainty of a voucherized Medicare program.

It is silent on the transportation crisis that is already upon us. The latest transportation extension expires May 31. Resources are not going to be available to get us through this fiscal year, let alone the next fiscal year that they would budget for. And if the budget that they have foreseen would somehow be enacted as written, the next fiscal year would see massive cuts for every single State across the country for transportation.

It continues to chip away at the ability of the Federal Government to hire and maintain the skilled workforce Americans depend upon. One of the most bizarre examples is their continued attack on the ability of the IRS, the Internal Revenue Service, to perform the functions necessary to finance our government.

What business cripples its accounts receivable department? And the proof of this approach is available to any American who tries to call the IRS to get information. It is almost impossible to get through now, let alone with the budget cuts that are anticipated. You can ask any CPA in your district about the devastating effects of crippling the IRS on not just the average citizen, but even on people who can hire the best legal and accounting services available.

While the IRS may be an attractive target for their assault on government, the attack is not limited to the Internal Revenue or the EPA. This budget will have crippling effects on the American way of life all across the country. This budgetary approach that is already baked in produces fewer people to be able to deal with the services for the exploding number of retired people seeking help from the Social Security Administration. It shortchanges the maintenance of our national parks. It underfunds medical research that can make a huge difference for American families.

Mr. Speaker, there are things that could be done. I introduced legislation this week, the REIN-IN Act, which would cut \$100 billion of unnecessary spending on nuclear weapons over the next 10 years. These savings could be used to shore up the Department of Defense without resorting to the budget gimmicks that they are using.

That is the bitter reality of their budget approach. It is not their theatrics or the creative terminology. Republicans are avoiding the hard questions and reasonable solutions. It is simply an assault on providing Americans with the services they want, need, and deserve. The more people understand this, the sooner we are likely to get the changes we need in the political process to get us back on course.

This budget may be a sham and a fraud, but it contains dangerous elements that will affect every family in America. We can and should do better.

#### CELEBRATING THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS HOWARD KEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished public service of the Honorable Thomas Howard Kean, 48th Governor of New Jersey, who will become 80 years old next month. Governor Kean is one of the most respected statesmen in the country due to his tremendous contributions to the civic life of New Jersey and of the Nation.

Governor Kean was born on April 21, 1935, in New York City, to Elizabeth Stuyvesant Howard and Robert Winthrop Kean. His father served for 20 years in the House of Representatives and became the ranking member on the Ways and Means Committee. His grandfather, Hamilton Fish Kean, was United States Senator from New Jersey. Historians can trace his family's long and proud history of public service to William Livingston, signer of the United States Constitution and the first Governor of New Jersey. Governor Kean was graduated from Princeton University in 1957, and after military service returned to Livingston, New Jersey, named for his ancestor.

Governor Kean started his own career in public office with election to the New Jersey General Assembly in 1967. Known as a thoughtful and diligent legislator, he was elected to lead the chamber in 1972, when he became the youngest speaker of the general assembly in New Jersey history. Governor Kean's two successful campaigns for Governor of New Jersey were each of historical significance: in 1981, his election marked the closest margin of victory in State history, while his 1985 reelection was the largest margin of victory ever recorded in a gubernatorial race in our State.

Mr. Speaker, New Jersey saw significant improvements to public education, environmental protection, access to high-quality health care, and stable taxing and spending policies during the Kean governorship. His most defining legacy was his record of inclusive public engagement that facilitated progress, compromise, and the advancement of the best interests of New Jersey. Following his time in Trenton, Governor Kean served for 15 years as president of Drew University in Madison, New Jersey, where applications, the physical structure, and the endowment increased dramatically.

In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, President Bush turned to Governor Kean and former Indiana Congressman Lee Hamilton to chair the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States. The two chairs led an exhaustive review of the intelligence, homeland security, and governmental response before and after the acts of terror perpetrated against this country. The 9/11 Commission's work and leadership drew bipartisan acclaim and resulted in major reforms to improve our Nation's security preparedness. The United States is safer today thanks to the tremendous work of Governor Kean and his colleagues.

I had the honor to serve as an assistant counsel to Governor Kean in Trenton and am honored now to call him a constituent in the congressional district I serve. I have learned continually from Governor Kean, whether through observation or instruction, and I am among the many New Jerseyans who consider him a mentor.

Governor Kean is a wonderful son and brother, husband, father and grandfather, educator, leader, colleague, and friend. He and his wife, the former Deborah Bye of Wilmington, Delaware, have raised three fine children, twin sons, Thomas and Reed, and daughter, Alexandra. His son, Thomas H. Kean, Jr., is my successor as minority leader in the New Jersey State Senate.

On his 80th birthday, I congratulate Governor Thomas H. Kean and wish him many years ahead of good health and happiness. The United States of America owes him a significant debt of gratitude for all that he has done in service to the Nation.

□ 1015

#### REPUBLICAN FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise against the Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution. This budget proposal would reduce critical economic investments, undermine growth in our jobs, as well as attempt to reduce the deficit on the backs of our students, seniors, low-income families, and the American middle class.

The Republican 2016 budget abandons our students. Our students, overall, are our country's future. It abandons our students by making cuts to college aid, research, job training, and innovation. It also abandons our most vulnerable. It would end Medicare as we know it and make harmful changes to Medicaid, threatening our seniors across this country.

The 2016 Republican proposal also threatens low-income families by reducing the food stamp program and by repealing the Affordable Care Act, leaving 16.4 million Americans who now have access to quality, affordable health care coverage without a viable option. In my State of Alabama alone, over 171,000 Alabamians have selected a plan and/or were automatically enrolled in the ACA—that is over 171,000 Alabamians. These citizens will be abandoned by the Republican budget proposal and would not have insurance for quality health care.

Furthermore, the Republican budget proposal does nothing to help incentivize job creation or put Americans back to work. We are currently on a path towards growth and prosperity.

Under President Obama's leadership, the economy has added more than 12 million private sector jobs in the last 60 months. The Republican 2016 budget proposal would reverse those valuable gains—12 million private sector jobs in the last 60 months.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that instead of putting forth a budget that would create jobs, balance our budget, and spur economic growth throughout our country, we are once again seeing divisive politics at work. Instead of attempting to balance the budget on the backs of American families, as this budget proposal does, we should be seeking to find a fair and balanced plan to responsibly reduce our deficit, to grow our economy, to strengthen our infrastructure, to spur innovation, and to create jobs.

As we move forward, it is my hope that we will pass a 2016 Federal budget that works for all Americans and leaves no one behind.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the Republican 2016 budget resolution.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican budget proposal released last week will serve as a strong blueprint to put our country on a long-term path to fiscal responsibility and sustainability.

Unlike the President's proposed budget, which is the same tax-and-spend policies that have not worked for the President or the American people, the House Republican proposal aims to balance the budget within 10 years without ever raising taxes.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, marked the fifth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act being signed into law. Let me be clear: ObamaCare is certainly not worth celebrating.

The House majority budget proposal would repeal ObamaCare in full, including the tax increases, erroneous regulations, and mandates, all while promoting freedom of choice, affordability, and true patient-centered health care solutions.

Furthermore, the budget proposal aims to further ensure a strong national security, economic competitiveness, and an atmosphere that will foster positive growth throughout Pennsylvania and all across the country.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support a clear path forward. The American people deserve as much.

#### BLACK LUNG BENEFITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to introduce my first bill, a resolution to protect black lung benefits.

Miners work hard to keep the lights on, to power our homes and businesses, and to provide for their own families.

In West Virginia alone, over 18,000 men and women work in the coal mines. It is good work, it is important work, work that puts food on the table and provides a better life for their families.

While great strides have been made in mine safety, some miners will still develop black lung disease.

The Federal Government made a promise decades ago to help coal miners and their families if miners develop black lung. Since 1973, miners have known that if they get black lung, the Federal Government will be there and stand up for them. More than 100,000 miners from West Virginia have filed for black lung benefits. And today, almost 5,000 miners and their families depend on these benefits for care for their families when they are no longer able to work.



Congress must uphold, protect, and secure these crucial benefits for our hardworking miners and their families. As we in Congress work on health care reform, we must remember the miners who toil above ground and underground to power our Nation. Any reforms must secure the black lung benefits program and ensure that these critical benefits will be available for our miners and their families. We made them a promise. We must keep that promise.

#### REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS WANT A STRONG U.S.-ISRAEL RELATIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, amid concerns of hostile treatment against Israel at the United Nations, I launched an initiative where I wrote letters to dozens of foreign ambassadors to the United Nations and explained why it was important that they stood against anti-Israel actions at the U.N.

I am saddened, Mr. Speaker, that the United States is apparently now in need of such a letter. Recent public reports indicate that President Obama warned Prime Minister Netanyahu, fresh off of his democratic election by the Israeli people, that the U.S. will reassess our options at the U.N.

Think about that for a second, Mr. Speaker. President Obama has left everyone with the impression that the United States could change its course and abandon Israel at the U.N. I can't think of a worse message to send to our friends in Israel and a better gift to the anti-Israel factions of the international community.

The delegitimization efforts of Israel are on the rise around the world and in the United Nations. Israel needs its friends in the United States now more than ever before.

These are bipartisan concerns, Mr. Speaker. Republicans and Democrats alike want a strong U.S.-Israel relationship, and the days of this administration challenging and undercutting Israel's Prime Minister, regardless of who that Prime Minister may be, must stop. The stakes are far too high. The challenges are amongst us.

We have to stand and speak with one united voice, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we will stand shoulder-to-shoulder with our one true ally. This is not right versus left; this is right versus wrong.

#### GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 194th anniversary of Greek independence.

Citizens of Greece have always been a proud people, in body, mind, and spirit. From Pericles, the Greek statesman and general, dubbed "the first citizen of Athens"; to Plato, who laid a groundwork in philosophy so vast that the entirety of European philosophical tradition is said to simply be a footnote to his work; to Count Ioannis Kapodistrias, the first head of state of an independent Greece, Greeks have been exceptional.

I am almost certain that Thomas Jefferson cast an eye across the Atlantic towards Greece when he uttered these words in 1821:

"The flames kindled on the 4th of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism. On the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them."

It is no coincidence that the Feast of Annunciation—Evangelismos—a commemoration of the conception of Jesus Christ, is also celebrated on March 25, just as Greek Independence Day is celebrated.

I am blessed to be of two cultures that have been beacons of freedom for all of civilization: the place of my birth, the land of the free and the home of the brave, the United States of America; and the land of my ancestors, the birthplace of democracy, the Hellenic Republic.

Many Greeks fought for years, holding on to their heritage, culture, and faith. Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the emblem of freedom for Hellenes, the flag bearing a white cross and nine blue and white stripes representing the nine letters in Eleftheria, meaning freedom.

Eight years of bloodshed and battle led to the Treaty of Adrianople, the formal declaration of a free and independent Greece.

Greece was the world's first advanced civilization, one that provided a cultural heritage that has influenced the world. Firsts in philosophy, mathematics, politics, sports, and art all stemmed from a free Greece.

Liberty and justice, freedom to determine the path of one's own life, these are human desires, and they were embodied by Greece throughout their fight for independence.

Those unyielding Hellenes paid life and limb for those desires, and generations of Greeks for decades to come owe their ancestors thanks.

As George Washington once said:

"Liberty, when it begins to take root, is a plant of rapid growth."

This held true in Greece in 1821, as it did in America in 1776.

"Freedom or Death" was the battle cry of the revolutionaries nearly 200 years ago. It rings true today. Freedom is a powerful and beautiful notion.

The Greek people achieved that for themselves 194 years ago, and I am proud to celebrate in memory of those

who fought bravely to shed the shackles of the Ottoman Empire.

We celebrate Greek independence to reaffirm the common democratic heritage we share. And, as Americans, we must continue to pursue the spirit of freedom and liberty, which characterizes both of our great nations.

God bless America. Long live Greece—Zito i Ellas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida will provide the Clerk a translation of his remarks for the RECORD.

#### DENY AMNESTY CREDITS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to speak on the recent introduction of my bill, H.R. 1332, the Deny Amnesty Credits Act of 2015, in order to put our country and our Americans first.

As a response to the President's unauthorized and illegal actions granting amnesty, my bill will prevent those who are granted deferred action under Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, and the Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents, or DAPA, from qualifying for the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit.

As it stands, the President's illegal executive amnesty would allow illegal aliens to obtain Social Security numbers and the ability to receive as much as \$35,000 of hardworking taxpayer moneys on their tax returns from the United States Treasury. The money that is from our hardworking taxpayers, don't they deserve to be put first?

□ 1030

According to the Congressional Budget Office, this would cost American taxpayers \$10.2 billion because of an illegal executive program never authorized by Congress.

America can no longer be the world's ATM. This President has trampled upon our Constitution and has circumvented Congress to ensure his political legacy far too many times, and it must stop. Instead of working with Congress to secure our borders and to uphold the law of the land, this administration is offering executive amnesty and tax credits to illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to put America first. We must hold this administration accountable for actions that circumvent Congress' constitutional power of the purse, costing billions of taxpayer dollars—our taxpayers.

My bill, the Deny Amnesty Credits Act of 2015, will do just that. It will put America first. It will help put us on that path. It will help our hard-working Americans to be first and foremost

in the hearts of us—of our Congress, the elected Representatives—who are, quite frankly, charged with putting Americans first.

Mr. Speaker, did I mention? It is time to put America first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Reverend Dennis Fountain, Moses Lake Baptist Church, Moses Lake, Washington, offered the following prayer:

Dear God and Heavenly Father, we come before You today humbling ourselves and seeking Your help. I want to thank You, first of all, for who You are.

Thank You for Your goodness, mercy, and grace in each of our lives, and thank You for the blessings You give to us every day.

Lord, I want to thank You for each and every Representative and all they do to direct our great country. I pray today that You would have your hand of grace and guidance upon them. I pray, God, that You would give them the wisdom they need on a daily basis to fulfill the office You have appointed them to.

I also ask that You would guide, encourage, and protect them in their personal lives, as well as their families and loved ones.

I pray for Your blessings upon our Nation and upon our day. I love You, Lord. It is in the name of Jesus Christ I pray.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HILL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING PASTOR DENNIS FOUNTAIN

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise with the honor to welcome today's guest chaplain, Pastor Dennis Fountain, the pastor of Moses Lake Baptist Church in Moses Lake, Washington.

Pastor Fountain has crossed the Cascade Mountain divide to serve common needs on both sides of Washington State. Pastor Fountain began his ministry in 2006 as a youth pastor in Lake-wood, in western Washington. He headed east across the Cascades to plant Moses Lake Baptist Church, which first opened its doors 4 years ago this month. Pastor Fountain also currently serves as the chaplain for the Grant County Sheriff's Office. I would like to thank him for his faithfulness and commitment to serve the needs of the people of our State, particularly first responders and the law enforcement community.

It is my privilege to welcome Pastor Fountain and his wife, Hannah, to the House of Representatives as fellow Washingtonians. I extend the thanks of this body for his delivering the morning prayer, and I ask my colleagues to join me in making Pastor Fountain's time in our Nation's Capital warm and inviting.

#### RESIGNATIONS AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AND COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Nebraska) laid before the House the following resignations as a

member of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 23, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives, The Capitol,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER BOEHNER: I write to offer my official resignation as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and the House Committee on Homeland Security, effective today, March 23, 2015. Both committees are vital to ensuring our nation is secure at home and abroad, and it has been an honor and a privilege to serve on these two committees over the last four years.

Sincerely,

STEVEN M. PALAZZO,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

#### ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 165

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Palazzo.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Russell.

Ms. FOXX (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### FLAT STANLEY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome a distinguished visitor to the House floor today.

Flat Stanley is visiting Washington, D.C., this week from Miss Martin's second-grade class at Clemmons Elementary in Clemmons, North Carolina.

Through Flat Stanley's adventures, the students in Miss Martin's class are learning about geography and maps.

It has been more than 50 years since Stanley Lambchop was first flattened by a bulletin board in Jeff Brown's 1964 children's classic. Today, the Flat Stanley Project is a global literacy activity that engages hundreds of thousands of children and includes more than 6,000 schools registered in 88 countries around the world.

It has been my pleasure to show Flat Stanley around the U.S. Capitol. I hope he has a safe trip back to North Carolina's Fifth Congressional District and that Miss Martin's class enjoys learning about his visit to Congress.

#### INCREASE HARBOR MAINTENANCE FUNDING

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call on Congress to keep its promise to invest in our Nation's ports.

The harbor maintenance tax collected at our ports should be returned to our ports, not stockpiled or diverted to other spending.

For years, only about 50 percent of the tax was returned to our ports. The harbor maintenance trust fund now has a surplus of approximately \$9 billion.

Last year, with bipartisan support, we passed the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which set targets for annual increases in usage of the trust fund, leading to 100 percent use by the year 2025.

I have offered an amendment to the budget resolution to meet that target funding level for 2016 established in WRRDA, and I am disappointed that the Rules Committee did not rule it in order.

To keep our United States ports globally competitive, we should fully use the harbor maintenance trust fund to maintain and improve our harbors and navigation channels.

#### ARKANSAS RUN FOR THE FALLEN

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the fourth annual Arkansas Run for the Fallen. Congratulations too to run organizer Chief Master Sergeant Bubba Beason.

Several years ago, to honor Arkansas' fallen heroes, the Arkansas Run for the Fallen was created.

This year's run started in Ozark, Arkansas, last Friday and concluded at the State capitol in Little Rock on Sunday afternoon.

A team of Active Duty and Reserve airmen, soldiers, marines, and Arkansas State Police embarked on a 146-mile memorial run to honor every Ar-

kansan who has died since the attacks on September 11, 2001.

I had the honor of attending the final ceremony on Sunday afternoon and was deeply moved to be in the presence of approximately 30 Gold Star families that were in attendance.

These men have served their country bravely, and their example and sacrifice are ones all Americans and Arkansans can admire.

#### JUST THE FACTS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as Congress debates how to best craft the 2016 budget proposal, I hope that heavier consideration will be given to reality over ideology.

Let's look at the facts of what has actually worked in the past and what has not. Because in real life, the facts show that Democratic administrations have outperformed the Republican administrations in creating jobs by a significant margin.

The most recent jobs report, for instance, showed that the economy added another 295,000 jobs in February. That is the 60th consecutive month of private sector job growth, and the longest streak in history that has been recorded.

Over the past 5 years, the American automobile industry added over 500,000 jobs due to the Democratic-led restructuring.

And during the past 4 years, while our friends on the other side of the aisle predicted hyperinflation, the collapse of the dollar, and worse, we put more people back to work than all other advanced economies combined.

Let's face the facts and consider what has worked in the real world in creating jobs.

#### CELEBRATION OF U.S.-TAIWAN RELATIONSHIP

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to celebrate the strong relationship between Taiwan and the United States. With the 70th anniversary of the ending of World War II this year and the 36th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act on April 10, we can reflect how this relationship has been beneficial for both countries.

Prior to World War II, America recognized the importance of protecting the Chinese people from invaders. In 1940, the U.S. operated a clandestine air support mission to protect the citizens of the Republic of China, carried out by a courageous volunteer group of pilots. Known as the Flying Tigers,

this group became the 14th Air Force and included my father, the late First Lieutenant Hugh Wilson.

America is eternally grateful that the Chinese military in 1942 rescued most of the crews after 15 U.S. planes crashed in China following the Doolittle Raid, which had been formed at Columbia Army Air Base, South Carolina.

Today, I am encouraging everyone to recognize the critical importance of the U.S.-Taiwan relationship and its continuation.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### VETERANS EDUCATION TAX SECURITY ACT

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, today, veterans who are disabled can get their Federal student loan debt discharged. But, unfortunately, the Department of Education reports discharged debt to the IRS, where it is considered as income for Federal and possible State tax purposes. In many instances, having Federal student loan debt discharged results in a substantial tax liability.

That is why I am introducing the Veterans Education Tax Security Act—the VETS Act. This bill will ensure that disabled veterans, deceased veterans, and deceased members of the Armed Forces are not financially penalized when their Federal student loan debts are lawfully discharged.

As veterans ourselves, Congressman ZINKE and I both understand the importance of putting politics aside to support our soldiers and veterans who have risked their whole lives and their families to defend our country. They, or their families, should not be penalized when Federal student loans are forgiven because of death or disability.

I thank Congressman ZINKE for his support on this issue and look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to champion fairness for our veterans.

#### FIGHTING FOR OUR FISHING INDUSTRY

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of one of New Hampshire's most vital industries—the fishing industry.

For nearly 400 years, our fishing industry has helped sustain and build our local economy in the seacoast region of New Hampshire, providing thousands of steady jobs and millions of dollars in

economic opportunity for the Granite State annually.

Unfortunately, increasing and constantly evolving government mandates are threatening to put an end to this very historic industry.

At a time when our Nation's job creators are already struggling to add jobs, increase revenue, and compete with cheaper international companies, the last thing that we should require of them is to spend their already limited time and resources on adhering to pages and pages of costly Federal regulations.

It is my charge to fight for regulatory relief and to strengthen New Hampshire's commercial fishing industry, which for so long has been an essential part of the New England tradition.

This remains one of my top priorities, and I will continue to work tirelessly in a bipartisan fashion with the New England region to preserve this industry, which is so essential to our Granite State.

□ 1215

#### SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE, Mr. Speaker, last week, the Republicans released their budget, which is a roadmap of their priorities and their values. Just as has been the case for the past few years, it comes as no surprise that this budget will squeeze hard-working American families and make them, again, work harder and get less.

One of our priorities must be to end the across-the-board sequestration cuts that have strangled our investments in national priorities like education, research, and innovation. Unfortunately, this GOP budget goes further and jeopardizes national security by keeping sequester cuts on our military and our defense needs.

Sadly, the past few months of Congress have been nothing more than continued giveaways to special interests and the wealthy and pandering to the most extreme voices, the Tea Party voices in Congress.

Today, the Democrats released our budget. This is a budget that works for hard-working Americans. It protects national security. It gives Michiganders and families all across America the tools they need to buy a house, to send their kids to college, and to save for a decent retirement.

We have got to put away these fights.

#### WPSU-TV CELEBRATES ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, Penn State University's public television station, WPSU-TV, celebrated its 50th anniversary.

On March 1, 1965, WPSU transmitted its first broadcast signal from atop Penfield Mountain, and viewers for the first time watched "Saludos Amigos," an introductory Spanish class aimed at schoolchildren across central Pennsylvania. Since that initial broadcast, WPSU has dedicated itself to informing and engaging central Pennsylvania communities and beyond.

More recently, WPSU has looked to make a global impact by expanding its documentary production. WPSU-TV has produced several award-winning projects, such as "Telling Amy's Story," which has reached more than 6 million people through on-air broadcasts, online, and at various community events.

Mr. Speaker, today, WPSU-TV reaches approximately 515,000 households in 29 counties through cable, satellite, and over-the-air delivery.

As a graduate of Penn State University, I am so proud of all that WPSU-TV has accomplished, and I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing them for 50 terrific years.

#### VETERANS MEDICAL ACCESS ACT

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to serve our veterans as well as they have served us and our country. That means a lifelong commitment to their health and well-being.

Veterans who are severely disabled or blinded after they return home are eligible for medical care at VA specialty rehabilitation clinics, where we can improve their quality of life and independence; but, too often, veterans cannot afford the cost of the trip.

The Blinded Veterans Association of America estimates that, even though these VA clinics have long wait lists, one of four beds is empty because veterans who need care cannot afford to pay for transportation for their care.

That is why I have introduced the Veterans Medical Access Act, legislation to reimburse blinded and severely disabled veterans for travel expenses in Ventura County and across the country so they can access the lifesaving and life-changing care they need.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in support of this critical legislation.

#### TRAILBLAZER BETTY WALL

(Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Women's History Month, which we celebrate as a nation each March, and to pay respect to those women across the generations who have been trailblazers in so many ways, including in our military.

In 1944, one such remarkable woman was blazing trails in the skies over what is now Nellis Air Force Base, which is in my district. Betty Wall, whom I had the opportunity to speak to yesterday, was one of those Women Airforce Service Pilots during World War II.

When a skeptical male pilot would climb into her aircraft for training, she treated him to an introductory flight he would never forget. As she put the aircraft through its incredible combat maneuvers, the guy in the backseat had no choice but to marvel at her skill and expertise, on par with the men who were allowed to go into combat.

In 2010, Ms. Wall and her fellow WASPs received the well-deserved honor of the Congressional Gold Medal. Now, decades later, she has been followed by many other female pilots who continue to break barriers and lead the way.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I call on us as a nation to pay tribute to these amazing women during the month of March.

#### LIFTING DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE BUDGET CAPS

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as the House begins to prepare to discuss the next year's fiscal budget, we need a budget that supports hard-working Americans, not one that puts our families in jeopardy.

The GOP budget ends Medicare as we know it; it cuts Pell grants; it decimates Head Start, and it doubles down on policies that put working families further behind. One thing that we all need to fear in this budget is the harmful, arbitrary budget caps on both our nondefense and defense programs. These caps hurt all Americans and make our military vulnerable.

Our military leadership has made clear that the budget caps are harming our national security. Michigan is an important northern border State, and at too many places, like at the Selfridge Air National Guard Base in Michigan, our men and women in uniform face dramatic cuts to the critical training and equipment they need to defend our country.

We can't afford more unrealistic budget gimmicks or plans that just kick the can down the road. We need to take up a serious budget, which the Democrats will offer this week.

### SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, according to the CBO, the House Republican budget's cuts to SNAP would drive the poorest working families deeper into poverty and would increase hunger in our communities.

The Republican budget would cut as many as 60 million people from SNAP, most of whom are working, and cuts of this magnitude would be tragic for millions of hard-working Americans and their families. Basically, the House Republican budget makes people work harder for less.

Today, the Democrats introduced an alternative budget, and this Democratic budget works for hard-working Americans. First, it makes it easier to own a home; second, easier to send kids to college; third, easier to have a secure and enjoyable retirement.

Once again, the difference between the two: House Republicans want Americans to work harder for less; Democrats, on the other hand, want to help hard-working Americans.

### VETERAN SPOUSES EQUAL TREATMENT ACT

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the LGBT veterans, who face discrimination by the very government they fought to defend, and I urge my colleagues to join me in ending this injustice.

Two years ago, DOMA was struck down, and most Federal benefits were effectively extended to legally married same-sex couples; yet an outdated law continues to bar access to VA benefits for LGBT veteran families in States that do not recognize marriage equality.

Our men and women in uniform do not serve in defense of a particular State, but of the United States. All veterans should have access to all Federal benefits, regardless of where they live, just as they do when they are in the military.

When President Lincoln laid out his vision for caring for veterans, he said we should support those "who shall have borne the battle." He didn't say anything about discriminating against some because of whom they love.

Please join me in ending this injustice, and support the bipartisan Veteran Spouses Equal Treatment Act, which I will introduce tomorrow.

### SUPPORT THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

(Mr. RUPPERSBERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against the majority resolution, which fails to repeal sequestration.

I am proud to represent not one, but two Army bases, Fort Meade and Aberdeen Proving Ground, as well as an Air National Guard base at Martin State Airport. I am a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and am co-chair of the Army Caucus. I am the former ranking member of the Intelligence Committee.

I have sat through hearing after hearing in which the leaders of our Armed Forces have all testified that, if sequestration is not repealed, it will make our country weaker against the threats that exist today, from terrorism to cyber, including the Russia-China threat.

These outdated spending levels are putting our national security at risk and are damaging our credibility throughout the world. The across-the-board cuts of sequestration take away all ability to make strategic decisions on the things we keep and the things we cut. Budgeting is the science of priorities, not cutting across the board.

We must ensure our Armed Forces and intelligence community have the resources they need to do their jobs around the world and to protect our country and our families. The alternative Democratic budget released today does that by repealing sequestration.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 24, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 24, 2015 at 9:18 a.m.:

Appointments:  
Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance.

With best wishes, I am  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 27, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 163 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 163

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Brady of Texas and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived. If more than one such amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been finally adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1230

Mr. Speaker, I was looking around to see if folks were getting goosebumps as

the Reading Clerk was reading the rule. I was. I think that if folks were honest with themselves, they would be getting some goosebumps, too, because we don't always have the most open of processes around here. It is hard. We have 435 of us. We all represent different districts, constituents that often have different hopes and dreams, different challenges that they face. It is not easy to craft a process that allows every Member of this institution to have a voice.

It is particularly not easy to allow every Member of this institution to have a voice on something as important as the budget of the United States of America. That is big, \$3.8 trillion worth of big. And yet what you just heard from the Reading Clerk, Mr. Speaker, is that if we pass this rule, this rule that my colleagues and I on the Committee on Rules sorted out yesterday, if we pass this rule, we will begin the process that will allow a debate on every single budget submitted by every single Member of this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have written those budgets in the past. That is not an easy job. There is a reason we are not going to consider 435 budgets. It is a big, big job. But more than being big in that it requires hundreds and hundreds of hours, it is big in that it requires you to put your money where your mouth is. That is not a task that folks often step up to the microphone to take on in this town, Mr. Speaker, but today we have budgets from the Progressive Caucus; we have budgets from the Democratic minority on the Committee on the Budget; we have budgets from the Republican Study Committee; we have budgets from the House Committee on the Budget and more. Every group that decided that they didn't run for this job to make campaign speeches but they ran for this job to make a difference has a chance to put their money where their mouth is.

My friends in the Progressive Caucus, Mr. Speaker, if we pass this rule, we will be allowed to vote on a Progressive Caucus budget. My back-of-the-envelope calculations suggest that their budget proposes increasing taxes by almost \$7 trillion—\$7 trillion. I don't support that kind of tax increase, but by golly, we ought to have a conversation about it. There are folks who are down here who are willing to recommend it. We should be willing to count the votes and see if it wins or whether it loses.

I sit on the House Committee on the Budget as well as the Committee on Rules, Mr. Speaker. Our budget doesn't raise taxes at all, at least not the tax rates. We believe if you implement a responsible budget, we are going to see the economic engine of America begin to churn once again. We believe revenues are going to rise because it turns out, if you don't make any money, you

can't pay any taxes. If you get the economy going, tax revenues begin to take care of themselves. Reduce about \$5.5 trillion in spending, that is what the House Committee on the Budget proposes.

I don't know where the votes are going to shake out, Mr. Speaker, and I am excited to find out. So often you come to the House floor, it has been pre-scripted: The votes have been counted; the process has been closed; it is just more of a show up and vote to give it some finality. But not so today.

If we can come together as a Committee on Rules and pass this rule, if we can come together as a body and begin this debate, I don't know which budget is going to pass at the end of the day, but I know this: I know America will be the better for us having a process that includes absolutely every voice in this Chamber, and I know that our chances of turning this budget process, this collection of hopes and dreams that are in a document into the law of the land to make a difference in the lives of families in each of our districts back home, the chances of that happening will be much, much greater.

Mr. Speaker, I have got lots to say about the budgets we have introduced. I have lots to say about the numbers that are behind those budgets, but I don't want to slow down what I know is going to be a bipartisan day and a bipartisan budget week.

So, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have some good economic news: the private sector has added 12 million new jobs over the last 60 months, 5 years; our national unemployment rate is down to 5.5 percent; we have reduced the deficit from 9.8 percent of our economy to nearly 3 percent; 16.4 million people now have affordable health care who didn't have it before. These are good economic indicators, and we are moving in the right direction, but there is more to do to ensure that our economy gets and stays stronger.

What we can't afford to do at this critical juncture is endanger all of the progress we have made by pursuing this drastic austerity agenda, and that is what the Republican budget is. They have an almost religious commitment to slashing government to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. So they propose severe cuts to everything except the military, even though it means destroying Medicare coverage that was promised to seniors, cutting education funding that we need to help our children compete in the global economy, literally taking food out of the mouths of the poor, and snatching health insurance away from millions who now have access to affordable care coverage for the first time.

Not only would the House majority raise taxes on the poor and give a \$50,000 tax break to millionaires—a play that some like to call the reverse Robin Hood—but the House majority would slash funding for bridges and roads and gut funding for law enforcement and schools, double down on trickle-down economics and dynamic scoring, a failed and discredited set of policies that we know don't work.

That is how the House majority wants to govern the greatest democracy on Earth, by cutting our way to prosperity. Not only is it dangerous, it is mathematically impossible. It just doesn't add up. But don't take my word for it. Here are some of the reactions to the Republican budget from the majority's allies and its own members.

The American Enterprise Institute said about this budget: "The House GOP leadership took the easy way out."

A Republican Member and Army veteran said that this budget "makes our country weaker."

Another member of the House majority said: "I am tired of seeing gimmicks in the budget process; I am tired of seeing gimmicks in the legislative process."

Finally, summing it up nicely, one Republican Member said, "It's all hokey."

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD several news reports documenting the criticisms of the GOP budget.

[From CNN, March 18, 2015]

HOUSE GOP MEMBERS THREATENING TO TAKE BUDGET DOWN OVER DEFENSE

(By Deirdre Walsh)

WASHINGTON.—A sizeable bloc of House Republicans are vowing to defeat the GOP budget that was unveiled on Tuesday, arguing it shortchanges defense programs at a time that multiple national security threats around the world means Pentagon spending should be boosted.

"As a Republican I do not want our budget to go down. But as a veteran and somebody who has served in the Army I am not going to be part of something that I believe that makes our country weaker," Florida GOP Rep. Tom Rooney told reporters Tuesday.

Failure to pass a budget won't trigger any crisis—budget resolutions are nonbinding and essentially symbolic documents. They do set spending levels for various government agencies and outline the party's priorities for reforming entitlement programs and the tax code, but they lack the force of law.

But if House Speaker John Boehner can't cobble together enough votes from his own members for a budget, he will add another embarrassing setback to a pile of failed efforts this year. Boehner and Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell pledged that total GOP control of Congress meant they would prove their party can govern and showcasing a unified budget is key to that pledge.

Last month, Ohio Republican Rep. Mike Turner, a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, got 70 House Republicans to sign a letter insisting that defense programs receive a minimum of \$561 billion that was included in President Barack Obama's budget plan.

Republican budget writers, however, were put in a box because of the automatic across the board spending cuts, known as sequestration, put into place by a previous budget law. Those cuts cap defense spending at \$523 billion.

To address concerns from defense hawks, the House Budget Committee used an accounting trick and added more than \$30 billion in defense money to the "Overseas Contingency Operations," an emergency fund that doesn't count toward their total spending number. On top of that money the committee created a separate \$20 billion reserve fund to add more savings from other programs and promised to set both pots of money aside for defense.

But multiple House Republicans told CNN the move is merely a gimmick.

"I don't think that it's fair game—I think it's fairy dust stuff," Rooney said.

The top Democrat on the House Budget Committee, Rep. Chris Van Hollen, also seized on the way Republicans structured Pentagon money, saying on Wednesday the GOP budget "plays a shameless shell game with our defense spending. It would make Enron accountants blush."

Boehner and his lieutenants also know some conservatives won't back the measure because they want bolder reforms, but threat from Republicans who want to see bolstered defense spending is real.

GOP Rep. Adam Kinzinger ticked off a list of flashpoints across the globe—ISIS in the Middle East, Ukraine, Boko Haram—that weren't major threats in 2011, arguing the trend shows the need to respond to growing threats, not cut back.

"It's a totally different world we live in and I think we have to recognize that," he told CNN, adding he's not sure how he will vote on the current measure and hopes it will be changed.

House Republican leaders also can't afford to lose more on a couple dozen of their own members on this vote, because Democrats will surely oppose the measure which repeals Obamacare and cuts food stamp and education programs.

There remains hope by some in the GOP, though, that they can strike a balance that works for the majority of the caucus.

But even if House Republicans figure out a way to pass this budget, the constraints on future proposals will persist until Democrats and Republicans broker a compromise to do away with the automatic cuts that they agree are unworkable for both domestic and defense programs.

"Both sides need to come together and put their grown up pants on and figure out how do we overcome this issue," Kinzinger said.

A budget resolution brokered between the two chambers is supposed to be negotiated by April 15th so spending panels can move forward with their work.

[From AEI, March 17, 2015]

#### HOUSE GOP 2016 BUDGET RESOLUTION IS DOA (By Mackenzie Eaglen)

Even though House Republicans just unveiled their draft budget for the next ten years, it is already painfully clear how this is going to end for defense.

1. The House budget resolution will not have enough votes to pass as written. There will be no conference with the Senate as a result.

2. The defense appropriations bill that passes the House will match the legal spending caps for the core defense budget at \$499 billion for 2016.

3. Congress will seek to add additional emergency supplemental funds—or overseas

contingency operations (OCO) money—for defense above President Obama's levels, but much of it will ultimately be stripped out during floor debate.

4. The defense spending bills that pass in both chambers will not become law. Most likely, the federal government will start the fiscal year operating under another continuing resolution (CR).

5. All eyes will turn to the Budget Committee chairmen to craft a follow on to the Ryan-Murray Bipartisan Budget Act to stanch the bleeding and triage the patient (defense) while providing some fiscal certainty and relief for the military later this summer or early fall.

Only after this long, torturous path to the end will leadership finally understand why the House Republican budget blueprint for 2016 is wholly insufficient to provide for America's military. First, the budget limits base defense spending to about \$499 billion in 2016, in line with caps mandated under current law. This is a budget \$35 billion below what President Obama has requested, and about \$112 billion below what former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates thought would be necessary for the Pentagon when he crafted his final budget in 2012.

As an attempt to appease both budget and fiscal hawks, the House budget seeks to offset a lower base defense budget by increasing Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) "wartime" spending. That is because these emergency funds are exempt from budget caps and essentially "off the books."

While the House GOP budget would ostensibly increase Pentagon OCO funding to about \$90 billion compared to the Obama administration's 2016 request of roughly \$51 billion, much of this increase is an illusion. First, the plan uses a budgetary procedure known as a deficit-neutral reserve fund to increase OCO spending by more than \$20 billion. Reserve funds call for increased spending in certain areas but only upon the condition that offsetting cuts or revenues are generated elsewhere.

Without corresponding deficit reduction, reserve funds do not lead to increased spending. This means that while the House plan promises about \$39 billion in OCO spending over the president's request, about half of this increase will not materialize.

Realistically, the Pentagon should expect no more than about \$569 billion from the House budget between base and wartime spending—well under the \$585 billion the president requested.

Even if taken at face value, the OCO increase contained in the House budget will not make up for years of neglected Pentagon modernization and readiness. The reality is that the base budget and war spending accounts buy different outcomes and effects. Emergency funds buy mostly perishable items like readiness, maintenance, training, and war-related consumables like fuel. This makes OCO spending the equivalent of a sugar high. It contains empty calories that are rapidly consumed by ongoing operations, but does not provide for the long-term health of the military. Only robust and predictable base budgets—as the bipartisan National Defense Panel recommended—can provide long-term funding for readiness, force structure and modernization.

Moreover, by relying on debt-financed supplemental money to put a Band-Aid on the military's growing wounds, the House budget provides a false sense of accomplishment of having "fixed" defense. The unfortunate reality is that it does not. While the budget does propose increased defense spending in

the future, the only year that matters is 2016. And, in 2016, the House GOP plan keeps current spending caps locked in. Not only is that insufficient, but the president is sure to veto the defense spending bill when it ultimately hits his desk at these levels.

For three and a half years, the military has languished under the Budget Control Act's irresponsible defense cuts as threats around the world have increased. While both political parties share in the responsibility for passage of the Budget Control Act, the GOP now controls Congress. The House budget resolution is clear that defense is only one priority of many, and one far down the line at that.

The House GOP leadership took the easy way out—politically and budgetary. This resolution will do little to draw support from policymakers with a deep understanding of the crisis in defense and will likely end up failing for not pleasing any bloc in the party, including defense hawks, fiscal hawks and appropriators.

For the Pentagon, this means another long year of budget uncertainty with no foresight into how or when the budgetary process will end and at what spending levels. That hurts not only the military, but taxpayers as well since it creates inefficiency and drives up program and planning costs across the largest federal agency.

[From The Examiner, March 17, 2015]

#### CONSERVATIVES QUESTION 'GIMMICKS' IN HOUSE GOP'S DEFENSE BUDGET (By Tara Copp)

Republican budget leaders announced a fiscal 2016 plan Tuesday that appeases the defense hawks in their party by nearly doubling wartime spending, but the move has prompted pushback from their most conservative flanks, highlighting the challenges ahead.

Nine conservative House Republicans who hosted a discussion with reporters shortly after the budget's release said they want "to get to yes" on the GOP's plan, but they raised concerns about the plan's direction.

They questioned whether additional military spending has been properly vetted, noted that the sequester-immune account boosting military spending is not in line with the promises they made to their constituents to deliver a balanced budget, and pointed out that the added defense needs will require concessions to Democrats that will further distance the party from its political goals.

"Republicans are in the majority, but conservatives are not," said Rep. Thomas Massie, R-Ky. But he added that the final bill will need to address conservatives' concerns. "There are a lot more conservatives than are at this table today."

Lawmakers said they specifically invited four officers and agents to testify.

The members were also doubtful that they could garner enough intra-party support for the blueprint to move the bill through on a process known as reconciliation, due to differences on spending within their party.

Reconciliation, if enough Republicans agree to it, would allow the budget to be passed on a simple majority, effectively cutting out Senate Democrats' ability to block it.

"We need to make sure we are the party of fiscal conservatism," said Rep. Justin Amash, R-Mich. "I understand some of the concerns from defense hawks who want to blow through the [spending] caps. But I'm tired of seeing gimmicks in the budget process. I'm tired of seeing gimmicks in the legislative process."



"At the end of the day, if you want to increase spending on programs Republicans like, you are going to have to accept some compromise for Democrats. So for those who are pushing for higher spending, they'd better be prepared to go to higher spending on Democratic programs and possibly tax increases."

In the 2016 plan, which House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price, R-Ga., announced Tuesday, keeps the Defense Department's baseline budget to the \$523 billion sequester cap—but then adds another \$94 billion in the wartime fund known as the overseas contingency operations account, which is not subject to sequester caps.

"That's one of the issues I am having with the budget," said Rep. Raúl Labrador, R-Idaho. "I think if you are going to plus up military spending you should have to do it within the budget—not in a separate [war-time] account. I think we have to ask the fundamental question, 'what is all that money being spent on in the military? It's not a question that Republicans are willing to ask.'"

Price's assurance that defense could be beefed up under a balanced budget also was questioned.

"I don't know anybody who honestly believes we are going to balance the budget in 10 years. It's all hokey," said Rep. Ken Buck, R-Colo. Buck said with winding down operations in Afghanistan and the end of the 2008 financial crisis, it is now time to make push difficult spending cuts to balance the budget.

"We continue to put off the pain," Buck said.

Labrador said it's not a question of defense as a priority, but the willingness to scrutinize defense spending.

"I want to protect the military as much as anybody. But it seems we have an unquestioning disregard for what is actually being spent in the military sometimes as Republicans, and I have a concern about that.

"So now what we are going to do is . . . put it in the [overseas contingency] account and we are going to forget about the promises that we made to our constituents that we are going to balance the budget," Labrador said.

Rep. Jim Jordan, R-Ohio, said he was "leaning toward yes" in supporting the additional Pentagon spending, but that he wanted to see the final bill. "Obviously we want to do everything we can for national defense, but we understand the dynamic we are in," Jordan said.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The Republican budget would force hardworking families to work harder for less. The proposal turns Medicaid into a State block grant, makes students pay more for tuition, decimates the Pell grants for college tuition, slashes food stamps, and turns Medicare into a voucher program for the future recipients, all the while keeping billions of dollars in tax breaks for Big Oil.

Today, Medicare guarantees insurance coverage for seniors, but imagine with me, if you will, a world in which Medicare is just a fixed amount voucher. Instead of insurance, your grandparent is given a set amount of money and is sent out on his or her own to negotiate with multinational companies; and if they need a medical plan that is more expensive than that voucher, the balance comes straight out of their

pocket, or, if they can't afford it, they have no insurance. Not only does the budget show a clear disdain for working families, middle class families, students, and the elderly, but it was so haphazardly drafted last week that the media exposed a drafting error in the bill that revealed an additional \$900 million in cuts. Imagine that, nearly a billion dollars that had been overlooked.

What is more, the House majority is playing fast and loose, using budget gimmicks to violate agreed-upon spending caps in the sequestration and to fund critical long-term Department of Defense needs out of a temporary war slush fund, the overseas contingency operations account, a slush fund the use of which Republicans decried just last year for undermining the budgetary process.

The Secretary of Defense, Dr. Ashton Carter, has highlighted the need for predictability in the Department's budget. He would like to know from one year to the next what is a gimmick and what is real, something that the House majority refuses to ensure. Ashton Carter, Secretary of Defense, says the only way that he can provide funding for the military is through stability, not through slush funds, spending caps, and budget games.

This is how the majority chooses to run our government: with tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires, with financial incentives for Big Oil, tax breaks for corporations that ship their jobs overseas, and tax policies that burden the people whose heads are barely above water. But, most importantly, it hurts the SNAP program, when thousands, millions of Americans go to bed hungry every night. How dare we threaten the very thing that gives them some peace of mind and some food to eat. That is also, by the way, an agriculture program that our farmers depend on to help them make a living.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a different course. Let's grow the economy from the middle class out, not try to hope something will trickle down on it. Let's fix our crumbling roads and bridges, and let's invest in our kids and make it easier to go to college, not harder. Let's respect the contribution of our Nation's seniors and make certain that they have the stability that they need in their health care to make financial decisions with some degree of certainty. We could do that by adopting the Democratic alternative. And while my colleagues in the minority might be getting fatigued saying this over and over that what we have isn't just a list of numbers, it is a statement of our ideals, instead of a slash-and-burn budget that puts at risk the economic growth of the last 5 years, we propose investments in our infrastructure, in our children, in our economy, and in our future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am not sure if I was clear when I got started, and I apologize if I was not. We are going to vote on every idea that folks have. We are going to vote on every budget that was introduced. If you have a plan about how to better run this Nation, you don't need to complain about somebody else's vision; you are allowed to bring your own vision to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, we all care about men and women back home in our districts. What you can see on this chart is the interest spending alone under current law in year 2025. That is the 10th year of the budget window, almost a trillion dollars in interest alone. When we hear about what the spending priorities are that each Member of this Chamber has, we have to ask ourselves, so what are you doing to balance the budget so that interest doesn't consume it all?

As you can see, Mr. Speaker, under current law, if we don't make necessary changes, we are going to be spending more on interest alone on the national debt than we are on all defense issues combined. We are going to be spending more on interest on the national debt than we spend on Medicaid, our largest health care program, to help those constituents in need in our district. If you care about folks who are in need in your district, you care about balancing the budget, because we all know that in a debt crisis, the folks who get hurt the most are the folks who are most dependent on government services.

Mr. Speaker, in this great festival of democracy that is the budget process, we have a budget before us today that purports to balance in 6 years. The Republican Study Committee has introduced that budget. We are going to have a vote on it today. We have the budget that came out of the House Committee on the Budget. It purports to balance in 10 years. We are going to have votes on budgets in this process, Mr. Speaker, that anticipate balancing never—never.

The President's budget, for example, Mr. Speaker, the President's budget projects \$2 trillion in new taxes—\$2 trillion in new taxes—and never balances. It doesn't balance next year; it doesn't balance 10 years from now; it doesn't balance 20 years from now. It balances never. Every time we borrow a dollar from our children or our grandchildren, we are promising, we are committing either an additional dollar in taxes on those same children and grandchildren plus interest in the future or an additional dollar in benefit cuts.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to have this robust debate about our spending priorities, but it ought to start from the position that we have an obligation to pay for the bills that we are running up today. I say to my friends, these are

not small things that we are arguing about. I want to talk to you about how do we invest more in transportation. I want to talk to you about how do we invest more lifting people up from that bottom rung of the ladder to the next rung of the ladder, to the next rung of the ladder.

□ 1245

I want to talk about how to invest in America, but every time we vote for a budget that doesn't balance, we threaten that future. We have more in interest payments on the national debt than on all national security combined.

I don't know that we are going to find that agreement today, Mr. Speaker, but if we pass this rule, again, we will be able to begin that process where all of the ideas will be debated.

I just encourage my friends, when each budget comes to the floor, ask this question: Do we plan for balance ever? Do we anticipate ending the added burden on our children ever? Do we anticipate mortgaging our children's future for as far as the eye can see, or do we anticipate taking responsibility?

We have got a lot of budgets to choose from, a lot of opportunities to take responsibility for. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my friends to support this rule so that we will be able to bring those bills to the floor.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time of year where we begin to debate our Nation's budget, ostensibly, our plans for the fiscal future of our Nation.

There was a time, far ago in the past, before the invention of the Ryan budget and the Price budgets, when this time of year represented an honest, informed discussion of our different views of the future of our Nation and how to restore fiscal stability.

Since the Ryan budget, though, which says it balances, but doesn't; which includes tax revenue for laws that it says it repeals; which creates fiscal growth out of thin air; this discussion, unfortunately, has devolved into nothing more than political theater.

Somewhat, this year, as we consider this rule today on the first ever Price budgets, the process has fallen even further. Gimmicks are being stacked on gimmicks. The Budget Control Act and its caps are law, and everyone on my side of the aisle stands ready to work together to come to a compromise solution that allows for both our domestic spending needs to be met as well as our national security needs.

But that is not the discussion we are having. Instead, we have a budget—or

budgets—which completely circumvent common sense and budgetary convention by adding billions of “base budget” money to the overseas contingency account, essentially giving President Obama a record slush fund to engage in wars of his choice without consulting the United States Congress.

Those are the Republican plans before you. What we have is a fictional budget. But then, that fictional budget wasn't enough for everyone. So here we are, being asked to pass a rule which looks a lot like the rules you might see at an auction at the county fair. The most votes wins the blue ribbon.

This isn't the county fair. This is the United States Congress. This is our official budget plan of a major American political party for fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

I reject this rule today. We can do better. We can have an honest discussion about our budget priorities and about restoring fiscal stability for the next generation. We deserve a serious proposal rather than this fun and games and gimmicks that we have before us under this rule.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose the rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to my friend, that is what is so wonderful about this process. The days for pointing out who is so wrong and their ideas are so bad are left for a campaign season. This is the day where you bring your ideas to the floor of the House, and every single idea that was offered is going to be considered. Mr. Speaker, that doesn't happen by accident.

At this time it is my great pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), the chairman of the Rules Committee and an outspoken advocate for trying to bring these ideas to the floor, without whom we would not be able to be here today.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, who represents not only the Rules Committee but conservatives from across our Conference on the Budget Committee. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for bringing this bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we had an opportunity to have Chairman TOM PRICE come and speak with us about the budget and what costs what and what decisions we wanted to make and what direction we were going to go.

It was really pretty simple. He said he is presenting a budget that is going to balance. He is presenting a budget that is going to fund our military properly. And he has got a budget which is one we cannot only understand but believe in.

One of the questions I asked him yesterday was: Mr. PRICE, how much does the Affordable Care Act, known as ObamaCare, cost the taxpayer and the

budget? He said: You know, I don't know, but I'll get back to you. Well, by the end of the hearing, he said—what he could figure—it is \$108 billion.

Now, I have not checked this out. In fairness to TOM PRICE, he is allowed to go and doublecheck everything. That was a cursory view.

Mr. Speaker, if that is true, and if I accept the figures that the gentlewoman, the ranking member of the committee, said of the number of people who are on ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act—about 12 million—if you just do simple multiplication, 12 million into \$108 billion, we are talking literally every single recipient would be costing this government more than \$5 million per person for their insurance.

It is staggering. It is staggering that our friends, the Democrats, passed—it took us all day—a bill that they told us at least 24 million people who were uninsured would be on it, and a whole bunch of other people, and now here we are some 4 years later, a whopping total of 12.5 million at a cost of \$100 billion or more. And yet they come to the floor and look at us like we are some self-righteous group of people because we want to balance the budget and change the direction.

Mr. Speaker, this budget is not about doing away with the Affordable Care Act. It is about properly looking at the money that comes in to the Federal Government and us properly allocating it back out. And \$108 billion for 12 million people is immoral. It is unconscionable. And yet that was the testimony yesterday. Once again, I am going to have to look at it again, and I know Chairman PRICE is going to as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is why we do budgets. We do budgets so that we do ask the tough questions, so that we can put a pencil to the millions, billions, and trillions that the American taxpayer sent us here to do.

For us to be on the defensive by our friends, the Democrats, about wanting to balance the budget, about us wanting to do the things that will balance out and not only netting them out to where we don't spend more than what we take in, but being on the defensive because we are doing the right thing to sustain America's greatest days ahead of us, I think is a real mistake for the people who make the argument against us, when they are the people that passed—without one Republican vote—what we were told is \$108 billion for 12.5 million people.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to get away from this yelling and screaming and go to the numbers. And that is what TOM PRICE did. That is what Mr. WOODALL is doing. They are looking at how we are spending our money and what we are getting as a result of it. And if it really is true that for everybody who is on this Affordable Care Act, the true cost

to the taxpayers is over \$5 million for each person, then shame on us for not knowing, asking, and understanding. And that is what we are doing today, Mr. Speaker.

TOM PRICE, our young chairman from Georgia, actually has taken time to go and look at the budget. He is also doing a lot of other things that the gentleman from Texas, MIKE BURGESS, gave him credit for yesterday, where he is looking at some \$800 billion—almost a trillion dollars—that is sitting in agencies, not spent yet, that has previously been given to them. The taxpayer paid for it, and they are just sitting there waiting to spend the money.

Mr. Speaker, it is Republicans, it is TOM PRICE, it is ROB WOODALL, it is the members of the committee who have taken the tough votes and have done their homework. And that is what we are presenting here today. We are presenting the hard work from a committee called the Budget Committee to come and look at, once a year, how much are we spending, what are we getting, and how can we do it better?

So I will reject the arguments from those who say that the Republicans aren't doing the right thing. We are doing the heavy lifting. It is Republicans who are trying to look at the billions that are being spent. Not just the thousands, but the hundreds of millions and the thousand billions. Because a thousand billion is a trillion. And this is a big budget, and we need people to do what we are doing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I stand up for not just my party, the Republican Party, but I stand up for the honest and legitimate work that TOM PRICE and the Budget Committee have done. And I intend to follow up with this committee and to make sure we know more about the real cost of government because it is the real cost of government that turns the direction of our country, where we pass by that effort of where we create good behavior and we help people to, one, where we create people who are leaning on the government for their life, for their lifestyle, and for their future. And that is a mistake. That is a mistake—and one that the Republican Party will try and stand up to.

I understand the difference between a person who is able-bodied and not. I have a son with Down Syndrome, and I understand that we do need to do the right things for people who can't take care of themselves—those with an intellectual or physical disability. I get it that we should be there for poor people.

But it is unconscionable if we are paying \$5 million for an insurance plan, per person, under the Affordable Care Act. That is beyond the wild ideas of boondoggle. It is immoral.

So, the Republican Party is going to ask the tough questions. And when we go to the voter or taxpayer and we say:

Here is what we want you to understand about your money, we can do it with the authority and the responsibility that we have done the homework. We sharpened our pencils and we made a real difference by understanding not just dollars and cents, but the future of this great Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Now I think I understand it all. I believe I understand how you could lose \$900 million when you are doing your budget.

By what possible means do you think that we are paying \$5 million for each person's health care who is on the Affordable Care Act?

The rising cost of health care for the first time in 50 years is going down. But nobody ever paid \$5 million for anybody's health care in a single year. It is the most atrocious thing I think I have heard on this floor.

Mr. and Mrs. America, these are the people you have entrusted your Congress to. They are the people who are writing your budget. They are the people who are going to voucherize your Medicare, who are going to turn Medicaid into a block grant and help some people, maybe not. These are the people making sure that the roads and bridges are crumbling and that are going to take food out of the mouths of the poor.

This is the kind of math that you are practicing over there? For heaven's sake.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who I hope is as angry as I am, a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Ms. LEE. I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for making it very plain in terms of what their budget does and does not do.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. Yes, I am a member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and I know that our national budget is a statement of our national priorities and our values. And I know very well that the Republican budget is full of misplaced priorities and it is not a moral document.

This budget should not be rigged in favor of special interests and the wealthy few, but the Republican budget is. Our Nation's budget should prioritize working families, too many of whom are making low wages and living below the poverty line. It should assist those working hard to find a job and invest in workforce training, job training, and job creation. Instead, this Republican budget keeps tax breaks for corporations and the superwealthy.

Our budget should open educational opportunities for all, but the Republican budget slashes Pell grants that Congress has already paid for by \$89 billion.

□ 1300

A budget—a moral document—a budget that invests in the American people should invest in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, but the Republican budget cuts funding for our roads, our bridges, and our rail.

It should contain a serious and effective strategy to end poverty if we really believe that our budget is a reflection of our values and is a moral document. The House Republican budget offers none of these.

In fact, it slashes programs that support low-wage workers and people working hard to find a job. These families shouldn't have to go hungry; yet, because their wages are so low, they need food stamps. By cutting \$150 billion from SNAP, this budget creates more hunger and more poverty for people who are working.

Many of the programs in this budget are a legacy of the War on Poverty, which cut the poverty rate in our country by one-third in 50 years. Let me just read the list of programs that you are cutting and what the War on Poverty listed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. The Civil Rights Act, the Criminal Justice Act, Food Stamp Act, Older Americans Act, Social Security amendments, Voting Rights Act, HUD, all of these programs, Higher Education Act, these are initiatives that you are cutting that provide pathways out of poverty.

This Republican budget balances on the backs of the most vulnerable to preserve tax loopholes for the superwealthy and slush funds for Pentagon contractors.

I urge a "no" vote on the rule and on this budget.

List of War on Poverty Programs: the Civil Rights Act (1964); the Urban Mass Transportation Act (1964); the Criminal Justice Act (1964); the Food Stamp Act (1964); the Older Americans Act (1965); Social Security Amendments (1965); the Voting Rights Act (1965); the Housing and Urban Development Act (1965); the Public Works and Economic Development Act (1965); the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (1965); the Amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act (1965); the Higher Education Act (1965); the Child Nutrition Act (1966); the Child Protection Act (1966); and the National School Lunch Act (1968).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 60 seconds just to ask the gentlewoman from California, I understand why she objects to the Republican budget. What I don't understand is why she objects to the rule.

We have made every single budget that any Member of Congress asked to be made in order, we made that in order. Could the gentlewoman tell me why she opposes the rule?

I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Ms. LEE. Why do I oppose the rule?

I oppose the rule, first, because this rule, if it moves forward, would allow for the Republican budget, which we know could pass this body, with these huge cuts. I think we need to go back to the drawing board and minimally put back and restore cuts to the SNAP program.

Any budget that has SNAP cuts, cuts to Pell grants, does not invest in infrastructure, any budget that does that, regardless of the budgets that have been put forward, I don't want to see this debate put forward with those cuts in place.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentleman.

Candidly, I am certainly on the other side of that issue. I understand that somebody is going to win and somebody is going to lose, but I think the process is always better when we allow everyone's ideas to come to the floor, and that is one of the things this rule does, and I am very grateful that we have been able to do that. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Rules Committee, a member of the Budget Committee, and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

I want to pick up and thank my friend and thank our chairman of the Rules Committee for doing exactly what he just suggested, bringing us a rule that lets everybody bring their choices to the floor. That is what we all like to do around here.

Interestingly enough, we essentially have three Democratic choices and three Republican choices, and we are going to have an opportunity for people to express a variety of opinions and arrive at a consensus in this body.

Now, obviously, as a Republican, I like all three Republican alternatives pretty well. I think my friend Mr. WOODALL has always worked on the Republican Study Committee budget; it gets us to balance faster than anything else on this floor.

The reality is, if you look at the three Republican budgets, they have several things in common. The first is they make tough choices because we have got an \$18 trillion debt; and, just left on autopilot, that will increase by another \$7.2 trillion. It aims to bring these things into balance, and each one of those Republican budgets does that—the Republican Study Committee budget a little bit faster—but all within the 10-year budget window.

Second, they all repeal ObamaCare—not a big surprise. No Republican voted for it. We have never liked it, and it would be remiss of us not to continue to argue our position.

Third, they all call for major tax reforms. We all know that lowering rates, eliminating exemptions, and rationalizing the Tax Code contributes to economic growth.

They all, frankly, defend the country pretty well. We do it in different ways, and we have debates, but they all manage to do that, and none of them raise taxes in the process of achieving those objectives.

I am pretty content with the Republican choices in front of us and look forward to that. I think it behooves us all to remember—and it gets lost in this debate—a budget is not the law of the land.

The budget is, essentially, a negotiating position. The President submitted a budget earlier. That is his initial negotiating position. Whatever emerges from this debate today is likely to be the Republican initial negotiating position.

My friends on their side will present a budget today which I presume represents their initial negotiating position. They have also got other budgets within the context of that—perfectly appropriate. We do, too, but they will have a general position. Our friends in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, are wrestling with this very issue as we talk.

Now, we seem to forget, as we draw our differences and distinctions here, we do live in an era of divided government; and despite what many people think, we do occasionally come to compromises around here.

Now, I am pretty pleased we have lowered the budget deficit every year that we have been in the majority, but that has entailed some compromises. We compromised in the Ryan-Murray agreement. That was actually a pretty good agreement that both sides were happy with.

Frankly, this week, we will probably compromise on the so-called doc fix, the SGR. We compromised last December on the CR/Omnibus bill which, again, gave us some fiscal stability.

I suspect, as we all define our initial negotiating positions, at some point down the road, we will indeed compromise. The President of the United States has got a signature that is going to have to happen to any appropriations bill. Our friends have a filibuster control in the upper House.

My hope is we state our positions. I am very content with where we are opening this debate; and then, frankly, over the course of the months ahead, we work together and see if we can find that common ground.

That common ground ought to do what the Republicans are trying to do in terms of lowering the deficit, reforming entitlements, not raising taxes, and moving us in a fiscally responsible direction while we modernize our Tax Code. That is our opening position. I look forward to defending it.

I thank my friend Mr. WOODALL for bringing this excellent rule to the floor, which allows everybody to put forward their position.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules and an extraordinary colleague.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the last 8 years have been very difficult. We are recovering from the single greatest economic crisis since the Great Depression. This recovery hasn't been easy, and it has forced us to make difficult decisions. Working on budget priorities and wrestling with spending cuts have been difficult, to say the least.

Our economy is beginning to turn around, thanks in large part to an increase in hiring and the success of the Affordable Care Act; yet we still must wrestle with the Nation's budget. It is true, as my Republican friends say, that tough choices have to be made.

Why is it that every time House Republicans try to put our fiscal house in order, they ask those among us who can least afford it to make the most sacrifices?

Mr. Speaker, we should not balance the budget on the backs of the poor and working families. They didn't cause the financial crisis, and they shouldn't be the ones forced to get us out of this mess.

There is a lot to dislike in the Republican budget, from repealing the Affordable Care Act to ending Medicare as we know it, to slashing Pell grants. Quite frankly, it is awful.

I want to focus on what the Republican budget does to SNAP, the Nation's premier antihunger program. Once again, the Republican budget would turn SNAP into a block grant, resulting in sharp cuts of \$125 billion. On top of that, the Republican budget requires a cut of at least another \$1 billion—maybe more—from SNAP.

Mr. Speaker, SNAP is one of the only remaining basic protections for the poor. For many of the poorest Americans, SNAP is the only form of income assistance that they receive. The numbers don't lie, but the stories are far more powerful.

Just listen to the people who rely on SNAP to make ends meet. Thousands of people sent messages to Congress written on paper plates, pleading with us not to cut SNAP.

One woman wrote:

SNAP means that, as a single mother, I was able to finish college, feed my family, and find a career where I am able to advocate for a program that I know works.

Another person wrote:

SNAP means dignity. SNAP matters to me because no senior should have to choose between buying food or paying for their medication. When I was a child, my father left,

and the only reason we could afford food was because of food stamps. I never got a chance to say thank you, so thank you.

For the life of me, I can't figure out why House Republicans are hell-bent on arbitrarily cutting a program that feeds hungry kids, seniors, and working families. These SNAP cuts are deep and hurtful. We have already seen how the farm bill cuts \$8.6 billion, how those cuts are wreaking havoc among the hungry. Imagine what a cut of \$125 billion-plus would do.

Republicans claim that SNAP spending is out of control; yet the Congressional Budget Office shows that SNAP spending is going down as the economy recovers and people go back to work.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to strike these SNAP cuts from the Republican budget. The Republicans blocked my amendment while, at the same time, increasing spending for the Pentagon by over \$90 billion, without even paying for it.

Mr. Speaker, budgets are moral documents; and what the Republicans are doing, in my opinion, is immoral. Penalizing working families—and, yes, the majority of people on SNAP who can work do work—penalizing these families by taking away food in the guise of fiscal prudence is just wrong. Cutting SNAP, while increasing unchecked spending for the Pentagon, is hypocritical.

Let's be clear. There is a cost to hunger in America. Hungry kids don't learn in school. Senior citizens who take their medication on an empty stomach end up in the emergency room. Workers who miss meals are less productive at work.

Cutting SNAP, a program that puts food on the table for hungry families, is just a rotten thing to do. Shame on anybody in this House who votes for a budget that increases hunger in America.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to my friend from Massachusetts I know he cares deeply about these issues; and, candidly, this House is a better House because of his leadership on these issues.

Just this year, we are going to spend four times more on interest on our national debt than feeding families through the Food Stamp program. An unbalanced budget is eroding those opportunities to invest in people.

I am certain that we would come together to invest in Americans. I am certain that we care. I will concede the gentleman cares. I won't concede he cares more than I do about lifting folks up and taking them to the next rung of that ladder.

Our debt and our deficit are eroding those opportunities to come together.

Mr. McGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would argue that the problem of hunger in America is actually increasing our deficit and our debt; but I would also argue, if you want to find ways to balance the budget, maybe go after some of those corporate tax breaks, instead of going after poor people.

Mr. WOODALL. As the gentleman knows—and, again, I thank the gentleman—I have introduced the only bill in Congress that abolishes every single corporate tax break in the Tax Code. I would welcome support and enthusiastic cosponsorship from any of my colleagues on the other side the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to allow for consideration of legislation that would help families afford college tuition by letting undergraduate borrowers refinance their student loans at a low interest rate of 3.86 percent. That is what the families we represent need, not the education cuts in the Republican budget.

To discuss our proposal, I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY).

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

I rise in opposition to the rule and to the previous question, as she just stated, would allow consideration of H.R. 1434, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is an emergency out there for young Americans who are trapped in high interest rate students loans. The Federal Reserve bank has tallied that. It is \$1.3 trillion of overhang in the U.S. economy.

None other than the former Republican Governor of the State of Indiana and the former Budget Director under George Bush testified before the Education Committee the other day, and this is what he said:

Research from the Pew Research Center and Rutgers shows that today's 20- and 30-year olds are delaying marriage, delaying childbearing, both unhelpful trends from an economic and social standpoint.

Between 25 percent and 40 percent of borrowers report postponing homes, cars, and other major purchases. Half say that their student loans increase their risk of defaulting on other bills.

□ 1315

There are 7.5 million young Americans who are behind on their student loans. Again, they are trapped in no collateral, high interest rate documents that our bill allows them to write down.

Anyone watching this debate knows that when there is a period of low interest rates—and that is exactly what is the situation today—middle class families refinance their houses, refi-

nance their car loans, and refinance their credit cards; but students and people carrying student loan debt because of the fact that they were no-collateral loans are trapped.

Our bill allows them to go to the Department of Education, write down those interest rates to 3.6 percent. The Congressional Budget Office has told us that half of the trillion-dollar overhang would be refinanced down if this bill took place. That puts money in people's pockets, as the Pew Research Center shows. That means that they are going to go out and buy cars, buy homes, and start families.

Our failure to deal with this issue is strangling this economic recovery. And incredibly, we are going to take up a Republican budget which cuts Pell Grants and also raises interest rate costs for Stafford loan programs.

Let's be very clear: this budget allows the government to charge interest while people are in school, which has been a pillar of the Stafford student loan program, that interest is not charged while kids are going through college. Yet the Republican budget adds to that \$1.3 trillion in overhang by adding interest costs in their budget plan.

The hard-working American people who want to buy homes, who want to send their kids to college, have an opportunity with this legislation, H.R. 1434, to allow them to refinance down their interest rates to a lower out-of-pocket cost that will provide an automatic, instant stimulus to the U.S. economy. That is what the American people are looking for, not a Republican budget plan that compounds the largest area of consumer debt in the U.S. economy. It adds costs to folks whose Pell grants won't rise and whose interest rates are going to go up on their Stafford loans.

The choice is very clear with this vote that we are about to take. One vote is going to add to the student loan problem, which the Federal Reserve has identified as the largest consumer debt challenge of our Nation, and the other vote will allow us to move forward to solving that problem.

Vote "no" on the rule. Vote "no" on the previous question. Let's help those 7.5 million kids and young people who are behind on their student loans. Allow them to refinance down their interest rates, which is what happens all throughout the U.S. economy during a time of low interest rates.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO).

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in opposition to the rule, and I rise in opposition to the previous question so that H.R. 1434 can be offered. Let me tell you why.

Every few weeks, I spend time calling constituents who have sent me letters

and emails. In many of these conversations, I hear about the burden of student loan debt. Just recently, I spoke with a couple with more than \$100,000 in student debt, and their monthly loan payments exceed the rent that they pay on their apartment.

There is absolutely no question, student loan debt is an enormous problem in this country. We all know the facts. As the gentleman from Connecticut stated, at \$1.3 trillion, student loan debt has surpassed credit card debt. Nearly three-quarters of college seniors graduate with some debt; bachelor's degree recipients graduate with an average of almost \$30,000 in debt.

The Federal Government, the States, colleges and universities and other relevant actors in higher education must come together to address this issue. We must take steps to reduce the underlying costs of degree completion, strengthen Federal and State investment in colleges and universities, provide additional aid to students, and diminish existing student loan debt.

The gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. COURTNEY's legislation, the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, would help bring down existing student loan debt by allowing eligible borrowers with existing debt to refinance their student loans and receive the same lower interest rates passed by Congress in 2013 that new borrowers currently receive.

Lowering interest rates for existing loan debt will benefit tens of millions of Americans. I oppose the rule. I oppose the previous question.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

If I could engage my friend from California, I understand why he doesn't like one of the Republican budgets that is here. But this rule also makes in order every single Democratic substitute budget that was offered.

I would ask my friend why it is that he opposes this rule since it allows everyone's ideas to be considered.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. TAKANO. Well, I am not so much in opposition to the rule because of not allowing other budgets to be considered, but because of the way the rule is structured, I would rather see us be able to consider H.R. 1434. If we would oppose the rule and oppose the previous question, we could solve the student debt question here.

Mr. WOODALL. I thank my friend.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that we can amend the rule to bring up the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act.

The magnitude of the problem cannot be overlooked. In 2013, there were 37 million American student loan borrowers with outstanding student loans. Those 37 million American students hold an enormous \$1.3 trillion in student loan debt, as my friend from Connecticut mentioned. Student loan debt is growing by \$3,000 per second. The Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act would be a good first step in allowing students to refinance their loans and put some much-needed money back in their pockets and back in the American economy.

In 2012, Congress passed a bill to allow new student loan borrowers to receive a low interest rate. Unfortunately, students with existing student loan debt were left out of this fix. This bill would provide those students who borrowed before 2012 the same opportunities that new borrowers have.

If student loan borrowers could get lower interest rates, they would be able to more fully participate in the economy. They could buy houses, eat out in restaurants, move out of their parents' homes, or even just have enough money to save for a better future.

This bill is simple, and it fixes a fundamental inequity. I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, in parliamentary parlance, what we have before us is termed a "structured rule." However, I would venture to say that this is an unstructured rule. It is a rule put forward by a majority with no clear structure to its strategy of how to govern this country.

This rule will allow them to bring two versions of their budget to the floor, as their deficit hawks and defense hawks continue to fight over what budget they should pursue. It is demonstrative of the deep divisions that we have seen displayed on a regular basis in the majority party.

We have now seen one example after another of this Republican majority being unable to assemble the votes from within its own ranks to pass important measures on its own. We saw it with funding to keep the Department of Homeland Security open. We also saw it last Congress, when Republicans were forced to withdraw an appropriations bill for Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development when they didn't have the votes to support their sequestration strategy.

The gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said at that time that the bill's removal meant that "with this action, the

House has declined to proceed on the implementation of the very budget it adopted just 3 months ago. Thus, I believe," Chairman ROGERS went on, "that the House has made its choice: sequestration—and its unrealistic and ill-conceived discretionary cuts—must be brought to an end."

That was the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee speaking—not STENY HOYER, not a Democrat, but a Republican leader.

So, Mr. Speaker, today is not the first time that we are seeing the majority plagued by dysfunction as it budgets in a partisan way, but today it has gone a step further with a rule that essentially acknowledges that there is no consensus among Republicans as to how they ought to proceed. That is why Republicans are putting forward this convoluted amendment strategy.

However, I tell my friends on the other side, the votes exist to pass a budget in this House but only if it is one that replaces both the defense and nondefense components of the sequester with a commonsense and fiscally responsible alternative.

And I predict today that this budget will not be followed, as previous budgets passed by the Republican majority have never been followed and were not followed by them.

Democrats would partner, I would tell my Republican friends, to pass a budget that invests in the future and does not stifle the growth of jobs and opportunity.

I urge my colleagues we can do better. Reject this rule. Let's go back to the drawing board. Let's get it right.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to my friend, whose leadership in this House I value, that he had an opportunity in that joint select committee, that supercommittee, an opportunity that I know he wishes that we had been able to come together on and we were not able to come together on.

What we have now is not a division amongst ourselves; it is a reflection of the fact that we actually have different opinions. Allowing different budgets to come to the floor is going to allow us to flush out those opinions.

I wish, thinking about bipartisan cooperation as we have had in years past, there would have been a Republican-Democratic substitute that would have gotten to balance as well, making those tough decisions. But instead, what we are left with are Democratic budgets that never balance and Republican budgets that achieve balance, all while ignoring the challenge that we have to deal with sequester long term.

I appreciate the gentleman's leadership on trying to deal with the sequester. I, too, wish we had had it.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.



Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

The fact of the matter is, I oppose this rule. I think my Republican friends' budget will pass. I understand that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield myself an additional 15 seconds, and I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

I wish he would go back to the drawing board. And I will tell my friend, I will participate with you.

Nobody believes, I think, that sequester is going to ultimately rule the day in our appropriation bills because it is, as your chairman said, ill-conceived and unrealistic. I would think it better policy for us to decide that now, and then implement appropriation bills consistent with something that is reasonable and not ill-conceived.

Mr. WOODALL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS).

Ms. ADAMS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today as a member of the Higher Education Subcommittee and as a retired professor of 40 years at Bennett College in North Carolina. I am steadfastly committed to making sure that every student has access to a quality, affordable college education because education is key to achieving the American Dream.

However, too many of our graduates are burdened with insurmountable debt, which hinders their prospect of achieving the great American Dream. Even worse, the rising cost of education and the threat of educational debt has become a barrier for many students considering college. That is not acceptable.

National student loan debt is more than \$1.3 trillion. It is time to invest in our constituents and help our graduates better manage their debt. Homeowners and car owners can refinance their loans. Why can't our hardworking graduates do the same?

The Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act will allow them to do just that. It will allow graduates to refinance their old debt so that they are better equipped to pay it off.

One in seven student borrowers defaults on their loans within the first 3 years. If we don't act now, our graduates will continue to be forced to choose between paying school debt, purchasing homes, creating a savings account, and starting families. The threat is too grave to our economy.

I know firsthand what higher education can do for a person's life because of what it did for me. That is why I am fighting for every student to have access to a quality, affordable education.

We can no longer sit back and watch students spend their entire adult lives paying off their student debt. I urge my colleagues to put our graduates before partisan politics, and let's pass this legislation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from New York that I have no further requests for time, and I would ask my friend if she has further requests for time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. WOODALL. With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the House majority has once again chosen to favor billionaires over the middle class, debunk economics over real investments, and politics over people. Democrats have a clear alternative that would keep our economy growing and ensure a strong fiscal future. Our alternative ensures that college is achievable, that jobs are available, and that health care is affordable. That is what will keep our economy on the right track.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the previous question, vote "no" on the draconian Republican budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I understand why folks want to vote "no" sometimes in this Chamber. You want to vote "no" because you don't like the ideas the other side has, and it turns out that if they have more votes than you have on any particular idea, they win and you lose. I lose in this Chamber from time to time myself, as I know all my friends do, but this rule offers an opportunity at least for every idea to be heard, and the best ideas ought to rise to the top. That is the America that I believe in. That is the Congress that I believe in, that if we allow this festival of democracy, if we allow all of these provisions to be considered, we will have the best ideas rise to the top.

When I hear my colleagues complaining about what isn't available today, it is an indictment of our collective work ethic because this rule makes every idea that was presented available.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side decided to talk about student loan debt today. It is a troubling issue. Member after Member has come to the House floor, and they have said that these students have taken out all of these loans, economic circumstances have changed, and now their opportunities are truncated. I feel for those students. America is in exactly that same circumstance. We have taken out loan after loan after loan, economic circumstances are changing, and if we continue on this path, America's opportunities will be truncated.

I hear my friends advocating for an opportunity to refinance student loans. Where is the opportunity to refinance America's \$18 trillion in debt? Mr. Speaker, over the next 10 years, if we do nothing—if we do nothing—as my colleagues propose, if we defeat this rule and do nothing, America will pay \$4.7 trillion in interest alone—not a penny of the \$18 trillion in principal, \$4.7 trillion in interest alone. That is an entire year, in fact, that is an entire year and one quarter of Federal spending wasted on interest.

These are not academic conversations we are having today, Mr. Speaker. These are decisions about whether we are going to be paying our creditors or investing in America. These are decisions about whether we are going to be paying our creditors or focusing on our collective priorities. These are decisions about whether the budget will balance or whether it never ever, ever will.

I choose balance, Mr. Speaker. I choose balance, and I choose the tough bipartisan decisions that we will have to make together. I choose the tough bicameral decisions we will have to make together. I choose the tough negotiations with the President that we will have to do together. But I will not be a party to mortgaging the future of America one more time. I am grateful that we will consider all of the ideas that are presented here today, and I am confident that balance and fiscal responsibility will rise to the top.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and get on to this great debate that we will have.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 163 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER OF NEW YORK

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1434) to amend the



Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1434.

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the pre-

vious question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; suspending the rules and passing H.R. 216; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 180, not voting 14, as follows:

#### (Roll No. 132)

#### YEAS—238

Abraham	Buck	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Bucshon	Denham
Allen	Burgess	Dent
Amash	Byrne	DeSantis
Amodei	Calvert	DesJarlais
Babin	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Dold
Barr	Chabot	Duffy
Barton	Chaffetz	Duncan (TN)
Benish	Clawson (FL)	Ellmers (NC)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Emmer (MN)
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Farenthold
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Fincher
Black	Collins (NY)	Fitzpatrick
Blackburn	Comstock	Fleischmann
Blum	Conaway	Fleming
Bost	Cook	Flores
Boustany	Costello (PA)	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Fortenberry
Brat	Crawford	Fox
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Franks (AZ)
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)	Garrett

Gibbs	MacArthur	Rothfus
Gibson	Marchant	Rouzer
Gohmert	Marino	Royce
Goodlatte	Massie	Russell
Gowdy	McCarthy	Ryan (WI)
Granger	McCaul	Salmon
Graves (GA)	McClintock	Sanford
Graves (LA)	McHenry	Scalise
Griffith	McKinley	Schock
Grothman	McMorris	Schweikert
Guinta	Rodgers	Scott, Austin
Guthrie	McSally	Sensenbrenner
Hanna	Meadows	Sessions
Hardy	Meehan	Shimkus
Harper	Messer	Shuster
Harris	Mica	Simpson
Hartzler	Miller (FL)	Smith (MO)
Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)	Smith (NE)
Hensarling	Moolenaar	Smith (NJ)
Herrera Beutler	Mooney (WV)	Smith (TX)
Hice, Jody B.	Mullin	Stefanik
Hill	Mulvaney	Stewart
Holding	Murphy (PA)	Stivers
Hudson	Neugebauer	Stutzman
Huelskamp	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)
Huizenga (MI)	Noem	Thornberry
Hultgren	Nugent	Tiberi
Hunter	Nunes	Tipton
Hurd (TX)	Olson	Trott
Hurt (VA)	Palazzo	Turner
Issa	Palmer	Upton
Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen	Valadao
Jenkins (WV)	Pearce	Wagner
Johnson (OH)	Perry	Walberg
Johnson, Sam	Pittenger	Walden
Jolly	Pitts	Walker
Jones	Poe (TX)	Walorski
Jordan	Poliquin	Walters, Mimi
Joyce	Pompeo	Weber (TX)
Katko	Posey	Webster (FL)
Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom	Wenstrup
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Westerman
King (NY)	Reed	Westmoreland
Kinzinger (IL)	Reichert	Whitfield
Kline	Renacci	Williams
Knight	Ribble	Wilson (SC)
LaMalfa	Rice (SC)	Wittman
Lamborn	Rigell	Womack
Lance	Roby	Woodall
Latta	Roe (TN)	Yoder
LoBiondo	Rogers (AL)	Yoho
Long	Rogers (KY)	Young (AK)
Loudermilk	Rohrabacher	Young (IA)
Love	Rokita	Young (IN)
Lucas	Rooney (FL)	Zeldin
Luetkemeyer	Ros-Lehtinen	Zinke
Lummis	Ross	

#### NAYS—180

Adams	Courtney	Hahn
Aguilar	Crowley	Hastings
Ashford	Cuellar	Heck (WA)
Bass	Cummings	Higgins
Beatty	Davis (CA)	Himes
Becerra	Davis, Danny	Honda
Bera	DeFazio	Hoyer
Beyer	DeGette	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	Delaney	Israel
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Jackson Lee
Bonamici	DelBene	Jeffries
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeSaulnier	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	Deutch	Johnson, E. B.
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Kaptur
Bustos	Doggett	Keating
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael F.	Kelly (IL)
Capps	Duckworth	Kennedy
Capuano	Edwards	Kildee
Cárdenas	Ellison	Kilmer
Carney	Engel	Kind
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Cartwright	Esty	Kuster
Castor (FL)	Farr	Langevin
Castro (TX)	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Chu, Judy	Foster	Larson (CT)
Cicilline	Frankel (FL)	Lawrence
Clark (MA)	Fudge	Lee
Clarke (NY)	Gabbard	Levin
Clay	Galleo	Lewis
Cleaver	Garamendi	Lieu, Ted
Clyburn	Graham	Lipinski
Cohen	Grayson	Loeb
Connolly	Green, Al	Loftgren
Conyers	Green, Gene	Lowenthal
Cooper	Gutiérrez	Lowey

Lujan Grisham (NM)	Peters	Sires	Hardy	McMorris	Ryan (WI)	Meeks	Richmond	Takano
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Peterson	Slaughter	Harper	Rodgers	Salmon	Meng	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Lynch (NM)	Pingree	Speier	Harris	McSally	Sanford	Moore	Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Carolyn	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)	Hartzler	Meadows	Scalise	Moulton	Rush	Titus
Maloney, Sean	Polis	Takai	Heck (NV)	Meehan	Schock	Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Tonko
Matsui	Price (NC)	Takano	Hensarling	Messer	Schweikert	Nadler	Sánchez, Linda T.	Torres
McCollum	Quigley	Thompson (CA)	Herrera Beutler	Mica	Scott, Austin	Napolitano	Sanchez, Loretta	Tsongas
McDermott	Rangel	Thompson (MS)	Hice, Jody B.	Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Neal	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
McGovern	Rice (NY)	Titus	Hill	Miller (MI)	Sessions	Nolan	Schakowsky	Vargas
McNerney	Richmond	Tonko	Holding	Moolenaar	Shimkus	O'Rourke	Schiff	Veasey
Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Torres	Hudson	Mooney (WV)	Shuster	Pallone	Schrader	Velázquez
Meng	Ruppersberger	Tsongas	Huelskamp	Mullin	Simpson	Pascrell	Scott (VA)	Visclosky
Moore	Rush	Van Hollen	Huizenga (MI)	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)	Pelosi	Scott, David	Walz
Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Vargas	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)	Perlmutter	Serrano	Wasserman
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Veasey	Hunter	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)	Peters	Sewell (AL)	Schultz
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Vela	Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Smith (TX)	Peterson	Sinema	Sires
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Velázquez	Hurt (VA)	Noem	Stefanik	Pingree	Slaughter	Welch
Neal	Schakowsky	Visclosky	Issa	Nugent	Stewart	Pocan	Speler	Wilson (FL)
Nolan	Schiff	Walz	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Stivers	Polis	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
O'Rourke	Schrader	Wasserman	Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Stutzman	Price (NC)	Takai	
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Schultz	Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Thompson (PA)	Quigley		
Pascrell	Scott, David	Waters, Maxine	Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Thornberry	Rangel		
Pelosi	Serrano	Welch	Jolly	Paulsen	Tiberi	Rice (NY)		
Perlmutter	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)	Jordan	Pearce	Tipton			
	Sherman	Yarmuth	Joyce	Perry	Trott			
	Sinema		Katko	Pittenger	Upton			
			Kelly (PA)	Pitts	Valadao			
			King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Wagner			
			King (NY)	Poliquin	Walberg			
			Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Walden			
			Kline	Posey	Walker			
			Knight	Price, Tom	Walorski			
			Labrador	Ratcliffe	Reed			
			LaMalfa	Reichert	Walters, Mimi			
			Lamborn	Renacci	Weber (TX)			
			Lance	Ribble	Webster (FL)			
			Latta	Wenstrup	Westerman			
			LoBiondo	Rice (SC)	Westmoreland			
			Long	Rigell	Whitfield			
			Loudermilk	Roby	Williams			
			Love	Roe (TN)	Wilson (SC)			
			Lucas	Rogers (AL)	Wittman			
			Luetkemeyer	Rogers (KY)	Womack			
			Lummis	Rohrabacher	Woodall			
			MacArthur	Rokita	Yoder			
			Marchant	Rooney (FL)	Yoho			
			Marino	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)			
			Massie	Roskam	Young (IA)			
			McCarthy	Ross	Young (IN)			
			McCaul	Rothfus	Zeldin			
			McClintock	Rouzer	Zinke			
			McHenry	Royce				
			McKinley	Russell				

## NOT VOTING—14

Brown (FL)	Graves (MO)	Payne
Buchanan	Grijalva	Roskam
Costa	Hinojosa	Ruiz
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Smith (WA)
Gosar	Norcross	

## □ 1402

Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. GARAMENDI changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 180, answered “present” 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

## YEAS—237

Abraham	Carter (GA)	Ellmers (NC)
Aderholt	Carter (TX)	Emmer (MN)
Allen	Chabot	Farenthold
Amash	Chaffetz	Fincher
Amodei	Clawson (FL)	Fitzpatrick
Babin	Coffman	Fleischmann
Barletta	Cole	Fleming
Barr	Collins (GA)	Flores
Barton	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Benishkek	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Conaway	Fox
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Cicilline
Black	Cramer	Garrett
Blackburn	Crawford	Gibbs
Blum	Crenshaw	Gibson
Bost	Culberson	Gohmert
Boustany	Curbelo (FL)	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Brat	Denham	Gowdy
Bridenstine	Dent	Granger
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Buck	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Burgess	Dold	Guinta
Byrne	Duffy	Guthrie
Calvert	Duncan (TN)	Hanna

## NAYS—180

Aguilar	Davis (CA)	Johnson Lee
Ashford	Davis, Danny	Jeffries
Bass	DeFazio	Johnson (GA)
Beatty	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Becerra	Delaney	Jones
Bera	DeLauro	Kaptur
Beyer	DelBene	Keating
Bishop (GA)	DeSaunier	Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer	Dingell	Kennedy
Bonamici	Doggett	Kildee
Boyle, Brendan F.	Doyle, Michael F.	Kilmer
Brady (PA)	Duckworth	Kind
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Kirkpatrick
Bustos	Ellison	Kuster
Butterfield	Engel	Langevin
Capps	Eshoo	Larsen (WA)
Capuano	Esty	Larson (CT)
Cárdenas	Farr	Lawrence
Carney	Fattah	Lee
Carson (IN)	Foster	Levin
Cartwright	Frankel (FL)	Lewis
Castor (FL)	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Lipinski
Chu, Judy	Gallego	Loeb
Cicilline	Garamendi	Loeb
Clark (MA)	Graham	Loeb
Clarke (NY)	Grayson	Lujan Grisham
Clay	Green, Al	(NM)
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray
Clyburn	Gutiérrez	(NM)
Cohen	Hahn	Lynch
Connolly	Hastings	Maloney,
Conyers	Heck (WA)	Carolyn
Cooper	Higgins	Maloney, Sean
Costa	Himes	Matsui
Courtney	Honda	McCollum
Crowley	Hoyer	McDermott
Cuellar	Huffman	McGovern
Cummings	Israel	McNerney

## ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Griffith

## NOT VOTING—14

Adams	Duncan (SC)	Payne
Brown (FL)	Graves (MO)	Ruiz
Buchanan	Grijalva	Smith (WA)
Bucshon	Hinojosa	Turner
Deutch	Norcross	

## □ 1410

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS BUDGET PLANNING REFORM ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 216) to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

## YEAS—420

Abraham	Benishkek	Boyle, Brendan F.
Adams	Bera	F.
Aderholt	Beyer	Brady (PA)
Aguilar	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Brat
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Bridenstine
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Ashford	Black	Brooks (IN)
Babin	Blackburn	Brownley (CA)
Barletta	Blum	Buck
Barr	Blumenauer	Bucshon
Barton	Bonamici	Burgess
Bass	Bost	Bustos
Beatty	Boustany	Butterfield
Becerra		Byrne

Calvert	Gosar	Lujan, Ben Ray	Royce	Smith (MO)	Wagner	Cook	Katko	Price (NC)
Capps	Gowdy	(NM)	Ruppersberger	Smith (NE)	Walberg	Cooper	Keating	Rangel
Capuano	Graham	Lummis	Rush	Smith (NJ)	Walden	Courtney	Reichert	Reichert
Cardenas	Granger	Lynch	Russell	Smith (TX)	Walker	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Ribble
Carney	Graves (GA)	MacArthur	Ryan (OH)	Speier	Walorski	Crawford	Kennedy	Rice (SC)
Carson (IN)	Graves (LA)	Maloney,	Ryan (WI)	Stefanik	Walters, Mimi	Crenshaw	Kildee	Richmond
Carter (CA)	Grayson	Carolyn	Salmon	Stewart	Walz	Crowley	King (IA)	Roby
Carter (TX)	Green, Al	Maloney, Sean	Sánchez, Linda	Stivers	Wasserman	Cuellar	King (NY)	Roe (TN)
Cartwright	Green, Gene	Marchant	T.	Stutzman	Schultz	Culberson	Kline	Rogers (KY)
Castor (FL)	Griffith	Marino	Sanchez, Loretta	Swalwell (CA)	Waters, Maxine	Cummings	Knight	Rohrabacher
Castro (TX)	Grothman	Massie	Sanford	Takai	Watson Coleman	Davis (CA)	Kuster	Rohit
Chabot	Guinta	Matsui	Sarbanes	Takano	Weber (TX)	Davis, Danny	Labrador	Roskam
Chaffetz	Guthrie	McCarthy	Scalise	Thompson (CA)	Webster (FL)	DeGette	LaMalfa	Ross
Chu, Judy	Gutiérrez	McCaul	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Welch	DeLauro	Lamborn	Roithfus
Cicilline	Hahn	McClintock	Schiff	Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup	DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Roys
Clark (MA)	Hanna	McCollum	Schock	Thornberry	Westerman	DeSaulnier	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Hardy	McDermott	Schrader	Tiberi	Westmoreland	DesJarlais	Latta	Russell
Clawson (FL)	Harper	McGovern	Schweikert	Tipton	Whitfield	Deutch	Lawrence	Ryan (WI)
Clay	Harris	McHenry	Scott (VA)	Titus	Williams	Diaz-Balart	Levin	Salmon
Cleaver	Hartzler	McKinley	Scott, Austin	Tonko	Wilson (FL)	Lieu, Ted	Lieu, Ted	Sanford
Clyburn	Hastings	McMorris	Scott, David	Torres	Wilson (SC)	Doggett	Lipinski	Scalise
Cohen	Heck (NV)	Rodgers	Sensenbrenner	Trott	Wittman	Doyle, Michael	Loeb sack	Schiff
Cole	Heck (WA)	McNerney	Serrano	Tsongas	Womack	F.	Lofgren	Schock
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	McSally	Sessions	Turner	Woodall	Duckworth	Long	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Herrera Beutler	Meadows	Sewell (AL)	Upton	Yarmuth	Duncan (TN)	Loudermilk	Scott (VA)
Comstock	Hice, Jody B.	Meehan	Sherman	Valadao	Yoder	Edwards	Lowe y	Scott, Austin
Conaway	Higgins	Meeks	Shimkus	Van Hollen	Yoho	Ellison	Lucas	Scott, David
Connolly	Hill	Meng	Shuster	Vargas	Young (AK)	Emmer (MN)	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Conyers	Himes	Messer	Simpson	Veasey	Young (IA)	Engel	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Cook	Holding	Mica	Sinema	Vela	Young (IN)	Eshoo	(NM)	Sessions
Cooper	Honda	Miller (FL)	Sires	Velázquez	Zeldin	Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sherman
Costa	Hoyer	Miller (MI)	Slaughter	Visclosky	Zinke	Farr	(NM)	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	Hudson	Moolenaar		NOT VOTING—12		Fattah	Lummis	Simpson
Courtney	Huelskamp	Mooney (WV)				Fincher	Maloney,	Smith (NE)
Cramer	Huffman	Moore	Brown (FL)	Graves (MO)	Payne	Fleischmann	Carolyn	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	Huizenga (MI)	Moulton	Buchanan	Grijalva	Perry	Forbes	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Hultgren	Mullin	Coffman	Hinojosa	Ruiz	Fortenberry	Marino	Speier
Crowley	Hunter	Mulvaney	Duncan (SC)	Norcross	Smith (WA)	Foster	Massie	Stefanik
Cuellar	Hurd (TX)	Murphy (FL)				Frankel (FL)	McCarthy	Stewart
Culberson	Hurt (VA)	Murphy (PA)				Franks (AZ)	McCaul	Stutzman
Cummings	Israel	Nadler				Frelinghuysen	McClintock	Takai
Curbelo (FL)	Issa	Napolitano				Gabbard	McCollum	Takano
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Neal				Gallo	McHenry	Tiberi
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	Neugebauer				Garamendi	McKinley	Titus
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	Newhouse				Goodlatte	McMorris	Trott
DeFazio	Jenkins (WV)	Noem				Graham	Rodgers	Tsongas
DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Nolan				Granger	McNerney	Upton
Delaney	Johnson (OH)	Nugent				Grayson	McSally	Van Hollen
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Nunes				Green, Al	Meadows	Vela
DelBene	Johnson, Sam	O'Rourke				Grothman	Meehan	Wagner
Denham	Jolly	Olson				Guinta	Meeks	Walker
Dent	Jones	Palazzo				Guthrie	Meng	Walters, Mimi
DeSantis	Jordan	Pallone				Gutiérrez	Messer	Walz
DeSaulnier	Joyce	Palmer				Hahn	Mica	Wasserman
DesJarlais	Kaptur	Pascrell				Hardy	Moolenaar	Schultz
Deutch	Katko	Paulsen				Harper	Mooney (WV)	Webster (FL)
Diaz-Balart	Keating	Pearce				Harris	Mullin	Welch
Dingell	Kelly (IL)	Pelosi				Hartzler	Murphy (PA)	Wenstrup
Doggett	Kelly (PA)	Perlmutter				Heck (WA)	Nadler	Westerman

Hill	Miller (FL)	Sánchez, Linda
Holding	Moore	T.
Honda	Moulton	Sanchez, Loretta
Hoyer	Mulvaney	Sarbanes
Hudson	Murphy (FL)	Schakowsky
Huizenga (MI)	Neal	Schrader
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Sewell (AL)
Israel	Noem	Shuster
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Sinema
Jeffries	Nugent	Sires
Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Slaughter
Jenkins (WV)	Pallone	Smith (MO)
Johnson (OH)	Pascarella	Stivers
Jones	Paulsen	Swalwell (CA)
Jordan	Pearce	Thompson (CA)
Joyce	Perry	Thompson (MS)
Kilmer	Peters	Thompson (PA)
Kind	Peterson	Tipton
Kinzinger (IL)	Pittenger	Torres
Kirkpatrick	Poe (TX)	Turner
Lance	Price, Tom	Valadao
Langevin	Ratcliffe	Vargas
Lee	Reed	Veasey
Lewis	Renacci	Velázquez
LoBiondo	Rice (NY)	Visclosky
Love	Rigell	Walberg
Lowenthal	Rogers (AL)	Walden
Lynch	Rooney (FL)	Waters, Maxine
MacArthur	Ros-Lehtinen	Watson Coleman
Maloney, Sean	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Wittman
McDermott	Rush	Woodall
McGovern		Yoder

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Gohmert Tonko

## NOT VOTING—20

Bishop (GA)	Graves (MO)	Quigley
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Ruiz
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Ryan (OH)
Buchanan	Miller (MI)	Smith (WA)
Cárdenas	Norcross	Thornberry
Duncan (SC)	Payne	Walorski
Graves (GA)	Pelosi	

□ 1424

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON  
THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR  
2016

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 163 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 27.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1425

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Govern-

ment for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, with Mr. YODER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), or their designees.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman, and I want to thank my ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), for his work on our budget that we bring forward and the spirited debate that we had in committee.

I want to thank all of our committee members for the productive activity that they brought forward over the last 10 or 11 weeks to work on our budget and produce this product.

I want to thank our staff. They have done incredible work to get us to this point.

I want to take a special moment to thank Congressional Budget Office Director Doug Elmendorf, who will be leaving at the end of the month. I know the ranking member and I are going to have some words later on about his service, but I want to thank him and his staff for the work that they have done.

Mr. Chairman, I am so proud and pleased to join my Committee on the Budget colleagues and Conference member colleagues on this side of the aisle to present A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

When I talk with folks back home in the district, the Sixth District of Georgia, and across the State of Georgia, truly across this country, individuals are concerned. They are very concerned. Many of them are angry. Most are frustrated about the direction of America. They feel we are adrift, that Washington seems incapable of addressing their concerns, that the Federal Government is getting in the way or impeding the very spirit of the people. The President's response in his budget? More taxes, more spending,

more borrowing, more debt, more stagnant growth, and a budget that never, ever, ever balances.

Remember, Mr. Chairman—the American people know this—every dollar that is taken for taxes and every dollar that is borrowed, stealing from the next generation, is a dollar that can't be used to pay the rent, to buy a car, to buy a home, to send a kid to college, to open a business or to expand a business and create jobs. We think there is a better way.

Framing that issue, as folks read our report, is our introduction, in which we say this: It is often said that a budget is more than a dry collection of numbers and budgeting more than a mechanical act. With respect to the congressional budget, no one has put it better than the renowned political scientist, Aaron Wildavsky, when he said:

Taxing and spending, resource mobilization, and resource allocation now take up as much or more time on the floors of Congress than all other matters put together. How large government will be, the part it will play in our lives, whether more or less will be done for defense or welfare, how much, and what sort of people will pay for the services, what kind of society, in sum, we Americans want to have, all these are routinely discussed in budget debates.

This resolution proceeds from that conviction. It seeks to restore fundamental principles of budgeting and governing, to reverse the drift toward higher spending and larger government, to reinforce the innovative and creative spirit stirring among the myriad institutions and communities across this country, and to revitalize the prosperity that creates ever-expanding opportunities for all Americans to pursue their destinies. Put differently, this budget resolution expresses a vision, a vision of governing, and of America itself.

So what is that vision? Mr. Chairman, we believe in promoting the greatest amount of opportunity and the greatest amount of success for the greatest number of Americans so the greatest number of American dreams may be realized, and doing so in a way that demonstrates real hope and real compassion and real fairness without Washington picking winners and losers.

Now, Americans just have a common sense about them, and they understand that something just isn't right, especially with our debt—very troubling, over \$18 trillion. They know that we can't spend more money than we take in forever. They can't do it in their personal lives, they can't do it in their families or their businesses or their communities, and we can't do it right here in Congress.

In fact, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said just a few years ago, Admiral Mike Mullen, the highest ranking military officer in our country, he was asked: What is the greatest threat to national security? The highest ranking military officer in our

country asked what the greatest threat was, and he said the national debt because he knows what Americans know, that unless we have economic security, we will never have national security.

□ 1430

So instead of the insecurity and the uncertainty of the President's plan, we think there is a better way.

What are our highlights? We balance the budget in less than 10 years, and we do so without raising taxes. Our budget reduces spending by \$5.5 trillion. It stays in balance and sets us on a path to pay off that debt—all of it.

We provide for a vote on the balanced budget amendment in the House of Representatives—this Congress—something that folks back home just think makes sense.

We support a strong national defense—providing resources above the President's number—when taking into account the base defense budget and the global war on terror funding.

We repeal ObamaCare in its entirety. As a physician, I can tell you it is not just harming the health of America; it is harming the economy of America.

We stop the raid on Medicare. We eliminate the Independent Payment Advisory Board, where a board of individuals can not pay seniors' doctors for caring for them.

We promote patient-centered health care where patients, families, and doctors are making medical decisions, not Washington, D.C.

We secure economic opportunity. We call for fair and simple and comprehensive tax reform to get this economy rolling again and get millions of Americans back to work.

We repeal Dodd-Frank and end the too-big-to-fail bank bailouts. We reform Fannie and Freddie. We cut corporate welfare.

We promote federalism. In fact, a letter sent from Governors across this State recently said:

Over the last several decades, the Federal Government has passed laws and promulgated regulations that restrict the ability of States to innovate while requiring States to implement and run programs dictated by Federal dollars and Federal rules.

For a long time, States were willing to trade off power and responsibility for Federal taxpayer funds, but we have reached a tipping point where States serve to carry out the wishes of the Federal Government instead of serving as laboratories of democracy.

So, we give States flexibility—flexibility in programs like Medicaid and nutritional assistance. The States are the ones that know how best to respond to their population. We return control of education to State and local governments.

We hold Washington accountable, reducing the size of the Federal workforce through attrition, and we support selling Federal assets and unneeded Federal lands. We call for regulatory

reform to free up small business and job creation across this land. We require fee-collecting programs in the Federal Government to account for that revenue in our own appropriations process so the people's Representatives can have a say about how that money is spent.

We cut waste, fraud, and abuse. We would end the double-dipping in disability insurance and unemployment insurance. We require able-bodied adults of working age to work in order to receive Federal welfare benefits.

We support the rights of conscience for doctors and health care providers and employers, and we push back on the executive overreach of this administration. We stop the President's war on coal. We prevent the carbon tax. We encourage construction of the Keystone pipeline, and we hold the IRS accountable for targeting American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, this is a positive vision for our country. It will deliver real results for the American people. We responsibly lay out a path for a healthy economy, an opportunity economy—one that opens doors for people, not subjects them to the dictates of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, we believe in America, and we believe in Americans. We understand our problems are significant, and we hear the people of this Nation crying out for leadership here in Washington, D.C.

The Balanced Budget for a Stronger America will result in a government that is more efficient, more effective, and more accountable—one that frees up the American spirit and optimism and enthusiasm to do great things and meet great challenges.

We encourage our colleagues and fellow citizens across this country to join us in this exciting opportunity.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by thanking the chairman of the committee, Chairman PRICE, for conducting the business of the Budget Committee in a professional manner. We have sharp differences but have expressed them in a civil fashion.

I also want to agree with him with respect to the great job the Budget Committee staff has done, both Democrat and Republican, and agree with him on one more thing—and it may be the last thing I agree with the gentleman on during this debate. Dr. Elmendorf, the current head of the Congressional Budget Office, has done a great job, and we are going to have a little bit more to say about that later.

We all believe in America, Mr. Chair, but I do not believe this Republican budget reflects the values and priorities. It is the wrong direction for America.

Now, as we gather here today, we are facing some good news, we are facing

some bad news, and we are facing some really bad news.

The good news is the economy is improving. More people are going back to work. In fact, the private sector has added 12 million new jobs over the last 60 months.

It is not all rosy. Many Americans are still looking for work, but the unemployment rate has fallen to 5.5 percent, and trends are good.

The bad news is that Americans are working harder than ever, but their paychecks are flat. This is not a new problem, Mr. Chairman. It is not even a problem in the last 2 years or just the last 5 years. It goes back quite a ways. In fact, as this chart indicates, we have seen a growing gap between worker productivity, which has been rising steadily, and the incomes and paychecks of most working Americans.

If you look at this chart, it is very interesting, because it goes from 1948 to the 1970s, and you see these two lines are convergent. That means the additional worker productivity—the hard work of American workers—was translated into higher paychecks and compensation for them.

But starting around the 1970s, you saw the great divergence. Worker productivity went up. People are working harder than ever, better than ever, but their paychecks and compensation have been pretty much flat.

So, where is the value of that hard work going? If people are working harder than ever, why aren't their paychecks keeping track?

Well, that additional value of hard work is no longer going to regular working Americans—people working for a paycheck. It has gone, overwhelmingly, to folks at the top. And I don't mean just the top 10. It has gone, overwhelmingly, to the top 1 percent of Americans, who have seen their incomes rise dramatically even as everybody else has pretty much been running in place and flat.

So, our challenge to all those people working really hard—harder than ever—is: How can we make sure that they benefit from that increased productivity?

Mr. Chairman, we had some hope right after the November election. I remember opening up the newspaper—The Wall Street Journal. There was an op-ed piece by Speaker BOEHNER and Republican Senate Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, and here is what they said. They said that they were humbled by the opportunity to “help struggling middle class Americans” and to deal with “wage stagnation.” That is what they said right after the election.

But, Mr. Chairman, the very bad news today for the country is, if you look at this Republican budget, it turns out they were just kidding. This Republican budget is really hard on hard-working Americans and those who are looking hard to find a job. It says,

Keep working harder, but you are going to get less.

It will do nothing to increase paychecks and take-home pay for working families. In fact, it squeezes them even harder and tighter. It will increase the tax burden on millions of families—those in the middle class and those working hard to join the middle class.

Amazingly, it just drops the higher education tax credits. It ends the boost in the child tax credit. Millions of Americans will lose access to Affordable Care tax credits.

It is not just working families. Students who are working hard to try and get a job are going to find college even less affordable than today.

This Republican budget cuts student loans. It increases the cost of student loans. It starts charging students interest while they are still in college. It cuts \$90 billion from Pell—mandatory—and more.

It is not just students and working families. Seniors who have worked hard to secure a healthy retirement are going to see their costs go up immediately. Prescription drugs will cost more. Copayments for preventive health services go up right away. Nursing home care will get much more expensive as they cut \$90 billion out of Medicaid, two-thirds of which goes to help seniors and disabled individuals. Most of the rest goes to families with kids. And then they turn Medicare into a voucher program that will reduce Medicare benefits.

So while this Republican budget squeezes hard-working families, increases the cost of college for students, squeezes seniors—higher costs for them—it is great for those who are already in the top 1 percent. It is great for millionaires. In fact, this budget paves the way for the Romney-Ryan plan to cut the tax rate for millionaires by a third. It paves the way. It green lights it.

If you look at this budget, it is based on a failed and unproven economic theory—top-down, trickle-down economics—the same old theory, the theory that collided with the real world under President Bush in the 2000s, right? It cut the top tax rate. The theory was that benefits would trickle down and lift everybody up. Guess what? Incomes to the top 1 percent went up. Everybody else ran aground. Yachts went up. Everyone else's boat ran aground. That is what happened.

Guess what else went up? Deficits went up, Mr. Chairman, but everybody else was running in place or fell behind.

And here is the thing. While this Republican budget makes life harder right away for hard-working Americans—life will get harder immediately—it also disinvests in our future. It slashes the part of the budget we use to invest in our kids' education—from early education and Head Start to K-12 and beyond.

It is a sad day when we start chopping away at the ladder of opportunity in this country.

It will also devastate the investments our country has historically made in scientific research and innovation, investments that have helped power our economy and keep us at the cutting edge of world technology.

And guess what else? It provides no solution, no answer to the fact that in just a few months, in May, we are going to face a shortfall in the transportation trust fund that will result in a construction slowdown this summer. It does nothing about that in the budget. It says: Oh, we're going to come up with something after today—in a couple months.

So, Mr. Chair, when I say that this budget disinvests in America, it is not rhetoric. It is a mathematical reality.

I want people to look at this chart. This is a chart of the share of our economy that we spend on the investment portion of our budget—the investment in our kids' education, the investment in scientific research like the medical research to help find treatments and cures to diseases like cancer or diabetes or other diseases that plague American families.

Here is what the Republican budget does. It takes that investment budget and throws it off the cliff, to the point that it is 40 percent below the lowest level as a share of the economy since we have been keeping records in the late 1950s.

Here is a country that invested in the GI Bill. We invested in our infrastructure and the National Highway System. We have invested in our kids' education. This Republican budget disinvests in America. So it cuts all those things.

I will tell you one thing it doesn't cut. It doesn't cut one single tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Not one penny. Not one penny to reduce the deficit.

□ 1445

We hear that the highest priority is to reduce the deficit; but, yes, let's cut our investment in education. Yeah, let's cut our investment in innovation. Let's not fund the transportation trust fund—but we are not going to cut one single tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit, not for corporate jets, not for hedge fund owners, not one.

Despite all that and despite the deep cuts it makes in our investment, the reality is this budget doesn't balance. It doesn't balance, not by a long shot, Mr. Chairman.

This budget takes budget quackery to new heights. It claims to repeal the Affordable Care Act, but it uses the revenues and the savings from the Affordable Care Act to claim balance at the end of 10 years.

Senator ENZI, the new Republican chairman of the Senate Budget Com-

mittee, said that was kind of a budget accounting that he didn't think was right. The Heritage Foundation, they called that question as well in comments last time this came up.

Here is the other thing. The budget doesn't account for the almost \$1 trillion in tax extenders that our Republican colleagues brought to the floor last fall and are on the way to bringing to the floor now, \$1 trillion. If you add that to the deficit, which is real money, it is even farther out of balance.

Then they go and claim a deficit dividend based on phantom deficit reductions. Here is the number. This is in the 10th year. This is in the 10th year when they say their budget is really in balance by \$33 billion. Well, it is not.

If you take out the Affordable Care Act revenue, if you take out the Affordable Care Act savings, if you add in the tax extenders costs that our Republican colleagues keep bringing to the floor, you don't come close to balance, not close, Mr. Chairman. This balanced budget stuff, it just isn't true. It is just not true. It would make Enron accountants blush.

I think, Mr. Chairman, most Americans would agree that this budget—cutting tax rates for the very wealthy, while increasing the tax burden on working families, raising the cost to seniors, raising the cost to students, cutting vital investments—will simply stack the deck even more in favor of the very wealthy and the very powerful and make it harder on everyone else to get ahead.

Mr. Chairman, we can do better. We can do much better, and Democrats will propose a budget that promotes a more rapidly growing economy, with more broadly shared prosperity. That will be the right direction for America.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, so much misinformation just presented and we will work through that over the course of the next 3 hours as we debate this bill.

I guess the most disheartening thing is the rhetoric that divides the American people. This is a time for the country to come together and solve the challenges that we have.

An individual who has been leading in that is the current chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the past chairman of the Budget Committee. I am proud to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just want to, first of all, tip my hat to the new Budget chairman. It is a very difficult job putting a budget together. I did it for the last 4 years and served in the capacity of the gentleman from Maryland as the ranking member of the Budget Committee for the prior 4 years before that, so I want to thank the gentleman for bringing an outstanding budget to the floor.

First of all, this is a budget to be proud of. This is a budget that makes our country stronger. This is a budget that balances. It is pretty important to note that hard-working taxpayers, the people that elected us here to represent them, they have to live within their means. Well, so should government. That is the basic decision here.

When you take a look at the budgets that are being considered here today, we are basically trying to get the government to get back into the business of being honest with people about our finances.

Here is the problem, Mr. Chairman. Our government is making promises to people in this country that it knows it can't keep. That is dishonesty. What this budget does is it puts our budget back on track so that the government can keep these promises, the promises that people are organizing their lives around.

What the gentleman from Maryland and the President's budget says is just keep raising taxes; tax more. Oh, by the way, that is not enough. Then we need to borrow more and spend more.

That seems to be the path to prosperity, according to them, and look at where we are, highest poverty rates in a generation. Our economy is growing below 2 percent in most cases, below 3, which is what we were supposed to be growing at. The gentleman, I just listened to his rhetoric. He says this slices, this slashes; we are chopping away at opportunity.

Here is what this budget does. Instead of increasing spending, on average, like the President's budget does at 5.1 percent, it does it at 3.4 percent. We are saying let's get the government to live within its means.

Government spending will still increase, on average, 3.4 percent a year, instead of 5.1 percent a year. I guess that is the difference between whether people can live the American Dream or not, whether we are slashing or chopping or doing all these horrible, awful things to people.

Mr. Chairman, just don't buy all this overheated rhetoric. The problem is we have got to balance the budget. We have got to get this debt under control.

We see the storm clouds on the horizon, and what this budget does is it gets government to be honest with the taxpayers that give us this money in the first place so that we can meet these priorities honestly and balance the budget and get this debt on the right track.

We invest it the right way by giving people more of their own money so that they can make decisions on what is right for their family, instead of having Washington run it all.

Now, there is one last thing I would like to say as I get carried away on the rhetoric. The CBO is an agency we use quite a bit here, and the Congressional Budget Office is a very important gov-

ernment agency that gives us all of our cost estimates. This budget is written on their estimates.

For the last 6 years, we have had a Director at the Congressional Budget Office by the name of Doug Elmendorf, who has done an outstanding job as Director of the CBO. I have worked very closely with Dr. Elmendorf and with CBO in my prior capacity. He was a Democratic appointee, but the CBO Director is supposed to call the balls and the strikes and play it fair. Doug Elmendorf has done that.

I just simply want to say, for the record, Mr. Chairman, that we wish him well. He is leaving at the end of the month. We wish him well. We thank him for his service. We thank the Congressional Budget Office for all the hard work that they put in so that we can be here on the floor with these budgets, and we wish him great success in the future in whatever it is he chooses and thank him for his service to this House, to this Congress, and to our country.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say this is an outstanding budget that deserves our support. Don't buy all the hype you are hearing from the other side, and pass this fantastic Price budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I listened to my friend and the former chairman and his remarks. The reality is that the President's proposal and the Democratic proposal, we don't increase tax rates; but, yes, we do get rid of some of the tax loopholes in the Tax Code that are riddled with preferences that are there not because they make America more productive, but because someone had a powerful lobbyist who was getting a special interest break for them.

If you think about it, if the government provides a grant of \$1,000 to somebody, that is \$1,000 in value; but if I say to you, Of the taxes you have to pay, I am going to give you a special break so it is \$1,000 less, that is a pretty good deal, too.

The reality is we spend \$1.4 trillion, according to the Congressional Budget Office, each year on tax expenditures, more than on Social Security. Now, some of those are for good purposes, good public policy purposes, but some of them are for like corporate jets, and some of them are for hedge fund managers.

Here is the thing. We think that we can get rid of some of those tax breaks to help reduce the long-term deficit. Our colleagues would just prefer to devastate our investments in education and other areas.

Math is math, to the former chairman. The reality is—and he knows it—that the portion of the budget we use to make these investments, the Republican budget does absolutely cut that

to 40 percent below the lowest levels of the shared economy since we have been keeping records. That is a fact.

Another reality is that this Republican budget doesn't balance unless you are using phony math.

Mr. Chairman, I am now very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a great member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

I want to add my voice to those who congratulate everyone on the Budget Committee, particularly the chair and the ranking member, for their really hard work—and the staff—that we put into this labor.

I can tell you that I was, indeed, shocked. Even though I have been on the Budget Committee for several cycles, I continue to be shocked at how this budget does not reflect what I call democratic values. I mean democratic, not as a Democratic Party, but as our democracy. I believe that our democracy is really at risk when we put forth such a budget.

I think that this budget hollows out the middle class; and, based on the constructs that we have seen in the past, it would raise taxes on middle class families. I am talking about those people earning modest incomes—\$50,000 to \$75,000 a year—by \$2,000 a year.

Of course, it abandons the poor. Of the \$5.5 trillion, 69 percent of this is on the backs of those who are the most poor and most vulnerable. A lot of people just don't care that much about poor people; but who do we care about in this budget?

This budget pulls up the ladder of opportunity from our kids, that next generation that is going to make our economy work. They are doing us a favor by trying to go to college; yet we cut Pell grants in this Republican budget by somewhere around \$90 billion.

It deconstructs our job-creating infrastructure investment by \$187 billion. There used to be a time when the transportation budget was a bipartisan thing; but, in the name of balancing a budget, we even throw these workers under the bus.

It pulls the lifeline from seniors, disabled, and kids by block granting our Medicaid program and cutting \$913 billion, that being a portion of the \$2 trillion that we cut from health care, a lifeline, by repealing the Affordable Care Act and all this in the name of a phony balancing of the budget.

□ 1500

We are going to see a display here at some point. I don't know if you call it the king of the hill, the queen-of-the-hill budget, the price-is-right budget—I don't know—where we are either going to have \$94 billion or \$96 billion in a slush fund, the overseas account that is \$36 billion, \$38 billion above



what the generals and the President say they need for war.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. That is \$1.4 trillion of entitlements that we spend through the Tax Code for gas and oil subsidies, jets, hedge fund managers. There is talk in this budget of eliminating the estate tax. Millionaires and billionaires are benefiting tremendously on tax income from CEO pay.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. MOORE. Don't believe the hype. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. Don't believe the hype. This is not a democratic budget, as Americans have come to know it.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this appears to be a common theme, moving forward with this rhetoric that is hyperbole and dividing American against American. It is just not positive. It is not what this Nation needs.

The gentleman from Maryland said that it is all about math. Math is math. And he is right.

We now spend about \$12,000 per American every single year, and we collect about \$10,000 per every single American each year. It doesn't work.

What does it get you? This is what it gets you. This is the debt-to-gross domestic product ratio, the debt since 1940 of this country until 2015. The red line is where the debt is going. This is the President's plan. This is the Democrat plan right here. That is what will crush this country. Our friends want to stick their heads in the sand and ignore that. This is what destroys lives. This destroys every American.

We stand for all Americans. We believe that having a balanced budget for a stronger America is the way to solve these challenges. We believe it is important to save and strengthen and secure the programs that are so vital for the American people.

I am proud to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chairman of the Budget Committee who has been working diligently on this from the very beginning.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chairman for his hard work. I thank all of my Budget Committee colleagues for their hard work.

Mr. Chairman, it has been hard work—it continues to be—to have this honest conversation with the American people.

The whole goal here is to allow the opportunity for Americans to build better lives for themselves and their families, not for the Federal Government to attempt to provide that better life because, Mr. Chairman, after 50 years of the War on Poverty, for exam-

ple, we know that the Federal Government can't do the job.

There is a lot of rhetoric out there. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, for the committee, it is not positive and not right either. It is just plain wrong.

We talk about hard work. You know what is hard work? Getting the competing priorities and a continuing usurpation of our limited moneys in terms of our mandatory spending and getting a budget to balance in 10 years. Yet again, this Budget Committee and this House of Representatives has a plan to do it and, unlike you have heard, to do it honestly.

What is not hard work, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, what is easier to do is to never balance, and this chart shows that. The President's budget never balances, ever.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, you know that you can't start paying down the \$18 trillion of debt that we have with another \$100 trillion on the way until you first count the balance. We do that in a responsible, honest way. We don't try to do it in a year. We do it in a responsible, logical 10-year window.

The Federal budget is very big. It is like an aircraft carrier, Mr. Chairman. You have got to turn it, and you have got to turn it decisively, but it doesn't turn on a dime. And that is what we show here. That is what we do here. Again, it is hard work.

It is also hard work, as I mentioned earlier, because, as time goes on, more and more of our over \$3 trillion worth of spending per year is spent on programs that are eventually going to bankrupt us if we don't reform them. If we don't strengthen them and save them for future generations, no one will be able to take advantage of Medicaid, of Medicare, of Social Security.

And I know we all put money into those programs—especially Medicare and Social Security—but on average, we only put about 30 percent into them, Medicare, for example. And that 70 percent delta goes on the backs of our children and grandchildren, a lot of whom haven't yet been born. Talk about taxation without representation.

Our budget solves this problem. We have the ability, and we on the committee have had the honesty to have this direct, forthright conversation with the American people, frankly, now for 5 years. The worst thing we could have done is to turn tail and run and not have this honest conversation.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ROKITA. But we did it 5 years ago when the new crew came in. We continue to do it. And I am encouraged, Mr. Chairman. I think the American people see the light. They see that unless we correct and reform this mandatory overspending, no one can be helped. We can't have Americans build-

ing better lives for themselves and their families. We are going to have them more dependent on the Federal Government, and in doing so, more and more people will be hurt.

Slush fund, no. A very important fund to fight the global war on terror, to keep our troops safe and effective. That is an important fund. I wouldn't call that a slush fund. And I wouldn't call dependency on broken programs good or positive either.

Republicans on the Budget Committee, Republicans in this Congress, I hope all of us eventually will have the courage and ability to not only have this conversation with the American people but to start putting this conversation into direct action.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am a little surprised the gentleman from Indiana brought up what is called the OCO funding. These are the funds in the overseas contingency operations account for overseas contingencies, like wars and other contingencies that come up.

The reality is that what the Republican budget does here is create a slush fund out of the overseas contingency account. It sends a signal that we are confused about how we are going to fund our defense obligations, and it is in total violation of what the Budget Committee itself stood for for years.

I want to read, Mr. Chairman, from the 2015 Republican budget. It is just a year ago, but we have got real amnesia among our Republican colleagues.

Here is what they said in their report:

Abuse of the OCO cap adjustment is a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process;

The Budget Committee will exercise its oversight responsibilities with respect to the use of the OCO;

The Budget Committee will oppose increases above the levels the administration and our military commanders say are needed to carry out operations unless it can be clearly demonstrated that such amounts are war-related.

I didn't write that. Our Republican colleagues put it in their report. It is like, ooh, didn't mean it.

So I am really baffled that our colleagues keep bringing this up. It is a total violation of what the Budget Committee has always stood for on a bipartisan basis.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee and a great friend to entrepreneurs around the country.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose a budget that will cut the legs out from under our Nation's small businesses. This budget would mean \$10 billion of cuts to initiatives that foster small

business growth. Taken together, these reductions would mean 190,000 fewer jobs created.

For many would-be business owners, the SBA's entrepreneurial development centers provide critical training and guidance; yet this budget would short-change those programs, removing local resources that allow small businesses to take root and grow in our communities. Nationally, Small Business Development Centers and Women's Business Centers would see cuts of \$195 million. This would mean 16,000 fewer small businesses are able to launch, while 150,000 existing small companies would be deprived assistance that speeds their growth.

Beyond technical assistance, small firms need capital to expand. Sadly, this budget also undermines credit programs. New York City alone would see a \$22.5 million reduction in microloans—microloans. Do you know that 62 percent of microloan borrowers are women, low-income women with a default rate of less than 3 percent? Shame on us. This lending helps the smallest businesses create opportunity in economically stricken communities. So it only makes sense that this budget, which targets the most vulnerable, would slash this program too.

Small businesses would suffer in other ways. For many small businesses, having the Federal Government as a customer can mean significant revenue and job creation opportunity. Under this plan, small business contract awards would be reduced by \$142 billion, lowering job creation by 2.1 million positions. New York City companies would lose out on \$3.6 billion worth of Federal work over the budget period.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans like to position themselves as small business champions. However, supporting small firms takes more than lip service. It requires wise investments in programs promoting entrepreneurship. This budget slashes those programs, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I was amused by my friend from Maryland's comments about the global war on terror fund, understanding that in 2015, 2014, and 2013, for those fiscal years, he voted for the appropriations bills that included the defense money and the OCO money. In fact, the levels were \$91.9 billion, \$91.9 billion, and \$98.7 billion that the gentleman voted for.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Maybe I will yield to the gentleman later if I have time.

I am pleased to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), my friend and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we need to discuss the budget under the ominously growing shadow of unprecedented debt that has literally doubled in the last 8 years.

With crushing debt comes ruinous interest costs that the CBO warns will exceed our entire military budget within the decade on our current trajectory.

The budget produced by Chairman PRICE's House Budget Committee meets our current defense demands by adding additional money into the war account. But I would reassure the ranking member that it funds that increase through a concomitant decrease in other spending. That will hold us on a trajectory to balance the budget in less than 10 years and then begin paying down the unprecedented debt that this administration has run up.

Unfortunately, this plan is met with opposition from so-called defense hawks who want the extra spending for defense, which this budget provides, but who don't want to go through the fuss and bother of paying for it. And therein lies the problem.

This is not just a 1-year increase. Because it increases defense spending without making other cuts, it changes the overall spending trajectory over the next 10 years.

And here is the simple math of the matter. This adds more than \$20 billion to our total spending this year, and it, in effect, repudiates the budget plan for additional reductions next year. On this new trajectory that these budget hawks would set, there will be no balanced budget in 10 years, even if we enacted every other reform called for in the budget and maintained all other departments within these constraints.

After 10 years, we will still be running deficits of nearly \$100 billion a year, and interest costs will have eaten us alive. That is why it is so important to pass the budget intact, without the amendments being proposed.

□ 1515

I am curious how the self-proclaimed defense hawks claim to defend our country when our credit is shot and our debt service is approaching \$1 trillion a year. They forget that in the spring of 1945, carrying a debt proportional to the one we have today, there was serious doubt over whether we could continue to conduct the war for another year.

When he was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullin warned that in his professional military judgment, the greatest threat to our national security is the national debt. He made that warning 5 years and \$4½ trillion of debt ago.

History warns us that countries that bankrupt themselves aren't around very long because before you can provide for the common defense, you have to be able to pay for it, and the ability of our Nation to do so is coming into

grave doubt. The Budget Committee's budget offers us a very narrow path out of debt while continuing to fund our military at the requested levels, and its adoption, intact, is indispensable both to our short-term and to our long-term defense needs.

Mr. Chairman, we have a stark choice before us: pay for the needed increases in defense by reducing other spending, or refuse to pay for those increases and sacrifice the long-term security and prosperity of our country on the altar of instant gratification.

Amongst the most chilling words in history are those attributed to Louis XV, "After us, the flood." Let that not be the epitaph of this Congress.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. MCCLINTOCK is right about this OCO slush fund.

To the chairman of the committee, you actually made exactly my point in your remarks. I did support the OCO money—again, this is for overseas contingency operations—at the level requested by the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our military commanders. It was higher a couple of years ago because we had tens of thousands more troops in Afghanistan. The gentleman may recall that we brought a lot of those troops home. As a result of that, we don't need as much money in our war account, the overseas contingency account.

So what I did, Mr. Chairman, is exactly what our Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee said we should do at that time; in other words, I opposed increases above the levels the administration and military commanders said were needed to carry out those operations. Yes, I did support a budget level at the level the President and our military commanders said was necessary, but as Mr. MCCLINTOCK said, the Republican budget does just the opposite. It does what we said we would not do—and I say "we," Republicans and Democrats alike. So it is important to heed our own words; otherwise, as the Budget Committee itself said, we will undermine the integrity of the budget process. That was the point Mr. MCCLINTOCK was making as well.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He is somebody who knows we have to fund the modernization of our country's infrastructure.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, let's depart from a little bit of the acrimony, the acronyms, the magic asterisks, and the end runs. Let's be concrete. So let's talk about infrastructure investment and what the Republican budget would do.

We are running a deficit this year. We fall off a cliff the end of May, and if we don't put up \$10 billion, many

States will cancel projects this summer. That is not the subject of this budget. This budget is for next year.

So what are they doing for the long term? They are going to reform the highway trust fund. Oh, thank you very much. I appreciate that. They are going to limit expenditures out of the fund to future income. We have been supplementing it from general funds because the income is not adequate, but they are going to say: No. No more general funds. You live on the income.

What does that mean? Well, it means, in this budget put forward by these people, there would be a 99 percent cut in State funding. Yes. No, I'm not exaggerating, 99 percent. Because basically the money is paying for past obligations, past projects for the States. When the States finish a project, they get reimbursed. While they are building it, they don't. So under their budget in fiscal year 2016, your State Department of Transportation will get 99 percent less Federal funds. That kind of has a pretty big impact in some States here. If you are in a bright yellow State, you are over 70 percent, depending on the Federal funds; if you are in a green State, 50 to 69; and a light green, 30 to 49.

I would note on the Republican side that the chairman of the committee, Georgia, they would get \$1.1 billion less. Now, I guess Georgia doesn't need the money. The roads, the congestion around Atlanta is not a problem. The Speaker's State would get \$1.2 billion less under this budget; California, \$3.2 billion less, the majority leader; and Louisiana, the whip, \$619 million less. These are facts. That is the actual impact of their proposed budget. It digs a hole so deep we will never get out of it.

What happens after the first year of their reform of the trust fund? Well, actually, unless we pass a long-term bill with new funding, which they are quite resistant to thus far, it would mean 30 percent less funding than today for all States and a 60 percent cut in surface transportation.

We already have a system with 147,000 bridges that need repair or total replacement. Forty percent of the surface on the National Highway System is in such bad condition it has to be dug up—not just resurfaced, no, major work—and a \$75 billion backlog in transit systems. Our legacy systems in our major cities are so obsolete, they are killing people. Right here in the Nation's Capital, people are dying unnecessarily because they can't afford to bring in modern cars without the Federal partnership.

We held a hearing just last week in the committee, and we heard from the Governor of North Carolina—red State, red Governor—the mayor of Salt Lake, and the transportation director from Wyoming. They all say the Federal partnership is absolutely critical, and you are going to reduce it to 1 percent.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would note for the gentleman that if he reads the budget resolution, we accommodate for appropriate funding for infrastructure and for highways in section 510. With a deficit-neutral reserve fund, that means that we actually accommodate for paying for it, for transportation and for infrastructure, because we believe it is a priority. We believe it is a priority for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the diligent work on the Budget Committee and the leadership you have shown there.

Mr. Chairman, Americans know that this country was built on a strong work ethic. This budget provides a framework to create work requirements for able-bodied, working-age adults receiving Federal benefits.

Some may ask, Why work requirements? In 1996, President Clinton, a fellow Arkansan from my hometown of Hot Springs but from across the aisle, said: Today we are taking an historic chance to make welfare what it is meant to be: a second chance, not a way of life. The goal of workforce requirements on able-bodied, working-age adults is simply to give Americans a hand up, not a hand out.

Mr. Chairman, we should be concerned about the negative effects these Federal benefit programs are having on our American work ethic when we review the data. The maximum an individual can earn and still receive government assistance under some programs, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, is only \$1,000.

The Cato Institute reports that in 39 States, individuals can make more on government assistance than by working an 8-hour, \$8-per-hour job. In six States, government benefits pay more than a \$12-per-hour job; and in eight States, government assistance pays for more than the average salary of an American teacher.

In my home State, where Medicaid expansion was accepted, 40 percent of the able-bodied, working-age adults receiving 100-percent-funded Medicaid had zero income. By adding workforce requirements for able-bodied, working-age adults in the Medicaid population alone, this budget establishes a blueprint for work requirements that will result in savings by 2022 of up to \$376 billion federally, with an additional \$170 billion saved at the State level.

President Franklin Roosevelt made clear during a 1935 address to Congress that these programs were not intended to be an entitlement but a temporary aid to those in need. He said:

"The lessons of history, confirmed by the evidence immediately before me,

show conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fibre. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. It is inimical to the dictates of sound policy. It is in violation of the traditions of America. Work must be found for able-bodied but destitute workers."

The principles President Clinton and President Roosevelt before him promoted are more important now than ever before as we find ourselves in a fiscal crisis created by dependence and entitlement. President Clinton reminded us in 1996 that this is not the end of welfare reform, this is the beginning, and we all have to assume responsibility.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WESTERMAN. This budget incentivizes work, not dependence. This budget reduces spending growth instead of growing government. This budget moves us in the right direction.

I encourage my friends on both sides of the aisle to assume responsibility by voting for this balanced budget for a stronger, working America.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, actually, this Republican budget strips away provisions that are in existence today to make work pay. Child tax credits for working families, they get rid of the bump up. They get rid of the enhanced earned income tax credit for working families. As I said, they get rid of the higher education deduction for families so that they can send their kids to school.

I also want to say a word about the transportation trust fund, because as the ranking member, as the senior Democrat on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee just pointed out, this Republican budget has no provision inside the budget numbers for dealing with the crisis we are going to face in a few months.

Now, the chairman of the committee mentioned the deficit-neutral reserve fund, section 510. I am looking at it now. Deficit-neutral reserve funds can play an important role in signaling a policy direction. After all, these are 10-year budgets. I would understand if we didn't know exactly what we were going to do with our transportation trust fund 10 years from now or 9 years from now, but we are talking about 1½ months from now. We are talking about in the first year of this budget. In the middle of May, we are going to see a construction slowdown.

Now, the Democratic budget alternative, we have a plan. The President put forward a 6-year plan, \$478 billion. It is included in his budget numbers. It

is not like, okay, a little asterisk, we will figure this out in a month and a half. The President makes sure we don't have a shortfall, and, actually, he says we need to modernize our infrastructure so we can compete in this global economy.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is just reckless to put forward a budget where it doesn't even provide any solution to something that is going to face us in a month and a half.

Now I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL), a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PASCARELL. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, there is a stark choice to be made, there is no question about it, as I am quoting from the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, this is the stark choice. Look at this. This is what you tried to do to the American people after Bill Clinton left office.

During his term, 21 million jobs were created. Then the next 8 years when we dropped the tax rate down from 39.6 to 35 percent for those most affluent, we didn't gain anything. In fact, we lost 463,000 jobs. You want to try this again? We are not going to try it again. You want to talk about dead on arrival? Those are your words. This is dead on arrival.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this budget. Forget about the trillions of dollars worth of cuts to programs that help people with low or moderate incomes. Forget about the tax increases that hit the middle class and working poor so that some millionaires and billionaires can squeeze a little more from the stone. Forget about repealing ObamaCare for the 56th time, taking affordable health care out of the hands of 16 million Americans, leaving them with nothing and not having the guts to tell them what is going on. Forget about all of that.

The fundamental problem with this document is that even with all the draconian spending cuts and with all the tax increases I just described, at the end of the day, it still doesn't balance, as the ranking member, just a few moments ago, said over and over again.

In fact, Mr. Ranking Member, it is not even close.

□ 1530

This budget, while calling for the complete and total repeal of the Affordable Care Act, continues to assume that the law's \$2 trillion revenue increases and Medicare savings—it assumes that. We will do away with the bill, but we will keep the money. I don't know another way to put it.

When we get to taxes, the budget assumes that revenues remain unchanged for the current law. Yet you, yourself—you, yourself, Mr. Chairman, I have a

great deal of respect for you, Doctor—you stated explicitly through the Chair that you don't think we should be using the current law baseline. You said that, I didn't.

Last Congress, we passed \$956 billion in unpaid-for tax breaks. You all voted for that. They weren't assumed in the current law baseline. This year, we have already passed \$100 billion in unpaid-for tax cuts. Where is this money coming from? We are the tax-and-spend Democrats. You folks know better than that.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. PASCARELL. Thank you.

Two hundred billion dollars more have been reported out of Ways and Means. And tomorrow, we are going to report out another \$300 billion tax cut for Paris Hilton, Ivanka Trump, and others fortunate enough to be left a nice inheritance. That is what you are going to do tomorrow.

My friend, the chairman, might just be assuming that your majority will shortly pass a trillion-dollar tax increase to offset these unpaid for tax breaks and abide by his budget's revenue assumptions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote for this budget. It is simply not worth the paper it is printed on.

The CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members of the body in the second person.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to make a comment about the highway trust fund that was referenced. My colleague from Maryland stated there is nothing in this budget that will deal with the problem that is about to occur in a month and a half. And he is right. This budget deals with fiscal year 2016, which begins in October.

The good news, Mr. Chairman, however, is that in last year's budget, FY15 budget, which addresses this year, this current year that we are in right now, we also had a proposal to be able to provide for a deficit neutral reserve fund for transportation, which was used previously for MAP-21. So a path to how we are able to actually solve the challenges before us.

I am so pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

At a time when our Nation is grappling with over \$18 trillion in national debt and an uncertain economic future, now more than ever Washington must learn to live within its means. Wash-

ington's spending problem is one that cannot be taken lightly.

According to former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mike Mullen, the "single, biggest threat to our national security" is our national debt. House Republicans are working to confront this issue head on.

In our budget proposal, we seek to tackle Washington's spending addiction by reducing Federal spending by \$5.5 trillion and balancing the Federal budget in less than 10 years. This is a sharp contrast to President Obama's budget, which never balances, ever, despite the President's continued insistence on raising taxes.

Our budget aims to strengthen vital programs like Medicare and Social Security in a fiscally responsible way so that we can fulfill the promises we have made to our Nation's seniors.

One of the Federal Government's top priorities is providing a strong national defense. This budget boosts defense spending above the President's levels so we can ensure a strong, safe, and secure Nation.

Furthermore, our proposal repeals ObamaCare in full, including the law's taxes, regulations, and mandates that are crippling hard-working Americans and small businesses nationwide.

We also empower patients by repealing the President's Independent Payment Advisory Board, an unelected, unaccountable board of bureaucrats charged with making patient's health care decisions.

The Republican budget is a positive step forward for our Nation. It seeks to address our Nation's debt crisis while also supporting the programs that are critical to our national and economic security.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, as we have previously pointed out, this Republican budget keeps the revenues from the Affordable Care Act even as it claims to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Without that level of revenue, along with other savings, it doesn't come close to balancing. No accountant would certify this Republican budget close to balance.

I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), a terrific member of the committee and someone who is an expert on all sorts of issues, including health care.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the ranking member.

This budget, the Republican budget, is a collection of \$5.5 trillion of devastating cuts to both mandatory and nondefense discretionary programs.

I have heard my colleagues say that we need to treat the budget like we do American families: when you can't live within your means, then you have to figure that out. The problem is, this is

a budget that actually takes away those means. If we are going to talk about entitlement reform, you have to provide an investment and actually create jobs and create opportunities to have careers and meaningful wages.

Now, as we debate these numbers, I really hope that my Republican colleagues, when they vote for this budget, will you really know what you are doing and what these numbers mean for hard-working American families? Because I know what the budget does and how it impacts them.

Here is what it means. It means 290 fewer New Mexican children are going to have access to Head Start. It means 18,700 fewer New Mexico residents are going to receive job training and employment services. It means 59,000 New Mexican students are going to lose access to their Pell grants for college. It means 24,100 New Mexican seniors are likely going to have to pay more for their prescription drugs. And about 431,000—that bears repeating—431,000 New Mexicans receiving SNAP, half of which are children, will be in jeopardy of losing their nutrition support.

Now, when we think about the budget, we cannot just think about the numbers that sit on a piece of paper. We need to think about the human meaning behind the numbers. We need to think about the child that will go hungry, the student who can't afford to pay for college, and the seniors who won't be able to pay their medical bills. We need to invest in economic security for everyone.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and, instead, pass a budget that lifts people out of poverty, invests in hard-working families who have been left behind by the economy, and that provides for shared prosperity.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), a senior member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, back on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the Federal debt in this country stood at \$10.6 trillion. The Federal debt today, as we stand here today, is over \$18 trillion. That is an increase of over 70 percent during his tenure.

Debt now represents 101 percent of the GDP. In other words—let's put this in context—America owes more money to its creditors around the world than the value of all the goods and all the services that are produced right here in the United States in 1 year.

That level of debt, quite honestly, is unsustainable. In fact, that is not just me saying this. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, states that our "high and rising debt would have serious negative consequences for both the economy and the Federal budget." And it certainly does.

Admiral Michael Mullen, also quoted on this floor before, perhaps put it best when he said: "The single, biggest threat to our national security" in this country is what?—"our debt."

So, Mr. Chairman, Americans are faced with two paths right now: one that continues down the path of blissful neglect of our very real budget crisis; or on the other path, one that seeks an honest solution to it.

Instead of solving our debt problem, President Obama has committed to exacerbating it.

The President's budget would add another \$8.5 trillion to our already staggering debt. But despite his \$2.1 trillion in new tax increases, in addition, the Obama budget never ever balances. It is a vision that consigns our children and grandchildren to a future of crushing debts and heavy tax burdens.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, is a stark alternative to the past 6 years of reckless spending and failed policies. Instead of ever-increasing debt and ever-higher taxes, Republicans will balance the budget in less than 10 years without raising more taxes on you.

Instead of pretending that Medicare is sound, Republicans will strengthen the program by making much-needed structural improvements to it.

Instead of dictating that Washington knows all the answers, Republicans will promote by innovation and also by flexibility for Medicaid, for education, and other programs by restoring local control.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge today all Members of this body to stand up to support the budget and to support the American taxpayers, to stand up for strengthening our social safety net, and to stand up for our children and to stand up for our grandchildren, who do not deserve to be handed the bill for our irresponsible spending today.

I urge a "yes" vote on the Republican budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I don't think that huge disinvestment in education, starting with early education going through K-12, helps our kids in their future. I don't think that the efforts that strip away a lot of the job training programs help hard-working Americans.

The President's budget's priority is to accelerate economic growth and have more broadly shared prosperity. I would remind my colleagues that the day the President was sworn into office we were losing 800,000 jobs every month in this country. The bottom was falling out. Now we have seen over the last 60 months 12 million jobs created. We have got a long way to go, but we are certainly on the right track. And the President's budget provides for additional economic growth in a fiscally responsible way. The President's budget

reduces the debt-to-GDP ratio. The President's budget reduces the deficit's share of the economy.

But what the President's budget does not do is disinvest in our kid's education, it does not increase the cost to seniors for prescription drugs and copays for preventive health care, and it doesn't get away from a lot of the important tax credits and relief for middle class Americans and those working to join the middle class. So, no, it does not do that.

Now I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HAHN), who knows a lot about the importance of economic growth, especially as it relates to small businesses, a distinguished member of the Small Business Committee.

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Chairman, I think a budget is a reflection of our priorities. The choices we make about how to invest and spend have an impact on our American families. We must make it easier for hard-working Americans to own a home, to send their kids to college, and to have a secure and enjoyable retirement.

That is why it is so important that we invest in our Nation's ports, which create good-paying American jobs and sustain American businesses. Providing our ports and waterways with the funding and support they need is a high priority for me, and one that is shared by many of my colleagues, especially the almost 100 members of the bipartisan Congressional PORTS Caucus.

□ 1545

We know that America must invest more in our ports to remain globally competitive and to be prepared for the expansion of the Panama Canal, which will impact international trade and shipping routes.

The budget we are considering today, however, does just the opposite. Cutting funding for programs that support American commerce is both short-sighted and harmful to the competitiveness of American businesses.

I applaud the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget because it fully meets the targets we set in the 2014 WRRDA bill for the harbor maintenance funding, using more of the revenue collected at our ports for its intended purpose of maintaining and improving ports and navigation channels.

Let me emphasize that the harbor maintenance trust fund is self-funded. This is not new spending or new fees. Shippers already pay this tax to fund improvements that Congress is refusing to authorize.

The trust fund now has a surplus of \$9 billion in fees that America's ports have collected; but unless we act, these funds will not be used as intended, which is to improve our ports.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting a budget that returns this tax back to the ports, where it is collected.

I want to thank the bipartisan group of 86 Members who signed the letter, which Congressman BOUSTANY and I sent to House appropriators last week, calling for the harbor maintenance trust fund funding to be at the WRRDA level.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for her comments because she is absolutely right. The budget is about priorities, and the priorities that we have in our budget, we believe, address in a very responsible way the challenges that we face in this Nation.

What is the President's priority? If you look at where his budget would take us, it is debt. This, again, is the chart that demonstrates the debt that this Nation has held since 1940. That is the dark area here. You see the debt has increased since this President came into office. It is at virtually the highest level it has been since World War II.

Where does his path go? Where does the Democrats' path go in their budget? Higher than ever before—ever before—that is their plan, apparently. It is what their budget outlines. It is what the President's budget outlines.

What does that mean? What that means is the interest on the debt, paying the debt service. Everybody knows what interest means. They pay it on their credit cards. They pay it on their home mortgages. They pay interest when they buy a car. That is money that you pay just to be able to borrow the money that you are using for whatever it is.

In this instance, the interest on the debt, when we get to numbers not too far away, consumes the entire Federal budget. That is what we are talking about. In a very short period of time, within the budget window of this 10-year period of time, interest on the debt rises to over \$1 trillion a year.

That is more than the amount spent on defense. That is more than the amount spent on Medicare. That is more than the amount spent on Medicaid. That is more than the amount spent on education. All of the priorities that the American people have is going to be spent on interest on the debt.

That is why we believe it is a moral question. Are we going to leave our kids this kind of debt? Are we going to destine them to a life that has no opportunity, to have them be servants to the Federal Government just to work so they can send their tax money to Washington to pay the interest on the debt?

Mr. Chairman, you know that is not the America we want to leave our kids and our grandkids. I don't believe it is the America that our friends on the other side of the aisle want to leave our kids and grandkids.

Sadly, that is what their budget does. That is what the President's budget does. That is why we are so excited about A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, a budget that puts us on a path to balance within less than a 10-year period of time and that saves \$5.5 trillion.

Our friends on the other side say, Oh, no; it really doesn't get to balance. Even if you conceded that—and I don't—our goal is to get it to balance. Theirs never does. It is more and more and more borrowing, more debt, more taxes, more spending. It is not what the American people want.

What we need to do is to come together and address these challenges that we have in a positive way, in a real way, in an honest way, and get real results for the work that we do here.

We are proud of the work that this budget does. It lays out a positive path, a path of real solutions, one of saving and strengthening and securing Medicare and Medicaid, one of tax reform that actually works to get this economy rolling again so we can grow the economy in this country and put people back to work. Those are the positive things that this budget does.

The safety net programs are vital. They are important. We protect those programs. We actually make them work better for the individuals who are receiving those moneys, and we encourage them, in a moral way, to better their lives and get back on their feet. We assist them in getting back to work.

Those are positive solutions, Mr. Chairman, positive solutions. It is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I said at the beginning of this debate, the one thing that the Republican budget, unfortunately, will do immediately is make life harder for hard-working Americans. How does it do it? As I indicated, it actually increases the tax burden on working Americans—middle-income Americans and people working their way to the middle—while providing another tax rate cut for folks at the very top.

For people who are working harder than ever and feel that they are just on a treadmill, it doesn't help them at all. In fact, they are going to move farther behind, in addition to the fact that they are going to pile more costs on to students by increasing the cost of student loans.

It is right there in their budget. They are going to start charging you inter-

est while you are in college. They are going to start charging seniors with high prescription drug costs even more because they are going to reopen what is called the prescription drug doughnut hole. I don't know how that is good for seniors in America.

It is hard on seniors, hard on students, hard on working families.

The Democratic budget, like the President's budget, meets those priorities. For example, working families are facing huge childcare costs, so we propose a significant expansion of the child independent care tax credit. We make it a little bit easier for those families who are working but who want to make sure their kids have quality childcare. We make it easier for them by providing them a significant tax credit for that cost.

For couples who are working, we scale back the marriage penalty so the second worker doesn't begin work at the same higher tax rate as the first worker in the household. That is the kind of important relief we provide to middle class families and to those working to join the middle class.

The Republican budget actually gets rid of some of the important provisions that are already there to help those families, but our budget does this in a fiscally responsible way. As we have seen, the Republican budget doesn't balance, not by a long shot.

I mentioned a quote in my opening remarks. I am going to quote the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Mr. ENZI, who said:

One of the problems I have had with budgets that I have looked at is that they use a lot of gimmicks. Now, when there was anticipation that ObamaCare would go away and that all of that money would still be there, that is not realistic. I would like to see us get to real accounting with the budget.

That is what Senator ENZI said; yet this budget assumes the revenue from the Affordable Care Act at the same time it repeals the Affordable Care Act.

What the President's and the Democratic budgets do is put us on a fiscally responsible path, reducing the debt to GDP ratio and doing it in a way that improves economic growth and provides for more shared prosperity, not a budget that provides another round of tax cuts for folks at the top with the hope that somehow it is going to trickle down and lift everybody up.

Somebody who knows a lot about these areas is someone who is both a member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, a budget is a statement of values and priorities.

You have heard people standing up here, talking about what their priorities are, that we don't want to load up our kids with debt, that we don't want to do all this kind of stuff; yet the

budget that is put forward by my Republican colleagues is a shortsighted statement that has no view of the future.

It gambles away the future of the next generation's in order to supply business and the ultrawealthy with near-term gains. What has made this country great is the strategic Federal investments in health care, roads, education, bridges, research—the types of investment that build the middle class and America.

Now, the Republicans say their budget plan balances the budget in 9 years. What they don't tell you is that they do this at the expense of Medicare, Medicaid, SNAP, Pell grants—everything in the social budget.

What you learn from this budget is that, when they say they are balancing the budget, they mean we are cutting domestic programs. We are cutting anything that helps hard-working families in this country.

It also fails to cut one single dime from the military, not one single dime. They actually want to give the military more than they asked for. Now, despite raising taxes, you would think they could at least cut a dime from the Defense Department.

By now, people's eyes are kind of glazed over at home in thinking about this, but let me talk to one group of people, to anybody who has a student with student debt. It is the largest debt load we have in this country. We have made our kids indentured servants of banks and of the Federal Government.

This budget contains \$127 billion over the next 10 years that we will have extracted from students in interest on their loans to give cuts in taxes to the wealthy, to lower the rates, to make it better for the rich.

If you know anything about student loans, those loans can't be renegotiated. You can renegotiate on your house, or you can renegotiate on anything else, but not on a student loan. When a student and his mother and father or her mother and father sign up for a loan and put their home in the deal and put their futures and their 401(k)'s and everything behind that kid's education, they are stuck with that loan rate.

You have got people in this country who are paying 6, 8, 9 percent—as high as 13—on loans, and they can't renegotiate them. Is that fair? Is that the future you want, to stick the kids in this country with those kinds of loans?

In my view, this budget has no humanity and no view of the future for our kids.

I urge Members to vote “no.”

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MOOLENAAR), a freshman Member and a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government has a spending problem.

Last week, the Government Accountability Office released a report estimating that the government made \$124 billion in improper payments during 2014. Wasteful spending like this is one of the reasons the national debt has skyrocketed to \$18 trillion today.

Divided among 320 million Americans, a child born today inherits \$56,250 in debt—or \$225,000 for a family of four. Americans work too hard to have the government waste their tax dollars. It is time to start our country on a new course. This Republican budget puts America on a more sustainable and responsible fiscal path.

In my district, there are over 130,000 Medicare-eligible residents and over 169,000 Social Security recipients. This budget keeps the promises that have been made to our seniors and to those near retirement age by stabilizing the Social Security trust fund. It also grants flexibility to the States on Medicaid, allowing them to craft their own programs to serve the needs of their States and their local communities.

This budget also enhances our national security. Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen, said our debt is “the single biggest threat to our national security.” Over 20 percent of it is held by foreign governments.

By balancing within 10 years, this budget ends deficits and slows the amount that will have to be paid to other countries. With less spending needed for debt payments, more future funding can go to our national security.

□ 1600

This is a budget for solving problems and creating a better future. This budget addresses our country's fiscal problems in a responsible way, without raising taxes, and puts our Nation on a brighter path for our children and grandchildren.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I do want to say a word about the impact on seniors. We have already talked about the fact that the Republican budget will immediately increase the cost to seniors with high prescription drug burdens, it will increase the copays immediately for preventive services.

Let me just say a word about what it will do to seniors who are in nursing homes and other settings that rely on Medicaid. The previous gentleman just mentioned the number of people in his district on Medicaid. Let me just say that seniors and people with disabilities account for 85 percent of Medicaid spending; 65 percent of that spending is to the aged and the disabled, 20 percent to kids.

Now, here is what the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan folks, said about the Medicaid cuts of this magnitude in the Republican budget

and the impact that they would have on States: even with significant efficiency gains, in other words, even if you imagine that the States are going to somehow come up with incredible efficiencies, even with that, the magnitude of the reduction in spending relative to such spending in other scenarios means that States would need to increase their spending on these programs, make considerable cutbacks in them, or both; in other words, you are just passing the buck down to the States. So they have a choice: either they raise taxes to make sure that folks in senior homes, seniors in nursing homes don't take a hit, or seniors in nursing homes take a hit through fewer benefits. You just can't have it both ways when you are cutting \$900 billion out of the program that helps seniors and the disabled; right?

Okay. Here, States, you do it on your own; we are just going to give you \$900 billion less. Any nonpartisan person looking at this would arrive at the conclusion the nonpartisan budget folks at CBO concluded, which is: either States are going to increase their taxes to maintain those services, or those people are going to get less services. That is why this Republican budget is hard on seniors, just like it is hard on students and why it is hard on working families around the country.

As I said, it is great if you are already at the top; right? If you are a millionaire, you are going to get greenlighted for the Romney-Ryan tax plan that cuts your rate by 30 percent while increasing the tax burden on working Americans. That is just not right.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard our friends on the other side talk about gimmicks. If you want to talk about a gimmick, let's talk about the President's budget and what he does for defense. The President comes out and pounds his chest and says: I am a big defense hawk. I think we need to give our defense folks more money—something that we actually believe—to keep this Nation safe, protect us from the threats we have today. The President says: Oh, oh, I believe in our budget, we will put \$566 billion in our budget for defense, in the base defense budget.

What the President knows, what our friends on the other side of the aisle know, is that that number is fiction. You talk about a gimmick. The President doesn't lay out any path at all to deal with the sequester cap, to deal with the law of the land right now that says that that number is going to be \$523 billion unless the law is changed, which is why we positively, honestly, sincerely bring about appropriate increases for our men and women who are in harm's way and defending our liberty and freedom.

If this House actually stuck with the President's number, went with the



President's number—and the President lays out no path to be able to change the law—that number would snap right back down to \$523 billion as soon as the next fiscal year, the next calendar year begins. That is why we believe it is appropriate to lay out that path, to lay out the path to be able to solve the challenge that we have, and we do that in our budget.

You talk about gimmicks, Mr. Chairman, the President's budget is full of gimmicks. What it isn't full of is responsibility, as I mentioned before, increasing the debt beyond where the eye can see. So we have got a positive budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my colleague on the Committee on the Budget, to talk about the responsible things that this budget can do.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman for yielding me the time. It has been a great privilege to work with Chairman TOM PRICE on the Committee on the Budget.

I was down here earlier bringing the rule to the floor, but I was trying to defend a rule that was going to allow all the ideas. Now we actually get to talk about which ideas are the good ideas. That is why I wanted to come down here and speak.

I heard my friend from Maryland speak with such passion and conviction on Medicaid, and I share his passion, and I know his conviction to be true. But if we do nothing, interest payments alone are going to be larger than the entire Medicaid budget. We have six different budgets that we can consider down here on the House floor. Three of them balance; three of them never, ever do.

I was listening to what the chairman said earlier. He said: I do not concede any of the discussion from the other side about whether or not this budget balances or not. But the point is at least we are trying. Even if you are right that the numbers don't work out, even if the economic circumstances change, we have as a goal ending this wasted taxpayer resource, which is interest to our creditors. It dwarfs everything—everything. It is larger than the defense budget. It is larger than the Medicaid budget. It is five times larger than the education budget, five times larger than the transportation budget.

Whatever it is you care about, whatever investments in America you want to make, by failing to commit yourself to a balanced budget today, you are trading away those opportunities. Every dollar borrowed today is a tax increase on children and grandchildren or a benefit cut for children and grandchildren.

I could not be prouder. When faced with a deteriorating economic situation, where every year the CBO says we

are constraining growth more and more and more, it has been the hardest year since I have been here to balance the budget. Our chairman said: If it is a big challenge, I want it in my committee. And he has done it.

It is a partnership in that committee. I have great respect for the ranking member from Maryland and his leadership of that committee as well. We are trading it all away. Balance this budget. Let's do it together; let's do it responsibly. But let it not be a question of whether or not we do it; let it be a question of when we do it. We will have that debate together.

I thank my chairman.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, just a couple of points. Again—and we keep hearing that the Republican budget balances—it does not balance. It is interesting that instead of having the priority right now be accelerated economic growth with rising paychecks and rising wages for Americans, our Republican colleagues have made the absolute priority a balance which their own budget doesn't achieve.

In fact, the Republican budget that was brought to the floor just 3 years ago didn't balance until something like 2047, and yet now instead of having the priority be growing the economy in a way that raises wages for all families, they have got a priority which their own budget doesn't meet.

Now, American families who are focusing on their pocketbooks know that from time to time they do borrow to invest in their future. They borrow to buy a home that can go up in value. They sometimes borrow for education because they know that is a good investment.

Actually, interest rates are very low right now. We should be investing in our national infrastructure so we don't become a pothole nation in the days ahead. You know, the chairman of the committee mentioned again the transportation trust fund a little earlier today.

The reality is that the President's proposal puts forward in the budget a 6-year transportation plan that avoids the shortfall and actually helps to boost our national infrastructure, our investment in roads and bridges and modernizing our national infrastructure, so that we can remain at the cutting edge and don't fall behind. The Republican budget has no plan more than the 10-months plan we have had, and in this budget nothing real at all.

Now, I do want to say one word about what the chairman said about the President's defense spending and the way the President did it. You ought to know, the President did not put it in the slush fund. He put our base defense needs where they always have been: in the defense budget for the Defense Department. In fact, I was really sur-

prised to hear the chairman say that, because the Republican study group budget—I believe the Republican study group budget represents a majority of Republicans; I am not sure—does it the same way the President did it, in a straightforward manner. They put the funds that the Joint Chiefs of Staff say they need for our base defense needs, they put it in their budget. They do exactly what the chairman said the President was doing in some indirect way.

Look, I really am pretty surprised that our colleagues keep coming back to this point because it is a total violation of what they, themselves, said, wrote down on paper a year ago, that you shouldn't be funding our defense needs as part of the ongoing defense budget by putting them in a slush fund for the overseas contingency account when the military leadership says they don't need that money for that purpose.

I am pleased the President did this in a straightforward manner, in the manner that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the military leadership said. In fact, it turns out the same way the Republican study group did, but apparently not the way the Republican majority wants to do business anymore.

I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, who understands the impact that the Republican budget decisions are going to have on everyday Americans, including in their pocketbooks.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for his leadership on the Committee on the Budget.

As ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, I would like to express my serious concerns about how this budget resolution undermines our financial stability, protection for American consumers, and the entire housing market.

It is now 7 years since our country's financial system was rocked by Wall Street greed and predatory lending. All of our constituents bore witness to an economy where family members lost their jobs, friends were made homeless, and everyone's savings, no matter how modest, were depleted. In all, trillions of dollars of wealth vanished in the span of a few months. When some of the money returned, it was not shared equally.

Democrats in Congress worked to prevent a repeat of this disaster by, among other things, putting in place the tools necessary to prevent bailouts of megabanks and creating an independent regulator solely tasked with defending consumers from financial harm.

Rehashing failed policies, the Republican budget resolution would repeal

these tools and bind the hands of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The Republicans would return us to a system where a company like AIG would once again threaten the entire financial system. The Republicans would return us to a system where lenders can make predatory mortgages to some of the most disadvantaged communities, including communities of color, but that is not all.

□ 1615

This budget resolution goes even further. It would privatize Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac along the lines of the failed PATH Act, a terrible piece of legislation rejected by everyone—housing advocates, realtors, mortgage banks, academics, and, I might add, a majority of Members in the House.

Why do we all reject it? We fear it would be the end of safe mortgages like the 30-year fixed rate mortgage. We fear it would favor only the big megabanks, hurting community banks. We fear that it would further widen the wealth gap in this country.

This budget resolution is built upon a flawed foundation that harms some of our most vulnerable communities. I urge that the Members of this House oppose the Republican budget resolution.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN), a very productive member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Republican House budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

Mr. Chairman, as we have seen over the last several years, the tax-and-spend policies of this President have made our economy very sluggish. It is a very slow recovery. Our wages are stagnant. Our national debt has increased to more than \$18 trillion. This is a 70 percent increase since President Obama took office. And if the President had his way, we would actually add another \$8.5 trillion of debt over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, if we look at this chart, it shows interest versus other spending. This line right here—net interest—is the one that we should all be very concerned about because this is something that we have to pay for. This is not a line item that we can all of a sudden say: No, we're not going to pay as much on net interest as we're going to maybe on defense or education or transportation. This is something that we as American people have to pay because of the interest on our debt. This only gets worse if we don't do something sooner.

And so today, in contrast to the President's budget that increases taxes and increases spending—and his budget actually never, ever balances—we, as Republicans, are putting forward a re-

sponsible budget, a balanced budget, and one that I believe is critically important for the future of our country and for the future of our economy. Our budget balances in 10 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, if you look at this chart, it doesn't take an economist to see which plan will ultimately lead to debt and decline and which plan will lead us to growth and prosperity.

The House Republican budget begins making payments on our national debt in year 2024, and the President's budget just digs us deeper and deeper into the hole.

I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, I have two sons, Payton and Preston, 13 and 9 years old. We cannot continue to hand them the bill and expect them and future generations to pay for the spending of Washington that is out of control. That is why we have to get to a balanced budget sooner rather than later.

On top of balancing the budget, this plan calls for a fair and simpler Tax Code. It ends ObamaCare's broken promises and strengthens our entitlement programs for current seniors and for future beneficiaries. In light of current threats, this budget also increases defense spending, which is a priority for us, so that our military—our men and women in uniform—can defend this country at a very dangerous time.

This plan is an opportunity for us to stand together and to show the American people that we are committed to A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, to starting to pay our debt down to make sure that future generations don't have to pay for those debts and that we can work together on common-sense reforms.

I thank the chairman for his work on this particular budget. I am proudly standing here today in support of that hard work, and I ask my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, not only does the Republican budget not balance, but it doesn't eliminate one special interest tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Not one. These are tax breaks that powerful interests have put into the Tax Code over many years.

Apparently, it is okay to deeply cut our investment in our kids' education. Apparently, it is okay to increase the cost of prescription drugs for seniors on Medicare, but, for some reason, we are not going to get rid of one corporate tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit. Those are not Americans' priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS), someone who understands the importance of moving America forward, my colleague and friend and a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank my friend and colleague from Maryland for his

leadership on the Budget Committee, and also the Democrats on the Budget Committee.

Mr. Chairman, Congress is really tasked at this time of year with developing a budget that lays out our Nation's priorities and spending, but those priorities really should reflect our values. As hard as it is to imagine—and it is hard—this Price budget resolution is actually worse than the previous Ryan budget for hard-working American families.

Once again, we see how little Republicans value protecting critical priorities that actually help Americans live a healthy life and enjoy a secure retirement. In fact, the Republican budget would force working families to pay more in taxes. It would make college education less affordable. It would force seniors to pay more for their health care and prescription drugs. It would end the Medicare guarantee by turning it into a voucher program. Lastly, Mr. Chairman, it would block grant both Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

The fact is that this budget would decimate our Nation's already crumbling infrastructure by reducing funding by 19 percent over the next decade. If you would imagine that, that means that every road that needs to be repaired, the bridges that are falling apart, the mass transit that needs investing in, this budget would actually cut our spending by 19 percent over the next decade.

It would require an additional \$318 billion from Federal and postal employees and their retirees—hard-working people who have given all that they can to deficit reduction. In fact, that is a constituency that has already contributed \$159 billion to deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, Republican priorities are making tax cuts for the wealthy permanent, and they are shrinking the size of government, regardless of the damage—great damage—that it would cause.

House Democrats, I believe, are investing in hard-working Americans. We have said it is important for us to improve access to high-quality child care and dependent care. It is important to invest in quality education for all our children. It is important to end the draconian across-the-board sequester cuts.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS. The Democrats' budget would protect seniors' health care and retirement. It would create jobs in America through rebuilding our infrastructure and support jobs by making sure our Nation's manufacturers get to invest in the research and development that they need.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote down this draconian Republican budget and support each of the Democratic alternatives. I know I will be voting for them because each of them, even though they are different, would be way better than the draconian budget that has been proposed by Republicans.

I thank my colleague from Maryland for his leadership. We need to invest in America's future, including our hard-working men and women.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard the budget described as draconian. I would say that doing nothing, ultimately, is draconian because what the numbers show is that if we do nothing, roughly in 10 years we will be spending about \$800 billion a year in interest alone—more than we spend on all of our Nation's defense.

I could give any number of different indicators that say if we do nothing, we are headed for a train wreck that will have real impact on the very constituencies that my Democratic colleagues were just alluding to.

It is not a perfect budget. We are having an intense debate, whether it is on the Democratic side or, frankly, even within the Republican family.

I just had a conversation with my colleague, MIKE TURNER from Ohio, who is really passionate about the need to spend more on defense. We are still working out those wrinkles. But what I do know, in fairness to the chairman and what he has tried to do in managing the different folks that are affected by this budget, is to say: If you are in a hole, you quit digging. And fundamentally, if you look at our Nation's budget trajectory, we are in a hole that is going to get far worse if we don't do what the chairman and the committee have suggested.

I would say, one, we are spending too much. And yet the President's proposal is to go from spending roughly around 20 percent of GDP up to 22 percent of GDP, from a historic average of, frankly, around 18 percent.

We are taxing too much. We are going to go in the President's proposal from spending of around 18 percent to around 20 percent—a little bit over that. That doesn't sound like much, but you take two points of a GDP in 2025, and you are looking at more than \$500 billion—more than, again, roughly what we spend in defense for our entire Nation on a yearly basis.

We have a budget trajectory where we are handing too much debt to the next generation. And we are headed, again, for this unsustainable train wreck.

Think about it this way. It took our country 200 years to accumulate \$5 trillion in debt. Under the Bush administration, in fairness to my Democratic colleagues, it went from \$5 trillion to \$10 trillion in the course of about 8 years. And then, under the Obama administration, it has gone from \$10 trillion to roughly \$20 trillion.

The growth is becoming geometric. And the question is: What are we going to do about it? What we can do is what the President has proposed, which is nothing—adding \$2 trillion in new taxes, adding \$8 trillion in new debt, and going from structural \$500 billion deficits to \$1.1 trillion deficits.

I think that what we are talking about here is ultimately made important by what Admiral Mike Mullen had to say on the subject. When asked what the biggest threat is to the American civilization, his response was the American debt and deficit.

We are reaching this tipping point. If you look at the numbers, by 2025 we will only have enough money for interest and entitlements, and nothing else, without raising taxes substantially or cutting those benefits that my colleagues have just been talking about.

I will leave you with one point, and I think it is this. Sir Alexander Fraser Tytler studied history for the whole of his life.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SANFORD. He got to the end of his life and the quote that was attributed to him at life's end was: A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves largesse from the public treasury, with the result that democracy always fails under a loose fiscal policy, and it is generally followed by dictatorship.

The average age of the world's great civilizations has been 200 years. These nations have progressed to this sequence: from bondage to spiritual faith; spiritual faith to great courage; great courage to liberty; liberty to abundance; abundance to selfishness; selfishness to complacency; complacency to apathy; apathy to dependency; and from dependency back again into bondage.

Ultimately, what I think that this budget is about is avoiding that very bondage that that historian and many others have talked about over the years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip, who understands the importance of a growing economy—a growing economy with shared prosperity and a growing economy with fiscal responsibility.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for yielding, and I thank

him for the extraordinary job that he has done as ranking member of the Budget Committee.

My friend from South Carolina has left the floor. I regret that. He was the Governor of a State. This budget would not have been tenable during his administration or, frankly, the administration of my own Governor, who happens to be a Republican. We have had Democrats in the past.

The gentleman ended with a number of cautions about the path of fiscal irresponsibility and what it would lead to. I agree with him on that, but I will tell him it is indeed unfortunate that, once again, we have a budget that does not put us on a path of fiscal sustainability. We have a budget that is not real. We have a budget that pretends. That is what USA Today said today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolutions offered by the chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. PRICE, for whom I have great respect. I say budget resolutions, plural, because there are two of them. One was reported by the committee that channels \$36 billion into the overseas contingency operations account, disguising it as emergency war funding as a way of getting around the defense sequester caps while offering token language providing about \$20 billion to be offset at a later date.

The other budget was unveiled by Republicans yesterday. It includes an additional \$2 billion on top of that \$36 billion in overseas contingency operations and removes any mention of paying for this effective negation of the defense sequester. The gentleman from South Carolina referred to devices like that.

□ 1630

This dueling budget strategy came about because Republicans didn't have the votes for their own proposal yet again. They are offering their Members two options: blow through the defense sequester ceiling by \$36 billion or blow through it by \$38 billion.

Apparently, some are going to mask their either hawkish perspective on the defense or hawkish perspective on the deficit by a vote either for A or for A.

Of course, while they blow through the cap on the defense side, they continue the cap on the domestic side for this year, before cutting dramatically below that level in future years, mercilessly gutting priority investments in education, job training, innovation, research, and other priorities of this Nation if it is to remain competitive in world markets, if it is to remain a growing, thriving nation.

This budget is a severe disinvestment in America's future and our long-term economic competitiveness. This approach is not a blueprint for growth and opportunity for America's businesses and workers. It is, rather, sadly, a recipe for economic and fiscal disaster in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, if we fail to invest in the next generation or to continue the War on Poverty in this country, we are doing a grave disservice to our children and our grandchildren by not giving them the tools they need to secure the jobs and opportunities that open doors to the middle class.

Like the Ryan budgets, which were never implemented by the majority party at any point in time from this House—forget about blaming Senator REID or the Senate, they were never implemented in this House—Mr. PRICE's budgets rely on a magic asterisk, hiding the specifics behind over \$1 trillion in cuts in order to appear to balance it in its stated goal of 9 years.

No one—no one—knows exactly what programs Republicans would cut or by how much. That is not being honest with the American people. They would turn Medicare into a voucher program and would take access to affordable health care away from millions of Americans by repealing the Affordable Care Act.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, make no mistake. These budget alternatives are political documents that are unworkable and unserious when it comes to governing.

Like previous Republican budgets that rely on sequestration, I have no doubt that the majority will not be able to enact appropriation bills that adhere to whichever version that you will pass. You have not done so in the past, and you will not do so this year.

They will continue to be, as the Republican chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. ROGERS, said, "unrealistic and ill-conceived."

Budget Committee Democrats, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and the Congressional Black Caucus have all put forward alternatives that are far better than these dueling Republican budget resolutions.

Democrats prioritize replacing the sequester, which Mr. ROGERS believes should be done, on both the defense and domestic sides, so that we can make investments in America's future that are fiscally sustainable.

I urge my colleagues to reject the two Republican budget alternatives and their strategy of selective sequester.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct all their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank Chairman PRICE and his staff for their hard work on this budget. With all the difficulties and complexities in drafting a budget, includ-

ing inheriting an \$18 trillion debt, Chairman PRICE and the committee have managed to find savings of \$5.5 trillion and to balance the budget in 10 years, all without any new taxes.

This has not been an easy task, but this budget resolution stands in stark contrast to what the President sent us. The President's irresponsible proposal makes no attempt to balance the budget, leaving future generations with even more debt. Indeed, his plan proposes returning to trillion-dollar deficits, leaving a legacy of staggering debt and further eroding our standing in the world.

For decades, Americans have been told that spending for things you can't pay for is good fiscal policy and that debts and deficits don't matter. President Obama believes that maxing out the Federal credit card to pay for government programs and using more of the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars to pay interest on the debt is actually good for our economy.

Well, the ruse is over. Families aren't buying it. The "charge now and pay later" mentality is no longer affordable. Parents know debt and interest payments add up. They understand that out-of-control debt cripples their ability to respond to an emergency, for example, when the basement floods or the furnace goes out.

Mr. Chairman, what is true for American families is true for the Federal Government. Just like working families must do, so must the government. Purchases we can't afford need to be put on hold until we can afford it; tough choices must be made.

Every day, families make responsible financial decisions. Do we sign up the kids for Little League, or do we buy the bigger van? The same principle must apply in our government.

This budget, Mr. Chairman, acknowledges that addressing our debt is a national priority. It puts forth parameters that will force the government to make reforms and live within its means so we can start to address a debt that now exceeds \$18 trillion.

This budget eliminates all of the ObamaCare taxes and mandates that are costing small businesses tens of thousands of dollars, cutting into Americans' take-home pay, and driving up healthcare costs for the American consumer.

Importantly, Mr. Chairman, this resolution sets the stage for us to pass real healthcare reform that will actually address cost and coverage and help American families in their healthcare choices with more freedom, more choice, and less bureaucracy. This budget respects the rights of conscience for our Nation's doctors and religious institutions and people of faith.

Finally, this budget will result in a leaner, more efficient government that is transparent and accountable to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the Budget Committee's resolution makes the hard choices needed to move the country forward, to make possible increases in our defense budget needed to address the threats in our world, and to set us on a path to a balanced budget.

Again, I thank Chairman PRICE for the work of him and his committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, this budget doesn't make tough choices. The Republican budget makes bad choices. It doesn't cut one single special interest tax break in the Code while it makes deep cuts to our kids' early education. That is a bad choice, not a tough choice.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, I honor my friend from Maryland for his extraordinary and outstanding leadership on a very difficult set of complex numbers and policies known as the U.S. budget. Thank you so much for your leadership.

Mr. Chairman, this year's Republican budget resolution is incredibly titled "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America," but by every measure, the draconian cuts proposed in this budget would severely weaken America's innovative advantage and competitiveness. It might as well be called "Let's Disinvest in America."

Consider the cuts to basic research, once a bedrock, a Federal priority that spurred new discoveries that are now vital in our daily lives and the economy. R&D is critical for my northern Virginia district, where the technology community is driving innovation.

This Republican budget would slash R&D funding by 15 percent, to its lowest level since 2002. That is a retreat from America's role as the global innovation leader and, essentially, cedes the playing field to our international competition.

Similarly, the Republican budget would disinvest in our classrooms. To achieve their ruse of balancing the budget over 10 years, Republicans would cut nondefense spending 24 percent below the already reduced sequester levels.

For K-12 education, that translates into an \$89 billion cut over the next decade and would surely leave every child behind their international peers. It would also put higher education further out of reach for low and middle class families. America did not ascend to its role as the world's leading economy by quashing the potential of future innovators and leaders.

Mr. Chairman, our Republican colleagues are, once again, showing they know the cost of everything and the value of very little. I often hear my colleagues lament that we should run government more like a business.

Well, if that is the case, perhaps we should start by listening to the business community which is advocating for us to invest more—not less—in R&D, in education, and in infrastructure for the future workforce of America and the building blocks of a competitive economy.

These are investments that yield tremendous returns for our families, for our children, for our future; and the Republican budget would eviscerate those pillars of American exceptionalism.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing up the issue of business in America, jobs in America.

I include in the RECORD letters from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America and from the National Federation of Independent Business in support of our budget.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, DC, March 18, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of  
Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation, representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers of commerce, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, appreciates your proposed budget resolution, "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America," which would establish the budget for fiscal year 2016.

This proposal recognizes the importance of restraining federal spending, correcting the unsustainable growth path of entitlement spending, reducing federal budget deficits, containing the growth of federal debt, and enacting comprehensive tax reform—all goals shared by the Chamber.

The proposal would balance the budget within 10 years without raising taxes through \$5.5 trillion in spending reductions, out of a base spending level of \$48.6 trillion. The Congressional Budget Office estimated the macroeconomic effects of the proposed deficit reduction and concluded output per person would be 1.5 percent higher at the end of 10 years, which in turn would reduce the budget deficit an additional \$147 billion. Such budgetary savings would move the budget from modest deficit to modest surplus by 2024.

The nation faces many challenging issues in budget policy that will require sustained debate over many months and, in some cases, years. Over the long term, the budget is a blueprint for restoring fiscal discipline by shrinking the size of government and debt compared to current law.

This budget proposal marks an important step toward a more sensible, more sustainable, pro-growth fiscal policy. The Chamber urges the Committee and the full House of Representatives to debate the issues fully and then adopt a budget resolution on a timely basis. The Chamber further urges the United States Senate likewise to meet its responsibility by passing a budget addressing our long-term challenges. The Chamber looks forward to working with Congress on the vital reforms to entitlements and our tax

code necessary to get our fiscal house in order.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

NATIONAL FEDERATION  
OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,  
Washington, DC, March 23, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,  
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of  
Representatives, Cannon House Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, thank you for your efforts to address our nation's fiscal problems in the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Resolution.

A budget that balances in fewer than ten years, and includes support for comprehensive tax reform, regulatory reform, and repeal of the Affordable Care Act, is a budget that addresses the top concerns of small business owners—our nation's job creators. NFIB and small business owners strongly support these efforts.

#### COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM

In your budget blueprint you state, "The U.S. tax code is absurdly complicated, patently unfair, and highly inefficient." NFIB members could not agree more and strongly support the inclusion of comprehensive tax reform in the budget resolution. The complicated tax code, which forces small businesses to pay 67 percent more for tax compliance than larger corporations, needs to be simplified. Most importantly, high tax rates continue to be a persistent problem for small business owners. Specific tax concerns account for five of the top ten most severe problems facing business owners. As over 75 percent of small businesses are structured as pass-through entities, lowering individual income tax rates is especially important. Pass-through entities employ 54 percent of all private-sector workers—their tax burden is directly tied to their ability to keep their workers employed.

#### SENSIBLE REGULATORY REFORM

NFIB appreciates that your budget "calls on Congress, in consultation with the public, to enact legislation to reform our regulatory system." While regulation is necessary, it must be pragmatic. Unfortunately, federal agencies rarely take into account how their regulations affect small business. Federal regulators should work with small business owners to help ensure compliance, rather than aggressively impose fines for violations that result from confusion. Government regulations rank as the fifth most severe problem for small business owners in the NFIB Research Foundation's most recent Small Business Problems and Priorities survey. Federal agencies, notably the Environmental Protection Agency and Occupational Safety and Health Administration, continue to demonstrate a lack of understanding of how regulatory proposals impact small business operations.

In order to provide for meaningful regulatory reform, Congress should eliminate loopholes and clarify language in the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) to ensure that all federal agencies take into account, and make public, both direct and indirect costs to small businesses in their rulemaking; expand the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement and Fairness Act (SBREFA) and Small Business Advocacy Review (SBAR) panels to apply to all federal agencies; waive fines for first time paperwork errors and pro-

vide small business with a grace period to fix minor violations when the public and employees are not at risk; and make compliance assistance programs a priority, instead of minimizing them in order to provide for the expansion of enforcement programs.

#### HEALTHCARE REFORM

The budget resolution also addresses small business owners' most severe business problem: the cost of health insurance. NFIB members continue to advocate for full repeal of the Affordable Care Act. Thank you for including this provision in the budget resolution. The Affordable Care Act only exacerbates a system of health insurance that is financially unsustainable, threatening the health and financial security of Americans. Small business owners and their employees are especially vulnerable to the weaknesses of the current system. As Congress addresses future healthcare policy, we urge you to put forward reforms to balance the competing goals of affordability, access to quality care, predictability and consumer choice.

According to a December 2014 survey by the NFIB Research Foundation, ten percent of small business owners had their personal insurance plans cancelled last year, something the President and the law's supporters promised wouldn't happen. Twelve percent of owners renewed their old plans early in order to avoid higher premiums and narrower choices, two results that were also not part of the deal. The NFIB survey found that 62 percent of small business owners are paying higher premiums while only eight percent say their costs have dropped. The President's sales pitch for the law included promised health insurance premium relief for small businesses. Five years later, a substantial majority of small business owners are reporting the opposite result.

#### PROVIDING FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

Small business owners have long supported balancing the federal budget. Additionally, according to the NFIB Federal Ballot, 90 percent of NFIB members support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Our nation's small businesses are calling on Congress to fix our dangerous fiscal situation without damaging economic growth or raising taxes on job creators. If our long-term fiscal outlook is not addressed by lawmakers today, future generations will continue to be faced with higher debt and interest payments, increased tax rates and fewer investment opportunities. Small business owners must compete in today's economy while operating within their budgets and so too should the federal government.

Thank you again for introducing the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Resolution. NFIB strongly supports its passage when considered by the full House of Representatives. We look forward to working with you on this, and similar measures to protect small business as the 114th Congress moves forward.

Sincerely,

AMANDA AUSTIN,  
Vice President, Public Policy.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Virginia (Mr. FORBES), a senior member of the Republican Conference.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend Chairman PRICE for shepherding this budget to the floor and doing such a tremendous job; yet, with the great job he has done, I know it is confusing, probably, to people listening to this debate at home because,

throughout today and tomorrow, a lot of very smart men and women are going to come to this floor and argue various debates.

When all those voices have silenced and everybody sits back down in their chairs, we all know that it is going to come down to two choices. Those two choices are going to be what we refer to as Price 1 or Price 2.

Mr. Chairman, we also all know that the difference between those two bills is going to be how much we are willing to spend for the national defense of this country to defend the greatest nation the world has ever known.

In addition, one of the things that will be clear is not that we will be spending what we need to defend the country, but we will be spending the amount we have to spend to keep from putting our national defense in a crisis situation and a devastating situation to the men and women who serve this country around the globe.

Just two points I would like to leave Members with as they cast those votes and the first one is this. The difference in the amount of money we will be spending for national defense between Price 1 and Price 2, if the budget were \$1, would be equal to half of this penny if I could cut it in two—half of this penny; yet, as small as that may seem, it makes the difference between a crisis in national defense and a devastating situation to our men and women in uniform.

The last thing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave everyone with as they cast those votes is this. It will not be about the men and women in suits who make speeches in here, but it is going to be about the men and women who wear uniforms around the globe because they will fight to defend this country, regardless of what we do.

The question is whether we will leave them in a crisis situation and a devastating situation. That is why I hope this body will vote “no” to Price 1, “yes” to Price 2, and then, if Price 2 passes, vote for final passage of this budget, which is a well-done document by the chairman.

□ 1645

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, just for all Members listening, the last gentleman was talking about the differences between the two versions of the Republican budget.

I want to point out that the President of the United States funds our defense budget in the straightforward way and in the way that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have asked for, funding the base budget as it should be and funding the OCO budget as it should be.

I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee who understands that growing our economy depends on our kids getting a good education.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the underlying Republican budget for fiscal year 2016, and I also rise to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for his strong opposition.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is not a serious plan. It contains trillions of dollars in tax cuts, but it doesn't show a dime's worth of tax increases when they say it is going to be revenue neutral. It includes trillions of dollars in unspecified cuts that will not be made. For example, are we really going to repeal Medicare as we know it?

If you actually believe that the Republican majority will carry out this plan, it would actually devastate our economy by balancing the budget on the backs of students, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities across the Nation.

The Republican budget assumes that sequestration cuts will be enacted and then adds an additional \$759 billion in nondefense discretionary spending cuts. That is the part of the budget that invests in education, workforce training, scientific research, transportation, and infrastructure.

With those cuts, the budget would be funded at 40 percent below the lowest level in the last 50 years as a percentage of GDP. Those cuts will not be made, but if they are, that would be devastating.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I am particularly concerned about the cuts in education. Education funding would be cut by \$103 billion over 10 years. That is a 22 percent cut in Federal aid to teachers, principals, school districts, colleges, and universities.

That will include significant cuts in title I funding, resources that go to areas of high poverty school districts. It would cut the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which supports educational services and resources for students with disabilities, and there would be significant cuts to Head Start. College students are having trouble paying for tuition, room, and board. Well, this budget cuts Pell grants.

In the area of job training and employment services, the budget would result in 2 million fewer workers receiving critical support and does nothing to help the long-term unemployed get back into the workforce.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget sends students, families, and workers down the wrong path at this important crossroad. We need a strong budget that reflects the values of all Americans and makes the necessary investments in programs that we know will expand the economy for all.

The Republican budget fails to do this and, therefore, should be rejected.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 min-

utes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER), the former mayor of the great city of Dayton.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairman PRICE for the work that he has done. The chairmanship of the Budget Committee is one of the most difficult.

He has a 360-degree responsibility of all aspects of funding the Federal Government, balancing our priorities, looking at our financial security, and most of the time, we ask the Budget Committee chairman to produce a budget. In this instance, we asked him to produce two.

I greatly appreciate that the chairman has produced two. We have what is coming to this floor, Price 1 and Price 2. I am here to speak in support of Price 2, but even beyond that, I am asking people to vote “no” on Price 1.

It is very important that you vote “no” on Price 1. We can't pass multiple budgets. We have to have one agenda coming out of this House, and that one agenda is only the difference between Price 1 and Price 2 with respect to how do we defend this Nation.

Now, Price 2 has \$523 billion for the Department of Defense and \$96 billion in overseas contingency operations funding. It fully funds our national defense. It is the amount that is endorsed by Chairman Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Department of Defense.

It is what he has asked for from this House and what he says is necessary in the face of things such as ISIS, ISIL, what is happening in Libya, what is happening with Putin and his aggressiveness.

The Secretary General of NATO was just here today and spoke to Members of Congress, and he said we are facing a Russia that is both willing to use its military force, modernizing its military force, and also is not being bound by international agreements. This is only going to be able to be responded to not by force, but by strength, a strength that we must give in this budget of Price 2.

Secondly, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Ray Odierno, was before us, and I asked him: What will happen if we go to the sequestration levels? What happens if we don't fully fund, as in Price 2? He says that it means that it will take us longer to do our mission. It will cost us in lives. It will cost us in injuries.

The difference between Price 1 and Price 2, from the Chief of Staff of the Army, is lives and whether or not we can win and do our mission and whether or not our men and women in uniform are injured.

That is serious stuff. It is serious enough that people in this Congress need to vote “no” on Price 1 and “yes” on Price 2.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to jeopardize our national security and reduce funding for defense anymore. Our

men and women in uniform need to have a clear message, and that clear message is that we are behind them. That message only comes by a vote “no” on Price 1 and a vote “yes” on Price 2.

I urge all Members of Congress to support our men and women. Vote “yes” on Price 2.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am now really pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have been in Congress now 13 years, and I have had many discussions with the chairman over the course of my career, but I am stunned—and I know he won’t be stunned that I am stunned—with the inability of the Republican Party to govern this Chamber or to govern the country.

I mean, if you just look at Price 1, Price 2, the contortions that the Republican Party has to go through in order to meet the basic standard of trying to govern the country is mind-blowing—and then to go through all these contortions just so you don’t have to fund the domestic agenda that is going to actually grow the economy in the United States.

I say this because I was here and watched when President Bush was here and the Republicans controlled Congress: cut taxes, deregulate, and the economy will grow, and jobs will be created.

We had a stagnant decade of growth because we failed to make the kinds of investments that we need to make in this country in order to grow the pie.

Here we are today, after we were able to survive a huge economic collapse after that agenda was fully implemented, and we have the average CEO making \$296 for every \$1 that the worker makes; we have the top 1 percent getting 17 percent of the tax expenditures that this Chamber and this government doles out, and wages have been stagnant.

I think we have got to go back and ask ourselves: How did we grow this great middle class? How did we grow this economy? How did we have the highest standards and the highest wages in the entire world for such a long period of time? We invested in research and development at the National Science Foundation. Now, we are down hundreds of grants from the National Science Foundation.

Do you think China is not putting money into these programs? India? Pacific rim countries? They are investing in research, development, technologies, alternative energy; and they are beating us to the punch. We are cutting our budgets and some of these programs that ultimately lead to growth.

These budgets are supposed to provide stability for the government and the private sector. We say: well, we are

providing stability, but we will tell you what the tax rates are going to be later. We are going to fund transportation; we will tell you how later.

This formula is fairly simple: invest in research, educate your workforce, invest in transportation, and make sure that everybody has access to a decent education, and your economy will take off.

This budget does the exact opposite. The ultimate contradictions are the deep cuts in the SNAP program, the cuts in the Medicaid, and everyone is supposed to pull themselves up by their bootstraps and go to work, but then we try to raise the minimum wage, and you fight us on that.

I think that we have proven how to grow this economy. I am sure most Americans would want to go back and say: we will take the Clinton economy; we will take the Democratic budget in ’93, and we will grow the economy where we see every income group increase in the incomes that their families are making.

This budget continues to hollow out our military and our domestic priorities.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. I thank the chairman for his hard work on this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the House Republican budget with the defense fix. Our country needs to get back on a responsible financial path, a path that protects our national security, repeals ObamaCare, and reforms our entitlement programs so they are sustainable.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind us of the rapidly deteriorating security situation we face. Russia has invaded Ukraine. ISIS is spreading. Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons and long-range missiles while actively supporting terrorist organizations around the world.

North Korea is pursuing a submarine-launched ballistic missile capability to go with its nuclear weapons program. China is threatening our friends and allies in Asia. This is just a laundry list of bad actors that threaten the very safety of our Nation.

Meanwhile, President Obama’s foreign policy is a disaster, which puts us at even greater risk. Shockingly, the President is even turning his back on Israel, damaging our partnership with our closest ally in the Middle East.

Our military has already faced drastic cuts. The Air Force is the smallest it has ever been. The Army is on a path to being the smallest since 1940. The Navy will soon be the smallest since 1915.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe most Americans agree that now is not the time to cut our national security spending. Russia isn’t cutting its military budget. Iran isn’t cutting its mili-

tary budget. ISIS certainly isn’t cutting its military budget.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this budget by voting “yes” on Price 2. This is a vital step in keeping our military strong in the face of dangerous threats around the world.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am now really pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. YARMUTH. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as a 6-year member of the Budget Committee and the second ranking Democrat, I have seen this budget proposal up close and personal. I have seen the way it has been reshaped over the years, from its early days as the first Ryan budget, to the collection of budget tricks and gimmicks we find before us today.

Despite the highly questionable math and mysterious growth projections, the consequences are clear. This budget hurts American families now and in the future, hitting their pocketbooks and their checkbooks today while disinvesting in our and their future.

It immediately raises taxes on the hard-working families who are simply looking for a shot at the American Dream: owning a home, providing their kids with access to a good education, living a healthy life, and being able to save for retirement while their parents enjoy theirs.

It makes college more expensive for those families, cutting Pell grants by \$90 billion and eliminating higher education tax credits. It cuts investment in our infrastructure and innovation, leaving us less competitive in the global economy.

This budget takes more than 16 million men, women, and children off of the health insurance plan they have now, thanks to the Affordable Care Act. People will, again, be denied care because of preexisting conditions. Lifetime caps on coverage return.

If the Affordable Care Act were repealed, as proposed in the Republicans’ “work harder for less” budget, here is what would happen in my State: more than 500,000 Kentuckians would lose their healthcare coverage.

We wouldn’t gain the 40,000 new jobs that are projected over the next 6 years because of the Affordable Care Act, and the Kentucky budget would miss out on \$800 million more in revenue.

For seniors, this budget ends the guarantee of Medicare as we know it. Prescription drug costs will go up on day one. Copays will increase. The prescription drug doughnut hole will reopen.

Eventually, seniors will be given a voucher and sent on their way, told to find their own health plan—ironically, something that very, very closely resembles the healthcare exchanges that our friends on the other side despise so much.



This is not what the American people want. They want us to invest in our people, invest in innovation, and continue our economic recovery by creating new opportunities.

The Democratic budget will do just that, cutting taxes for working families, making college more affordable, health care more accessible, and retirement more secure.

It is time we reward hard work, and I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it gives me particular pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), one of the most diligent and dedicated Members of this Congress who is a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Budget Committee.

□ 1700

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you very much, Chairman. You are a wonderful chairman and have helped us produce a wonderful, responsible budget.

Mr. Chairman, this budget goes a long way to address the out-of-control spending problem and crushing debt the administration has fostered over the last few years. Unlike the President's proposal, though, our budget contains progrowth economic reforms, repeals ObamaCare, and it balances. Most importantly, Price 2 restores harmful defense cuts and provides the necessary resources our warfighters need.

The threats facing this Nation and the world right now are vast, real, and expanding: ISIL has proclaimed a caliphate in the Middle East, and it is now looking to expand into other countries; Russia is continually making headlines with aggression and invasions into Ukraine and surrounding areas; China continues to build its military as it gains more and more power globally; and Islamic extremism continues to spread to more and more countries.

We, as representatives of the people, are charged with providing for the common defense. Given the size, reach, and increasingly brutal nature of the threats we face, we should feel obliged to make sure that we create a budget that gives our military the tools necessary to address today's threats and be fully prepared to address the threats of tomorrow, whatever they may be and wherever they may come from.

As the only Member to sit on both the House Budget Committee and the House Armed Services Committee, I am proud that these two committees have come together for Price 2 to provide total defense funding spending above the President's request.

Missouri's Fourth Congressional District is proud to be one of our Nation's most military-intensive congressional

districts, home of two major military installations—Whiteman Air Force Base and Fort Leonard Wood—and thousands of dedicated military families sacrificing so much to keep us safe.

Providing our military the resources necessary to safeguard our liberties and protect our shores is one of the top legislative priorities I have, and I am proud that these resources are provided in Price 2.

Again, I thank Chairman PRICE for his leadership on this committee and in this process, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on Price 2.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I think our colleagues can hear that there is an awful lot of confusion and uncertainty among our Republican colleagues about funding our national defense. The President's budget is very clear. He funds the national defense the way the Joint Chiefs of Staff proposed is best for the country.

Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee who fights for justice and other really important causes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Let me thank my good friend from Maryland for his leadership consistently that really speaks to the hearts and minds of Americans because we know what Americans want: just a simple opportunity to live, thrive, and to create the values that we have built this country on. If you work hard, you are successful.

Mr. Chairman, the budgeteers on the majority side have a very poor track record when it comes to economic forecasts and projections.

Let me also acknowledge the chairman of this committee for the work that he has done. We just happen to disagree.

Ever since the Affordable Care Act was passed, it has been the challenge of Republicans to suggest that it wasn't working. We have close to 11 million people insured. Some populations who were never insured now have high numbers—citizens who were uninsured. And so the idea of the Affordable Care being a failure, you are just dead wrong.

I am very glad to support the Democratic alternative because it is the opposite of the Republican budget, which says work harder for less when we know what Americans need and what they want for their families. They want to be able to buy a home; they want to be able to send their kids to college, and they want a secure retirement. Under the GOP budget, it is harder to buy a home, absolutely almost impossible to send your children to college, and certainly harder to enjoy a secure retirement.

House Republicans oppose increasing the minimum wage, claiming that it costs jobs. Wrong again. For every increase in the minimum wage, it has

been accompanied by an expanding economy.

House Republicans opposing comprehensive immigration reform, wrong again. Studies conducted by groups as far apart as the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO indicate that the gross domestic product will grow \$1.5 trillion over 10 years.

This is a sorry track record of economic forecasting, and therefore, this budget is one that I have to oppose because it favors the wealthy over working class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class. I oppose the Republican budget because it asks major sacrifices of seniors who can barely make ends meet and fundamentally alters the social contract by turning Medicaid and the SNAP program into a block program and Medicare into a voucher.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It is clearly not a working road map for success. If the House Republican's "work harder to get less" budget were adopted, here is a sample of the pain and misery that will be visited on working families: an end to higher education tax credits, an end to needed increases in the child tax credit, the loss of access to tax credits for the Affordable Care Act, a reduction in tax rates for the wealthy, yielding average tax cuts of \$200,000 for millionaires financed by a \$2,000 tax increase on the typical working class family.

Mr. Chairman, this "Price is not right" budget will make it harder to get to the middle and working class parents to send their kids to college, ending these higher education tax credits and cutting student loan programs and Pell grants.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. As I close, let me thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN is right. I have served on the Judiciary Committee. It is there that we deal with the problems, particularly on the Crime Subcommittee, at the end of someone's detour in life. Do you know what, Mr. Chairman? Those detours in life that wind up with 75,000 persons in the Federal prison system on mandatory minimums has been because people cannot read, do not have opportunities, and do not have jobs.

I want to invest in a budget that lifts the boats of all people; if you work hard, you get a home; if you work hard, you can send your kids to school; if you work hard, you can retire. That is the budget I want to support, not this

no-success budget that is being proposed by our Republican friends.

I ask my colleagues to support the alternative budget along with the CPC and the CBC budget.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 27, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016" because it continues the reckless and irresponsible approach to fiscal policy that the House majority has championed for years, with disastrous results.

Mr. Chair, the budgeteers on the majority side have a very poor track record when it comes to economic forecasts and projections.

For years, they have based their entire legislative agenda and strategy on their belief that the Affordable Care Act or "Obamacare" would be a failure.

The wish was father to the thought. But they were wrong.

Because of Obamacare more than 16.4 million Americans now know the peace of mind that comes from affordable, quality health insurance that is there when you need it.

House Republicans oppose increasing the minimum wage, claiming that it costs jobs. Wrong again.

Every increase in the minimum wage has been accompanied by an expanding economy, especially during the Clinton Administration.

House Republicans opposing comprehensive immigration reform claim that it will lead to lower incomes and lost jobs.

Wrong again. Studies conducted by groups as far apart as the Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO consistently show that comprehensive immigration reform will grow the Gross Domestic Product by \$1.5 trillion over 10 years.

Given this sorry track record of economic forecasting, I strongly oppose the Republican budget because it favors the wealthy over middle class families and those struggling to enter or remain in the middle class.

I oppose this Republican budget because it asks major sacrifices of seniors who can barely make ends meet, and fundamentally alters the social contract by turning Medicaid and SNAP programs into a block grant and Medicare into a voucher.

I cannot and will not support a resolution that attempts to balance the budget on the backs of working families, seniors, children, the poor, or mortgages the future by failing to make the investments needed to sustain economic growth and opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, the GOP "Work Harder, Get Less" Budget squeezes hard-working Americans by making it: 1. Harder to buy a home by keeping their paychecks stagnant; 2. harder to send your kids to college by cutting student loans; and 3. harder to enjoy a secure retirement by privatizing Medicare.

If the House Republicans' "Work Harder to Get Less" budget were adopted, here is a sample of the pain and misery that will be visited on middle-class and working families: 1. An end to higher education tax credits; 2. an end to needed increases in the child tax credit; 3. the loss of access to tax credits for affordable health care for millions of Americans; and 4. a reduction in tax rates for the wealthy yielding an average tax cut of \$200,000 for

millionaires financed by a \$2,000 tax increase on the typical middle class family.

Mr. Chair, this "Price is not Right" budget will make it harder to middle and working class parents to send their kids to college by: 1. Ending higher education tax credits; and 2. cutting student loan programs and Pell Grants, making college less affordable and adding to the already huge levels of student debt.

The damage caused by the Republican budget is not limited to working families and students; there are also lumps of coal for seniors who have earned and deserve a secure retirement: 1. The Medicare guarantee is turned into a voucher program with increased costs for seniors. 2. Seniors who have worked hard for a financially secure retirement will immediately have to pay new co-pays for preventive care and much higher costs for prescription drugs.

The Republican budget also disinvests in America's future: 1. Slashes the part of the budget we use to invest in our children's education; and 2. devastates our investments in scientific research and innovation.

Mr. Chair, the Republican budget exacerbates the drag on the economy resulting from a crumbling infrastructure by cutting \$187 billion, or more than 19 percent, from transportation funding over the coming decade and provides no solution to address the current shortfall in the federal transportation fund, which means we can expect construction slowdowns beginning this summer.

Mr. Chair, compared to the President's budget, the Republican budget would result this fiscal year in 35,000 fewer children in Head Start and up to 6,000 fewer special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and other related staff.

The Republican budget also shortchanges America's future by cutting investments in scientific research and innovation in real terms by failing to lift the draconian sequester on domestic priorities.

As a result, under the Republican budget, there would be 1,300 fewer medical research grants at National Institutes H and 950 fewer competitive science research awards at the NSF, affecting 11,600 researchers, technicians, and students.

Finally, Mr. Chair, the Republican Budget mistreats the poorest and most vulnerable persons in our country.

The Republican "Work Harder, Get Less" budget takes aim at millions of families with children struggling to make ends meet and put food on the table by converting the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) into a block grant beginning in 2021 and cutting funding steeply—by \$125 billion (34 percent) between 2021 and by 2025.

These dramatic cuts could mean in 2021 through 2025 either cutting off assistance to 11 to 12 million eligible people each year, or cutting benefits by almost \$55 per person per month.

In contrast, the Democratic Budget works FOR American families by giving them the tools to buy a home, send their kids to college and enjoy a secure retirement.

Mr. Chair, the Democratic Budget represents a better way.

We Democrats understand that we are all in this together and that our current economic

situation calls for a balanced approach between increased revenues and responsible reduction in expenditures.

Our plan will protect and strengthen our recovering economy, reduce the deficit in a responsible way, while continuing to invest in the things that make our country strong like education, health care, innovation, and clean energy.

Mr. Chair, this Republican budget is bad for America but it is disastrous for the people from my home state of Texas who sent me here to advocate for their interests. Let me highlight a few examples.

1. If the Republican budget resolution were to become the basis of federal fiscal policy, 3,435,336 Texas seniors would be forced out of traditional Medicare and into a voucher program. Under the Republican plan to end Medicare as we know it, Texas seniors will receive a voucher instead of guaranteed benefits under traditional Medicare.

2. For the 3,435,336 Texans aged 45–54, the value of their vouchers would be capped at growth levels that are lower than the projected increases in health care costs. Previous analyses showed that this type of plan would cut future spending by \$5,900 per senior, forcing them to spend more out of pocket and diminishing their access to quality care.

3. Additionally, private insurance plans will aggressively pursue the healthiest, least expensive enrollees, thereby allowing Medicare—currently the lifeline for 3,187,332 Texas seniors—to "wither on the vine."

4. If the Republican budget resolution were to be adopted by Congress, 206,304 Texas seniors would pay more for prescription drugs next year.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON), a senior member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Chairman PRICE, for your extraordinary leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful today to join with my House Armed Services Committee colleagues and speak in support of Chairman PRICE's defense alternative budget, Price 2.

As the chairman of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee on the House Armed Services Committee, my top priority is to provide adequate funding for our Special Operations Forces who are currently deployed in more than 80 countries worldwide defeating the terrorists overseas. I support our cyber forces who play a critical role in the defense of our national security from state and nonstate aggressors alike. And I appreciate our scientists and engineers who develop the cutting-edge technologies provided for our warfighters to protect American families.

In an environment where our Air Force is the smallest since its creation, the Army is on the path to being the smallest since 1939, and the Navy will soon be the smallest since 1915, we cannot risk reducing our national defense. We can best provide for peace through strength.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that tomorrow we will be taking a vote on two seemingly similar budgets, Price 1 and Price 2, but there are two major differences between the budgets. Price 2 represents the product of fruitful negotiations between the leadership, the House Budget Committee, and the House Armed Services Committee.

In Director of National Intelligence James Clapper's recent Worldwide Threat Assessment before the Senate Armed Services Committee, he said:

In 2013, just over 11,500 terrorist attacks worldwide killed approximately 22,000 people. Preliminary data just for the first 9 months of 2014 indicate nearly 13,000 attacks, which killed 31,000 people. When the accounting is done, 2014 will have been the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled.

The world is becoming more dangerous, and it is time Congress came together and funded our troops appropriately. Terrorists have declared war on American families.

I would like to thank our leadership team, Chairman PRICE and Chairman MAC THORBERRY, for their work in negotiating Chairman PRICE's defense alternative, Price 2, and it is my hope that tomorrow we can come together and pass Price 2.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my Republican colleagues, if you want to vote for a defense budget in a straightforward manner the way the Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended, then vote for the Democratic alternative.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HILL). The gentleman from Georgia has 27 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), a member of the Armed Services Committee and a gentleman who has served this country in the armed services.

Mr. HUNTER. I would like to thank the gentleman from Georgia for dealing with the entire Congress and coming up with only two budgets, Price 1 and Price 2.

I think that the chairman has been pulled in just about every different direction, and I am actually glad that this is coming to fruition.

I would like to urge my colleagues to vote for Price 2, the defense budget that Chairman PRICE is putting out, and vote "no" on Price 1. There is a reason for that: Price 2 is the defense budget.

Our job as Members of Congress is to do a lot of things. We go to different

meetings. We vote on transportation, education, labor issues, and all kinds of things. But our number one job, our number one job of the American people is to keep them safe. It is national security. That is why I am here.

I did three tours. I did two tours in Iraq and one in Afghanistan. I was in Iraq when we didn't have up-armored Humvees. I was in Iraq when we didn't have enough scopes for our Marines and security forces. I was in Afghanistan when we didn't have enough stuff, too. In fact, if you vote for Price 2, you are still only voting for the ragged edge of what our Defense Department needs.

We have things going off all over right now. Africa is gone. The Middle East is gone and going. Eastern Europe is going now because of the Russians. And Asia and China, China is impinging and coming eastward towards the United States. Things will never be safer. Things will never be safer. I think the American people have to realize that, but they have to contend with it.

The American people need to know that their Navy is patrolling the ocean, that their Marines and their Army are able to go wherever we ask them to at a moment's notice and wherever we need them to. The American people need to know that their Air Force is patrolling the skies.

If we are \$20 billion under the ragged edge of what our Defense Department needs, we are going to have to make sacrifices, and the American people are not going to be as safe. If we vote and Price 1 wins, we are going to have to leave here and tell the American people that the American military cannot do what they think it can do. Price 2 will fund the U.S. military where it needs to be to face all these challenges, still barely—still barely—but the American military will be able to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to look around the world and ask themselves one question: What is their job as a U.S. Congress Member? What is their number one job? There is no social security without national security. It doesn't matter what our education budget is if another 9/11 happens.

I wear this 9/11 memorial bracelet on my wrist. That is what made me join the Marine Corps is when our towers went down. When those towers fell, we realized what was important, and it was keeping this country safe. Price 2 will help keep this country safe; Price 1 will make it a more dangerous place. Again, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote "no" on Price 1 and vote "yes" on Price 2.

Again, I thank the chairman for giving his heart and soul to this and listening to so many people and trying to come up with something that this side of the aisle can agree on.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I just point out to my colleagues that

both of what we are referring to as Price 1 and Price 2 are a total violation of what the Budget Committee, on a bipartisan basis, has said we would not do with respect to using the overseas contingency account as a slush fund. Both Price 1 and Price 2 do that to different degrees. If you want to fund defense in the straightforward manner that the military leadership has recommended to the President and the President has put in the budget, then you should support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It saddens me to have our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about a slush fund when they are talking about the military. I think it maligns our military. It doesn't give the honor and the dignity to the men and women who stand in harm's way every single day to protect our liberty and protect our freedom. It is hard to even recognize the comment when you are talking about those men and women of a slush fund.

I have great respect for members of the armed services, incredible respect for their leadership. We believe strongly in their ability to take the resources that we provide them and do the job, do the mission, make certain that this Nation is safe and kept from harm.

So I would encourage our colleagues on the other side to rethink their language and their rhetoric. Words mean something. Words mean something. I hope that they are able to recognize that that language doesn't do dignity to this Chamber, it doesn't do dignity to the men and women who stand in the breach.

I want to take a few minutes, Mr. Chairman, and I want to recognize those folks who have recognized us in supporting A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, groups all across this Nation, men and women who stand up and say: We know that there is a challenge out there, we know that the fiscal situation of this Nation is difficult, and we want to support those who are actually providing positive solutions:

Council for Citizens Against Government Waste—I have a letter from the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste supporting our budget; Americans for Tax Reform, supporting our budget; Americans for Prosperity, supporting our budget; National Taxpayers Union, supporting our budget; 60 Plus Association, supporting our budget; Association of Mature American Citizens, supporting our budget. And I mentioned before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters of support that have been provided by these organizations.

AMERICANS FOR TAX REFORM

Washington, DC, March 17, 2015.

Chairman TOM PRICE,  
Committee on the Budget,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CHAIRMEN PRICE: On behalf of Americans for Tax Reform, I write in strong support of the recently released U.S. House of Representatives budget proposal. The budget blueprint authored by House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price (R-GA) will ensure that Washington lives within its means by balancing the budget in less than ten years and cutting \$5.5 trillion in federal spending.

The budget proposal calls for a fairer, simpler tax code, reforms struggling entitlement programs, clamps down on inefficient and ineffective government programs, and lays the groundwork for strong economic growth. The plan also empowers the states to make their own decisions by restoring the principle of federalism.

By keeping to the proposed reforms, Congress stands to secure America's economic prospects, protect jobs, and accelerate economic development to levels which would be unattainable given the current spending policies. Lower, flatter taxes plus a competitive international tax regime would enshrine our place as the world's number 1 destination for entrepreneurship. Simply put, asking taxpayers to pay \$160 billion per year is an undue burden that we can do without.

Notably, the House budget repeals Obamacare in its entirety and reforms the health care system to increase access to affordable care and provide patients with better medical choices. Repealing Obamacare would eliminate numerous job killing regulations including the employer mandate and the individual mandate. In place of this complex system, the House budget prioritizes a patient-centered approach that gives power back to the individual.

Repealing Obamacare will also put a stop to the raiding of the Medicare trust fund. In turn, this will help secure and strengthen Medicare so the program can continue to provide retirees with the care that they deserve. The budget will also build a new premium support program for Medicare that will further empower seniors to make their own choices.

Finally, the budget implements improvements to Medicaid. Specifically, it repeals the Obamacare Medicaid expansion and grants increased flexibility to the states, which will allow the states the opportunity to build a strong and sustainable system of Medicaid that suits their needs.

The House Budget maintains the spending restrictions mandated in the Budget Control Act of 2011, ensuring the continuation of the savings from discretionary spending. In contrast to the White House budget, which ignores 2011 spending caps and raises spending through misleading promises, the House budget abides by federal law. The budget allocates funding to the DOD's Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) fund to meet the complex and dangerous global threats, balanced by cuts to mandatory spending.

It is important to keep the caps in place that have stabilized federal spending since 2011 and will lead to \$1.79 trillion in savings through 2021. You should be congratulated for proposing a more fiscally responsible solution despite the urging of some of his more reckless colleagues to break spending caps and undo years of fiscal restraint.

We urge the House Budget committee to support this bold pro-growth proposal. It returns power to states and localities while making great, positive strides in the tax code.

Sincerely,

GROVER G. NORQUIST,  
President,  
Americans for Tax Reform.

THE 60 PLUS ASSOCIATION,  
Alexandria, VA, March 18, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,  
Chairman, House Committee on the Budget,  
Cannon House Office Building, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE: On behalf of more than seven million senior citizen activists, the 60 Plus Association applauds your leadership in putting forth a responsible Balanced Budget plan. Not only will this legislation protect seniors but also our children and grandchildren.

We need positive, common sense solutions to put our nation's spending on a path of sustainability that both strengthens and preserves our Social Security and Medicare benefits. By reducing spending through responsible government-wide reforms, the House Republican budget also ensures America's economic security.

Again, we thank you for your efforts and introducing a Balanced Budget that puts our nation back on the right path! This plan will protect the investment of our generation as well as for future generations.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. MARTIN,  
Chairman.

ASSOCIATION OF  
MATURE AMERICAN CITIZENS,  
March 18, 2015.

Hon. TOM PRICE,  
6th District, Georgia, Cannon House Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,  
8th District, Maryland, Cannon House Office  
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN PRICE AND RANKING MEMBER VAN HOLLEN: On behalf of the 1.3 million members of AMAC, the Association of Mature American Citizens, I am writing to convey our strong support for many of the policies set forth in the House Budget Committee's FY 2016 budget resolution, "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America." This budget proposal correctly identifies the financial and economic challenges facing America today and provides a blueprint for tackling those problems with positive, responsible solutions.

Time and again, it has been said that America's national debt is the single biggest threat to our national security. For this reason, it is imperative that Congress unite around a plan to pay down our debt and balance the budget so that Washington can begin living within its means. "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America" promises to balance the budget in less than 10 years without raising taxes by reducing federal spending by \$5.5 trillion and making government programs more effective and efficient.

Not only does this budget promote healthy economic policies and reduce federal spending, it also provides a path forward to save and strengthen vital programs like Social Security and Medicare. On Social Security, the budget clearly states that Congress should not raid the retirement trust fund to temporarily patch the disability program, which is projected to be insolvent in 2016. AMAC strongly supports this policy position

and believes this is the kind of forward-thinking leadership that is required to save and secure this critical program. While these important senior programs face uncertain futures, AMAC appreciates that this budget compels Congress to adopt long-term legislative solutions that will guarantee Social Security and Medicare benefits for today's seniors and tomorrow's retirees.

Last, AMAC is pleased to see that the budget fully repeals the "Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act," or "ObamaCare." Repealing ObamaCare will save over \$2 trillion, will end the egregious \$700 billion raid on Medicare, and will unburden the public from obtrusive government mandates and regulations. Instead of imposing one-size-fits-all government health care on the American people, this budget proposes health reform that is patient-centered. AMAC supports the budget's patient-centered approach to health care that places value on increased access to quality, affordable care and expanded choices for individuals, families, and businesses.

As an organization committed to representing the interests of mature Americans and seniors, AMAC is encouraged by the positive vision outlined in "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America." We feel that this budget will help to restore our nation's financial and economic security and will put America on a path toward greater prosperity.

Sincerely,

DAN WEBER,  
President and Founder of AMAC.

CCAGW PRAISES FY 2016 HOUSE BALANCED  
BUDGET RESOLUTION

(WASHINGTON, DC).—Today, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW) praised House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price's (R-Ga.) fiscal year (FY) 2016 Budget Resolution. The blueprint balances the budget in less than 10 years, a clear divergence from President Obama's budget, which never balances at all.

The budget proposal cuts waste, improves accountability, and eliminates redundancies in the federal government. A particularly laudable component is the elimination of "double dipping" of Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment Insurance, as recommended by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) on March 4, 2015. The budget proposal also makes note of duplicative programs that need to be consolidated, including food aid and housing assistance that not only waste millions of taxpayer dollars but also fail to achieve their stated objectives.

The budget includes numerous recommendations from "Prime Cuts," such as the privatization of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the elimination of the Commerce Department's Hollings Manufacturing Extension Program and International Trade Promotion Activities, and the termination of dozens of green energy grants funded in the stimulus bill that would "protect taxpayers from being on the hook for future boondoggles." The 2015 Prime Cuts will be released on April 1.

Moreover, the budget proposal's commitment to devolving programs to the states, particularly Medicaid, food stamps, and educational programs, will spur innovation, increase flexibility, and save taxpayers money. Government that is closer to the people governs more effectively, with less waste and more accountability.

"We are very supportive of Chairman Price's budget proposal and look forward to

working closely with the committee to safeguard the interests of taxpayers," CCAGW President Tom Schatz said. "We are also pleased to see the budget contains many Prime Cuts recommendations. With the national debt more than \$18 trillion, it is time to balance the budget and end deficit spending in Washington."

The Council for Citizens Against Government Waste is the lobbying arm of the nation's largest nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to eliminating waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in government.

[March 17, 2015]

AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY ON THE HOUSE  
BUDGET PROPOSAL

ARLINGTON, VA.—Today Americans for Prosperity, the nation's largest grassroots advocate for economic freedom, applauded the House Budget Committee for introducing a budget resolution this morning. AFP Vice President of Government Affairs Brent Gardner issued the following statement:

"We applaud House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price for putting together a common sense budget resolution. While not perfect, we are pleased to see a number of positive policies proposed in this common sense budget. We applaud Chairman Price for holding firm on Congress's past agreement to control spending by adhering to the discretionary spending caps established in the Budget Control Act. Keeping these caps is the best tool for lawmakers to restrain spending, and we encourage Congress to keep these caps.

"This is a welcome change from the President's recent call for higher levels of federal spending and higher taxes on American families. Additional reforms that Americans for Prosperity supports in this budget resolution is that it balances within 10 years, sets the stage for comprehensive tax reform, and turns control over certain mandatory programs over to the states. It also includes a full repeal of the President's health care law that has already seen millions of people lose their health care plans. Overall, this budget resolution is a strong step in the right direction."

Earlier in March, Americans for Prosperity sent a letter of specific items that should be included in the upcoming budget resolutions in Congress. Online here. We continue to encourage federal lawmakers to work towards budget solutions that protect American taxpayers and reduce spending.

Groups Supporting: Americans for Tax Reform; Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Americans for Prosperity; US Chamber of Commerce; Association of Mature American Citizens; National Federation for Independent Business (NFIB); 60 Plus Association.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I also want to address this issue of morality. We have had a number of folks on the other side of the aisle talk about the morality of a budget. And budgeting is priorities, it is a moral document; there is no doubt about it.

In the earlier debate, a number of folks on the other side talked about this notion that moral documents, moral issues, are raised in budgets. And I agree, there is no doubt about it. Budgets say what kind of people we are. They say what kind of people we want to be.

So I want to ask this question, Mr. Chairman:

What is the morality of trapping disadvantaged people in a web of welfare programs that discourage self-sufficiency and instead shackle them to government dependency? What is the morality of that?

What is the morality of keeping retirees in a health care coverage program that is going bankrupt, becoming insolvent, not according to my numbers, according to the trustees of the program itself, and that can't keep its promises if its so-called providers keep blocking reform? What is the morality of that?

What is the morality, Mr. Chairman, of forcing low-income people into a second-rate health care program in which many can't get appointments with doctors and those doctors are grossly under-reimbursed by the government? What is the morality of that?

What is the morality, Mr. Chairman, of stifling medical innovation, preventing new treatments from reaching patients because of ever-expanding Washington bureaucracy and red tape? Where is the morality in that kind of program?

What is the morality of tying college students to years of crippling debt because of a government-run student loan program that drives up tuitions? I hear my friends on the other side talk about how difficult it is for students, and it is. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult because of the student loan program that they put in place when they were in the majority that doesn't give students access to low interest rate loans. Where is the morality of that?

Where is the morality of heaping trillions of dollars of debt onto future generations to finance today's government spending because today's policymakers refuse to stop outspending our tax revenue? Where is the morality in that, Mr. Chairman?

And these are only a few examples of the regrettable consequences of well-intentioned, government-sponsored compassion.

Our Republican budget aims to break that pattern. We aim to respect the American people and talk to them about the seriousness of the challenges that we face, but provide positive alternatives, real solutions with real results. That is what they are longing for, real leadership in this town.

Our budget isn't about cutting programs, it is about improving and saving them to ensure a sustainable safety net for those who need it, while encouraging and helping others sustain themselves, the most truly compassionate thing one can do for another. That is the morality of our Republican budget. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just start with some comments about the importance of making

sure we make investments in defense in a straightforward and honest way.

The chairman's comments were directly contrary to the position he took 1 year ago. Here is what he said as part of the Republican majority: "Abuse of the OCO"—that is the overseas contingency account—"is a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process." That is what our Republican colleagues said. They said they weren't going to allow it. They are using the overseas contingency account as a slush fund for moneys that should be invested in the normal Defense Department accounts. That is what they said last year. They have done a 180 here. That is a discredit to this House.

We keep hearing all day about Price 1 and Price 2. What is that all about? I am sure colleagues listening have got to be going: What is going on, Price 1 and Price 2? It is because our Republican colleagues haven't figured out how they are going to fund the defense of the country. But both Price 1 and Price 2 are a violation of the position our Republican colleagues took just a year ago.

So let's do this in a way that honors our commitment to our defense and do it in a straightforward manner, the way that the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others have recommended.

Now, it is always interesting to understand people's different perceptions in morality. I would just ask a question: Is it right to have a budget that refuses to cut a single special interest tax break in order to reduce the deficit while cutting our investment in our kids' education? Is it right to have a budget that won't cut a corporate tax break, like the corporate jet loophole, but cuts our investment in our kids' education, increases the cost of prescription drugs to seniors, says to students you are going to pay more for your student loans?

I was really interested to hear the chairman's comments about the student loan program. What the Democrats did when they were in the majority was get rid of a system where the big banks were making guaranteed returns off of taxpayer dollars that were not going to students. They were making guaranteed 9 percent returns.

So we said: Why should we have a system where the big banks are getting these guaranteed taxpayer-subsidized returns? And we moved to a direct loan program. That meant every dollar could go farther in terms of providing student loans. Cut out the big banks. They were just siphoning off dollars that were intended to go to students. That is what we did. But we also understand that despite those improvements, our students are finding it costly to go to college.

That is why actually in our budget we provide for increased opportunity and more affordable college, the opposite of what our Republicans do, which

is they say they want to increase interest rates on student loans and cut \$90 billion-plus from Pell grants.

Is it moral or, I should just ask: Does the country really think it is right to have a budget that paves the way for cutting the top tax rate for the wealthiest people in the country, the people who have done just great over the last 20, 30 years? Is it right to cut their tax rates by one-third, from 39 percent down to the mid-20s, while increasing the tax burden on working families, middle class families, and those who are working their way into the middle class, getting rid of the deduction for higher education, getting rid of the increase in the child tax credit, getting rid of the Affordable Care Act tax credits that help people afford education?

The Tax Policy Center did a study that said a proposal like the Romney-Ryan plan would provide about an average tax cut of \$200,000 to millionaires and increase the tax burden on middle-income families by \$2,000. Is that right?

Look, the issue here is whether you believe that we should grow our economy and accelerate economic growth in a way with more shared prosperity, or whether you believe in an economy that grows through trickle down, the idea that cutting tax rates for the top will somehow lift everybody up. That theory ran into the hard wall of reality. Folks at the top had their incomes go up, everybody else was running in place. We should not go back to that.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am amused by my colleague's interpretation of what happened with student loans. It is an interesting rewriting of history.

What the translation is is that the Federal Government now controls the vast majority of student loans, controls and dictates interest on those loans. So the money that the students are paying out there in interest on those loans, where is it going? It is going to the Federal Government when, in fact, those students could actually get loans at a lower rate, but that is now precluded. So our friends have a proclivity for rewriting history. Their plan, by the way; that was their plan to put the Federal Government in charge of student loans.

The gentleman says, What has changed in a year? Well, a lot has changed, Mr. Chairman: Russian aggression in Eastern Europe, ISIS, Chinese making more noise.

Look, I admit that funding the defense for our country in this way, \$613 billion—\$523 billion in the base budget and \$90 billion in the global war on terror fund—is not ideal.

Why are we doing that? The President so far has refused to lay out a

path to change the law, which it takes in order to put it in the base defense budget, which is why we in our budget responsibly, proactively, honestly lay forth the path to be able to get that done.

Our friends know that if the President's number were included in the budget, as soon as the next year begins, boom, right back down to \$523 billion. He can talk about the number he has got all he wants, but the law of the land brings it right back down to \$523 billion unless the law is changed.

We look forward to working with our colleagues, we look forward to working with the administration, so that we can actually do so in a way that modifies the base defense budget. I hope that that is able to happen, I hope that that is able to happen.

I am now pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a very active member of the Appropriations Committee and of the Budget Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I rise today, first, to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for the job he has done and the staff of that committee.

As the chairman stated, this budget actually deals with the issues that are important to our country. The President has put together and has put forward a budget, but as the chairman stated, it is a budget that assumes that the law is not the law. He assumes that you can just throw money on top of the law and that it is going to stay there by some miracle of nature when the reality is that we know, as the chairman stated, that that is fake, because if we were to mark up to those numbers, the sequester would kick in and just eliminate those funds outright.

□ 1730

This budget deals with reality. This budget deals with the fact that, if we don't deal with and if we don't reform what is causing, frankly, the debt, the deficits—which is mandatory spending—it will consume 100 percent of the budget in a generation.

This budget also demands from Congress tax reform, tax reform that we all know would increase the economy, that would create more jobs, that would make it easier for Americans to open businesses—small, medium, and large—to create jobs here in this country.

I want to thank the chairman because it also recognizes the fact that, no, al Qaeda is not on the run; that, no, we have not defeated terrorism; and that the world is not as safe as any of us would like it to be. This recognizes that we have to give our military what it needs to do its job.

Yes, the President adds money to the base, but I repeat—and the chairman mentioned this—that that is fake because, unless you change the law,

which this budget cannot do, that money automatically goes away.

The one thing that we can do that is in the hands of this bill, of this budget that is in front of us, is to do precisely what the chairman has put forward.

Is it perfect? Absolutely not—it is responsible. It helps create jobs, and it will grow the economy. It will stop this out-of-control spending; and, yes, it will deal with making sure that our military has the tools that it needs to fight the enemies of freedom and the enemies of America. It does it in a realistic fashion, not in this dream world that the President's budget seems to be living in.

I encourage my colleagues to support this effort from our chairman of the Budget Committee. Again, I thank the chairman for his effort.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am just a little puzzled by the comments from the gentleman from Florida since the Republican study group's budget—and I understand the Republican study group consists of about 170 members of a big majority of the Republican caucus—funds defense in a straightforward way that the President's budget does and that the Democratic alternative budget does.

I am interested to hear the Republican study group's budget approach to defense characterized as a fake. I think that would be a surprise to the members of the Republican study group.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to put a little more meat on the bones, if you will, of this issue of discretionary spending and of mandatory spending because it really is the locus of the problem that we have, and I think our friends on the other side of the aisle would agree.

When you look at history, over the last 50 years or so—the red on this is mandatory spending, and the blue is discretionary spending—back in 1962, mandatory spending was about a third of our Federal budget, and discretionary spending was about two-thirds.

Over the last 50 years, what has happened is that that has flipped, and mandatory spending has become two-thirds or even more of Federal spending, and discretionary spending has become about a third.

Now, why is that important? All of the things that we say that we care about outside of Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security, basically, are in this blue area. Defense is in the blue area, as are transportation, energy, education, research.

All of the things we say that we want to protect are in the blue area. This is what our Appropriations Committee deals with. The automatic spending—the mandatory programs—are crowding out, as you see, Mr. Chairman, the discretionary spending. The challenge to



my colleagues is to recognize this problem, to recognize what needs to be done.

What needs to be done is that the mandatory programs need to be addressed. You can't bury your head in the sand and say it doesn't make any difference. We spend about \$3.6 trillion a year on the entire Federal budget.

About \$2.6 trillion—ballpark figures of \$2.5 trillion, \$2.6 trillion—is of basically three things, which is Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt, which has been talked about and that we aren't able to do anything about. We can't change it.

When you think about the Federal Government, everything else is about \$1 trillion a year: education, energy, legislative branch, judiciary, court system, transportation, research, defense. Everything else in the Federal Government, with the exception of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, is about \$1 trillion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, people out there across this great Nation know that, for 4 out of the last 6 years, Washington—this country—has run a deficit of greater than \$1 trillion each year, which means that you could do away with the entire Federal Government—the entire thing, everything—with the exception of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security, and you wouldn't even balance the budget. That is the challenge. Very shortly, mandatory spending is going to consume the entire Federal budget.

We have got a problem that we have got to deal with. If we don't, what happens is that we are no longer going to be able to pass off to our kids and our grandkids the kind of opportunity for them to realize their dreams.

That is what we need to do, Mr. Chairman. We need to recognize the problems, and we need to recognize the challenges, and that is what our budget does. It recognizes that mandatory spending can't continue on the path that it is on.

Sadly, in that mandatory spending, those programs are actually going broke: Medicare, insolvent by 2033; Social Security, insolvent by 2034.

What our budget does is responsibly, positively, honestly say to the American people that we recognize that challenge. It is reckless for us not to recognize and address that challenge, so we do in our budget put forward positive solutions to those challenges so that we can, as a percentage of the amount of spending in the Federal Government, narrow the amount of money spent on mandatory programs so that we have more moneys available for the kinds of things that everybody on this House floor and everybody in this Chamber wants to do.

We want to make certain that we have the greatest opportunity for the next generation, but that light is getting dim unless we address the chal-

lenges that we face. That is why it is so important to adopt a positive budget, an honest budget, a sincere budget, a budget that recognizes these challenges but that puts in place positive solutions.

I appreciate the conversations and the discussions of my friends on the other side of the aisle, but it is absolutely vital that we, as Representatives of the people, come together and solve these challenges that we have from a financial standpoint so that we can pass on to our kids and our grandkids the greatest nation the world has ever known.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURBELO of Florida). The gentleman from Maryland has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve unless the gentleman wants to close.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I would say to my friend that I am prepared to close, so I am happy to have the gentleman close.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

When we are talking about the budget and priorities, the chairman of the committee left out one of the biggest areas of "spending" in the Tax Code according to the Congressional Budget Office, and that is the amount of spending that goes through a whole range of tax breaks.

If you look at this chart, you will find that what the Congressional Budget Office calls "tax expenditures" exceed the amount spent each year on Social Security, on Medicare and Medicaid, on defense: \$1.4 billion in tax breaks.

Now, some of those are for good policy purposes, but some of them and a lot of them are there because some powerful special interest got some special break that helps him and nobody else, and this Republican budget doesn't touch one of those in order to reduce the deficit, not one. It doesn't close one of those \$1.4 trillion in tax expenditures to reduce the deficit.

What it does do is make life harder for people who are working hard every day. It increases the tax burden on middle class Americans and on those who are working to join the middle class. It raises the cost of going to college by increasing the cost of student loans. It increases the daily costs of seniors, who are going to face higher prescription drug costs and higher fees for copayments—seniors, students, working class families.

I started this discussion by pointing out that we have seen worker productivity grow. American workers are working harder than ever, but their paychecks have been flat. Our Demo-

cratic alternative budget will address that issue.

This Republican budget makes the situation worse. It doesn't do anything to help hard-working Americans get ahead. It says, Work harder, but get less. You are going to take home less, and you are going to get hit with higher taxes because they take away certain important tax benefits for middle-income and working people.

Why in the world we would want to pass a budget that makes it harder on hard-working people today and that disinvests in the future of America tomorrow, I don't know. There is a much better way to do it. We will present an alternative tomorrow which does that.

It says we should have a Tax Code that is not rigged in favor of making money off of money, but that actually favors people who earn a living through hard work every day. Our current Tax Code actually gives better tax rates to unearned income than to earned income. That doesn't make sense.

We propose to provide important tax incentives and benefits to hard-working Americans; whereas the Republican budget just provides another tax rate cut for folks at the top on the failed theory that it is going to trickle down and lift everybody up. That is not the way to accelerate economic growth.

The way to accelerate economic growth is to make sure all hard-working Americans can bring back bigger paychecks to provide for their families, to make sure their families can achieve the American Dream.

That is an economy in which everyone moves forward together, as opposed to an economy that says to the folks at the top: you have made it; we are going to give you even more tax breaks, and once you climb the ladder of opportunity, it is okay to lift the ladder up after you.

That has not been the way our country has worked from the beginning. Let's reject this budget. There is a better way, and we will have a chance to debate that tomorrow.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we have heard a lot of conversation this afternoon about the budget; a lot of hyperbole, a lot of misinformation, I would suggest.

I suspect that those out there watching, if they are looking at this, have said to their spouses: hide the kids and pets, dear; they are talking about the budget.

Let me set the record straight on a couple of items. Some folks on the other side have talked about the research budget is being decimated. Table one in the budget report has a line item for general science, space, and technology. That is research and innovation—for 2016, \$28.381 billion; in going to 2025, \$34.488 billion; for the 10-



year window, \$313 billion to research and innovation.

Chairman RYAN, early on in this conversation, in this debate, talked about all of the hyperbole on the other side and of the words “slashing” and “cutting” and “decimating” and “destroying.”

Mr. Chairman, what the other side proposes, what the President proposes, is a growth in the budget of 5.1 percent on average. That is what gets you this amount of debt.

□ 1745

It crowds out everything else that we want to do in our society. Our growth rate, 3.4 percent—3.4 percent. That is what gets you A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

Now, my friend talks about the productivity in this country; and it is true, productivity is up, but let me talk about the growth. If they want to double down on the policies that we have had for the last 6 years, let's talk about what has happened. This is the Congressional Budget Office estimate of growth over the ensuing 10 years: in 2012, they predicted that the growth was going to average 3 percent; in 2013, 2.9 percent; in 2014, 2.5 percent; this year, 2.3 percent growth over the next 10 years.

Now, what does that mean? What that means is that a full percent growth off the average growth rate over the last 40 years, and such a distinctive decrease in growth that jobs aren't going to be able to be created at the numbers that they need to be, that the economy doesn't get to be roaring at the way that it needs to be, that revenue into the Federal Government is diminished because the growth isn't projected to be what it ought to be.

How much? Is it a little bit? If— if, when, we are able to adopt the policies in our budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America projection, we would suggest that we can return to the average growth rate of the last 40 years, 3.2, 3.3 percent. What that means is more jobs, more activity, more economic vitality out there. What that means is nearly \$3 trillion, \$3 trillion more to the Federal Government in terms of revenue just because of the increased activity in our economy. Imagine what we could do with those kinds of resources, to balance the budget, to get this economy going again, to allow the American people to realize their dreams in so many, many wonderful and vital ways.

How do you do that? You do that with tax reform. You do that with tax reform. My friends on the other side of the aisle say: Well, no, you haven't identified what you are going to do. No, that is the responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means. The budget lays out the pathway, and then the committees of jurisdiction go to work and accomplish that pathway,

put in place the programs that would accomplish that pathway, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I want to reiterate once again, remember, Mr. Chairman, that every dollar that is taken in taxes from the American people and every dollar that is borrowed is a dollar that can't be used to pay the rent, can't be used to buy a house, can't be used to buy a car, can't be used to send a kid to college, can't be used to expand or to begin a business.

So what we need are positive solutions, real solutions, honest solutions, like we put forward in our budget. Highlights once again: We balance the budget in less than 10 years without raising taxes. Our budget decreases spending by over \$5.5 trillion in the 10-year budget window—\$5.5 trillion—instead of adding trillions of dollars of spending. We support a strong national defense; we have defined that, \$613 billion combined with base defense spending and global war on terror spending. We repeal ObamaCare in its entirety, once again, as a physician, not just because it is harming the economy, but it is also harming the health of the American people. We secure economic opportunity for all citizens.

We don't leave anybody behind. We recognize the imperative and the opportunity that is so necessary for folks. We do, however, believe that there are places where appropriate federalism ought to occur, where States and local communities can better respond to the needs of their citizens, whether it is in the area of health care, whether it is in the area of nutritional assistance, or whether it is in the area of education, something that so many State legislatures and so many Governors are talking about as we speak.

We hold Washington accountable. We think it is important to have a right size of Washington, not an expanded Federal bureaucracy that continues to overreach and continues to affect adversely, in regulatory schemes, the lives of the American people. We cut waste and fraud and abuse all across the Federal Government, defining areas that need to be audited and where we need to find savings. The American people, the hardworking American people, they are sick and tired of the kind of waste in this government. We support rights of conscience for physicians all across this land, and we push back on the executive overreach.

This is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. It will result in a greater efficiency, greater effectiveness, and greater accountability of this government. I urge my colleagues to support A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate on the congressional budget has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOOLENAAR) having assumed the chair, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

#### BENJAMIN P. GROGAN AND JERRY L. DOVE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION MIAMI FIELD OFFICE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1092) to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the “Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Bureau of Investigation Miami Field Office”, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1092

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, shall be known and designated as the “Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building”.

#### SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all

Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1092, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1092, as amended, would designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building.

FBI Special Agents Jerry Dove and Benjamin P. Grogan were killed in 1986 during a gun battle with robbery suspects. Special Agents Dove and Grogan had been a part of a surveillance effort in connection with a series of violent bank robberies in Miami, Florida.

Special Agent Dove was born in January 1956 in Charleston, West Virginia. He earned degrees from Marshall University and West Virginia University and had been in law enforcement for 4 years prior to his death.

Special Agent Grogan was born in Atlanta, Georgia, in February 1933. He became an FBI special agent in 1961 and had been with the FBI for 19 years prior to his death.

This legislation recognizes the ultimate sacrifice of these two FBI agents who were killed in the line of duty. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON) for her leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, I spoke with George Piro, special agent in charge of the FBI's Miami field office, and on behalf of the families of the fallen officers and of all of his colleagues, he conveyed his sincere appreciation to this House for considering this important legislation today.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1092, as amended, which designates the Federal building located in Miramar, Florida, as the Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Bureau of Investigation Miami Field Office.

I would also like to thank my dear friend and pioneer and legend, the gentlelady from Florida, Madam FREDERICA WILSON, who really is a Floridian icon, but I want to recognize her for her dedicated work with law enforcement officers, including the two who died in the line of duty.

On April 11, 1986, Mr. Speaker, FBI Agents Jerry Dove and Benjamin Grogan were killed in southwest Miami, Florida. While these two FBI agents were investigating a spate of

violent armed robberies, they observed a vehicle suspected to be connected to the robberies. When the agents attempted to stop the vehicle and the suspects refused, a high-speed chase ensued. A gun battle followed, and Special Agents Dove and Grogan were killed. Five other agents were injured in the attack.

Now, since this incident, Mr. Speaker, every April 11, the Miami FBI field office has held a special ceremony to honor Special Agents Dove and Grogan and other law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty.

As a former police officer, I have a deep appreciation of this honor being bestowed today. Naming this new facility after FBI Special Agents Jerry Dove and Benjamin P. Grogan is a fitting tribute to these two law enforcement officers who gave their lives in service and protection of the citizens of Miami, Florida.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting H.R. 1092, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Florida, Ms. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank our brand-new Florida colleague, the gentleman from Miami, Mr. CURBELO, for his leadership in bringing this important bill to the floor before us tonight. I especially commend my good friend, the gentlelady from Miami, Dr. WILSON, for spearheading this effort to commemorate and thank our law enforcement officers, and especially to highlight the sacrifice that these two special agents made.

As was pointed out by the previous speakers, Mr. Speaker, in 1986, Special Agents Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove were killed while serving bravely in the line of duty after they and other agents gave chase to two robbery suspects.

□ 1800

A 5-minute gun battle—the bloodiest in FBI history—erupted when the suspects' vehicle was stopped in my sleepy neighborhood of Pinecrest, Florida, and both suspects began firing on law enforcement.

In addition to the tragic loss of Special Agents Grogan and Dove, five other agents, including the agent who shot and killed the suspects, were injured, as approximately 145 shots were fired during this exchange.

Even though scenes as tragic as this one are very rare in south Florida today, our community understands the dangers that all law enforcement officers face in the course of their daily work to protect civilians. The sacrifice of both special agents and their families is a testament to the ethos of service in our south Florida community.

Although nothing will bring back these brave agents, I am proud to sup-

port Ms. WILSON's important bill to name the FBI's new south Florida field office for them. It is just one way, Mr. Speaker, in which we can honor their service and their sacrifice.

Special Agents Dove and Grogan are role models for our new generation of law enforcement officers. Their bravery, their courage, their selfless dedication is seen every day in law enforcement officers in south Florida.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON), the author of the bill.

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a special thank you to Speaker BOEHNER for realizing the urgency of this bill. We just got this information, and I went to the Speaker and he redlined the bill and brought it to the floor.

I am proud to have my Florida colleagues here with me: a legend in her own time, Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CURBELO, who is new. He has really jumped into Congress and has been so helpful in all that we do.

It is a pleasure for the time to be managed by ANDRÉ CARSON, who himself is a police officer and who understands who we consider a role model in that field. I thank you so much for being here today for this important bill.

I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1092, which proposes to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, in the heart of my district, as the Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building.

This new 475,000-square-foot facility is a state-of-the-art office building and is developed in accordance with the 2030 Zero Environmental Footprint project goal, according to the architects.

This facility is a part of the GSA's Design Excellence Program, and in the words of the architect, it "expresses the dignity, enterprise, and stability of the United States Government, while the landscape restores the native environment by reintroducing wetlands and vegetation typical of the Everglades."

The facility is LEED certified and is designed to reduce the consumption of potable water by 95 percent. There are also solar panels on the roof of the annex and garage that will provide renewable electricity. The building will be high tech and be able to support over 1,000 employees.

There are a few major points that I want to mention about the building. First, the building is aesthetically gorgeous and far from what you would consider your typical government building. It sheds the model that government buildings always place function over form. The building stands out from the neighboring buildings so much that most people don't know that it is the FBI's new field office.

Also, the construction cost was approximately \$8 million below the budgeted amount, and this was achieved through the operational efficiency of the contractor Hensel Phelps, the FBI, and GSA.

The project provided a boost to the local economy by creating hundreds of jobs for the residents of my community. The employees will be able to give back to the economy—which is so great—by spending money in the city of Miramar.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to create an even stronger personal connection with the local community.

We are naming the building in honor of Special Agents Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove, members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who died valiantly on Friday, April 11, 1986, in what is still considered the bloodiest gun battle in the storied history of the FBI.

Most men and women in law enforcement leave their homes for work knowing that there is a possibility that they may not return, but I don't know if that was on the minds of Agents Grogan and Dove as they left their homes on April 11, 1986.

I do know that it was an unusually cool and breezy spring morning in south Florida. I do know that Miami in the 1980s was plagued by crime and graphic violence. This period has been chronicled in media reports and dramatically portrayed on the TV show "Miami Vice" and in movies like "Scarface."

I know that Agents Grogan and Dove knew about this violence when they said good-bye to their families, picked up their badges and guns, and left home on the morning of April 11, 1986. Yet they still answered the charge to protect their community in the face of this danger.

I know that Agent Grogan was a company man. I know that he had 25 years of dedicated service to the Bureau and was 1 year from retirement. His wife was also an employee of the Bureau.

I know that Agent Dove had only 4 years of service in the Bureau after completing law school, but he was living his boyhood dream, according to his family.

I have their photos displayed here so that you can see the men we are proposing to honor. I wanted to have their pictures so that you can see the bravery in their eyes.

I know that their bravery was the motivation for their joining a team of fellow agents on the morning of April 11, 1986, to tail a vehicle with two suspects on board whom they thought were connected to a string of violent bank robberies.

The agents attempted to hail the driver of the vehicle to pull over, and when that failed, the agents strategi-

cally cornered the vehicle, which came to a crashing halt by hitting a tree. A gun battle immediately ensued. There was a barrage of bullets.

I can only imagine how the crackle from the guns cut through the normally peaceful morning of that south Dade neighborhood. Yet our brave men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation returned fire. Their fire hit the suspects several times but, unfortunately, those weapons were not powerful enough to stop them.

On the other hand, the weapons that were used by the suspects were so powerful that the agents were injured by misses that tore pieces of metal from their vehicles. However, those agents continued to battle on. Those agents knew that this could be that day which they prayed to avoid as they said good-bye to their loved ones and left their home, but they still battled on.

I can only imagine the frustration of Special Agents Richard Manauzzi, Gordon McNeill, Edmundo Mireles, Gilbert Orrantia, John Hanlon, Ronald Risner, and Grogan and Dove as they shot dozens of bullets into the suspects' direction and the high-powered rifle continued to return fire, but they still battled on.

In a desperate attempt to flee, the suspects tried to commandeer Grogan and Dove's vehicle. When they came around to the side of the vehicle, Grogan and Dove were on the ground in a defensive position they had taken to battle the suspects. It is reported that the suspects shot both agents with a high-powered rifle at close range. Shortly after, the suspects were themselves fatally shot by Agent Edmundo Mireles.

Agent Mireles made a very impressive statement about his role in that tragic event. He said:

I knew that I was going to die, but I was going to do my best to make sure that the suspects didn't get away.

When the dust cleared, two agents lay dead on that spring morning, and five were seriously injured.

I know one other thing: that if for no other reason, we are here in Congress to honor, commend, and decorate those Americans who live up to the ideals upon which this great country was founded.

Mr. Speaker, I implore you and my colleagues in Congress to join me, the Transportation Committee, and my Florida colleagues, and lift up Special Agent Benjamin Grogan and Special Agent Dove from that street in south Miami and place their names high, where the world can know that we are proud of their sacrifice for their Nation.

It is only fitting that these names should be placed on the same mantle with the letters FBI because Special Agents Grogan and Dove embody the motto for which the agency has become known: fidelity, bravery, and integrity.

God bless the FBI, and God bless America.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank my two colleagues from Florida for their moving and eloquent remarks. I especially want to thank Ms. WILSON for raising awareness and taking this very special initiative to honor these men who gave the ultimate sacrifice for the safety and the security of our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is often in this House that we take time to remember those who are defending our freedoms around the globe, our men and women in uniform, as we should, because many of them also pay the ultimate sacrifice. Less frequently do we take time to honor our heroes in law enforcement, those who live with us in our neighborhoods and who keep our neighborhoods and our homes safe.

By doing this today, this House is honoring not just these men, not just their families, but all of our law enforcement officers throughout this country who every day fight to keep us safe and to guarantee the security of our neighborhoods and of our families.

Once again, I thank my colleagues for this wonderful bipartisan effort to honor those who truly deserve to be honored by this House.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1092.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the 'Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1815

#### COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Homeland Security:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,  
Washington, DC, March 24, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the

House of Representatives, that the Committee on Homeland Security and its subcommittees have received document subpoenas issued by the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts in a civil case.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoenas, I have determined that compliance is not consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL MCCAUL,  
Chairman.

#### COMMEMORATING FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand here today on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize the upcoming 50th anniversary of my alma mater, Florida International University, on April 6, 2015.

Not only is FIU worlds ahead in finding solutions to the most challenging problems of our time, but the university and the entire FIU community has moved Miami-Dade County worlds ahead as well.

Since its founding in 1965, FIU has grown alongside south Florida and has helped enable the region's notable progress and evolution over the last five decades.

To President Mark Rosenberg, my good friend, and the whole Florida International University family, I say happy anniversary, and thank you for decades of outstanding contributions to south Florida. I look forward to the next 50 years of amazing accomplishments to come.

As a two-time graduate of FIU, I say, Go, Golden Panthers.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud to stand here today on the Floor of the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize the upcoming 50th Anniversary of my alma mater, Florida International University, on April 6th, 2015.

Not only is FIU "Worlds Ahead" in finding solutions to the most challenging problems of our time, but the University and the entire FIU community has moved Miami-Dade County "Worlds Ahead" as well.

Since its founding in 1965, FIU has grown alongside South Florida, and has helped enable our community's notable progress and evolution over the last five decades.

Miami-Dade County's only public research university has now awarded over 200,000 degrees in more than 180 bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs, and currently enrolls more than 54,000 students.

FIU is also a major economic engine that contributes nearly \$9 billion each year to the local economy as a top-10 employer in the county.

To President Mark Rosenberg, my good friend, and the whole Florida International Uni-

versity family: happy anniversary and thank you for decades of outstanding contributions to South Florida.

I look forward to the next 50 years of amazing accomplishments to come.

And as a two-time graduate of FIU, I say Go Golden Panthers!

#### RECOGNIZING THE COMPETITIVE CARRIERS ASSOCIATION

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Competitive Carriers Association, which is the leading organization for competitive wireless carriers and stakeholders.

CCA was founded in 1992 by nine rural and regional wireless carriers. Since its founding, CCA has grown to become the Nation's leading association for competitive wireless providers serving all areas of the United States.

Today is the first day of CCA's 2015 Global Expo in Atlanta. More than 100 CCA member volunteers will gather for a special day of volunteering with Hands On Atlanta. CCA will assemble 2,000 boxed meals and deliver them in person to schools, senior citizen homes, and other locations in the Old Fourth Ward neighborhood.

I am pleased that CCA is bringing the spirit of community to Atlanta, and I am confident this event will be quite successful.

#### HONORING PUCKETT EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, Georgia's 11th Congressional District is home to some of the Nation's most innovative and leading-edge businesses. One such business has been providing emergency management services to residents in northwest Georgia.

Puckett EMS is a family-owned and -operated business with a strong reputation for delivering state-of-the-art medical services to the people of Cobb and Dade Counties. Today, I am especially proud that this business has recently taken the national stage as one

of the leading innovators in emergency health technology.

In 2013, Puckett Emergency Management Services was recognized by the Cobb County Chamber of Commerce as the Small Business of the Year for its work to support the local community and to ensure the highest level of care.

Most recently, Puckett EMS' software company, EMS Technology Solutions, received the Emergency Management Services World Magazine's Top Innovation award for its controlled substance tracking software, Operative IQ.

This cutting-edge solution uses biometric technology to track controlled substances from the time the medication is administered to the very last dose. In fact, using this software is a much more secure way of monitoring prescription drug use and bringing medical records in line with today's technology.

What is even more remarkable is Operative IQ uses available technology to continually update patient medical records, helping prevent substance abuse. In the emergency management industry, where seconds could mean the difference between life and death, this technical innovation is a lifesaver.

I commend Puckett EMS for their tireless efforts to protect the public safety of our citizens and congratulate them on their well-deserved recognition as a top innovator.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand before this body to recognize the contributions the management and employees of Puckett EMS have made to our community and their success in improving the safety and access to critical health care.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of foot surgery.

Mr. RUIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for March 23, today, March 25 and 26 on account of birth of twin baby girls.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 25, 2015, at 10 a.m.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BOUTSANY, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 2. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Agriculture, Natural Resources, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1558. A bill to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SIRE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 1559. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NUNES (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 1560. A bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE

JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 1561. A bill to improve the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's weather research through a focused program of investment on affordable and attainable advances in observational, computing, and modeling capabilities to support substantial improvement in weather forecasting and prediction of high impact weather events, to expand commercial opportunities for the provision of weather data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 1562. A bill to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1563. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1564. A bill to require Members of Congress to disclose delinquent tax liability and to require an ethics inquiry into, and the garnishment of the wages of, a Member with Federal tax liability; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1565. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to establish a national usury rate for consumer credit transactions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself and Mr. PIERLUISI):

H.R. 1566. A bill to improve security at State and local courthouses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. BASS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 1567. A bill to authorize a comprehensive, strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, pro-

mote inclusive, sustainable agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARGAS (for himself, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.R. 1568. A bill to establish processes for certain aliens located in Iraq and certain other countries who are or were nationals or residents of Iraq or Syria who have been persecuted or have a credible fear of being persecuted by the group commonly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, or by a similar group, to apply and interview for admission to the United States as refugees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify that the estate of a deceased veteran may receive certain accrued benefits upon the death of the veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 1570. A bill to provide for greater transparency and information with respect to Federal expenditures under the Medicaid and CHIP programs in the territories of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. KEATING, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HANNA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital stay requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMBORN (for himself and Mr. DESANTIS):

H.R. 1572. A bill to require certifications by prospective contractors with the United States Government that they are not boycotting persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1573. A bill to require institutions of higher education to provide students with information from the Occupational Employment Statistics program and the Occupational Outlook Handbook of the Bureau of

Labor Statistics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, to add a work-study program for off-campus community service at selected after-school activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 1575. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make permanent the pilot program on counseling in retreat settings for women veterans newly separated from service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. ASHFORD, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1576. A bill to require a study by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to assess the Food and Drug Administration's current regulatory pathway for reviewing generic versions of nonbiologic complex drug products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1577. A bill to require additional entities to be subject to the requirements of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DELANEY (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. BRAT, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1578. A bill to establish the Commission on Long Term Social Security Solvency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. SIRE, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1579. A bill to establish United States embassies with consular services in the five countries in the Caribbean with which the United States has diplomatic relations but no permanent diplomatic presence: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 1580. A bill to extend the final planting date for grain sorghum under Federal crop insurance policies because of extreme weather conditions that have adversely affected field conditions for planting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLEG0 (for himself and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1581. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income the discharge of certain student loans of deceased or disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. COSTA, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 1582. A bill to amend the Forest Legacy Program of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 to authorize States to allow certain entities to acquire, hold, and manage conservation easements under the program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 1583. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to clarify the requirements related to small business contracts for services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1584. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide greater extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction over certain credit card and other access device fraud offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. FOXX, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. OLSON):

H.R. 1585. A bill to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1586. A bill to modernize laws, and eliminate discrimination, with respect to people living with HIV/AIDS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 1587. A bill to amend section 1201 of title 17, United States Code, to require the infringement of a copyright for a violation of such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. SALMON, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 1588. A bill to prohibit the intentional hindering of immigration, border, and customs controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1589. A bill to prohibit the use of funds by the Secretary of the Interior to make a final determination on the listing of the northern long-eared bat under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1590. A bill to establish a prize program to award a prize and contract for the development of a fully-integrated electronic health records program for use by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROSS (for himself and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 1591. A bill to require zero-based budgeting for departments and agencies of the Government; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1592. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. SALMON):

H.R. 1593. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to establish a United States Ambassador at Large for Arctic Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for

himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FARR, Mr. FORBES, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GIBSON, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 1594. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan for military surviving spouses to offset the receipt of veterans dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOHO (for himself and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida):

H.R. 1595. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to implement security measures in the electronic tax return filing process to prevent tax refund fraud from being perpetrated with electronic identity theft; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FOXX:

H. Res. 165. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ASHFORD:

H. Res. 166. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to preclude the Committee on Rules from reporting a rule or order that would provide for the consideration of a bill or joint resolution with less than 10 hours of debate; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H. Res. 167. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the committees of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives should craft replacement language for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that includes the amendments made to the Black Lung Benefits Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself and Mr. COOK):

H. Res. 168. A resolution expressing support for designation of a "Welcome Home Vietnam Veterans Day"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAKAI (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H. Res. 169. A resolution acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific lead to World War II; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOYCE, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H. Res. 170. A resolution recognizing the National Association of Letter Carriers' One Day Food Drive; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California introduced a bill (H.R. 1596) to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to Special Forces Command Sergeant Major Ramon Rodriguez of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam War; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 2.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 1557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 1558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—The Congress shall have power to . . . make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer Thereof.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. NUNES:

H.R. 1560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States government support the national security interests of the United States, support and assist the armed forces of the United States, and support the President in the execution of the foreign policy of the United States. Article I, section 8 gives Congress the power "to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." The Necessary and Proper Clause of that section also grants Congress the power "[t]o make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested in this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 1565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 3 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 1566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. VARGAS:

H.R. 1568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ZELDIN:

H.R. 1569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 1570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. LAMBORN:

H.R. 1572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana:

H.R. 1574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Clause 1 of section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. BROWN of Florida:

H.R. 1575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

ARTICLE I SECTION 8

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 1576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ:

H.R. 1577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; . . .

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 1578.



Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 1579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H.R. 1580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The ability to regulate interstate commerce pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. GALLEGGO:

H.R. 1581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII, Clause I: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; all but duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H.R. 1582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, of Section 8, of Article I.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 1583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purposes in taxing and spending.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 1585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 6

The Senators and Representatives shall receive a Compensation for their Services, to be ascertained by Law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 1586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1 of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 1588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 1590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional Authority for this bill derives from Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ROSS:

H.R. 1591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 1592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution."

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Section 18

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 1594.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Mr. YOHO:

H.R. 1595.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

H.R. 1596.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 13 and 14

The Congress shall have the Power To provide and maintain a Navy; and to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 21: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 38: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 131: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 140: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 213: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 232: Mr. PETERS, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 244: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 267: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 292: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 310: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 359: Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. JONES, and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 420: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 472: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. RUSSELL.

H.R. 524: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 543: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 546: Mr. SALMON and Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 547: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 556: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 579: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 588: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 595: Mr. HANNA, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 601: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 625: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 628: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 631: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 650: Mr. ROSS, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 653: Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. HONDA, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PIERLUISI, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 658: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 667: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. HECK of Nevada, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 674: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 685: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 709: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 712: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 721: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 746: Mr. MACARTHUR, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 767: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 784: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 815: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 818: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 831: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 855: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 868: Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 885: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 908: Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. COSTA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. BERA, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 911: Mr. PETERS and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 912: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 920: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 921: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 944: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 973: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 977: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 978: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 985: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. HANNA, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 990: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1057: Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 1058: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1059: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1062: Mr. LANCE and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 1086: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1091: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 1104: Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1105: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1135: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1137: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.

H.R. 1142: Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. GIBBS.

H.R. 1153: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1154: Mr. YOUNG of Indiana.  
 H.R. 1195: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ROUZER.  
 H.R. 1210: Mr. POE of Texas and Mr. GUTHRIE.  
 H.R. 1214: Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 1215: Mr. GUINTA.  
 H.R. 1259: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.  
 H.R. 1267: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mrs. BUSTOS.  
 H.R. 1269: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. NUGENT.  
 H.R. 1283: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. BASS.  
 H.R. 1299: Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
 H.R. 1300: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mr. SIMPSON.  
 H.R. 1301: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. JOYCE.  
 H.R. 1306: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 1309: Mr. POSEY and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 1339: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 1343: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. HIGGINS.  
 H.R. 1358: Ms. SPEIER.  
 H.R. 1369: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. LATTA.  
 H.R. 1386: Mr. GIBSON.  
 H.R. 1389: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. STIVERS.  
 H.R. 1399: Mr. ZINKE.  
 H.R. 1413: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.  
 H.R. 1427: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 1434: Mr. HECK of Washington and Miss RICE of New York.  
 H.R. 1441: Mr. FOSTER.  
 H.R. 1453: Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. FARENTHOLD, and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
 H.R. 1463: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H.R. 1470: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. ABRAHAMT.  
 H.R. 1479: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. ROE

of Tennessee, Mr. JONES, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. BYRNE.  
 H.R. 1480: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 1482: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 1485: Mrs. LUMMIS.  
 H.R. 1486: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 1498: Mr. ROONEY of Florida and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.  
 H.R. 1502: Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 1527: Ms. MENG, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Mr. MEEKS.  
 H.R. 1528: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. BARR.  
 H.R. 1547: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. ROTHFUS.  
 H.R. 1550: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.  
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. PIERLUISI.  
 H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. TURNER, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. RUIZ.  
 H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. HARRIS and Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H. Res. 11: Mr. JORDAN.  
 H. Res. 12: Mr. KATKO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Mr. NEAL.  
 H. Res. 15: Mr. POLIQUIN.  
 H. Res. 54: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
 H. Res. 139: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
 H. Res. 161: Mr. HIGGINS.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

#### OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Agriculture in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

#### OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 2, the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

#### OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 2, "Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

#### OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 2 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

**SENATE—Tuesday, March 24, 2015**

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Holy God, Superintendent of the universe, thank You that You give us the gift of forgiveness. In spite of our shortcomings, You continue to bury our mistakes in the sea of forgetfulness. Help us to respond with loving gratitude for Your generous mercies.

Today, use our lawmakers to advance Your kingdom. Lord, enable them to contribute to the well-being of our Nation and world. Help them to remember as they labor they are either making a deposit or a withdrawal. May all the deliberations on this high hill of our Nation's life begin, continue, and end with You.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

**A BALANCED BUDGET**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, throughout the Obama era, families across the country have had to make a lot of tough decisions. Lost jobs or lower wages meant doing more with less and refocusing on what truly mattered. It wasn't easy, but families made the best of difficult situations in order to position themselves for greater success in the better days to come.

Meanwhile, in Washington, we saw record levels of overspending, trillion-dollar deficits, and historic levels of debt. Hard-working families made tough choices while the Obama administration and its allies aimed to keep right on overspending. It was more than just wrong; many would say it was unfair.

But, today, Democrats can join together with Republicans to help rectify the inequity. Instead of having Washington play by one set of rules and the

middle class by another, we can force Washington to start confronting very big challenges, just as everyone else has to do.

We can force Washington to focus on serving the middle class again instead of the other way around, and we can begin by passing the balanced budget before the Senate today.

This balanced budget pivots on an essential truth—that Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem—and strives to make government more accountable, more efficient, and more accessible. It represents a significant step forward when it comes to solving our country's many fiscal challenges.

But that is just one reason this balanced budget is so important. Here is another: It will help promote economic growth right now and promote sustained opportunity well into the future.

It aims to do so in a variety of ways; one is promoting energy advancement as an engine for growth. The energy revolution is truly historic. It is creating thousands of jobs, lowering costs for the middle class, and helping lift many into that middle class. This budget embraces that progress. It aims to remove needless barriers to environmentally responsible energy development. I expect other Members to come to the floor to discuss the energy component in greater detail today.

I also expect Members will come to discuss funding America's national security needs. As we know, there are numerous threats facing our country—terrorism practiced by groups such as ISIL, Al Qaeda and its associates; Iranian efforts to advance its ballistic missile program, pursue a nuclear weapon, and sponsor terror; and Russian and Chinese attempts to expand their spheres of influence, which will require us to modernize our force.

We must eventually give the Defense Department the certainty it needs to modernize the force. Members continue to work toward solutions for funding defense in the most robust and predictable way possible.

I commend Chairman ENZI and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM for providing us with a path forward in the interim. Their proposal represents a good-faith compromise to begin the legislative process for the Defense authorization bill we will consider later this year—when the additional overseas contingency funds can be prudently allocated against the actual procurement and modernization needs of our military, if only for the coming fiscal year.

Short of revising the BCA, this is the best strategy to keep faith with our

armed services, and this is the best option we currently have for leaving President Obama's successor in a better position to face so many global challenges.

Every budget, obviously, is a compromise. This one is surely that, but it is a good compromise. It embraces growth. It reaches for a more prosperous energy future. It positions our Nation for a better outcome than we have seen otherwise on defense. It is bold, yet balanced, and it aims to change Washington's focus away from the needs of big-spending politicians and toward the aspirations of hard-working Americans who are very right to demand a government that is efficient, accountable, and focused on growth.

This budget is all of those things, and I urge our colleagues to support it.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

**THE BUDGET**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, these budgets we deal with are more than just a piece of paper with a lot of numbers. Each budget we put forward and the Republicans put forward are statements of our values, and it tells Americans basically whose side we are on.

I think, when we look at these budgets, we will find the budget we have propounded—and we will see when the votes take place this week—contains values that put the middle class first. Ours is a budget that supports hard-working families, creates jobs, and invests in our future.

The Republicans, by contrast, have developed a budget that attacks the middle class and serves the interests of special interests and the superwealthy. How can I say that? I say that because it is the truth.

For example, here are some of the priorities the Republicans are proposing in their budget. They want to take away health care from 16.4 million Americans now insured through ObamaCare. The Senate Republicans' budget wreaks havoc on Medicare at the expense of America's seniors. The Senate Republicans' budget makes drastic cuts to Medicaid and undercuts millions of families who rely on it to pay for nursing homes and other care. A lot of the care we have in nursing homes is not for people who are indigent; it is for people who have had to go to Medicaid because everything they

have worked for their whole life is gone.

The budget the Republicans are pushing guts nutrition assistance for those in need, slices job training and employment services for millions of American workers, and it cuts billions of financial aid for college students. That is the truth.

These items are all attacking middle-class priorities. The Republicans, as usual, have gone the extra mile to protect special interests and the super-rich.

Incredibly, even as they take money away from hard-working families, seniors, and students, Republicans will not close a single tax loophole to reduce the deficit—not one. Do they indirectly pay those super-rich more money? Of course they do.

Forbes magazine had an article. For 2 years, between 2011 and 2013, the top 14 richest people in America gained during that period of time almost \$200 billion. It is hard to comprehend, but it is true—14 people, about \$200 billion.

Would the budget that has been put forth by the Republicans end tax breaks for companies that ship jobs overseas? No. Would they close loopholes for wealthy hedge fund managers? No. Would they take away wasteful and unneeded breaks for these huge oil and gas companies? No, not a single one. Would they ask millionaires and even billionaires to pay a penny more? No, not one.

Attacking the middle class while protecting the superwealthy isn't just irresponsible, some would say it is immoral.

There is more. The budget is dishonest. It claims to balance the budget, but it doesn't. To talk about balancing the budget over 10 years is so foolish and so untrue.

USA TODAY—the newspaper—said the Republicans' budget relies "heavily on huge and politically unlikely spending cuts and bewildering gimmicks that don't begin to add up."

The New York Times, in one of its op-eds, said the budget is a "trillion dollar con job."

I am not saying this. We have USA TODAY and the New York Times.

But who is being fooled here? In fact, there is one area where so far many people have been fooled and they have been fooled a lot.

During the markup of the budget resolution, Senate Republicans claimed to increase defense spending by adding an extra \$38 billion in war funding, known as overseas contingency operations or OCO as we call it. The Republican leader talked about that a few minutes ago, but that money isn't even close to being real. Because of what seems to be a drafting error, not one extra dollar can be spent on defense above the sequestration caps.

The resolution currently on the floor puts a strict cap on OCO spending. For

whatever reason, Republicans neglected to increase the cap to allow for the additional \$38 billion for defense. In other words, the Republicans' extra defense money is a fraud, a hoax, and certainly a political gimmick.

We want to provide real sequestration relief, which has so bewildered the country in so many different ways, not only to defense but also the National Institutes of Health and virtually every program in America. We are going to propose just that as we move forward to get rid of sequestration.

So we all look forward on this side to the debate. When it is over, Americans will have no doubt which party stands with the middle class and which party stands with special interests, millionaires, and billionaires.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 11, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

Pending:

Sanders/Wyden amendment No. 323, to create millions of middle class jobs by investing in our nation's infrastructure paid for by raising revenue through closing loopholes in the corporate and international tax system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Colleagues, good morning. Working with Senator SANDERS yesterday, we made good progress on opening day for the budget resolution. It might not have been as fun as being at opening day for baseball, but getting underway on the first balanced budget resolution this Senate has seen in nearly 20 years was pretty exciting for me, and I appreciate the good work and the full debate we have had.

Today, I am looking forward to more work on a variety of amendment ideas for the resolution. Some Senators want to debate amendment ideas that have to do with the budget and some Senators want to debate amendment ideas that have nothing to do with the budget. So we will hear from some Senators today on issues such as our spending caps or the sequester, how best to preserve and protect Social Security, and what is the best way to ensure women are treated fairly in the workforce.

Other Senators may want to discuss items such as how to treat the water-

ways of the United States, free from overreach from the EPA, or how our communities and localities are under siege from Washington when it comes to ideas about taxing carbon or coal, and Senators may wish to discuss how our national security is best served by the spending levels contemplated in the budget. But we will also hear about something that really interests me, as it marries the numbers our budget resolution carries with the work our committees and Congress can do once the budget is passed.

I think one of the frustrations of the other side is this is a fairly general budget because it sets the spending limits for the committees and then builds in some reserve funds for some flexibility. It doesn't go into the specifics of exactly how the committees are to operate. The reason for that is the committees are the people who have at least an intense interest in that field or maybe even a lot of expertise. When we try to preclude what they are doing by what we do in the budget, it won't work.

We will also hear about something that marries the numbers our budget resolution carries with the work our committees and Congress can do once the budget is passed. The statutory deadline for passing the budget is April 15. Just prior to that, we are going to have a 2-week recess, which shortens the amount of time we have to work.

I would remind everybody that Republicans have only been in charge for a few weeks and are going to pass the first budget in 6 years. That is a pretty fast track to be on, but I am pleased with where we are at the moment.

Later on this morning, the Senate will consider an amendment to help improve care for children with medical complexity within Medicaid. Children with medical complexity require intensive health care services. These children often have two or more serious chronic conditions, and often see six or more specialists and a dozen or more physicians. They also often require care that takes them across State lines. There are 2 million of these children on Medicaid.

Reflecting a bipartisan bill, Senator PORTMAN intends to offer an amendment to create a reserve fund in anticipation of committee action that recognizes the critical importance of Medicaid to children with medical complexity, and the need for greater coordination and integration of care for this population within Medicaid. If Congress can write a bill that fits this reserve fund, then we can benefit children with medical complexity and their families. I look forward to a good debate and several votes in the Senate today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I look forward to continuing to work with

Senator ENZI in a thoughtful and important process, and I thank the Senator for his civility. I think we are going to have an interesting few days.

To my mind, the basic issue surrounding this budget debate is whether we address the enormous needs facing a declining middle class and whether we come forth with ideas that create the jobs—the millions of jobs our people need—whether we raise the wages that millions of workers desperately need who today are working for \$7.50 an hour, \$8 an hour, whether we deal with the scandal of pay equity in this country where women are making 78 cents on the dollar compared to men, whether we make sure we do not cut Social Security at a time when there are so many vulnerable seniors out there whose entire income or almost their entire income is Social Security.

In my view, we cannot balance the budget on the most vulnerable people in this country. We cannot cut the Meals on Wheels Program. We cannot cut Head Start. Essentially at a time when the middle class is shrinking, we cannot balance the budget on the backs of the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor.

On my side of the aisle in the Democratic Caucus, what people are looking at is massive wealth and income inequality taking place in America. Senator REID a few minutes ago made the point that in the last 2 years alone—the last 2 years alone—the wealthiest 14 people in this country have seen their wealth increase by over \$150 billion—in 2 years. That is more wealth that they have increased in 2 years than the bottom 40 percent of the American people own. That is pretty crazy. The richer are becoming phenomenally richer, and we have tens of millions of Americans struggling to keep their heads above water.

My Republican colleagues say, well, we want to deal with the deficit by cutting programs for the working families, lower income people, the people who are struggling, but we are not going to ask the wealthy or largest corporations in this country who are doing phenomenally well to pay an additional nickel in taxes. That does not make sense to me. I do not believe it makes sense to the American people.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 323, AS MODIFIED

Having said that, what I wish to do now is get to an amendment that is currently at the desk, and I ask that the pending amendment be modified with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$25,001,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$51,201,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$65,879,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$71,784,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$72,916,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$73,405,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$48,535,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$22,338,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$7,660,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,755,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$25,001,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$51,201,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$65,879,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$71,784,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$72,916,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$73,405,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$48,535,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$22,338,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,660,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$1,755,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$79,667,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$25,001,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$51,201,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$65,879,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$71,784,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$72,916,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$73,405,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$48,535,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$22,338,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$7,660,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,755,000,000.

On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by \$30,000,000.

On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by \$480,000,000.

On page 19, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,530,000,000.

On page 19, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 14, increase the amount by \$2,580,000,000.

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,880,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by \$2,970,000,000.

On page 20, line 1, increase the amount by \$2,520,000,000.

On page 20, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,470,000,000.

On page 20, line 9, increase the amount by \$420,000,000.

On page 20, line 13, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by \$7,570,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by \$9,760,000,000.

On page 20, line 21, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$10,380,000,000.

On page 20, line 25, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 1, increase the amount by \$10,650,000,000.

On page 21, line 4, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 5, increase the amount by \$10,660,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, increase the amount by \$11,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 9, increase the amount by \$10,660,000,000.

On page 21, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,090,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by \$900,000,000.

On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by \$280,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by \$17,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by \$177,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by \$360,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by \$627,000,000.

On page 24, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by \$885,000,000.

On page 24, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 14, increase the amount by \$968,000,000.

On page 24, line 18, increase the amount by \$983,000,000.

On page 24, line 22, increase the amount by \$823,000,000.

On page 25, line 1, increase the amount by \$640,000,000.

On page 25, line 5, increase the amount by \$373,000,000.

On page 25, line 9, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by \$14,494,000,000.

On page 25, line 13, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by \$37,754,000,000.

On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by \$50,344,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by \$54,432,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 26, line 1, increase the amount by \$54,806,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by \$60,667,000,000.

On page 26, line 5, increase the amount by \$54,962,000,000.

On page 26, line 9, increase the amount by \$40,517,000,000.

On page 26, line 13, increase the amount by \$17,260,000,000.

On page 26, line 17, increase the amount by \$4,670,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, increase the amount by \$582,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,890,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,030,000,000.

On page 27, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by \$3,265,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,495,000,000.

On page 27, line 18, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,685,000,000.

On page 27, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,815,000,000.

On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by \$975,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by \$835,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by \$600,000,000.

On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by \$370,000,000.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, what this amendment deals with is something I think virtually every Member of this body understands to be an enormously important issue, and the American people understand it as well, and that is our crumbling infrastructure and the fact we have to begin the process to substantially invest in our roads, our bridges, our water systems and our wastewater plants, our levees and our dams and our airports. The needs out there are enormous. When we do that, we can create millions of jobs at a time when we need to create millions of jobs. I heard Senator ENZI yesterday speaking on the issue. I think he reflects the views of many. I don't think there is a great debate on whether our infrastructure is crumbling. I don't think there is a great debate—and I speak as a former mayor—that if you allow your infrastructure to continue

to crumble, it only becomes more expensive to rebuild it. I don't think there is a debate on that. The debate, of course, comes down to how you pay for it. That debate has been going on here for many years.

If anyone had a magical solution, I suspect it would have been brought forth already. But the proposal we are bringing forth calls for a \$478 billion investment over a 6-year period. That will be paid for by eliminating some outrageous corporate loopholes today that, among other things, allow large, profitable corporations to stash their profits in the Cayman Islands, in Bermuda, and in other tax havens and not have to pay one nickel in taxes to the U.S. Government. Our proposal is pretty simple. Let's eliminate some of those loopholes, let's take that money, let's invest in rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure, let's make our country more efficient, more productive, safer, and let us create millions of jobs.

The need for rebuilding our infrastructure should not be in doubt. One out of every nine bridges in our country is structurally deficient, and nearly one-quarter are functionally obsolete. Almost one-third of our roads are in poor or mediocre condition. And as everybody stuck in a traffic jam at this moment knows, more than 42 percent of urban highways are congested.

Much of our rail network is obsolete. We are competing against countries which have high-speed rail, which operates much more rapidly than our railroads do. America's airports are bursting at the seams and still rely on antiquated 1960s radar technology. More than 4,000 of our Nation's dams are considered deficient, and nearly 9 percent of all levees are likely to fail during a major flood. That is a pretty scary proposition. Our drinking water systems are nearing the end of their useful lives all over this country. Virtually every day there is another pipe which bursts, causing flooding in downtowns and wasting huge amounts of clean drinking water. Further, our wastewater plants routinely fail during heavy rains, allowing all kinds of crap to go into our lakes and our rivers, which should not be the case. Our aging electrical grid has hundreds of avoidable power failures each year and is unacceptably vulnerable to cyber attacks.

Now \$478 billion may seem like a lot of money. It is a lot of money, but the American Society of Civil Engineers tells us we need to invest an additional \$1.6 trillion to get our infrastructure into a state of good repair by 2020. To be honest with you, while this amendment is a significant step forward, it does not go anywhere near as far as it should go.

I would hope on this amendment we would have strong bipartisan support. It is not good enough for people to continue to say what everybody acknowl-

edges—yes, we need to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure, but, no, we don't know how we are going to come up with the money to do it. It is too late to keep expressing that rhetoric. We have heard it for too many years. Every day we don't act, it becomes more expensive for us to act.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to today make an important statement that, A, we cannot continue to delay rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure; that, B, when real unemployment in this country is not 5½ percent but 11 percent, when youth unemployment is 17 percent, when African-American youth unemployment is off the charts, we need a major jobs program to put our people back to work at decent wages. That is what work on infrastructure does. The time for rhetoric is gone. The time for action is now. Let's rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. Let's put people to work. Let's end outrageous corporate tax loopholes. Let's make our country safer, more efficient, and more productive. I ask for support for that important amendment which comes up for a vote I believe at around 12:00 or so.

I yield 5 minutes off the resolution to Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if no one arrives, may I have 10 minutes?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, yes, of course.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am so grateful to Senator SANDERS because he explains things like no one else. He takes it down to the average working family in America. That is really who we are here to protect, not the super top rich people. They are doing fine.

Senator SANDERS taught me something this morning. I am just going to make sure I remember it correctly. The wealth of the top 14 richest people in America in the last couple of years went up over \$100 billion.

How much was it?

Mr. SANDERS. It was \$157 billion in a 2-year period.

Mrs. BOXER. In a 2-year period—the wealthiest of the wealthiest, 14 people—that wealth rose \$157 billion. Yet when we look at this Republican budget, those people get every benefit we can imagine. They are not asked to do a thing—a thing. When people are struggling sending their kids to college, Lord knows, when people are struggling trying to afford a new home, when people are struggling every day to make ends meet—some even to put nutritious food on the table—this budget is a blueprint of unfairness. This budget, this Republican budget, is a blueprint for another recession. It is a terrible budget, and it makes believe it balances. It doesn't balance one bit.

Our ranking member will explain the smoke and mirrors that have been used in this budget. I used to serve on the

Budget Committee. Let me be clear to anyone within the sound of my voice. In recent times the only time the budget was balanced was when President Clinton was President, and only Democrats voted for his budget. We balanced the budget. And you know what; we created 23 million jobs because we invested in people, in education, in our children.

Not this budget—they cut—deep cuts out of domestic spending. They take \$236 billion over 10 years from non-defense. That means they are cutting education, scientific research, food safety, law enforcement, and every single program the middle class and working Americans depend on.

I want to thank the ranking member of the Budget Committee. He is taking on such leadership in his position here and on the Environment and Public Works Committee by calling attention to our failing infrastructure. There are 63,500 bridges that are structurally deficient in America, and 50 percent of our roads are in less than good condition. And what does this Republican budget do? By the way, this is a big problem for our businesses. They cut 17 percent of overall spending, ignoring the fact that our roads are in disrepair and ignoring the fact that we face the prospect of crumbling bridges. That is a blow to everyone who drives on our roads.

At a time when energy costs are weighing heavily on families and businesses, they cut 85 percent in overall energy spending, including weatherization funding. What are they thinking? When a middle class family weatherizes their home, the energy bill goes down. They are putting a tax on every middle class person who has to pay a heating bill. Energy efficiency grants, no—cut. Research to clean energy, cut. It is a blow to our consumers and to our efforts to mitigate climate change.

At a time when college is a necessity and priority, they want to cut Pell grant funding by 30 percent over 10 years and to reduce overall spending on education and training by 15 percent—a blow to our students. Not for the students whose parents are in that top echelon—there is no problem there. They can afford \$40,000 a year college—\$30,000, \$60,000. It is for our middle class and for those striving to be in the middle class. They are doomed with this budget.

Now, President Obama has turned this great recession around, but our ranking member points out the problems that remain. The solutions aren't that hard to come by. You make investments—not wasteful spending but investments in energy, investments in transportation, investments in finding cures for diseases. And what do you do? You make this a greater country, and you make lives better across the board.

There are 45 million people who are still recovering from the recession, in-

cluding 16 million children who live in poverty. The Republicans leave the top echelon alone, who are making billions of dollars, and they are cutting \$660 billion from income security over 10 years. That means they are cutting supplemental nutrition assistance, school lunch, unemployment insurance, earned-income tax credit.

I don't know who they think they represent, but I will tell you who they fight for—the wealthiest of the wealthiest few. That is who they fight for.

That old notion that you give billionaires money and somehow it will trickle down to the rest of us doesn't work. It doesn't work to cut education funding. It doesn't work to cut transportation funding. It doesn't work to cut energy assistance programs.

I have to say that it is a shock to see this budget. If that is why they think they got elected, then the people better pay attention.

Listen to what they do with health care. They do away with the Affordable Care Act, when 16 million people now have insurance who didn't have it before. And guess what; do they have a replacement? They are working on it. Oh, good, we worked on it for 50 years. We finally got it done. It is not perfect, but it is working. In my State it is magnificent to see people who now know they won't lose everything if they get sick. At a time when 70 million Americans rely on Medicaid and children's health coverage, they want to block grant that program and cut it by more than \$1.2 trillion. What will it mean for maternity care when half of all births in the U.S. are financed by Medicaid? This is another blow to our families, to our babies. They fight for your right to be born. How about after you are born? How about after you are born?

At a time when more than 50 million seniors and disabled Americans are on Medicare and the baby boomers continue to age in, they want to cut Medicare by \$430 billion. Now, look, they are afraid to spell out how they want to cut it. They kind of hide it in the documents, but we know what happens. People will be suffering, paying more, getting less care—a blow to our seniors.

They do not close one tax loophole for the wealthiest corporations—some of which pay no income tax—or these billionaires. Now, I have nothing against being a billionaire at all, but this Congress ought to ask everyone to pay their fair share, including billionaires—not just the middle class.

Now, their gimmicks are unbelievable. They hide defense spending in an off-budget account called OCO. Oh no, OCO—they hide it, but we got their number. I think Al Sharpton says on his show: "We gotcha." We know what you are doing. Where is the emergency fund for our children? Where is the

emergency fund for education? Where is the emergency fund for transportation? No, there is no OCO for that, no.

Then they claim they balance the budget. That is the biggest fib ever. Look at their record. When George W. Bush got elected, he had a surplus. It took him 15 minutes to blow it—two wars on the credit card, tax cuts for the rich on the credit card. This budget continues that legacy of shame—shame—hurting our seniors, hurting our children, hurting our middle class, all at the expense of the wealthy few.

We see that President Obama has cut this deficit by more than half. We are on the right track. Let's not walk away from policies that work.

I want to say to the ranking member, Senator SANDERS, I am strongly supporting your amendment on infrastructure, because to be a great Nation we have to move people, we have to move goods. This is a global marketplace. Ships are coming in to California—40 percent of the imports. They are transferred to trucks, and they go on roads that are full of pot holes. They are a mess. They have rail crossings that are dangerous.

So I will conclude in 20 seconds, if I might.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

Mrs. BOXER. I will conclude. I want to thank our ranking member on the Budget Committee because he talks from the heart, the soul, and from facts. If we follow his leadership, rather than the leadership of those on the other side of the aisle who want to go back to the days of high deficits, high unemployment, and chaos—and we were here; we know there was chaos—if not, then vote for this Republican budget. I hope we will vote no, and I hope we will support the amendment that will come forward to put us on the right track again.

Thank you very much. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

If no one yields time, it will be charged equally to both sides.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 349

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 349.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.



The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PORTMAN], for himself and Mr. BENNET, proposes an amendment numbered 349.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve health outcomes and lower the costs of caring for medically complex children in Medicaid)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE HEALTH OUTCOMES AND LOWER THE COSTS OF CARING FOR MEDICALLY COMPLEX CHILDREN IN MEDICAID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the health outcomes and lowering the costs of caring for medically complex children in Medicaid, which may include creating or expanding integrated delivery models or improving care coordination, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we are here talking about the budget. One of the issues on the budget is how we spend our money, including on health care and in this case on some of our most vulnerable young people, our children, who have what are termed to be "complex medical conditions."

I appreciate the fact that Senator BENNET is cosponsoring this amendment with me. It is based on some bipartisan legislation we have been working on over the years that helps to ensure that these children have the opportunity to get better care, and also we can save some funds in what is a very inefficient Medicaid delivery system now for these children.

It would allow, basically, health care providers to deliver health care services to these medically complex kids through models that coordinate care between providers, again helping to improve quality of care—and much better outcomes in the cases where this has been tried—but also to lower costs for Medicaid.

There are roughly 3 million children who fit in this category. It is about 1 in every 25 children. Of these children, by the way, most of them rely on Medicaid to access care, about 2 million out of the 3 million.

Although children with complex conditions represent only about 6 percent of pediatric Medicaid patients, they comprise about 40 percent of the cost,

so 6 percent of the kids, about 40 percent of the cost of all Medicaid spending on children.

Children with these medically complex situations tend to have multiple and high acuity and chronic conditions that often require the service of a lot of different specialists. These circumstances call out for better coordination of care, particularly because a lot of it goes across State lines. Each Medicaid Program in each State has some different rules, but specialized care often requires these children to go to specialized providers outside of their State. This amendment would correct that fragmented system which those kids sometimes encounter now when they do seek that access across State lines.

Not only would the amendment ensure that medically complex children have access to necessary care, it would also allow the Medicaid system to realize savings through these increased efficiencies, including reducing hospitalizations and emergency room visits, while providing the array of outpatient and community services and support that are needed by these children. So it is a more holistic approach to their care, avoiding, frankly, some of the costs associated with emergency room visits and other hospitalizations and other fragmented care. It is based on the experiences in the real world.

There are programs that are doing quite well at improving those outcomes and saving costs. Some of the great children's hospitals have established their track record in developing these care-coordination models for kids with medical complexity. I have seen it in action in Ohio, where we are blessed to have a number of great children's hospitals. I have talked to medical professionals who are very pleased to have this better coordination of care. More importantly, I have talked to the parents and talked to some of the children themselves who are ecstatic about it. You know, many of them received their care through a different process previously that was not coordinated. What they tell me is they are deeply grateful for the coordination, partly because it saves them a lot of time and effort, partly because they are getting much better care, and partly because they just feel as if somebody cares. They are getting the love and support and care they need through the coordination. They are grateful for the difference.

As the overall population of children with medical complexity continues to grow, thanks to some great advances in medical science and medical care, including care for premature babies, we are going to see more and more of this need for better coordination. I want to thank my colleague Senator BENNET and many others on both sides of the aisle who have been involved in this issue over the years. This is an important amendment for us to have in the

Budget Committee because it shows where our heart is as a Senate—to be able to take better care of these kids and also have more efficient care in the Medicaid system, where, again, 6 percent of these children now comprise about 40 percent of the cost in Medicaid for children.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this commonsense approach to provide better health care outcomes for some of the most vulnerable of our Nation's children.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 386

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 386.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 386.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicaid beneficiaries from benefit cuts)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES FROM BENEFIT CUTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Medicaid, which may include protecting children, pregnant women, individuals with disabilities, low-income adults, and Americans that need long-term services and supports, including nursing home care, who are guaranteed benefits under Medicaid, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, Senator PORTMAN's amendment touches upon a serious issue that I hope and expect will have broad bipartisan support, and that is the needs of children with serious chronic conditions.

In the United States, over 3 million children have medically complex health conditions. Of those 3 million kids, 2 million rely on Medicaid for their health insurance. That is two out of three kids, which should tell every Member of the Senate how important Medicaid is.

Let me repeat. Two out of three children rely on Medicaid. They have medically complex issues—the issues Senator PORTMAN is speaking about.

Last Congress, Senator NELSON offered a similar amendment during the budget process to address this important issue, and I was pleased to support it. I also plan to support this amendment today and hope that we have widespread bipartisan support for it.

But what I must say is that given that the Republican budget eliminates the Affordable Care Act, which throws 15 million Americans off of health insurance—many of whom have just, for the first time in their lives, received health insurance—and given that the Republican budget cuts Medicaid by some \$400 billion over a 10-year period, the amendment Senator PORTMAN is offering deals with only one tiny and small part of what the Republican budget is doing. What the Republican budget is doing is decimating health care in the United States of America.

Senator PORTMAN says: Well, we have a situation with kids who have medically complex problems.

He is right, but we have many other issues out there that the Republicans are decimating.

Medicaid provides 6.4 million elderly seniors who rely on Medicaid, many of whom are living in nursing homes—6.4 million elderly seniors, some 80 or 90 years of age, rely on Medicaid for their nursing home care. In some cases, these seniors have incomes of \$8,000 to \$9,000 a year. The Portman amendment does not address the devastating cuts that happen to elderly Americans in nursing homes.

Pregnant women who rely on Medicaid for vital prenatal care that improves the health and well-being of mothers and babies—those programs are going to be cut. The Portman amendment does not protect them in any way.

Nearly 33 million children in our country rely on Medicaid for their health insurance. These are kids of low-income, working-class families, and they need important medical care when they are young, such as immunizations and well-child visits. The Portman amendment does not address the fact that many of those people will be thrown off of health insurance.

Some 10 million Americans with disabilities rely on Medicaid to treat serious, sometimes life-threatening disabilities. The Portman amendment does not address what happens to people with disabilities who are on Medicaid.

While I support this amendment, I am also concerned about the devastating impact the Republican budget will have on many millions of Americans by ending the Affordable Care Act—16 million Americans thrown off of health insurance, \$400 billion in cuts in Medicaid, millions more.

I believe we need a budget that strengthens health care in America, not decimates it. I believe we need a budget that doesn't force us to choose between a seriously ill child and a pregnant woman with small children at home. These are false choices which a great nation such as ours should not be forced to make, especially at a time, as Senator BOXER mentioned, when we have the wealthiest 14 people in this country seeing their wealth increase in the last 2 years by \$157 billion. Our Republican friends say: No, these people should not be asked to pay more in taxes, but we should balance the budget by taking millions of people off of health insurance. I don't think anybody in America thinks those priorities make any sense at all.

I am offering a side-by-side, and in doing so, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Portman amendment but also to vote for my amendment, cosponsored by Senator WYDEN, which supports all Medicaid beneficiaries by opposing cuts to the program.

Let's not sit around saying: Well, we are making some progress in one area, but we don't care about the millions of other people who have been thrown off of Medicaid.

I urge support for the amendment Senator WYDEN and I are offering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 12 noon today be equally divided between the managers or their designees; that at 12 noon, the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Sanders No. 323, as modified, Sanders No. 386, and Portman No. 349, with 2 minutes of debate equally divided before each vote; and that following the votes, the Senate recess under the previous order. I further ask that the time from 2:15 p.m. to 3 p.m. be under the control of the minority and that the time from 3 p.m. to 3:45 p.m. be under the control of the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. For the information of all Senators, there will be three rollcall votes at 12 noon today, with an additional stack of votes expected at 4:30 p.m. today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, despite the repeated statements and warnings from our military and some of our congressional leaders, including myself, we are again staring down the barrel of sequestration.

This has been the great fear we have had, and I think we have come to a compromise here that might be

liveable—not ideal, not where we should be, but where we are at this time.

Each service chief and each Secretary—and I have never seen this before—has testified that no service will be able to meet the wartime requirements under sequestration—that is in the event we have to have sequestration of the military portion.

Let me just mention that it was done wrong from the very beginning. When you talk about sequestration, it would seem to me that we would want to be sequestering or reducing in a relationship or proportion as to what that is of the budget. For example, our military is 16 percent of the budget, and yet we have had to take 50 percent of the cuts. So sequestration has gotten us to this point.

This budget we will be voting on has kind of a temporary solution or relief from sequestration.

Secretary Carter, our new Secretary of Defense, testified that "readiness remains at troubling levels across the force" and "that even with the FY16 budget, the Army, Navy and Marine Corps won't reach their readiness goals until 2020 and the Air Force until 2023."

This was interesting because we had a hearing where we had faces from the past—Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, and Madeleine Albright. So we had Democrats and Republicans, and they all agreed.

Madeleine Albright testified about her concerns about the deep cuts to the Defense Department, saying that it "jeopardizes America's military reach." This is a Democrat talking—Madeleine Albright.

Over the last 6 years, significant cuts to the national security spending have forced our men and women in uniform to endure a steep and damaging drop in capabilities and readiness.

All of them testified that our readiness is dropping. When you are talking about readiness, you are talking about risk. When you are talking about risk, you are talking about American lives. Our naval fleet is at a historical low level of ships. The Air Force is the smallest in its history. The Army is shrinking to a force not seen since before World War II.

At a time when our security is being increasingly threatened by terrorism, a rising China, ISIL, ISIS, and rogue nations such as Iran and North Korea, the men and women charged with protecting this Nation are being undermined and forced to endure devastating cuts to the tools they need to keep America safe.

What we are talking about is something that has happened up to this point—not the potential of sequestration, which hopefully we can avoid and I think we will avoid, but what has happened up to this point.

The President believes the world is getting safer. He is negotiating a bad

deal with Iran. He thinks global warming is a bigger threat to Americans than terrorism, but top leaders inside and out of the administration disagree.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper—James Clapper has been in this kind of capacity for well over 40 years—said:

When the final accounting is done, 2014 will have been the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled. . . . Roughly half of the world's currently stable countries are at some risk of instability over the next two years.

The Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Lt. Gen. Vincent Stewart, before our committee just a couple of weeks ago, stated:

A confluence of global, political, military, social, and technological developments, taken in aggregate, have created security challenges more diverse and complex than those we have experienced in our lifetimes.

That was Lt. Gen. Vincent Stuart, the DIA Director.

Over the last three decades, we have built the most powerful fighting force in history and filled it with the most talented men and women ever to wear our uniform. We can't break our promise to them or our responsibility to protect the Nation.

I believe our military—our men and women in uniform—will not accept failure and will do everything they can to succeed no matter how constrained they are by inadequate budgets. However, there will come a point when, without the training, equipment, and force size, it will fail because it was not given the resources to succeed. We cannot let our military get to this point, but that is what we are risking should we have another level of sequestration.

Before sequestration even came into effect, the President cut some \$500 billion from our military. We stood on this floor and talked about it at that time, about how we can't continue having cuts just to the military. That is what happened from this President before sequestration. Because of sequestration for fiscal year 2013, the Army had to cancel seven combat training center rotations, deferred maintenance on aircraft and vehicles, and postponed reset of weapons and equipment. The Air Force stood down 17 combat squadrons, cut 40,000 flying hours for its remaining units, cut training, and deferred maintenance activities.

This is a problem that we have, too, because we have to consider the difference between retraining and retaining in the Air Force. The pilots—to train a pilot to F-22 standards costs in excess of \$9 million, while retentions are something like \$200,000 over a 9- or 10-year period.

Because of the sequestration in 2013, the Navy and Marine Corps canceled deployments, deferred maintenance on ships, aircraft, and vehicles, reduced purchases of spare parts, and reduced training activities. All the services had

to cut or delay weapon system and infrastructure modernization.

Modernization is one of the first things they do when they cut. They really can't do the readiness, they can't cut the personnel who are out there, the force strength, so modernization is what suffers because that is not something people are aware of today. Yet that is where the cuts were. They are still attempting to recover from all of these cuts.

But recent budget turmoil has forced our generals and admirals to worry about our military's ability to fulfill its critical national security role in, arguably, the most dangerous time in our Nation's history.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—that is General Dempsey—warned that continued national security cuts will “severely limit our ability to implement our defense strategy.” He means there the defense strategy to defend our country and to save lives out there. “It will put the nation at greater risk of coercion, and it will break faith with men and women in uniform.” That is General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Our Nation relies on less than 1 percent who volunteer to risk their lives on its behalf. I was trying to get a comparable figure to put that in perspective, but we are talking about 1 percent of our population is involved in protecting the other 99 percent. When these brave men and women are ordered into harm's way, they will salute with courage, they will go and do their job, their mission, and very effectively, but they do not have the right equipment to do it with. In return, they rightfully expect a supportive nation to provide them with the best training, technology, and equipment to accomplish their mission and then to come home safely. Tragically, we are not doing that.

Put simply, top military leaders are telling us that continued cuts to national security spending are making this country less safe. These cuts are making it more likely that our military men and women will not return from the battlefield alive, and this is immoral.

We must increase our defense budget, and I prefer to increase its base budget in fiscal year 2016 and over the next 5 years to give our military leadership the required and predictable funding they need. Because of Senate rules, however, we aren't able to do this without changing the law. I am committed to working to the point where we can replace sequestration with cuts to mandatory spending, as was originally planned with the Budget Control Act.

We went through the Budget Control Act assuming some of these things would happen. For the purposes of a Senate budget resolution, however, I am proud of the Budget Committee and the hard work they have done for

adopting an amendment during their markup to provide additional funding for the Department of Defense through overseas contingency operations. That is OCO. This is far from ideal. OCO money is better than no money at all, and until we provide the solution to sequestration we need, this is the best we can do.

Our country is at war and will be for the foreseeable future and we are going to have to do something to keep America strong. I don't like this alternative. We have had nothing but a series of bad alternatives and this is the least bad alternative. So I salute Senator ENZI and others who are responsible for coming up with something that still is going to defend our Nation, particularly as we are faced with another potential round of sequestration. We can't let that happen to our men and women in uniform nor to America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. INHOFE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that even though we had an agreement for time to be equally divided—yesterday, we passed one that said whenever we are in a quorum call, the time would be equally divided—I hope that would continue through all these quorum calls, and so I ask unanimous consent that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, first of all, I want to thank my good friend from Vermont for drawing attention to the critical importance of passing a long-term Transportation reauthorization bill. This is one that Senator BOXER and I have been working together on for a long period of time. We have gone through these reauthorizations for many years, and we know this is the way to do it.

The reauthorization bill is far superior to just the short-term efforts for extensions. I think we all realize extensions cost about 30 percent off the top.

And while I can't support the specific proposal of my good friend from Vermont, passing a bipartisan long-term fully funded bill is my top priority as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee.

As we all know, the current Transportation reauthorization expires on May 31, and EPW will be prepared to move on a reauthorization bill before that deadline. That is our goal. My staff has been working closely with the staff of my good friend and partner from California, the ranking member, Senator BOXER, and we are getting close to having our bill ready.

I know my colleagues on the Committees on Finance, Commerce, Science and Transportation, and Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs are also committed to passing a long-term bill as soon as possible, because this does involve not just the Environment and Public Works Committee but the other two committees as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I want to thank my colleague and friend from Oklahoma, and I also want to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Finance for being here because he is so right, we have to work together. On the EPW Committee, we know how critical this is. The Committee on Finance knows how critical it is because they have to figure out the pay-fors—let's be honest, the hardest part of all this—and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation also has to work. I am sure Senator THUNE is very aware of that, and his ranking member as well.

MAP 21, our transportation bill, is set to expire as the summer construction season is beginning. Several States—Arkansas, Georgia, Wyoming, and Tennessee—have already delayed or canceled construction projects due to the uncertainty in the Federal transportation funding system. Other States are considering similar actions as the construction season fast approaches.

I want to make this point. We are going to hear from all of our States. I am fortunate, I have such a large State they can go a little longer with the uncertainty, but even California, which receives quite a bit from the highway trust fund, is going to start to hurt pretty soon.

I am so proud that my friend, my chairman, is here, because we have such a great history of working together on infrastructure projects—not so good on the environment; we go toe to toe and don't work together on that, but we work together on infrastructure. He talks about it as a proud conservative and I talk about it as a proud liberal, and we see why it is so critical for our Nation.

So we do have to work carefully to craft another bipartisan MAC-21, and I

look forward to bringing that bill to the floor.

I want to make sure that when we do bring that bill to the floor we have no controversial riders on it to bring it to a dead stop. We have seen that on so many bills already. I am really looking forward to bringing such a bill that is a clean bill that addresses our transportation funding to the floor with Chairman INHOFE, with the support of Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN and others.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me say I agree and look forward to that.

Sometimes people forget some of the things we are supposed to be doing around here. The Constitution says roads and bridges. That is what we are supposed to be doing. So I will work closely with my friend from California to achieve this.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, the Senate is going to spend much of this week debating the contours and the details of the Federal budget. Our colleagues are going to offer a variety of amendments, and we will undoubtedly cast a lot of votes. Those watching are going to hear speeches that are peppered with numbers and statistics. So I would like to start out the debate by setting aside, to the extent we can, this flood of numbers and statistics, and focus on what this means to working families in my home State of Oregon and across the country.

My view is the great economic challenge of our time is expanding opportunity for these families. It is about strengthening the middle class and adding sturdier rungs to America's economic ladder so everybody has the chance to climb upward.

Seven years after a crippling economic collapse, we have seen our unemployment rate go down, home foreclosures have gone down, gas prices have gone down. We are finally starting to see wages beginning to grow, and manufacturing is picking up steam. The American economy is now performing better than at any recent time in memory.

But the fact is there are still millions of Americans who feel stuck. They listen to all of the positive economic news that ricochets across the news media and wonder when things are actually going to get better for them and their families. I hear it firsthand in every townhall meeting I hold in our State, including several this month. These are young parents who are overwhelmed by the cost of childcare. There are students practically in shock over the sticker price of a college education. We have workers who are nearing retirement age, confirmed by the Finance Committee, who have hardly been able to save at all.

What the Senate budget is all about is not just facts and figures but about the hopes and aspirations of those people I have described who want things to change. In my view, the budget the Congress sets should take on those middle-class challenges directly. It ought to help working-class families and give more Americans a chance to get ahead in life.

This week, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are putting forward a different kind of budget—a budget that would poke some new holes in the safety net and, in my view, would worsen inequality. We would see millions of Americans face cuts in programs that are a lifeline for them. I have to ask, How will cutting a Pell grant and education tax credits help a disadvantaged student in La Grande, OR, who wants to work hard, play by the rules, and get ahead? How is cutting food stamps going to help a single mother in Ashland who is walking on an economic tightrope every month? How is it going to help her keep food on the table? How will slashing Medicaid help a struggling family in Roseburg, OR, stay healthy and out of the emergency room? And, finally, how would repealing the Affordable Care Act help a cancer survivor in Corvallis who has finally been able to get health insurance for the first time in years?

So my bottom line is pretty direct: Our middle class declines with every rung that is pulled from the ladder of opportunity. So what we all ought to say is the budget is about trying to help Americans climb upward with a budget that is designed to give all Americans the opportunity to get ahead.

To me, we start by investing in America's infrastructure. We simply cannot have big league economic growth with a little league infrastructure. The roads and highways in Oregon and across our country are now pocked by ruts and potholes, making it harder to do business and harder to travel. Dozens of people have been killed or injured in bridge collapses. Without adequate roads, bridges, and transit, drivers spend far too much time sitting in traffic choking on exhaust.

This also has taken a big toll on America's ability to compete internationally. We have to have big league infrastructure to draw jobs and investment to our country, and that depends on the quality of our roads and ports and airports and railways. We know investing in infrastructure creates thousands of jobs in America right away and supports millions more over the long term.

In my view, effective, targeted investments in infrastructure ought to be a no-brainer on both sides of the aisle.

Second, the Congress ought to strengthen programs that assist rural

communities and brighten their economic futures. For example, homes in Oregon and across the West are being threatened by fires that are growing bigger and hotter and more damaging each year.

Chairman ENZI's budget took several steps in the right direction to improve the way governments budget for fires, but with a growing threat, more resources are needed to fight and prevent fires. Having just visited Medford, OR, they told me it was going to be the driest in 25 years, and we take out a map and California just looks dry, dry, dry. Passing the bipartisan legislation that Senator CRAPO and I have authored is urgent.

I also feel funding for agricultural research is another vital tool for giving rural communities a chance to get ahead. Each dollar that goes into agricultural research will be far outstripped by the value created in crops and croplands.

I was told just recently by wheat farmers in Eastern Oregon that investing in agricultural research is going to give them and people all through Eastern Oregon a better chance to get ahead and be more successful with their farms.

I want to make mention of the important low-income and middle-class tax challenge. We ought to make the tax cuts for middle-class and low-income Americans permanent. There is a very big tax looming in 2018, unless the Congress moves to prevent it. Millions of families in Oregon and across the Nation depend on the expansion of the earned-income tax credit, the child tax credit, and the American opportunity tax credit. These are all set to expire, and the longer families sit in the dark wondering what their tax obligations will be, the harder it is for these families—already struggling to get ahead—for them to predict how to budget. In my view, it would be legislative malpractice to leave these low-income and middle-class tax cuts teetering on a cliff while others are permanently enshrined into the law. Furthermore, taking that uncertainty off the table is going to make comprehensive tax reform easier to accomplish.

My colleagues and I on the Finance Committee are working hard to bring our broken Tax Code into the 21st century. I have worked for more than a decade, first with our former colleague Senator Gregg and most recently with our current colleague Senator COATS, to produce the first bipartisan Federal income tax reform plan in more than a quarter century. So I know it is possible to make the Tax Code simpler and fairer. It ought to give everybody the chance to climb the economic ladder, and making the critical low-income and middle-class tax cuts permanent is a big step in that direction.

Next, I think the question of college affordability and doing more to help

students get to graduation day ought to be a focus of this budget. The skyrocketing price of tuition keeps far too many young people from enrolling in college, and it keeps too many others from completing it. In effect, the price of college can reinforce inequality. Millions of students are buried up to their eyeballs in debt before they ever put on that cap and gown.

It is time to come at this challenge from every angle. For one, it is important to make student debt more manageable so graduates don't spend decades weighed down by loan payments. It is absolutely essential to help students take on less debt from the start. That will get more students in the door to challenge and free graduates from a lifetime of debt. That is why, in my view, cutting the Pell grant is the wrong way to go, and the Byzantine web of tax incentives for higher education needs to be cleaned up as well. It should not take dozens of calculations and hours of time for students to navigate the Byzantine tax rules. It should be simpler and easier so more students see a more meaningful benefit. Some student loan debt may be unavoidable, but leaving students with less debt is possible.

My next concern with respect to the budget is making sure needless cuts are made in essential health care programs. The cuts to Medicaid, in my view, that have been proposed by the other side are a guaranteed formula to make life harder for struggling families.

Just contemplate—and having been to Iowa, I know of the many seniors in Iowa—seniors who rely on Medicaid to cover the cost of nursing home care. That is, to a great extent, what the Medicaid budget is all about. Medicaid for those frail seniors—whether it is Oregon or Vermont or Iowa, Medicaid is what keeps a lot of those frail seniors from falling into absolute destitution. In another era, impoverished seniors might have been thrown into almshouses or poor farms. Today, Medicaid is a lifeline for tens of millions. But the budget proposal we have seen from the other side, in my view, would inflict substantial cuts on Medicaid, endanger our future. I don't believe that is the right course for frail seniors who rely on Medicaid for nursing home care.

The last point I would make deals with the effects of repealing the Affordable Care Act. If we repeal the Affordable Care Act, make no mistake about it, America goes back to the days when health care is for the healthy and the wealthy because no longer will we have protections for people with preexisting conditions. It is fine if you are healthy and it is fine if you are wealthy, but that is not most Americans. There are plenty of ways to improve the Affordable Care Act in a bipartisan fashion. That is not what

the budget from the other side does. I hope we will not go back to the days in America when health care is for the healthy and wealthy, which is the bottom-line consequence of full repeal.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 323, AS MODIFIED

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, first I wish to thank Senator WYDEN for his remarks. I concur with what he said, and I thank him for cosponsoring the amendment on infrastructure that we will be voting on in a few minutes.

Senator WYDEN and I understand that you cannot be a great nation if your roads and bridges, water systems, wastewater plants, airports, levees, dams, and railroad system are crumbling. That is not what a great nation is about.

Years ago, the United States used to be the envy of the world in terms of infrastructure. Countries all over the world looked to the United States and asked: How do you do it? How do you provide clean water to your people? How do you have such an efficient transportation system? How do you have such great roads?

That is no longer the case. Today we are in 12th place, and I don't think any of my Republican colleagues would deny that. In fact, our infrastructure is crumbling. We have to address this issue. We cannot kick the can down the road. We can't say: Well, let's wait a few years until we come up with some magic funding formula.

We have to do it, and we have to do it now. The reason we have to do it now is that every year we delay, the problem only becomes worse. We are spending billions of dollars just to maintain the status quo, patching up a deteriorating system—whether it is transit, rails, roads or bridges. We have to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. There is no disagreement, I believe, in the Senate on that.

Second of all, I hope there is no disagreement that unemployment in this country is much too high. Real unemployment is at 11 percent, counting those who have given up looking for work and those who are working part-time. Youth unemployment is 17 percent, and African-American youth unemployment is higher than that. We need a major jobs program to put millions of people back to work at decent wages, and that is what rebuilding our infrastructure does.

The economists tell us that if we want to create jobs, the fastest way to create jobs in America is to rebuild our roads, bridges, and rail system. That is the fastest way to do it. Many of my Republican colleagues probably understand that as well. Where we disagree is how we fund the front.

Some on the Republican side will say: Well, we are looking at tax reform, and we are looking at this and looking

at that, and maybe it will happen, but maybe it will not happen. We certainly have not had a lot of luck on these issues in recent years. Our Republican friends are not particularly interested in investments in America. Their idea of dealing with the deficit is to cut, cut, cut.

What we are proposing here is a \$478 billion infrastructure package for 6 years, and it is funded by something I hope all of us can agree is unacceptable, and that is that at a time when corporate profits are at an all-time high, many corporations are stashing their profits in the Cayman Islands, Bermuda, Luxembourg, tax havens around the world. Guess what they are paying in American income tax to the United States Government. Zero.

We eliminate those loopholes. We raise substantial sums of money. We put that money into rebuilding our infrastructure, creating jobs, and making our country more efficient, safer, and more productive. That is what happens when you have a strong infrastructure.

I ask that Americans try to imagine what America will look like when we have some 9 million workers. This proposal would create some 9 million good-paying jobs in all of our States. People would be working to improve our roads and our water systems, and we can try to begin to compete effectively with the rail systems of other countries throughout the world. Think of what America will look like when we become and develop a first-rate infrastructure, not a third-rate infrastructure. I know people think this is a lot of money, but it is nowhere near what the American Society of Civil Engineers is telling us that we need.

If you are interested in creating a 21st century infrastructure, please vote for my amendment. If you are interested in creating and maintaining some 9 million jobs over a 6-year period, please vote for my amendment. If you are interested in ending an outrageous corporate loophole, which in some cases enables large, profitable multinational corporations to pay zero in Federal income tax, please vote for this amendment. It will send a powerful message that now is the time to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure and put our people to work and end absurd loopholes.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I will be very brief. My colleague has expressed his thoughts on this issue well, and we have had a number of discussions on infrastructure with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

I come back to the fact that all Americans have a stake in this amendment—whether you are a commuter, whether you are an exporter, whether you are someone who lives in rural Wyoming or rural Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats' time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I will be very brief. I thank my colleagues for their courtesy.

This amendment is about more than bumpy roads, popped tires, and broken axles. It is about jobs and economic growth in every nook and cranny in our country, and the key to that growth is infrastructure. Attracting investment depends on the condition of our infrastructure. Suffice it to say that our competitors in a tough global marketplace are increasing their investments in infrastructure. It is time to adopt this amendment and for us to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I get a little upset when I hear one side say that the other side doesn't care about infrastructure. That is not true. We even had a colloquy just a little while ago where the two sides said we need infrastructure. I agree that we need infrastructure, but I will oppose this amendment because it is telling the tax committee exactly what to do to provide infrastructure. One committee is getting into another committee's jurisdiction to say exactly how to do it, and that is not right. That is not the way we handle legislation around here.

Senator WYDEN is on the tax committee. He is the ranking member on that committee. Senator HATCH is the chairman of that committee. They are both concerned about infrastructure. There is already a provision in the bill that allows for the money to be put into place to do it, but that provision does not tell the Finance Committee that it must plug a certain tax loophole and put it into infrastructure. The committee can do that, and the President's budget—one of the reasons there is some excitement here—on money that is held overseas by companies, puts a mandatory 14 percent tax on that and expects it to be brought back right away to fund these things. That is a proposal that has been in the tax committee before—but not at 14 percent. It has been at a lower rate. Fourteen percent is more money than both the highway committee and the defense committee are talking about. We cannot produce a budget in which we tell committees exactly how to do their work. We need to build in the flexibility so they can do their job.

The chairman of the committee is convinced that we can do the job of fixing our infrastructure. Of course, we will never fix the infrastructure as well as we would like to have it fixed. I think the ranking member on the

Budget Committee mentioned that we have four times as much need as what his proposal addresses. He has a proposal for \$468 billion. There is a couple trillion dollars' worth of need out there. Of course, we hope we can get a lot of people involved in fixing these problems. It is not just a Federal problem. It is a local and State problem as well. We hope everybody will participate so that we can improve the infrastructure. It does put people to work, just as Keystone would put people to work.

I ask that my colleagues vote against the bill because we are telling one committee exactly where to get the money for another committee.

I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of our time.

Madam President, I yield the balance of our time for the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, in a few minutes we will be voting, and while I sincerely appreciate the effort of my good friend Senator SANDERS, I will be opposing this approach mostly because I don't think we need to go through what I consider to be a massive tax increase in order to do this. But just for a moment, I wish to talk about the seriousness of the transportation reauthorization bill. I know this issue has been talked about during the budget conversation and debate, but I think sometimes we ought to drag up that old document that hardly anyone pays attention to anymore—the Constitution.

The Constitution specifically says in article I, section 8 that there are some things we are supposed to be doing here. The two major things that are mentioned in the article I, section 8 are, No. 1, defending America—that is our military—and the other is roads and bridges.

I think we are concentrating and working very hard. A minute ago I had a colloquy with my friend from California, Senator BOXER. Senator BOXER observed that she is a proud liberal and recognized me as a proud conservative. Yet here is something we agree on, something we can do, something that is very important and that we need to take care of.

Now, I won't say anything about the defense problem. We have a serious problem in our defense system right now, but that is not the discussion for today. I do believe that while we have an amendment that would address a highway reauthorization bill—and how critical that is—we are working on that.

I have to remind people that there is a reserve fund in Chairman ENZI's budget that serves as a placeholder for Chairman HATCH to address a long-term highway bill later this year.

The last bill we had was a 27-month bill. Again, that was to setup this idea



of having a long-term bill. The last good bill we had was in 2005, and that was a 5-year bill. It was really produced very well. The problem with extensions—and I think we all know this—is that extensions take about 30 percent off the top because short-term extensions—and anyone who has been in business knows this—are things you cannot do in the short term. You cannot get the streamlining. Our 27-month bill had a lot of really good streamlining provisions in there. You cannot do that on short-term extensions.

I look forward to having a very large bill. We have a deadline at the end of May to make this a reality, and I believe we are going to be able to do that. We are meeting on a regular basis, including a meeting today with Senator HATCH. We will be coming up with ways that we can pay for this.

Again, I can remember in the very beginning we used to have a problem in the highway trust fund because we had too much surplus. Well, it is not that way anymore. We all know how we got in the mess we are in right now. We will have to address that, and I look forward to doing that and providing some of the leadership, right along with Senator BOXER and Senator SANDERS, in making this a reality.

With that, noting that 12 noon is here, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator INHOFE for his remarks on infrastructure. I hope we can all work together for what I would suspect every Member here sees as a serious problem.

But this amendment says let's not kick the can down the road. Our infrastructure is crumbling. We used to be the envy of the world; today we are in 12th place. This impacts not just people who are driving cars, it impacts every business in America. We need now to start the process of rebuilding our roads and bridges and dams and levees and airports. When we do that, this amendment, over a 6-year period, can create and maintain 9 million jobs—9 million jobs—at a time when we need decent-paying jobs.

I understand the difference of opinion stems from how we get the funding for this. Our approach is pretty simple. It eliminates an outrageous loophole that allows large, profitable corporations to stash their money around the world and, in some cases, pay zero in Federal income taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for support for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 1 minute in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, as I said a few minutes ago, I agree with Senator SANDERS, the author of this amendment, in terms of what is the problem we have. We have to have a transportation reauthorization bill and we are going to have it.

I know Senator SANDERS has characterized his bill as being paid for by closing tax loopholes, but I would still say that, in my opinion and my analysis of this, this would equate to nearly a half a trillion dollar tax increase, and this is not the way I want to have a transportation reauthorization bill.

Let me remind my colleagues that there is a reserve fund in Chairman ENZI's budget that serves as a placeholder for Chairman HATCH to address a long-term highway bill later this year. We have a deadline of May 31, and I think we can meet that deadline. We are working with Senator HATCH right now to come up with that plan.

So I urge my colleagues to vote against the Sanders amendment and pursue our bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote in the series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 323, as modified, offered by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Baldwin	Boxer	Carper
Bennet	Brown	Casey
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Coons
Booker	Cardin	Donnelly

Durbin	Markey	Sanders
Feinstein	McCaskill	Schatz
Franken	Menendez	Schumer
Gillibrand	Merkley	Shaheen
Heinrich	Mikulski	Stabenow
Heitkamp	Murphy	Tester
Hirono	Murray	Udall
Kaine	Nelson	Warner
King	Peters	Warren
Klobuchar	Reed	Whitehouse
Leahy	Reid	Wyden

NAYS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Ayotte	Flake	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Graham	Roberts
Boozman	Grassley	Rounds
Burr	Hatch	Rubio
Capito	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeben	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Isakson	Shelby
Collins	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	
Ernst	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Kirk	Manchin
------	------	---------

The amendment (No. 323), as modified, was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 386

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 386, offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, Senator PORTMAN's amendment touches on a very serious issue that I believe has broad bipartisan support, the need to deal with children who have serious, chronic conditions. In fact, over 3 million kids in this country have medically complex health conditions.

Senator PORTMAN appropriately is calling attention to that issue. I support him. But when you look at the overall Republican budget, it throws 16 million people off of health insurance by ending the Affordable Care Act and millions more through a \$400 billion cut in Medicaid. What happens to a pregnant woman on Medicaid who needs prenatal care? No health insurance for her. What about a kid who was in an automobile accident whose family has no health insurance and is thrown off of Medicaid? No health insurance for that kid. What about an elderly person in a nursing home? There are millions of elderly people on Medicaid in nursing homes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. Please support this amendment. No cuts to Medicaid for all our kids.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments and support for the Portman amendment. I want you to know I support the Sanders amendment. We support pregnant women and kids who are hurt in car accidents or face other unfortunate circumstances.



So we would be happy to take this by voice vote.

Mr. SANDERS. I think it would be better to do a rollcall vote. We appreciate your support.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Sanders amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Leg.]

#### YEAS—94

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Franken	Perdue
Baldwin	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blumenthal	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hatch	Roberts
Booker	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Heitkamp	Rubio
Boxer	Heller	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Sasse
Burr	Hoeben	Schatz
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schumer
Capito	Isakson	Scott
Cardin	Johnson	King
Carper	Kaine	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coats	Lankford	Sullivan
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Markey	Thune
Coons	McCain	Tillis
Corker	McCaskill	Toomey
Cornyn	McConnell	Udall
Cotton	Menendez	Vitter
Crapo	Merkley	Warner
Daines	Mikulski	Warren
Donnelly	Moran	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Wyden
Ernst	Nelson	
Feinstein		

#### NAYS—3

Flake	Lee	Sessions
-------	-----	----------

#### NOT VOTING—3

Cruz	Kirk	Manchin
------	------	---------

The amendment (No. 386) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 349

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 349, offered by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It is a deficit-neutral reserve fund to help the most vulnerable kids among us to have

better coordinated care under Medicaid.

It allows health care providers to deliver health care services to medically complex kids through models that coordinate care between providers, resulting in better care but also lower costs, including helping with regard to a problem, including across State lines.

These children with complex medical conditions make up about 6 percent of the children who get health care under Medicaid, but it is about 40 percent of the cost of pediatric care under Medicaid and Medicaid.

This is an opportunity for us on a bipartisan basis, I know, to be able to help these kids to get the necessary care they need and actually allow the Medicaid system to realize some savings through efficiencies, such as reduced emergency room stays, hospitalizations, and other procedures.

I thank my colleague Senator BENNET, who will speak in a second on his cosponsorship.

I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense measure to help these vulnerable kids.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I also rise to speak in favor of the Portman amendment. This amendment is based on a bill I introduced earlier this year called the ACE Kids Act that recognizes the critical importance of Medicaid to children with severe medical conditions. It highlights the need for greater coordination and integration of care across the country for 2 million children.

Earlier this month, I met with Everett Ediger at Children's Hospital of Colorado in Denver. Everett is 8 years old and has spina bifida, a neurological disorder of the spine. It took his mom Maureen 2 years to get him signed up under Medicaid and to establish a system to coordinate all of his care.

While Everett was beating me at air hockey, he let his mom explain to me about the frustrating experience of trying to coordinate all of her son's specialists and the payments for his care.

We need to focus on children such as Everett all across this country.

I thank my colleague Senator PORTMAN for his leadership in offering this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the Portman amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 80 Leg.]

#### YEAS—96

Alexander	Fischer	Murray
Ayotte	Flake	Nelson
Baldwin	Franken	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reed
Booker	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heinrich	Roberts
Boxer	Heitkamp	Rounds
Brown	Heller	Rubio
Burr	Hirono	Sanders
Cantwell	Hoeben	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Schatz
Cardin	Isakson	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Cassidy	King	Shaheen
Coats	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Markey	Thune
Cornyn	McCain	Tillis
Cotton	McCaskill	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Daines	Menendez	Vitter
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Enzi	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Manchin
Kirk	Reid

The amendment (No. 349) was agreed to.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:15 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. FISCHER).

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3 p.m. will be controlled by the Democrats and the time from 3 p.m. until 3:45 p.m. will be controlled by the majority.

The Senator from Maryland.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 362

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 362.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. STABENOW, proposes an amendment numbered 362.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to amending the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to allow for punitive damages, limit the any factor “other than sex” exception, and prohibit retaliation against employees who share salary information)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to ensure equal pay policies and practices and to reform section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) (commonly known as the “Equal Pay Act of 1963”) to allow for punitive damages, limit the exception for unequal pay described in paragraph (1) of such section to business necessity rather than any factor “other than sex”, and prevent retaliation against employees for sharing salary information by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, my amendment is about paycheck fairness, a topic I know the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Nebraska, is absolutely familiar with. I come to the floor to finish the job we began with Lilly Ledbetter to end pay discrimination in the workplace once and for all. That is why I am offering this amendment, which is based on the bill I have offered in the past three Congresses. It is called the Paycheck Fairness Act.

My Senate colleagues and I want to be sure women get a raise. The way we want to do that is to put more money in the family checkbook by putting change in the Federal law book.

My amendment will do three things.

No. 1, it will stop retaliation in the workplace for sharing pay information. For years, the famous Lilly Ledbetter was harassed and humiliated just for asking questions about her coworkers’ salaries. In many workplaces around the country, you are forbidden to discuss shared pay information even if you are the same lab technician, computer operator or others. This would stop retaliation simply for asking not only what do you make but what do others make doing the same work.

It also stops employers from using any reason to pay women less. “Oh, they are breadwinners.” “Oh, he is a family man.” “Oh, gee, they do a harder job,” when it is the same job. We have to make sure it is equal pay for equal work.

This bill also allows punitive damages for women who have been discriminated against. When the only deterrent against pay discrimination is the threat of paying women backpay, discrimination can just be factored into the cost of doing business and treating it like loose change.

Now, people say to me: Hey, Senator BARB. You led the fight on Lilly Ledbetter to make sure we had equal pay for equal work. Didn’t we solve that problem?

Well, we made a good first step. That bill kept the courthouse doors open for women who are discriminated against so there would not be a statute of limitations as defined by the original Supreme Court decision, but that was only a downpayment. What this amendment does is say we need to change the law so Lilly would not have had to sue in the first place. This amendment says: Put an end to the incentives that cause employers to think paying women less is just loose change.

This amendment would close loopholes in the law which allow pay discrimination to occur in the first place. It would also put an end to paycheck secrecy—yes, paycheck secrecy—that makes it harder to uncover discrimination. It would also prohibit retaliation against women for even talking about pay differences. These are loopholes that often stop women who have endured discrimination from being fairly compensated.

What are the facts? Women still earn 77 cents for every \$1 a man makes. It is even worse for women of color. African-American women earn 64 cents for every \$1 a man makes, Hispanic women earn 54 cents for every \$1 a man makes. For women closer to the age of retirement, the wage gap increases to more than \$14,000 a year. It not only affects their pay, but it affects their retirement, and it affects their Social Security.

When you earn less, you get less in your Social Security benefits because you are making smaller contributions to your retirement. Women’s Social Security benefits are about 71 percent of men’s benefits, and that is not because of the mommy factor, where women have taken time out of the workplace and the marketplace to be in the home with their children.

Women earn 23 cents less for every \$1 a man earns, even when she does the same job and has the same education. Women do not get a 23-percent discount on their student loans. They do not get a 23-percent discount on their utility bill. They do not get a 23-percent discount on their mortgage. So we end up paying the bill just for our ability to work.

Madam President, I could go on and tell you compelling stories about my constituents who have shared them with me.

I have heard from Latoya Weaver. She lives in Great Mills, MD. She is a

single parent to three children. She worked in guest services at a hotel. She found out that her pay of \$8 an hour—\$8 an hour—was \$2 less than new males in the same position. So a new guy working in the same job, doing the same thing made \$2 more. That makes a big difference when you are making \$8 an hour rather than \$10 an hour. She filed an EEOC lawsuit, and she prevailed. You cannot necessarily go to the EEOC in every case.

I heard from Donna Smith, who lives on Maryland’s Eastern Shore. She worked as a retail clerk. She was also told not to discuss her wages, but she found out she was being paid less than a male clerk—not “mail” as in post office mail but “male” as in a guy—a guy clerk whom she actually trained and was doing the same exact job she did when she started. Again, in all of the effort to go to the EEOC, it was found that two other female workers were also discriminated against. No one would have known had Donna not sought out that information.

So we can see that paycheck fairness is absolutely needed.

There is a lot of mythology out there about the Paycheck Fairness Act.

Myth No. 1, that the bill would require employers to cut the salaries of their male employees. The Equal Pay Act currently on the books prohibits employers from lowering the wages of men to make up for discrimination against women.

Another myth, that the bill is unnecessary. Well, the facts speak for themselves. When American women who work full time year round are paid only 77 cents for every \$1 made by their male counterparts, it speaks for itself.

The wage gap is not merely a matter of choice in their occupation; they are paid less in the same occupation with the same education.

Here is another myth, that the bill would subject employers to criminal penalties for refusing to disclose wage information. No part of this bill provides for criminal penalties for employers for any conduct. There is no criminal penalty in this bill.

Another myth is that the bill would require the government to set salaries for Federal employees. Again, nothing in the Paycheck Fairness Act allows the Federal Government to set salaries for a public or private employer. So I think that speaks for itself.

Madam President, I have a factual document from the National Women’s Law Center. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Women’s Law Center,  
May 2015]

**WHAT THE PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT WOULD REALLY DO**

For nearly 50 years, the Equal Pay Act has made it illegal for employers to pay unequal

wages to men and women who perform substantially equal work. Although enforcement of the Equal Pay Act as well as other civil rights laws has helped to narrow the wage gap, significant disparities remain and need to be addressed. Women today still make only 77 cents for every dollar paid to their male counterparts. And for women of color, the gap is even larger.

The Paycheck Fairness Act would strengthen current laws against wage discrimination by protecting employees who voluntarily share pay information with colleagues from retaliation, fully compensating victims of sex-based pay discrimination, empowering women and girls by strengthening their negotiation skills, and holding employers more accountable under the Equal Pay Act. Opponents of the Paycheck Fairness Act have put forth rhetoric about the bill that is misleading—this document contrasts the various myths about the bill and explains what the Paycheck Fairness Act would accomplish in reality.

Myth: The bill would require employers to cut the salaries of their male employees.

Fact: The Equal Pay Act prohibits employers from lowering the wages of men to make up for discrimination against women. In fact, the first paragraph of the Act states: An “employer who is paying a wage rate differential in violation of this subsection shall not, in order to comply with the provisions of this subsection, reduce the wage rate of any employee.” The bill does nothing to disturb this longstanding rule.

Myth: The bill is unnecessary because there is no wage gap.

Fact: American women who work full time, year round are paid only 77 cents for every dollar paid to their male counterparts. This gap in earnings translates into \$10,784 less per year in median earnings, leaving women and their families shortchanged. The wage gap is even more substantial when race and gender are considered together, with African-American women making only 62 cents, and Hispanic women only 54 cents, for every dollar paid to white, non-Hispanic men.

The wage gap is not merely a matter of choice in occupation—women typically are paid less than men in the same occupation. This is the case whether that occupation pays high or low wages, whether they work in traditionally male occupations, traditionally female occupations, or occupations with an even mix of men and women.

Numerous studies show that even when all relevant career and family attributes are taken into account, there is still a significant, unexplained gap in men’s and women’s earnings. Thus, even when women make the same career choices as men and work the same hours, they earn less. For example, a study of college graduates one year after graduation determined that women earned only 95 percent of what men earned, even after accounting for variables such as “job and workplace, employment experience and continuity, education and training, and demographic and personal characteristics.”

Myth: The bill would subject employers to criminal penalties for refusing to disclose wage information.

Fact: No part of the bill provides for criminal penalties for employers for any conduct. But pay disparities often go unnoticed because employers forbid employees from sharing wage information with each other. The bill enhances employees’ ability to learn about wage discrimination by merely banning retaliation against workers who inquire about their employers’ wage practices or dis-

close their own wages. It does not ban pay secrecy policies altogether—in fact, employers with access to colleagues’ wage information in the course of their work, such as human resources employees, may still be prohibited from sharing that information.

Myth: The bill requires the government to set salaries for federal employees.

Fact: Nothing in the Paycheck Fairness Act allows the federal government to set salaries for any private employer. But the tools for detecting and addressing pay disparities under the Equal Pay Act have been limited by courts over time. For example, courts have opened loopholes in the defenses that employers are permitted to raise when seeking to justify a decision to not pay workers equal wages for doing substantially equal work. Some courts have said that an employer may justify paying unequal wages even if there is no business reason for paying men and women unequal salaries. The bill also would require the Department of Labor to reinstate a survey instrument that will help the Department detect and remedy wage discrimination by federal contractors and would serve as a critical tool in the federal government’s effort to enforce civil rights laws.

Myth: There is no need for the bill after the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act.

Fact: The Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act restored the protection against pay discrimination stripped away by the Supreme Court’s decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear*. But, even after the Act, our existing equal pay laws remain weakened by a series of other court decisions and insufficient federal tools to detect and combat wage discrimination. The Act made clear that each discriminatory paycheck, not just an employer’s original decision to engage in pay discrimination, resets the period of time during which a worker may file a pay discrimination claim. The steps taken in the *Ledbetter* Act are essential, as they enable workers to bring wage discrimination cases again. But the *Ledbetter* Act simply returned the law to what it was prior to the Court’s decision. And wage disparities go undetected because employers maintain policies that punish employees who voluntarily share salary information with their coworkers. The Paycheck Fairness Act would update the Equal Pay Act by closing loopholes in the law and ensuring that workers will no longer be punished simply for talking about their own wages.

Ms. MIKULSKI. So here we are, in 2015. It has been almost 50 years since the first equal pay bill was passed. For 50 years we have tried to have financial catchup to get equal pay for equal work, and every time we make a reform, there are always other loopholes. We want to close the loopholes. We want to end discrimination. We want to end retaliation. And, most of all, we want to end the fact that women often end up for their whole lifetime earning less. It affects the way they raise their families. It affects the way they pay into their pensions, the way they pay into their Social Security. Now we need to pay our respects to them and pass the paycheck fairness bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to thank Senator MIKULSKI for of-

fering this really important amendment because I believe that real, long-term economic growth is built from the middle out, not from the top down. Our government and our economy should be working for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

We in Congress need to be focused on raising wages and expanding economic security and making sure our workers have the opportunity to work hard and succeed. That is exactly what the amendment the Senator from Maryland has offered will do.

It would build on the promise of the Equal Pay Act to help close the pay gap between men and women. Today, nearly half of our workforce is not earning equal pay for equal work. In fact, women across the country, as we know, get paid just 78 cents for every \$1 a man makes for the same work. That is not just unfair to women, it hurts our families and it hurts our economy and we need to fix it.

Last year, at a hearing in the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, we heard from a woman named Kerri. For 5 years, Kerri worked for an auto supplier as a supervisor. She liked her job. She did it well. Her boss gave her glowing performance reviews for her work. But when that auto industry ran into trouble, her company had to file for bankruptcy, and it was through those bankruptcy court reports that Kerri found out she was making significantly less than the men she supervised.

After all those years of hard work, she found out her employer valued her work less just because she was a woman. She said she was heartbroken and embarrassed, but more than that, she told our committee last year that those years of lost wages affected her family for the rest of her life. And she is not alone.

Across the country, pay discrimination hurts women and families’ ability to make ends meet and get ahead in the workplace.

I thank the Senator from Maryland for her extraordinary leadership in the fight for equal pay and for bringing this important amendment forward today. This amendment will help move us toward an economy where women get a fair shot at pay equity in the workplace and set us up to tackle pay discrimination head-on.

Pay discrimination, by the way, is not just unfair to women, it is bad for our families, and it is a real and persistent problem that hurts our economy.

It is important to remember that women’s roles in our economy has shifted dramatically in the last few decades. Women now make up nearly half of our workforce. Today, 60 percent of families rely on earnings from both parents—up from 37 percent in 1975. More than ever, today women are likely to be the primary breadwinners in their family.

So we have to make sure working women can succeed in today's economy because their success is critical to families' economic security and to our Nation's economy as a whole.

According to a recent report, closing the pay gap between men and women would add \$446 billion to our economy. I hope we can all agree that in the 21st century workers should be paid fairly for the work they do regardless of their gender, and I hope we can agree we need to expand economic security for more families. That should be our mission to move our country forward.

This amendment supports the basic principle of fairness in the workplace. It would help women, families, and our Nation's economy.

I want to make this clear: I am urging my colleagues to vote for the Mikulski amendment—the only proposal on the table right now that would move us toward a real solution to this problem.

Senator MIKULSKI has been our leader on this issue. I hope Republicans will join Democrats on real solutions and work with us to create jobs, increase wages, and expand economic security that benefits all workers and families, not just the wealthiest few.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, this is an important moment in the Senate each year because we try to define what our values are and the way we spend our money.

If you want to know a family's values, take a look at the family budget. Are they putting some money away for their young son or daughter to go to college, making sure they can own a home, paying their bills on a regular basis, or are they wasting money on things they can't afford? The budget tells a story about values.

This budget presented by the Republicans tells another story. It tells a story about America's future.

I have a friend back in Springfield, IL. He has been a friend for years and years. Ten years ago, his wife was diagnosed with Alzheimer's. His life changed dramatically. He could no longer go to work on a regular basis. He devoted every waking minute to his wife. She is still alive today and struggling, but that family was different. Their lives were different. Across America, families just like his family learn about the diagnosis of Alzheimer's every day. Do you know how often we diagnose an American with Alzheimer's? Once every 68 seconds. The millions who are now afflicted by that disease—many of them have a very tough future ahead of them, as do their families.

What does that have to do with this political debate? It has a lot to do with it. It has to do with some basic things. First, should we continue to cut the

money for medical research in America? The Republican budget says: Yes. We can't afford medical research.

Really? Well, last year, we spent \$200 billion in Medicare and Medicaid on Alzheimer's victims alone—\$200 billion. When we asked for \$3 or \$4 billion more for medical research in the hopes we can find a way to delay the onset of Alzheimer's or, God willing, even find a cure for it—we will more than pay back the money we invest in research. But the Republican budget says that is something we cannot afford in America today.

When it comes to those who are suffering from Alzheimer's, how do they get by? Many of them get by with Medicare, which, of course, is the insurance policy for the elderly and disabled. But this budget cuts Medicare. Many low-income victims of that disease and many others rely on Medicaid, but this budget makes dramatic cuts in Medicaid.

That is the vision the Republicans present to us in their budget—the vision of an America that cannot afford to do the research to find cures for diseases such as Alzheimer's, cancer, diabetes, and the list goes on. They see an America where we cannot afford to help people who are struggling to get by.

This budget proposes takes 26 million Americans off of health insurance. I will repeat that—26 million Americans off of health insurance. Is that the answer to America's future? Have you ever been the father of a sick child and not had health insurance? I have. I will never forget it as long as I live. I felt helpless and worried that my little daughter was not going to get the right care she needed. Thank God the day came when I was covered with health insurance and could get her the best. But I think about the millions of Americans who never saw that day and the fact that 26 million Americans would lose health insurance because of the Republican budget. We are a better nation than that. We should prepare for a better future than one where the have-nots are growing in number.

The sad reality is that the Republican budget, although it finally answers its political prayer and eliminates the Affordable Care Act, still collects all of the revenue from the Affordable Care Act. They will never be able to explain that one to us.

How will they explain to the millions of seniors who are under Medicare that they are eliminating the program that reduces the cost of prescription drugs? These are seniors on fixed incomes who are trying to stay healthy and independent at home and who depend on drugs that could be pretty expensive. The Republican budget eliminates that provision in the Affordable Care Act which helps those seniors pay for their prescription drugs—the so-called doughnut hole.

As I go through the lengthy list of what the Republicans have done in their budget, I have to ask, is this their vision of America—fewer people having health insurance, fewer seniors being able to afford the prescription drugs they need to get by, cutting Medicaid, where we provide prenatal care for moms so the babies are healthy? For goodness' sake, it is not only the right thing to do, it is the economic thing to do. A sick baby is a tough challenge for any family, but it is a challenge for all of us. The medical bills a premature baby might incur far exceeds the cost of good prenatal care so the mom and baby are healthy. But that is just another area of cutbacks when it comes to this Republican budget.

This budget is certainly not going to become the law of the land. I believe even some Republicans will have a struggle trying to vote for it or explain it.

More, importantly, though, I hope this budget is a chance for us to have a conversation about what middle-income America is going to look like in the future. I think that is the key to America's success.

We talk a lot about income inequality. To put it in a few words, it means that a lot of families are working hard every single darn day and they cannot make ends meet. They are living paycheck to paycheck. What are we doing for them? This Republican budget cuts the available college assistance for their kids to go to school. That doesn't help that middle-income family. This Republican budget doesn't invest in America when it comes to education. This Republican budget cuts back on the help to schools to make sure they are producing graduates with the skills to compete in the 21st century.

If we really want to focus on helping middle-income families, we cannot vote for this Republican budget. It is a set of priorities for them which America really cannot accept.

As Senator SANDERS has said—our ranking member on the Budget Committee—we need to work to give middle-income families in this country a fighting chance. This bill does not do that. Sadly, this bill makes too many cuts in too many critical areas.

I am going to offer an amendment to this bill. See if you like this idea. I think it is a good one. My colleagues will get to vote on it. Here is what it says. We have a tax code full of provisions to encourage businesses to do certain things. We give them deductions, credits, incentives to do things, such as drilling for oil, building wind turbines, so many things—some good, some bad; it depends on your point of view.

I suggest that we put a provision in our Tax Code that says we will provide a tax credit to companies that stay in the United States and don't bail out and head to a foreign country, companies that invest in American jobs by

maintaining or increasing the number of workers in the United States compared to the number of workers overseas.

Secondly, those companies will get a tax credit if their corporation pays fair wages by paying most employees a wage so that a family of three doesn't have to depend on the government for a safety net program. That is about \$15 an hour.

If a company keeps jobs in the United States and pays about \$15 an hour as a minimum, we will give them a tax credit.

Those companies should also provide quality health insurance for their employees. Who would disagree with that one? They should also prepare their workers for retirement by providing a pension or 401(k) with fair employer contributions.

The last point is that those companies should support our veterans, our troops, and people with disabilities by giving them a chance to work there.

How about those companies? From where I am sitting, those are patriotic American companies that deserve a break in the Tax Code as much, if not more, than any other company.

I will bring that amendment to the floor and let my colleagues vote on it. I hope we can get a bipartisan consensus. We ought to create incentives for companies to stay in the United States, employ Americans, pay a good wage, provide health insurance and pensions, and give a break to veterans and people with disabilities who are applying for jobs.

Let's have some priorities that reflect the future of a growing, solid America—an America with a growing middle class.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 362

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I rise in very strong support of Senator MIKULSKI's amendment on equal pay for equal work for the women of our country. Senator MIKULSKI has been a tireless advocate for policies that bolster the American middle class and has been a champion for many years for pay equity for women, and I thank the Senator from Maryland for all she has done. I also concur with the strong remarks made by Senator MURRAY, who has also been a champion for pay equity.

To my mind, it is very hard to defend the current reality in which women continue to earn 78 cents on the dollar compared to men. We want to end that discrimination against women workers. This is not only an issue of justice, it is also an issue of economics because when we establish pay equity in this country—equal pay for equal work—millions of women will receive higher pay and many of them and their families will leave the ranks of the poor.

This is an extraordinarily important amendment for justice, and it is an important amendment for economic rights.

The pay gap we see in this country is found at every level of education and at every stage of a career. No matter how hard women work, it is next to impossible to overcome it because they move up the ranks, but there is still pay inequity.

The pay equity gap has a significant bearing on the economic status of female-led households. Only 18 percent of families headed by single moms have economic security. Female-headed households are twice as likely to live in poverty as male-headed households, and more than half of poor children live in female-headed households. It is no surprise that a lifetime of lower earnings results in less retirement savings and fewer Social Security benefits for women.

Senior women are twice as likely as senior men to live in poverty, and the average senior woman receives approximately \$4,000 less a year than a senior man.

Senior women are more likely than senior men to rely on Social Security as their sole source of income, especially if they are unmarried.

My State of Vermont has done better than most in terms of pay equity and, in fact, is first in the Nation in making sure women get equal pay for equal work. But even in the State of Vermont, which leads the Nation in this area, women are still only earning 91 cents for every dollar men make. We have done better than the rest of the country, and we still have more to do, but the rest of the country has a whole lot more to do if we are going to fulfill the promise of equal pay for equal work.

I hope very much that we will all be supporting Senator MIKULSKI's very important amendment.

In terms of the overall Republican budget—and I say this with all due respect—one of the reasons I suspect that the media is not particularly interested in this budget is because when they look at it, they find it to be so preposterous, so unbelievable, and so unrealistic that nobody really takes it seriously, and certainly many of the major provisions in it are not going to be turned into law.

I will go out on a limb, but I think I am fairly safe in saying that President Obama is not going to sign legislation that abolishes ObamaCare. Maybe I am wrong, but I think it is fairly safe to say that. The Republican budget wastes a whole lot of time and energy by proposing the repeal of ObamaCare.

I will tell everyone what the repeal of the Affordable Care Act would mean in this country, and I know people will think I am exaggerating. I am not exaggerating, and if I am not telling the truth, I want my Republican friends to

come down here—or when they get the floor—and say: Senator SANDERS was inaccurate. Please tell me that. We have read the legislation, and I am not inaccurate.

If they repeal the Affordable Care Act, it will eliminate health insurance coverage for 16 million people. Sixteen million people would lose the health insurance they currently have.

Today, we are the only major country on Earth that doesn't guarantee health care to all people. Today, despite the modest gains of the Affordable Care Act, 35 million Americans have no health insurance. So the Republicans say, 35 million without health insurance—that is not enough. Let's raise that number to 51 million by eliminating the Affordable Care Act.

They go further than that. The Republicans say we should cut Medicaid by \$400 billion over the next decade. Medicaid is the program that provides health insurance for lower-income Americans as well as—very significantly—older people who are in nursing homes. So if people think this is just a low-income issue—if people think it is not a middle class issue—think again, because it just might be your mom who is 90 years of age who is in a nursing home which is being paid by Medicaid. It could be your dad who is dealing with Alzheimer's in a nursing home being paid for by Medicaid.

What the Republicans propose is a \$400 billion cut over the next decade which would deny health insurance to an additional 11 million Americans, including millions of children.

My arithmetic might not be too good, but I think if we add 16 million who lose health insurance through the ending of the Affordable Care Act to 11 million who lose health insurance by a \$400 billion cut in Medicaid, that means—16 plus 11 is 27—27 million Americans would lose health insurance, almost doubling the number of people who don't have health insurance.

Does anybody in their right mind take this proposal seriously? It is beyond comprehension. It would cause massive chaos and disruption in the United States of America.

This means that low-income, pregnant women who need to make sure—as Senator DURBIN mentioned a moment ago—that they get the health care they need when they are pregnant would lose their health insurance. A kid who is in a car who has an automobile accident would lose his or her health insurance. A worker who feels a pain in his chest and needs to go to the doctor—he doesn't have any health insurance, doesn't go to the doctor, dies. Well, that is a result of cutting 27 million people off of health insurance.

So in a certain sense we needn't discuss the issue terribly much because it is such an absurd proposal that I don't

think there are too many people who would take it seriously.

We should also understand that when my Republican colleagues talk about ending the Affordable Care Act, what they are also doing is denying over 2 million young adults the right to stay on their parents' health insurance plan until the age of 26. As a result of the Affordable Care Act—previously children would be dropped from their parents' health insurance when they reached 21. The Affordable Care Act keeps them covered until they are 26. So suddenly, if one is 24 years of age and they have health insurance through their parents' health program, they are gone, they are out.

The Affordable Care Act would bring us back to a very dark age in America's medical history. That was the time not so many years ago, before the ACA, when if a person had a pre-existing condition—can we imagine that? Now we think it is so crazy. It is hard to believe this existed 7 or 8 years ago. A woman walks into an insurance company looking for health insurance and she says: Yes, I had breast cancer 10 years ago, and I had an operation dealing with breast cancer.

The insurance company says: Oh, you had breast cancer? We can't cover you. That might recur.

Somebody else walks in and says: Well, I had a heart attack or I had a stroke 8 years ago.

Oh, that is a preexisting condition. You are discriminated against. We don't want you. You might get sick again.

Incredibly enough, then, the people who needed insurance the most are the people to whom insurance companies said: Sorry, we are not going to provide insurance to you. The Republican budget brings back those dark days.

The Republican budget will say to insurance companies again that being a woman is an illness, being pregnant is an illness. Insurance companies would be able to discriminate against women and charge them extra for the crime of being a woman. Does that make sense to anybody? I don't think so. But that is, in fact, what is in the Republican budget.

We have worked long and hard. This is an issue that has been dear to my heart for a very long time, and that is the knowledge that many of our seniors cannot afford the prescription drugs they need. Because of the power of the pharmaceutical companies in this country, our people are forced into paying the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. That is just the simple reality.

Another very serious problem is that generic drug prices are soaring. We have many seniors and many Americans who have a variety of illnesses. They go to the doctor, the doctor writes a prescription, and do we know what happens? I remember talking to a

doctor in the northern part of Vermont who said her guess was that one out of four of her patients did not fill the prescriptions they wrote because they simply can't afford them. And when one is older, by definition, one is often sicker and one needs medicine.

The Republican budget resolution we are debating now would increase prescription drug prices for some 4 million seniors and persons with disabilities who are on the Medicare Part D Program by reopening the doughnut hole. For years we have tried to close that hole and make sure the elderly do not have to pay for prescription drug costs out of their own pockets. The Republican budget would undo the progress we have made.

The bottom line of the Republican budget suggests the huge philosophical divide that exists in this Chamber. But, interestingly enough, I don't think it exists within the American people. I think the more the American people understand about the Republican budget, the more they will understand that something is fundamentally wrong with that budget.

Where many of us come from is we look at an America in which the wealthiest people are doing phenomenally well. I had a chart up yesterday which was, to me, really extraordinary. It pointed out that in the last 2 years, the 14 wealthiest people in this country—all multibillionaires—combined, saw an increase in their wealth in a 2-year period—14 people—of \$157 billion. Fourteen people in a 2-year period saw a \$157 billion increase in their wealth. That is literally beyond comprehension. That increase in wealth in a 2-year period is more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of the American people own in their entirety.

Some of us believe that when multibillionaires see a huge increase in their wealth such that the top one-tenth of 1 percent now own almost more wealth than the bottom 90 percent, maybe they should be asked to pay more in taxes. That is what we believe. Our Republican colleagues disagree. They have nothing of significance to say about income and wealth inequality, and their view is that if we want to deal with the deficit and we want to deal with the national debt, the only way to go forward is to make horrendous catastrophic cuts in programs that middle-income and working-class people desperately need—programs they desperately need.

So I have spoken a little bit about the Republican cuts in health care, but I also should mention that there are major cuts in education. I can tell my colleagues, because I have had a number of town meetings on this issue in my State of Vermont, almost all of the young people I talk to are extremely worried about the high cost of college and about the debts that are wrapped around their shoulders when they graduate from college.

What does the Republican budget do to address the crisis of the affordability of college and the deep debts millions of our young people face when they leave school? Well, instead of addressing the problem, they make it even worse. It is hard to believe, but it is true. The Republican budget would eliminate mandatory Pell grants. Pell grants are the Federal program that helps low-income and working-class students get help in going to college. So at a time when it is harder to afford college, the Republican proposal eliminates mandatory programs, cutting this program by nearly \$90 billion over the next 10 years, which would increase the cost of a college education for more than 8 million Americans.

Now, what can we say about that? People today can't afford to go to college. Students are leaving school deeply in debt. And what the Republicans say is let's cut \$90 billion in mandatory Pell grant funding and increase the cost of a college education for more than 8 million Americans.

I can tell my colleagues that in Vermont—and throughout this country, I know—working-class families have a very difficult time finding quality, affordable child care. The Republican budget addresses this problem by making a bad situation worse and by coming forward with a budget which would mean that 110,000 fewer young children would be able to enroll in Head Start over the next 10 years.

We need to expand Head Start. We need to expand preschool education. We need to expand child care. The most important years of a human being's life are 0 to 4 years old. Those little kids need the intellectual and emotional nourishment that good preschool education and child care provides them. What is the Republican proposal? Knock 110,000 kids off of Head Start.

Under the Republican budget, 1.9 million fewer students would receive the academic help they need to succeed in school by cutting about \$12 billion in the title I education program which is focused on the needs of lower income kids. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act would be cut by \$10 billion.

So here is the point. At the end of the day, what politics is about is which side are people on. Are people on the side of millionaires and billionaires and large campaign contributors or are people on the side of working families who are struggling to keep their heads above water economically, who are trying to figure out how they are going to send their kids to college. They are trying to figure out how they are going to help take care of their parents. They are trying to figure out how they are going to pay their rent or, in some cases, even pay for their groceries. That is what this debate is about.

What the Republicans are saying loudly and clearly is the rich are getting phenomenally richer; we are not



going to ask them to pay a nickel more in taxes. Corporations are enjoying record-breaking profits, and we have major corporation after major corporation paying zero in Federal income tax because they stash their money in tax havens so they can avoid paying taxes to the U.S. Government, but we are not going to ask them to pay a nickel more in taxes.

That is what this debate is about. Which side are you on? I think the vast majority of the people in this country want the Senate to stand up for the middle class, for the working families of this country, and ask the billionaires and the large, multinational corporations to start paying their fair share of taxes.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last month President Obama released his fiscal year 2016 budget proposal. Americans could be forgiven for thinking it was created in a vacuum, since the proposal completely ignores our current fiscal reality. Six years ago, when the President took office, our massive debt was already a massive \$10.6 trillion. For the past 6 years of the President's administration, our national debt has increased by more than \$7.5 trillion, to a dangerously high \$18.2 trillion. That kind of debt slows economic growth, threatens government programs such as Social Security and Medicare, and jeopardizes America's future. But apparently the President is not concerned because the President's budget proposal would increase our national debt to a staggering \$25 trillion-plus over the next 10 years.

Let me repeat that. Over the next 10 years, the President's budget would increase our national debt to more than \$25 trillion. Now, I don't need to tell the American people that kind of debt is unsustainable. American families know you can't keep racking up debt indefinitely, and they know the solution to being in debt is not increasing spending.

It is too bad nobody in the White House has that same kind of common sense. The President's budget would increase spending by 65 percent over the next 10 years. If a family already in debt tried increasing spending that way, they would very quickly end up bankrupt. They would lose their home, their cars, their credit. Well, the government works the same way. The government may be able to keep up appearances a little longer, but sooner or

later unchecked government spending results in financial ruin. It has happened in other countries, and it will happen here if we don't take action.

If we keep racking up debt the way we have been going, we are not going to be able to pay for our priorities. Social Security, Medicare, national defense, national security, infrastructure—all these priorities could face huge cuts if we don't get our Nation on a sound fiscal footing.

Last week, Senate Republicans introduced a budget blueprint for fiscal year 2016 that would balance the budget in 10 years and put our Nation on a path to fiscal health. Instead of ignoring our Nation's fiscal problems, it promotes spending restraint, it creates a framework for Congress and the President to come together on long-term solutions. While it is not a perfect plan—it doesn't solve every one of our Nation's problems—it gets things moving in the right direction.

First, the Senate Republican budget balances. The President's budget never balances—not in 10 years, not in 75 years, not ever. The President may think we can keep spending more than we take in indefinitely, but the fact is we can't. We need to get to a place where balanced budgets—not deficits—are the new normal. Under the Senate Republicans' budget, our Nation would achieve a \$3 billion surplus by the year 2025, and our budget encourages honest accounting.

For example, our budget would provide for the Congressional Budget Office to score legislation increasing the deficit by \$5 billion or more not just over 10 years but over 40 years. Typically, the Congressional Budget Office estimates the cost of legislation over a 10-year period. These estimates can be misleading because many pieces of legislation start out by costing relatively little but end up costing huge amounts in the long-term. By looking at the 40-year cost of legislation instead of the 10-year cost, we can get a much clearer view of a bill's true cost and the effect it will have on the debt.

Our budget also makes economic growth a priority. Almost 6 years after the recession ended, millions of Americans are still struggling and opportunities for advancement are still few and far between. A big reason for that is the oppressive, big government policies and deficit spending of the Obama administration. Our budget would help get the government off the back of the economy by limiting the growth of spending and reducing the debt.

On the jobs front, the Senate Republicans' budget would pave the way for the removal of inefficient and ineffective government regulations that are making it difficult and expensive for many businesses to hire new workers and create new opportunities. Our budget also lays the groundwork for an overhaul of our outdated Tax Code,

which needs to be reformed to lessen the tax burden facing families and to encourage businesses to create American jobs.

Yesterday, we celebrated the fifth anniversary of the President's budget-busting health care law. Five years on, the President's health care law has resulted in higher costs, lost health care plans, reduced access to doctors, and new burdens on businesses, large and small. The health care law's latest disasters include incorrect tax forms dispatched to nearly 1 million Americans and surprise tax bills for tens of thousands of households in this country. It is no surprise that according to a recent poll, over 60 percent of voters have an unfavorable view of the Democrats' signature law. Senate Republicans promised the American people we would do our best to repeal ObamaCare and replace it with real health care reform, and our budget provides the framework for that process to move forward.

ObamaCare has failed to provide the health care solutions the President promised. It is time to replace this law with reforms that will actually make health care more affordable and accessible and that will not put government between patients and doctors.

Finally, our budget would start the process of putting major entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare on a sounder footing going forward. Right now the Social Security trust fund is headed toward bankruptcy. If we do not take action, Social Security recipients could be facing a 25-percent cut in benefits in 2033.

Medicare faces similar challenges to those faced by the Social Security Program. Under the worst-case scenario, the Medicare trust fund could become insolvent as early as in 2021. That is just 6 short years away. The Senate Republican budget would help preserve Medicare by extending the trust fund solvency by an additional 5 years, which would protect retiree benefits while giving policymakers additional time to ensure that this program provides support to seniors for decades to come.

Our country is not in the best fiscal shape, but it is not too late to do something about it. Senate Republicans have proposed and produced a responsible budget that will fund our Nation's priorities while restraining spending growth and driving down our Nation's deficit. This budget will give the American people a more efficient, a more effective, and a more accountable government. I look forward to passing it this week and to getting our Nation back on the path to fiscal health, which starts with a balanced budget.

We cannot continue down the path we are on. The American people deserve better. We should give them better. For the first time in most of the years I have been here, we are actually



going to have a budget on the floor of the Senate that balances in 10 years. That is something I think the American people who sit around their household and sit around their kitchen tables trying to make these hard decisions for themselves and their families—that is what they deserve and that is what they expect. That is what we are going to deliver.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

AMENDMENT NO. 409

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 409.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. FISCHER] proposes an amendment numbered 409.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to promoting equal pay, which may include preventing discrimination on the basis of sex and preventing retaliation against employees for seeking or discussing wage information)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND  
RELATING TO PROMOTING EQUAL  
PAY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting equal pay, which may include preventing discrimination on the basis of sex and preventing retaliation against employees for seeking or discussing wage information, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, as a strong supporter of equal pay for equal work, I am pleased to offer this amendment to combat pay discrimination in the workplace. Our solution provides a reasonable, fact-based approach to equip Americans with the knowledge and the tools they need to fight discrimination. This amendment contains language similar to President Obama's April 2014 Executive order, clearly stating that employees cannot be punished for exercising their First Amendment rights by speaking with employers or coworkers about their wages.

Furthermore, this amendment does not authorize any new Federal regulations, nor does it compel employers to

disclose salary information. It simply prevents punitive actions against employees seeking information.

Women want good-paying jobs. That means we need policies to promote economic growth and opportunities for all Americans. This is a simple amendment. This is an amendment that would create a deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote equal pay by reinforcing a commitment to existing law. Every Senator in here supports equal pay for equal work. That is existing law.

This amendment is a chance to not just reaffirm support for the principles of equal pay for equal work, but also for free speech. This free speech includes the right to discuss wage information with coworkers. This amendment would prevent retaliation from employers against employees who discuss wages with other employees or seek such information from their employers. Importantly, this amendment does not authorize any new Federal regulations, nor does it compel employers to disclose that salary information. It simply prevents punitive action against employees who seek or share wage information.

I believe this amendment is something all of us in this Chamber can support.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, budgets are all about priorities. It is about living within your means and not mortgaging our children's future by overspending money we do not have that we are going to have to ask them to repay. When it comes to priorities, I cannot think of a higher priority for the Federal Government—I am not talking about State or local government, I am talking about the Federal Government—I cannot think of a higher priority for the Federal Government than national security.

That was one of the basic reasons the United States of America was originally created—for mutual defense and national security. This budget, importantly, helps set the course for the future security of not only this country but also of the world, by funding our military services. It is no secret—because we see it in the headlines every day, we see it on television, we see it online—we are living in an increasingly dangerous world. We would prefer that it be otherwise, but the truth is different.

All we need to do is take a look at the stories from—well, let's pick last week. Russia is threatening to point nuclear weapons at Danish military ships, trying to bully another European country into not playing a role in NATO and its missile defense shield, in particular.

In the Middle East, Yemen is on the brink of a civil war that would bring

even more instability to an already unstable region.

Then there is Iran. Just this last weekend, the Supreme Leader of the regime that the Obama administration is so committed to working out a nuclear deal with called for “death to America.”

The American people understand this is an increasingly dangerous world and we are not safer today than we were when this administration started. In fact, things are more tenuous, less stable.

Last month, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified before Congress that after the final analysis is complete, the year 2014 is likely to go down as “the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled.” That is a quote—“the most lethal year for global terrorism in the 45 years such data has been compiled.”

Preliminary data for the first 9 months of 2014 shows nearly 13,000 terrorist attacks across the world that have taken the lives of 31,000 people. That is just the first 9 months of 2014. With so many different threats out there, and untold twists and turns in global security in the coming months and years, we need a national defense that ensures our armed services are prepared not just to respond to today's threats but tomorrow's threats, whenever and wherever they occur.

The brave men and women who serve in the Armed Forces are, without a doubt, the best in the world. But they cannot fight wars and they cannot keep us safe, they cannot maintain the peace, without the backing from Congress to ensure they have the resources they need. This budget we will pass this week does just that. It keeps that sacred bond and commitment to our men and women in uniform, and it, in effect, says to them: If you are brave enough and you are patriotic enough to serve in the U.S. military, we will make sure you have the resources necessary to do your job.

The budget we are debating today provides \$612 billion in defense spending for this year. Some people may say: That is too much money. Well, the fact is we know that the United States is the one irreplaceable national security force in the world, not just for us but also for our friends and allies.

A strong America, as Ronald Reagan demonstrated, means a more peaceful world. Ironically, those who want to slash our defense spending and say, we cannot afford it, are sending a signal that America is retreating from the world stage. When America retreats and its leadership recedes, then the bullies and thugs and pirates fill that gap. It is a law of nature.

This budget will provide certainty and stability in funding for our armed services, as they will not be required to make across-the-board spending cuts

this year. In fact, under our budget, defense spending increases every year after fiscal year 2016. But the truth is, we do not have a crystal ball. We cannot forecast future world events that our armed services will need to respond to. That is why this budget also includes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow our military to react to a changing threat situation and make additional investments as necessary throughout the 10-year budget window. This fund could be used to further invest in world-class training for our armed services or otherwise enhance military readiness, or even modernize critical military platforms.

In other words, this fund will help Congress work together to increase defense spending further and to keep our commitment, not just to the brave volunteers who wear the uniform of the U.S. military, but our commitment as Members of Congress to do our job and to make sure the Federal Government does its job when it comes to national security. It does so while maintaining fiscal discipline.

I am committed to working with my colleagues to achieve both of these goals. It is so important for our military to stay prepared, because the problems facing our country have rarely been more significant. That is not just my assessment, that is the assessment of Dr. Henry Kissinger, the former Secretary of State.

Earlier this year at the Senate Armed Services Committee, Dr. Kissinger said, "The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War."

Let me say that again. "The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War."

The scale of the challenges we face is matched by the consequences of us handling these challenges poorly and failing to meet our responsibilities as Members of Congress to make sure our men and women in uniform have the resources they need to do the job we have asked them to do and which they have volunteered to do.

That is why it is so vitally important that we continue our commitment to our armed services, that we fund them fully and we give them the flexibility to react to changing conditions around the world. This budget does all of that. As threats continue to mount, this budget will ensure the U.S. military remains unrivaled and that it has the tools it needs to keep our country and the rest of the world peaceful and safe.

Mr. President, later on this afternoon, we are going to give all Members of the Senate a chance to vote on the President's proposed budget. I will vote no. That is probably no surprise to anyone, but I think everyone in this Chamber deserves the opportunity to express themselves by voting on the President's proposed budget.

## AMENDMENT NO. 357

(Purpose: To raise taxes and spending by enacting President Obama's fiscal year 2016 budget)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN] proposes an amendment numbered 357.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. If the Senator from South Carolina comes to the floor, which I believe he will, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to engage in a colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## UKRAINE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, on Sunday, I was in the city of Chicago. I had been invited by the Ukrainian-American community to speak to a large gathering. There are many Ukrainian Americans who have chosen the city of Chicago to live in and work. They have made an enormous contribution to the city and to the State of Illinois.

I spoke to several hundred, some of whom had not that long ago been in Ukraine. It was very moving because these people who love America but also love the country of their birth or origin are now watching their country being dismembered by Vladimir Putin and the Russians and watching the United States of America fail to help them, literally, at all.

In case my colleagues have forgotten, the United States of America, this President, has refused to provide not only defensive weapons to Ukraine—I would remind you what we all know; that there are literally hundreds, if not thousands, of Russian troops inside of eastern Ukraine, Russian weapons. Remember, it was Russian equipment—if not Russians themselves—that shot

down the Malaysian jetliner, and we have sat by and watched it on the delusory view of the President of the United States that he doesn't want to "provoke Vladimir Putin."

The Senator from South Carolina and I predicted every single move Vladimir Putin has taken. By the way, I am pleased to be again sanctioned by Vladimir Putin. I wear it as a badge of honor.

So we have watched as they went into Crimea, in order that Vladimir Putin could have the naval base at Sevastopol, then into eastern Ukraine.

Then a Malaysian airliner was shot down. We all seem to have forgotten about that. Sanctions have been imposed on Vladimir Putin, none of which have had any significant effect, and the aggression continues.

Now there is a pause while more Russian equipment comes into eastern Ukraine, and his next target will be the city of Mariupol so he can complete his land bridge ambition to Crimea.

Right now, he is having to resupply Crimea from air and sea, which is very expensive, but Mariupol will be next. Then, depending on whether he gets away with it, the pressure will increase on Moldova, and pressures are already being exerted on the Baltic countries as well.

Our European friends, with the leadership of the United States of America, is conducting itself in the finest tradition of Neville Chamberlain. It was in the 1930s when we watched Hitler go into one area of another, usually in the name of "German-speaking peoples."

So I must say the people—the wonderful Ukrainian-American group I spoke to on Saturday—is puzzled, sad, and angry that the United States of America will not even give them weapons with which to defend themselves.

We have given them, my dear friends, MREs. We have gone from the West and democracy's arsenal to the West's linen closet.

So I say, again, this is a shameful chapter in American history. It is shameful. It is shameful we will not at least provide these people with weapons to defend themselves as they watch for the first time in 70 years a European nation being dismembered.

Have no doubt about Vladimir Putin's ambitions, it is the restoration of the Russian Empire, and no one should have any illusions about that. Unless a stand is taken, day after day, week after week, Vladimir Putin, diverting attention from his economic troubles, will continue to commit aggression until he feels he has restored the old Russian Empire.

We are writing a shameful chapter in American history, the nation that used to stand up for people who were struggling for freedom and assist them. I remind my colleagues that the Ukrainians are not asking for a single American boot on the ground, they are just

asking for weapons to defend themselves. Isn't that shameful.

#### MIDDLE EAST

Mr. President, I wish to speak about the Middle East. First, let me remind you of a couple of comments in recent months that the President of the United States has made, one concerning ISIS, which has now moved into Africa, Libya, and Tunisia—recent attacks. Of course, we know about their caliphate that they have set up in Iraq and Syria. Boko Haram has declared their allegiance. They are spreading like an epidemic.

The President of the United States said, speaking of ISIS: "The analogy we use around here sometimes, and I think is accurate, is if a jayvee team puts on Lakers uniforms that doesn't make them Kobe Bryant."

I say to my colleagues, I am not making that up. That is what the President of the United States said about ISIS.

Then, he said recently:

Over the last several years, we have consistently taken the fight to terrorists who threaten our country. We have targeted al Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen—

In Yemen—

and recently eliminated the top commander of its affiliate in Somalia.

This strategy of taking out terrorists who threaten us, while supporting partners on the front lines, is one we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years.

Is one that we have successfully pursued in Yemen and Somalia for years.

Again, I tell my colleagues, I am not making this up.

Then, of course, Iran. The White House has repeatedly slammed the Israeli Prime Minister for comments made during an election campaign, statements he has clarified or apologized for.

But the White House continues to threaten a reassessment of American policy toward Israel because "words matter." That is what the White House spokesman said—"words matter."

But when Iran's Ayatollah Khamenei chanted "Death to America" in a recent address, the White House dismissed the remarks as aimed at a domestic, political audience.

General Petraeus said on March 20: "The Islamic State isn't our biggest problem in Iraq."

Our biggest problem in Iraq, according to General Petraeus, is Iran. He is right.

ISIS is a terrible and awful disease that is afflicting the Middle East and may in Africa. But when you look at what the Iranians are doing, they are in Sanaa in Yemen, they are in Baghdad, they are in Beirut, and they are in Damascus.

Today, as we speak, Mr. Soleimani, the head of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, is leading the fight in Tikrit. This is the same head of the Iranian

Revolutionary Guard who sent thousands of copper-tipped IEDs into Iraq while our troops were there fighting and killed hundreds—hundreds—of American soldiers and marines, while we watch them retake the city of Tikrit, and then we will get the credit with the Iraqi people.

So David Petraeus, in answer to the question, "You have had some interaction with Qasem Soleimani in the past. Could you tell us about those," Petraeus talks about those he met with:

When I met with the senior Iraqi, he conveyed the message: "General Petraeus, you should be aware that I, Qasem Soleimani, control Iran's policy for Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Gaza, and Afghanistan."

That is what Soleimani claimed. It was probably not true at the time, but there is very little doubt that Soleimani and the Iranians are on the move. Our Arab friends, whether they be the Saudis, the UAE or many others, are keenly aware of this movement and success of the Iranians.

Very frankly, they do not understand this Faustian bargain that is now being attempted to be concluded by this administration and the Iranians in the form of a nuclear agreement, somehow thinking that if there is this nuclear agreement—and I am not on the floor today to talk about it—that somehow there will be a whole new relationship with Iran, the same people who recently said: "Death to Israel."

So you can understand why our friends in the Middle East and the Sunni-Arab countries are finding their own way, developing their own strategy, and have no confidence in the United States of America.

#### ISRAEL

Lately, there has been a lot of pressure on Israel as a result of the only free and fair election that you will see take place in that entire part of the world. There has been a harsh criticism of the things Prime Minister Netanyahu said during that campaign.

I point out to my colleagues sometimes things are said in campaigns that maybe we say in the heat of the campaign and maybe it is OK if we apologize.

Today, one of the most astute observers, in my view, Bret Stephens of the Wall Street Journal, had some advice for the Israelis. From his article in this morning's Wall Street Journal entitled "The Orwellian Obama Presidency":

Here is my advice to the Israeli government, along with every other country being treated disdainfully by this crass administration: Repay contempt with contempt. Mr. Obama plays to classic bully type. He is abusive and surly only toward those he feels are either too weak, or too polite, to hit back. The Saudis figured that out in 2013, after Mr. Obama failed to honor his promises on Syria; they turned down a seat on the security council, spoke openly about acquiring nuclear weapons from Pakistan, and tanked the price of oil, mainly as a weapon against Iran.

Now Mr. Obama is nothing if not solicitous of the Saudi Highnesses.

The Israelis will need to chart their own path of resistance. On the Iranian nuclear deal, they may have to go rogue. Let's hope their warnings have not been mere bluffs. Israel survived its first 19 years without meaningful U.S. patronage. For now, all it has to do is get through the next 22, admittedly long, months.

I note the presence of my colleague from South Carolina, and I guess my question to him is: How in the world do we justify this delusionary idea that somehow an agreement with Iran on nuclear weapons—and I am not asking to go into the details of it now, because my colleague and I are in agreement that it is an agreement, as Henry Kissinger described, that was once designed to eliminate nuclear weapons and is now designed to delay Iranian acquisition of nuclear weapons—how do we translate that into believing that people who chant "Death to America" are going to be our friends, particularly in light of their aggression throughout the region and their successful movement in these parts of the world?

Mr. GRAHAM. If I could give my best answer to that, No. 1—and my colleague from Arizona has been more right than wrong for the last 4 years about what was going to happen in the Mideast if we made the choices the President made—No. 1, my colleague said if we don't leave any troops behind in Iraq, all our gains will come unraveled. At the end of the day, the sectarian rise in violence was a direct result of, I think, American troops leaving Iraq. We had a good thing going after the surge. It did work. After drawing the redline against Assad and doing nothing about it, ISIL was able to fill in that vacuum.

But here is the question: Given Iran's behavior today, what would they do with the extra money that would come into their coffers if sanctions were lifted? Let's say we got a nuclear deal tomorrow, and as a result of that deal sanctions would be lifted. Without a nuclear program, the Ayatollahs are wreaking havoc throughout the region. The pro-American government in Yemen has been taken down by Houthi militias funded by Iran. Assad in Syria has killed 220,000 of his own people and he is a puppet of Iran. John Kerry said that Assad was Iran's puppet. We have Lebanon, where Hezbollah is an agent of Iran that saved Assad and creating discontent all over the region. We have Shia militias on the ground in Iraq being led by the leader of the Revolutionary Guard in Iran.

So here is the answer to my colleague's question. How could anybody believe the money we would give them for sanction relief would go to hospitals and schools? Don't you think the best evidence of what they would do with money is what they are doing today? The administration has never

tied behavior to sanctions relief. So my big fear, Senator MCCAIN, is that not only would the Arabs want a nuclear weapon of their own if we got a bad deal with Iran, but the money we gave the Iranians would go into their missile program to hit us, would go into further destabilizing the Middle East.

Does my colleague agree that given Iran's behavior there is not one ounce of moderation in this regime? Does my colleague agree there are no moderates in charge of Iran; that when President Obama speaks to the Iranian people, urging them to argue for this deal, they have no voice; that the last time the Iranian people rose up to petition their government they got gunned down? Does my colleague agree with me that President Obama has no idea what is going on inside Iran and no understanding what this regime is up to with the money they already have?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would respond to my friend, I wish the President of the United States, who issued some comment to the Iranian people about the necessity of a nuclear agreement, would have spoken up in 2009 when thousands and thousands of Iranians were on the streets in Tehran protesting a corrupt election and wanting freedom and he refused. They were chanting "Obama, Obama, are you with us or are you with them?" And he refused to speak out on their behalf. That is when he should have spoken up to the Iranian people.

I would also ask my friend: Is there anyone in Iran who is free to speak up? You either get killed or put in prison if you speak up. So my question is: Who was the President of the United States speaking to with those remarks?

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, all I can say is it would be like telling a North Korean to speak up. That may be a bit of an extreme example, but not too much.

The point we are trying to make to President Obama is that if he believes there is a moderate element in Iran, who are they? Who is in charge of this government he is trying to empower at the expense of the hardliners?

The assembly of experts are the people who pick the next Ayatollah. On March 10, they had an election—I think it was 46 to 24. Ayatollah Yazdi—I don't want to mispronounce his name—won the election to be in charge of the assembly of experts. Their No. 1 goal is to pick the next Ayatollah. He is widely known to be the hardest of the hardliners.

So I want the administration to explain to us, the Congress, who the moderates are and how do you square that circle with the election of the most hardline Ayatollah to pick the next Ayatollah? What information does the President have that there is a moderate element that we can empower in Iran?

Can my colleague name one moderate voice that has a real say in the Iranian Government?

Mr. MCCAIN. Not any who are alive or out of prison. I am sure there are many moderate voices in the Ayatollah's prisons throughout Iran by the tens of thousands.

But I would also ask my colleague: Is it not true that every manifestation of Iranian behavior—whether it be in Baghdad, where they now have significant control; in Beirut, where Hezbollah basically has control of the country; in Damascus—Bashir Assad would not be alive today or in Syria today if it hadn't been for the Iranians flying in hundreds of tons of equipment, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, and bringing Hezbollah out of Lebanon and into Syria. And now we see Soleimani, the leader liberating Tikrit, getting all the publicity. And the people of Iraq, naturally, are thanking him for freeing Tikrit from the forces of ISIS.

One other comment. I know other colleagues are on the floor, but David Petraeus, probably the most brilliant military officer I have ever had the honor of knowing, made a very interesting comment in an interview the other day and I would like my colleague's comment on it. He said the major threat in the Middle East and in the world today is not ISIS. It is not ISIS. He said it was Iran.

I think when we look at a map and we see where the Iranians are now in control, we have to give great credence to General Petraeus's assessment. Would my colleague agree?

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me not only say why I agree, but here is what is about to happen in the Mideast. Because of our lack of leadership, the Iranians have gone on a rampage. My colleague had a very august group of people today—some of the smartest people in the Mideast and the country, leading think tank folks—come before the committee today, and I asked the question: Do you agree with me that Iran is wreaking havoc? Three out of four said yes. The one lady said seriously destabilizing.

Whatever adjective you want to use, it is commonly viewed that the Iranian regime is projecting power in the most disruptive manner in recent memory. They are backing people who took down the pro-Yemen Government, and now we have lost the ability to follow Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula that is responsible for the attack in Paris.

Assad wouldn't last, as my colleague said, 5 minutes, and the Assad regime, which has killed 220,000 people and driven over a million people out of Syria, is putting pressure on Lebanon and Jordan.

The Shia militia on the ground today are probably war criminals by any classic definition, and they are being led by Soleimani, the head of the Revolutionary Guard, the biggest exporter of terrorism in the world.

Mr. MCCAIN. And responsible for the deaths of hundreds and hundreds of

American marines and soldiers. What do we tell their mothers?

Mr. GRAHAM. Exactly. So the point we are trying to make to the President and the Members of this body is that Iran is on a rampage without a nuclear weapon. Clearly they are not a moderate regime trying to live peacefully with their neighbors. They are trying to disrupt the whole Mideast and have influence unlike at any other time.

Here is what is going to happen. The Arabs in the region are going to push back. They no longer trust us. Remember when the head of the Saudi Arabian intelligence community said it is better to be America's enemy than her friend? We heard this twice in the Mideast on our recent tour—that people believe Iran is getting a better deal from America being her enemy than the traditional friends of this country.

So here is what is going to happen. Turkey is going to align with the Sunni Arab world and go after Iran themselves, and we are going to have a Sunni-Shia war the likes of which we haven't seen in 1,000 years, because without American leadership the whole place is falling apart.

Here is the legacy of Barack Obama. He tried to change the Mideast by giving speeches. And every time he was told by military leaders you should do A, he did B. He has reached out to the Ayatollahs, not understanding who he is talking to. He has empowered the most brutal, vicious, murderers on the planet today in Iran.

This Ayatollah in Iran is not a good man. He has blood on his hands.

The President is talking to the people who killed our soldiers by the hundreds. He is giving them resources they wouldn't have otherwise, and he is making a deal with the devil. At the end of the day, this is blowing up in our face.

If the President doesn't self-correct, we are all in trouble. And if this Congress sits on the sidelines and allows this nuclear deal with Iran to go unchecked, and we don't look at it and vote on it, then we own the consequences of it.

To every Member of this body I say: We have an independent duty, as does the President of the United States, to make sure the deal we do with Iran is a good deal for America and not a nightmare for the world. So we are asking our colleagues to take their independent duty seriously. We have a check-and-balance responsibility. Do not let this administration do a deal with the Ayatollahs in Iran who go to the United Nations and bypass us. If it is a good deal, we will vote for it.

As strongly as I know how to say it, I am telling my colleagues that our policies in the Mideast are failing, Iran is the biggest winner of America leading from behind, all our traditional allies are in a world of hurt, and they are going to take matters in their own hands.

I thank Senator MCCAIN for his leadership and for telling America about the right choices, even though they are the hard choices. I will continue to work with my colleague as long as I can to speak truth to what I think is the biggest foreign policy disaster in my lifetime unfolding before our very eyes.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Wall Street Journal article entitled "The Orwellian Obama Presidency," by Bret Stephens.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, March 23, 2015]

THE ORWELLIAN OBAMA PRESIDENCY  
(By Bret Stephens)

Under Mr. Obama, friends are enemies, denial is wisdom, capitulation is victory.

The humiliating denouement to America's involvement in Yemen came over the weekend, when U.S. Special Forces were forced to evacuate a base from which they had operated against the local branch of al Qaeda. This is the same branch that claimed responsibility for the January attack on Charlie Hebdo and has long been considered to pose the most direct threat to Europe and the United States.

So who should Barack Obama be declaring war on in the Middle East other than the state of Israel?

There is an upside-down quality to this president's world view. His administration is now on better terms with Iran—whose Houthi proxies, with the slogan "God is great, death to America, death to Israel, damn the Jews, power to Islam," just deposed Yemen's legitimate president—than it is with Israel. He claims we are winning the war against Islamic State even as the group continues to extend its reach into Libya, Yemen and Nigeria.

He treats Republicans in the Senate as an enemy when it comes to the Iranian nuclear negotiations, while treating the Russian foreign ministry as a diplomatic partner. He favors the moral legitimacy of the United Nations Security Council to that of the U.S. Congress. He is facilitating Bashar Assad's war on his own people by targeting ISIS so the Syrian dictator can train his fire on our ostensible allies in the Free Syrian Army.

He was prepared to embrace a Muslim Brother as president of Egypt but maintains an arm's-length relationship with his popular pro-American successor. He has no problem keeping company with Al Sharpton and tagging an American police department as comprehensively racist but is nothing if not adamant that the words "Islamic" and "terrorism" must on no account ever be conjoined. The deeper that Russian forces advance into Ukraine, the more they violate cease-fires, the weaker the Kiev government becomes, the more insistent he is that his response to Russia is working.

To adapt George Orwell's motto to Oceania: Under Mr. Obama, friends are enemies, denial is wisdom, capitulation is victory.

The current victim of Mr. Obama's moral inversions is the recently re-elected Israeli prime minister. Normally a sweeping democratic mandate reflects legitimacy, but not for Mr. Obama. Now we are treated to the astonishing spectacle in which Benjamin Netanyahu has become persona non grata for

his comments doubting the current feasibility of a two-state solution. This, while his Palestinian counterpart Mahmoud Abbas is in the 11th year of his four-year term, without a murmur of protest from the White House.

It is true that Mr. Netanyahu made an ugly election-day remark about Israeli-Arab voters "coming out in droves to the polls," thereby putting "the right-wing government in danger." For this he has apologized, in person, to leaders of the Israeli-Arab community.

That's more than can be said for Mr. Abbas, who last year threatened Israel with a global religious war if Jews were allowed to pray in the Temple Mount's Al Aqsa mosque. "We will not allow our holy places to be contaminated," the Palestinian Authority president said. The Obama administration insists that Mr. Abbas is "the best interlocutor Israel is ever going to have."

Maybe that's true, but if so it only underscores the point Mr. Netanyahu was making in the first place—and for which Mr. Obama now threatens a fundamental reassessment of U.S. relations with Israel. In 2014 Mr. Abbas agreed to a power-sharing agreement with Hamas, a deal breaker for any Israeli interested in peace. In 2010 he used the expiration of a 10-month Israeli settlement freeze as an excuse to abandon bilateral peace efforts. In 2008 he walked away from a statehood offer from then-Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert. In 2000 he was with Yasser Arafat at Camp David when the Palestinians turned down a deal from Israel's Ehud Barak.

And so on. For continuously rejecting good-faith Israeli offers, Mr. Abbas may be about to get his wish: a U.S. vote for Palestinian statehood at the United Nations. For tiring of constant Palestinian bad faith—and noting the fact—Israel will now be treated to pariah-nation status by Mr. Obama.

Here is my advice to the Israeli government, along with every other country being treated disdainfully by this crass administration: Repay contempt with contempt. Mr. Obama plays to classic bully type. He is abusive and surly only toward those he feels are either too weak, or too polite, to hit back.

The Saudis figured that out in 2013, after Mr. Obama failed to honor his promises on Syria; they turned down a seat on the Security Council, spoke openly about acquiring nuclear weapons from Pakistan and tanked the price of oil, mainly as a weapon against Iran. Now Mr. Obama is nothing if not solicitous of the Saudi highnesses.

The Israelis will need to chart their own path of resistance. On the Iranian nuclear deal, they may have to go rogue: Let's hope their warnings have not been mere bluffs. Israel survived its first 19 years without meaningful U.S. patronage. For now, all it has to do is get through the next 22, admittedly long, months.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleagues for their patience.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, before the Senators from Arizona and South Carolina leave the floor, I want to say a couple of words about their contribution to our collective efforts on the budget.

As I said a moment ago, the No. 1 priority for the Federal Government is national security. And while we are all

concerned about runaway spending—and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has been quite determined to rein that in by producing a balanced budget over the next 10 years—it is due to the leadership of the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from South Carolina, along with our other colleagues on the Committee on the Budget, who also happen to serve on the Committee on Armed Services, who I think have led us to a much better place—a place where we can all feel better that we are closer to making sure our military has the resources they need in order to meet the commitments we have asked them to make.

We maybe have a few things we need to still talk about, and we will keep talking until we get it right, but the fact is, without the leadership of the Senators from Arizona and South Carolina and others on the Committee on the Budget, we wouldn't be where we are today and able to hold our heads up high and say we believe in our duty to our men and women in uniform, we believe in America's leadership role in the world, and we will not shrink from that.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 471

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed on behalf of Senator WYDEN, Ranking Member SANDERS, and myself to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 471.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE], for Mr. WYDEN, for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN, proposes an amendment numbered 471.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would cut benefits, raise the retirement age, or privatize Social Security)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ POINT OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill,

joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction of benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) increase either the early or full retirement age for benefits described in paragraph (1); or

(3) privatize Social Security.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, for my colleagues, this is an amendment which relates to protecting Social Security.

Social Security is a program that has been an enormous success, that is at the heart of the American middle class, and that represents a solemn promise our seniors have earned over a lifetime of work. It makes a real difference in real people's lives. It is the difference between comfort and poverty for over 20 million Americans.

Rhode Island is a State where we count on Social Security. We value Social Security. We know how important it is. What I have heard firsthand from Rhode Island seniors over and over again is they want to make sure this program is solid and remains strong, not just for them but for their children and their grandchildren.

Sadly, for decades, the history of the Republican Party has been one of repeated attempts to undermine this bedrock of middle-class retirement security, proposing over and over again various types of security cuts and, believe it or not, even turning Social Security's assets over to Wall Street to manage.

This Democratic amendment establishes a point of order against any legislation that would reduce Social Security benefits, that would increase the Social Security retirement age, or that would privatize the program. This would help our moderate friends protect Social Security from rightwing attacks, and it would ensure that seniors, as a part of their American experience, can continue to count on benefits they have earned.

Social Security is at present projected to remain fully solvent through 2033. It does not drive our current budget deficits and should not be sacrificed to the quarrels over the budget. Ultimately, I think we will need to strengthen Social Security, and when we do, simply asking the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share into the system can make that difference. Simply asking the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share into the system can extend it another 50 years, while also making our tax system fairer to the middle class. So it is a true

win-win. And we want to make sure we do not have to watch Rhode Island seniors and seniors across the country pay the price for a deficit they had no part in creating.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island not only for his important remarks but for the work he has been doing for years to protect and defend Social Security.

Let's be clear about a number of facts. When people jump up and say Social Security is going broke—not quite true. As Senator WHITEHOUSE indicated, Social Security can pay out every benefit owed to every eligible American for the next 18 years.

When people jump up and say Social Security is contributing to the deficit—also not quite accurate. As everybody knows, Social Security is funded by the payroll tax, an independent source of revenue for Social Security.

The fact is that for many, many years, in a variety of ways, my Republican colleagues have been attempting to either cut Social Security or, in the extreme case, privatize Social Security and allow—force—Americans to go to Wall Street for their retirement benefits.

While this budget does not include a provision to cut Social Security, what I will say is, if my memory is correct, in three out of the four hearings held by the Budget Committee, there were Republican representatives—people who were asked to testify—who did talk about various ways to cut Social Security.

So what this amendment does is it establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund—it establishes a budget point of order which prevents benefit cuts, a raise in the retirement age, or the privatization of Social Security benefits. That is what it does.

Now we are going to have a lot of people coming up here and saying: Well, we want to preserve Social Security.

What they really mean is that in order to preserve Social Security, they want to cut Social Security benefits—maybe not for the people on Social Security today but for future beneficiaries.

They say: Well, that is the only way we can protect Social Security.

Well, that is not accurate. I introduced legislation which, in fact, makes Social Security not only solvent until the year 2065—50 years from today—but also expands benefits. We do that by saying that it is currently very absurd that a multimillionaire is paying the same amount of money into the Social Security trust fund as somebody making \$118,000. There are some very wealthy people who are paying all of their Social Security taxes in the first day or two of the year.

Right now, we have a situation where millions of people in this country depend upon Social Security, people who are getting benefits of \$12,000, \$13,000, \$14,000 a year. That is how they are living. Those benefits should not be cut.

When we talk about a so-called chained CPI, which cuts COLAs for seniors and disabled vets, what we are talking about is cutting Social Security benefits for an average 65-year-old by more than \$658 a year by the time that person reaches age 75 and a cut of more than \$1,100 a year by the time that person reaches age 85. Those are very significant cuts for people who are trying to live on \$13,000 or \$14,000 a year.

So here is the argument. Is Social Security important? Obviously, it is. As the middle class continues to decline, Social Security is enormously important for the elderly and the disabled people of this country.

Point No. 2: Do we have to cut benefits in order to save Social Security? The answer is, obviously, yes. But we are back to the same old question we debate all day here. Our Republican friends seem absolutely determined not to ask the wealthiest people in this country who are doing phenomenally well to contribute to the well-being of the American people. That is this overall budget. But on the issue of Social Security, what we have to do is raise the cap, which is now at \$118,000, and start it at \$250,000. Just doing that will enable us to expand Social Security to the year 2065 and expand benefits for lower income seniors.

This point of order is enormously important. It says there will be a need for 60 votes for any effort to cut Social Security, to raise the retirement—I don't know what world some people are living in. There are some who have come forward and said we should raise the Social Security retirement age to 70. Let's have people out there working at 68, 69, 70 years of age. Let's force them to keep working before they get their benefits. My God, that is a horrendous idea. They also say we should cut COLAs—cost-of-living adjustments—for disabled vets. What a terrible idea.

There is a way to extend Social Security for many decades and to expand benefits. This amendment says: Do not cut Social Security.

I think a number of my Republican friends will say: Well, we are not going to cut Social Security for anybody on Social Security today. That is not good enough. There are people out there who are 50, 55, 60, 63, 64, and they want to know that the benefits they will get are the benefits they will be able to live on. Don't cut benefits for working people, and that is what this very important amendment is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 4:40



p.m. today be equally divided between the managers or their designees and that at 4:40 p.m., the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Sanders amendment No. 474, a side-by-side to the Ayotte amendment; Ayotte amendment No. 400 on vets; Fischer amendment No. 409, a side-by-side to the Mikulski amendment; Mikulski amendment No. 362 on equal pay; a Hatch amendment, the text of which is at the desk; Wyden amendment No. 471 on Social Security; and Cornyn amendment No. 357, the President's budget.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided between the managers or their designees prior to each vote, and that all votes after the first in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, there will be up to four rollover votes at 4:40 p.m.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 471

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont. I wish to add my support to our ranking member's remarks.

At present, somebody making \$110 million a year—and there are people who make \$110 million a year in this country—will make the same contribution or less to Social Security as somebody making \$110,000 a year in salary. At best, they will pay the same despite the fact that they are making 1,000 times more. At worst, they will pay even less into it because they have treated their income as capital gains and they have dodged the payroll tax on it. To me, that makes no sense, particularly when more and more of our national income is moving up into the top 1 percent, the top 2 percent, the top one-tenth of 1 percent.

In fact, there has been a pronounced effect on Social Security's balances just from the increased income inequality. More and more of the income generated in the United States of America is moving to the wealthiest people, and that means the amount of income under \$110,000 that is subject to taxation for Social Security is a smaller fraction of the total income package than it was before, which means there will be less income to support Social Security, and that is a significant part of why Social Security is underfunded and why it may only last for the next 18 years instead of longer.

First of all, I think Social Security is so important that even if there were not this fairness discrepancy, it is worth it to our country to have people know that they and their aunts and their uncles and their grandparents

have the security of Social Security, and we should protect it at virtually all costs.

But even if that alone were not sufficient, the fact that everybody making under \$110,000 supports Social Security and the billionaires make no greater contribution and perhaps less of a contribution than regular working folks is completely backward and completely wrong, but, unfortunately, that is the principle of primacy in this Republican budget. The principle of primacy in this Republican budget is that every tax loophole is sacred. Every tax loophole is to be defended at all costs. It doesn't matter what you have to cut, it doesn't matter what harm you have to do to Social Security or to other programs, nothing matters as much to this Republican budget as protecting every tax loophole.

When we consider who has the clout around here in this country to get tax loopholes, guess what—it is the corporations and it is the wealthy. Those are the guys who really do the mischief.

There are other tax protections for the middle class, and nobody wants to change those. But these tax loopholes that move jobs overseas and pay for that and allow companies to pretend their intellectual property is in another country when they only have half-a-dozen employees there and they are running big time across our country because they locate themselves for tax purposes in a tax haven—there is no benefit to that. We should fix that. But in this budget, all of that is kept sacred. It is the highest primary principle of this budget to defend every corporate tax loophole and every loophole that helps millionaires and billionaires, and I happen to think that is wrong.

We brought this up over and over again in the hearings in the Budget Committee. We have heard from experts—not only experts brought in by the Democrats, we even heard from experts brought in by the Republicans who said that revenue has to be part of the solution to our deficit and that many of these tax loopholes are—there is no justification for them. Even with this testimony and that support in the record, this budget still stands by its principle of Republican primacy, and that is that every tax loophole is sacred.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. How much time remains on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 6½ minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this is a very important amendment, and I hope the American people are listening.

Social Security is probably the most important Federal program ever devel-

oped in the modern history of this country. It is an enormously popular program, and it has been an enormously effective program. The truth is that it has significantly reduced poverty among seniors. Before Social Security, about 50 percent of seniors lived in poverty. Today, while the number is too high, it is somewhere around 10 percent.

The extraordinary beauty of Social Security is that in good times and in bad times—in an economic boom, depression, or recession—Social Security has paid out every check owed to every eligible American without fail. No one has ever received a letter that said: You know, we are in the middle of a recession, so we have to cut your benefits in half. That has never been the case. We take it for granted, but that is an extraordinary record.

Because we have a number of Republicans who simply do not like government programs, there has been for many years an effort to either cut or privatize Social Security and give it over to Wall Street. What we hear are a lot of misleading arguments. The argument is, well, Social Security is unsustainable, and it is not going to be there. And they throw out all of these reasons. But the answer is that Social Security is absolutely sustainable, but, as Senator WHITEHOUSE just indicated, we have to deal with issues such as income and wealth inequality, which has resulted in a significant reduction in the solvency of Social Security because people's incomes have not risen, and therefore they contribute less to the Social Security trust fund, or many other people have gone way above the cap and are still paying less than they should.

The Republicans' solution seems to be—and I think there will be a side-by-side amendment that will say: Well, we are not going to cut Social Security benefits for those who are in the program right now. But essentially their language says that they will cut benefits for future retirees, people who are 55, 60, and 63 years of age. When we have so many seniors and elderly people who are struggling right now to make ends meet, I think the last thing in the world we should do is cut Social Security.

Over half of all Americans have less than \$10,000 in savings, and these people, when they reach Social Security age, do not want to see their benefits cut. Two-thirds of seniors depend on Social Security for more than half of their income, and one-third depend on Social Security for almost all of their income. These people do not want to see their benefits cut.

Just 2 weeks ago, Senator WHITEHOUSE and I accepted petitions from 2 million people which said loudly and clearly: Do not cut Social Security. And in the polling I have seen in these tough economic times, Republicans say



do not cut Social Security, Democrats say do not cut Social Security, and Independents say do not cut Social Security. Yet what our Republican friends are saying is that if you are 55, 60, or 63 and are not yet on Social Security, beware because we are prepared to cut your Social Security. Maybe we will raise the retirement age or maybe we will cut your COLAs through a so-called chained CPI.

I will say as the former chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee that virtually every veterans organization has been loud and clear in opposition to the chained CPI because they understand that chained CPI does not just cut benefits for seniors, it cuts benefits for disabled veterans. Do we really want to be cutting benefits for disabled veterans? I hope we will not.

This is a very important amendment. It is an amendment that says: If you stand with the overwhelming majority of the American people who say we should not cut Social Security—yes, let's move forward to make it solvent beyond the 18 years that it is solvent, but do not cut benefits, do not cut COLAs, and do not raise the retirement age.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

AMENDMENT NO. 400

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 400.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Ms. AYOTTE] proposes an amendment numbered 400.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to maintain and enhance access, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Choice Card program under section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE ACCESS, CHOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN VETERANS CARE THROUGH THE VETERANS CHOICE CARD PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining and enhancing ac-

cess, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Choice Card program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, last year in this body, we heard and saw evidence about what was happening at some of our VA facilities—the manipulated wait lists, the delays our veterans had to endure—and, unfortunately, some of our veterans died waiting for care.

We passed a bipartisan bill, one on which we all worked together, and I appreciate that Senator SANDERS worked very hard on that bill. The Veterans Choice Program was part of that bipartisan bill, but this program has yet to be implemented in the way this body intended. The goal was to expedite care for veterans who had been waiting longer than 30 days or who live farther than 40 miles away from the VA hospital. In my home State of New Hampshire, we don't have a full-service veterans hospital, so too often our veterans are driving long distances—to Massachusetts or to other locations—to get the care they earned for having served and sacrificed so much for our country.

Recently, a study conducted by the VFW found that 92 percent of program-eligible veterans were interested in non-VA or private care options that they could go to. Yet that same survey found that 80 percent of eligible veterans were unable to access the Veterans Choice Program.

Barely 2 months after the program started—and we worked on it on a bipartisan basis in this Congress—the administration announced plans to divert money from this important program by saying it was underutilized. Let's be clear. It is underutilized because the VA is not implementing it properly. Veterans are not being told their rights, and we owe it to them to get this Veterans Choice Program right and give veterans the choice they want for private care options so they are not driving or waiting in line, given what they have done for our country.

Our veterans chose to fight on our behalf. We should honor the work we did together and ensure that this program is properly implemented by the VA, which is not happening right now. Our veterans want this choice. Let's get this veterans program right.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which, again, is an amendment designed to support what we intended in this body—to ensure that veterans don't have to wait in line, that they can exercise private care options when they want to, thereby giving them the choice for the sacrifices they have made for this country. They deserve nothing less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 481

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 481.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. COTTON] proposes an amendment numbered 481.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral fund relating to supporting Israel)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING ISRAEL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to United States policy toward Israel, which may include preventing the United Nations and other international institutions from taking unfair or discriminatory action against Israel, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, since its founding in 1948, Israel has been a strong and steadfast ally to the United States in the Middle East, a region characterized by instability and violence.

The U.S.-Israel relationship is built on mutual respect for common values, including a commitment to democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, and ethnic and religious diversity.

Last week, President Obama and other administration officials suggested a fundamental rethinking of this alliance, citing Prime Minister Netanyahu's simple restatement of fact that there can be no Palestinian State until conditions change. The Palestinian Authority must, at a minimum, eject Hamas from its governing coalition, reclaim control of the Gaza Strip, accept a demilitarized eastern border, and recognize Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State.

Further, Prime Minister Netanyahu recently reiterated these points and his support for a two-state solution in principle. In this light, any suggestion that the United States may reconsider our support for Israel—especially our

support at the United Nations—is wrongheaded and shortsighted, because the United Nations, regrettably, has consistently employed a double standard in its treatment of Israel, making false allegations against Israel while, even worse, ignoring even worse behavior by other countries.

The U.N. has often questioned Israel's legitimacy—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COTTON. I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. The U.N. Human Rights Council has focused obsessively on Israel. The U.N. General Assembly has adopted 21 resolutions singling out Israel.

Because of this regrettable history, my amendment lays the groundwork for a restriction of funding to the United Nations should it take unfair and discriminatory action against Israel or attempt to impose a final settlement on Israel and the P.A.

My hope is this will not be necessary, but this Congress should be prepared to take actions to defend the U.S.-Israel alliance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 498

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up the Hatch amendment No. 498.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for Mr. HATCH, proposes an amendment numbered 498.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to legislation submitted to Congress by President Obama to protect and strengthen Social Security)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LEGISLATION SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to legislation submitted to Congress by the President of the United States to protect current beneficiaries of the Social Security program and prevent the insolvency of

the program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Vermont.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 474

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 474.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] proposes an amendment numbered 474.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect and strengthen the Department of Veterans Affairs, hire more health care professionals for the Department, and ensure quality and timely access to health care for all veterans)

At the end of title III, add the following:

#### SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, HIRE MORE HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS FOR THE DEPARTMENT, AND ENSURE QUALITY AND TIMELY ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR ALL VETERANS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include legislation that strengthens quality and timely access to health care by hiring more health care professionals at facilities of the Department and making necessary improvements to infrastructure of the Department, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. SANDERS. This side-by-side is a simple and noncontroversial amendment. It creates a deficit-neutral reserve fund so the VA can have the health care professionals—the doctors and nurses—it needs to make sure the VA is providing quality care to all of our veterans in a timely manner. That is about it.

From what I heard—I will speak with Senator AYOTTE a little bit later—her amendment is simply making sure the VA implements the law we passed. I don't have any objection to that and I don't know that anyone should.

Our amendment simply says we want the VA to have the medical personnel—

doctors, nurses, and staff—it needs to provide quality and timely health care to our veterans. I hope it will receive unanimous agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 474, offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, this is a pretty simple and straightforward amendment. Senator AYOTTE mentioned a moment ago we have had problems at the VA. No question about it; veterans have waited too long to get the timely and quality care they need. What this amendment does is establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect and strengthen the Department of Veterans Affairs, to hire more health care professionals for the Department, and ensure quality and timely access to health care for all veterans.

If we talk to veterans organizations, they think the care within the VA is good once people get in there. I want to make sure we have the doctors and nurses to provide the quality and timely care our veterans deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I don't think we have a problem with this amendment. Again, I ask the Senator if he would be willing to voice-vote it.

Mr. SANDERS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the amendment, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 474.

The amendment (No. 474) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 400

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 400.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Does the Chair wish to change places at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Thank you.

(Mr. ENZI assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I urge a "yes" vote on amendment No. 400.

Unfortunately, the bipartisan work we have done on the Veterans Choice Card has not been properly implemented by the VA. Our veterans want this choice of private care. The Senator from Vermont has worked very hard on this issue, which enjoys bipartisan support.

I urge my colleagues to make sure we get this right for our veterans. That is what my amendment does.

Mr. SANDERS. Would the Senator agree to a voice vote?

Ms. AYOTTE. I would.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague from New Hampshire for her work on this amendment with my office. We have successfully completed language that I think moves us forward in the right direction.

I also wish to thank my colleague Senator SANDERS for his tireless efforts on behalf of veterans, indicated most recently by this amendment, which is fully compatible with the Ayotte amendment.

I urge support for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate?

All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 400) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 409

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 409, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, this amendment I think satisfies the desire for all of us to reassert and reaffirm our support for equal pay for equal work.

Senator MIKULSKI spoke earlier about an amendment that I questioned because it ends merit pay, which I think hurts workplace flexibility and truly limits career opportunities for women.

My amendment again reaffirms that support, equal pay for equal work. But it also affirms the course of free speech, because free speech includes the right to discuss wage information with fellow coworkers, and that reflects the President's action that he took in 2014 to prevent retaliation from employers against employees who discuss wages with other employees or seek such information from their employers.

This is an amendment I believe all of us can support. It again reaffirms equal pay for equal work and the nonretaliation clause.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I appreciate Senator FISCHER offering her side-by-side on equal pay. I am glad to see that this is, in fact, a stronger amendment than what my Republican colleagues have offered in the past. However, this amendment still does not go far enough.

In my view, Senator MIKULSKI's amendment is a far better alternative. It is not enough to ban retaliation about discussing salary information. This amendment would not allow women to act on any information they

discovered. It would not give women their day in court and the opportunity to get money owed to them after sometimes months—sometimes years—of discrimination.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mrs. FISCHER.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 81 Leg.]

#### YEAS—56

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Sessions
Corker	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	

#### NAYS—43

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reid
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Shaheen
Cantwell	Markey	Stabenow
Cardin	McCaskill	Tester
Carper	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Warner
Coons	Mikulski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Peters	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 409) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 362

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 362, offered by the Senator from Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI.

The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise to urge the Senate to agree to the

Mikulski amendment on paycheck fairness. This finishes the job we started with Lilly Ledbetter. What it does is not wishful thinking, but the real deal, where employers would be prohibited from retaliation for sharing pay information. Punitive damages would be allowed. So it would be a real deterrent for discriminating on pay. It stops employers from using any reason to pay women less, where they fabricate: "Oh, he is the head of the household," or whatever.

I also then remind my colleagues that in addition to what it does, I will tell you what it does not do. This bill would not require an employer to cut the salaries of male employees. This bill would not have any criminal penalties in it for refusing to disclose wage information. This bill does not require the government to set salaries for Federal employees or anybody.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Mikulski amendment. The specificity of it makes it corrosive to the privilege of the budget. The budget resolution is focused on expanding economic growth, and that growth comes from new jobs—over 1 million jobs, according to the CBO, if our budget takes full effect.

As the economy grows, putting more people to work is our best strategy to increase pay for women and men. We all want women and men to earn equivalent pay for the same job at the same firm. That is why Congress enacted the Equal Pay Act of 1963, which prohibits discrimination in pay on the basis of gender for substantially similar work. Congress also passed Title 7 of the Civil Rights Act to prohibit businesses from discriminating on the basis of sex. These laws empower women to demand equal pay, and they have. The gap has been narrowing.

I ask Senators to vote no on this amendment because of its specificity. It is corrosive to the privilege of the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 82 Leg.]

## YEAS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

## NAYS—54

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Sasse
Cochran	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Sessions
Corker	King	Shelby
Cornyn	Kirk	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Wicker

## NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 362) was rejected.

## AMENDMENT NO. 498

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 498, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, for Mr. HATCH.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, saving Social Security will require Congress to work in a bipartisan fashion, but most of all it will require Presidential leadership.

In 2009, President Obama held a fiscal responsibility summit to talk about the need for entitlement reform. During the summit the President said:

What we have done is kicked this can down the road. We are now at the end of the road and are not in a position to kick it any further. We have to signal seriousness in this by making sure some of the hard decisions are made under my watch, not someone else's.

I agree with what the President said then, even if he hasn't exactly followed his own advice. It is time to roll up our sleeves and get to work.

Every year we delay makes it more difficult to implement gradual reforms to Social Security that will allow us to avoid abrupt changes for future beneficiaries. Delay makes it more difficult for hard-working Americans to gradually adjust their plans and makes it more likely they will be hit with an uncertain blow to benefits or more taxes.

My amendment calls for a reserve fund to allow Congress to consider legislation submitted by President Obama to protect current beneficiaries and

save Social Security for future generations.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Wyden amendment, which does not seem directed at bipartisan discussion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, this is a very important amendment, and I hope the American people listen carefully to what is in it. As Senator HATCH indicated, it protects current beneficiaries. In other words, they are not going to cut benefits for those currently on Social Security. But if you are 63 years of age, 64 years of age, 65 years of age, watch out. They are going after you.

I would suggest there is a way to extend the solvency of Social Security, and it deals with raising the cap and asking wealthy people to contribute more. We can make Social Security solvent for the next 50 years without cutting benefits for anybody. I urge a "no" vote on the Hatch amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 498.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 83 Leg.]

## YEAS—75

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Ayotte	Fischer	Murray
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blumenthal	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Reid
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cantwell	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Carper	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Schumer
Coats	Johnson	Scott
Cochran	Kaine	Sessions
Collins	King	Shaheen
Coons	Kirk	Shelby
Corker	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McCain	Tillis
Donnelly	McCaskill	Toomey
Durbin	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Warner
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker

## NAYS—24

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Booker	Hirono	Reed
Boxer	Leahy	Sanders
Brown	Markey	Schatz
Cardin	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Nelson	Wyden

## NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 498) was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT NO. 471

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 471, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, for the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, colleagues, Social Security is a promise between workers and seniors that should never be broken, and Social Security benefits ought to be protected and should not be cut.

The Congress needs to take steps to ensure that Social Security can pay full benefits for future generations and must avoid creating artificial roadblocks to the proper use of Social Security trust funds.

The House of Representatives has refused to do that even though Social Security trust funds today have a balance of \$2.8 trillion, and should be able to pay all earned benefits until 2033.

Support this amendment. Don't privatize Social Security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I know all my colleagues are committed to preserving Social Security. We all want Social Security to be there for today's and tomorrow's seniors. However, the Wyden amendment is not germane to the budget resolution.

The Finance Committee has jurisdiction over the Social Security program, both its benefits and finance structure. The Budget Committee has no purview over the Social Security program.

Moreover, the Wyden amendment instructs the Finance Committee how to write the legislation—language that is inappropriate for a budget resolution. In fact, it is corrosive. It damages the privilege of the budget.

For this reason, I am compelled, as chairman of the Budget Committee, to raise a point of order against the Wyden amendment. I make a point of order that this amendment violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment is very clear, unlike the Hatch amendment. This amendment says we do not support cuts to Social Security—not for current beneficiaries, not for future beneficiaries. That is what this amendment is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all

applicable sections of the act for purposes of this pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Murphy
Bennet	Heitkamp	Murray
Blumenthal	Heller	Nelson
Booker	Hirono	Peters
Boxer	Hoeven	Portman
Brown	Kaine	Reed
Cantwell	King	Reid
Cardin	Kirk	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Collins	Manchin	Shaheen
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Donnelly	McCain	Tester
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—48

Alexander	Ernst	Perdue
Ayotte	Fischer	Risch
Barrasso	Flake	Roberts
Blunt	Gardner	Rounds
Boozman	Graham	Rubio
Burr	Grassley	Sasse
Capito	Hatch	Scott
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Isakson	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Sullivan
Corker	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	Toomey
Crapo	Moran	Vitter
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Enzi	Paul	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 48.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 357

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 357, offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, President Obama's budget has gotten some pretty rough coverage in the media recently. For example, the Los Angeles Times called the President's annual budget "... a strange, almost fictional document."

An article in Politico said, "As he prepares to deliver his budget on Mon-

day, President Barack Obama is lurching to the left."

Another Politico article said, "It's a progressive's dream version of Obama, untethered from earlier centrist leanings. . . ."

The President's budget has not had a great voting history in the Senate. Since 2011, there were only 2 votes for the President's proposed budget and 1,023 votes against it. This is an opportunity for all Members of the Senate to express their views on President Obama's proposed budget.

I recommend and ask that my colleagues vote no on this budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I don't know whose budget Senator CORNYN is presenting, but it is certainly not the President's budget. The President's budget recommends raising the minimum wage, and that is not in Senator CORNYN's proposal.

The President's budget includes 2 years of free community college. That is what the American people want, and it is not in Senator CORNYN's proposal.

The President's budget talks about a fair tax proposal, not more tax breaks for billionaires, and that is not in Senator CORNYN's proposal.

I will vote no because I am not quite sure what is in Senator CORNYN's proposal, but it is certainly not what President Obama presented to the American people.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 seconds remaining.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I say to my friend that this is the President's proposed budget. Senators can vote yes or no. I am glad to hear the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Senator SANDERS, is going to vote no. I will vote no, and I encourage all Senators to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if Senator CORNYN wishes to bring a proposal that has 2 years of free community college to the floor, which is in the President's budget, I invite my friend to do that.

Is the Senator from Texas up for that?

If Senator CORNYN wants to bring a proposal to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 an hour, which is in the President's budget, I invite my friend to do that.

Will the Senator from Texas introduce that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 1, nays 98, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—1

Carper

NAYS—98

Alexander	Franken	Nelson
Ayotte	Gardner	Paul
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Grassley	Portman
Blumenthal	Hatch	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Reid
Booker	Heitkamp	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Boxer	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sanders
Cantwell	Isakson	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Sessions
Coats	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cochran	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Corker	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Thune
Cotton	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Vitter
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Enzi	Mikulski	Warren
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden
Flake	Murray	

NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 357) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 545

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Kirk amendment No. 545.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for Mr. KIRK, proposes an amendment numbered 545.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to reimposing waived sanctions and imposing new sanctions against Iran for violations of the Joint Plan of Action or a comprehensive nuclear agreement)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REIMPOSING WAIVED SANCTIONS AND IMPOSING NEW SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE JOINT PLAN OF ACTION OR A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Iran, which may include efforts to immediately reimpose waived sanctions and impose new sanctions against the Government of Iran for violations of the Joint Plan of Action or a comprehensive agreement on Iran's nuclear program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 412

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 412.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. ROUNDS], for himself and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 412.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service from engaging in closed-door settlement agreements that ignore impacted States and counties)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT CERTAIN CLOSED-DOOR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to environmental laws and citizen suits, which may include prohibitions on the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entering into any closed-door settlement agreement without seeking approval from all State, county, and local governments that would be directly impacted by the agreement, by the

amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, my amendment aims to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from entering into settlement agreements without seeking approval from State, county, and local governments that would be affected by the settlement.

All too often, rather than writing and implementing environmental regulations in an open, transparent process, environmental regulations are implemented as the result of citizen suits that establish arbitrary timelines that force the agency to rush through the regulatory process. As a result, regulations that affect all sectors of the economy are implemented without following the proper administrative procedures.

It is unfortunate, but legislating by lawsuit has become commonplace as agencies repeatedly miss deadlines and are challenged by citizen suits alleging improper agency action.

A 2014 report by the Government Accountability Office found that legal mandates do influence an agency's selection of regulatory options. These lawsuits leave inadequate time for agencies to analyze the options available to them. As a result of this shortened timeline, agencies cannot do a proper analysis of proposed regulations. This leads to inadequate time for notice and comment. It keeps the citizens in the dark about economic impacts of significant regulations and does not allow for State and local governments to provide input regarding how these regulations will affect them.

For example, in 2011, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service entered into a settlement agreement with environmental groups that will lead to the potential listing of more than 250 species. Millions of acres across the United States will be impacted. Yet no State or local government was allowed to give input into the process.

Similarly, the Environmental Protection Agency has entered into settlement agreements on issues such as regional haze, which have no impact on public health but cost billions of dollars in impacted States. While the EPA is willing to talk to radical environmental groups in the settlement process, they did not consult with the impacted States or communities.

A vote for this amendment is a vote to say that we should fix this problem and that we make certain that our State and local governments are given a say in settlement agreements that will have impacts within their borders. A vote against this amendment is a vote against transparency and a vote

to give radical environmental groups more say in the process than the States or local governments where the impacts actually occur.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor this afternoon to speak about our budget and how the choices we will make over the next few days will reflect our values and priorities.

As someone who has acted as a countywide elected official writing balanced budgets, I have long viewed them as not just a collection of numbers and programs but also really a statement about our basic values and a reflection of what we hold dear. We can say we believe in this or that, but at the end of the day, our budgets tell the true story. Over the last 2 years in this body, following the hard work and leadership of Democratic Senators PATTY MURRAY and BARBARA MIKULSKI, the previous chairs of Budget and Appropriations Committees, we have taken important strides to stabilize our government's finances, invest in our middle class, and protect the most vulnerable among us.

After a few really hard years, our economy has begun to heal and grow again. We are now in the longest period of uninterrupted private sector job growth in our Nation's history—a period in which our businesses have created 12 million new jobs. Today, our national unemployment rate stands at 5.5 percent, and the deficit has fallen nearly two-thirds since the depths of the great recession. At a time when the economies around the world are slowing down, ours remains, relatively speaking, a global bright spot.

We need to continue on this path. We need to invest in this growth. And in my view, it is the wrong time to hit the brakes on our economy's resurgence.

Unfortunately, the budget proposed by Senate Republicans misses the mark and would, I fear, reverse these gains. It denies our basic values by balancing the budget on the backs of the poor and middle class while cutting investments essential for our Nation's competitiveness and future.

It relies on some budget gimmicks to actually increase defense spending while making broad cuts elsewhere, and it uses overly rosy predictions about growth and our debt that has time and again proven false. It does all this while protecting tax breaks for the very wealthiest and corporations at the expense of working families.

It is my hope that we can reach a budget that is responsible, balanced, and fair, that takes stock of our needs today and what the future will demand of us. So I would like to take a few minutes and outline broadly what I think our budget priorities should be.

First, we need a budget that preserves our social safety net by building a circle of protection around the most vulnerable among us and protecting the promises we have made to our seniors. Part of the basic bargain we make in this country is that when one of our neighbors falls on truly hard times, their country offers a hand up. We need to ensure these basic protections to health care, food, and a home are there for those of our neighbors in deepest need. It is also part of that same bargain that after a lifetime of work, you will be able to retire with dignity and some security. As workers, we all pay in to Medicare and Social Security, and we need to ensure that as future generations of Americans grow up, raise their families, and contribute to our economy, the benefits they have spent their lives paying into will be there for them, just as they were for previous generations.

Yes, we should have a conversation about how to responsibly bring our long-term health care costs under control, but we can't do it the way this budget does, by irresponsibly shifting costs to seniors and the poor.

For retired Delawareans, for instance, the Republican budget would reverse an important reform in the Affordable Care Act and would raise prescription drug costs by an average of \$1,100 a year.

Second, just as we are there for each other when times are hard, we must rebound and grow together by making specific and thoughtful investments in our future. We need a budget that understands that without critical investments in infrastructure, research, and science, our economy will struggle to grow and support a strong middle class. We need a budget that invests in our middle class and gives working families a fair shot—an economy that is built on growth and opportunity. These investments in growth are the basic building blocks of our economy. They make up our economic backbone and help create an environment for our Nation's drive and dynamism to flourish.

Growth, however, requires infrastructure. We have a roughly \$3.6 trillion infrastructure debt—investments in infrastructure that are due by 2020. Every year we put off investing in our roads, bridges, tunnels, and ports. Every year we fall behind our competitors, and we make it harder for our businesses to grow and create jobs. Growth also requires investing in research and development. Our long-term competitiveness depends on our ability to innovate faster than our competitors. Although businesses already invest a huge amount in R&D, the Federal Government plays a critical role through our national labs, through the manufacturing extension partnership, and other grant programs that either directly invest in or incentivize the research that leads to innovation.

Finally, growth in our country requires ensuring that every child has access to a quality education. It requires making it easier for families to send their kids to college and easier for young people to manage the costs of their college through managing student loans after school, and it requires strengthening the real connection between the classroom and workplace so education can be a sturdier rung to a longer ladder of opportunity.

Throughout our history our middle class has thrived and our economy has been strong when we made these sorts of investments in our economy and middle class. We need a budget that continues those investments.

Finally, we need a budget that lowers our deficit responsibly, in a way that is fair and forward-looking—not on the backs of the middle class and poor and not done in a way that kills jobs and stifles growth. Over the last few years we have done a lot to get our deficit under control, using about three-quarters of spending cuts and about a quarter of increased revenue. We have also benefitted from a steadily growing economy which has lowered our deficit.

As we move forward, we need balanced deficit reduction that preserves our investments in our future and our promises to each other. That will mean raising some revenues by asking the wealthy and corporations to pay a bit more, just as it will mean making hard choices over the long run about the true causes of our deficits and debt.

But let's be clear. We can do this while investing in our future and keeping our promises to our seniors, to our veterans, and to each other. The best way to lower our deficit is to grow our economy. So we need to invest in that growth. After all, an airplane needs an engine to take off, even in strong headwinds.

Over the coming days we will be voting on a wide series of amendments that will say a lot about our values and priorities. I would urge my colleagues to keep in mind that which has always powered our economy and will continue to into the future—an economy that gives families a fair shot and invests in the strength and opportunity of the middle class and those fighting to get into the middle class. That is how we build an economy. I hope we will dedicate ourselves to a budget that will help us do so, far into the future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 423, AS MODIFIED

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the

pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 423, as modified with the changes at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. RUBIO] proposes an amendment numbered 423, as modified.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase new budget authority fiscal years 2016 and 2017 and modify outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2022 for National Defense (budget function 050))

On page 14, line 2, strike "\$620,263,000,000" and insert "\$696,776,000,000".

On page 14, line 3, strike "\$605,189,000,000" and insert "\$658,021,000,000".

On page 14, line 6, strike "\$544,506,000,000" and insert "\$657,496,000,000".

On page 14, line 7, strike "\$576,934,000,000" and insert "\$659,073,000,000".

On page 14, line 11, strike "\$588,049,000,000" and insert "\$588,239,000,000".

On page 14, line 15, strike "\$546,685,000,000" and insert "\$577,154,000,000".

On page 14, line 19, strike "\$573,614,000,000" and insert "\$580,468,000,000".

On page 14, line 23, strike "\$586,038,000,000" and insert "\$588,936,000,000".

On page 15, line 3, strike "\$596,103,000,000" and insert "\$596,065,000,000".

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, let me begin by saying that I believe defense spending is the most important obligation of the Federal Government. That doesn't mean we throw money away or we put money in places where it doesn't belong or we fund projects that have no utility. But it does mean the most important thing the Federal Government does for America is to defend it.

We have benefitted from the fact that for the last 100 years, America has had the most powerful military force on the planet. This is especially true since the end of the Second World War. There have been times in our history when we tried to save money by cutting back on defense spending, and each and every time, it has forced us to come back later and spend even more to make up for it.

It is interesting to point out that in times in the past when we have taken a peace dividend—this idea that the world is no longer unstable or unsafe and we can now spend less on defense—each and every time, we have had to come back and make up for it later as a new threat emerged. I don't think we can make the argument that this is a time when the world is stable or peaceful. Yet this is a time of dramatic reductions in defense spending.

During this administration, first came the defense cuts of \$480 billion over 10 years. Adding insult to injury,



by the way, was that the savings found in the defense budget were redirected to already bloated domestic programs.

Secretary Gates wrote in his memoirs about the extent to which he was forced to cut costs, saying: “[N]o other department had done anything comparable—even proportionally.”

This was then followed by tens of billions more in defense cuts each year through sequestration, which will add up to a total of a trillion dollars over the next decade, despite the warnings of three secretaries of defense and our entire military leadership.

All in all, inflation-adjusted defense spending has declined 21 percent since 2010. Even if we discount the drawdowns in Iraq and Afghanistan, it has still declined by a dangerous 12 percent. This is happening at the same time that China is undergoing the most expansive, most aggressive defense increase in modern history; at a time when Russia, despite being eviscerated by economic sanctions, has held their defense spending largely harmless; at a time when radical Islam around the world—both the rise of ISIS and the existence of Al Qaeda and other groups such as al-Nusra and the Khorasan group and others—poses an ongoing threat to the United States. This at a time when many of our potential adversaries and adversaries, such as North Korea and Iran, are developing long-range rocket capabilities that could reach the continental United States. This is the worst possible time to be reducing our defense spending, and yet that is what we are doing. We are setting ourselves up for danger.

I would recognize that people who have worked hard on this budget have tried to find new ways to address this through contingency funding. I respect the work they have done, and ultimately that may be where we end up. But before we do, it is important for this body to have a serious debate about how we are underfunding defense spending in this country and the dangers it poses for our future.

That is the purpose of this amendment. The purpose of this amendment is to replace the defense numbers in this budget with the projected fiscal year 2016 number from the fiscal 2012 Gates budget. This was the last defense budget, the Gates budget, that was put together solely on the assessment of the threats we face and the requisite military needs to deal with it. It is the budget that the bipartisan congressionally mandated National Defense Panel stated was the minimum required to reverse course and set the military on more stable footing.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from Arkansas, Senator COTTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUBIO. I would ask Senator COTTON, who has extensive experience both

serving in uniform and here in the Senate as well as in the House, his views on the dangers this poses, the rates that we are reducing military spending, and what it means to the long-term security of the United States.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. I am pleased to offer this amendment with him. I do agree that it is critical we have this debate on what we should be spending on our military. While I respect the work of the Budget Committee, I also call attention to the views of the chairman and the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee on which I sit, that they would spend \$577 billion on defense next year, which would eliminate sequestration.

I suggest, as the Senator from Florida did, that we need to look to the views of the National Defense Panel, which did draw from Secretary Gates' fiscal year 2012 budget, projecting into fiscal year 2016. While Secretary Gates had a reputation as a reformer, he had already found \$450 billion of savings in the Department of Defense at that time. It is hard to say there is much fat left.

Second, as the Senator from Florida pointed out, that was the last time the Department of Defense engaged in what we should do in this body, which is the budgeting for the military based on the threats we face and the strategy we need, not having a strategy that is driven by the budget.

But that is not enough. As the National Defense Panel said itself, at \$611 billion, that projection is not enough. Why is it not enough? Some of the threats the Senator from Florida identified. In the last 4 years, what have we seen? The Islamic State on the rise, rampaging across Iraq and Syria. Iran racing toward a nuclear weapon even as it asserts greater control and dominance over Baghdad, Damascus, Beirut, and now Sanaa.

We have seen Russian revisionism, invading a sovereign country in the heart of Europe, shooting a civilian airliner out of the sky in the heart of Europe, and China on the rise, developing military capabilities that are quite clearly directed against the United States and our allies in the first island chain. That is why we need this debate. That is why we need the military budget the Senator from Florida and I are proposing, because the eyes of the world are upon us, not just our enemies, but our allies as well, wondering if America will not only have the resolve to stand by its commitment but if it will have the capabilities to stand by those commitments, whoever the Commander in Chief may be.

But there is one final important group whose eyes are on this institution this week. It is our soldiers, our sailors, our airmen, and our marines, who are wondering if the elected representatives of the people will stand

with them, will provide them the resources they need to be ready, to be trained, equipped, and ready to fight our Nation's wars so they do not have to fight them in the first place.

Earlier today, I had the great benefit of being able to meet with a group of Army majors and captains, the mid-career officers, just like the mid-career noncommissioned officers who are the backbone of our military. Two of those men I started officer candidate school with at Fort Benning 10 years ago this coming Friday, one of whom has been seriously injured.

To a person, they all said that training is down, families are strained, operations are stressed, equipment is overused, and they wanted to know, will the Congress of the United States give them the tools they need to fight and win our country's wars? That is why I am proud to stand here with the Senator from Florida to offer this amendment and say that, yes, we will stand by them. Yes, we will make sure they are ready to fight and win our wars so they do not have to fight them in the first place.

I yield back.

Mr. RUBIO. I would say there is not much to add to what the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out. As he well knows, the importance that we have made to the men and women of our armed services, that is, that we will never put them in a fair fight. It will always be an unfair fight to their advantage. They will be the best trained, best equipped, and best-taken-care of fighting men and women on the planet.

We cannot keep that commitment if we continue to reduce spending on the military and on defense at the rate we are going today.

I would add one more point, that is, that much of the world security today is based upon American military alliances that are built upon American military assurances, so, for example, in the Asia-Pacific region, where the Japanese, the South Koreans, and other allies in the region look to an American umbrella of defense to provide them certainty in the face of real risk, whether it is territorial claims made by China that are illegitimate, or the nuclear threat of North Korea.

Why haven't the South Koreans developed their own nuclear weapons? Because they believe the United States will be there to help them defend themselves. Why have the Japanese never felt compelled to use their technological know-how to build a nuclear program? Because they believe the United States is their ally and will come to their collective self-defense.

These countries do their own spending. The Japanese have a very capable military force and a great force multiplier in the region, despite not being called a military force.

The South Koreans are a very impressive fighting force and have a very

courageous history. But that American security alliance in the region is critical to the long-term stability and security of that region, a region where a lot of global growth is happening on the economic front, where 50, 60, 70 percent of global trade and commerce transits through the South and East China Seas.

The U.S. Navy's presence in the region, along with our other branches, is critical for the defense of the region. The same is true with the NATO Alliance in Europe. It relies on American security guarantees. The same is true—if a terrible deal, God forbid, is arrived at by this administration with Iran, our partners and allies in the region, particularly Saudi Arabia and others, are going to look to the United States and say: Well, what are you going to do to help us be protected from an Iranian nuclear weapon, with the missiles they are able to acquire?

So what is going to happen when they turn and we say to them: We are with you; we are going to be there; We are going to continue to work with you; we are going to continue to live up to our defense capabilities, but we do not have the capabilities to meet our obligations? In essence, you can talk pivoting to Asia, but you have to have something to pivot with. If we have eviscerated our military, we have eviscerated our naval capacity, if we are on pace, as we are now, to have the smallest Air Force and the smallest Navy we have had in a very long time, we can say whatever we want, but our allies will not believe us because we will not have the capabilities to meet it.

The other challenge we have is when we talk about modernization, we are not talking about the Commander in Chief today. When we decide how much money we are going to spend on modernizing our military capabilities, what we are deciding is what are the technologies and tools that are going to be available to a future Commander in Chief in 5, 10, or 15 years.

These innovative systems that we use today that have cut down on civilian casualties, that allow us to improve our targeting, our intelligence-gathering capabilities, that have made the United States the premier fighting force in all of human history—all of those things were developed a decade ago or longer, through years of experimentation and testing, through innovation.

So if we cut back on that now, in 10 years a future Commander in Chief will be faced with a threat to our national security, and will not have the latest, greatest technology on the planet to address it.

What about the asymmetrical capabilities that China and others are developing? Instead of trying to out-aircraft-carrier us, they build weapons to destroy aircraft carriers. As we try to

adjust to that threat, what is going to happen in a few years if we do not keep pace?

The absence of a long-range bomber, the need to replace an aging submarine fleet, a Navy that is headed for a catastrophic low number of ships, all of these things need to be confronted, not to mention the fact that we are not modernizing at an efficient and effective rate our nuclear arsenal, which is a key part of our deterrence, in a world where China, Russia, and others have significant stockpiles of weapons, particularly the Russians.

All of those things are important. These are long-range, long-term decisions that will have an impact on a future Congress, on a future Commander in Chief, and on our children and grandchildren, who will be the ones who have to live in that world. I promise you that a world where America is no longer the most capable fighting force on the planet is a world that is more chaotic and less safe.

I look forward to having a debate on this. I encourage my colleagues to rally around these numbers. This is what we should be funding defense at. As my colleague, the Senator from Arkansas, accurately pointed out, and I am honored to work with him on this, strategy should not be driven by defense spending, the defense spending should be driving the strategy. In essence, to put it succinctly, we should not have a strategy that is based on limited resources. We are going to have to do the best we can with limited resources. We should first outline a strategy. This is what the strategy should be for the future of our country to keep us safe. Then we should fund that strategy, not the other way around. That is not what we are doing now. We are setting a dangerous precedent. More importantly, we are putting at risk the national security of this country. Once you have made that decision, it is very difficult to reverse it in a timely way. We have learned this lesson the hard way multiple times in our history. I hope we do not have to it learn it again.

I look forward to working with the Senator from Arkansas on this amendment, and with my colleagues. There is great respect for the work that has gone into this budget, and the work of many others who are equally committed to the national defense of our country. I acknowledge the hard work they have put into finding a solution to get more money into defense, but it is not enough. Everyone knows that. The sooner we deal with this, the safer our country is going to be.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, in response to the colloquy that just transpired, I would simply say that for all of the earnest and I am sure sincere

spirit behind it, there is no willingness to even close one corporate tax loophole to support our Nation's defense, which I think puts into some context the priority in which that is held as a practical matter, as opposed to a theoretical matter.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to urge this Chamber to wake up to the urgent threat of climate change. I have done this every week the Senate has been in session for nearly 3 years. Today is my 94th time. I have asked my colleagues to heed the warnings from our scientists, from our military and national security professionals, from many of our leading American corporations and executives, from their own home-State universities, and from so many of our faith leaders.

Since it is budget week, we would do well to also consider that for years the Government Accountability Office has placed climate change on its biannual high-risk list of the greatest fiscal challenges facing the Federal Government. But even so, there is no attention from the other side.

This risk is particularly great in coastal areas, such as in my home State of Rhode Island, where sea levels rise ever closer to infrastructure and property, and extreme weather exacts an ever heavier toll. Secretary of the Treasury Lew put it pretty plainly: If the fiscal burden from climate change continues to rise, it will create budgetary pressures that will force hard tradeoffs—larger deficits or higher taxes. And these tradeoffs would make it more challenging to invest in growth, to meet the needs of an aging population, and to provide for our national defense.

My Republican colleagues want to slash spending. Indeed, they have almost a fixation on slashing spending. They say they do not want to leave a financial mess for future generations to bear, but they ignore the need to slash our carbon emissions and don't care a bit about leaving an environmental mess for future generations to bear. They refuse because the polluters and their allies have built a fearsome political machine in Citizens United, and the polluters demand that the Republicans follow their denier script.

Well, unfortunately, nature won't wait for our politics to sort themselves out, and nowhere are these changes occurring more clearly than in our oceans. The changes in our oceans are real, and they are measurable. They follow the laws of biology, of chemistry, and of physics. Our steady flood of carbon pollution has real consequences.

Scientists from the University of California, Stanford, and Rutgers recently published a peer-reviewed paper in *Science* magazine on marine defaunation. "Defaunation" is a big

word for the widespread loss of animal life in the ocean. Human activities, they argue, including overfishing, pollution, and carbon emissions, are wiping out sea life. Populations of marine vertebrates, including sea birds, mammals, and turtles, have decreased by an average of 22 percent over the last 40 years. Fish have declined by nearly 40 percent. Major fish species have crashed 90 percent. Coral is having massive bleaching and die-off. We are living, the authors say, in a time of “empty reefs,” “empty estuaries,” and “empty bays.”

How is it that carbon pollution changes the ocean environment? Pretty simply, greenhouse gases in the atmosphere trap heat. That is not news. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. Much of that heat goes right into the ocean. Globally, oceans absorb 90 percent of the heat captured by greenhouse gases.

Well, all that heat disrupts marine life. Corals, for example, will expel the algae living in their tissues when water is too warm, causing the coral to turn completely white and die in what is known as coral bleaching.

Other species that aren't stuck in one place like coral are literally swimming away. We have seen fish, accustomed to specific temperatures, migrating to cooler waters. Along the entire Northeast seaboard, the movement of fish farther north and into deeper waters is well documented. NOAA has even developed tools to allow fisheries managers and scientists to go online and track the movement of different species through time.

I have had fishermen back home tell me they are catching fish their fathers and grandfathers never saw come up in their nets. One Rhode Island fisherman told me: “Sheldon, it's getting weird out there.” Forty percent of fishermen in the Northeast reported catching new fish species in places where they wouldn't expect to find them.

In a recent Center for American Progress survey, those who believe climate change is happening outnumber deniers four to one.

Just last week, the Providence Journal, my own home State paper, reported on the continuing loss of ice smelt from the waters of the Northeast. The smelt live in estuaries and bays in the wintertime, once making it a favorite for ice fishermen. But now where the ice-fishing cottages used to cover the ice, there are very few. That fishery has crashed. In Narragansett Bay, the winter flounder fishery has crashed.

From Maine comes a recent news article from our former Republican colleague, Olympia Snowe. It is titled, rather bluntly, “Lack of Action on Climate Change is Costing Fishing Jobs.” Senator Snowe reports that the shrimp fishery in the Gulf of Maine was closed this winter for the second year in a row

because the shrimp are nowhere to be found.

The shrimp fishery has crashed, and the crash has been precipitous. As recently as 2010, shrimpers in the Gulf of Maine hauled in 12 million pounds of northern shrimp. By the time they had to close the fishery, the catch was down to less than 600,000 pounds. One likely culprit is warming seas. The Gulf of Maine is at the southern end of the shrimp's range, and the Gulf of Maine is warming exceptionally fast. An estimate from the Gulf of Maine Research Institute shows that water temperatures in the gulf rose eight times faster than the global average in recent years.

The rapid changes in the Gulf of Maine are causing things to get strange for the other fisheries as well. Our colleague ANGUS KING has come to the floor repeatedly to describe the northward march of the iconic Maine lobster.

Cod populations in the Gulf of Maine suffered for years from overfishing. Now the cod are struggling to recover as temperatures in the gulf increase. The cod might not return, instead seeking out cooler water elsewhere.

Another scientific fact: Warmer temperatures make oxygen less soluble in water. When oxygen is too low for marine life to flourish, that creates dead zones, which are growing around our oceans in size and in number. If carbon pollution continues at pace, global oxygen levels in the ocean are predicted to drop by more than 3 percent over the century. Do we tell the fish to hold their breath while we wait to wake up?

Carbon pollution also makes the oceans more acidic—another scientific fact. Ocean water has absorbed roughly a quarter of all historic carbon dioxide emissions, driving up the pH level of the oceans at rates not seen in perhaps the last 300 million years. To put 300 million years in context, that is more than 1,000 times as long as our species has been on this planet. We are gambling with very big changes that we have never seen in human time and that are a long way back in geologic time.

Acidifying waters make it harder for animals such as oysters or even the humble pteropod—a main component of the salmon diet—and a lot of other creatures at the base of the oceanic food chain to make their shells and develop properly from juveniles to adults.

Increasingly, those acidic oceans are hurting U.S. shellfish, and shellfish are a \$1 billion American industry. More acidic waters have already cost the oyster industry in the Pacific Northwest nearly \$110 million, putting 3,200 jobs at risk. The Pacific Northwest is being hit first by ocean acidification, but the effects are expected to be felt hardest in the Northeast—my home—according to a recent article in the journal *Nature Climate Change*. Condi-

tions in the Northeast will jeopardize the \$14 million annual mollusk harvest in my State of Rhode Island, putting my home State's coastal communities at real risk of economic harm.

Bill Mook, president of Mook Sea Farm in Maine, testified before the Environment and Public Works Committee last summer about the decline in oyster larva that he has linked to more acidic water. As he said, delicate shellfish hatcheries are “canaries in the coal mine,” the first victims of a growing menace.

Yet we still don't listen. From coast to coast and pole to pole, the oceans are warning us, and we still do not listen. The authors of the *Science* magazine paper warned that we are headed into “an era of global chemical warfare” on the oceans—and we don't listen.

We must wake up to the warnings that are coming from our oceans. The evidence is there for everyone to see. It is a matter of measurement, basic measurements of temperature, of pH, of sea level—real high school science class stuff—that are showing us these changes. Yet we won't listen.

Fishermen in Rhode Island and across the country are already feeling these changes. They see them around them.

Colleagues, if you are not a scientist, go ask the coastal and ocean scientists at your home State university. They will give you the answer.

I conclude by going back to what Senator Snowe wrote:

The loss of Maine's \$5 million shrimp fishery should serve as a warning. A similar blow to our \$300 million lobster fishery must be avoided at all costs. That will require honest, fact-based discussion and a genuine bipartisan commitment to solutions.

Well, we have had neither around here for a long time. There has been no honest, fact-based discussion, and there has been no bipartisan commitment to solutions. That has to change.

I hope Senator Snowe's fellow Republicans in the Senate will join with us Democrats in that honest, fact-based discussion and in a genuine bipartisan commitment to solutions. I hope our colleagues will unshackle themselves from the fossil fuel industry—which is an industry riddled with appalling conflicts of interest on this subject—and wake the heck up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 388

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 388.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 388.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the designation of national monuments)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that State and local governments support designations of national monuments under section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, as a fifth-generation Montanan and avid sportsman, I know firsthand how important Montana's lands and resources are to our economy and our way of life. I also know how important it is for Montanans to play a strong role in the management of these precious parts of our State. In Montana, we understand that our resource use must be done responsibly. We understand the importance of protecting our State's treasures so that future generations may continue to have the same experiences and job opportunities we have today. We also know that the Montanans who use and live on the land every day best understand how to best protect those resources. But, unfortunately, the Obama administration's persistent efforts to stretch the true intent of the Antiquities Act threatens Montana's ability to manage our State's resources, and it is a trend we are seeing across other States as well.

Too often these unilateral designations completely ignore the needs of the local community—the farmers and ranchers, the sportsmen and small business owners directly impacted by these new designations. My amendment will establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation to ensure States and local governments support national monument designations.

This amendment in no way precludes the President from proposing a national monument. However, any bill or designation that has a potential to impact land management must be locally driven, not spearheaded in Washington, and must have local government and State support as well. This amendment ensures the people affected most by these designations have a seat at the table and their voices are heard.

**AMENDMENT NO. 389**

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 389.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 389.

Mr. DAINES. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOLDING MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ACCOUNTABLE FOR FAILING TO PASS A BALANCED BUDGET.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I offer amendment No. 389 to the budget resolution to establish a deficit-neutral reserve to hold Members of Congress accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget.

Washington has balanced its budget only five times in the last five decades. Let me say that again. Washington has only balanced its budget five times in the last 50 years. This is completely unacceptable, and it threatens the prosperity of future generations. By strengthening accountability and demanding results, my amendment will help restore fiscal responsibility—I would call it fiscal sanity—in Washington.

I have introduced related legislation—the Balanced Budget Accountability Act—which would terminate the salaries of Members of the House and Senate if their respective Chamber does not pass a balanced budget. Simply put, no balanced budget, no pay. It is time to hold Congress accountable to the taxpayer. It is time to hit the Members of Congress in their pocket-books if they can't pass a balanced budget.

Chairman ENZI's budget meets this commonsense principle, and by passing my amendment to the budget resolution we will reinforce our commitment to passing similar balanced budgets in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from West Virginia.

**MORNING BUSINESS**

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**LYNCH NOMINATION**

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, before turning to the budget resolution pending before the Senate this week, I would like to first discuss the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General. Last week, I met with Loretta Lynch to discuss the legality of President Obama's Executive actions and her views concerned me.

President Obama and his administration have a record of overstepping legal authority on immigration, implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and imposing anti-energy regulations. Despite her qualifications, I am not confident that Loretta Lynch will exercise the independence needed to stand up for the proper separation of powers, and I will not support her nomination.

**THE BUDGET**

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, turning to the budget, I rise in strong support of this resolution that delivers on the promise to balance our budget without increasing taxes. West Virginia families and families across our country understand they cannot continually spend more money than they take in. Each month families have to balance their budgets and decide how to spend their limited resources, make tough choices, set priorities, and account for unexpected expenses.

Unfortunately, annual deficits are routine for the Federal Government, but we have recently endured 4 straight years with an annual deficit of at least \$1 trillion. Despite recent drops, our national debt now stands at \$18 trillion. That totals more than \$56,000 for every American.

American families cannot withstand spending more than they earn from month to month and neither should the Federal Government.

The debate on this budget resolution brings the Senate to an important crossroads. We can choose the President's path, which increases taxes and

adds another \$6 trillion to our national debt, or we can choose to support the responsible budget on the Senate floor this week. If we fail to make the tough decisions to reduce our Federal spending, we will leave mountains of debt to our children and our grandchildren.

Our first responsibility as leaders should be to leave our country better and stronger for the next generation of Americans. That starts by taking steps to balance our budget, and this budget balances in 10 years.

This budget provides us with the flexibility to address many of the important issues confronting our Nation, including evolving threats from terrorists. When West Virginians hear about ISIS, instability in Yemen, the failing state of Iraq, the first thing we think about is the safety and security of our own families. Terrorism hits close to home, and we must ensure we have the flexibility to fund a strong national defense. Like American families, we must have flexibility to account for unexpected expenses and unexpected threats as they arise.

This budget resolution gives us the ability to pass a long-term highway bill that is paid for. We must invest in our Nation's roads and bridges and do so in a fiscally responsible way.

This budget resolution paves the way for an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program—a bipartisan initiative which will, hopefully, be considered by the Senate in short order. This budget facilitates changes that help our rural hospitals continue to provide critical medical services in their communities.

Our Nation's priorities are reflected in this Nation's budget. I want to draw special attention to the energy provisions in this budget. I have said many times an energy economy is a jobs economy. Energy is at the forefront of many West Virginians' minds, whether we are paying for our monthly energy bill or checking the gas prices.

The production of coal and natural gas accounts for tens of thousands of jobs in West Virginia. In recent years, we have seen what advances in energy technology can do to broaden energy production and benefit the broader economy. The shale boom has made the United States a leading producer of both oil and natural gas. The benefits are felt by Americans every time they fill their tank and balance their budgets at the end of the month.

In my State of West Virginia, Marcellus shale natural gas production is creating jobs and providing the opportunity to expand downstream manufacturing, but Federal Government policies can hamstring our energy economy by slowing the production and the use of our resources.

West Virginia, unfortunately, has seen that firsthand in our State's coal mining industry, where thousands of jobs have been lost. Just last week,

AEP issued layoff notices to employees at three West Virginia powerplants. These closures are years ahead of schedule and the early closures are solely because of the Federal Government's MATS rule.

Yesterday, Patriot Coal announced it was temporarily idling the Paint Creek Complex, which employs 400 workers in West Virginia. Coal-fired plant closures driven by EPA emission regulations were cited as part of the problem.

The upcoming EPA regulations for carbon emissions from powerplants will have an even more devastating impact. Findings from reports by well-respected economic analysis firms show costs could get up to \$479 billion over a 15-year period while causing double-digit electricity price increases in 43 States.

Over half of the country's power comes from coal. Yet EPA is predicting that by effectively eliminating one-half of our energy production we will reduce average electricity prices by 8 percent. Well, somehow that just doesn't add up. How does this impact our Federal budget?

An energy economy that works will provide the low-cost, reliable electricity to power our broader economy. By contrast, excessive regulation means fewer people working in my State's energy sector. Higher cost, less-reliable energy is a tax against manufacturing and job growth across the country. That means fewer individuals working, fewer businesses providing jobs, and, ultimately, fewer government revenues.

The budget resolution before us this week recognizes the importance of American energy production. The reserve funds in this budget will improve our energy infrastructure, reform environmental regulations and promote job growth. To supplement the strong energy provisions already in the budget, I have filed several amendments to strengthen our energy security.

Last year, the administration reached a climate agreement with China. That agreement requires short-term carbon emission reductions in the United States, but China is allowed to continue increasing its carbon emissions until 2030. That disparity could place the United States at a significant economic disadvantage.

My amendment would block any international environmental agreement that would result in serious harm to the U.S. economy.

I have also filed an amendment that would block EPA from finalizing, proposing or issuing any regulation that would reduce the reliability of the electricity grid. Our economy relies on electricity being available. Families expect the lights will come on when they flip the switch. They expect to have heat in the winter and air-conditioning in the summer. This simple amendment says no regulation from

EPA can imperil access to reliable electricity. That makes sense to me.

I urge my colleagues to support the balanced budget that is before the Senate this week, including these amendments, and to support policies that will allow our economy to benefit from America's vast energy resources. The jobs and the revenues that come from energy production can play a significant role in a responsible Federal budget.

The American people elected us to make government more efficient, effective, and accountable. American families must live within a budget, States must adhere to a budget, and it is time for the Federal Government to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### THE BUDGET AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise to talk tonight about one issue: the issue of children. But I wish to speak about that one issue in two separate contexts: One is the budget we are debating now and will continue to vote on all week and the second is with regard to the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Let me start with the premise that I believe those of us who were elected to both Houses of the Congress and in both parties are charged with a basic responsibility to our children. It doesn't matter where we live or what State we represent or what district, in the case of the House, I believe we are charged with that responsibility.

A long time ago, Hubert Humphrey, who served in this Chamber for many years and was well known across the country, set forth a moral test for government. He talked about the moral test being how government treats those in the dawn of life, those in the shadow of life, and those in the twilight of life. Of course, in speaking of the dawn of life, we are talking about children. That test is still appropriate and we should try our best to adhere to it in terms of public policy, especially when it comes to the budget.

The budget, of course, is a reflection of who we are as a country and what our values are. It is in a sense a mirror into which we look or should be looking to see who we are. And if we are not setting forth policy and being strong advocates for our children, we may as well not be here. So I think there is a test that each one of us must face when it comes to what we are doing on behalf of children.

I also believe in a very real sense that the programs, the strategies, the expenditures we make on behalf of children are in fact an investment—an investment in the long-term economy of the United States. This isn't just the

right thing to do; it is also the best thing we could do for a growing economy and for our fiscal situation years from now. If kids are healthier, they will get better jobs. If they learn more when they are younger, they are going to earn more when they are older. That is not just a rhyme, it is true, and all the studies show it. So I believe this budget debate is a time to reflect upon what will happen to our children. I have real concerns about the budget as it relates to children.

Again, these are in our society the folks who are powerless and in many cases voiceless. They are not voting, they don't have a lobbyist, they don't have a high-paid strategist or voice for their needs. Because they are powerless and because they are in a sense voiceless, it is up to us to speak on their behalf—and we speak with our votes, we speak with our work.

So what is the proposal in this budget? Let me work through some of the numbers.

According to one of the leading advocacy organizations in the United States, First Focus, discretionary investments make up nearly one-third of all Federal investments that go to children. So what we do on the discretionary part of the budget—which, by definition, because it is discretionary, we have decisions to make about it year after year. Because of that, we have to be very careful when it comes to these decisions—whether it is the budget resolution, whether it is the authorization process, or whether it is in fact the appropriations process. This funding, this so-called discretionary, nonmandatory—if I can call it that—part of the budget includes programs such as Head Start, childcare assistance, housing support, special education, to name a few examples that have a direct and substantial impact upon our children.

The Republican budget we are debating this week cuts \$236 billion over 10 years in the nondefense discretionary part of the budget. Nondefense discretionary is a long way of saying the part of the budget that we vote on and we will have votes on that relate to the appropriations. So \$236 billion over 10 years is the cut. That cut, I would argue, falls disproportionately in a substantial way upon children.

What do these cuts mean for children and for families? Of course, we cannot separate one from the other. We will look at Head Start, and 35,000 children will be cut from Head Start—some 1,250 fewer children in a State like Pennsylvania, just by example for one State. What are we going to gain? How better off would the country be with 35,000 fewer kids in Head Start? I don't think we are going to be better off. I think we are worse off if we do that. It makes no sense. This is a program that has been in existence for 50 years. It has helped a lot of children succeed.

The State director from my office in Pennsylvania, who just left our staff recently and served with distinction, Ed Williams, was a Head Start kid. I meet people all the time in our State who are leading very successful lives in the private sector or public sector. Ed is just one example of having had the benefit of Head Start to get a head start in life because of disadvantages that certain children face.

How about students with disabilities, a \$347 million cut to funding for students with disabilities, which means a little more than \$12 million less for Pennsylvania children with disabilities.

How about housing, 133,000 nationwide fewer housing vouchers. In Pennsylvania, that adds up to 620 families who, if they had those vouchers, would be able to afford decent and safe housing. What are we getting for fewer families who have access to housing vouchers? Again, it is not an experimental program. It is a program that we know works, a program that has been in existence for a long time to help folks.

We know when we invest early in a child's life, we see a great return on investment. All the studies show this. It is irrefutable: If you spend a buck, you get a lot more than a buck back. By some estimates, the bang for the buck is in the double figures. In one study on early learning, we get \$17 back for the \$1 spent.

I mentioned before that if we make investments in children in terms of their early learning, they will in fact learn more now and earn more later. That is what we should be focused on when it comes to our children, when it comes to their ability to succeed in school and, of course, when it comes to their ability to get a good job and be part of a growing economy.

The budget proposal makes deep cuts in many other investments to protect our most vulnerable children, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the so-called SNAP program that we used to call food stamps. That, of course, provides nutrition aid. If we were doing the right thing as a nation—and we are not there yet, even though we have made some progress on some fronts—we would make sure children have enough to eat. That would be one pillar of our protection for children. We are not there yet, but the SNAP program helps substantially on that. We would make sure they have early learning opportunities. I talked about that and will talk about it more. We would make sure they have access to health care. That is why we have Medicaid for poor children, that is why we have the Children's Health Insurance Program for others, and that is why so many private sector companies provide health care that, of course, covers children of their employees. But if we are doing at least those three things—early learning, food security or

food and nutrition, as well as health care—we are going to be doing what is right for our children.

I would argue we have to examine this budget and apply a kids' test—not a special interest test, not a lobbyist test, not a who-is-powerful test, not a test about who has the most to gain from this budget, but who might have to most to lose, and one of those groups, I would argue, is our children.

When it comes to the SNAP program, according to Feeding America—another great advocacy group—nearly half of all SNAP participants are children. And according to another organization we rely upon for analysis, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, investments in SNAP lifted 2.1 million children out of poverty in 2013.

So why would we cut a program like that, that would disproportionately and adversely impact our children? What do we gain from that as a country? What do we gain when fewer and fewer children are helped with a nutrition program that will make sure they have enough to eat?

In addition to SNAP, the Republican budget would roll back significant progress we have made for children who qualify for the child tax credit or the earned-income tax credit. If the improvements to these credits are allowed to lapse, the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that 1 million children will fall back into poverty. I think people in both parties would argue that these two—and maybe especially the earned-income tax credit—are one of the best, some would argue the best—the best—poverty reduction strategies we have ever had in place in our policy.

I think if the earned-income tax credit is keeping children out of poverty, we should make sure it remains in place and remains a tax strategy that can help prevent 1 million children from falling back into poverty.

We should also be using the Tax Code to help working families rise into the middle class, those families who may not be there yet but can rise into the middle class. But instead, the Republican budget does nothing to prevent tax increases, averaging \$1,100 for 12 million families and students paying for college, and \$9,000 for 16 million working families with children. That makes no sense for those families or for those children.

As many as 486,000 Pennsylvania families could benefit from the earned-income tax credit, the child tax credit and the opportunity tax credit of 2015—all good ideas, all impacted adversely by the budget.

Finally, I will conclude with Medicaid. Medicaid for some people is some program far away that they don't think affects their lives. A lot of families—lower income families, middle-class families, even—benefit from the long-term care part of Medicaid. A lot

of families may not know that Medicaid is the reason that their mother, father, or loved one could be in a nursing home.

What does it mean for kids? Medicaid for so many children, millions of them, is the only health care they have. The good news is that it is very good health care for a lot of children. They get access to early periodic screening and diagnostic testing. So they get the screening and the testing they need so we can provide the kind of health care that child needs, but we cannot provide unless we do that screening for those children. It provides quality health care for millions of children in the country. We should remember that when people make proposals around here to slash Medicaid, some by hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade, that it is a direct hit—a direct hit on children.

Based on calculations from the White House, the Republican budget proposal would block-grant Medicaid funding to Pennsylvania by more than \$41 billion over 10 years. I don't know how the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania or any State is going is to be better off when Medicaid is block-granted, sent back to the States, hoping—just hoping—that maybe the States can pick up the cost. That makes no sense. Our State is going to be worse off if we lose \$40 billion, or even a number lower than that, over the next 10 years on Medicaid.

By one estimate last fall, 47 percent of children who live in rural areas are the beneficiaries of either Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program. So when those folks talk about cutting Medicaid or not doing what I hope we can do—which is to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program for the next 4 years, not only 2—they should remember that 47 percent of rural children benefit from those programs.

When it comes to Medicaid, children may only make up 20 percent of the cost of Medicaid, but half of the enrollees in Medicaid are children. So they might only be 20 percent of the cost, but they are half of the enrollees.

We know that Medicaid was created 50 years ago. The government put forth a promise, which is somewhat of the test I started with about children in the dawn of their life. The promise was to ensure that the most vulnerable members of society had access to health care, a pretty simple promise and pretty easy to understand our obligation when we recite that promise.

So whether it is our kids, whether it is older Americans who need to get nursing home care, or whether it is Americans and many of them children with disabilities, Medicaid ensures that access to health care. Medicaid is the promise we must keep to folks who need nursing home care, to children who are poor and may not have health insurance without Medicaid, and of

course to individuals with disabilities. So we have a long way to go to prove that we are keeping that promise.

Mr. President, I will conclude with some thoughts about the Children's Health Insurance Program. We all know this is not only a bipartisan program but a very successful program. From 1997, when it was enacted, to the year 2012, the uninsured rate for children fell by half—from 14 percent to 7 percent—across the country, a remarkable achievement. It means we are not there yet because we still have 7 percent who are uninsured, but that is a substantial step forward and a substantial measure of progress for the country.

This program, the Children's Health Insurance Program, along with Medicaid, is helping to reduce disparity in health coverage affecting low-income children across the country. Without legislative action to extend funding beyond September 30 of this year, over 10 million children across America are at risk of losing their comprehensive, affordable—I will say that again, comprehensive and affordable quality care, including, by one estimate, 270,000 children in Pennsylvania. About 2 million of the children currently enrolled in CHIP would likely end up uninsured while the others would face higher premiums and higher out-of-pocket costs. We should do the right thing and make sure we have funding in place for 4 years for the Children's Health Insurance Program, not just 2 years.

Unfortunately, what we are hearing from the proposal sent to us from the House is that the 4-year commitment is only 2 years. So we have a lot of work to do. I believe the right thing to do on CHIP is to enact what Senate Democrats have proposed—a 4-year so-called clean extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program as soon as possible, and that is S. 522. That would be the right thing to do.

We can give speeches and talk a lot about how we all support kids, and it is nice to say that and it is nice to vote once in a while for programs and strategies that help kids, but I believe the test is a lot tougher than that. The test will come on this budget vote—a test on whether we support children. If we are cutting Medicaid by hundreds of billions of dollars over the next 10 years, if we are cutting the SNAP program by tens of billions of dollars or more, maybe even higher than that over the next 10 years, and if we are not doing the right thing on children's health insurance—and I could go down a longer list—then we are not doing what we need to do for children. They don't have lobbyists, they don't give campaign contributions, they don't have power, and they may be voiceless, but we have an obligation in both parties and in both Houses to be their voice. But I am afraid we are headed down a road with a budget that harms

children substantially, and I hope that over the next couple of days we will make the right decisions for our children.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. CASEY. I will.

#### F-35 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I support the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter. I believe this is a critical defense acquisition program which will greatly strengthen not only our national security, but that of our closest allies and partners.

The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Program began more than 20 years ago. In an age where emerging technologies are introduced daily and where we have become accustomed to instant gratification, we sometimes grow impatient with how long it takes to achieve war-winning capabilities—and we should. Yet today, the F-35 stands on the threshold of being used effectively and decisively in operational missions.

During its journey, the Joint Strike Fighter Program Office has encountered its fair share of setbacks, and—at times—faulty leadership decisions by those in government as well as those in the private sector. From the Pentagon itself, we heard the accusation of “acquisition malpractice.”

The senior Senator from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, has repeatedly pointed out these shortfalls and missteps. I echo his frustrations.

In response to the accusations and grievances about the F-35 program, one could have just thrown one's hands up in frustration. Yet through the renewed determination of the F-35's Joint Strike Program Office under the leadership of Lt. Gen. Christopher Bogdan, what once was the poster child for acquisition reform has reached vital milestones and will soon be used by our combat forces.

During his tenure, General Bogdan has demanded and achieved greater performance and accountability among his own staff and his industry partners. He has established and is executing a corrective plan. With that said, there is still much more to do. The problems General Bogdan and the collective F-35 team are overcoming did not occur in an instant, nor will they be fixed in an instant.

Accordingly, today, I call on my colleagues to support the F-35 and provide the F-35 Program Office with the backing it needs to achieve critical future milestones.

In addition, the Congress must continue to challenge the Department, the F-35 Program Office, and the program's industrial partners to reduce not only each aircraft's initial purchase price, but the cost of using and maintaining this strike fighter in the decades that



follow. As history teaches us, upwards of 80 percent of the total ownership costs of a weapon system resides not in the purchase price, but in its use and resulting maintenance. This means the Department must pay critical attention now to the development and execution of a robust F-35 sustainment strategy to ensure long term costs are reduced.

We must also not forget the current purchase price of the F-35 exceeds \$110 million per aircraft. It is inevitable that the price of the F-35 will come down as the numbers of aircraft produced goes up. But the quest for price reduction must be central to our current and future efforts if we are to be able to procure the number of aircraft required to properly execute our deterrent strategies and, if necessary, war plans. Indeed, price will have a dramatic effect on the ability of our allies to purchase the F-35. Therefore, I challenge both the Department and our defense contractors to work toward achieving what many experts agree is an obtainable goal: a procurement price of less than \$80 million per aircraft, and as close to \$60 million per aircraft as possible. If we do this, the current program of record for more than 3,000 aircraft will naturally increase. My personal desire would be to see over 6,000 of these aircraft safeguarding our precious liberties and those of our allies.

This is an ambitious objective, but it is based upon achieving what is best for America and its allies. And I believe everyone in the Department of Defense, the F-35 Program Office, and, yes, the employees of our Nation's defense contractors have this as their central goal.

Therefore, I am reminded of a story from our history about the industrialist Collis Potter Huntington. He was one of the so-called "Big Four" of the western railroads during the late 1800s and built the Central Pacific Railroad as part of the first transcontinental railroad. He also led and developed other interstate lines such as the Southern Pacific Railroad and the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway, known simply as the C&O. As Huntington furthered the C&O's extension through the Virginia peninsula, he opened the pathway for West Virginia's coal industry to reach the coal piers in the harbor of Hampton Roads. Seeing a need for export shipping, he started the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company in 1886.

Huntington started a long tradition of superb shipbuilding, and he is also credited with giving the shipyard its motto. The motto simply states: "We will build good ships here. At a profit if we can. At a loss if we must. But always good ships." This motto is emblazoned on a plaque and fixed to a granite monument at one of the entrances to the yard. This motto defined the mindset of generations of ship builders at the yard.

In 1968, the privately held Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company merged with another company. Thereafter, the "Good Ship" monument was removed due to its misalignment with the "new" company's goals. As a testament to the character of the workers who built many of our Nation's great warships, the shipyard almost came to a standstill, leading to the monument's eventual return.

The "Good Ship" motto is a lesson for us all, but especially for the F-35 Program Office and its industry partners. We should all rally around a "Good Strike Fighter" motto. After all, these jets are being built for our men and women in uniform, to protect our rights and liberties as well as those of our allies.

The fighting spirit of the United States and her allies can enable the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter to emerge from its challenges like the mythical phoenix: reborn, regenerated and renewed. But for this to succeed, we must commit ourselves to excellence—in essence, the "Good Strike Fighter" motto. The war fighter, the American people, our allies and partners, and the whole free world are depending on it.

#### NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my remarks at the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

We're here today to review the president's fiscal year 2016 budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration, which is a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy that is responsible for managing our nuclear weapons stockpile, reducing global dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction, and providing the Navy with safe and effective nuclear propulsion.

This is the subcommittee's third hearing this year on the president's budget request, and I look forward to hearing our witnesses' testimony.

The NNSA, has an important national security mission, but faces many challenges. That's why we need to do what we were sent here to do—to govern.

Governing is about setting priorities, and we are going to have to make some hard decisions this year to make sure the highest priorities are funded.

The president's 2016 budget request for defense spending is about \$38 billion higher than what is allowed under the spending caps in the Budget Control Act.

In fact, if spending this year is consistent with the Budget Control Act, fully funding NNSA's budget request alone would require almost the entire increase in defense spending for all defense programs—including the Department of Defense.

We will work with Senator Cochran and Senator Mikulski to increase the sub-

committee's defense spending allocation, but we're going to need your help to understand the NNSA's most urgent priorities, and that is why we are holding this hearing.

I'd like to focus my questions on three main areas, all with an eye toward setting priorities:

Keeping large construction projects on time and on budget; Senator Feinstein and I have worked pretty hard on that.

Effectively maintaining our nuclear weapons stockpile; and

Supporting our nuclear Navy.

The NNSA is responsible for three of the largest construction projects in the federal government: the Uranium Processing Facility in Tennessee; the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility in South Carolina; and the Plutonium Facility in New Mexico.

Combined, these projects could cost as much as \$20 billion dollars to build, and over the past four years, Senator Feinstein and I have worked hard with the NNSA to keep costs from skyrocketing and to make sure hard-earned taxpayer dollars are spent wisely. We need to make sure these projects are on time and on budget.

Senator Feinstein and I have focused much of our oversight on the Uranium Processing Facility, because costs had increased every time we would get a status update.

Three years ago, we began holding regular meetings with the NNSA administrator and his team.

We said we wanted 90 percent design completed before we began construction and urged the NNSA to take aggressive steps to get costs under control.

The administrator asked Thom Mason, the laboratory director for Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee to head a Red Team to review the project. The result of that review may be a model for how to keep these kinds of projects on time and on budget.

The Red Team's report included 17 recommendations, nearly all of which the NNSA has now adopted, to keep the uranium facility within a \$6.5 billion budget with completion by 2025.

Based on these recommendations, the Uranium Facility will now consist of at least two buildings—one with high security and one with less security—with construction of these buildings to begin once their design is at 90 percent.

As I understand it, NNSA recently completed a portion of the site preparation for this project under budget by \$10 million. That's a good start, but there's a lot more work to be done.

I'm going to ask you more today about the uranium facility, particularly about your schedule for completing the design and when you anticipate construction can begin.

I also want to ask you about how you are applying the lessons we learned from the Red Team Review Team and to the other big construction projects, and look forward to any updates you can provide.

General Klotz, I know you plan to go to Tennessee tomorrow to see the progress on this project. I appreciate your hands-on approach to making sure this important project is delivered on time and on budget.

Another large portion of the budget request is the work NNSA is doing to maintain our nuclear weapons stockpile, and I want to make sure we are spending taxpayer dollars effectively.

The budget request includes \$1.3 billion to continue the four ongoing life extension programs, which fix or replace components in weapons systems to make sure they're safe and reliable.

These life extension programs are needed but they are very expensive, and I will ask you today whether you will be able to meet your production deadlines on time and on budget.

Naval Reactors is responsible for all aspects of the nuclear reactors that power submarines and aircraft carriers. Naval Reactors is currently designing a new reactor core that will not need to be refueled during the life of the ship.

This work will save taxpayers billions of dollars because we won't have to build two extra submarines to make up for those that are not in service when they are being refueled.

The small nuclear reactors that Naval Reactors designs have had an impeccable safety record for more than 60 years; there has never been a reactor accident.

I also want to hear more about your plans for storing the Navy's used nuclear fuel.

We talked a lot in our hearing last week with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission about Yucca Mountain and storing used nuclear fuel from commercial reactors, and I'd like to hear from you how this issue impacts your operations.

With that, I would recognize Senator Feinstein to make her opening statement.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO LINDA HODGDON

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I congratulate New Hampshire commissioner of administrative services Linda Hodgdon on her retirement and to recognize her nearly 30 years of dedicated public service to New Hampshire and our Nation.

Commissioner Hodgdon has distinguished herself as an extraordinary public servant. Linda's administrative and analytic talent, commitment to the prudent use of tax dollars, and her exceptional work ethic resulted in her holding increasingly challenging and responsible positions throughout New Hampshire's State government. She started her service in 1985 as a financial analyst in the Governor's office, and has since served in various positions with the Department of Transportation, Department of Health and Human Services, as well as the Department of Justice. In 2008 she was appointed to serve as the commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services. Throughout her career serving the people of New Hampshire, Linda has earned a reputation for her exemplary commitment to fulfilling the fiduciary duty we all have to spend tax dollars wisely, and she has worked to boost efficiency and increase accountability.

On a personal note, I had the opportunity to work with Linda when she served as the director of administration for the New Hampshire Department of Justice from 2004 to 2006. During my tenure as attorney general I came to value and greatly appreciate Linda's work managing our budget and many other administrative functions

within the office. Her skill, dedication, and hard work played an integral role in the success the office enjoyed. When Linda took on a task you knew it would be done thoroughly, professionally, and on time. Linda was a trusted member of my leadership team, who was greatly appreciated by all of the members of the office.

As Commissioner Hodgdon retires from public service, I commend her on a job well done. The government of the State of New Hampshire and the lives of the people of our State are better off because of her exemplary service. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Linda for her service and wishing Linda, her husband Mark, and their daughter well in all future endeavors.●

##### TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN ANDY BLOMME, COMMANDER DANIEL WALSH, AND LIEUTENANT COMMANDER ROBERT POTTER

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize CAPT Andy Blomme, Chief of Congressional Affairs for the U.S. Coast Guard; CDR Daniel Walsh, U.S. Coast Guard Senate Liaison; and LCDR Robert Potter, U.S. Coast Guard Deputy Senate Liaison, for all of the hard work they have done for me, my staff, and other members of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee over the past several years.

Captain Blomme graduated from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1985. His illustrious, 30-year career includes nearly 12 years of sea duty and command of three Coast Guard cutters, command of Coast Guard Sector Jacksonville, FL, and service as Military Assistant to the Secretary of Homeland Security during the terms of Secretary Chertoff and Secretary Napolitano.

Commander Walsh graduated from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1993. His distinguished career includes service aboard U.S. and allied vessels, multiple assignments as a Coast Guard aviator, and service as Military Aide to the President of the United States during the terms of President George W. Bush and President Barack Obama. Commander Walsh will next assume the Coast Guard Service Chair at the National War College in Washington, DC where he will serve as a service representative and instructor.

Lieutenant Commander Potter graduated from the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in 1999. His noteworthy career includes 2 years aboard the Coast Guard Cutter *Hamilton*, operational assignments at two air stations, and service as an MH-60T flight examiner at the U.S. Coast Guard Aviation Training Center in Mobile, AL. Lieutenant Commander Potter will be assigned to U.S. Coast Guard Sector San Diego where he will serve as the sector response chief.

I congratulate Captain Blomme and thank him for his selfless and dedi-

cated service to our Nation. I wish him and his family all the best in their future endeavors following his retirement from the Coast Guard this spring.

I would also like to extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Commander Walsh and Lieutenant Commander Potter for all of the fine work they have done and for their continued service to our Nation. I wish them further success in the years to come.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:46 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 233. An act to allow reviews of certain families' incomes every 3 years for purposes of determining eligibility for certain Federal assisted housing programs.

H.R. 360. An act to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended by Public Law 114-6, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate jointly reappoint the following individuals on March 23, 2015, each to a 2-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Mr. Alan V. Friedman of Los Angeles, California, Ms. Susan S. Robfogel of Rochester, New York, and Ms. Barbara Childs Wallace of Ridgefield, Mississippi.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 233. An act to allow reviews of certain families' incomes every 3 years for purposes of determining eligibility for certain Federal assisted housing programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 360. An act to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-995. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2-Propenoic Acid, Polymer with Ethenyl Acetate, Ethenylbenzene, 2-ethylhexyl 2-propenoate and ethyl 2-propenoate; Tolerance Exemption" (FRL No. 9923-63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate

on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-996. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Sodium L-lactate and Sodium DL-Lactate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9924-24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-997. A communication from the Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's biennial strategic plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-998. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Department of Defense 2015 Major Automated Information System (MAIS) Annual Reports (MARs) and an index of the 39 MARs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-999. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Housing Trust Fund" (RIN2590-AA73) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1000. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules" (FCC 15-28) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1001. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Significant New Uses of Metal Salts of Complex Inorganic Oxyacids" (RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9924-09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1002. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; California; Regional Haze Progress Report" (FRL No. 9924-64-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1003. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Mississippi Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9924-99-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1004. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Reporting Emission Data, Emission Fees and Process Information" (FRL No.

9924-44-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1005. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Preconstruction Requirements—Nonattainment New Source Review" (FRL No. 9924-57-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1006. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Laboratory Investigations of Soils and Rocks for Engineering Analysis and Design of Nuclear Power Plants" (Regulatory Guide 1.138, Revision 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1007. A joint communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1008. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 2014 report of the Department of Health and Human Services' Federal Coordinated Health Care Office; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1009. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Submission of Evidence in Disability Claims" (RIN0960-AH53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-1010. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-153); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1011. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-151); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1012. A communication from the Director, Employee Services, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of Certain Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas" (RIN3206-AN10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1013. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes to Implement the Hague Agreement Concerning International Registration of Industrial Designs" (RIN0651-AC87) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1014. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United

States, transmitting, a report relative to the Conference's Article III judgeship recommendations and corresponding draft legislation for the 114th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1015. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report relative to bankruptcy judgeship recommendations and corresponding draft legislation for the 114th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1016. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Amendments to Regulation Listing Substances Temporarily Controlled under Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act" (Docket No. DEA-406) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 20, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Air Force nomination of Col. Randall Reed, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Brian J. Mennes, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Mark A. Ediger, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Gen. Robin Rand, to be General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Jeffrey B. Clark, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Ronald J. Place, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nomination of Brig. Gen. Burke W. Whitman, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. Michael F. Fahey III, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Craig C. Crenshaw and ending with Brig. Gen. Craig Q. Timberlake, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. Paul K. Hurley, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Timothy J. Kadavy, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Stephen J. Townsend, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Tammy L. Miracle, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Maria C. Powers, to be Brigadier General.

Navy nomination of Capt. John G. Hannink, to be Rear Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Arnold W. Bunch, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Stephen W. Wilson, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr., to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Michael T. Franken, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Joseph P. DiSalvo, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. John W. Baker and ending with Brig. Gen. Flem B. Walker, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 19, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. Ronald P. Clark, to be Brigadier General.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORD on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nominations beginning with Korey E. Amundson and ending with Christopher L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 26, 2015. (minus 1 nominee: Rhys William Hunt)

Air Force nominations beginning with Christopher M. Abbott and ending with Christopher G. Zummo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Nicole H. Armitage and ending with Shannon G. Womble, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Army nomination of Jacinto Zambrano, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Cheryl D. Anderson and ending with Carlton G. Smith, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Eugene S. Alkire and ending with Patrick R. Staesina, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2015.

Army nomination of Jacob A. Johnson, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Patrick Mascarenhas, to be Major.

Army nomination of Debra Mayers, to be Major.

Army nomination of Dwaipayan Chakraborti, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Eric B. Hintz and ending with Bart D. Wilkison, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Army nomination of Kathryn A. Spletstoser, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Rachel S. Theisen, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Robert A. Blessing and ending with Paul L. Minor, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 19, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Joanne S. Martindale and ending with Charles Yost, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 19, 2015.

Army nomination of James L. Boggess, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Andrew J. Copeland and ending with Brian A. Lionbarger, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sean M. Miller and ending with Joseph B. Powell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 25, 2015.

By Mr. BARRASSO for the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. McCAIN):

S. 842. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to extend Interstate Route 11; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. NELSON, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 843. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 844. A bill to repeal the medical device excise tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 845. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to implement security measures in the electronic tax return filing process to prevent tax refund fraud from being perpetrated with electronic identity theft; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 846. A bill to require Federal agencies to review certain rules and regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 847. A bill to prohibit the intentional hindering of immigration, border, and customs controls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 848. A bill to clarify that compliance with an emergency order under the Federal Power Act may not be considered a violation of any Federal, State, or local environmental law or regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 849. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 850. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation of horses in interstate transportation in a motor vehicle containing 2 or more levels stacked on top of one another; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 851. A bill to promote neutrality, simplicity, and fairness in the taxation of digital goods and digital services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 852. A bill to provide that employment-related arbitration agreements shall not be

enforceable with respect to any claim related to a tort arising out of rape; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 853. A bill to improve the efficiency and reliability of rail transportation by reforming the Surface Transportation Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 854. A bill to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 855. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to permit Governors of States to regulate intrastate endangered species and intrastate threatened species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 856. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require criminal background checks for school employees; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 108. A resolution commemorating the discovery of the polio vaccine and supporting efforts to eradicate the disease; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. Res. 109. A resolution acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 110. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate about a strategy for the Internet of Things to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment; considered and agreed to.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal

and federally funded construction projects.

S. 182

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 182, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to prohibit Federal education mandates, and for other purposes.

S. 194

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 194, a bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to clarify the rule allowing discharge as a nonpriority claim of governmental claims arising from the disposition of farm assets under chapter 12 bankruptcies.

S. 226

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 226, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 483

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 483, a bill to improve enforcement efforts related to prescription drug diversion and abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 614

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 614, a bill to provide access to and use of information by Federal agencies in order to reduce improper payments, and for other purposes.

S. 615

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 615, a bill to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 646

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 646, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide an individual with a mental health screening before the individual enlists in the Armed Forces or is commissioned as an officer in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 655

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 655, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 694

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 694, a bill to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old children employed in logging or mechanized operations from child labor laws.

S. 698

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 698, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr.

HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 753

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) were added as cosponsors of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 802, a bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

S. 808

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes.

S. 811

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 811, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require States to develop policies on positive school climates and school discipline.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses,

increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 828, a bill to clarify that a State has the sole authority to regulate hydraulic fracturing on Federal land within the boundaries of the State.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 323

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 323 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 329

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 329 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 331

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 331 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 334

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 334 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 342

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 342 intended to be

proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 344

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 344 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 346

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 346 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 347

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 347 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 347 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 348

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 348 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 854. A bill to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in introducing the Nuclear Waste Administration Act, a bill to establish a national nuclear waste policy.

This bipartisan legislation, which has been years in the making, is also cosponsored by Senators MARIA CANTWELL, LISA MURKOWSKI, and LAMAR ALEXANDER.

This legislation represents our best attempt to establish a workable, long term nuclear waste policy for the United States, something our Nation lacks today. It does so by implementing the unanimous recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.

First, the bill would create a new independent entity, the Nuclear Waste Administration, with the sole purpose of managing nuclear waste.

Second, the bill would authorize the siting and construction of two types of waste facilities: permanent repositories for disposal and interim facilities for storage, including a pilot facility prioritizing waste from shut down reactors.

Third, the bill creates a consent-based siting process for both storage facilities and repositories, based on other countries' successful efforts.

The legislation requires that local, tribal, and State governments must consent to host waste facilities by signing incentive agreements, assuring that waste is only stored in the States and communities that want and welcome it.

Fourth, the bill would resume collection of the nuclear waste management fees from nuclear power ratepayers at a rate of 1/10 of a cent per kilowatt-hour, or about \$750 million annually, and would rededicate these revenues to the Nuclear Waste Administration to fund construction of waste facilities.

Finally, the legislation ensures the Nuclear Waste Administration will be held accountable for meeting Federal responsibilities and stewarding Federal dollars.

The Nuclear Waste Administrator will be appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate. The administration will be overseen by a five-member Nuclear Waste Oversight Board, modeled on the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and will have an Inspector General. The administration will collect fees from nuclear utilities to pay for the development of storage and disposal facilities; those fees will be immediately available without appropriation, unless otherwise limited in an appropriations or authorization act. The current balance of the Nuclear Waste Fund, now valued at \$32 billion, will be available by appropriation only. Finally, if the agency fails to open a nuclear waste facility by 2025, fees paid by utilities will cease to be collected.



The United States has 99 operating commercial nuclear power reactors that supply  $\frac{1}{5}$  of our electricity and  $\frac{3}{4}$  of our emissions-free power.

However, production of this nuclear power has a significant downside: it produces nuclear waste that will take hundreds of thousands of years to decay. Unlike most nuclear nations, the United States has no program to consolidate waste in centralized facilities.

Instead, we leave the waste next to operating and shut down reactors sitting in pools of water or in cement and steel dry casks. Today, nearly 74,000 metric tons of nuclear waste is stored at commercial reactor sites. This total grows by about 2,000 metric tons each year.

In addition to commercial nuclear waste, we must also address waste generated from having created our nuclear weapons stockpile and from powering our Navy.

The byproducts of nuclear energy represent some of the nation's most hazardous materials, but for decades we have failed to find a solution for their safe storage and permanent disposal. Most experts agree that this failure is not a scientific problem or an engineering impossibility; it is a failure of government.

Although the Federal Government signed contracts committing to pick up commercial waste beginning in 1998, this waste program has failed to take possession of a single fuel assembly.

Our government has not honored its contractual obligations. We are routinely sued, and we routinely lose. So today, the taxpayer is paying power plants to store the waste at reactor sites all over the Nation. This has cost us \$4.5 billion so far, and our liability continues to grow each day. The lack of action is estimated to cost taxpayers another \$22.6 billion between now and 2065 if the government can start taking possession of waste in 2021. Further delays will only increase these costs.

We simply cannot tolerate continued inaction.

In January 2012, the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future completed a 2-year comprehensive study and published unanimous recommendations for fixing our Nation's broken nuclear waste management program.

The commission found that the only long-term, technically feasible solution for this waste is to dispose of it in a permanent underground repository. Until such a facility is opened, which will take many decades, spent nuclear fuel will continue to be an expensive, dangerous burden.

That is why the commission also recommended that we establish an interim storage facility program to begin consolidating this dangerous waste, in addition to working on a permanent repository.

Finally, after studying the experience of all nuclear nations, the commission found that siting these facilities is most likely to succeed if the host States and communities are welcome and willing partners, not adversaries. The commission recommended that we adopt a consent based nuclear facility siting process.

Senators ALEXANDER, MURKOWSKI, CANTWELL, and I introduce this legislation in order to begin implementing those recommendations, putting us on a dual track toward interim and permanent storage facilities. The bipartisan bill is the product of thoughtful collaboration, building on our work last Congress with Senator WYDEN and before that with former Senator Bingaman in the 112th Congress.

In my view, one of the most important provisions in this legislation is the pilot program to immediately begin consolidating nuclear waste at safer, more cost-efficient centralized facilities on an interim basis. The legislation will facilitate interim storage of nuclear waste in above-ground canisters called dry casks. These facilities would be located in willing communities, away from population centers, and on thoroughly assessed sites.

Some members of Congress argue that we should ignore the need for interim storage sites and instead push forward with a plan to open Yucca Mountain as a permanent storage site.

Others argue that we should push forward only with repository plans in new locations.

But the debate over Yucca Mountain, a controversial waste repository proposed in the Nevada desert, which lacks State approval, is unlikely to be settled any time soon.

I believe the debate over a permanent repository does not need to be settled in order to recognize the need for interim storage. Even if Congress and a future president reverse course and move forward with Yucca Mountain, interim storage facilities would still be an essential component of a badly needed national nuclear waste strategy.

By creating interim storage sites, a top recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission, we would begin reducing the federal liability while providing breathing room to site and build a permanent repository.

Interim storage facilities are of particular importance for the sites of decommissioned power plants that are maintained solely to store the spent nuclear fuel. In the last fourteen months alone, four nuclear power plants have been taken out of service: the Crystal River plant in Florida, the Kewaunee plant in Wisconsin, the San Onofre plant in California, and the Vermont Yankee plant in Vermont.

Until there is an interim storage facility for this waste, these sites will join the likes of Rancho Seco and Hum-

boldt Bay, which stopped operating in the 1980s but continue to store spent nuclear fuel. All told, there are more than 6,500 metric tons of nuclear waste stored at sites that no longer have operating reactors.

Interim storage facilities could also provide alternative storage locations in emergency situations, if spent nuclear fuel ever needs to be moved quickly from a reactor site.

Both short- and long-term storage programs are vital.

Because of the long timeline for permanent facilities, interim storage facilities allow us to achieve significant cost savings for taxpayers and utility ratepayers and finally start the process of securing waste from decommissioned plants by finally removing waste from the sites of decommissioned power plants.

One thing is certain: inaction is the most costly and least safe option.

Our longstanding stalemate is costly to taxpayers, utility ratepayers and communities that are involuntarily saddled with waste after local nuclear power plants have shut down.

It leaves nuclear waste all over the country, stored in all different ways.

It is long overdue for the government to honor its obligation to safely dispose of the nation's nuclear waste—and this bipartisan bill is the way to do that.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 108—COMMEMORATING THE DISCOVERY OF THE POLIO VACCINE AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO ERADICATE THE DISEASE

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 108

Whereas April 12, 2015, is the 60th anniversary of the announcement of the discovery of the first safe and effective polio vaccine;

Whereas the vaccine was developed by Jonas Salk with the support of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, now known as the March of Dimes Foundation;

Whereas the vaccine developed by Jonas Salk was proven safe and effective in a massive nationwide field trial organized by the March of Dimes Foundation, relying on the largest peacetime mobilization of volunteers in the history of the United States;

Whereas polio is a crippling and potentially fatal infectious disease for which there is no cure, which means that vaccination is the only viable pathway for eradication of the disease;

Whereas nearly 60,000 children in the United States were reported to have polio in 1952 alone, with more than 20,000 cases of paralysis;



Whereas, due to vaccination, polio was eliminated from the United States in 1979;

Whereas the use of the inactivated polio vaccine developed by Jonas Salk and the oral polio vaccine developed by Albert Sabin has dramatically reduced the incidence of polio worldwide;

Whereas the fight against polio has been part of the mission of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this preamble as the "CDC") since the 1950s;

Whereas, as part of the fight against polio, the CDC established a national polio surveillance unit and worked with Jonas Salk and Albert Sabin to widely distribute vaccines;

Whereas, through the Global Polio Eradication Initiative (referred to in this preamble as the "Initiative"), the Federal Government, Rotary International, the World Health Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund (commonly known as "UNICEF"), the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the United Nations Foundation have joined together with governments around the world to successfully reduce cases of polio by more than 99 percent since the launch of global polio eradication efforts;

Whereas Rotary International, a global association founded in Illinois, has contributed more than \$1,000,000,000 alone to, and volunteered countless hours in, the global fight against polio;

Whereas October 24 of each year is recognized internationally as World Polio Day to commemorate the fight against the disease;

Whereas, according to the CDC, polio vaccination has prevented over 13,000,000 paralytic polio cases and 650,000 deaths since 1988;

Whereas only 3 countries (Afghanistan, Nigeria and Pakistan) remained polio-endemic in 2014, which is a decrease from more than 125 countries in 1988;

Whereas there is a global push to eradicate polio by 2018;

Whereas investments in polio eradication are helping improve routine immunization systems and creating lasting infrastructure to support other health priorities;

Whereas the Initiative is finding and reaching the most vulnerable children in the world with the polio vaccine and combining those efforts with other health care resources;

Whereas, in December 2011, the CDC activated Emergency Operations Center of the CDC to "support the final push for polio eradication";

Whereas the eradication of polio would be the only time in history aside from the eradication of smallpox that a disease affecting humans has been eradicated, and the eradication of polio would be a "once-in-a-generation opportunity for global public health"; and

Whereas the success of the polio vaccine has shown the public what sustained medical research can accomplish and should encourage support for future Federal funding for biomedical research and public health prevention and control: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) commends the work of Jonas Salk and Albert Sabin in developing effective, safe vaccines for polio;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative;

(3) encourages and supports the international community of governments and nongovernmental organizations in remaining committed to the eradication of polio; and

(4) encourages the Federal Government to continue committing funding to the Global Polio Eradication Initiative and for bio-

medical and basic scientific research so that more life-saving discoveries can be made.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 109—ACKNOWLEDGING AND HONORING BRAVE YOUNG MEN FROM HAWAII WHO ENABLED THE UNITED STATES TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN JURISDICTION IN REMOTE EQUATORIAL ISLANDS AS PROLONGED CONFLICT IN THE PACIFIC LED TO WORLD WAR II

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 109

Whereas in the mid-19th century, the Guano Islands Act (48 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) enabled companies from the United States to mine guano from a number of islands in the Equatorial Pacific;

Whereas after several decades, when the guano was depleted, the companies abandoned mining activities, and the control of the islands by the United States diminished and left the islands vulnerable to exploitation by other nations;

Whereas the Far East during the late 19th century and early 20th century was characterized by colonial conflicts and Japanese expansionism;

Whereas the 1930s marked the apex of the sphere of influence of Imperial Japan in the Far East;

Whereas military and commercial interest in Central Pacific air routes between Australia and California led to a desire by the United States to claim the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, although the ownership of the islands was unclear;

Whereas in 1935, a secret Department of Commerce colonization plan was instituted, aimed at placing citizens of the United States as colonists on the remote islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis;

Whereas to avoid conflicts with international law, which prevented colonization by active military personnel, the United States sought the participation of furloughed military personnel and Native Hawaiian civilians in the colonization project;

Whereas William T. Miller, Superintendent of Airways at the Department of Commerce, was appointed to lead the colonization project, traveled to Hawaii in February 1935, met with Albert F. Judd, Trustee of Kamehameha Schools and the Bishop Museum, and agreed that recent graduates and students of the Kamehameha School for Boys would make ideal colonists for the project;

Whereas the ideal Hawaiian candidates were candidates who could "fish in the native manner, swim excellently, handle a boat, be disciplined, friendly, and unattached";

Whereas on March 30, 1935, the United States Coast Guard Cutter *Itasca* departed from Honolulu Harbor in great secrecy with 6 young Hawaiian men aboard, all recent graduates of Kamehameha Schools, and 12 furloughed Army personnel, whose purpose was to occupy the barren islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis in teams of 5 for 3 months;

Whereas in June 1935, after a successful first tour, the furloughed Army personnel were ordered off the islands and replaced with additional Kamehameha Schools alumni, thus leaving the islands under the exclusive occupation of the 4 Native Hawaiians on each island;

Whereas the duties of the colonists while on the island were to record weather conditions, cultivate plants, maintain a daily log, record the types of fish that were caught, observe bird life, and collect specimens for the Bishop Museum;

Whereas the successful year-long occupation by the colonists directly enabled President Franklin D. Roosevelt to issue Executive Order 7368 on May 13, 1936, which proclaimed that the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis were under the jurisdiction of the United States;

Whereas multiple Federal agencies vied for the right to administer the colonization project, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, and the Navy Department, but jurisdiction was ultimately granted to the Department of the Interior;

Whereas under the Department of the Interior, the colonization project emphasized weather data and radio communication, which brought about the recruitment of a number of Asian radiomen and aerologists;

Whereas under the Department of the Interior, the colonization project also expanded beyond the Kamehameha Schools to include Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians from other schools in Hawaii;

Whereas in March of 1938 the United States also claimed and colonized the islands of Canton and Enderbury, maintaining that the colonization was in furtherance of commercial aviation and not for military purposes;

Whereas the risk of living on the remote islands meant that emergency medical care was not less than 5 days away, and the distance proved fatal for Carl Kahalewai, who died on October 8, 1938, en route to Honolulu after his appendix ruptured on Jarvis Island;

Whereas other life-threatening injuries occurred, including in 1939, when Manuel Pires had appendicitis, and in 1941, when an explosion severely burned Henry Knell and Dominic Zagara;

Whereas in 1940, when the issue of discontinuing the colonization project was raised, the Navy acknowledged that the islands were "probably worthless to commercial aviation" but advocated for "continued occupation" because the islands could serve as "bases from a military standpoint";

Whereas although military interests justified continued occupation of the islands, the colonists were never informed of the true nature of the project, nor were the colonists provided with weapons or any other means of self-defense;

Whereas in June of 1941, when much of Europe was engaged in World War II and Imperial Japan was establishing itself in the Pacific, the Commandant of the 14th Naval District recognized the "tension in the Western Pacific" and recommended the evacuation of the colonists, but his request was denied;

Whereas on December 8, 1941, Howland Island was attacked by a fleet of Japanese twin-engine bombers, and the attack killed Hawaiian colonists Joseph Keliiananui and Richard Whaley;

Whereas in the ensuing weeks, Japanese submarine and military aircraft continued to target the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, jeopardizing the lives of the remaining colonists;

Whereas the United States Government was unaware of the attacks on the islands, and was distracted by the entry of the United States into World War II;

Whereas the colonists demonstrated great valor while awaiting retrieval;

Whereas the 4 colonists from Baker and the 2 remaining colonists from Howland were

rescued on January 31, 1942, and the 8 colonists from Jarvis and Enderbury were rescued on February 9, 1942, 2 months after the initial attacks on Howland Island;

Whereas on March 20, 1942, Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, sent letters of condolence to the Keliihanani and Whaley families stating that “[i]n your bereavement it must be considerable satisfaction to know that your brother died in the service of his country”;

Whereas during the 7 years of colonization, more than 130 young men participated in the project, the majority of whom were Hawaiian, and all of whom made numerous sacrifices, endured hardships, and risked their lives to secure and maintain the islands of Howland, Baker, Jarvis, Canton, and Enderbury on behalf of the United States, and 3 young Hawaiian men made the ultimate sacrifice;

Whereas none of the islands, except for Canton, were ever used for commercial aviation, but the islands were used for military purposes;

Whereas in July 1943, a military base was established on Baker Island, and its forces, which numbered over 2,000 members, participated in the Tarawa-Makin operation;

Whereas in 1956, participants of the colonization project established an organization called “Hui Panala’au”, which was established to preserve the fellowship of the group, to provide scholarship assistance, and “to honor and esteem those who died as colonists of the Equatorial Islands”;

Whereas in 1979, Canton and Enderbury became part of the republic of Kiribati, but the islands of Jarvis, Howland, and Baker remain possessions of the United States, having been designated as National Wildlife Refuges in 1974;

Whereas the islands of Jarvis, Howland, and Baker are now part of the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument;

Whereas May 13, 2015, marks the 79th anniversary of the issuance of the Executive Order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaiming United States jurisdiction over the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, islands that remain possessions of the United States; and

Whereas the Federal Government has never fully recognized the contributions and sacrifices of the colonists, less than a handful of whom are still alive today: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the accomplishments and commends the service of the Hui Panala’au colonists;

(2) acknowledges the local, national, and international significance of the 7-year colonization project, which resulted in the United States extending sovereignty into the Equatorial Pacific;

(3) recognizes the dedication to the United States and self-reliance demonstrated by the young men, the majority of whom were Native Hawaiian, who left their homes and families in Hawaii to participate in the Equatorial Pacific colonization project;

(4) extends condolences on behalf of the United States to the families of Carl Kahalewai, Joseph Keliihanani, and Richard Whaley for the loss of their loved ones in the service of the United States;

(5) honors the young men whose actions, sacrifices, and valor helped secure and maintain the jurisdiction of the United States over equatorial islands in the Pacific Ocean during the years leading up to and the months immediately following the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the entry of the United States into World War II; and

(6) extends to all of the colonists, and to the families of these exceptional young men, the deep appreciation of the people of the United States.

# SENATE RESOLUTION 110—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ABOUT A STRATEGY FOR THE INTERNET OF THINGS TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH AND CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT

Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

## S. RES. 110

Whereas the Internet of Things currently connects tens of billions of devices worldwide and has the potential to generate trillions of dollars in economic opportunity;

Whereas increased connectivity can empower consumers in nearly every aspect of their daily lives, including in the fields of agriculture, education, energy, healthcare, public safety, security, and transportation, to name just a few;

Whereas businesses across our economy can simplify logistics, cut costs in supply chains, and pass savings on to consumers because of the Internet of Things and innovations derived from it;

Whereas the United States should strive to be a world leader in smart cities and smart infrastructure to ensure its citizens and businesses, in both rural and urban parts of the country, have access to the safest and most resilient communities in the world;

Whereas the United States is the world leader in developing the Internet of Things technology, and with a strategy guiding both public and private entities, the United States will continue to produce breakthrough technologies and lead the world in innovation;

Whereas the evolution of the Internet of Things is a nascent market, the future direction of which holds much promise;

Whereas the Internet of Things represents a wide range of technologies that are governed by various laws, policies, and governmental entities; and

Whereas coordination between all stakeholders of the Internet of Things on relevant developments, impediments, and achievements is a vital ingredient to the continued advancement of pioneering technology: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States should develop a strategy to incentivize the development of the Internet of Things in a way that maximizes the promise connected technologies hold to empower consumers, foster future economic growth, and improve our collective social well-being;

(2) the United States should prioritize accelerating the development and deployment of the Internet of Things in a way that recognizes its benefits, allows for future innovation, and responsibly protects against misuse;

(3) the United States should recognize the importance of consensus-based best practices and communication among stakeholders, with the understanding that businesses can play an important role in the future development of the Internet of Things;

(4) the United States Government should commit itself to using the Internet of Things to improve its efficiency and effectiveness

and cut waste, fraud, and abuse whenever possible; and

(5) using the Internet of Things, innovators in the United States should commit to improving the quality of life for future generations by developing safe, new technologies aimed at tackling the most challenging societal issues facing the world.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 349. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

SA 350. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 351. Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 352. Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 353. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 354. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 355. Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 356. Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 357. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 358. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 359. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 360. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 361. Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 362. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 363. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 422. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

ment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 538. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 599. Mrs. CAPITO (for Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 72, *supra*.



SA 600. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 601. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 602. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 603. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 604. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 605. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 606. Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 349.** Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE HEALTH OUTCOMES AND LOWER THE COSTS OF CARING FOR MEDICALLY COMPLEX CHILDREN IN MEDICAID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the health outcomes and lowering the costs of caring for medically complex children in Medicaid, which may include creating or expanding integrated delivery models or improving care coordination, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 350.** Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for

fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A TAX OR FEE ON CARBON EMISSIONS.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) would result in revenues that would be greater than the level of revenues set forth for the first fiscal year or the total of that fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years under the concurrent resolution on the budget then in effect for which allocations are provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) for any year covered by such resolution, includes a Federal tax or fee imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of the emissions.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 351.** Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DREDGING OF SHALLOW DRAFT PORTS ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding the regular dredging of shallow draft ports located on the inland Mississippi River to the respective authorized widths and depths of those inland ports, in a manner that treats the ports as a system serving as the on- and off-ramps to the Mississippi River, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 352.** Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which

was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AWARDS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reform of Federal employee performance award and bonus programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 353.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING LETHAL AID TO UKRAINE IN OPPOSITION TO RUSSIAN AGGRESSION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the defense capabilities of the Government of Ukraine by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 354.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MILITARY READINESS, TRAINING, AND MODERNIZATION WHILE DECREASING RISK OF CASUALTIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to troop levels capable of meeting global threats without undue risk to warfighters by the amounts provided in such



legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 355.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT ADDITIONAL PREMIUM INCREASES FOR TWO YEARS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that delays by 2 years any annual fee on health insurers that will result in higher premiums for individuals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 356.** Mr. MORAN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING HEALTH CARE TO VETERANS WHO HAVE GEOGRAPHIC INACCESSIBILITY TO CARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing health care to veterans who reside more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provides the care sought by the veteran, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 357.** Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.**

(a) **DECLARATION.**—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025:

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 102. Social Security.

Sec. 103. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 104. Major functional categories.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,782,118,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$2,911,598,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,154,504,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,032,807,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,283,622,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,384,769,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,547,148,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,723,593,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,906,565,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,101,653,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$106,616,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$136,022,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$163,087,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$172,375,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$176,675,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$137,549,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$154,357,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$169,369,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$182,816,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$195,747,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,255,201,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,327,408,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,499,239,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,671,830,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,842,839,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$4,002,266,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,137,887,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,331,167,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,525,063,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,698,213,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,176,604,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,313,951,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,453,391,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,629,820,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,794,704,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,958,813,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,125,757,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,295,745,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,472,764,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,658,696,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: -\$393,486,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: -\$402,353,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: -\$420,584,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: -\$475,316,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: -\$511,082,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: -\$574,044,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: -\$578,609,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: -\$572,152,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: -\$566,169,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: -\$557,043,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,073,693,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$19,710,827,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$20,376,934,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$21,086,158,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$21,829,431,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$22,636,111,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$23,426,980,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$24,229,751,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$25,047,922,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$25,828,001,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,843,727,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$14,331,751,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$14,843,906,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$15,431,538,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$16,077,703,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$16,813,416,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$17,582,663,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$18,380,709,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$19,212,617,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$20,078,436,000,000.

**SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) **SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$795,375,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$830,498,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$871,536,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$908,592,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$945,625,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$984,103,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$1,025,522,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$1,067,086,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$1,110,741,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$1,157,956,000,000.

(b) **SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$776,949,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$823,456,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$879,794,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$938,167,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$1,002,954,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$1,071,455,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$1,144,538,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$1,223,255,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$1,306,944,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$1,395,254,000,000.

(c) **SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance

Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,832,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,808,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,438,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,461,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,548,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,602,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,589,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,658,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,648,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,771,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,754,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,886,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,866,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,004,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,983,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,124,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,247,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,226,000,000.

#### SEC. 103. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$267,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$266,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$271,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$271,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$277,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$280,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$280,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$282,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$282,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$288,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$288,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$294,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$305,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$305,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$312,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$312,000,000.

#### SEC. 104. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$621,330,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$606,012,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$581,877,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$589,877,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$592,886,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$581,502,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$600,988,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$590,465,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$607,130,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$597,310,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$619,323,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$606,320,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$631,457,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$621,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$644,588,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$629,037,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$657,732,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$637,096,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$670,928,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$654,427,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$54,490,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,006,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$48,862,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$50,790,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$50,103,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$50,215,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$50,779,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$50,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$51,192,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$49,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$52,269,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$50,185,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$53,555,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$50,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$54,647,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$51,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$55,743,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$52,279,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$56,872,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$53,206,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,059,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,672,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$32,302,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,881,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$32,623,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$32,948,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,619,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$33,606,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$34,279,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$34,962,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$34,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$35,658,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$34,969,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$36,372,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$35,667,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,210,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,933,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,587,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,811,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,559,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,867,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,563,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,392,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,648,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,733,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,934,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,080,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,130,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,454,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,698,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,678,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,032,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,698,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,043,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$44,067,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$41,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$41,814,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,989,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,650,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,793,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,603,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,213,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,569,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,972,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,562,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,064,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$44,192,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,541,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$44,798,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$45,230,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$45,552,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$45,259,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,479,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,078,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,179,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,024,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$22,285,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,024,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$22,285,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,550,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,795,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,449,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,922,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,859,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,342,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,694,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,161,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,298,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,765,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,334,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,774,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,585,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,075,000,000.  
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$16,313,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,840,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,480,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$2,563,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,434,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$4,756,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,125,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$8,060,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$15,466,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,315,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,937,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$3,955,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$10,498,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$5,738,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$10,563,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$7,007,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,049,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$7,918,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$11,872,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$8,289,000,000.  
(8) Transportation (400):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$107,196,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$94,865,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$108,014,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$98,555,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$109,096,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$100,244,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$110,177,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$102,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$111,465,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$103,310,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$113,149,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$104,702,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$94,207,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$105,490,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$96,051,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$105,531,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$97,928,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$105,345,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$99,838,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$105,793,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,276,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,514,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,127,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,830,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,677,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,778,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,865,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,968,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,754,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,803,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,130,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,687,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,885,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,708,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,573,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,790,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,659,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$13,922,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$14,979,000,000.  
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$128,347,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$100,345,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$122,722,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$117,075,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$129,756,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$126,539,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$138,135,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$135,536,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$143,915,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$141,643,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$146,601,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$146,688,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$152,658,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$151,411,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$157,308,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$155,775,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$160,097,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$160,715,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$162,423,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$164,212,000,000.  
(11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$528,401,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$540,146,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$571,887,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$573,341,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$596,242,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$597,665,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$619,715,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$623,714,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$651,448,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$643,847,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$670,514,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$671,337,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$704,552,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$703,963,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$738,325,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$737,835,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$773,401,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$772,915,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$808,966,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$808,859,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$582,142,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$580,480,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$576,297,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$576,226,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$576,991,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$576,907,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$640,412,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$640,216,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$681,465,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$681,314,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$729,296,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$729,134,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$820,107,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$819,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$838,468,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$837,365,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$848,394,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$847,031,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$935,922,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$940,432,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$541,029,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$535,536,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$551,297,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$544,418,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$556,470,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$545,902,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$576,770,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$569,345,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$590,163,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$582,303,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$603,662,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$595,638,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$623,872,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$620,819,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$634,962,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$626,823,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$647,056,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$633,473,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$670,776,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$661,899,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,116,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,159,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,544,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,572,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,419,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,436,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,651,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,651,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,132,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,132,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,758,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,758,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,618,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,618,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,562,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,562,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,702,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,702,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,961,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,961,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$168,149,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$172,287,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$169,056,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$172,526,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$167,449,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$166,730,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$177,868,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$177,632,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$181,997,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$181,720,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$185,563,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$185,241,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$197,427,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$196,870,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$193,599,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$192,947,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$189,928,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$189,197,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$203,297,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$202,560,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$58,250,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,913,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,731,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,333,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,804,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,250,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,227,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,495,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,656,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,820,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,787,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,288,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,489,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,764,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,525,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,636,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,581,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,539,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$71,547,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$71,371,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,867,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,669,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,152,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,451,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,852,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,360,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,550,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,063,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,237,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,787,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,820,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,343,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,382,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,895,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,968,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,450,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,299,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,799,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,873,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,294,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$368,902,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$368,902,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$421,272,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$421,272,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$494,228,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$494,228,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$560,202,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$560,202,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$621,298,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$621,298,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$671,109,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$671,109,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$721,582,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$721,582,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$769,645,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$769,645,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$814,278,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$814,278,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$850,543,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$850,543,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$33,270,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$33,276,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$10,125,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,361,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$59,827,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,095,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,541,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,319,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,668,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,317,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,601,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,175,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$49,129,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$39,073,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,672,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,114,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$82,823,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$83,580,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,533,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,780,000,000.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$77,852,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$77,852,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, -\$87,043,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$87,043,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$91,530,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$91,530,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$87,514,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$87,514,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,761,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$85,761,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,796,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$88,796,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$90,370,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$90,370,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$91,936,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$91,936,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$95,960,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$95,960,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$98,194,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$98,194,000,000.

**SA 358.** Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENHANCING TRADE ACROSS THE SOUTHWEST BORDER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving, increasing, and enhancing legal trade and commerce across the border between the United States and Mexico, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 359.** Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECURING THE SOUTHWEST BORDER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving effective control of the

Southwest border and detecting and eliminating illegal activity across the border between the United States and Mexico, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 360.** Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DETERRING THE MIGRATION OF UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN FROM EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, AND HONDURAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to deterring the attempted migration of unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras into the United States, which may include the expedited removal of unlawful entrants from non-contiguous countries and for providing in-county consulate processing of refugee applications, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 361.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING PROHIBITING THE CONSIDERATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to consideration of greenhouse gas emissions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), which may include a prohibition on the consideration of greenhouse gas emissions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 362.** Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to ensure equal pay policies and practices and to reform section 6(d) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)) (commonly known as the “Equal Pay Act of 1963”) to allow for punitive damages, limit the exception for unequal pay described in paragraph (1) of such section to business necessity rather than any factor “other than sex”, and prevent retaliation against employees for sharing salary information by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 363.** Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REID, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MODERNIZING AND UPDATING FOOD SAFETY OVERSIGHT WITHIN THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modernizing and updating food safety oversight within the Food and Drug Administration, which may include increased investments in inspection modernization and training, education and technical assistance for industry stakeholders, implementing a National Integrated Food Safety System to strengthen collaboration and improve coordination with State and local food safety regulators, expanded activities to improve the safety and reliability of imported foods, and other crucial investments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 364.** Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN AND PREGNANT WOMEN UNDER MEDICAID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to initiatives that would improve oral health care for children and pregnant women under the Medicaid program by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 365.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING AND ENFORCEMENT RELATED TO DOJ PROFILING GUIDANCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding to State and local law enforcement agencies that receive Federal funds to be used for training and enforcement related to the profiling guidance established by the Department of Justice by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 366.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO BE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO PROFILING BY THE DOJ.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for State and local law enforcement agencies that receive Federal funds to be used for data collection related to profiling by the Department of Justice by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 367.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING PROVIDING A FUNDING STREAM FOR A VOTER REINFRANCHISEMENT INITIATIVE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing a funding stream for a voter reinfranchisement initiative, which may include Bureau of Prisons notifications for released inmates of voting rights, notifications by United States attorneys of voting rights restrictions during plea agreements, and a Department of Justice report on the disproportionate impact of criminal disenfranchisement laws on minority populations, including data on disenfranchisement rates by race and ethnicity, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 368.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING STATES THE MEDICAID FLEXIBILITY THEY NEED IMPLEMENT INNOVATIVE REFORMS TO IMPROVE CARE AND ENHANCE ACCESS FOR OUR NATION'S MOST VULNERABLE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Medicaid that allows States the flexibility to build off of successful State innovations to ensure our Nation's most vulnerable Americans have improved access to quality care while reducing taxpayer costs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 369.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BIPARTISAN COMMISSIONS TO GOVERN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the establishment of bipartisan commissions to govern independent agencies, which may include structural changes to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 370.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING GREATER DISCRETION TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION IN SPENDING HIGHWAY TRUST FUND ALLOCATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolu-

tions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing State departments of transportation greater discretion in spending Highway Trust Fund allocations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 371.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR BUDGET FUNCTION 050 ARE SPENT EXCLUSIVELY ON NATIONAL DEFENSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that funds available for budget function 050 are spent exclusively on national defense by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 372.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING STATES TO IMPLEMENT DRUG TESTING AND WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS FOR APPLICANTS AND RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF) PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring States to operate a drug testing program and establish work requirements for applicants and recipients of assistance as part of their Federal welfare programs including, but not limited to, the temporary assistance for needy families (TANF) program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new

revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 373.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING ADEQUATE IMPACT AID FUNDING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring adequate funding for impact aid payments under sections 8002 and 8003 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7702, 7703) in order to enable local educational agencies to provide a level of service that is not less than the level provided to students during the 2014–2015 school year by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 374.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING COVERAGE OF VIRTUAL COLONOSCOPIES AS A COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING TEST UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing coverage of virtual colonoscopies as a colorectal cancer screening test under the Medicare program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 375.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional

budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RETURNING THE AUTHORITY OVER SCHOOL NUTRITION BACK TO THE STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to returning the authority over school nutrition back to the States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 376.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, insert the following:

**SEC. 422. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION IMPOSING USER FEES WITH RESPECT TO GENERAL AVIATION.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would impose a user fee with respect to general aviation during any of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 377.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING GREATER TRADE BETWEEN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolu-

tions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging greater trade between Africa and the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 378.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING THE STATUS OF QUALIFIED MORTGAGES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing qualified mortgage status to mortgages held in portfolio by financial institutions by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 379.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RELIEVING FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FROM REDUNDANT ANNUAL PRIVACY NOTICE MAILINGS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing relief from redundant annual privacy notice mailings required to be provided by financial institutions when there have been no changes to the privacy policies of the financial institution by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 380.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by



him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT STATE DROUGHT PREVENTION PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to assisting the States in carrying out drought prevention plans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 381.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PREVENTION OF GOVERNMENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST INDIVIDUALS, BUSINESSES, AND ORGANIZATIONS DUE TO SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal agencies do not discriminate against an individual, business, or organization, with sincerely held religious beliefs against abortion that marriage is the union of one man and one woman, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 382.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE CONTINUED EXCEPTION OF CERTAIN POPULAR AMMUNITIONS TRADITIONALLY AND PRIMARILY USED FOR SPORTING PURPOSES AS INTENDED UNDER THE LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS PROTECTION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 99-408).**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the protection of the Second Amendment by preventing Federal agencies from banning popular forms of ammunition by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 383.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO UPHOLD SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND PROHIBIT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL FIREARM REGISTRY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include a prohibition on the establishment of a national firearm registry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 384.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF THE SECOND AMENDMENT BY PREVENTING FEDERAL AGENCIES FROM TARGETING LAW-ABIDING FIREARMS DEALERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolu-

tions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring Federal agencies under certain banking programs, including Operation Choke Point, do not pressure banks to stop servicing the accounts of law-abiding firearms businesses by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 385.** Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY PRIOR TO SENATE RATIFICATION AND ADOPTION OF IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would make funds available to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty Secretariat or any other international organization created to support the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty until the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Treaty and the House and Senate adopt implementing legislation for the Treaty.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 386.** Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES FROM BENEFIT CUTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Medicaid, which may include protecting children, pregnant women, individuals with disabilities, low-income adults, and Americans that need long-term services and supports, including nursing home care,

who are guaranteed benefits under Medicaid, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 387.** Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO POSTAL REFORM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the United States Postal Service, which may include measures addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 388.** Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that State and local governments support designations of national monuments under section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 389.** Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOLDING MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ACCOUNTABLE FOR FAILING TO PASS A BALANCED BUDGET.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 390.** Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REGULATORY REVIEW.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to regulatory review, which may include requiring a Federal agency to review each regulation issued by the Federal agency every 10 years, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 391.** Mr. COONS (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. Kaine, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANSION OF ACCESS TO THE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES OF SMALL EMPLOYERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions,

amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expansion of access to the income tax credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 392.** Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE USE OF COLLEGE SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the use of college savings accounts while students are in elementary school and secondary school, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 393.** Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EMPHASIZING MANUFACTURING IN ENGINEERING PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to emphasizing manufacturing in engineering programs, which may include directing the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in coordination with other appropriate Federal agencies including the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and National Science Foundation, to designate United States manufacturing universities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 394.** Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. Kaine) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SPECIAL TREATMENT OF THE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR RESEARCH EXPENDITURES FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to special treatment of the income tax credit for research expenditures for startup companies by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 395.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REVERSING CUTS IN THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to support for the International Affairs Budget, which may include urgently needed reversal of cuts to nonwar-related programs, a robust investment in exports and economic development, a focus on key security challenges and global hot spots, such as Syria, Yemen, Ukraine, and West Africa, and greater accountability transparency, and results, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 396.** Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal

years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EMPOWERMENT OF STATES TO PROTECT CITIZENS OF THE STATE FROM DAMAGING REGULATIONS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY PURSUANT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing any State the option of opting out of the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)) if a Governor or legislative body of a State determines that the requirements of that section would increase retail electricity prices with a disproportionate impact on low-income or fixed-income households, or present a risk to electric reliability, or impair investments in existing electric generating capacity, or impair manufacturing and other important sectors of the economy of the State, or decrease employment, or decrease State and local revenues, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 397.** Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING MENTAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR VETERANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving mental health care services for veterans, including expanding the availability of services and choices from outside the Department of Veterans Affairs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 398.** Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels

for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FUNDING COAST GUARD AIR FACILITIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding Coast Guard air facilities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 399.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE NET DIRECT SPENDING IF THE NATIONAL DEBT IS GREATER THAN THE SIZE OF THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the net level of direct spending, excluding net interest, relative to the most recent Congressional Budget Office baseline during any period in which the gross Federal debt is greater than 100 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States in the prior year.

(2) DETERMINATION OF GROSS FEDERAL DEBT AS A PERCENT OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT.—For purposes of this section, the percent of total gross Federal debt as a percent of gross domestic product shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate on the basis of the most recently published Congressional Budget Office estimate of nominal gross domestic product in the prior calendar year.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 400.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE ACCESS, CHOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN VETERANS CARE THROUGH THE VETERANS CHOICE CARD PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining and enhancing access, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Choice Card program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 401.** Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT SENTENCING REFORM LEGISLATION THAT DOES NOT IMPOSE COSTS ON CRIME VICTIMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to sentencing reform without imposing costs on crime victims by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 402.** Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING INFORMATION SHARING BY THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS WITH RESPECT TO INVESTIGATIONS RELATING TO SUBSTANDARD HEALTH CARE, DELAYED AND DENIED HEALTH CARE, PATIENT DEATHS, OTHER FINDINGS THAT DIRECTLY RELATE TO PATIENT CARE, AND OTHER MANAGEMENT ISSUES OF THE DEPARTMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolu-

tions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving information sharing by the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs with respect to investigations relating to substandard health care, delayed and denied health care, patient deaths, other findings that directly relate to patient care, and other management issues of the Department by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 403.** Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE ANNUAL CONTRIBUTION LIMIT FOR COVERDELL EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the annual contribution limit for Coverdell education savings accounts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 404.** Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE MODERNIZATION OF THE NUCLEAR COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATIONS ARCHITECTURE OF THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modernizing the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems, the nuclear command and control system, and the nuclear weapons stockpile, and supporting related infrastructure, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the

deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 405.** Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE EFFORTS BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to sexual assault prevention and response efforts by the Department of Defense, which may improve and prioritize initiatives designed to reduce instances of retaliation against victims of sexual assault who report unwanted contact, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 406.** Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LIMITING CERTAIN RESEARCH CONDUCTED OR CONTRACTED BY THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Federal Communications Commission from—

(1) conducting or contracting for research studies that categorize or analyze media content, journalism, or editorial decision making; or

(2) actively soliciting non-public information about news and content; by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 407.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTIGATING SERVICE DISRUPTIONS AT WEST COAST PORTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requesting the Government Accountability Office to investigate the impact of service disruptions at West Coast ports during 2014 and 2015 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 408.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to ensure more transparency and stakeholder participation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 409.** Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING EQUAL PAY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting equal pay, which may include preventing discrimination on the basis of sex and preventing retaliation against employees for seeking or discussing wage information, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 410.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX CREDITS FOR EMPLOYERS PROVIDING PAID FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the allowance of tax credits to employers who provide paid family and medical leave by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 411.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE MAXIMUM LOAN LIMITS UNDER THE MICROLOAN PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the maximum loan limits under the program established under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 412.** Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT CERTAIN CLOSED-DOOR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to environmental laws and citizen suits, which may include prohibitions on the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entering into any closed-door settlement agreement without seeking approval from all State, county, and local governments that would be directly impacted by the agreement, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 413.** Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS ON GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to any international agreements on greenhouse gas emissions, which may include requiring congressional advice and consent before any agreement may be binding, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 414.** Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HYDRAULIC FRAC-TURING REGULATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to hydraulic fracturing regulations of the Department of the Interior, which may include a prohibition on any preemption of any States' laws regulating hydraulic fracturing, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 415.** Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A REQUIREMENT THAT ANY NEW ENVIRONMENTAL AGREEMENT SIGNED WITH ANY FOREIGN COUNTRY NOT RESULT IN SERIOUS HARM TO THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a requirement that any new environmental agreement signed by the United States with any foreign country or countries not result in serious harm to the economy of the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 416.** Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE RELIABILITY OF THE ELECTRICITY GRID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or issuing any regulation that would reduce the reliability of the electricity grid by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 417.** Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO ADVISE ALL VETERANS OF THEIR POTENTIAL ELIGIBILITY FOR PRIVATE HEALTH CARE BENEFITS PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to advise all veterans of their potential eligibility for private health care benefits provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 418.** Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR FOSSIL ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring sufficient funds are provided to the Department of Energy to support research on and development of clean coal technologies (including carbon capture

and sequestration activities) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while continuing to make use of domestic energy resources by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 419.** Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE SAFETY OF TANK CARS CARRYING CRUDE OIL BY RAIL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that require the Department of Transportation to finalize a regulation to improve the safety of tank cars carrying crude oil by rail, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 420.** Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE HEROIN AND METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE EPIDEMIC IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expanding efforts to combat heroin and methamphetamine abuse in the United States without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase spending over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 421.** Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States



Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF HIGH-SPEED BROADBAND IN RURAL AREAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring the Federal Communications Commission to focus efforts of the Federal Communications Commission on expanding high-speed broadband access to rural communities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 422.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE CONSERVATION OF NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT POPULATIONS AND LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ARE COMPATIBLE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), which may include requirements that State conservation plans relating to the northern long-eared bat are given maximum flexibility to be successful so as to preserve and protect local and rural economies before any Federal listing decision is made with respect to the northern long-eared bat, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 423.** Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 14, line 2, strike “\$620,263,000,000” and insert “\$696,776,000,000”.

On page 14, line 3, strike “\$605,189,000,000” and insert “\$658,021,000,000”.

On page 14, line 6, strike “\$544,506,000,000” and insert “\$657,496,000,000”.

On page 14, line 7, strike “\$576,934,000,000” and insert “\$659,073,000,000”.

**SA 424.** Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

**SEC. 105. ELIMINATION OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE INITIATIVES.**

Notwithstanding section 104(2), the new budget authority and outlays set forth for fiscal year 2016 under the heading International Affairs (150) shall each be reduced by \$1,289,600,000.

**SA 425.** Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING RETIREMENT SECURITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving retirement security by making it easier for small businesses to provide retirement plans for their employees by easing the administrative burden and by encouraging individuals to increase their savings by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 426.** Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting economic growth and job creation by making it easier for small businesses to plan their capital investments and reducing the uncertainty of taxation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 427.** Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTMENT IN ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE RESEARCH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient investment in Alzheimer's disease research, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 428.** Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXTENDING THE EXCEPTION FOR THE TAX TREATMENT OF PUBLICLY TRADED PARTNERSHIPS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY POWER GENERATION PROJECTS AND TRANSPORTATION FUELS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extending the exception for the tax treatment of publicly traded partnerships for other forms of renewable energy, including energy power generation projects and transportation fuels, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through



2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 429.** Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RELIEVE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FROM ANNUAL PRIVACY NOTICE MAILINGS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to providing relief from annual privacy notice mailings required to be provided by financial institutions when there have been no changes to the privacy policy of the financial institution, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 430.** Mr. MORAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAINTAINING ACCESS TO HOSPITALS AND HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS IN RURAL COMMUNITIES UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining access to hospitals and health care providers in rural communities under the Medicare program, which includes preserving and strengthening access to critical access hospitals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 431.** Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional

budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MEDICAL TREATMENT AND COMPENSATION FOR FIRST RESPONDERS, SURVIVORS, AND THEIR FAMILIES INJURED AND MADE ILL BY THE 9/11 ATTACKS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the September 11th terrorism attacks at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and the Shanksville Crash site, which may include legislation that extends medical monitoring and treatment services and compensation for first responders, survivors, and their families, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 432.** Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$17,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by \$4,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$6,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$6,900,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$8,200,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$8,600,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$9,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$17,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by \$4,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$5,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$6,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$6,900,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$7,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$8,200,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$8,600,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$9,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,151,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$2,729,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,453,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,821,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$6,358,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,282,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$9,311,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$12,123,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$12,736,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$13,422,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by \$172,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$660,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$2,903,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,119,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$5,605,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$6,783,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$8,548,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$11,067,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$12,427,000,000.

On page 7, line 7, decrease the amount by \$17,272,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$5,060,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, decrease the amount by \$3,800,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, decrease the amount by \$3,397,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, decrease the amount by \$2,781,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by \$1,695,000,000.

On page 7, line 13, decrease the amount by \$917,000,000.

On page 7, line 14, increase the amount by \$348,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,467,000,000.

On page 7, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,427,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, decrease the amount by \$17,272,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, decrease the amount by \$12,212,000,000.

On page 7, line 23, decrease the amount by \$16,012,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, decrease the amount by \$19,409,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, decrease the amount by \$22,190,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, decrease the amount by \$23,885,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, decrease the amount by \$24,802,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, decrease the amount by \$24,454,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, decrease the amount by \$21,987,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, decrease the amount by \$18,560,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, decrease the amount by \$17,272,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, decrease the amount by \$12,212,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, decrease the amount by \$16,012,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, decrease the amount by \$19,409,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, decrease the amount by \$22,190,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, decrease the amount by \$23,885,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, decrease the amount by \$24,802,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, decrease the amount by \$24,454,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, decrease the amount by \$21,987,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, decrease the amount by \$18,560,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,365,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$41,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,020,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by \$951,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,854,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$2,401,000,000.

On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,395,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,477,000,000.

On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,061,000,000.

On page 29, line 12, increase the amount by \$4,822,000,000.

On page 29, line 15, increase the amount by \$8,085,000,000.

On page 29, line 16, increase the amount by \$6,408,000,000.

On page 29, line 19, increase the amount by \$10,182,000,000.

On page 29, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,653,000,000.

On page 29, line 23, increase the amount by \$13,018,000,000.

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$9,443,000,000.

On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by \$13,583,000,000.

On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by \$11,914,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$14,171,000,000.

On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$13,175,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, decrease the amount by \$213,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, decrease the amount by \$213,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by \$291,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by \$291,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, decrease the amount by \$401,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, decrease the amount by \$401,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by \$574,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, decrease the amount by \$574,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, decrease the amount by \$703,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, decrease the amount by \$703,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, decrease the amount by \$803,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, decrease the amount by \$803,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, decrease the amount by \$870,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, decrease the amount by \$870,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, decrease the amount by \$895,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, decrease the amount by \$895,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, decrease the amount by \$847,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, decrease the amount by \$847,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, decrease the amount by \$748,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$748,000,000.

**SA 433.** Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONTINUING AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH FUNDING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to continuing funding for all agricultural research through fiscal year 2025 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 434.** Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.**

If a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) for wildfire suppression funding, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

**SA 435.** Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORT FOR UKRAINE, WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE THE PROVISION OF LETHAL DEFENSIVE ARTICLES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding to support the Government of Ukraine in reestablishing its sovereignty and territorial integrity, which should include the provision of lethal defensive articles, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 436.** Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 405.

**SA 437.** Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENHANCING AND IMPROVING THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE APPLICATION BACKLOG.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing and improving the United States Patent and Trademark Office in order to reduce the patent application backlog by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 438.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION ON FINANCIAL PRODUCTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which may include directing the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to implement the reporting requirements established by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-203), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 439.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE GUARANTEE THRESHOLD FOR THE SURETY BOND GUARANTEE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Surety Bond Guarantee Program of the Small Business Administration, which may include exploring or raising the range for surety bonds, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 440.** Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RAISING THE FAMILY OF FUNDS LIMIT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Small Business Investment Company Program of the Small Business Administration, which may include raising the Family of Funds limit of the Small Business Investment Company Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 441.** Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to oil spill liability, which may include changes to current law to equalize the per barrel Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund taxes for all oil sources, a permanent extension of such taxes, or elimination of tax deductions for settlements or judgments relating to oil spills, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 442.** Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF FULL-TIME EMPLOYEE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to the employer penalties under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), which may include changes to the definition of "full time employee" under that Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 443.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING PRIVATELY HELD WATER RIGHTS AND PERMITS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting communities, businesses, recreationists, farmers, ranchers, or other groups that rely on privately held water rights and permits from Federal takings by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 444.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM AND EXPAND THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming and expanding the earned income tax credit by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 445.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT ECONOMIC DISRUPTIONS AT SEAPORTS IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing economic disruptions at ports in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 446.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORT PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting public-private partnerships of the Armed Forces of the United States with institutions of higher education in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 447.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAKE HIGHER EDUCATION MORE AFFORDABLE AND EXPAND ACCESS AND OPPORTUNITY TO OUR NATION'S STUDENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making higher education more affordable and expanding access and opportunity to our Nation's students by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 448.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING EXPEDITED APPROVAL OF LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS EXPORT APPLICATIONS BY DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging approval of liquefied natural gas export applications, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 449.** Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING EFFICIENT RESOURCING FOR THE ASIA REBALANCE POLICY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding related to supporting efficient resourcing for the Asia rebalance policy by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 450.** Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENHANCE AND ENCOURAGE BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT AND ADOPTION IN RURAL AMERICA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing and encouraging broadband deployment and adoption in rural America, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 451.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PAY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS IF THE BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS ARE NOT COMPLETED IN A TIMELY MANNER.**

It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) both Houses of Congress should approve a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills before October 1 of each fiscal year;

(2) if a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills are not approved by October 1 of each fiscal year then no funds should be appropriated or otherwise be made available from the Treasury of the United States for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period after October 1 that a concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills are not completed; and

(3) no retroactive pay for any Member of Congress should be made during a period after October 1 when the concurrent resolution on the budget and all the regular appropriations bills are not completed.

**SA 452.** Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ENTERS INTO CERTAIN CANDIDATE CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS WITH WESTERN STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) determinations, which may include determining whether the greater sage-grouse warrants protection, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 453.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRIORITIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS THAT ARE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE AND PROJECTS IN HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prioritization of the Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States on projects that are of national and regional significance and projects in high priority corridors of the National Highway System by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 454.** Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY PREVENTING THE BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES FROM RECLASSIFYING AMMUNITION PRIMARILY INTENDED FOR SPORTING PURPOSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Second Amendment rights, which may include the rights of individuals and retention of the right to manufacture, import, and sell ammunition previously granted an exemption from prohibition or restriction by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 455.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PRIORITIZE THE ELIMINATION OF THE RAPE KIT BACKLOG.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prioritization of the elimination of the rape kit backlog by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 456.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEET THE NEEDS OF WOMEN VETERANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that medical facilities

of the Department of Veterans Affairs meet the needs of women veterans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 457.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN BONUSSES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to bonuses paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include prohibitions on awards to employees responsible for eliminating the backlog of claims, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 458.** Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BARDA AND THE BIO-SHIELD SPECIAL RESERVE FUND.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening our national security, which may include fully funding the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority and the BioShield Special Reserve Fund, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 459.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING THE QUANTITY OF FEDERAL LAND AVAILABLE FOR NATURAL RESOURCE EXTRACTION TO FUND INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to infrastructure financing, which may include expanding the Federal land available for natural resource extraction and using the receipts to fund infrastructure maintenance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 460.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COST AND FEASIBILITY CONSIDERATIONS AND ALLOWING STATES REASONABLE TIME TO CURE REJECTED STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to environmental laws requiring State implementation plans, which may include requiring the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to consider the costs, direct benefits, and feasibility of control measures when assessing the adequacy of State implementation plans rather than a Federal implementation plan or requiring the Administrator to allow States reasonable time to cure a rejected State implementation plan before imposing a Federal implementation plan on the States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 461.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional

budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MILITARY READINESS, TRAINING, AND MODERNIZATION WHILE DECREASING RISK OF CASUALTIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to troop levels capable of meeting global threats without undue risk to warfighters by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 462.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE ACCESS TO MEDICATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to over-the-counter medications, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 463.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT MARKETING MATERIALS RELATING TO THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal spending on health care promotional and marketing activities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 464.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING AN ENFORCEABLE TREATY FROM TOP 10 MAJOR GREENHOUSE GAS EMITTERS BEFORE IMPLEMENTATION OF REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FROM EXISTING POWER PLANTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing for the continued competitiveness of the United States economy, which may include requiring an enforceable treaty ratified by the top 10 major emitting countries before regulation of greenhouse gas emissions from existing power plants may be implemented, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 465.** Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include preventing the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives from impinging upon those rights, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.



**SA 466.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES THROUGH INTERNATIONAL AND DOMESTIC TRAVEL AND TOURISM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) making aviation security more efficient and effective;

(2) improving the United States visa system;

(3) strengthening travel infrastructure; or  
(4) attracting foreign travel and commerce; by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 467.** Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DIRECT PROVISION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES, DEFENSE SERVICES, AND RELATED TRAINING TO THE KURDISTAN REGIONAL GOVERNMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the direct provision of defense articles, defense services, and related training to the Kurdistan Regional Government by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 468.** Mr. BLUNT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MILITARY AID TO ISRAEL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing grants only in Israel for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development to assist Israel in maintaining its qualitative military edge, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 469.** Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN ALIENS WITHOUT LEGAL STATUS IN THE UNITED STATES FROM RETROACTIVELY CLAIMING THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to benefits for certain aliens without legal status in the United States, which may include prohibiting qualification for certain tax benefits on a retroactive basis, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 470.** Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND TO SUPPORT UNACCOMPANIED WOMAN IN INTERNATIONAL EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for unaccompanied women to secure access to vital services, including water, sanitation facilities, food, and health care, in emergency situations, including humanitarian crises or natural disasters, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 471.** Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. POINT OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction of benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) increase either the early or full retirement age for benefits described in paragraph (1); or

(3) privatize Social Security.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 472.** Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING CYPRIOT-ISRAELI COOPERATION IN ENERGY EXPLORATION IN THE EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this



resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for programs to support the development of growing Cypriot-Israeli cooperation in natural resource exploration and extraction in the Eastern Mediterranean, which may contribute to European energy security, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 473.** Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING TO COMBAT ANTI-SEMITISM IN EUROPE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for programs to counter anti-Semitic activity in Europe, which may include efforts to empower civil society, including diverse religious and ethnic groups, civil and human rights organizations, and the business community, to fight anti-Semitism and discrimination and convening regular consultations with Jewish community organizations and non-Jewish civil and human rights organizations to demonstrate visible support, listen to concerns, and solicit recommendations on improving security and supporting victims, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 474.** Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, HIRE MORE HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONALS FOR THE DEPARTMENT, AND ENSURE QUALITY AND TIMELY ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR ALL VETERANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include legislation that strengthens quality and timely access to health care by hiring more health care professionals at facilities of the Department and making necessary improvements to infrastructure of the Department, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 475.** Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening the United States Postal Service, which may include imposing a moratorium to prevent mail processing plants from closing, reestablishing overnight delivery standards, recognizing the importance of rural delivery, allowing the Postal Service to innovate and adapt to compete in a digital age, or improving the financial condition of the Postal Service by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 476.** Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXEMPTING CERTAIN SCHOOLS FROM OBAMACARE'S EMPLOYER MANDATE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to exempting elementary schools, secondary schools, and institutions of higher education from the employer mandate under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legisla-

tion for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 477.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INTEROPERABILITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving health information technology interoperability, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 478.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPRIORITIZING EDUCATION SPENDING TOWARD IMPACT AID OR OTHER FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS TO STATES AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, AND AWAY FROM ADMINISTRATIVE EARMARK PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reprioritizing education spending toward formula grant programs to States and local educational agencies, such as the impact aid program under title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), and away from administrative earmark programs like the Race to the Top program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 479.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD NEGATIVELY AFFECT RURAL HEALTH CARE.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would negatively affect rural health care.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 480.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 13, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by \$8,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 20, line 21, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 20, line 25, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 1, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 4, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 5, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 9, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 12, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 13, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 38, line 19, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 38, line 20, increase the amount by \$9,000,000.

On page 38, line 23, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 38, line 24, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 2, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 3, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 6, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 7, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 10, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 11, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 14, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 15, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 18, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 19, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 22, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 39, line 23, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 40, line 2, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 40, line 3, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, increase the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 43, line 19, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 43, line 20, decrease the amount by \$17,000,000.

On page 43, line 23, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 43, line 24, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 2, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 3, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 7, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 10, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 11, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 14, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 15, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 18, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 19, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 22, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 44, line 23, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 45, line 2, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 45, line 3, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 45, line 6, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 45, line 7, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

**SA 481.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING ISRAEL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to United States policy toward Israel, which may include preventing the United Nations and other international institutions from taking unfair or discriminatory action against Israel, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 482.** Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE INCREASED USE OF PERFORMANCE CONTRACTING IN FEDERAL FACILITIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 483.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COMBATING SEXUAL ASSAULT, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that—

(1) provide resources for programs administered through the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13701 et seq.) and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (42 U.S.C. 10401 et seq.), and other related programs;

(2) address trafficking in the welfare system;

(3) provide safe shelter and services for runaway and homeless youth, including counseling and mental health services; or

(4) combat sexual assault on college and university campuses,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 484.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING LETHAL AID TO UKRAINE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing lethal aid to Ukraine by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 485.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE EQUITY IN THE TAX TREATMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER DEATH BENEFITS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing tax equity for death benefits paid to the families of public safety officers who lose their lives in the line of duty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 486.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN MENTAL HEALTH EFFORTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to mental health education, awareness and access to treatment, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 487.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REIN IN FISHING REGULATIONS AND PROVIDE DISASTER RELIEF FOR FISHERIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reining in onerous regulations on the United States fishing industry or providing assistance for fishery disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce during 2014 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 488.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPAND BROADBAND IN RURAL AREAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting investments in rural broadband infrastructure, including changes to the Connect America Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 489.** Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY RELIEF, PROTECTING STATE-REGULATED INSURERS FROM GLOBAL REGULATORS, AND PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE REGULATIONS FOR INVESTMENT ADVISORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating regulatory burdens on small businesses, fostering small business export growth, protecting State-regulated insurers from international capital standards, and preventing duplicative regulations for investment advisors by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 490.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE DISPROPORTIONATE REGULATORY BURDENS ON COMMUNITY BANKS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 491.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Corporation for National and Community Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 492.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADVANCE WORKPLACE EQUALITY BY ENDING PREGNANCY DISCRIMINATION AND CONFRONTING SEX-BASED WAGE DISCRIMINATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to ensure workplace equality policies and practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 493.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING MISSILE DEFENSE COOPERATION WITH ISRAEL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening missile defense cooperation with Israel by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 494.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EFFECTS OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS ON DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the validity of international agreements on reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, which may include assurances that any agreements do not impede economic growth and development of developing nations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 495.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ACHIEVING DOMESTIC ENERGY INDEPENDENCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reform of statutes governing domestic energy production, which may include increasing production to levels eliminating the need for energy imports from

abroad, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 496.** Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING PUBLIC TRANSPARENCY IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH LITIGATION SETTLEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring Executive branch agencies to make publicly available and keep current on the website of the agency deadlines for promulgating rules established pursuant to a litigation settlement or court order by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 497.** Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING JOBS BY PREVENTING FEDERAL AGENCIES FROM OVERRIDING EFFORTS BY STATES TO CONSERVE SPECIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to amending any statute governing the protection of any species from extinction, which may include deferring conservation planning and implementation to States and units of local government, unless the efforts of the States and units of local government are determined to be inadequate for species conservation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of

fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 498.** Mr. ENZI (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LEGISLATION SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROTECT AND STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to legislation submitted to Congress by the President of the United States to protect current beneficiaries of the Social Security program and prevent the insolvency of the program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 499.** Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE AVAILABILITY TO THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF FULLY MODERNIZED AND MISSION-CAPABLE AIRCRAFT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring the availability to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of fully modernized and mission-capable aircraft by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 500.** Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING FEDERAL FUNDS FROM BEING USED TO CREATE A FEDERAL COLLEGE RATINGS SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing Federal funds from being used to create a Federal college ratings system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 501.** Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE BIOMEDICAL INNOVATION FOR PATIENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the research, development, and regulation of innovative, safe and effective drugs, diagnostics, and medical devices to help American patients, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 502.** Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PRESERVE EMPLOYEE WELLNESS PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving employee wellness programs that provide financial incentives for employees who take steps to improve

their health and reduce health care costs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 503.** Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING AN EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS FOR ROUTINE MAINTENANCE ACTIVITIES RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing, for certain routine maintenance activities relating to transportation infrastructure, an exemption from the permitting requirements of section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 504.** Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DISARMING THE EPA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to limiting the ability of Environmental Protection Agency personnel to carry firearms, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 505.** Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE GROUND-BASED MIDCOURSE DEFENSE AND THE LONG-RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR PROGRAMS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting programs related to the ground-based midcourse defense and the long-range discrimination radar programs of the Department of Defense by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 506.** Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING VULNERABLE FAMILIES FROM JOB KILLING REGULATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal agencies consider the full cost of regulations, including indirect job losses, prior to enacting or amending any regulation or rule, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 507.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING OBAMACARE SUBSIDIES FOR ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ending health care subsidies for immigrants illegally residing in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 508.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO TERMINATE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WITH SERIOUSLY DELINQUENT TAX LIABILITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal employees, which may include measures addressing Federal employees with seriously delinquent tax liability, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 509.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING THE STATE DNA ANALYSIS KIT BACKLOG.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to DNA analysis, which may include measures addressing the serious backlog of DNA analysis kits that in the possession of State and local governments and are awaiting testing, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fis-

cal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 510.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING HEALTH CARE TO VETERANS WHO HAVE GEOGRAPHIC INACCESSIBILITY TO CARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing health care to veterans who reside more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provides the care sought by the veteran, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 511.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND PREVENTING THE BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS, AND EXPLOSIVES FROM CLASSIFYING M855 OR ANY .223/5.56MM CARTRIDGE OR PROJECTILE AS ARMOR PIERCING AMMUNITION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to classifying any .223/5.56mm cartridge or projectile as armor piercing ammunition by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 512.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and



setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 105, strike line 9 and all that follows through page 106, line 8.

**SA 513.** Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. KING, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING MEDICARE BENEFICIARY ACCESS TO EYE TRACKING ACCESSORIES AND SPEECH GENERATING DEVICES FOR DISABLED INDIVIDUALS UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing Medicare beneficiaries access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program with respect to speech generating devices by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 514.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ALLOWING STATES TO ADOPT WORK REQUIREMENTS FOR ABLE-BODIED MEDICAID RECIPIENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Federal Government allowing States to adopt work requirements for able-bodied Medicaid recipients by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 515.** Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ALLOW STATES TO OPT OUT OF COMMON CORE WITHOUT PENALTY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or coercing States to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other specific academic standards, instructional content, curricula, assessments, or programs of instruction and allowing States to opt out of the Common Core State Standards without penalty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 516.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AGREEMENTS MADE BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES TO ARBITRATE DISPUTES THAT ARE MADE UNENFORCEABLE WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS RELATED TO TORTS ARISING OUT OF RAPE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to any agreement made between an employer and an employee to arbitrate a dispute that is made unenforceable with respect to any claim related to a tort arising out of rape by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 517.** Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congress-

sional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING CONGRESS'S AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S EXEMPTION FROM PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ending Congress's, the President's, the Vice President's, and political appointee's exemption from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) without raising revenues, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 518.** Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RECOUPING GRANTS FROM STATES WITH FAILED STATE-BASED EXCHANGES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to recouping grants given to States pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) to establish State-based exchanges that subsequently failed, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 519.** Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:



**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPAND BENEFITS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO SAILORS EXPOSED TO AGENT ORANGE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs for exposure to Agent Orange, which may include legislation that expands presumptive coverage to Vietnam War veterans who were exposed to Agent Orange while serving in bays, harbors, or territorial seas, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 520.** Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO SEXUAL ASSAULT AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to sexual assault at institutions of higher education, which may include the implementation of an independent and standardized online survey tool developed and administered by the Department of Education, in consultation with the Department of Justice, to measure the prevalence of sexual assault at institutions of higher education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 521.** Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND BASIC RESEARCH IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to investment in science, technology, and basic research in the United States, which may include educational or research and development initiatives, public-private partnerships, or other programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 522.** Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESERVING THE RIGHT TO CONNECT DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES TO THE ELECTRICITY GRID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving the right of access of distributed energy units to the electrical grid, such as combined heat and power systems, residential- or commercial-scale photovoltaic systems, residential wind turbines, or other renewable or fossil-fueled electric generation systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 523.** Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BRINGING JOBS BACK TO AMERICA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to tax provisions to encourage United States enterprises to relocate operations from overseas to within the United

States, closing offshore tax loopholes (including those relating to inversions), or discouraging United States enterprises from relocating United States operations to other countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 524.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION BY REDUCING THE COST OF CAPITAL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting economic growth and job creation by reducing the cost of capital, which may include repealing the 3.8 percent tax on investment income imposed by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 525.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TAX RELIEF FOR CATASTROPHIC MEDICAL EXPENSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing tax relief for catastrophic medical expenses, which may include restoring the value of the itemized tax deduction for costly medical expenses that was reduced by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 526.** Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT HIGH-QUALITY CHARTER SCHOOLS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 527.** Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE TRANSLATION OF BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH INTO TREATMENTS AND CURES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the translation of biomedical research into treatments and cures, which may include legislation to develop a strategic plan with funding priorities based on disease burden, the streamlining of Federal processes that would accelerate cures, and the creation of more transparency in the funding approval process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 528.** Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO UPGRADING DATA COLLECTION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS CONDUCTED ON HEALTH CARE SERVICES DELIVERED AT THE FACILITIES OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to upgrading data collection and statistical analysis conducted on health care services delivered at the facilities of the Veterans Health Administration in order to increase the desired health outcomes that are consistent with current professional knowledge and facilitate comparisons with other health care delivery systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 529.** Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING SCREENING, TESTING, AND DIAGNOSIS FOR VIRAL HEPATITIS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving screening, testing, and diagnosis for Viral Hepatitis, which may include legislation to increase the number of individuals tested for Viral Hepatitis with a priority for early diagnosis of chronic cases of hepatitis type B (HBV) and Hepatitis type C (HCV) in veterans or other high-risk populations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 530.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE DIVERSION OF FUNDS SET ASIDE FOR THE USPTO.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the diversion or transfer of funds made available for use by the United States Patent and Trademark Office by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 531.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DETERRING ABUSIVE PATENT LITIGATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to deterring abusive patent litigation, which may include fee shifting, heightening pleading and discovery standards, demand letter reforms, stays of customer suits, an accountability mechanism that allows for the recovery of fees against shell companies, and providing appropriate funding for the United States Patent and Trademark Office, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 532.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE VITALITY OF TRADITIONAL CRIMINAL LAW REQUIREMENT OF MENS REA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to restoring and fortifying the traditional criminal law requirement that in

order to convict a person of a criminal offense the Government must prove that the defendant acted with a guilty mental state, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 533.** Mr. HATCH (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ATTORNEYS COMPLY WITH DISCLOSURE OBLIGATIONS IN CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that all Department of Justice attorneys comply with all legal and ethical obligations in criminal prosecutions, which may include legislation that ensures the disclosure to the defendant in a timely manner of all information known to the Government that tends to negate the guilt of the defendant, mitigate the offense charged or the sentence imposed, or impeach the Government's witnesses or evidence, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 534.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING ACCESS TO MARIJUANA EDIBLES BY CHILDREN IN STATES THAT HAVE DECRIMINALIZED MARIJUANA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing access to edible marijuana products by children in States that have decriminalized marijuana, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 535.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to balancing the Federal budget, which may include legislation to ensure that total outlays for any fiscal year do not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year and legislation to ensure that total outlays for any fiscal year do not exceed 18 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States for the calendar year ending before the beginning of such fiscal year, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 536.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SAFEGUARDING DATA STORED ABROAD FROM IMPROPER GOVERNMENT ACCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to safeguarding data stored abroad from improper government access, which may include prohibiting the United States Government from compelling the disclosure of data from United States providers stored abroad if accessing of such data would violate the laws of the country in which such data is stored, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 537.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE AGGRESSIVE AND CONSISTENT ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL LAWS PROHIBITING THE PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND POSSESSION OF ADULT OBSCENITY AND CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the aggressive and consistent enforcement of Federal laws prohibiting the production, distribution, and possession of adult obscenity and child pornography, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 538.** Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RAISING THE FAMILY OF FUNDS LIMIT OF THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Small Business Investment Company Program of the Small Business Administration, which may include raising the Family of Funds limit of the Small Business Investment Company Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 539.** Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING MEDICAID BASED ON SUCCESSFUL AND BIPARTISAN STATE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to initiatives that would improve the Medicaid program and provide stable and predictable funding for long-term services and supports under the program, including initiatives that are based on successful and bipartisan State demonstration projects, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 540.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING HEALTH CARE RATIONING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the use of data obtained from comparative effectiveness research to deny coverage of items or services under Federal health programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 541.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE TRANSPARENCY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION'S REGULATORY FEES AND THE COMMISSION'S RECOVERY OF COSTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that require the Federal Communications

Commission to adjust its regulatory fees to more accurately correspond to the benefits that the Commission's activities provide to the payor of each such fee by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 542.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY FOR CLOSING OUT EXPIRED GRANT ACCOUNTS WITH AN EMPTY BALANCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving transparency for closing out expired grant accounts with an empty balance by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 543.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Department of Commerce, which may include elimination of funding for the National Technical Information Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 544.** Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXTRADITING INTERNATIONAL CYBERCRIMINALS COMMITTING CREDIT CARD THEFT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extraditing international cybercriminals committing credit card theft, which may include legislation pursuing additional extradition agreements or authority, enhancing international negotiations, or providing additional protection for Americans' financial information, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 545.** Mr. KIRK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REIMPOSING WAIVED SANCTIONS AND IMPOSING NEW SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE JOINT PLAN OF ACTION OR A COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Iran, which may include efforts to immediately reimpose waived sanctions and impose new sanctions against the Government of Iran for violations of the Joint Plan of Action or a comprehensive agreement on Iran's nuclear program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 546.** Mr. MCCAIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 95, line 6, strike "\$57,997,000,000" and insert "\$96,000,000,000".

**SA 547.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WELFARE REFORM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to any welfare reform initiative that increases State flexibility, innovation, and efficiency in operating anti-poverty programs and provides for a wage-enhancement tax credit targeted at low-income individuals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 548.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT INTERNET FREEDOM AND THE CURRENT MULTI-STAKEHOLDER GOVERNANCE OF THE INTERNET.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting Internet freedom and the current multi-stakeholder governance of the Internet by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 549.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROVIDING LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME STUDENT ACCESS TO PRIVATE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS THROUGH A TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a program or programs to serve low- and middle-income students by providing access to private elementary and secondary schools through a tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 550.** Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSOLIDATING TAX INCENTIVES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to consolidating tax incentives for higher education into a universal tax credit for higher education and skills obtainment, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 551.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING RELIGIOUS FREEDOM, INCLUDING PROMOTING FREEDOM OF RELIGION (INCLUDING BELIEF) AROUND THE WORLD, GIVEN THE IMPORTANCE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM TO HUMAN RIGHTS, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, STABILITY, AND DEMOCRACY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting religious freedom, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 552.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE RELOCATION OF THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN ISRAEL FROM TEL AVIV TO JERUSALEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for United States embassies, which may include the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 553.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting public-private partnerships with the National Laboratories under the Department of Energy to facilitate innovation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 554.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ELIMINATION OF THE RETIREMENT EARNINGS TEST UNDER THE SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM.**

In the Senate, no point of order shall lie under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that eliminates the Retirement Earnings Test under the Social Security program.

**SA 555.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ELIMINATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY PAYROLL TAXES FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ATTAINED RETIREMENT AGE.**

In the Senate, no point of order shall lie under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 against any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that eliminates the imposition of payroll taxes relating to old-age, survivors, and disability insurance under the Social Security program for individuals who have attained retirement age.

**SA 556.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DELIVERING WEAPONS TO UKRAINE USING EMERGENCY DRAWDOWN AUTHORITY IN THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an emergency drawdown, which may include an emergency drawdown to provide lethal assistance to the Government of Ukraine to respond to critical threats to the territorial integrity of Ukraine, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through

2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 557.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE SPIRIT OF TRANSPARENCY, RESPECT FOR BASIC HUMAN FREEDOMS, AND EFFECTIVE NONPROLIFERATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the United Nations in the spirit of transparency, respect for basic human freedoms, and effective nonproliferation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 558.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO PALESTINE AND INCREASING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing foreign assistance to Palestine and increasing foreign assistance for Israel by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 559.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING HIGHER EDUCATION DATA AND TRANSPARENCY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving higher education data and transparency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 560.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the enforcement of the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act (S. 404, 114th Congress), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 561.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO UNDERUTILIZED FACILITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND THEIR POTENTIAL USE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is the ninth largest real property holder of the Federal Government, with more than 123,000 acres and 4,819 buildings and other structures with a replacement value of more than \$32,700,000,000.



(2) The annual operation and maintenance costs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have increased steadily, and, as of November 2014, the Administration had more than \$3,350,000,000 in deferred annual maintenance costs.

(3) According to Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Administration continues to retain real property that is underutilized, does not have identified future mission uses, or is duplicative of other assets in its real property inventory.

(4) The Office of Inspector General, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and Congress have identified the aging and duplicative infrastructure of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as a high priority and longstanding management challenge.

(5) In the NASA Authorization Act of 2010, Congress directed the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to examine its real property assets and downsize to fit current and future missions and expected funding levels, paying particular attention to identifying and removing unneeded or duplicative infrastructure.

(6) The Office of Inspector General found at least 33 facilities, including wind tunnels, test stands, airfields, and launch infrastructure, that were underutilized or for which National Aeronautics and Space Administration managers could not identify a future mission use and that the need for these facilities have declined in recent years as a result of changes in the mission focus of the Administration, the condition and obsolescence of some facilities, and the advent of alternative testing methods.

(7) The Office of Inspector General found that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has taken steps to minimize the costs of continuing to maintain some of these facilities by placing them in an inactive state or leasing them to other parties.

(8) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has a series of initiatives underway that, in the judgment of the Office of Inspector General, are "positive steps towards 'rightsizing' its real property footprint", and the Office of Inspector General has concluded that "it is imperative that NASA move forward aggressively with its infrastructure reduction efforts".

(9) Existing and emerging United States commercial launch and exploration capabilities are providing cargo transportation to the International Space Station and offer the potential for providing crew support, access to the International Space Station, and missions to low Earth orbit while the National Aeronautics and Space Administration focuses its efforts on heavy-lift capabilities and deep space missions.

(10) National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities and property that are underutilized, duplicative, or no longer needed for Administration requirements could be utilized by commercial users and State and local entities, resulting in savings for the Administration and a reduction in the burden of the Federal Government to fund space operations.

(b) **SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to underutilized facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administra-

tion and their potential use, which may include actions described in subsection (c), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(c) **ACTIONS.**—The actions referred to in this subsection are—

(1) reduction of National Aeronautics and Space Administration infrastructure and, to the greatest extent practicable, making Administration property available for lease to a government or private tenant;

(2) pursuit of opportunities for streamlined sale or lease of National Aeronautics and Space Administration property and facilities, including for exclusive use, to a private entity, or expedited conveyance or transfer to a State or political subdivision, municipality, instrumentality of a State, or Department of Transportation-licensed launch site operators for the promotion of commercial or scientific space activity and for developing and operating space launch facilities; and

(3) lease or transfer of underutilized National Aeronautics and Space Administration facilities and properties to commercial space entities or State or local governments to reduce operation and maintenance costs for the Administration, save money for the Federal Government, and promote commercial space and the exploration goals of the Administration and the United States.

**SA 562.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A NEW OUTCOMES-BASED PROCESS FOR AUTHORIZING INNOVATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a new outcomes-based process for authorizing innovative higher education providers to participate in programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 563.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REFORM OF FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reform of repayment plans for student loans made, insured, or guaranteed under part B, D, or E of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 564.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BUDGETING REGULATORY PROMULGATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing for regulatory reform, which may include regulatory reform that would allow Congress to budget regulatory promulgation under each Federal agency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 565.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT MEDICARE IS NOT RAIDED TO BAIL-OUT INSURANCE COMPANIES UNDER THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE OVERHAUL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this



resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Medicare funds are not used to bailout insurance companies, which may include through the risk corridor program or other programs established in the President's health care law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 566.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FINANCIAL VEHICLES OTHER THAN LOANS TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO PAY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing for financial vehicles other than loans to provide funds to pay for higher education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 567.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING DUPLICATION, FRAGMENTATION, AND OVERLAP IN GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ending duplication, fragmentation, and overlap in Government economic development programs in order to create efficiencies in such programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or

the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 568.** Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TO IMPLEMENT THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT AND REDUCE IDENTITY THEFT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for the Internal Revenue Service, which may include increasing funding to fully implement the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and to reduce identity theft and fraudulent tax returns, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 569.** Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN RURAL AND TRIBAL WATER INFRASTRUCTURE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to designate funds for water projects, which may include authorized rural water projects or tribal water rights settlements or irrigation projects, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 570.** Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-REDUCING RESERVE FUND FOR REQUIRING SENATORS TO FILE CAMPAIGN FINANCE REPORTS ELECTRONICALLY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring Senators to file designations, statements, and reports under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 in electronic format, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over both the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 571.** Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST THE SALE OF FEDERAL LAND TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEFICIT.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide for the sale of any Federal land (other than as part of a program that acquires land that is of comparable value or contains exceptional resources) that uses the proceeds of the sale to reduce the Federal deficit.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 572.** Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT RURAL SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the establishment of the Office of Rural Education Policy within the Department of Education, which could include a clearinghouse for information related to the challenges of rural schools and school districts or providing technical assistance within the Department of Education on rules and regulations that impact rural schools and school districts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 573.** Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPAIR AND REPLACEMENT OF NATURAL GAS DISTRIBUTION PIPELINES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NO LONGER FIT FOR SERVICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the repair and replacement of natural gas distribution pipelines and infrastructure no longer fit for service by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 574.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE RELIABILITY OF THE ELECTRIC GRID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to electric grid reliability, which may include legislation to address any regulation that would affect the reliability of the grid, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal

years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 575.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL THE TRICARE EXCLUSION FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the TRICARE program, which may include legislation that would repeal the Reserve Select exclusion, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 576.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECURING SOURCES OF SUPPLY OF RARE EARTH MINERALS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the supply chain vulnerabilities of rare earth materials extracted, processed, and refined from secure sources of supply to develop and produce advanced technologies in support of the requirements of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 577.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REDUCTION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACTORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reduction of Department of Defense contractors by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 578.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing methamphetamine abuse in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 579.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing full and dedicated funding for the various Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 580.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR THE CONTRACT TOWER PROGRAM OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing full and dedicated funding for the Contract Tower Program of the Federal Aviation Administration by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 581.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REESTABLISHING THE OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT TO PROVIDE NONPARTISAN INFORMATION TO CONGRESS ON COST-BENEFIT ANALYSES OF REGULATIONS AND REGULATORY CHANGES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reestablishing the Office of Technology Assessment to provide nonpartisan information to Congress on cost-benefit analyses of regulations and regulatory changes by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 582.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL SERVICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to significantly increasing the number of young adults participating in 2 years of national service, which may include expanding national service programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 583.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE COMMERCIALIZATION OF CARBON TECHNOLOGIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the research, development, and demonstration projects necessary for the commercialization of fossil energy related technologies required for electric generating units (EGUs) and other energy conversion facilities to meet proposed and future emissions standards, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 584.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING EXPORT PROMOTION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting export promotion for small businesses, which may include educational programs, marketing services, or

participation in foreign trade missions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 585.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 55, strike line 4 and insert the following:

support for caregivers; or

(8) improving outreach, access, and services for rural veterans;

**SA 586.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 54, line 9, insert “, including the growing backlog of appeals of decisions regarding claims for disability compensation” after “veterans”.

**SA 587.** Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO DISALLOW ANY FEDERAL TAX DEDUCTION FOR THE COST OF COURT-ORDERED PUNITIVE DAMAGES AS AN ORDINARY BUSINESS EXPENSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to individual and corporate deductions allowable under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include provisions to disallow any Federal tax deduction for the cost of court-ordered punitive damages or similar costs if covered by taxpayer insurance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 588.** Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE NUMBER OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICERS AT AIR PORTS OF ENTRY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers at air ports of entry to reduce wait times and otherwise facilitate travel, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 589.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS FROM LIMITING COMPENSATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that employers are not precluded under the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) from providing compensation to employees that is greater than the compensation specified in an applicable collective bargaining agreement by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 590.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE MEDICARE ADVANTAGE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare Advantage program, which may include reversing the cuts to the Medicare Advantage program that were enacted under the President's health care law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 591.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE LIFELINE PROGRAM AND REDUCE FRAUD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient funding for the Federal Communications Commission to modernize the Lifeline program, which may include fundamental reforms to reduce waste, fraud, and abuse, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 592.** Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE NEGOTIATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to intellectual property rights in international trade negotiations, which may include the protection of United States intellectual property, the improvement of the global intellectual property protection regime, or the strengthening of intellectual property protections among United States trading partners, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of

fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 593.** Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 87, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 88, line 4.

**SA 594.** Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE PARTICIPATION OF UNDERREPRESENTED INDIVIDUALS, INCLUDING WOMEN AND MINORITIES, IN 21ST CENTURY FIELDS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging underrepresented individuals, including women and minorities, to pursue careers in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields, which may include competitive grants, workshops, internship programs, outreach efforts, and mentoring programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 595.** Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE CYBERSECURITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increased sharing of cybersecurity threat information while protecting individual privacy and civil liberties interests,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 596.** Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ TO CONVEY CLEAR INFORMATION TO CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC ABOUT PROJECTED DEFICITS.**

As part of the annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook required by section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 602(e)), the Congressional Budget Office shall—

(1) include a projection of Federal revenues, outlays, and deficits for a 30-year period beginning with the budget year, expressed in terms of dollars and as a percent of gross domestic product; and

(2) publish a graph depicting the magnitude of projected deficits in the Federal budget on a unified basis under current policy, expressed in terms of billions of dollars, arranged appropriately to show—

(A) the magnitude of the combined projected deficits of the budget year and the 9 subsequent fiscal years;

(B) the magnitude of the combined projected deficits of the 10th through 19th subsequent fiscal years;

(C) the magnitude of the combined projected deficits of the 20th through 29th fiscal years; and

(D) the magnitude of the combined projected deficits of the entire period that includes the budget year and the 29 subsequent fiscal years.

**SA 597.** Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ TO CONVEY CLEAR INFORMATION TO CONGRESS AND THE PUBLIC ABOUT PROJECTED FEDERAL OUTLAYS, REVENUES, AND DEFICITS.**

As part of the annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook required by section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 602(e)), and at any other time the Congressional Budget Office releases projections of Federal deficits over any term of years, the Congressional Budget Office shall publish with its projection a 1-page statement—

(1) summarizing and categorizing total outlays, receipts, surpluses, and deficits of the Federal Government on a unified basis for that same prospective time period;

(2) categorizing and subtotaling separately—

(A) outlays for mandatory programs and for discretionary programs;

(B) outlays, payroll tax revenue, and offsetting receipts for Social Security and for Medicare;

(C) the surplus or deficit of revenues over outlays for Social Security and for Medicare; and

(D) revenues.

**SA 598.** Mrs. CAPITO (for Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 72, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine; as follows:

On page 4, beginning on line 6, strike “provide” and all that follows through “unanimously supported by Congress” on lines 7 and 8 and insert “prioritize and expedite the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies, as authorized and supported by Congress”.

**SA 599.** Mrs. CAPITO (for Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 72, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine.”.

**SA 600.** Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 20, decrease the amount by \$9,000,000.

On page 22, line 21, decrease the amount by \$9,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, decrease the amount by \$9,000,000.

On page 23, line 4, decrease the amount by \$9,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 23, line 8, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, decrease the amount by \$11,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, decrease the amount by \$11,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, decrease the amount by \$11,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, decrease the amount by \$11,000,000.

**SA 601.** Mr. BENNET (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE MEDICARE, CUT GUARANTEED BENEFITS, INCREASE OUT-OF-POCKET SPENDING, OR TURN MEDICARE INTO A PREMIUM SUPPORT PLAN.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) privatize or change the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) into a system that provides a payment either to pay for or offset private plan premiums or the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program;

(2) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program; or

(3) increase out-of-pocket spending for prescription drugs or preventive services under the Medicare program.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 602.** Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A SINGLE FOOD AGENCY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to food safety, which may include creating a single independent Federal food safety agency to implement Federal food safety law, including inspections, enforcement, standards-setting, and research or consolidating all the authorities for food safety inspections into a single agency to benefit both consumers and industry by preventing food borne illness and limiting costly recalls, by the amounts provided in such

legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 603.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THE PROMOTION OF NUTRITION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the improvement of operations in the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 604.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING COST SAVINGS IN OFFICE SPACE USED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging cost savings in office space used by Federal agencies, which may include encouraging Federal agencies to utilize office space unused by the Federal Government before purchasing or renting additional space, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 605.** Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HOMELESSNESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to homelessness, which may include ensuring that Federal agencies that serve homeless populations are using the same methodology in counting the number of homeless persons served, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 606.** Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFRICAN ELEPHANT IVORY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to amending the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.) or the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) to conserve elephants while appropriately regulating the United States trade in ivory, including the import and export of objects containing antique ivory, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

**COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Waters of the United States: Stakeholder Perspectives on the Impacts of EPA's Proposed Rule."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Examining the Regulatory Regime for Regional Banks."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled "Surface Transportation Reauthorization: Performance, not Prescription."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled "Unmanned Aircraft Systems: Key Considerations Regarding Safety, Innovation, Economic Impact, and Privacy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Continuing America's Leadership: Advancing Research and Development for Patients."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.



COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND  
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Securing the Border: Assessing the Impact of Transnational Crime."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-418 of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "The Veterans Choice Act—Exploring the Distance Criteria."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SECURITIES, INSURANCE, AND  
INVESTMENT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Investment be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 24, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Capital Formation and Reducing Small Business Burdens."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to Rob Jones, Virginia Lenahan, Karen Matthews, Baxter Matthews, David Mitchell, Jennifer Phillips, Jacob Puhl, Chris Shim, Polly Webster, and Austin Williams for the remainder of the 114th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BOYS TOWN CENTENNIAL  
COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 301, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 301) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of Boys Town, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 301) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 301

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds that—

(1) Boys Town is a nonprofit organization dedicated to saving children and healing families, nationally headquartered in the village of Boys Town, Nebraska;

(2) Father Flanagan's Boys Home, known as "Boys Town", was founded on December 12, 1917, by Servant of God Father Edward Flanagan;

(3) Boys Town was created to serve children of all races and religions;

(4) news of the work of Father Flanagan spread worldwide with the success of the 1938 movie, "Boys Town";

(5) after World War II, President Truman asked Father Flanagan to take his message to the world, and Father Flanagan traveled the globe visiting war orphans and advising government leaders on how to care for displaced children;

(6) Boys Town has grown exponentially, and now provides care to children and families across the country in 11 regions, including California, Nevada, Texas, Nebraska, Iowa, Louisiana, North Florida, Central Florida, South Florida, Washington, DC, New York, and New England;

(7) the Boys Town National Hotline provides counseling to more than 150,000 callers each year;

(8) the Boys Town National Research Hospital is a national leader in the field of hearing care and research of Usher Syndrome;

(9) Boys Town programs impact the lives of more than 2,000,000 children and families across America each year; and

(10) December 12th, 2017, will mark the 100th anniversary of Boys Town, Nebraska.

**SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.**

(a) **\$5 GOLD COINS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall mint and issue not more than 50,000 \$5 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 8.359 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(b) **\$1 SILVER COINS.**—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 350,000 \$1 coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 26.73 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(3) contain 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper.

(c) **HALF DOLLAR CLAD COINS.**—The Secretary shall mint and issue not more than 300,000 half dollar clad coins in commemoration of the centennial of the founding of Father Flanagan's Boys Town, each of which shall—

(1) weigh 11.34 grams;

(2) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(3) be minted to the specifications for half dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(d) **LEGAL TENDER.**—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(e) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

**SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the 100 years of Boys Town, one of the largest nonprofit child care agencies in the United States.

(b) **DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.**—On each coin minted under this Act, there shall be—

(1) a designation of the value of the coin;

(2) an inscription of the year "2017"; and

(3) inscriptions of the words "Liberty", "In God We Trust", "United States of America", and "E Pluribus Unum".

(c) **SELECTION.**—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the National Executive Director of Boys Town and the Commission of Fine Arts; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens of Coinage Advisory Committee.

**SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.**

(a) **QUALITY OF COINS.**—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) **MINT FACILITY.**—Only 1 facility of the United States Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) **PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.**—The Secretary may issue coins under this Act only during the period beginning on January 1, 2017, and ending on December 31, 2017.

**SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.**

(a) **SALE PRICE.**—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins; and

(2) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) **BULK SALES.**—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) **PREPAID ORDERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) **DISCOUNT.**—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.



**SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge as follows:

(1) A surcharge of \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin.

(2) A surcharge of \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin.

(3) A surcharge of \$5 per coin for the half dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be paid to Boys Town to carry out Boys Town's cause of caring for and assisting children and families in underserved communities across America.

**SEC. 8. FINANCIAL ASSURANCES.**

The Secretary shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that—

(1) minting and issuing coins under this Act will not result in any net cost to the Federal Government; and

(2) no funds, including applicable surcharges, shall be disbursed to any recipient designated in section 7 until the total cost of designing and issuing all of the coins authorized by this Act (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping) is recovered by the United States Treasury, consistent with sections 5112(m) and 5134(f) of title 31, United States Code.

### EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ATTACKS ON THE CIVILIAN POPULATION IN MARIUPOL, UKRAINE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 72.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 72) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lee amendment be agreed to and that the Senate now vote on adoption of the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 598) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To urge the President to prioritize and expedite the provision of lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies)

On page 4, beginning on line 6, strike "provide" and all that follows through "unanimously supported by Congress" on lines 7 and 8 and insert "prioritize and expedite the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal

military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies, as authorized and supported by Congress".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 72), as amended, was agreed to.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to, the Leahy amendment to the title be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, reads as follows:

#### S. RES. 72

Whereas Russian-backed rebels continue to expand their campaign in Ukraine, which has already claimed more than 5,000 lives and generated an estimated 1,500,000 refugees and internally displaced persons;

Whereas, on January 23, 2015, Russian-backed rebels pulled out of peace talks with Western leaders;

Whereas, on January 24, 2015, the Ukrainian port city of Mariupol received rocket fire from territory in the Donetsk region controlled by rebels;

Whereas, on January 24, 2015, Alexander Zakharchenko, leader of the Russian-backed rebel Donetsk People's Republic, publicly announced that his troops had launched an offensive against Mariupol;

Whereas Mariupol is strategically located on the Sea of Azov and is a sea link between Russian-occupied Crimea and Russia, and could be used to form part of a land bridge between Crimea and Russia;

Whereas the indiscriminate attack on Mariupol killed 30 people, including 2 children, and wounded 102 in markets, homes, and schools;

Whereas, on April 19, 2000, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1296, reaffirming its strong condemnation of the deliberate targeting of civilians;

Whereas, even after the Russian Federation and the Russian-backed rebels signed a ceasefire agreement called the Minsk Protocol in September 2014, NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, General Philip Breedlove, reported in November 2014 the movement of "Russian troops, Russian artillery, Russian air defense systems, and Russian combat troops" into Ukraine;

Whereas, on January 24, 2015, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg stated, "For several months we have seen the presence of Russian forces in eastern Ukraine, as well as a substantial increase in Russian heavy equipment such as tanks, artillery, and advanced air defense systems. Russian troops in eastern Ukraine are supporting these offensive operations with command and control systems, air defense systems with advanced surface-to-air missiles, unmanned aerial systems, advanced multiple rocket launcher systems, and electronic warfare systems.";

Whereas, on January 25, 2015, after Russian-backed rebels attacked Mariupol, European Council President Donald Tusk wrote, "Once again appeasement encourages the aggressor to greater acts of violence; time to step up our policy based on cold facts, not illusions.";

Whereas, on November 19, 2014, at a Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate

confirmation hearing, Deputy National Security Adviser Anthony Blinken stated that the provision of defensive lethal assistance to the Government of Ukraine "remains on the table. It's something we're looking at.";

Whereas the Ukraine Freedom Support Act (Public Law 113-272), which was passed by Congress unanimously and signed into law by the President on December 18, 2014, states that it is the policy of the United States to further assist the Government of Ukraine in restoring its sovereignty and its territorial integrity to deter the Government of the Russian Federation from further destabilizing and invading Ukraine and other independent countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, and Central Asia; and

Whereas the Ukraine Freedom Support Act authorizes \$350,000,000 in fiscal years 2015–2017 for the President to provide the Government of Ukraine with defense articles, defense services, and military training for the purpose of countering offensive weapons and reestablishing the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine, including anti-tank and anti-armor weapons; crew weapons and ammunition; counter-artillery radars; fire control and guidance equipment; surveillance drones; and secure command and communications equipment: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,*

#### SECTION 1. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

The Senate—

(1) condemns the attack on Mariupol by Russian-backed rebels;

(2) urges the President to prioritize and expedite the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine, consistent with United States national interests and policies, as authorized and supported by Congress in the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-272);

(3) calls on the United States, its European allies, and the international community to continue to apply economic and other forms of pressure on the Russian Federation, especially in the form of sanctions, if the Government of the Russian Federation continues to refuse to cease its aggression in Ukraine;

(4) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately end its support for the rebels in eastern Ukraine, allow Ukraine to regain control of its internationally recognized borders, and withdraw its military presence in eastern Ukraine; and

(5) expresses solidarity with the people of Ukraine regarding the humanitarian crisis in their country and the destruction caused by the military, financial, and ideological support of the Government of the Russian Federation for the rebels in eastern Ukraine.

#### SEC. 2. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as an authorization for the use of force or a declaration of war.

The amendment (No. 599) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the January 24, 2015, attacks carried out by Russian-backed rebels on the civilian population in Mariupol, Ukraine, and the provision of defensive lethal and non-lethal military assistance to Ukraine.".

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE  
SENATE ABOUT A STRATEGY  
FOR THE INTERNET OF THINGS  
TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH  
AND CONSUMER EMPOWERMENT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 110, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 110) expressing the sense of the Senate about a strategy for the Internet of Things to promote economic growth and consumer empowerment.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 110) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF  
ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani into the House Chamber for the joint meeting at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, March 25, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH  
25, 2015

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 25; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be

approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 11, with 18 hours of debate time remaining, and that the time until 10:30 a.m. be equally divided and controlled by the two managers or their designees; further, that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair at 10:30 a.m. to allow for the joint meeting of Congress; lastly, that all time during the recess count against the remaining debate time on the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mrs. CAPITO. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:51 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 25, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MS. GEORGIA HENLEY  
ON THE OCCASION OF HER 90TH  
BIRTHDAY

## HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Georgia Henley upon the joyous occasion of her 90th birthday, which will be celebrated with her family, friends, and church family on March 22nd, 2015 at Unity Church of Buffalo.

Ms. Henley was born in Mobile, Alabama on March 21st, 1925. In 1945, during the period of the "The Great Migration" Ms. Henley and her husband joined the millions of African Americans leaving the rural South to find better opportunities in the Northeast. This journey landed her in our beloved Queen City, Buffalo, NY. After a divorce in 1954, Ms. Henley was left to raise 5 small children and often worked 6–7 days a week, from 4 AM and not finishing sometimes until 9 PM. Her strong determination coupled with her propensity for unconditional love allowed her to provide for her children and in turn her sacrifice has blessed her with 10 grandchildren, 18 great grandchildren, and 5 great-great-grandchildren.

A longtime member of Unity Church of Buffalo, Ms. Henley will also be celebrating her 50th Anniversary of church membership. She is deeply devoted to her church and community and has served on the Unity Church Board, Erie County Senior Services Advisory Board, and received the Network of Religious Communities Religious Service Award.

Ms. Henley is well-known for her generosity and spirit. She has said, "The most important thing and the greatest blessing I've received in life is learning to love unconditionally." Ms. Henley continues to demonstrate this power to love in life, despite challenges and hardships.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to celebrate the life of Ms. Georgia Henley. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Ms. Henley a very happy birthday and congratulate her for reaching this exciting milestone. I wish Ms. Henley and all those who worship with her at the Unity Church of Buffalo all the best for years to come.

COMMEMORATING THE 36TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF THE TAIWAN RELA-  
TIONS ACT

## HON. BLAKE FARENTHOLD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, it has been 70 years since the end of World War II. Seventy years since, as allies, the R.O.C.

(Taiwan) and the United States stood shoulder to shoulder against the forces that threatened the destiny of our two peoples.

In commemoration of another event of the combined interests of our two peoples, the 36th anniversary of the passage of the Taiwan Relations Act (TRA), we rededicate ourselves to enhance the critical relationship between the people of Taiwan and the United States of America.

The economic and strategic security of Taiwan is of highest importance to our well-being. In these times of worldwide political chaos, we must have dependable allies; Taiwan has proven itself time and time again. In addition to being a dependable ally, Taiwan is one of our strongest trading partners; contributing greatly to our economic stability.

To ensure the viability of Taiwan, which is in our self-interest, we must enable Taiwan under the mandate of the TRA the ability to purchase defensive arms necessary to help them defend themselves.

## CLARE EDMUNDSON

## HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Clare Edmundson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Clare Edmundson is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Clare Edmundson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Clare Edmundson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE 36TH ANNIVER-  
SARY OF THE TAIWAN RELA-  
TIONS ACT

## HON. SCOTT DesJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join many of my colleagues in recognizing the 36th anniversary of the enactment of the

Taiwan Relations Act. Through the Taiwan Relations Act, the United States and Taiwan have enjoyed a warm and mutually beneficial relationship, which has promoted security and economic prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

I would like to point out another anniversary that will take place later this year of great significance to both the people of the United States and Taiwan—the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II.

The contributions of the Republic of China played a key role in the successful victory over the Axis Powers. While many are familiar with figures such as General Joseph Stilwell, General Claire Chennault and the Flying Tigers, few fully appreciate the fact that for eight years, ROC forces tied down Japanese troops in China, preventing Tokyo from throwing its full military might against the rest of the Allied Powers.

The war came at a great cost to the ROC both during and after the war. In the post WW II upheaval, the communists took power, and in 1949, the ROC was forced to relocate to Taiwan.

Despite the seemingly impossible challenges the ROC faced over much of the 20th century, Taiwan has achieved the vision of Dr. Sun Yat-sen and other visionaries, who foresaw a modern, democratic state with a great deal to offer to its neighbors and the world. Today, Taiwan is a multiparty democracy with an advanced economy that is an important component of the regional and global economy. Taiwan remains one of our closest economic and security partners, and I am proud to call myself a friend of Taiwan.

I hope my colleagues will join me during this 70th anniversary year, in recognizing the contributions all of our allies made to defeat the Axis Powers and in securing the peace and prosperity of the postwar Asia-Pacific. I thank the Taiwan people for their important contribution.

HONORING CATHY PERKOWITZ  
FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE

## HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Cathy Perkowitz, an extraordinary woman from the sixth district of Illinois. Recently, the Alzheimer's Association named Cathy the 2015 Outstanding Advocate of the Year. This award is given to an advocate who has a deep commitment and strong passion for the Alzheimer's cause.

Cathy's husband, Bill, was diagnosed with younger-onset Alzheimer's in 2006 at the age of fifty two. Cathy has been actively involved with the Alzheimer's Association since 2009. Since then, she has dedicated herself to caring for her husband and advocating on behalf

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of those with Alzheimer's disease. She has been an Alzheimer's Ambassador since the program's inception in 2010 and recently traveled to Springfield, Illinois to attend her sixth straight lobby day on behalf of the Alzheimer's cause.

During her time as an Alzheimer's advocate, Cathy has worked to develop strong personal relationships with elected officials. I can personally speak to this. Cathy was kind enough to invite me to visit her husband Bill in his long-term care facility. This was a special experience for me, and I am grateful for Cathy and her family's willingness to help me understand what it's like to live with and care for someone with Alzheimer's. Not many people are willing to open their lives up that way.

Cathy's involvement also stretches beyond the advocacy field. She is active in a local younger-onset caregiver support group since 2006, when there were less than twelve contributors. Now, Cathy is one of seventy. She also participates in the Walk to End Alzheimer's and her team has been the top fundraiser for the past three years. Since that fateful news in 2006, she has dedicated her life to the Alzheimer's cause. Cathy is the true definition of an advocate.

Mr. Speaker, and distinguished colleagues, please join me in congratulating Cathy Perkowitz on receiving this distinct honor and wishing her and her family many future successes as they continue their advocacy on behalf of those with Alzheimer's disease.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE  
LIFE OF CAROL BURGESS  
EMMOTT, PH.D.

### HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and work of a dear friend and revered colleague, Carol Burgess Emmott. Born on November 11, 1946, Carol died peacefully at her home in Hillsborough, California on February 25, 2015, at the age of 68, in the arms of her loving husband, Cameron.

Carol was born and raised in Bartlesville, Oklahoma. She graduated from Southern Methodist University in 1969 with a double major in History and Political Science. In 1975, while working for the California Senate Pro Tem George Moscone, she earned her Ph.D. from Oklahoma University in Health Policy, studying the California Legislature through UC Berkeley's Institute of Governmental Studies. After completing her Ph.D., Carol contributed to the health policy research agenda of the Institute for Health Policy Studies at the University of California, San Francisco.

After her tenure at UCSF, Carol accepted a political appointment in Washington, D.C. working under Joseph A. Califano, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. During her tenure there she managed a third of the health care legislative agenda for the Carter Administration. Carol returned to California as Chief Deputy Director of the State Health Department, working under Director Beverlee

Myers. She was later the Deputy of the San Francisco Department of Public Health under Mayor Dianne Feinstein, where she shaped policies to respond to the AIDS crisis.

Carol's commitment to California's public safety net facilities led her to found and serve as CEO of the California Association of Public Hospitals. During her long tenure at CAPH, Carol and her colleagues were successful in bringing billions of dollars of state and federal funds to help support California's health care safety net, facilitating the passage of legislation to rebuild the majority of these vital facilities.

After 15 years in federal, state, and local health policy, Carol complemented her career by contributing to private sector health care through senior level executive recruiting. During the course of her 25-year career, Carol was a partner at three of the top four international recruiting firms: Spencer Stuart, Heidrick & Struggles, and Russell Reynolds Associates. Carol's last 10 years were dedicated to building and leading the Health Services Practice at Russell Reynolds Associates. She was successful in recruiting many of the top leaders in American health care across a broad swath of the industry, including academic medical centers, major health plans, significant health systems, and prominent health policy positions.

Carol's dedication to executive development was manifested in her leadership forums in California and Massachusetts, and her CEO/Innovator's Roundtable. Devoted to her professional colleagues, Carol focused especially on mentoring the emerging young women leaders across the industry. The recent creation of the Carol Emmott Fellowship stands as a testament to her commitment to the success of women in the health care industry.

Carol was deeply devoted to her family. Cameron, her husband of 45 years, was the love of her life. Having met in high school, they were soul mates in all endeavors, most particularly in the nurturing of their son, Parker Emmott. While Carol was a dedicated wife and professional, she was a devoted mother, always prioritizing her connection to Parker, his friends, and his evolution as a unique and talented individual. Carol was predeceased by her parents, Robert Banks Burgess and Mary Gary Bedwell. In addition to her husband and son, she is survived by her sister, Betsy Wright, and many other beloved family members and friends.

Carol was special in every way. She knew how to be a friend. She used her intellect for the betterment of humanity, and she was beautiful inside and out. Once you met Carol, she became unforgettable. I am blessed to have known her, to have learned from her, to have been inspired by her, and to have had her as a trusted friend and colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life and work of Carol Burgess Emmott and in extending our deepest condolences to her magnificent family. She strengthened our community and our country, and bettered the lives of countless Americans.

IN HONOR OF 2014 MISS UNITED STATES ELIZABETH SCOTT SAFRIT BEING NAMED MISS WORLD AMERICAS

### HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Elizabeth Scott Safrit, a constituent from Kannapolis, North Carolina, who placed 3rd in the 64th Miss World pageant on December 14, 2014, in London, England.

Elizabeth represented North Carolina in the Miss United States Pageant last year, and upon winning qualified to represent our country in the Miss World competition.

The 130 Miss World contestants were judged not only on beauty but also on physical fitness, modeling, social media skills, interview skills, and their philanthropy project, called "Beauty with a Purpose."

Elizabeth represented the United States well, finishing first in the multimedia portion of the competition. She ultimately was crowned 2nd Princess, a 3rd overall finish in the 2014 Miss World pageant, thereby receiving the additional title of Miss World Americas.

So far, Elizabeth has served admirably as Miss United States. She has traveled across the country promoting "Save the Children", advocating for the welfare of children, and has also served as a spokesperson for "Rock the Vote." She will travel much of the world as Miss World Americas.

Her parents, Walter and Lynne Safrit, who I know well, along with Elizabeth's extended family and friends, are very proud of her accomplishments.

It is a great honor and privilege to extend these congratulatory remarks to an inspiring young lady who represents Kannapolis, North Carolina's 8th District, North Carolina, and the United States worldwide in her role as Miss United States and Miss World Americas.

SUE POSER OF PIERZ

### HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Sue Poser of Pierz, Minnesota who has been named the 2015 Quilter of the Year by Minnesota Quilter's Inc. Not only is she an exceptional quilter, she is also the third generation owner of Gruber's, which many people liken to a "Laura Ingalls Wilder" style shop and community hub—and award-winning quilting mecca in Genola. Her quilting business began with Poser's grandparents and a small general store serving a town of a population of 75 and perhaps another 100 in the surrounding farms and townships. The store eventually included everything from quilting supplies to movie rentals, although it was particularly famous for its meat market and quilting parties. An often-told story in the area tells of a man who brought a bear into the meat market for procession

and while negotiating, he saw a group of 50 women enjoying margaritas from the bar across the street for a quilting party. Curious to find out more about the party, he stopped in only to hear one of the spirited women say, "We have to get back to the convent before they lock the doors at eight!"

The meat market, like so many small businesses, no longer operates—though the quilting shop prospered and has expanded to other locations. Gruber's now operates with 20 employees in Waite Park and has been voted one of the best quilt shops in the nation.

Sue is the common thread that binds huge sections of the quilting community together, not only as a crafter but as an encourager helping a lot of people find success in the quilt and pattern-design industry. Some years ago, she was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis—but that doesn't stop her from doing what she loves. She said, "If God gave me MS, it was to slow me down because otherwise I'd never stop." She is such an inspiration to others. People who struggle with a recent health diagnosis or life changes often come to her for support and a ready ear to listen.

In our rural areas, weekly or monthly quilting bees are still a time for women to leave their cares at home and join in the laughter, fellowship and wisdom of others—and often a pot-luck lunch or dinner, and yes, the occasional margarita shared with a group of nuns.

Sue Poser exemplifies the embodiment of utilizing creativity and hard work to build a small business success while staying rooted to family, friends and community.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE UNITED STATES-CARIBBEAN PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2015

**HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce the United States-Caribbean Partnership Act of 2015, along with my friends and colleagues Representatives GREGORY MEEKS, FREDERICA WILSON, ALCEE HASTINGS, BARBARA LEE, YVETTE CLARKE, LOIS FRANKEL, ALBIO SIRES and TED DEUTCH. This bill will establish embassies in the five Caribbean countries where we currently have no physical diplomatic presence—Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Five years ago, President Obama attended the Summit of the Americas in Trinidad and Tobago and declared that, "It's appropriate and important that we hold this summit in the Caribbean. The energy, the dynamism, the diversity of the Caribbean people inspires us all, and is such an important part of what we share in common as a hemisphere." I could not agree more. As we approach the upcoming Summit of the Americas in Panama next month, the United States must redouble our commitment to the people of the Caribbean. That is precisely why I am introducing this bill today.

I ask my colleagues to imagine countries where tens of thousands of American citizens

travel for pleasure or business; where thousands of American citizens go to school; where there is a constant concern about drug trafficking to the United States; but where the United States has no U.S. embassies. Most people I speak to are surprised to learn that there are five countries in the Caribbean—only a few hundred miles from the United States—where we have no physical diplomatic presence. My legislation will correct this problem by establishing U.S. embassies in Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Currently, all diplomatic relations with these countries are run out of the U.S. embassy in Barbados.

While these countries are small, they must not be taken for granted. They are key voting members of the United Nations and other international organizations. As members of the Organization of American States (OAS), their votes are extremely important. Without a U.S. presence in these five countries, it is very difficult to conduct in-person diplomacy with our counterparts on a range of crucial international issues. These countries are also of profound interest and importance to the millions of Caribbean-American citizens in the United States.

Currently, in order to meet with local officials, the private sector or civil society, U.S. diplomats must fly in from Barbados (or Washington) on often expensive, infrequent flights, and stay overnight in often expensive island hotels. Close working relationships with key leaders cannot develop, because our diplomats are not there to establish them. And, our diplomacy is limited to phone calls, emails and faxes, even though we all know that the best interaction is carried out in person. In addition to our stymied diplomacy, U.S. citizens living in these countries do not have full consular services to assist in the event of emergencies.

This bill establishes uses existing embassy construction funding to establish these new embassies. In 2011, I authored a bipartisan amendment with the former Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, Congressman Connie Mack (R-FL), to create these embassies which was approved unanimously by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I look forward to working with the Obama Administration to get this legislation across the finish line and to seeing U.S. diplomats permanently stationed in every country in the Caribbean.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

#### TRIBUTE TO CAROLINE JOK

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents

and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Caroline Jok attends Seven Lakes High School in Katy, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should the government play in our lives?

It is said: One can never have too much of a good thing.

While it is certainly true that in many cases it is harder for a good thing to turn bad, it is impossible for this statement to be infallible with the absolute qualifier "never" hanging in the balance. For example, though water is essential to life, if one drinks too much of it they will face hyponatremia, otherwise known as water intoxication. While chocolate is undeniably sweet and pleasant, too much chocolate induces contrastingly unpleasant feelings, sickness, and even dangerous health conditions. Even something as wonderful and essential as freedom—the very virtue this great Nation is founded on, the very virtue that our ancestors fought and gave their lives for—can become a negative force if there is too much of it. The statement "too much freedom" sounds seemingly absurd, however, this is precisely why our founding fathers, despite the hard fought efforts to escape the oppression of one government, worked to build another. Too much freedom can result, ironically, in oppression, in chaos, in exploitation, and in a bloodbath driven by greed. This is where the role of our government comes in.

Our government serves as a counterbalance to a good thing, not to control all things; it is the protector of this good thing. It is the role of our government to address and settle conflicts from an unbiased standpoint to the best of its ability. It is the role of our government to compose and enforce legislation that will benefit, protect, and create opportunity for its citizens, to set limitations on freedom so that freedom can be preserved and ensured. It is the role of our government to serve as the voice of the nation to the rest of the world, to serve as our representative, as our ambassador. It is the role of our government to serve the people who elected it. It is essential for our government to be involved in the day to day lives of its citizens, be it through the corporate world, cyberspace and security, on a local level, in education, immigration, in the health industry, and countless other niches, not to control these realms, but to serve as an equalizer, safeguard and creator of opportunity in each of these.

Professor of Communication at American University, Leonard Steinhorn comments, "[if many] Americans feel 'unease' toward [our] government's role in our daily lives, it is either because they take much of what the federal government does for granted, or because the media tend to give a disproportionate voice to those whose ideological temper tantrums against government make for good copy and sound bites." Our government's involvement in day-to-day life proceedings is essential to balance and preserve a very good thing: freedom. This is precisely the role our government plays in our lives.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. DAVID P. ROE**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote yesterday because of a family medical issue. Had I been present, I would have voted:

Roll Call #130—NAY

Roll Call #131—YEA

**EGAN WALKER****HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Egan Walker for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Egan Walker is a 10th grader at Standley Lake High School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Egan Walker is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Egan Walker for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. JOE WILSON**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following remarks regarding my absence from votes which occurred on March 23, 2015. I was delayed in arriving in Washington because I was in attendance at a funeral for a beloved family within our community. The Columbia community and the University of South Carolina worshipped in thankful memory for the life of Charles "Charlie" Leverett Adams Terreni, Jr.

H.R. 360—Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act—NAY

H. Res. 162—Calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity—AYE

## JASON SHORT OF INTERNATIONAL FALLS

**HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jason Short of International Falls, Minnesota and the work of the Falls Hunger Coalition under the leadership of Nancy Anderson.

I am sure many of my fellow Members have seen the nightly weather reports indicating that International Falls has the coldest temperatures in the United States.

Jason is a young adult working as a delivery driver for UPS in the International Falls region that covers a 300-mile route. On one brisk day, one of his package recipients noted that Jason was wearing shorts and told him he was crazy for dressing like that in the cold weather. He took that craziness and his love of wearing shorts to Facebook to initiate a challenge to his friends and posted, "Until I raise 1,000 dollars for the Falls Hunger Coalition Food Bank, I'm going to wear shorts no matter if it's snowing, 30 below, rain, sleet, or snow."

Soon the amount turned into \$2,000, \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000 to \$7,192 at the end of the year.

The comments on his Facebook ranged from, "We need to dress this young man," or "I don't know, maybe we want to keep Jason in shorts all winter. However, he did stop wearing his shorts when he reached \$5,000 with contributions from friends and strangers all over the United States. He modestly says, "It's all about paying it forward. Everyone can use a helping hand once in a while and you never know if the shoe was on the other foot, you never know if you're going to need something yourself so why not get out there and help somebody."

The Falls Hunger Coalition served over 8,000 people in 4,178 households in calendar year 2014. That added up to over 164,000 pounds of food distributed through Bonus Bucks, Senior Select, the Nutritional Assistance Program for Seniors, and the Summer Snack Packs and Summer Meals. Population wise, it's a small county but the coalition is doing an outstanding job of serving the needs of many.

I understand that Jason is planning to hatch another fundraising later this year and as a former UPS employee during my college days and spending time on a ride-along-driver "in the browns" this past summer in Duluth, I know he has the determination to once again achieve great success. With one out of five children in this country going to bed hungry every night, I am so proud of this young man for stepping up and trying to alleviate the issue of hunger in his own community.

Let's just hope for warmer temperatures during his next fundraising phase.

## HONORING THE RETIREMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL CASSIE STROM OF THE UNITED STATES AIR NATIONAL GUARD

**HON. WM. LACY CLAY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Missouri's 1st district, I am proud to honor one of our most distinguished constituents and home-grown heroes, Major General Cassie Strom of the United States Air National Guard. In June of this year—2015, General Strom is retiring, after an incredible 31 plus years of dedicated service.

General Strom received her commission by direct appointment and began her active duty career with the Air Force in February 1984. She has served at all levels—Department of Defense, Combatant Command, Headquarters United States Air Force, Major Command, wing and base legal offices. She previously served on active duty for six years at the base legal offices at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, Osan Air Base, Korea and Torrejon Air Base, Spain. General Strom is admitted to practice law in the State of Missouri and the State of Nebraska.

General Strom transferred to the Air Force Reserve with an assignment as an Individual Mobilization Augmentee at Scott Air Force Base, Illinois. She then moved to the Missouri Air National Guard in 1990 as a traditional Guard member. She has deployed to Bosnia and Herzegovina and augmented the Army Civil Affairs mission, worked a variety of international peacekeeping exercises, served in the Department of Defense Office of General Counsel in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, acted as the Deputy Staff Judge Advocate, United States Transportation Command, and as a Supervising Senior Attorney at the United States Air Force Academy.

Major General Cassie A. Strom concludes her achievement filled career as the Air National Guard Assistant to The Judge Advocate General. In this position, she is the principal adviser and liaison to The Judge Advocate General on Air National Guard legal matters. In addition, she serves as a senior representative on The Judge Advocate General's Air National Guard Council, providing leadership, strategic planning and management of the entire Air National Guard Judge Advocate program, encompassing over 440 judge advocates and paralegals at Air National Guard legal offices throughout the United States.

Her service to our country does not stop with her time in military status—she runs the Veteran's Advocacy Project for the Catholic Legal Assistance Ministry, which is housed in Scott Hall, in our own St. Louis University School of Law!

As further testament to her exceptional service, General Strom's military decorations include the Defense Superior Service Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Joint Service Commendation Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal (with 3 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Army Commendation Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal (with 1 Bronze Oak Leaf

Cluster), Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, Air Force Organizational Excellence Award (with 1 Bronze Oak Leaf Cluster), National Defense Service Medal (with Bronze Star), Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Armed Forces Service Medal, Humanitarian Service Medal, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Short, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Long, Air Force Longevity Service (with 3 Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters), Armed Forces Reserve Medal (with 1 Gold Hourglass) Air Force Training Ribbon, and NATO Medal!

General Strom has set a truly inspiring example of dedication to the defense of freedom, service before self, and what it means to be an Officer. She has been a trailblazer—as one of the first JAGs to deploy into Bosnia to becoming the first female ANG Advisor to Air Force Special Operations Command's Staff Judge Advocate to becoming the first woman to become a Major General Air National Guard Judge Advocate! The people of the first district of Missouri—thank General Strom for her service and wish her well in her future endeavors!

---

CHARLIZE GALLEGOS

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Charlice Gallegos for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Charlice Gallegos is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Charlice Gallegos is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Charlice Gallegos for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

---

TRIBUTE TO KANIKA  
DRAKSHARAM

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the po-

litical process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Kanika Draksharam attends Clements High School in Sugar Land, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should the government play in our lives?

In my opinion, the role of the government in our lives should be to protect and help the people of the country when they are not able to do those things themselves.

The topmost priority for a government should be the safety of the people living in that country. If the people are not safe, then the country will fall apart. Providing safety for the people includes a police force, military, a fire department or emergency response team, and an emergency medical system. Without a working police force, society would not be stable, as there would be large amounts of crime. This should be provided from a local government. A military is vital to a country's protection. A government must ensure that the borders of a country are protected. Federal protection is necessary in order to maintain the safety and well being of the people. The military should be provided from a federal level however. Federal and local law enforcement must be enforced. If a country did not have a fire department or emergency medical system, the safety of people would be threatened, and lives would be lost and endangered. It is the responsibility of the government to ensure that people are safe.

Another role the government must play in people's lives is to provide basic necessities such as education and infrastructure. It should be prioritized, that the citizens of a country are educated and are able to support themselves and benefit to the country. Providing education should be one of the roles of a state or local government to determine the standards of. Providing infrastructure lies in the role of the government, because water, roads, waste collection and electricity are needed. These things are required for a country to be functioning and to ensure the well being of the people. An equal priority, of the government should be to provide a democratic federal justice system. If an individual violates a law, the role of the government is to make sure this person is brought to justice.

In conclusion, when we consider the role of the government in our lives today, my opinion is the role should be to provide defense, protection, infrastructure facilities, quality education, and a democratic justice system. These things all benefit the people themselves, but at the same time, do not have complete control over them.

---

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL GRAZIANO,  
FILMMAKER, AND THE DOCUMENTARY  
FILM RESISTANCE

**HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Michael Graziano and his extraordinarily talented team at Uji Films who have created a fantastic documentary called Resistance. Michael recently joined me along with a panel of experts on antibiotic resistance for a screening of Resistance in my district of

Rochester, New York, to an amazing response. The film uses microscopic footage, harrowing personal stories and expert insight to delve into the history of antibiotic resistance, starting with the mass production of antibiotics 70 years ago and tracking the rise of superbugs into the 21st Century.

Resistance does a tremendous job laying out the issues at hand, explaining that eighty percent of the antibiotics sold in this country are used on the farm, mostly with healthy animals to "prevent disease," and how that impacts human health and modern medicine. The World Health Organization said in a recent report that antibiotic resistance is, "a problem so serious that it threatens the achievements of modern medicine." In ten years, surgeries, procedures, and illnesses that rely on antibiotics could be fatal. Pulling your teeth. Hip replacements. These could all be rendered obsolete without antibiotics. Strep throat could be fatal.

We must preserve medically important antibiotics for the treatment of humans, and for sick animals. That is exactly what my bill, the Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act, or PAMTA, would do. Tomorrow I will reintroduce that bill for the fifth time.

The American people need to understand that while I am fighting every day in Congress to highlight this issue, consumers, neighbors, doctors, and parents will be the ones who turn the tide of antibiotic resistance. Citizens taking a stand and asking grocery stores like Costco or fast food chains like McDonald's and Chick-Fil-A to sell meat and poultry raised without unnecessary antibiotics has made a difference. Resistance is making a difference. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the film and the filmmakers for making an important contribution to fighting the public health crisis of our time.

---

IN HONOR OF DR. BARRY  
SHEPHERD'S CAREER

**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Barry Shepherd for his faithful service as the Superintendent of the Cabarrus County School system in the 8th Congressional District of North Carolina.

When Dr. Shepherd became Superintendent in 2008, he brought a unique vision that transformed Cabarrus County Schools during many challenging years. In spite of reductions in funding, Dr. Shepherd continually emphasized the value of people and his students.

As a result of this approach, students from Cabarrus County Schools are scoring higher on end-of-year assessments, graduation rates have increased, and the school system was able to open eight new schools during his tenure.

Today, Cabarrus County Schools boast some of the most unique learning experiences offered in the country. Specifically, Cabarrus County Schools have a partnership with the Center for International Understanding at the University of North Carolina called Confucius



Classrooms. This program features a reciprocal agreement where teachers and administrators from Cabarrus County visit schools in China to fine tune best practices in education. As part of this program, Chinese educators come to Cabarrus County Schools to learn from their successes as well.

Dr. Shepherd is a native of Wilkes County, North Carolina, and received a Bachelor's Degree in Music Education and a Master's Degree in Educational Leadership from Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina. He went on to receive his Doctoral Degree in Education from Columbia University in New York.

Dr. Shepherd served as Superintendent of Elkin City Schools and as Assistant Superintendent in the Mooresville Graded School District before arriving in Cabarrus County. He also held various administrative positions in the Iredell-Statesville Schools, Lexington City Schools, and Thomasville City Schools.

It is truly an honor to extend these remarks congratulating Dr. Shepherd on his retirement and to thank him for his esteemed service to our local community as a visionary educator.

---

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL  
DEBT

**HON. MIKE COFFMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,412,192,314.93. We've added \$7,525,535,143,401.85 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

---

DAISY SHAW

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Daisy Shaw for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Daisy Shaw is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Daisy Shaw is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Daisy Shaw for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. GILKISON

**HON. LUKE MESSER**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Frank E. Gilkison, a longtime Muncie attorney and a truly admirable Hoosier.

Frank was a devoted husband to his wife Donna, the loving father to five children, and stepfather to two step-sons. After initially serving as an Air Cadet for two years in the U.S. Army Air Corps, Frank diligently attended IU Law School before moving to Muncie. He started his 62-year law practice with a predecessor firm to Beasley and Gilkison and remained a member until his retirement in 2012. Not only was Frank one of the longest practicing attorneys from East Central Indiana, but he also served on the Indiana Supreme Court Commission on Character & Fitness for 35 years. Additionally, he was the CEO of Home Beverages, Inc., a small beverage distribution company for 45 years.

Frank and Donna are also my close friends, who both played a key role in my career. They were among the first friends in Muncie to step forward in support of my initial Congressional pursuits. I will always be grateful for their friendship and early leadership.

Today, it is my privilege to honor the life of Frank Gilkison. My thoughts and prayers go out to Frank's family, and may God comfort those he left behind with His peace and strength.

---

GLEN STEVENS FROM NORTH  
BRANCH

**HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a story of how a conversation at the National Association of Secondary School Principals Conventional last year in Dallas turned into a transformational life experience. Glen Stevens, who serves as the Assistant Principal at North Branch Area High School, was offered an opportunity to have an expense-paid volunteer trip to the Dominican Republic to help in the building of a vocational center of a local school. He submitted an application and his name was thrown into a large pool of educators willing to have the experience. He said, "When you're 13 or 14 in the Dominican Republic, and you're done with elementary school, unless you have phenomenal talent or potential, you're not going to high school." Because sixty percent of the Dominican Republic's vegetables come from the Constanza area where he was volunteering, many of these families only find work in the fields, earning perhaps \$4 to \$5 a day. Stevens could see the disparity of the income gap between workers and the wealthy land owners.

Fortunately, Glen was able to speak some Spanish, but it took him a while to understand what the school children were trying to com-

municate when they kept saying "espaldas." After a short time, he found out the children wanted to ride on his big, strong shoulders. During his volunteer stint from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm each day, he was moving blocks and mixing concrete all day. Though he had a short break for lunch, children would come clamoring for attention and suddenly his weariness was gone. He explained, "It was like a big 'boom' and your energy level would be back up again." He was heart-warmed from the warm reception he received from all the Dominicans. "Even though most of the volunteers spoke little or no Spanish, and the Dominicans didn't speak English, a bond had formed between them than transcended language.

He said he came back a different person and knows the next group of volunteers coming to finish painting and completing the electrical work will find the same spirit.

This school, founded by Pastor Angel Moreta, will give children more options than working in the fields after elementary school. They will be adding programs for culinary arts, beautician trades, music and woodworking in addition to building on their skills in reading and mathematics.

Glen Stevens has hopes and dreams for these children to achieve success with newfound skills. I am certain he came home with far more than he brought with him and will share this new message to the students at the North Branch Area High School.

---

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 70TH AN-  
NIVERSARY OF THE CIVIC  
LEAGUE OF GREATER NEW  
BRUNSWICK

**HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick as it prepares to celebrate its 70th anniversary at a gala celebration on March 28, 2015. I would also like to join with the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick in congratulating its gala honorees, Mayor James Cahill, Richard Kaplan and Charlene Brown.

Since its inception, the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick has striven to strengthen the minority populations of central New Jersey. Its efforts have created several programs and services to advance opportunities and improve the quality of life of all residents. Its focus on employment and housing services helps develop a foundation to better the well-being of individuals and families. Through its youth programs, the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick offers tutoring and enrichment activities to students and builds leadership skills. The Civic League of Greater New Brunswick continues to fulfill its mission of an equal society for all through the enhancement of our communities.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating the Civic League of Greater New Brunswick on its 70th anniversary and recognizing the outstanding efforts of the Civic League and the gala honorees.

## HONORING JUDE KIBODEAUX

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Jude Kibodeaux attends Dawson High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

Making landfall on August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina was the most destructive disaster in United States history. A Category 3 storm with winds faster than 100 miles per hour, the storm took a great toll on the country. Its social cost, at least in New Orleans, is obvious. Nearly 2,000 of its citizens were killed by the storm, and thousands more were displaced by the grievous destruction it caused. Even today, nine years later, the city is still recovering from its losses. But the effects of Hurricane Katrina were not limited to just the area hit. The winds of Katrina were felt throughout the entire nation, if not through physical destruction then through economic downturn and political discontent.

The cost of the storm can be measured not only in deaths but also in dollars. This latter loss was not as tragic as the former, but it was significant enough to impact the rest of the country. The damage caused cost, according to the lowest estimate, a staggering \$96 billion, only \$40 billion of which was insured. And this does not even account for losses in the various affected industries. Its most serious impact was on oil production. Oil pipelines and offshore rigs were destroyed, causing national oil prices to rise and pushing the government to tap into the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The sugar industry, worth \$500 million annually in Louisiana alone, was also severely damaged. Chemical plants in the area, which accounted for one-fourth of the country's chemical production, were not spared either. The losses suffered by these important industries were great enough to stunt the economic growth of the whole country. After Katrina, national GDP growth decreased from 3.8% to 1.3%. With all of these losses taken into account, the total cost of the hurricane amounts to \$250 billion. It was undoubtedly a severe setback for the economy.

The government stepped in to try and alleviate the storm's effects, but its efforts were not as cohesive as many would have hoped. On the federal level, it was days before the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), an organization created for this kind of situation, got its act together in New Orleans. And even once it had established itself, FEMA lacked an effective strategy and had a minimal impact on the recovery. The organization was evidently unpre-

pared to do its duty. The director of FEMA, Michael D. Brown, was forced to resign in the fallout, and the popularity of President George W. Bush plummeted, the beginning of a trend that ended Bush's political career. There was also much criticism at the local level. Most was directed toward the mayor of New Orleans, Ray Nagin, for having understated the severity of the storm before it hit and responded inadequately in the aftermath. He managed to stay in office but faced serious criticism, making it difficult for him to implement policies. In all, Katrina caused just as much a political disturbance as an economic one.

The winds of Katrina had proven themselves the winds of change as they caused great disturbances to the society, economy and government of this nation. Homes destroyed by the hurricane can still be seen today in New Orleans, serving as a testament to the lasting effect this storm has had.

**DEVORAH LINFORD****HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Deborah Linford for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Deborah Linford is a 7th grader at Drake Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Deborah Linford is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Deborah Linford for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. PETER J. ROSKAM**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 130/131 my flight was cancelled due to inclement weather. Had I been present, I would have voted Aye on both.

## THE 4 CHAPLAINS

**HON. TED POE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, anywhere there is someone in the military, there will be chaplains. They are men of God, doing God's

work. Bringing faith in a time of misery, pain and sorrow, chaplains serve their spiritual duty on the battlefields alongside our servicemen and women. Chaplains help battle demons in every sense of the word. While their efforts are spiritual in nature, their courage deserves to be celebrated.

The Chaplain Corps was created in 1775 by the Continental Congress to be an essential part of the Army while ensuring American soldiers would have spiritual guidance available anytime. The corps is made up of both ordained clergy who are commissioned officers and enlisted soldiers who serve as chaplain assistants and they can be assigned anywhere they are needed.

One of the most famous stories about these brave faith warriors is the tale of the Four Chaplains. It was February 3, 1943. The U.S. Army Transport *Dorchester* made up a three ship convoy that was moving from Newfoundland to an American base in Greenland. The ship was at full capacity, carrying 902 servicemen, merchant seamen and civilian workers.

Only 150 miles from its destination, the *Dorchester* became a quick target for a German submarine. The hit was detrimental.

It was 12:55 a.m., when 902 lives were completely turned upside down. The *Dorchester* began rapidly taking on water. It was sinking. The ship's captain, Hans J. Danielsen, gave orders to abandon the ship.

The fate of the ship however was not much better; the icy waters gave many of the men hypothermia, even killing some of them. All alternatives were bleak.

The torpedo hit killed and wounded many of the men. Those who were still alive were desperately trying to get aboard lifeboats and rafts and struggling to find life preservers. As mass chaos erupted aboard, four men remained calm and brave. Aboard the ship were four Army chaplains: Lt. George Fox, a Methodist; Lt. Alexander Goode, a Jewish Rabbi; Lt. John Washington, a Roman Catholic Priest; and Lt. Clark Poling, a Dutch Reformed minister.

Witnessing the situation in front of them, the chaplains took charge. They began quickly handing out lifejackets, prayers and words of encouragement. Rabbi Goode even gave his own gloves to a soldier. When there were no more lifejackets, the chaplains simply removed their own and handed them out, no questions asked.

In a mere 20 minutes, the ship slipped below the surface of the sea, drifting to its final resting place in the Atlantic. 672 men died. Only 230 survived. Among the casualties were the four selfless chaplains. They were an earthly liaison and a light of peace during a time of complete turmoil. It was a German death wish, but death was defeated by faith, the divine won that day at sea.

The Distinguished Service Cross and Purple Heart were awarded posthumously as well as a posthumous Special Medal of Heroism; The Four Chaplains' Medal was approved by Congress and awarded by the President in 1961.

They were from different denominations and even religions, but bound together by a God's love and their faith in his eternal promise. The chaplains lived by a uniting example that transcends religions, countries and generations: laying down their lives for others, there is no greater love.

The epitome of selflessness, they fought a silent battle. While in a literal sense they lost, they gained all in the eyes of their creator. And that's just the way it is.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KENTUCKY YMCA

##### HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 125th Anniversary of the Kentucky YMCA by recognizing March 1st as Kentucky YMCA Day in Lexington, Kentucky.

On March 1, 1890, the Kentucky YMCA was incorporated by an Act of the Kentucky General Assembly. For 125 years, the YMCA has supported families and communities across our Commonwealth through programs that promote youth development, healthy living, social responsibility, and that build a healthy spirit, mind, and body for all.

Nineteen YMCA Associations throughout Kentucky proudly serve more than 367,100 individuals, including 160,000 children and youth as well as 32,700 seniors. They also provide nearly \$7 million in financial assistance for families to participate in YMCA programs and membership. YMCAs mobilize almost 8,300 Kentuckians each year to volunteer and serve their local communities, including over 100 students in the Y-Corps service learning program who collectively perform over 1,500 hours of service.

The Kentucky YMCA is home to the largest YMCA Youth and Government program in the country, providing thousands of middle school, high school, and college-aged students the opportunity to become better leaders and engaged citizens through the Kentucky Youth Assembly (KYA) and Kentucky United Nations Assembly (KUNA).

The sixth district of Kentucky is proud to be home to 50 Student YMCAs and KYA/KUNA Delegations with over 1,000 student members, including my alma mater, Henry Clay High School. The mission of the Kentucky YMCA is to develop engaged citizens and servant leaders, inspired to affect change in their school, community, Commonwealth, nation, and world. The YMCA has and will continue to shape the future of the Sixth District and Kentucky.

Therefore, I encourage all Kentuckians and my colleagues to observe March 1, 2015 as "Kentucky YMCA Day."

#### TRIBUTE TO JONATHAN ROTH

##### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight

into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Jonathan Roth attends Seven Lakes High School in Katy, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, why is it important to be involved in the political process?

Why should you be involved?

The United States was founded on the principle of freedom, freedom from oppression, freedom from foreign rule, and freedom to participate openly in our government. The United States rebelled against the British Crown so that they and future generations may experience the freedom they so desperately desired.

The national voter turnout for the 2012 general election dipped all the way down to 57.5%. That's almost a situation in which one in every two people doesn't vote. Only 65.1% of the voting eligible general population was registered to vote in that general election. For a nation that prides itself on its democratic processes, it is quite ironic that less than three fourths of the nation actually participates in that democracy. Our nation politically travels the world masquerading as the ideal democratic country when we rank in the lower half of global voter participation. There are many in our country that complain about laws and decisions made by those on Capitol Hill. Yet the majority of these people have never contacted a congressman nor attempted to voice their opinions in a constructive way. "No taxation without representation" was the battle cry during the United States' quest for freedom. Even though there are more problems than taxation in our country today, the representation part fits our situation perfectly. Our government needs to be representative of the population as a whole. That means that everyone (or the majority) needs to participate. For a democratic government to function at its fullest capacity with the least amount of issues all demographics and cultures need to be represented so that all decisions that are made keeping the whole population in mind. Without an equally diverse voting populace some populations will not be represented as they should be. The majority of the problems that plague our country stem from the perception that some laws seem unfair to a certain group or groups in the nation. If everyone voted and voiced their opinion then those problems and perceptions would diminish greatly. Not only would these problems disappear there would also be an increase in national pride and patriotism. With an increase in voter participation more citizens would feel involved in how the nation is run and the democratic process. This increased national pride could lead to a decrease in social or hate crimes or perhaps even racial violence. If the populace feels included and an active part of the nation then they may look at themselves as a contributing member of the country and not an outsider in a foreign land.

In conclusion voter participation is essential to the overall success of our country. Not only is it a founding principle of our country but it may also lead to an increase in common understanding between various social and ethnic groups decrease in violent crime and frustration over perceived unfair legislation.

#### CHRISTIAN CASTILLO

##### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Christian Castillo for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Christian Castillo is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5-8 and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Christian Castillo is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Christian Castillo for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

CELEBRATING LIFE OF DR. YOSEF  
ALFREDO ANTONIO BEN-  
JOCHANNAN, DISTINGUISHED  
SCHOLAR AND  
KEMETAPHYSICIAN

##### HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life and historic contributions of my dear friend Dr. Yosef Alfredo Antonio ben-Jochannan (Dr. Ben), one of our community's most distinguished scholars who passed away on March 19, 2015. Dr. Ben was the foremost intellectual on the history of religion and its impact on the world. He was an influential professor and activist—a pioneer of Africana studies. Dr. Ben was a man who believed in the value of digging deep for facts that have been long obscured. He has inspired generations of scholars and students with his tireless research and thoughtful teachings.

Dr. Ben's cultural journey began as a student of Arthur Schomburg in Puerto Rico and Edward Wilmot Blyden in St. Croix, where as a youth he spent time participating with Pedro Albizu Campos during Puerto Rico's independence quest in the 1950s to providing African-centered reading material to Malcolm X in the early 1960s and educating young teenaged Five Percenters at Harlem Prep during the late 1960s. Through his annual fact-finding tours to Kemet (Egypt) for over four decades, he helped uncover the history of Africa and our own roots. Dr. Ben accomplished a great deal in his life, most notably writing 49 books on African history. Dr. Ben was well known for his thought-provoking assertions on the influence of Africans on ancient civilizations. Dr. Ben was a regular invited special guest on the popular late Gil Noble's "Like It Is" television Sunday show.

A man way ahead of his time, Dr. Ben spoke truth about the origins of world religion and documented it to prove it. I am proud to have called Dr. Ben my neighbor. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and loved ones. While I am sad that Harlem has lost a great prophet and spiritual leader, I know Dr. Ben's legacy will live on for many years to come.

ABC UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
50TH YEAR ANNIVERSARY

**HON. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize ABC Unified School District (ABCUSD) on their 50th Anniversary. I am proud to represent the students, teachers, and parents of ABC Unified. Their educational excellence is a source of pride for the 38th Congressional District.

In 1965 the school districts of Artesia, Bloomfield, and Carmenita combined to form ABCUSD. The school district serves Cerritos, Hawaiian Gardens, as well as portions of Lakewood, Long Beach, and Norwalk.

The district's motto "Student Achievement—Our Main Thing," exemplifies the district's leadership and dedication to strong counseling, staff development, and alternative education programs. ABCUSD has received numerous awards and recognitions for its educational excellence. In recent years, it was the recipient of National Blue Ribbon, California Distinguished Schools, and Schools to Watch awards.

ABCUSD is a prime example of how educators and community groups can work together for the benefit of our students. In 1999, ABCUSD and the ABC Federation of Teachers formed the ABC Labor Management Partnership. This collaboration is focused on student achievement and has inspired many districts and unions to form similar partnerships. The district also has a strong history of working with local colleges and local businesses to build vibrant educational programs for its students.

This year, ABCUSD will be celebrating 50 years of excellence. On this special occasion, I would like to congratulate the ABC Unified School District, the teachers, faculty, students, and parents, past and present, who make the ABCUSD community so exceptional.

IN RECOGNITION OF JAY DAVIS'  
RETIREMENT

**HON. ERIC SWALWELL**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Dr. Jay Davis, President of the Hertz Foundation, who will be retiring after decades of service to our country as a scientist and philanthropist. Jay resides in Livermore, California, in my congressional district.

Dr. Davis graduated from the University of Texas with a Bachelor's and Master's degree in 1963 and 1964 respectively. In 1969, he graduated from the University of Wisconsin with his PhD in physics.

For three decades, Dr. Davis worked as a scientist at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), supporting the lab's fusion program through research in nuclear physics and material science. Dr. Davis also founded the Center for Accelerator Mass Spectrometry at LLNL.

Following his service at LLNL, in 1998, Dr. Davis used his science background to support the Department of Defense as the Associate Director for Earth and Environmental Sciences. He worked to develop and enhance arms control treaties and twice served as an inspector for the United Nations Special Commission's mission to Iraq following the first Gulf War. During his time with the Department, he served as the founding Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency. Because of Dr. Davis' exceptional service to the nation, he was twice awarded the Distinguished Public Service Medal, the Department of Defense's highest civilian award.

In 2009, following his exceptional career in public service, Dr. Davis was elected to serve as President of the Hertz Foundation. The Hertz Foundation provides talented PhD students in the Applied Sciences and Engineering the opportunity for financial and fellowship support to pursue their careers. On top of his work at the Hertz Foundation, Dr. Davis has also been a tireless advocate for benefits owed to retired lab employees.

Dr. Davis' distinguished legacy of service to the Livermore community and the nation will continue through his scientific accomplishments and his philanthropic work at Hertz foundation. I wish Jay all the best in his retirement.

HONORING SONYA ROMERO

**HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great pride to honor one of our exceptional teachers, Ms. Sonya Romero from Lew Wallace Elementary School in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Sonya Romero is a bilingual teacher who focuses on early childhood education. She is a candidate for National Board certification; she serves on the state's NMTEACH council; and was recently appointed Executive Vice President of the Albuquerque Teachers Federation.

A teacher for the past 20 years, Sonya has worked at Lew Wallace Elementary located in downtown Albuquerque for the last 10 years. The small student population is represented by a wide variety of cultures and languages. Three out of every four students qualifies for the National School Lunch Program. Many of the kids are from families that are homeless or rely on housing assistance; and they struggle with food insecurity.

The tightknit Downtown community is also home to everyday heroes who will do anything

for students, colleagues and neighbors, including rallying around families in need; locating desperately needed services; packaging food in back packs for the weekend; inviting parents to have a free breakfast with their son or daughter; spending their own money on clothes, shoes or school supplies; and even inviting an illiterate mother to sit in during story time to help her learn to read.

Several months ago, some of her former students were placed in a dire family situation causing Child Protective Services to intervene with the intent of placing the two sisters with a foster family. Sonya and her teenage son made the decision to take the girls into their own home and they have been there since.

Sonya and Lew Wallace Elementary School were recently featured on "The Ellen DeGeneres Show" and received \$20,000 from Target. Sonya is grateful that her story is shedding light on the roles that many teachers embrace for the benefit of their students. She considers her work and that of her fellow teachers very special and views this recognition as a community celebration. Sonya reminds us that most teachers are not just providing instruction, but are deeply committed to the overall well-being and success of their students. They overcome challenges, and create a secure and trusting environment for our children.

CANDICE CODR

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Candice Codr for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Candice Codr is an 8th grader at Wheat Ridge 5-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Candice Codr is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Candice Codr for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO JACK HAWKINS

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high

school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Jack Hawkins attends Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

The most important reason I believe Americans should be involved in the political process is because of the right we were given to vote for the leaders of our country. One reason I believe this is a crucial role of citizens is because with this right it allows us to vote into office the people who we believe will pursue and advocate effectively what we as citizens are needing from our city, state, and federal government. This right is one of the primary reasons our great nation was founded, so that people could live in a democracy and advocate to officials what they needed instead of having a monarchal (or more commonly today) a dictatorship classification of government speak for them. But more importantly, I believe citizens should exercise this right because we have thousands of soldiers stationed all over the world helping to both defend this right for our country, and try to help others achieve the type of democratic government that we possess and believe in so prominently. Therefore by exercising this right, it is a small way to show our appreciation and gratefulness for our troops by exercising this right that they are fighting for so valiantly.

The other important reason I believe Americans should be involved in the political process is because with the election of our nation's leaders it is has repeatedly proven by history that through former political leaders, specifically past American presidents, the United States has made substantial positive differences in both domestic and international affairs. For example with the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt who transformed the country's economy. With the enacting of his New Deal policies Roosevelt was able to provide millions of Americans with jobs and economic security therefore helping America incredibly through the Great Depression. Also America has made major strides in international affairs such as through President Obama who with the aid of America's top military leaders and the United States' Navy SEALs team was able to kill Osama bin Laden, the leader of the terrorist group Al-Qaeda who was responsible for horrific acts including most infamously the bombing of the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001. Although it has not stopped Al-Qaeda completely, President Obama along with his esteemed colleagues made American history and showed the strength of the United States as an international power. The United States is the by far the best country in the world and it is repeatedly shown through the election of our country's leaders who throughout history and in the future will continue to show America's greatness both domestically and internationally if the citizens of our magnificent country continue to take an active role in America's political process.

#### CONGRATULATING LEROY AND OVIA MARIE MCGINNIS ON THEIR 65TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

##### HON. JASON SMITH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Leroy and Ovia Marie McGinnis on their 65th wedding anniversary. They were married on March 3, 1950 in a courthouse in Arkansas. Although they were young, their love for one another was unconditional. In fact, Leroy was so intent on marrying the love of his life that he spent the last four dollars to his name to pay for their modest ceremony. Worried of what their families might think, Leroy and Ovia Marie kept their marriage a secret for several weeks.

Soon after marrying, the young couple moved to Cuba, Missouri, where their love and affection for one another continued to grow. They have raised six children together, and Mr. McGinnis still serves as CEO of McGinnis Wood Products, a very successful business that he founded in 1968.

Again, I want to wish Mr. and Mrs. McGinnis a Happy Anniversary and many more years of joy!

#### HERMANTOWN FIFTH-GRADERS

##### HON. RICHARD M. NOLAN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three very compassionate fifth-grade school children for their leadership in protecting us against the silent killer of carbon monoxide poisoning. The students who have stepped forward to meet an important community need are Bryanna Kliegle, Alexa Aagenes and Ani Jovanovich of Hermantown Middle School.

I don't think I have to remind anyone that winters in Minnesota can be very cold. We Minnesotans are hardy souls and deal with it. But with the cold temperatures, there is a silent killer that unfortunately creeps into our communities every year as people try to warm their homes. This killer is called carbon monoxide poisoning.

Bryanna had a friend who died from carbon monoxide poisoning just a few weeks before Christmas. She turned her grief into action, reaching out to two friends to help her so others would not be lost to this killer. They formed a group and went door-to-door raising donations to buy carbon monoxide detectors for local families. These detectors cost only about \$20.00 each, but within a short span they formed Hopes of Faith to handle the donations. To date, they have raised more than enough money to buy 200 detectors and then received 100 more from Safe Kids Minnesota and Kiddie, a company that makes the units.

Bryanna recently spoke at a school assembly and told her classmates, "We didn't think we could do this much at first. We're just fifth-graders. Regular fifth graders, but we reached out and wanted to take a chance."

How many times do we look around our communities and think something should be done and wait for others to lead the way? Bryanna, Alexa and Ani are exceptional young students we can look to as leaders. They saw a need, stepped forward and did something about it. I am so very proud of them.

#### HONORING LUCY COFFEY

##### HON. JOAQUIN CASTRO

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lucy Coffey, the oldest living female veteran who passed away last week after 108 vibrant years. Originally from Indiana, Ms. Coffey was working in a Dallas, Texas supermarket when she learned of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Putting country before self, Ms. Coffey quit her job and joined the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. She bravely served in the Pacific Theater during World War II, earning two bronze stars and ascending to the rank of sergeant.

For 13 years after her discharge in 1945, Ms. Coffey worked as an Army civilian in Okinawa, Japan. She ultimately settled in my hometown of San Antonio, where she worked in the procurement office at Kelly Air Force Base until her retirement in 1971.

Last year, Ms. Coffey visited the nation's capital on an Honor Flight. While in Washington, she not only visited the women's memorial at Arlington National Cemetery and the National World War II Memorial, she also met with both Vice President Biden and President Obama.

Ms. Coffey leaves behind an abundance of admirers who have sung her praises since her passing. President Obama cited Ms. Coffey's pioneering spirit and the inspiration she has provided generations of patriots since her service. Vice President Biden celebrated her legacy and said he was honored to have met her. Bexar County veterans service officer Queta Marquez highlighted Ms. Coffey's liveliness and spunk.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer Ms. Coffey's loved ones my sincere condolences for their loss and echo San Antonians' deep gratitude for her exemplary service and unwavering patriotism. She was a remarkable American who will be greatly missed.

#### HONORING COAST GUARD CAPTAIN ANDY BLOMME

##### HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor a proud son of North Carolina, Captain Carlyle "Andy" Blomme, as he prepares to retire from the United States Coast Guard.

Captain Blomme has served as the Coast Guard Chief of Congressional Affairs since June 2012, where he has been an excellent

representative of the Coast Guard here on Capitol Hill. Captain Blomme has worked diligently to ensure the Coast Guard has the resources and authorities necessary to not only keep our nation safe, but to be a steward of its natural resources. His deep knowledge of Coast Guard operations, acquisitions, and strategic priorities has been invaluable to the members who work closely with the Coast Guard, which I came to appreciate as Ranking Member of the Appropriations Subcommittee of Homeland Security. This has been especially true as we have worked to recapitalize the Coast Guard's aging fleet in a time of shrinking budgets.

There has been no better advocate for, or representative of, the Coast Guard than Captain Blomme and I am proud to have had the opportunity to work closely with Andy during this time. My staff and I have often relied on him and his staff's knowledge and understanding of the missions, challenges and responsibilities of the Coast Guard.

Captain Blomme comes from a distinguished family of seafarers from North Carolina. His great, great grandfather was First Mate on the SS *Ella and Annie*, a Blockade Running Steamship in the Civil War. *Ella and Annie* ran the Federal blockade on behalf of the Confederacy until November 1863, when she was captured by USS *Niphon* off New Inlet, North Carolina. Demonstrating his pride as the son, of the son, of a sailor, Captain Blomme came back to the same proud roots decades later as the Commanding Officer of Coast Guard Cutter *Diligence*, homeported in Wilmington, North Carolina.

Captain Blomme is a 1985 graduate of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy in New London, Connecticut. He has served at sea and ashore in a variety of operational and staff tours throughout his distinguished career, including serving in Command of Coast Guard Sector Jacksonville, as well as Coast Guard Cutters *Diligence*, *Nantucket*, and *Point Huron*. He also rounded out his nearly twelve years of sea duty with tours aboard Coast Guard Cutters *Gallatin* and *Chase*. Aside from an impressive record of sea service, Andy has also served ashore as a controller in the Coast Guard's Fifth District Command Center in Portsmouth, VA, as the Operations Officer at Coast Guard Group Miami and as Military Assistant to the Secretary of Homeland Security during the tenures of Secretaries Michael Chertoff and Janet Napolitano.

This week, Captain Blomme will depart his post on Capitol Hill and retire after 30 years of honorable service. During that time, he has embodied the spirit of the Coast Guard and its motto, *Semper Paratus*, Always Ready. We thank him and his family for his service to the United States Congress and to the country. On behalf of the House of Representatives, we wish Captain Blomme, his wife Peg, and their two sons, Matthew and Alex, the best in their future endeavors. We congratulate Captain Andy Blomme on his retirement and wish him fair winds and following seas.

## PLATTE VALLEY MEDICAL CENTER

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Platte Valley Medical Center for receiving the 2014 Commerce City Business on the Move Award.

The Business on the Move Award recognizes businesses bringing new employment, growth in sales or new capital investment to the city in the last year. The Platte Valley Medical Center built their first off-site medical office building in the Reunion Marketplace area expanding their service to northern Commerce City. This provides critical service from medical providers to a community that has had limited access at this new location while ensuring access to quality care and support to the community.

I extend my deepest congratulations to the Platte Valley Medical Center for this well-deserved recognition by Commerce City.

## HONORING CONOR DEVLIN

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Conor Devlin attends Tompkins High School in Katy, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

Our government has evolved far beyond its original parameters. It now regulates entire economic industries, healthcare, going so far as to regulate the types of things we can and cannot buy. Our government has left its original designation as a Laissez-Faire Democratic Republic to a borderline Socialist country like the rest of the European and the EU. Our government is an overgrown bureaucracy that costs us—the American people—trillions each year, and yet it fails to accomplish its task when its people are spiraling into debt and unemployment is skyrocketing. The job of the American government is to protect its citizens with an up to date military comprised of the most advanced arsenal. Secondly, the government needs to protect the welfare of its citizens and by that I mean low taxes that are not crushing small business and forcing Corporations to locate to other places like China and Japan because it is cheaper there, and a dissolution of the current welfare state which

would put millions of American back to work if they no longer receive a monthly check for not being productive. The government needs to defend the rights of all its citizens by preventing foreign nations from infringing on our rights or any companies and agencies from infringing on our rights. The government also needs to stimulate the economy by providing a workplace that will foster economic growth in the private sector and not continually grow the bureaucracies in the public sector wasting the revenues generated by its citizens. Additionally, the government needs to step back and change its role in the healthcare system it should not waste taxpayer's dollars providing for other people's healthcare, which is that individual's choice not to be insured by the government. The government shouldn't waste money on useless agencies that can be easily cut down such as the EPA, the IRS, the USDA and many other branches that are full to the brim with useless employees wasting the American taxpayer's money. The American government's job is to protect the American citizens and their welfare. This does not include regulating major economic industries, driving companies and small businesses out of business and out of America, infringing on American's God-given rights and becoming a major player in an American citizen's life.

## HONORING CAPTAIN LAWRENCE R. VASQUEZ

### HON. JULIA BROWNLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Captain Lawrence R. Vasquez, Installation Commander of Naval Base Ventura County, on the special occasion of his Change of Command.

Since February 2012, Captain Vasquez has been recognized for his outstanding leadership and service as Commanding Officer of Naval Base Ventura County. His exemplary tour as the senior ranking officer in charge has been marked with distinction and remarkable success.

Under his dedicated command, Naval Base Ventura County became the first and to date only military installation to operate manned and unmanned aerial systems in FAA-controlled airspace. Naval Base Ventura County is also the only Navy installation tapped to support the Department of Health and Human Service's mission to house and process unaccompanied minors apprehended crossing the border into the United States.

During the Springs Fire of May 2013, Captain Vasquez's exceptional leadership enabled a joint city, county, and federal response to the fast-moving blaze, which threatened homes, California State University Channel Islands, and valuable military assets near the Pacific Coast Highway in Ventura County.

Captain Vasquez has been a staunch supporter of community engagement, personally participating in over 250 public meetings, and hosting tours and events to bring a better understanding of the Navy's mission and better collaboration among community partners, including government organizations, schools and business entities.



Captain Vasquez is the embodiment of an extensive and distinguished career of service to our country in the United States Navy. As a Naval aviator with over 26 years of commendable service, Captain Vasquez led a 12-aircraft helicopter squadron, the HSL-45 "Wolfpack." Additionally, he served as the Flag Aide to Commander of the Naval Coordinator Mid-South Region, as well as personal administrative aide to the Secretary of the Navy.

Captain Vasquez is recognized for his outstanding leadership and served as Commander of the Provincial Reconstruction Team in Farah, Afghanistan, a joint military and civilian team charged with extending the reach of the government in Afghanistan through reconstruction, development, governance, and security.

Captain Vasquez's exemplary work has earned him numerous accolades and awards to include the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Navy and the Marine Corps Commendation Medal, the Navy Achievement Medal, the Combat Action ribbon and various unit and campaign awards. Additionally, he was awarded the 2004 League of United Latin American Citizens' (LULAC) "Excellence in Military Service" award.

Captain Vasquez's remarkable career and many accomplishments are indicative of his unwavering commitment and dedication to his country and community. As he embarks on a new chapter in his career as the Chief of Staff for the Navy Region Europe, Africa, Southwest Asia in Naples, Italy, I want to express my sincere appreciation for Captain Vasquez's honorable and selfless service to our community and wish him the best in all his future endeavors.

CIERAH KELLEY

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Cierah Kelley for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Cierah Kelley is an 8th grader at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Cierah Kelley is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Cierah Kelley for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

THE PRESERVATION OF ANTI-BIOTICS FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT ACT OF 2015—H.R. 1552

**HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that I have introduced H.R. 1552, the Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act of 2015. This legislation would preserve the effectiveness of antibiotics by ending the unnecessary non-therapeutic uses of antibiotics in healthy food-animals.

The discovery of antibiotics literally transformed modern medicine, but their effectiveness is now being threatened by the spread of antibiotic resistant bacteria. Recently the World Health Organization warned that the crisis is "so serious that it threatens the achievements of modern medicine."

Already the CDC has told us that these superbugs cause two million infections and kill at least twenty-three thousand Americans every year. We spend twenty- to thirty-five billion dollars fighting these infections—sometimes in vain, as there are now strains of bacteria which have become completely untreatable. The scale of this problem worldwide is truly staggering—each year, seven hundred thousand people die unnecessarily and the global cost could be as high as \$1.2 trillion.

Unfortunately this problem is our own doing. Despite warnings from the very scientists who discovered antibiotics we have utterly failed to use them wisely. Overuse in medicine and rampant misuse in food-animal production has caused widespread resistance and led to the current crisis.

Food-animal production currently uses 80% of all antibiotics sold in the U.S. The majority of these are routinely given to healthy animals for "growth promotion" or "disease prevention." These non-therapeutic uses are not only unnecessary, but they also create the perfect environment for bacteria to evolve resistance, resulting in antibiotic resistant superbugs. Right now, we are allowing the greatest medical advancement of the 20th century to be frittered away, in part because it's cheaper for factory farms to feed these critical drugs to animals rather than fix the stressful, overcrowded or unsanitary conditions which allow disease to spread.

By the 1970's the dangers of misusing antibiotics in food-animals were well known and in 1977 the Food and Drug Administration sought to end sub-therapeutic uses of penicillin and tetracycline in food-animals. However, no substantive action was ever taken, antibiotic use has steadily increased and the problem is now worse than ever.

The FDA's recent decision to ask pharmaceutical companies to voluntarily remove "growth promotion" uses from drug labels is an inadequate response which fails to address routine non-therapeutic uses, often called the disease prevention loophole. A recent analysis by the PEW Charitable Trust clearly shows that this loophole can be exploited as many drugs have overlapping approvals for disease prevention and growth promotion and can be given to animals with no limit on the duration of use.

The Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act would phase out the use of the eight classes of medically important antibiotics that are currently approved for non-therapeutic use in animal agriculture. The bill clearly defines the term "non-therapeutic use" to ensure that sick animals may be appropriately treated, but that any use of medically important antibiotics outside of treatment of a sick animal is not permitted.

Both the American people and the U.S. government need to give this issue the attention it demands. Unless we act now and act together to preserve the effectiveness of our current antibiotics we face a future without them. Strep throat could once again lead to fatal heart infections. Common surgeries such as having wisdom teeth removed, joint replacements and Cesarean sections would become too risky to perform. Even something as common as dressing your child's scrapes with Neosporin could no longer be able to keep an infection at bay.

Protecting the public's health is one of the greatest responsibilities of this body and I urge my colleagues to stand with me to support the Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FRANCISCAN SISTERS OF MARY

**HON. WM. LACY CLAY**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable and historic order of Catholic women called to the service of all God's children and his creation, the Franciscan Sisters of Mary, who have been at the forefront of healing the sick, fighting discrimination, advocating for equal rights under the law, and protecting the wonders of the natural world.

Arriving from Germany in the winter of 1872, Mother Mary Odella Berger and four other religious sisters crossed the icy Mississippi River by ferry to land on the St. Louis riverfront near the site of today's Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, better known as the magnificent Gateway Arch.

They came to St. Louis seeking religious freedom and as a response to a call to serve the sick and indigent. Beginning with only five dollars among them, and armed with their resolute faith, they quickly deployed to the streets of our growing city to provide care to thousands suffering from tuberculosis, cholera and other epidemics of the time.

St. Mary of Victories Church, at 744 S. 3rd Street would become their first home where they treated the poor suffering from small pox, diphtheria, typhoid fever and scarlet fever. As their patient load increased so did their numbers and they eventually became known as the Sisters of Mary because of their connection to the church.

On May 24, 1877, the sisters opened their first hospital in a renovated home on Papin Street. During its first year, St. Mary's Infirmary treated 82 patients. Eventually, a newer and much larger facility was built on the same site.



Mother Mary Concordia Puppenthal, the superior general of the Sisters of St. Mary from 1921 until 1956 believed that all persons deserved the best possible medical care regardless of their race, ethnic background or country of origin. At a time when educational opportunities lagged for women, Mother Concordia organized the congregation's first school of nursing in 1907.

In 1924, Mother Concordia signed an agreement with Saint Louis University designating three facilities operated by the sisters (St. Mary's Infirmary, St. Mary's Hospital, and Mount St. Rose Chest and Throat Hospital) as teaching hospitals. In later years, Mother Concordia helped reorganize the St. Mary's Infirmary School of Nursing into the Saint Louis University School of Nursing. In 1933, St. Mary's Infirmary became the first Catholic hospital dedicated to treating African Americans and training African American physicians and nurses.

In the 1960s, the sisters became very active in the civil rights movement, most notably Sister Antona Ebo, who marched shoulder to shoulder in Selma, Alabama with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and our heroic colleague, Congressman JOHN LEWIS (D) Georgia, to demand the right to vote for African Americans in Alabama, and across this country.

On Wednesday, March 10, 1965, she and several other sisters and clergymen boarded a rickety airplane in St. Louis bound for Selma with several other sisters and clergymen to protest the Bloody Sunday attack on peaceful marchers and to join Dr. King in his second attempt to cross the bridge on the way from Selma to the state capital in Montgomery.

Once there, Sister Antona, the only African-American sister in the crowd, found herself thrust to the front of the march. Before the marchers reached the end of the block, they were stopped by rows of helmeted policemen standing shoulder to shoulder, three deep, batons in hand.

In the midst of it all, a microphone was thrust in front of Sister Antona. She spoke simply and from her heart into a sea of Confederate flags: "I am here because I am a Negro, a nun, a Catholic, and because I want to bear witness." She later recalled, "We wore our full regalia of habits at that time. We got a lot of people shook up who thought we should be in church with our hands folded." Many years later, she added, "Selma happened really because it was the time and place to take a risk. Taking a risk has its payoff, too." Their courageous actions led to passage of the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The legacy of healing and devotion to building communities of compassionate care by the sisters inspired the development of SSM Health, a system of 19 non-profit Catholic hospitals, more than 60 outpatient care sites, a pharmacy benefit company, an insurance company, two nursing homes, comprehensive home care and hospice services, a technology company, and two Accountable Care Organi-

zations operating in Missouri, Illinois, Wisconsin and Oklahoma.

And most recently, the sisters have added their moral force, spiritual guidance and integrity to the cause of environmental justice in North St. Louis County where neighborhood groups and civic activists are advocating for the removal of radiological waste left over from the Manhattan Project that was illegally dumped in an unlined landfill, near homes, schools, businesses and an underground fire.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members of Congress to join me in honoring the Franciscan Sisters of Mary for their living example of faith in action to heal the sick, advocate for equality and preserve our environment for future generations.

#### TRIBUTE TO GRANT DENTRY

#### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Grant Dentry attends Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

An important event that has occurred in the past 15 years is the rapid evolution of technology in our everyday lives. From single function cell-phones, to compact flip phones with cameras, to the now pervasive "smart phone" that serves as a multi-function computer, phone, hi-resolution camera, personal assistant, and a comprehensive tracking device. I believe technology, although innovative and fun, can have a negative effect on our country. While technology has benefited our lives, its evolution has changed how America operates and is watched over.

Even though technological evolution has made our lives easier, it can expose our personal and private business to the Government (and hackers) who can access our information at will. The evolution of technology has reshaped the security of American citizens. Our Constitutional freedoms as Americans have been infringed upon because of our technological devices do not guarantee secure privacy. Now that almost everyone in America has a laptop or cellphone, the Government is able to conduct surveillance on its citizens. Constantly being watched over

has had unfortunate effects on what we consider personal, private, freedom. The effect of being watched over has caused citizens to be constantly vigilant of what they are doing on electronic devices, where they go, and what they say. The Government is able to read our text messages and listen to our calls as well as see us through cameras on streets, smartphones and computers. Although we are still technically free, it is not the freedom we used to have before technology evolved. Fifteen years ago, concerns about Government surveillance on citizens was not as alarming as today.

The next 15 years will bring changes in the relationship between Governments and their citizens. While many found out in 2012 about Government surveillance, more and more Americans are becoming increasingly concerned about the issue of privacy now. Sadly, our media is distracting our citizens away from privacy issues. Many disapprove of the spying and frown upon the Government's decisions to monitor U.S. citizens. Since 9/11, security has been stepped up (rightfully so), but it has been taken to a level almost comparable to George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four in which everything is closely monitored and scrutinized.

Overall, the surveillance technology revolution has changed our country drastically and has brought concern and worry to many American citizens. Monitoring citizens was not the intent when surveillance technology first developed, but now it has the potential for large scale abuse. While technology has benefited our lives in many ways, it has also changed how America operates, how we are kept safe, and how we view our Constitutional freedoms and our privacy. Hopefully, the next 15 years will bring us towards a balance between security, safety, and privacy.

#### BREANNA NELSON

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 24, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Breanna Nelson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Breanna Nelson is an 8th grader at Arvada K-8 and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Breanna Nelson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Breanna Nelson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 25, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 25, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ALEXANDER X. MOONEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### PRAYER

Reverend Tim Crumpton, Cleburne County Baptist Church, Heber Springs, Arkansas, offered the following prayer:

Dear Heavenly Father, thank You, Almighty God, for the promise in Your holy Word that says whosoever believes in Your only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, has everlasting life.

Thank you, Lord, for the freedoms and blessings that still remain in our great country. Thank You for those that stood strong for the Biblical principles that have shaped us, and also for those that fought for these principles that have kept us free.

Lord, please forgive the sins of our Nation. Your Word promises: "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."

Lord, please help this Congress and their families. When each item of legislation is presented, help these men and women to seek Your wisdom and perform their duties ethically, remembering always the people they represent and also Your principles that have continued to preserve this country.

In the name of Jesus Christ I pray.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GOHMERT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### WELCOMING REVEREND TIM CRUMPTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend, Pastor Tim Crumpton of Heber Springs, Arkansas, for his service today as guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

I have personally had the pleasure of knowing Pastor Crumpton for the past several years, and I am humbled by the leadership that he has shown his community through his dedication to God and Scripture.

Ever since he was a young man, Pastor Crumpton has been involved in various ministries, and he holds a bachelor's degree and master's degree in Christian education. In 1995, he began traveling with his family, preaching in children's ministries, Christian youth camps, and singing in churches throughout the States and several countries abroad. Today, he serves as the pastor of the Cleburne County Baptist Church in Heber Springs, Arkansas.

Tim and his wife, Shannon, met at a youth camp and will be celebrating their 25th wedding anniversary next month. They have five children, one daughter-in-law, and one grandson.

Please join me in thanking Pastor Crumpton for leading us in prayer as

today's guest chaplain of the House of Representatives.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After consultation among the Speaker and the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent, the Chair announces that, when the two Houses meet in joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those immediately to his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House. Due to the large attendance that is anticipated, the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly enforced. Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor. The cooperation of all Members is requested.

The practice of reserving seats prior to the joint meeting by placard will not be allowed. Members may reserve their seats by physical presence only following the security sweep of the Chamber.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, March 19, 2015, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly, (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

### JOINT MEETING TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY MOHAMMAD ASHRAF GHANI, PRESIDENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

During the recess, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 10 o'clock and 56 minutes a.m.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Ms. Kathleen Joyce, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The joint meeting will come to order.

The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic

Republic of Afghanistan, into the Chamber:

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY);

The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE);

The gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS);

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN);

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER);

The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX);

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE);

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY);

The gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES);

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN);

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI);

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER);

The gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY);

The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO);

The gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS);

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL);

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO);

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE);

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. SUSAN DAVIS);

The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF); and

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as members of the committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL);

The Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN);

The Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH);

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO);

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT);

The Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER);

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER);

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN);

The Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY);

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW);

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ); and

The Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Her Excellency Dr. Alia Hatoug Bouran, the Ambassador of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seat reserved for her.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The Members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 11 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m., the Sergeant at Arms, the Honorable Paul D. Irving, announced His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

The SPEAKER. Members of Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

President ASHRAF GHANI. In the name of God the merciful, the compassionate, Speaker BOEHNER; Vice President BIDEN; Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL; House Majority Leader MCCARTHY; House minority leader, Ms. PELOSI; Senate minority leader, Mr. REID; ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, please allow me to thank you for your gracious invitation to address this unique forum of deliberative democracy.

Above all else, I would like to begin by thanking the people of the United States, whose generous support for my country has been of such immense value in advancing the cause of freedom.

More than 1 million brave Americans have served in Afghanistan. They have come to know our snowcapped mountains, our verdant valleys, our windswept deserts, our parched fields, our unharnessed, flowing rivers, and our plains of waving wheat.

But more important than knowing our geography, they have come to defend and to know our people. And in return, the people of Afghanistan recognize the bravery of your soldiers and the tremendous sacrifices that Americans have made to keep Afghanistan free.

We owe a profound debt to the 2,315 servicemen and -women killed and the more than 20,000 who have been wounded in service to your country and ours. We owe a profound debt to the soldiers who have lost limbs to buried bombs, to the brave veterans, and to the families who tragically lost their loved ones to the enemies' cowardly acts of terror.

We owe a profound debt to the many Americans who have come to build schools, repair wells, and cure the sick. And we must acknowledge with appreciation that at the end of the day, it is the ordinary Americans whose hard-earned taxes have over the years built the partnership that has led to our conversation today. I want to thank the American taxpayer and you, their representatives, for supporting us.

The service of American men and women—civilian or military—in our country has been made possible by the bipartisan support of the Congress of the United States. On behalf of our own parliament and people, I salute and thank you. It has always been a pleasure to receive and interact with Congressmen and -women during your visits to Afghanistan. Please do come again and again, and if you are reservists, please come in your proud uniforms. I had a unique opportunity that, when Senator GRAHAM was dressed as a colonel, I asked him to salute a three-star British general, and he complied. So thank you.

Veterans will always be welcome in Afghanistan. Our deepest hope is that the time will come when Americans visiting our country see the cultural heritage and natural riches of the Bamiyan valley; the ancient Timurid architecture of Her-at and Mazar-e-Sharif; the fishing streams of Badakshan and Takhar; the forests of Khost, Kunar, Nuristan, and Paktia; and the ancient architecture of Farah, Helmand, and Nimroz, not as soldiers, but as parents showing their children the beautiful country where they served in the war that defeated terror. On behalf of my entire country, when that day comes, you will be our most welcome and honored guests.

America's support to Afghanistan has been led by a succession of remarkable generals. I am proud to have known and worked with Dan McNeill, David McKiernan, Stanley McChrystal, David Petraeus, John Allen, Joseph Dunford, and John Campbell. Their commitment and dedication is inspirational. These generals lived in simple quarters. They worked tirelessly through the night. And their leadership of their troops has set an example that our generals are working hard to follow.

Your civilian leaders are no less inspirational. Ambassadors such as Ronald Neumann, Zal Khalilzad, Karl Eikenberry, Ryan Crocker, James

Cunningham, and my good friend Michael McKinley give American diplomacy first-class leadership and strategic understanding. And I would be remiss not to mention the stimulating conversations with my friends from this Chamber, like JOHN MCCAIN, LINDSEY GRAHAM, Carl Levin, and many of your visitors. But I must also acknowledge the deeply appreciated contributions of the aid workers and NGOs who are the day-to-day representatives of your country. I have met people from all 50 States of the Union, from Senators and Representatives to construction workers and computer operators. I want to thank all of them for introducing the best of America to the people of Afghanistan.

And finally, I would like to thank President Obama. He is an admirable and principled partner. His support for Afghanistan has always been conditional on our performance. I like and appreciate his clear and disciplined approach to American engagement. Thanks to his strict rigor, we were encouraged and supported to build up the Afghan Armed Forces into the self-reliant army that it is today. Because he stood firm on the deadline for the surge and the transition, the U.S. Army pulled off a logistical near miracle, first deploying and then withdrawing more than 100,000 soldiers without a hitch and timed to deadline. And it is thanks to his promise to America to end active combat that we saw a seamless handover of responsibility for all combat operations from your side to ours on December 31, 2014.

U.S. soldiers are no longer engaged in combat. But we are delighted to have them in the train, assess, and advice mission.

Tragedy brought our two countries together, but it is our shared interests and values that will keep us together. September 11, 2001, was not a distant image that I watched on the emotionless screen of television. It was horrific, and it was personal. I was in my office at the World Bank when the first plane smashed into the World Trade Center and forever changed the lives of each and every one of us.

New York is a special place for me and my family. My wife and I are both graduates of Columbia University. I was another beneficiary of Americans' wonderful generosity that has built so many longstanding friendships through its unparalleled universities. I ate corned beef at Katz's, New York's greatest, greasiest, pickle-lined melting pot.

Close friends were working near the Trade Center. My children were born in New York City, and my daughter was living in New York when the Twin Towers fell. I visited Ground Zero that very week. Seeing firsthand the tragedy and devastation drove home the realization that after 9/11, the world would never be the same. I went home

knowing that America would seek justice, and I began to write the plan for our national reconstruction.

Indeed, justice came swiftly. Al Qaeda terrorists were killed or driven underground. The Taliban, acknowledging their losses after the initial encounters, quickly vacated the cities, with their leadership moving to Pakistan and their rank and file returning to their villages.

There was considerable anxiety about how the Afghan people would respond to the American presence. The issue was put to rest by the welcome accorded to the American soldiers and civilians as partners. Even today, despite the thankfully rare if no less tragic "green on blue" incidents by Taliban infiltrators, the overwhelming majority of Afghans continue to see partnership with the United States as foundational to our future. There is no better proof of this than last October's overwhelming and immediate parliamentary approval of the bilateral security agreement and the status of forces agreement, both of which testify to our desire to continue the partnership.

Afghanistan has been the front line of the global battle against extremists. America, as a result, has been safe, but that safety has been ensured through the loss of American and Afghan lives in the fight against terror.

We have made great sacrifices—we Afghans—but then it is our patriotic duty to do so. You, on the other hand, had a choice; and when you came to a fork in the road, you chose to do the right thing.

Thank you.

Most recently, due to the refusal of our previous government to sign the bilateral security agreement and the status of forces agreement with NATO, we had lost momentum, and both partners had to operate under uncertainty, resulting in some 8 months of lost time in the most critical moment of transition.

You could have used this opportunity to end the partnership and return home in frustration, but you did not. Thanks to the flexibility shown by President Obama and Congress, we have made up for the loss and have regained momentum without breaking, by even a day, the promise of President Obama to the American people that the U.S. combat role would end on December 31, 2014.

Thank you for staying with us.

I would like to talk a little about our partnership because it is evolving. We are starting to balance the focus on security with a new emphasis on the rule of law and justice, growth, and the pursuit of peace and reconciliation.

The framework for our future relationship is defined by our Strategic Partnership Agreement and the bilateral security agreement. On your side, you have reaffirmed your commitment to support Afghanistan. On our side, we

will focus on self-reliance. To get there, we have initiated reforms that will create a self-sustaining Afghanistan.

I know the American people are asking the same question as the Afghan people: Will we have the resources to provide a sustained basis for our operation? The answer is: within this decade, we will.

As the current phase of our relationship draws to a close, our appreciation for the depth of America's contribution to our people cannot be measured in words alone, but it can be seen quite literally in the number of Afghans whose futures have been changed thanks to America and its allies.

On September 10, 2001—this will no longer shock you—there were no girls enrolled in school in Afghanistan. It was illegal to educate girls. Today, more than 3 million girls in primary schools across the country are learning to openly and actively participate in the future of a democratic Afghanistan.

Their parents thank you.

In 2002, when the allies built their first clinics, the average lifespan of the ordinary Afghan was 44 years. Today, it is over 60.

Their children thank you.

Today, the rate of maternal mortality in our poor country remains unacceptably high, but thanks to the immense effort you have made to build clinics and to train nurses, an Afghan woman is no longer more likely to die because she gives birth to a child than if she had somehow fought on the front line of combat.

Their husbands and their children thank you.

Our partnership with America and its allies has brought our country hope where we had none. We would, once again, like to thank you for that wonderful gift from your people to ours, the gift of hope; but, in Afghanistan, there is a saying that no gift can remain unreciprocated.

Today, I would like to return that gift of reborn hope by offering the American people a partnership with a nation that is committed to the cause of freedom and that will join the fight against the growing threat of terrorism.

I will use my remarks today to tell America the history of how a future Afghanistan came to be. It is a story about how a poor country that relied on foreign help became a self-reliant nation where free trade and the rule of law let Afghan businesses create jobs and prosperity for its people. It is also a story about how a country that had been ravaged by conflict became a platform for peace and regional stability and prosperity.

Ladies and gentlemen, the story about Afghanistan's path to self-reliance has already started. It began with last year's election and the formation

of our national unity government. Afghanistan's external image is of a traditional country that has been frozen in time; but my partner and the CEO of Afghanistan, Dr. Abdullah Abdullah, and I ran intense and passionate campaigns on the most modern of issues, such as the need to end corruption, taking the actions that will build transparency into government, and guaranteeing support for the impartial rule of law. Campaigns became forums for public debate.

In the final election, not only did more than 7 million Afghans turn out to the polls, but more than 38 percent of the votes were cast by women, many of whom had never previously had the chance to speak politically with their own voices.

There is no denying that the election was hard fought, but in the end, we chose the politics of unity over the politics of division. The national unity government brings together all parts of the country to make the government the arena where disputes are raised and resolved.

Dr. Abdullah and myself may not initially agree on every issue, but we both believe deeply that spirited debate will produce better outcomes than will confrontational stalemate. We not only work together, we like working well together.

The Afghanistan country, to world perception, is well suited to democracy. Like Americans, Afghans are individualists. None of us defers to anyone else. We have neither had caste nor class, so persuading each other is an art form.

Our key characteristics are our openness and hospitality. We believe in equality. Even in the most traditional parts of the country, our leadership must earn rather than inherit their positions. There is a strong public conscience. People are expected to act for the common good. We love debate.

Ladies and gentlemen, please allow me to introduce you to Afghanistan. We are an old country with a proud heritage and a history of trade with our neighbors. We have had bills of exchange for at least 2,000 years, and our women could write 2,500 years ago. For at least three millennia, we have been a hub for the caravans and trade networks that spread across Asia, bringing Chinese silks and Indian textiles to ancient Rome and Renaissance Italy.

The 19th century disrupted this world, as it did in so many other places. Afghanistan became an isolated buffer caught between two expanding empires. The emergence of the Soviet Union further isolated our country, culminating in the 1979 invasion and the subsequent war of resistance.

Today, however, the isolation is over. First, awareness is growing that Afghanistan is, quite literally, the heart of Asia. Asia cannot become a continental economy without us. Asia, in

the next 25 years, will have its 1869 moment—the year that the East and West Coasts of the United States were joined through the transcontinental railway—but this completion of a new, interconnected Asia cannot happen without us. We are in the midst of 3½ billion people, and we should be able to export something and not just import.

Our fragmented geography can once again become the opportunity for integrating central, west, east, and south Asia into a network that supports stability and prosperity over a vast swath of the world's surface. Diplomatic efforts to advance integration can free up cross-border trade and support multicountry investments in energy, transport, and water; and this, again, is beginning. The first major project between central Asia and south Asia, called CASA 1000, for transmitting energy from Kyrgyzstan to Pakistan is already underway.

I truly believe that diplomatic efforts backed by the leaders of our countries will build the peace and prosperity for south and central Asia in the same way that the common market has done so for Europe and ASEAN has done for our neighboring region to the east. We envisage an Afghanistan that in 20 years has become a hub of trade and gas pipelines, power transmission lines, railways, modern telecom, and banking services; but American support for all of these is essential, and we thank you for that commitment.

Ladies and gentlemen, if one story of our future history is bright, there is another, darker cloud that is making its way towards our country. Afghanistan's security transition took place against the backdrop of the unexpected rise of religious extremism in the Middle East. The promise of the Arab Spring gave way to the emergence of Daesh terror and collapse of states, but the changed ecology of terror could have not formed without some states tolerating, financing, providing sanctuary, and using violent, nonstate actors as instruments of shortsighted policies.

It is critical that the world understand the terrible threat that the Daesh and its allied forces pose to the states of western and central Asia. Terrorist movements, whose goal is to destabilize every state in the region, are looking for new bases of operation. We are the front line, but terrorists neither recognize boundaries nor require passports to spread their message of hate and discord. From the west, the Daesh is already sending advance guards to southern and western Afghanistan to test our vulnerabilities. To the south, Pakistan's counterinsurgency operations, in which more than 40,000 people have already died, are pushing the Taliban from South Waziristan toward Afghanistan's border region.

Criminalization of the economy is an indispensable part of this new ecology

of terror. Control over the narcotics trade is providing the financing for these groups to find weapons and recruits, blurring the lines between criminal economics and criminal politics.

Each of these groups poses a clear and present danger to our neighbors, to the Arab-Islamic world, and to the world at large. Afghanistan is carrying forward everyone's fight by containing this threat. But extremism is becoming a system, one that, like a dangerous virus, is constantly mutating, becoming more lethal, very media savvy, well financed, and thriving on state weakness and an overall lack of regional coordination.

To date, Afghanistan's people have rejected the allure of violent movements. We are willing to speak truth to terror.

Military fighting may stem the advance of extremism, but it will not put an end to the anger and hatred being promulgated across Muslim majority countries by these groups. That hatred must be challenged and overcome from within the religion of Islam.

The heart of the issue remains who is entitled to speak for Islam. Leaders, intellectuals, and those many millions of Muslims who believe that Islam is a religion of tolerance and virtue must find their voice. Silence is not acceptable.

But silence is not what the world will hear from us. Afghanistan is joining a new consensus that is emerging in the Muslim world, a consensus that rejects intolerance, extremism, and war. Scholars such as Fredrick Starr have documented beautifully central Asia's long tradition of rationalism and scientific inquiry. During Islam's Golden Age, Muslim scholars synthesized and recorded all known knowledge of the medieval world, giving the world advances in algebra, astronomy, water resource management, printing, and positive science. This is the Islamic civilization that needs to reinvent itself.

The Islamic world must understand its own gloriously tolerant and inquisitive past. It must reengage with the world openly and without paranoia of encirclement.

We, the unity government of Afghanistan, know that Islam is a religion of peace. We are responding to extremist threats by building partnerships at the global, regional, Islamic, and national levels of governance.

Globally, Afghanistan abides by international conventions and the rule of law. We are staunch supporters of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is firmly embedded in our Constitution, obliging the state to achieve these rights for our citizens. We are committed to supporting our independent human rights commission, and I am pleased that Dr. Sima Samar, a tireless champion of human rights, is a member of this delegation and is

today sitting in the audience of this great Chamber. And our government will join the free trade system and harmonized investment rules that build prosperity and promote peace.

Regionally, we are engaging our neighbors across Asia to build trust and trade. Afghanistan will become a platform for cooperation in a vast region that extends from India to Azerbaijan and beyond. We have already made significant headway in making the vision of the Lapis Lazuli Corridor that will link us to Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkey, and Europe into a reality. Thank you, Members of Congress, for wearing Lapis Lazuli.

The Arab Islamic world, from Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates, Qatar and Iran, is keenly aware of the new threats, and we hope they will soon agree on a regional framework for cooperation. The recent declaration of a Council of Ulema across the Muslim world may well be a historic turning point in building that alliance.

Condemnation of terror by this largest gathering of Muslim Ulema is an unprecedented step in acknowledgment of the shortcomings of Muslim majority country governments.

Properly supported, Afghanistan is uniquely positioned to block the spread of extremism. We have none of the historical inferiority complexes that fuel the resentment against Western domination. After all, we defeated most of the empires.

With the bitter exception of the aberrant Taliban regime, Afghan Islam has traditionally been inclusive and reflective, not violent and angry. And after 36 years of conflict, our people are well-vaccinated against the seduction of ideologically based conflicts.

Our people, our children, desperately want to be normal. Ordinary is what has escaped us—and we would really like to be leading ordinary lives: to go to school and come back, to shop without being blown up, to play volleyball without being attacked. So many children I have held in my arms who have been mutilated. That must not be permitted and cannot be permitted and will not be permitted.

For Afghanistan to oppose the violence of extremists, we must turn our sights to the struggle to end the conditions that give rise to extremism in the first place. Our effort begins with the frank recognition of our problems and the challenges that we must tackle with determination and commitment.

Nearly 40 years of conflict have produced a country where corruption permeates our government. Until we root out this cancer, our government will never generate the trust to win the hearts of our people or the trust of your taxpayers. We will eliminate corruption.

On our second day in office, we tackled the notorious case of Kabul Bank,

which for years had lay in abeyance. I am pleased to report to you that all the court systems of Afghanistan, including the supreme court, has now made a decision against these thieves and has allowed us to collect from them. And we will collect and get the public purse refilled.

Ladies and gentlemen, ending corruption and impunity are the precursors of self-reliance, but the true test will be whether we can restore the fiscal basis of public expenditure. We must create an environment where private investment, sustainable natural resources, and critical market-linking infrastructure development provide our youth with jobs, help us balance the budget, and launch the virtuous cycle that will let freed markets build our nation's wealth.

Here, I am pleased to report that we are reversing decades of mismanagement. We have just reached an agreement with IMF. But, most significantly, we are determined to create the wealth that will not make us dependent.

During this decade, we can assure you that we will be able to pay both for our security and delivery of our services.

If economic growth is the first foundation block of self-reliance, the second foundation is with the education of Afghanistan's women.

No country in the modern world can be self-reliant with half of its population locked away, uneducated and unable to contribute its energy, creativity, and drive to national development.

We have a tradition of respecting women. And let us not forget the largest trader in Arabia was the wife of the Prophet. And the greater transmitter of knowledge—the authentic sayings of the Prophet—was his second wife.

Aberrant customs do not replace the fundamental sense of justice between men and women that societies that seek fairness are built upon.

Afghan culture traditionally had space for women as leaders, managers, and traders. The gender apartheid imposed by the Taliban came from people who had grown up outside of families, in refugee camps and religious boarding schools.

Our plan for restoring women's place in society is built of three pillars that rest on a foundation of respect for the human, religious, and constitutional rights of all of our citizens.

First—and I want to spend a little time on this theme—educating women is not solely a matter of rights, important though they are. It is a matter of national necessity.

I have said in the past that educating one Afghan young girl will change the next five generations of a family. I would not be standing before you today as an educated man had my grandmother—in exile in India who had

learned to read under the British—not taken it upon herself to make sure that I would match my youthful passion for hunting and riding horses with mastering the classics in Dari and Pashto and striving to excel in foreign languages.

Thank you, Grandmother.

Afghanistan's self-reliance demands men and women who can run a modern economy. Basic health and education must reach all Afghan girls. That is a promise. But beyond providing all Afghan girls with these basic rights, we will increase to parity the number of women graduating from high schools and colleges.

Even as I address you today, in Kabul designs are already being finished for an all-women's university that will provide safe, top-quality education for the next generation of Afghan women leaders.

Let me tell you the story of Khatera Afghan, a young woman from Kandahar. Her schooling began when she braved threats of disfigurement by people swearing that they would throw acid in her face before they would let a girl attend a school. She would not be dissuaded. Her uncle threatened to disown her when she applied to university. But she stared him down.

Khatera went to the American University of Afghanistan, where she not only topped her class but, aided by a Fulbright scholarship, went on to get a master's degree from the Ohio State University.

Today, Khatera's formerly angry uncle is so proud of her that he tells his grandchildren, both little boys and little girls, that they must be as brave as their Aunt Khatera.

Khatera, like thousands of Afghan women, thanks America for those opportunities—for the primary school teachers, for the university in Kabul, for the scholarship to Ohio—that changed her life and her children's future. And she is dedicated to create opportunities for millions of other Afghans.

The second pillar is that women must have the same access to economic opportunities as men. Women's full empowerment will come about, not through global conventions or government programs, but when they have jobs and own businesses.

The United States has been a steadfast supporter of the nationwide National Solidarity Program which, for 10 years, has given not thousands but millions of poor village women their first chance to control their own resources.

Our third and final foundational belief is that a mental and cultural revolution must take place over the treatment of women in and by our society. There is no point talking about how much we respect women's honor if we let rape go unpunished or allow harassment in our streets.

We have signed the global conventions to end violence and discrimination against women; we will implement

them vigorously, but work is still needed to convince our people that the protection of women's rights is part and parcel of their own quest for social justice.

I, personally, as the leader of Afghanistan, am committed to working with the ulema, activists, and thought leaders of our country to bring about this mental change. Both the CEO, Dr. Abdullah, and I will insist that the officials of our government set the national standard for workplace fairness.

Thanks to your help and support, the opportunities for women are indeed changing. I am sure that many of you have seen those stunning Skateistan videos of fathers proudly taking their shiny-eyed daughters to show off their newfound skills in the ancient art of skateboarding. They are but the tip of the changes that are underway and which must be protected and advanced.

I am meeting, frequently, women who are entertaining the idea—seriously—the idea of becoming the first woman President of Afghanistan, and we will support them.

I am pleased to state that we have fulfilled our promise to name four women to the Afghan Cabinet, raising the women's share to 20 percent—still too low, but at least fulfillment of our promise.

We are determined to name qualified women as ambassadors and to increase their number as deputy ministers, and we are working hard to attract and train a whole new cadre of women technocrats into our government. I promise you that, 5 years from now, our ministries will have a whole new look to them, with women in leading positions.

We are a country of young people. The absolute majority of people are under 30 years of age. Youth are invested in the future, not in repeating the past. Jobs and engagement with the world are their first priority.

Despite all of the assistance that Afghanistan has received over the years, 30 percent of the population still lives below the poverty line, lacking even basic services such as clean water or household electricity. This cannot continue.

We have articulated a citizen's charter that will guide the investments that are needed to reduce poverty across the nation and prepare the next generation for capitalizing on the new opportunities that a thriving economy can provide.

Ladies and gentlemen, so far, I have talked about how we will achieve self-reliance by ending corruption, balancing the budget, mobilizing the energies of our women and youth, and growing the economy. Let me now turn to the elephant that is lurking in the back of the room.

We must secure peace.

Afghans have shown that we know how to fight. Unfortunately, we have inherited that skill for 3 million years.

Since as far back as the invasion of Alexander and the more modern expulsion of the Soviet Union, Afghans have shown that we will protect our country against foreign attack, no matter how steep the price or how well armed the intruder.

I have no doubt that, provided that they continue to receive equipment and training, our Armed Forces will stand firm against any efforts by outside extremists to build a base inside our territory; but we must now show that we can also bring peace.

Our strategy is built around three initiatives. The first is to use our diplomacy to build a community of nations that is committed to stability in Asia. Dr. Abdullah and I have met with the leaders of Pakistan, India, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Saudi Arabia, the Emirates, and China, among others. Their commitment for building mutual security across nations includes ending the financing and sanctuary for extremist groups.

The second initiative is to build up the ability of our Armed Forces to project the elected government across our entire national territory. Our partnership with the United States and ISAF, now transformed into the resolute support mission, has given Afghanistan a well-trained army that is bringing the fight to the enemy. We are no longer on the defensive, but have taken the offensive.

On December 31, 2014, all combat operations were handed over to Afghan National Security Forces. General John Campbell, the U.S. commander of the Resolute Support mission, has publicly testified in this very Chamber that the Afghan Army's professionalism and morale meet all of a military man's expectations.

Thanks to our army, we will negotiate with the Taliban from a position of strength, not weakness, so that the hard-fought gains in education, health, governance, media freedom, and women's rights are not lost.

The third initiative will be our push for national reconciliation. The Taliban need to choose not to be al Qaeda and be our friend; and, if they choose to be our friend, they will be welcome to be part of the fabric of our society.

Many believe themselves to be patriots rebelling against the corruption and criminality that they saw in their towns and villages. We can deal with legitimate grievances. Provided that combatants agree to respect the constitution and the rule of law as the outcomes of negotiations, we are confident that we can find a path for their return to society.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am not here to tell you a story about an overnight transformation of my country. You are too wise for such stories. Twelve years of partnership provide evidence enough that the road ahead will be difficult.

We live in a rough neighborhood. We are a very poor country. Self-reliance is our goal. We bear the scars of the fight against the Soviet Union and the forces of fundamentalism, scars that are as much in our minds as on the bodies of the Afghan farmers and American soldiers who have fought for freedom.

Although we may be poor, we are very proud. Our goal of self-reliance is no pipedream told to pacify partners who are tired of hearing the promises that we later fail to keep. We want your know-how, the business skills of your corporations, the innovation of your startups, and the commitment of your NGOs, but we don't want your charity.

We have no more interest in perpetuating a childish dependence than you have in being saddled with a poor family member who lacks the energy and drive to get out and find a job. We are not going to be the lazy Uncle Joe.

Afghanistan can and will be an enduring success. Your support, your understanding, and your commitment to our country will not have been in vain. Afghanistan will be the graveyard of al Qaeda and their foreign terrorist associates.

Never again will our country be a host to terrorists. Never again will we give extremists the sanctuary to plan their destructive plots. We are determined to become the Asian development roundabout and the platform for the peaceful cooperation of civilizations.

Together, our two countries will finish the job that began on that clear, terrible September morning almost 14 years ago. We have the will and we have the commitment that will anchor our country in the world community of peaceful, democratic nations.

Knowing our conditions, you—the American Congress—and the American people will decide how to ensure that our common goals and interests are written into the books that will be telling the history of our shared future.

Thank you again, and may God bless the partnership between America and Afghanistan.

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m., His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

#### JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed,



the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1229

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) at 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

#### PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 25, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 25, 2015 at 10:26 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 301.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 163 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 27.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 1230

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent

resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, March 24, 2015, general debate on the congressional budget had expired.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, under the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, the Joint Economic Committee provides analysis and recommendations about the goals and policies set forth in the economic report of the President, and this is to assist the House in its consideration of the budget resolution.

During the next hour, the members of the Joint Economic Committee will answer two questions: Why has this economic recovery been so weak when compared with past recoveries? And secondly, how would a gradual reduction of Federal spending, relative to the size of America's economy, as envisioned in the House Republican budget resolution, how would this help hard-working Americans by accelerating economic growth, job creation, and real wage increases?

Regrettably, our economy remains stuck in second gear. Last year, real GDP—in other words, apples-to-apples economy—grew by a mere 2.37 percent. That is an imperceptible increase over the average annual growth rate of 2.33 percent during the entire recovery.

Although conditions have improved, the Obama recovery remains the weakest, or near the bottom, in terms of every major measurement of economic performance, compared with other recoveries over the past half century.

The Joint Economic Committee describes the difference in economic performance in this recovery and with the average of other recoveries since 1960 as the "growth gap"—and this growth gap is real.

Since the recession ended, the economy has grown by 13.5 percent, compared with the average growth of 24.1 percent during other recoveries. This growth gap means our economy is currently missing \$1.5 trillion, a hole comparable in size to the economy of Australia or Mexico or Spain.

Since the recession ended, private sector payrolls—that is, Main Street jobs—increased by 10 percent, but over the average of other recoveries, it was

more than 15 percent. Thus, from the end of the recession, the growth gap in Main Street jobs is a staggering 5.5 million jobs. America is missing 5.5 million jobs, enough to hire everyone looking for work in 45 States.

Not surprisingly, hard-working American families have felt the adverse effects of slow growth and lagging job creation in their pocketbook. Since the recession ended, real after-tax income per person has increased by a total of merely 7 percent—7.1 percent, to be exact. In other recoveries, it was over 15 percent. Thus, the growth gap in real after-tax income equates to nearly \$3,000 per person. It is \$2,915. So what that means for a family of four in America is that they are missing \$11,000 a year from their family budget.

Ironically, for a President that obsesses about income inequality and promotes "middle class economics," the White House has presided over a disappointing recovery that has bestowed most of its benefits to the wealthy and the well-connected. While families and businesses on Main Street continue to suffer from a very disappointing recovery, the S&P Total Return Index, adjusted for inflation—meaning Wall Street—has increased by 125.4 percent since the end of the recession. So Wall Street is roaring; Main Street and hard-working taxpayers are suffering.

Closing the growth gap in the economy and jobs and paychecks will be very hard for this President to achieve with his current slow-growth policies.

While the economy has improved month after month, in truth, it has gone so slow. It is like bragging that your car has run for 63 straight months, but it only is running at 5 miles an hour. Well, that is what our economy is doing. And to catch up from these slow-growth policies, we need to break even with the average performance of other recoveries. By the time President Obama leaves the White House:

Our economy will have to grow at an annual rate of 7.4 percent in each of the next eight quarters. This is triple the growth rate in the Obama recovery.

Private sector jobs—Main Street jobs, in effect—would have to generate 403,000 jobs every month for the next 22 months. So this is well above the average of the disappointing Obama recovery of 285,000 jobs, especially in the last 6 months.

Real after-tax income for every person in America—that is, what their real disposable income is—would have to grow at an annual rate of 6.3 percent through the rest of President Obama's term. This is more than four times faster than what it has been doing during the Obama recovery.

So why has our economy been so weak? Why has the Obama recovery been nearly dead last in all of these areas?

First, Federal spending is out of control.

Albert Einstein defined insanity as doing the same thing over and over again yet expecting different results. Is this not the perfect description of President Obama's budget? His budget reflects his dogmatic commitment to failed Keynesian economic policies—withstanding the overwhelming evidence that we are mired in the worst economic recovery of the last 50 years, creating this large and persistent growth gap. From the failed stimulus through ObamaCare to demands for more Federal infrastructure projects, President Obama's thirst for new spending has never slackened.

Like a basketball team that cannot make halftime adjustments, this President refuses to learn from his failures. His budget would increase Federal spending next year by another \$74 billion and by another \$300-plus billion over the next 5 years. This, as this President is taking more in tax dollars from every American than almost at any time in history.

We don't have a revenue problem; we have a spending problem. If you look at this chart, you can see where per person revenue in America through the Federal Government nearly the highest it has been, frankly, in the last 30 to 40 years. Fortunately, a Republican House has successfully applied the brakes to this spending, preventing a far worse economic mess.

Second, our tax system is broken.

For businesses, America has the highest corporate income tax rate among developed countries. And we are the only one in our global competitors with a system that taxes you here, taxes you abroad, and punishes you if you bring your profits back to invest in America. This puts American companies and the workers at a huge disadvantage with foreign competitors.

For individuals here in America, our income tax system is so complex that 90 percent of taxpayers need to use a paid preparer or tax software, and families can't possibly keep up with the 4,000 changes in the tax law that occurred over the last decade. That is one new tax change every day of the year.

And third, President Obama has greatly expanded the regulatory burden—red tape—on American businesses and families during and after a severe recession. For example, the Affordable Care Act has imposed enormous new burdens on America's families, on our local businesses and health care providers.

Mr. Chairman, 4.5 years after enactment of financial regulations, regulators still haven't completed writing more than 40 percent of the new rules required under the Dodd-Frank Act; meanwhile, our local bankers and local businesses have not been able to finance growth in their communities as a result of these regulations.

President Obama has slow-walked the development of oil and natural gas on Federal lands and waters and stubbornly vetoed the job-creating Keystone XL pipeline.

Most recently, President Obama's Federal Communications Commission went back in time and imposed a 1930s-style regulation designed to control the telephone monopoly and now applied to the highly competitive Internet.

Fourth, President Obama greatly expanded social welfare benefits during and after the severe recession. During the 1960s, Democratic Presidents John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson knew that America's economy needed to be strong in order to afford the Medicare, Medicaid, and food stamp programs they favored. Both Presidents insisted that Congress enact an investment tax credit, an across-the-board reduction in income tax rates, to put our economy into high gear before enacting new entitlement programs.

Instead, President Obama did the opposite. He rammed ObamaCare through in a divided and controversial late-night maneuver, rammed through a large expansion of food stamps, extended unemployment benefits through a Democrat-controlled Congress before our economy had fully recovered. His entitlement expansions reduced the labor force participation. In other words, it has held back those who want to be in the workforce.

According to University of Chicago economist Casey Mulligan, ObamaCare alone will, by 2017, cause roughly a 3 percent reduction in weekly employment, 3 percent fewer total hours worked, and a 2 percent reduction in labor income—so less jobs, less hours worked, less in your paycheck.

Taken together, President Obama's economic policies have increased the cost of doing business now and heightened uncertainty about their future. This is the opposite of what economically successful Presidents such as John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan did.

The Republican budget recognizes the Obama recovery is disappointing for Republicans, for Democrats, for Independents, for college graduates, for middle class, hard-working Americans. The Republican budget, which is a balanced budget for a stronger America, will give us a healthier economy.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my friends across the aisle claimed that this recovery is weaker than "average" ones. However, economic research reveals that this is terribly misleading because financial crises like the one that caused the Great Recession have deeper, more damaging, and longer lasting effects. In

addition, the Great Recession was caused by a bursting of a housing bubble, limiting housing's ability to contribute to recovery as it typically had after previous recessions.

The recovery from the Great Recession is also different because monetary policy's ability to support the economy was limited by hitting the zero lower bound—interest rates simply could not go any lower.

There have been a number of economic downturns since the founding of our Nation—some mild, some deep and strong.

Last week, at a hearing of the Joint Economic Committee with Chairman Jason Furman of the Council of Economic Advisers, I asked him how would he characterize the 2008 financial meltdown under former President George W. Bush. I asked him: How does the 2008 Bush recession rate?

He said that the economic blows in this recession were five times greater than the Great Recession. And he also said, when I asked him to put it into laymen's terms—was it a common cold? pneumonia? a heart attack? the flu?—he said that the Bush recession was especially deep and damaging, the worst since the Great Depression.

And I asked him: Was it a common cold?

He said: No. It was a heart attack.

The reality is that when you compare our record to other countries that are recovering from the Great Recession, you can see in this chart that the United States economy has expanded at a significantly faster rate than other leading, advanced economies in the world. So when he says we are slow, we are certainly a lot faster than the rest of the world.

Look at this. Here is the United States. Here is the European Union. Here is Japan. Here is the United Kingdom. The United States has recovered stronger and faster than the other world economies.

So when my colleagues across the aisle say that the Obama recovery pales in comparison to average ones, just remember that the comparison is an absolutely ridiculous one.

The recession was an economic heart attack, a financial calamity, and we should thank President Obama that we are now recovering, and recovering faster than like economies in the world.

A budget is about planning for the future. That planning must be based on reality and must be grounded in our recent experience. The Republican budget is a misleading, dishonest budget which relies on accounting gimmicks and \$1 trillion in unspecified cuts.

□ 1245

It rejects lessons we should have already learned. In 2008 and 2009, this country faced the greatest economic downturn since the Great Depression.

The shocks that hit the U.S. economy in the fall of 2008 were at least as large as those that caused the Great Depression. The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Jason Furman, told the Joint Economic Committee last week that during the Great Recession, household wealth fell by at least five times the decline seen in 1929. More than \$16 trillion in wealth evaporated in American families, causing great pain and suffering.

Today, some 6½ years later, the economy is a very different place. The U.S. economy has expanded at a faster pace than nearly all other advanced economies. The GDP has grown in 20 of the past 22 quarters, and we have had a record—a record—60 straight months of private sector job growth. This didn't just happen. It happened because of the unprecedented response from the Federal Reserve and the bold actions taken by the Democratic Congress and President Obama.

The Recovery Act stimulated growth and invested in our future, investing in infrastructure, education, research, and job training. Those are things we don't see in the Republican budget. We don't see those investments.

The Recovery Act cut taxes for middle class families, increased tax credits for the working poor, and directed Federal funds to States and cities so that they could keep police officers on the beat, firemen on the job, and teachers in the classroom. It invested \$50 billion in transportation infrastructure. We don't see any of that in the Republican budget. We don't even see cutting tax loopholes for special interests. We don't see any of that. We just see cutting tax support for the middle class and the working Americans.

Other actions taken by Congress included extensions of unemployment insurance and COBRA subsidies, a payroll tax credit for hiring unemployed workers, a payroll tax cut for all workers, and help for small businesses. It stopped an economic disaster and got our economy moving again.

Mr. Chairman, this chart shows this. Numbers do not lie. The deep, dark red valley covered Republican policies that are in this budget. When President Obama came to office, we slowly worked our way up and have continued to add millions of jobs for working Americans. Today, the unemployment rate is 5.5 percent, its lowest level in almost 7 years. We have had 12 straight months of private sector job gains exceeding 200,000 jobs, something that has not happened since 1977. The auto industry is thriving. Remember the Republicans wanted to abolish the auto industry? But we invested in restructuring, and 5 years later the industry has added more than 500,000 jobs, and we are exporting American cars at the highest level.

The economy is strong and getting stronger. Now is the time to build on

this progress. Now is the time to ensure that the economic recovery reaches every American. Now is the time to invest in our future by funding infrastructure, education, workforce training, and scientific research. But that is not what the Republican budget does. The Republican budget slashes spending on things that would help continue our forward blue high rise of creating more jobs, and it uses a slush fund and unspecified cuts to make it appear that it all adds up.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget offered would get us off the path—this beautiful path of success—taking us back in the direction of the Bush recession. It represents an abrupt U-turn, one that we cannot afford. It would risk the recent economic progress and harm working families struggling to get ahead.

So let's support the Democratic budget and the progress that we are making in creating jobs and improving the quality of life of Americans and the security of our country. Let's not turn around to the old, tired Republican policies that gave us that dark, deep recession and that red, dark valley.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out this was a serious recession. It was not the most serious and severe since the Great Depression. The recession in 1981 and the November of 1982 recession reached a higher unemployment rate, 10.8 percent greater than this recession. And that was settled, frankly, when interest rates reached over 20 percent.

The truth is there have been jobs added for 60 straight months. You ought to take that graph and double it in job growth, there you would get just the average economic recovery. We continue to struggle as a country, and we shouldn't settle for this second-rate economic recovery.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), a new member of the Joint Economic Committee. He is someone who has had longstanding experience in Arizona managing money, understanding State finances, and handling the numbers that our economy, frankly, is based on.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. For my friend from Texas, thank you. It is actually a joy being on this committee. It is fascinating the access to data. It is also fascinating how the data sort of gets, as you have already heard here in the first few minutes, sort of politicized by some of us almost to the edge of fantasy.

Remember, if we step back to 2011, if we look at the President's own economic graphs, we were going to see economic GDP expansion approaching 5 percent of GDP. The indicators we were just getting this last week, it is this

coming quarter, the quarter we are in right now, we may be about to see GDP of about 1.2 percent.

At some point, holding up a board, it says look at the jobs, and then looking at the actual math, reality should hit home.

Here is the President's own economic report. If you start to look at the numbers in here, if someone will actually break it open and actually read it, look at the numbers in here of workforce participation, how many of our brothers and sisters out there in the workforce are actually in the job market? There is something horribly, horribly wrong out there.

So why do the Republicans so focus, so fixate on economic growth? It is the reality of what is about to happen in this country. In 4½ years—so right now we are discussing a \$3.8 trillion budget. In 4½ years, we are expecting \$1 trillion more in spending. Where is that growth? Where is that money coming from?

Look at this slide. We are going to try to put up some slides that just show you how quickly mandatory spending is consuming everything in its path, and if we do not have a phenomenal economic growth, we are not going to be able to keep our promises.

For right now, here is where we are today. We are basically, right now, only 31 percent of the budget we ultimately get to vote on. The vast majority of our budget is in what we call mandatory spending: Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new ObamaCare health care law.

Well, what happens over just the next 4½ years? How quickly does this mandatory spending begin to consume everything else in its path? Well, think about this. Just a couple years ago in the 2013 budget, we were projecting that it was going to take all the way out to the end of 2023 before we hit this split where only 24 percent were things we get to vote on and 76 percent—76 percent—of the spending was going to be Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits, and the new health care law.

Well, guess what is happening because of the Democrats' policy on economic growth, this President's policy on economic growth. So how quickly do we now hit where 76 percent of our money is going into mandatory? It is not 2023. It is in 4½ years.

Now, yes, when we track what is happening, particularly in Medicare and Medicaid spending, it is tracking faster than we expected. And, yes, we have had discipline in this body on dealing with what we are allowed to have discipline on because of the relationships having a split Congress and being disciplined in discretionary spending.

But understand, if we do not do those things that are necessary to dramatically grow this economy—and it is

more than just talking about fantasies within this economic profile. It is regulatory, it is tax systems, and it is trade. And yet simple things—and this one is rather personal to me, and the ranking member was actually somewhat helpful on this—things like crowdfunding, little things that are simple, disappear in the bureaucracy for years after we even have bipartisan legislation.

What is it with this White House, with the Democrat Party's fear of those things that create economic expansion? Why does it always have to be some sort of massive, collectivist dogma to drive economic growth instead of letting the markets go? Understand, this is important because we are trying to help sell the story of why do we care so much about this economic growth. When you look at what is about to happen in net interest, look at how fast this grows.

I am going to actually move to the next slide just so you have a comparison. I want you to think about this. In just a few years, Mr. Chairman, the interest—and this is using nominal interest rates. If we have a spike, then it gets really bad really fast. But in just a few years, we are going to be spending as much money in this body on interest as we do for all of defense.

Well, at that point, if you care about the entitlements, if that is where you are ideologically, you care about protecting the country, you care about medical research, you care about these things, then the economic growth is everything. We can't grow ourselves out of this debt and deficit, but we can sure do some great good.

I beg my brothers on both sides of the aisle and my sisters, too, you need to step away a bit from some of the crazy dogma, pull back on some of the crazy regulations, the arrogance of thinking Washington knows everything, and let America begin to grow, allow it to begin to prosper. That is what the Republican budget is doing. It is dealing with the reality of the math we have been given by this President's policies and trying to drive it to a pro-growth future with lots of options.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in response to my good friends on the other side of the aisle, numbers don't lie. These numbers were compiled by the bipartisan Bureau of Labor Statistics and updated in early March. It clearly shows that our economy was shedding 800,000 jobs a month before President Obama took office. And then because of his policies, it has continued to grow. Mr. Chairman, 12 million private sector jobs were added in the past 60 months—the longest of streak on record of job growth—and 288,000 private sector jobs added in February.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Maryland (Mr. DELANEY), an outstanding member of our committee.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for yielding me time to talk about my colleagues', the Republicans', budget, which is something I oppose.

I oppose it for a number of policy reasons, but I thought I would spend my time today talking about what I view is a more fundamental, analytical flaw in the budget, and that relates to the overall goal of the budget. Because if you have the wrong goal, you often make a series of bad decisions to support that goal. So I think it is important that we talk about what the goal of the budget is and what the goal of the budget should be.

The goal of the Republican budget is to have zero deficits within 10 years. In my opinion, that is the goal because it sounds good. We have all heard the line that we should not spend more money than we take in.

□ 1300

That sounds really good, but it ignores to many extents the basic math of budgets.

It is also an unrealistic goal, and it is also an unnecessary goal. And as a result of pursuing an unrealistic and unnecessary goal, a series of very bad decisions are embedded in the budget, which is why I want to talk about the goal.

It is an unrealistic goal when you look at the condition of the Federal budget at this moment in time. After several decades of this Congress and several administrations ignoring, in many ways, the fiscal responsibility of this great country and allowing our debt to become such a high percentage of our economy, we put ourselves in a position where we have had very significant deficits and the debt levels are such that we have very limited financial flexibility as a country, and if interest rates were to go up, it would increasingly consume a very large percentage of our budget. That is the problem and that is the situation we find ourselves in.

In addition, Mr. Chair, we are entering a phase where the demographic trends in the country and the aging on a relative basis of the population are putting tremendous pressure on the resources of the Federal Government.

So this is a very, very challenging time to take a budget that has had very significant deficits and try to bring them to zero within 10 years. That is why it is unrealistic.

It is also unnecessary because the most important metric in the financial health of the United States of America is our debt as a percentage of our economy.

If we want to lower our debt as a percentage of our economy, what we have to do is have a budget where our deficits, expressed as a percentage of our economy, are consistently lower than

economic growth. So we should be targeting deficits of 1 to 2 percent with a view that the minimum baseline economic growth of this country will be 2 to 3 percent, and definitionally over time that will take the debt of the country as a percentage of the country down. It will give us more financial flexibility in the future and position us so that when interest rates rise, which they will, it will consume a much smaller percentage of our budget. That should be the goal.

But because we have this unrealistic and unnecessary goal of getting deficits to zero within 10 years, my Republican colleagues are forced to overcorrect in the budget to achieve that goal.

There are two fundamental ways to overcorrect in a budget. You either raise taxes very high to get revenues to get it to zero, or you cut investments very significantly.

Now, my Republican colleagues don't choose to raise taxes. In fact, what they choose to do is to cut taxes, which makes an already unrealistic goal more unrealistic. So the only thing that is left, the only thing that is left to bring this budget to zero within 10 years is massive, massive reductions in the investments we are making in our future and in our Nation, which, to me, is a very odd decision in light of the facts that are in front of us, and the facts that are in front of us are very clear. We are in a global and very competitive economy, and we haven't made the investments, particularly in things like infrastructure, to position this country to compete as successfully as it should in a world that is increasingly interconnected.

Also, we have to make investments in our children, Mr. Chair. We are in a knowledge-based economy. And to make sure that our kids are capable of being employed and having a rising standard of living across their lives, we have to invest in their future.

So to achieve this unrealistic goal, my Republican colleagues make very significant, very, very significant cuts to these critical investments, which you could argue it has never been more important to do that. In fact, they bring many of these levels down to half of what they have been historically—again, and importantly, expressed as a percentage of our economy because it is irrelevant to talk about absolute numbers. The only numbers that should be talked about is the budget in terms of a percentage of our economy.

That is why I view this budget as so troubling and misguided. Mr. Chair, I spent my whole career prior to coming to Congress running publicly traded companies that I started. I used to observe other managers who are running publicly traded companies from time to time make really bad decisions about what to do with their business. Those bad decisions were often based on a fundamental premise that they

would pander to the market and put forth unrealistic expectations. They would make bad decisions to achieve those expectations, and the story would end badly.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. DELANEY. That is what we have here. We have unrealistic expectations, a series of bad decisions, and, if this were to be followed, a bad outcome.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

The message we hear today from my Democrat friends is the economy is great. This is really historical. We are adding just millions of new jobs. But that is not the real story. That is not the real economy.

The truth is millions of Americans have become so discouraged they have just dropped out of looking for work. Four out of 10 college graduates, they can't find a job, or they can't find a job that needs a college degree, so they are working behind a cash register.

We have got the fewest number of adults percentagewise in the workforce today since the recovery began. So we have actually, since things are supposed to be so great, fewer adults than ever since that period. We are about flat. In some cases, we have gone backwards.

And the unemployment rate, while it is lowered to 5.5 percent in real terms, if our number of workers had stayed in the workforce, the true rate is closer to 9.7 percent.

If we want to stay with this second-rate disappointing recovery, stay the course. But if we want a stronger, healthier economy, we need to change direction. The Republican budget under Chairman TOM PRICE changes the trajectory and the momentum of America's economy, balancing it without raising taxes. The Federal Reserve said one of the drags on our economy are the tax increases from President Obama's fiscal cliff. We have so much more work to do to help our families, young people, and those looking for a job, we can't settle for second rate.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Republican budget looks like a blueprint, but it is not. It is more like a vague set of directions, with the most important pieces missing.

This budget calls for vast cuts, but it doesn't specify what will be cut or who will suffer the pain. It claims to lower budget deficits, but it relies on accounting gimmickry.

This document is not a blueprint. It is not an engineering marvel. It does not deserve our praise or even serious attention. It is fundamentally dis-

honest. It is a dishonest document that would hurt millions of Americans and imperil our future.

The deceptions in this document have already been brought to light by some of our Nation's leading papers. At this point, the fact that this budget is misleading doesn't surprise us, but the scope of the deception is absolutely breathtaking.

Before we go to the great leader from the great State of North Carolina, I would like to point out who gets hurt in this budget.

The Republican budget is also deceptive because it hides the fact that the "savings" they talk about, it achieves these savings at a huge cost to working families. Their budget is balanced on the backs of working Americans.

This budget slashes our investment in education. It devastates our investment in research and innovation. It ignores the problems of our crumbling infrastructure. It provides no solution to the looming bankruptcy of the Federal transportation fund, and it will destroy up to 2.9 million jobs in 2017 alone.

This is not general belt-tightening. It is the wholesale strangling of the dreams and opportunities of those who are already struggling.

It could fairly be called a plan to "soak the poor," because the poor and working Americans would be hit especially hard by this budget proposal, which would allow critical provisions of the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit to expire at the end of 2017. Democratic programs to help working Americans would expire under their plan.

And that would increase the number of people in poverty by an estimated 1.8 million, including 1 million children.

This budget falsely claims that it will, in the Republican words, "make sure that those who need assistance get more than an invitation into a broken system."

It then proceeds to cut the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by \$125 billion between 2021 and 2025. This would either mean the end of food assistance for millions of low-income families or a cut in benefits below the less than \$1.50 per person per meal households now receive.

This budget would then further convert Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program into a block grant and drastically reduce its funding. This is not a budget for the future. It destroys the dreams of working Americans for the future.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a new member of our committee.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York.

I stand in opposition to this blatantly dishonest Republican budget.

Republicans call this A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, but I call it Robin Hood in reverse.

Republicans say that it will bring greater opportunity and a healthier economy for the working class, but I say it widens the gap between the haves and the have-nots.

Our economy is driven by middle class American families.

This budget attacks them, and it attacks our economy. It is a one-sided partisan plan, increasing savings for the rich by \$200,000, increasing taxes for the average American by \$2,000. It repeals the Affordable Care Act, which has insured 16 million more people previously uninsured.

The district in North Carolina I represent benefits from the Democratic alternative budget. It is negatively impacted by this Republican budget.

My district has an unemployment rate more than double the State and the national average, and more than 27 percent of people in my district live below the poverty line. That is 12 percent more, Mr. Chair, than the national average.

Cuts to SNAP funding in this budget impact more than 1.5 million North Carolinians and more than 65,000 people in our 12th District. I cannot support a budget that hurts my constituents. We need a budget that brings jobs back to the 12th District and to the millions of Americans across this Nation who work hard every day to feed their families.

This budget launches a strong attack on education. As a former professor and member of the Education and the Workforce Committee, I am troubled by the fact that this budget slashes \$1.2 billion in education funding for our country, cutting more than \$36 million in education funding for North Carolinians. 790 children under 5 in North Carolina would be left out of critical Head Start programs. Pell grants would be frozen for students. When our children fail, everyone fails.

The Democratic alternative budget is what we need because it supports hard-working middle class families, it contributes to job growth, it invests in our children's education, and it supports our most vital programs.

I ask my colleagues on the other side to join me and countless other Members in supporting a sensible Democratic alternative. Let's continue the blue rise that our President made possible.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, the budget deceptively claims to adhere to the budget

caps that are otherwise known as the sequestration levels of 2016, yet it adds tens of billions of dollars to what Republicans themselves have called a “slush fund” for defense, including lucrative military contracts.

The budget dishonestly calls for another \$1.1 trillion in cuts to “mandatory” programs somewhere, somehow without specifying what those cuts would be, who they would hit, or how it would all happen.

And it does not balance the budget. The budget falsely claims that it will place the country on a path of prosperity and paying off the debt when, in fact, it will not. As the Nobel Prize-winning economist Paul Krugman has pointed out: If this budget were to become law, as written, it would actually leave the Federal Government several trillion dollars deeper in debt than claimed.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my good friend.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Chair, today, we will be asked to vote on a budget resolution that should outline our priorities and our values as a nation.

But this year, House Republicans have proposed what I refer to as a “magic budget” that goes far beyond the sleights of hand and fiscal gimmicks that folks have grown accustomed to seeing here in Washington.

□ 1315

Republicans would like us to believe that their painful spending cuts will balance the budget in just 9 years. Unfortunately, the basic immutable laws of accounting contradict this claim. The Republican budget claims to save \$5.5 trillion and balance the budget in just 9 years. Allow me to explain this magic budget.

The magic budget extends tax cuts for corporations and eliminates the alternative minimum tax, but it doesn't account for the \$150 billion in lost revenue. This is where it gets even trickier. The Republican budget then cuts \$1.1 trillion in spending without any indication of where it would come from.

It then takes a sharp turn to the right and repeals ObamaCare, but it still, amazingly, uses the \$1 trillion in future revenue from ObamaCare to balance the budget by 2024.

Mr. Chairman, this is one magic budget. America deserves better.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The one thing that economist Paul Krugman is expert at is being wrong. Had we followed his prescription, this economy would be even slower than it is, and our Nation would be deeper in debt.

Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem.

The latest numbers, as of January of this year, show the amount of revenue the Federal Government has been taking in from each and every American is at nearly record highs.

The Republican budget strengthens the economy, tackles the spending problem, and changes the course of this disappointing recovery.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to respond to my good friend on the other side of the aisle.

Economist Paul Krugman, Nobel Prize winner, did not support the Republican policies that led to the red, deep valley when we were losing 800,000 jobs a month. He supported many of the proposals that President Obama and the Democrats implemented, which led to growth and more jobs.

The President and the Democrats will not be satisfied until every American who wants a job has a job; yet numbers don't lie, and this chart, which is based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics' numbers, shows policies that led to 800,000 jobs lost per month to, now, an economy that is growing.

I admit that Democrats will not be happy until it grows even more, but 12 million private sector jobs have been added. I want to go back to a budget that, I believe, will turn this blue into the red again. We have to continue with the blue policies that led to economic opportunities and job growth.

Now, the Republican budget document claims that it aims to make sure that government keeps the promises that it has made, and then it proceeds to lay out plans to demolish Medicare. Medicare is one of the most successful and universally popular programs ever designed.

It provides high-quality health care for Americans over the age of 65; yet this Republican budget would replace this program with a voucher program, giving seniors a coupon to help defray the cost of private insurance. Seniors would have to immediately pay new copays for preventative care and much higher costs for prescription drugs.

They don't say how they are going to help the seniors. They are just going to give them this voucher program. Can private insurance companies provide better coverage? They don't know. They don't say anything about it. They just give them vouchers and let them go to private insurance.

They don't say whether their program will cost more in out-of-pocket expenses, but I think it definitely will. Dismantling health care is a radical proposition. My guess is that, if Congress tries to take apart Medicare, millions of Americans will storm Capitol Hill.

Let's remember what happened in the early 2000s when then-President George W. Bush tried to partially privatize So-

cial Security. Like Medicare, Social Security is extremely popular with seniors because it works, and it makes a huge, positive difference in their lives.

For many older Americans, Social Security is the only source of retirement income they will have, and for others, it is a critical supplement to their savings. Republicans have previously tried to privatize it.

Let's be honest with the American people. If my Republican colleagues want to dismantle Medicare, they should come right out and say it and say it loudly.

In their budget proposal, our friends across the aisle complain about how long it has taken our economy to recover from the Great Recession. Remember that it bubbled up and blew up on their watch. The recession was on their watch with their proposals.

Their budget talks a great deal about accountability; yet nowhere do our Republican colleagues indicate that they should be held accountable for the mistakes and the mismanagement that led to the Great Recession. To the \$17 trillion in household wealth that was lost, thankfully, most of that household wealth has been regained, and that is thanks to the Obama recovery.

For my Republican friends who want to brush away any mention of the failed Republican policies of the past that brought us to the verge of economic collapse, I would remind you of the prophesy—of the words—of a great philosopher who said: Those who do not know the past are condemned to repeat it.

I do not want to go back to the past of the red, deep valley that this chart shows. Republicans' promises in the past of prosperity through austerity have proven to be hollow. Democratic policies have produced an economy that has just added more than 200 private sector jobs every month for 12 straight months. That is the first time that has happened since 1977.

Republicans' predictions that the passage of the Recovery Act would produce economic doom, hyperinflation, and the collapse of the dollar were all proven wrong. Democratic policies have produced an economy that has been growing steadily, with low inflation, a strong dollar, cheap gas, a deficit that has shrunk by two-thirds, and a Dow Jones index that has tripled.

Republicans lamented that the passage of the Affordable Care Act would make health care unaffordable. It turned out to be totally untrue. The annual increase in healthcare premiums has dropped to a 50-year low.

Now, I would like to take a short detour to give some advice for home buyers. If you ever consider buying a new house that is built on a blueprint like this Republican budget blueprint, please do not do it. Save your money.

Look for a home that is built on a solid foundation. Look for a house that has strong walls and a solid roof. Look for one that will protect your family for a long time. Don't buy a house built on a blueprint that is as shoddy as this one.

They are going back to their same failed policy. This budget is a fiasco, and the numbers do not add up. I am pleased that even some of my Republican colleagues have had the courage to say so. Some have called it budgetary tricks, gimmicks, funny money, slush funds; but the truth is far worse than that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, did I hear the Chair say that all time has expired on the Democrat side of the aisle?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Look, I don't blame Democrats for not understanding this budget. They could never pass one. In fact, there hasn't been a budget for this great country since 2009, when they were in charge. In fact, it is the Republicans who have consistently in the House passed a budget only to have a Democrat Senate do nothing.

Now, for the first time, the American public has said: we have had enough of this, enough of the deficits, enough of this struggling economy, enough of this out-of-control spending; we want a real budget.

This step takes place today with Chairman PRICE's balanced budget for a stronger economy. I would point out that the American public knows exactly the Democratic policies that have brought them the weakest recovery in 50 years, and it is why, 5 years after the recovery began, most Americans still think they are in a recession. They think their families and their communities are still in a recession. We are not going to settle for this second-rate economy.

I would point out, while I am pleased there has been some job creation over the last 60 months, compare it to the average. If this were just a C-grade recovery—just the middle of the pack, nothing to brag about—we would be creating 403,000 new jobs every month, not 200,000-plus. It would be almost double that. If you look at the Reagan recovery, which had higher unemployment, there were 750,000 jobs more a month.

That chart does show positive growth, but it is so weak and so disappointing, and it is accompanied by stagnant paychecks and college graduates who are working behind cash registers. If we want to stick with that, no problem, we know exactly what to do; but if we want to change course as a

country, if we want to stop growing Washington's economy and grow our local economies, we are going to have to change course.

The weakness of this recovery can be captured in three numbers. We are missing \$1.5 trillion out of today's economy, and people are suffering. We are missing 5.5 million jobs, which is enough to put everyone looking for work in 45 States back to work, and we are missing \$11,000 a year out of a family of four's family budget.

Can you imagine what \$11,000 could do in paying for tuition and fuel and college costs? This growth gap will persist unless we change course.

Firstly, the budget resolution gradually addresses these issues by gradually bringing Federal spending back into line, allowing Washington to balance the budget and grow the economy.

Secondly, the budget resolution builds on the success of the welfare reform of the 1990s when Democrat President Bill Clinton and a Republican Congress worked together to give block grants to the States so they could develop programs to help able-bodied, working poor people find jobs, and it succeeded.

In employing this successful model, the budget resolution envisions converting Medicaid and food stamp programs into block grants that would allow States to tailor these programs to the needs of their States, to experiment and to find more innovative ways to get people out of work and into a career and a lifetime that they have envisioned.

Thirdly, the budget envisions the repeal of the unpopular and unworkable monstrosity known as ObamaCare.

Fourthly, the budget resolution envisions saving Medicare once and for all, putting in place the reforms that would actually keep this important program for seniors and for generations to come.

Finally, the budget resolution envisions progrowth tax reform—built for growth—to get America back to work and American companies competing and winning around the world.

There is so much more we must do in reforming the Tax Code and balancing regulation and creating a sound dollar and creating sales agreements around the world so our companies can compete, but we can't do that until this government has a budget that is built for America's growth, not for the government's growth.

I strongly commend the work of Chairman PRICE and of the other Republican members of the Budget Committee. I urge the House to vote for this budget resolution. We need to change course in this country so we can get hard-working taxpayers, young people, and families back to work and living the American Dream.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chair, Section 804 of H. Con. Res. 27 contains the budget resolution's policy statement on tax reform. These policy goals are familiar, as we have been pursuing them for several years now. They include simplifying the tax code for families and businesses, reducing tax rates and consolidating the existing seven brackets into just two, repealing the burdensome Alternative Minimum Tax, reducing what is currently the highest corporate rate in the developed world, and transitioning to a more competitive system of international taxation.

With respect to this last goal, the budget resolution includes language that did not appear in previous budget resolutions. Section 804(b)(5) specifies that our international tax system should be reformed "in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular type of income or industry." Because this language is new, I would like to explain in more detail how it should be interpreted.

Nondiscrimination is a key principle of tax reform. The tax code should not pick winners or losers. All businesses should be on a level playing field, so that the free market decides where to allocate capital based on the most promising economic opportunities, not based on where one can obtain the most tax breaks. At the same time, when some taxpayers use sophisticated tax planning to exploit loopholes in the tax code to achieve a result much more favorable than other taxpayers can achieve, the nondiscrimination principle is violated and capital flows to the least taxed investments rather than to the most economically productive investments, leading to economic distortions and lower growth. For this reason, the committee report on H. Con. Res. 27, House Report 114-47, clarifies that, "This nondiscrimination principle, however, is not intended to prevent the adoption of reasonable anti-avoidance rules."

As an example, under the current tax code a U.S. company that keeps its intellectual property (IP) in the United States and licenses it to foreign customers must pay a corporate tax rate of 35 percent on royalties related to that IP. But a competitor that moves its IP from the United States to a foreign subsidiary in Bermuda and then licenses it to foreign customers pays zero on its royalties. That means our tax code discriminates against U.S.-owned IP and in favor of foreign-owned IP, which is why so much of our valuable intellectual property has left the country. On the other hand, a tax reform proposal that says both companies pay the same low tax rate on those royalties—for instance, a rate similar to Ireland's rate, which is where so many U.S. companies are moving to lower their tax burden—would end this discrimination and therefore would be consistent with section 804(b)(5). And by ending this discrimination with the same low tax rate for both companies, the proposal would encourage not only intellectual property to return to the United States, but also the R&D and manufacturing jobs associated with it.

I hope this clarifies how section 804(b)(5) should be interpreted, and I look forward to working with Chairman PRICE and the rest of my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, as we continue working to enact tax reform legislation in the 114th Congress.



The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 27

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.  
Sec. 202. Reconciliation procedures.  
Sec. 203. Additional guidance for reconciliation.

#### TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Sec. 301. Submissions of findings for the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

#### TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.  
Sec. 402. Limitation on measures affecting Social Security solvency.  
Sec. 403. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.  
Sec. 404. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.  
Sec. 405. Limitation on advance appropriations.  
Sec. 406. Fair value credit estimates.  
Sec. 407. Limitation on long-term spending.  
Sec. 408. Allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.  
Sec. 409. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.  
Sec. 410. Concepts, aggregates, allocations and application.  
Sec. 411. Rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 501. Reserve fund for the repeal of the President's health care law.  
Sec. 502. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for promoting real health care reform.  
Sec. 503. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the President's health care law.  
Sec. 504. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.  
Sec. 505. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for graduate medical education.  
Sec. 506. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.  
Sec. 507. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.

Sec. 508. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.

Sec. 509. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.

Sec. 510. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation.

Sec. 511. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.

Sec. 512. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.

Sec. 513. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

#### TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 601. Direct spending.

#### TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

Sec. 701. Long-term budgeting.

#### TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

Sec. 801. Policy statement on balanced budget amendment.  
Sec. 802. Policy statement on budget process and baseline reform.  
Sec. 803. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.  
Sec. 804. Policy statement on tax reform.  
Sec. 805. Policy statement on trade.  
Sec. 806. Policy statement on Social Security.  
Sec. 807. Policy statement on repealing the President's health care law and promoting real health care reform.

Sec. 808. Policy statement on Medicare.  
Sec. 809. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery and innovation.

Sec. 810. Policy statement on Federal regulatory reform.

Sec. 811. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.

Sec. 812. Policy statement on Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 813. Policy statement on Federal accounting methodologies.

Sec. 814. Policy statement on scorekeeping for outyear budgetary effects in appropriation Acts.

Sec. 815. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.

Sec. 816. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.

Sec. 817. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.

Sec. 818. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

Sec. 819. Policy statement on "No Budget, No Pay".

Sec. 820. Policy statement on national security funding.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$0.

Fiscal year 2017: \$0.

Fiscal year 2018: \$0.

Fiscal year 2019: \$0.

Fiscal year 2020: \$0.

Fiscal year 2021: \$0.

Fiscal year 2022: \$0.

Fiscal year 2023: \$0.

Fiscal year 2024: \$0.

Fiscal year 2025: \$0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,934,975,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,873,969,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,013,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,091,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,248,109,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,327,968,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,462,962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,529,073,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,586,467,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,715,272,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,009,033,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,893,883,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,927,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,062,131,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,205,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,298,907,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,452,463,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,497,911,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,538,398,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,685,320,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: -\$342,278,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: -\$130,555,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: -\$68,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: -\$87,984,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: -\$106,079,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: -\$56,944,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: -\$63,775,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$52,477,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$183,746,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$220,418,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The budgetary levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,047,763,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$19,393,542,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$19,641,396,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$19,947,774,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$20,261,172,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$20,505,542,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$20,906,471,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$21,075,678,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$20,916,009,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$20,904,522,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,838,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$14,040,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$14,145,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$14,338,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$14,560,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$14,742,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$15,128,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$15,300,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$15,162,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$15,235,000,000,000.

# **SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$531,334,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$564,027,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$582,506,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$572,025,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$607,744,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$586,422,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$620,019,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$604,238,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$632,310,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$617,553,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$644,627,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$630,610,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$657,634,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$648,269,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$670,997,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$656,389,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$683,771,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$663,936,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$698,836,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$683,350,000,000.  
(2) International Affairs (150):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$38,342,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,923,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,623,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,821,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,539,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,736,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,437,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,214,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,390,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,564,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,861,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,108,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,081,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,868,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,070,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,633,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,098,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,470,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,148,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,349,000,000.  
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$28,381,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,003,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,932,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,924,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,579,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,357,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,227,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,798,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,904,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,388,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,584,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,957,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,293,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,637,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,003,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,338,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,742,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,059,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,488,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,795,000,000.  
(4) Energy (270):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority -\$3,581,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$654,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,410,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$649,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,189,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$234,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,196,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$307,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,259,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$472,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,309,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$728,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,335,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$863,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,375,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,332,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,037,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$964,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,215,000,000.  
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$35,350,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,113,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,047,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,268,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,385,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,674,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,206,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,747,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,171,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,304,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,367,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,685,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,221,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,361,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,108,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,319,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,962,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,486,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,095,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,471,000,000.  
(6) Agriculture (350):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$20,109,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,164,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,064,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,194,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,987,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,396,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,907,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,275,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,835,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,386,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,296,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,849,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,245,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,830,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,821,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,391,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,020,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,553,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,256,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,851,000,000.  
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority -\$3,269,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$16,617,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$12,373,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$26,620,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$10,252,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$24,998,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$8,801,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$28,587,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$6,903,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$27,479,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$6,522,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$21,769,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$5,742,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$22,819,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4,965,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,306,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$3,991,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,635,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$3,370,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,845,000,000.  
(8) Transportation (400):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$36,743,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,181,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$69,381,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,298,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$73,623,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,397,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,051,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$77,763,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,767,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$79,149,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,369,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$80,613,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,946,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$82,128,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$81,336,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$83,709,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$82,724,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$85,335,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$83,983,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$7,082,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,928,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$7,688,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,753,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,089,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,383,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,381,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,789,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,409,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,567,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,305,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,095,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,304,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,937,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,359,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$9,345,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,447,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$8,890,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,579,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$8,930,000,000.  
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$80,620,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$90,389,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$84,746,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$90,513,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$87,029,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$87,366,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$85,514,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$85,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$87,901,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$87,669,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$88,908,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$89,276,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$90,148,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$90,467,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$91,237,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$91,646,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$92,744,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$93,101,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$94,734,000,000.  
(11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$416,475,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$426,860,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$360,678,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$364,823,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$358,594,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$360,468,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$367,103,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$367,916,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$387,076,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$377,341,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$388,981,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$389,025,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$398,136,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$398,233,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$408,454,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$408,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$425,381,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$425,477,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$433,945,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$434,143,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$577,726,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$577,635,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$580,837,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$580,777,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$580,782,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$580,741,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$639,293,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$639,213,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$680,575,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$680,481,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$726,644,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$726,548,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$808,204,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$808,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$825,577,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$825,379,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$834,148,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$834,037,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$927,410,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$927,292,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$512,364,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$513,709,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$479,836,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$475,234,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$481,994,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$471,951,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$483,293,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$477,470,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$516,193,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$510,603,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$502,001,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$496,856,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$518,690,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$518,542,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$525,230,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$519,391,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$532,515,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$521,105,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$550,057,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$543,361,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$33,878,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$166,677,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$170,121,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$164,387,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$163,009,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$162,385,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$174,862,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$174,048,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$179,735,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$178,778,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$183,969,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$183,019,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$196,283,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$195,255,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$192,866,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$191,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$189,668,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$188,553,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$203,517,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$202,383,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$52,156,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,006,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,450,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,547,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,169,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,659,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,854,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,572,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$58,585,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,392,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,498,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$59,992,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$63,032,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,485,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,917,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,355,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,844,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,264,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,632,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,051,000,000.  
 (17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$23,593,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,576,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,761,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,202,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,817,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,279,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,252,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,084,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,947,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,602,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,309,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,981,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,695,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,840,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,010,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,878,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,968,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,825,000,000.  
 (18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$366,527,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$366,527,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$414,768,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$414,768,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$477,731,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$477,731,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$531,032,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$531,032,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,654,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$578,654,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$612,121,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$612,121,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$642,388,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$642,388,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$667,089,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$667,089,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$684,301,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$684,301,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$695,929,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$695,929,000,000.  
 (19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority -\$33,462,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$17,275,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$29,863,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,277,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$32,175,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,249,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$34,261,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$31,078,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$39,009,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$35,136,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$42,221,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$38,438,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$46,013,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$42,205,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$49,123,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$45,430,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$50,652,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$47,736,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$48,913,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$48,058,000,000.  
 (20) Government-wide savings (930):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$27,465,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,416,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$15,712,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,005,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$32,429,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$20,148,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$41,554,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$32,383,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$50,240,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$42,168,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$55,831,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$50,276,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$63,954,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$57,849,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$71,850,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$65,124,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$78,889,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$71,689,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$113,903,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$93,929,000,000.  
 (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority -\$73,514,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$73,514,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$83,832,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$83,832,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,115,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,115,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$90,594,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$90,594,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,193,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,193,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$96,623,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$96,623,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$99,437,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$99,437,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$104,343,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$104,343,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$111,213,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$111,213,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$117,896,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$117,896,000,000.  
 (22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-  
 al War on Terrorism (970):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$94,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,304,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,716,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,758,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,117,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,862,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,776,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,956,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$278,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.  
 (23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority -\$21,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$17,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$22,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$20,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$25,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$27,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,000,000.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

### SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than July 15, 2015, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

#### (b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(5) **COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.**—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(6) **COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.**—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(7) **COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.**—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(8) **COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.**—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(9) **COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.**—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(10) **COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.**—The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(11) **COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(12) **COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.**—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(13) **COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.**—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

## **SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES.**

### **(a) ESTIMATING ASSUMPTIONS.**

(1) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—In the House, for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall use the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 (January 2015) when making estimates of any bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon. If adjustments to the baseline are made subsequent to the adoption of this concurrent resolution, then such chair shall determine whether to use any of these adjustments when making such estimates.

(2) **INTENT.**—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) should only be exercised if the estimates used to determine the compliance of such measures with the budgetary requirements included in the concurrent resolution are inaccurate because adjustments made to the baseline are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution. Such inaccurate adjustments made after the adoption of this concurrent resolution may include selected adjustments for rulemaking, judicial actions, adjudication, and interpretative rules that have major budgetary ef-

fects and are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution.

(3) **CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.**—Upon the request of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House for any measure, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare an estimate based on the baseline determination made by such chair pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) **REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW THROUGH RECONCILIATION.**—In preparing their submissions under section 201(a) to the Committee on the Budget, the committees named in section 201(b) shall—

(1) note the policies described in the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget that repeal the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(2) determine the most effective methods by which the health care laws referred to in paragraph (1) shall be repealed in their entirety.

### **(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.**

(1) **SUBMISSION.**—Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) **CONFERENCE REPORT.**—Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) **REVISION.**—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

## **SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR RECONCILIATION.**

(a) **GUIDANCE.**—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may develop additional guidelines providing further information, budgetary levels and amounts, and other explanatory material to supplement the instructions included in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and set forth in section 201.

(b) **PUBLICATION.**—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may cause the material prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to be printed in the Congressional Record on the appropriate date, but not later than the date set forth in this title on which committees must submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in order to comply with the reconciliation instructions set forth in section 201.

## **TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE**

### **SEC. 301. SUBMISSIONS OF FINDINGS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.**

(a) **SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.**—In the House, not later than October 1, 2015, the committees named in subsection (d) shall submit to the Committee on the Budget findings that identify changes in law within

their jurisdictions that would achieve the specified level of savings through the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED.**—After receiving those recommendations—

(1) the Committee on the Budget may use them in the development of future concurrent resolutions on the budget; and

(2) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make such recommendations publicly available in electronic form and cause them to be placed in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after receipt.

(c) **SPECIFIED LEVELS OF SAVINGS.**—For purposes of this section, a specified level of savings for each committee may be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(d) **HOUSE COMMITTEES.**—The following committees shall submit findings to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (a): the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(e) **REPORT BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.**—By August 1, 2015, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report identifying instances in which the committees referred to in subsection (d) may make legislative changes to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of programs within their jurisdiction.

## **TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT**

### **SEC. 401. COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.**

(a) **CBO ESTIMATES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, an estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation considered in the House or the Senate during fiscal year 2016 shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(b) **JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, any estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(c) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in this section shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (a) and (b)) of

such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution sets forth budgetary levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—  
(1) the term “major legislation” means any bill or joint resolution—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(2) the term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, budget authority, outlays, and deficits.

#### SEC. 402. LIMITATION ON MEASURES AFFECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, it shall not be in order to consider in the House or the Senate a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

#### SEC. 403. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

#### SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

#### SEC. 405. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading:

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”; and

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) VETERANS.—\$63,271,000,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2016.

#### SEC. 406. FAIR VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate of the budgetary effects of a measure prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform” shall, as a supplement to such estimate, and to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares an estimate pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 of the budgetary effects which would be incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and if the Director determines that such bill or joint resolution has a budgetary effect related to a housing, residential mortgage or student loan program under title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, then the Director shall also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of such bill or joint resolution that result in such effect.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an esti-

mate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

#### SEC. 407. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of \$5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning in the fiscal year following the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

#### SEC. 408. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE OCO/GWOT ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

(b) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2016. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays counting toward the allocation established by subsection (a) shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### SEC. 409. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—In the House, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or offers any amendment thereto or submits a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2016 and the period of fiscal years 2016 through fiscal year 2025 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 410. CONCEPTS, AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**

(a) CONCEPTS, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPLICATION.—In the House—

(1) upon a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly;

(2) any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(A) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable;

(3) section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall have no force or effect for any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to instructions set forth in this concurrent resolution;

(4) the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from the most recently published or adjusted baseline of the Congressional Budget Office; and

(5) the term “budget year” means the most recent fiscal year for which a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted.

(b) AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.—In the House, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement—

(1) the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 407 of this concurrent resolution; and

(2) revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 411. RULEMAKING POWERS.**

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

**TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS****SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that consists solely of the full repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 or measures that make modifications to such law.

**SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that promotes real health care reform, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, expands access to, and improves, as determined by such chair, graduate medical education programs, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 506. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 507. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.**

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 508. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations,

aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 509. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 510. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 511. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 512. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.**

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit reforms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 513. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure is related to the support of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism by the amounts provided in such legislation in excess of \$73.5 billion but not to exceed \$94 billion, but only



if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

##### SEC. 601. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 4.6 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic president reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the five years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This budget applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this budget assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into flexible State allotments, which States will be able to tailor to meet their unique needs. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that ties the hands of State governments and would provide States with the freedom and flexibility they have long requested in the Medicaid program. Moreover, this budget assumes the repeal of the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of the crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates, as well as the overwhelming pressure the law's Medicaid expansion puts on an already-strained system.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth. Such a reform would provide incentives for States to ensure dollars will go towards those who need them most.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 5.4 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 5.5 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions. Future retirees would be able to choose from a range of guaranteed coverage options, with private plans competing alongside the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program. Medicare would provide a premium-support payment either to pay for or offset the premium of the plan chosen by the senior, depending on the plan's cost. The Medicare premium-support payment would be adjusted so that the sick would receive

higher payments if their conditions worsened; lower-income seniors would receive additional assistance to help cover out-of-pocket costs; and wealthier seniors would assume responsibility for a greater share of their premiums. Putting seniors in charge of how their health care dollars are spent will force providers to compete against each other on price and quality. This market competition will act as a real check on widespread waste and skyrocketing health care costs. As with previous budgets, this program will begin in 2024 and makes no changes to those in or near retirement.

(B) In keeping with a recommendation from the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, this budget calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

#### TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

##### SEC. 701. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2035, and 2040 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) REVENUES.—The budgetary levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 18.7 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 19.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.0 percent.

(2) OUTLAYS.—The budgetary levels of total budget outlays are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 18.4 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 17.8 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 16.9 percent.

(3) DEFICITS.—The budgetary levels of deficits are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: -0.3 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: -1.2 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: -2.1 percent.

(4) DEBT.—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 44.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 32.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 18.0 percent.

#### TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

##### SEC. 801. POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government collects approximately \$3 trillion annually in taxes, but spends more than \$3.5 trillion to maintain the operations of government. The Federal Government must borrow 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of the year 2014, the national debt of the United States was more than \$18.1 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a Constitutional Convention for the consideration of adopting a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(4) Forty-nine States have fiscal limitations in their State Constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte (R-VA), was considered by the House of Representatives on November 18, 2011, though it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(6) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Twelve were introduced in the 113th Congress alone, including H.J. Res. 4 by Democratic Representative

John J. Barrow of Georgia, and H.J. Res. 38 by Republican Representative Jackie Walorski of Indiana.

(7) The joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution referred to in paragraph (5) prohibited outlays for a fiscal year (except those for repayment of debt principal) from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year (except those derived from borrowing) unless Congress, by a three-fifths roll call vote of each chamber, authorizes a specific excess of outlays over receipts.

(8) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed of passage by one vote in the United States Senate.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pass a joint resolution incorporating the provisions set forth in subsection (b), and send such joint resolution to the States for their approval, to amend the Constitution of the United States to require an annual balanced budget.

##### SEC. 802. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS AND BASELINE REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—

(1) In 1974, after more than 50 years of executive dominance over fiscal policy, Congress acted to reassert its "power of the purse", and passed the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

(2) The measure explicitly sought to establish congressional control over the budget process, to provide for annual congressional determination of the appropriate level of taxes and spending, to set important national budget priorities, and to find ways in which Members of Congress could have access to the most accurate, objective, and highest quality information to assist them in discharging their duties.

(3) Far from achieving its intended purpose, however, the process has instituted a bias toward higher spending and larger government. The behemoth of the Federal Government has largely been financed through either borrowing or taking ever greater amounts of the national income through high taxation.

(4) The process does not treat programs and policies consistently and shows a bias toward higher spending and higher taxes.

(5) It assumes extension of spending programs (of more than \$50 million per year) scheduled to expire.

(6) Yet it does not assume the extension of tax policies in the same way, consequently, extending existing tax policies that may be scheduled to expire is characterized as a new tax reduction, requiring offsets to "pay for" merely keeping tax policy the same even though estimating conventions would not require similar treatment of spending programs.

(7) The original goals set for the congressional process are admirable in their intent, but because the essential mechanisms of the process have remained the same, and "reforms" enacted over the past 40 years have largely taken the form of layering greater levels of legal complexity without reforming or reassessing the very fundamental nature of the process.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that as the primary branch of Government, Congress must:

(1) Restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) Reassert Congress's "power of the purse", and reinforce the balance of powers between Congress and the President, as the 1974 Act intended.

(3) Create greater incentives for lawmakers to do budgeting as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially adopting a budget resolution every year.

(4) Encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending.

(5) Consider innovative fiscal tools such as: zero based budgeting, which would require a department or agency to justify its budget as if it were a new expenditure; and direct spending caps to enhance oversight of automatic pilot spending that increases each year without congressional approval.

(6) Promote efficient and timely budget actions, so that lawmakers complete their budget actions by the time the new fiscal year begins.

(7) Provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts overall economic growth and job creation.

(8) Remove layers of complexity that have complicated the procedures designed in 1974, and made budgeting more arcane and opaque.

(9) Remove existing biases that favor higher spending.

(10) Include procedures by which current tax laws may be extended and treated on a basis that is not different from the extension of entitlement programs.

(c) **BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**—Comprehensive budget process reform should also remove the bias in the baseline against the extension of current tax laws in the following ways:

(1) Permanent extension of tax laws should not be used as a means to increase taxes on other taxpayers;

(2) For those expiring tax provisions that are proposed to be permanently extended, Congress should use a more realistic baseline that does not require them to be offset; and,

(3) Tax-reform legislation should not include tax increases just to offset the extension of current tax laws.

(d) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget intends to draft legislation during the 114th Congress that will rewrite the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers' dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

#### **SEC. 803. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession more than 5 years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product GDP growth over the past 5 years has averaged slightly more than 2 percent, well below the 3.2 percent historical trend rate of growth in the United States. Although the economy has shown some welcome signs of improvement of late, the Nation remains in the midst of the weakest economic recovery of the modern era.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 2.3 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country's fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while govern-

ment spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher. Clearly, there is a dire need for policies that will spark higher rates of economic growth and greater, higher-quality job opportunities

(4) Although job gains have been trending up of late, other aspects of the labor market remain weak. The labor force participation rate, for instance, is hovering just under 63 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. Long-term unemployment also remains a problem. Of the roughly 8.7 million people who are currently unemployed, 2.7 million (more than 30 percent) have been unemployed for more than 6 months. Long-term unemployment erodes an individual's job skills and detaches them from job opportunities. It also undermines the long-term productive capacity of the economy.

(5) Perhaps most important, wage gains and income growth have been subpar for middle-class Americans. Average hourly earnings of private-sector workers have increased by just 1.6 percent over the past year. Prior to the recession, average hourly earnings were tracking close to 4 percent. Likewise, average income levels have remained flat in recent years. Real median household income is just under \$52,000, one of the lowest levels since 1995.

(6) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country's economic outlook. Investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. They know that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation and they act accordingly. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(7) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels) is a net positive for economic growth over time. The logic is that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(8) CBO analyzed the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and found it would increase real output per capita (a proxy for a country's standard of living) by about \$1,000 in 2025 and roughly \$5,000 by 2040 relative to the baseline path. That means more income and greater prosperity for all Americans.

(9) In contrast, if the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a "crowding out" of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(10) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(11) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$326 billion.

(12) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(b) **POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.**—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustain-

able path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code will put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

#### **SEC. 804. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all three counts: It is notoriously complex, patently unfair, and highly inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Over the past decade alone, there have been 4,107 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carving out special preferences, exclusions, or deductions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than \$1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and highly complex.

(3) In addition, these tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals.

(4) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the tax base. A narrow tax base, in turn, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(5) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending \$160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(6) Standard economic theory shows that high marginal tax rates dampen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(7) Roughly half of U.S. active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a "pass-through" basis, meaning the income flows through to the tax returns of the individual owners and is taxed at the individual rate structure rather than at the corporate rate. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the top Federal rate on such small business income can reach nearly 45 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(8) The U.S. corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages and discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(9) By deterring potential investment, the U.S. corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The U.S. tax rate differential with other countries also fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate behaviors intended to avoid the tax,

which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(10) The “worldwide” structure of U.S. international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the United States tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and it would also greatly reduce tax avoidance.

(12) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, on consumers in higher prices, and on investors in diminished returns.

(13) Revenues have averaged about 17.4 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 18.3 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through new tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans’ ability to save for their retirement and their children’s education.

(15) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a new source of revenue. Such a plan would damage the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

(16) Closing tax loopholes to fund spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(17) The goal of tax reform should be to curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(18) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform (i.e. a broader tax base and lower tax rates) would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which, over time, would have a positive impact on total national output.

(19) Heretofore, the congressional scorekeepers the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

(20) Static scoring implicitly assumes that the size of the economy (and therefore key economic variables such as labor supply and investment) remains fixed throughout the considered budget horizon. This is an abstraction from reality.

(21) A new House rule was adopted at the beginning of the 114th Congress to help correct this problem. This rule requires CBO and JCT to incorporate the macroeconomic effects of major legislation into their official cost estimates.

(22) This rule seeks to bridge the divide between static estimates and scoring that incorporates economic feedback effects by providing policymakers with a greater amount of information about the likely economic impact of policies under their consideration while at the same time preserving traditional scoring methods and reporting conventions.

(b) **POLICY ON TAX REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform that—

(1) simplifies the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and re-

duces the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowers tax rates for individuals and consolidates the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular type of income or industry.

#### **SEC. 805. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade, adherence to trade agreement rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) Trade Promotion Authority is a bipartisan and bicameral effort to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

(4) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to “hollow out” United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(5) Trade agreements have saved the average American family of four more than \$10,000 per year, as a result of lower duties. Trade agreements also lower the cost of manufacturing inputs by removing duties.

(6) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(7) When negotiating trade agreements, United States laws on Intellectual Property (IP) protection should be used as a benchmark for establishing global IP frameworks. Strong IP protections have contributed significantly to the United States status as a world leader in innovation across sectors, including in the development of life-saving biological medicines. The data protections afforded to biologics in United States law, including 12 years of data protection, allow continued development of pioneering medicines to benefit patients both in the United States and abroad. To maintain the cycle of innovation and achieve truly 21st century trade agreements, it is vital that our negotiators insist on the highest standards for IP protections.

(8) The status quo of the current tax code also undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(9) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They

are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage. A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

(10) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a “tax loophole,” cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(11) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(b) **POLICY ON TRADE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system to promote job creation in the United States. The United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade opportunities, adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and by enforcing United States rights. To that end, Congress should pass Trade Promotion Authority to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

#### **SEC. 806. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the “three-legged stool” of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2033, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut nearly 23 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most

recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$2 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower income Americans' retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to the CBO, between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by more than 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. David Autor and Mark Duggan have found that the increase in individuals on disability does not reflect a decrease in self-reported health. CBO attributes program growth to changes in demographics, changes in the composition of the labor force and compensation, as well as Federal policies.

(6) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 20 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the "Greenspan Commission" which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(8) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that bipartisan action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes reform of a current law trigger, such that:

(1) If in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. Recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees.

(2) Not later than 1 December of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit their recommendations, the President should promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including his recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House should introduce the President's legislation upon receipt.

(3) Within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been re-

ferred should report a bill, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on, and provide certainty for, future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes reform that—

(1) ensure benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(2) prevents a 20 percent across-the-board benefit cut;

(3) makes the Disability Insurance program work better; and

(4) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—Any legislation that Congress considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance trust fund also must improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance (OASDI) trust fund.

**SEC. 807. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPEALING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW AND PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The President's health care law put Washington's priorities first, and not patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised; instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500 a year; instead, according to the 2014 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 7 percent for individuals and families since 2012.

(2) The President pledged "If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan." Instead, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 9 million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans due to the President's health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Pelosi, said that the President's health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reduction in hours worked due to Obamacare represents a decline of about 2.0 to 2.5 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. The full impact on labor represents a reduction in employment by 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent, while additional studies show less modest results. A recent study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Obamacare

will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) The President has charged the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of unelected bureaucrats, with cutting Medicare by an additional \$20.9 billion over the next ten years, according to the President's most recent budget.

(5) Since ACA was signed into law, the administration has repeatedly failed to implement it as written. The President has unilaterally acted to make a total of 28 changes, delays, and exemptions. The President has signed into law another 17 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual "mandate" could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees if doing so violates these companies' religious beliefs. Even now, almost five years after enactment, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate the legality of how the President's administration has implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly underlying the entire program health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(6) The President's health care law is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. The law should be fully repealed, allowing for real, patient-centered health care reform: the development of real health care reforms that puts patients first, that make affordable, quality health care available to all Americans, and that build on the innovation and creativity of all the participants in the health care sector.

(b) **POLICY ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law should be fully repealed and real health care reform promoted in accordance with the following principles:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Health care reform should enhance affordability, accessibility, quality, innovation, choices and responsiveness in health care coverage for all Americans, putting patients, families, and doctors in charge, not Washington, DC. These reforms should encourage increased competition and transparency. Under the President's health care law, government controls Americans' health care choices. Under true, patient-centered reform, Americans would.

(2) **AFFORDABILITY.**—Real reform should be centered on ensuring that all Americans, no matter their age, income, or health status, have the ability to afford health care coverage. The health care delivery structure should be improved, and individuals should not be priced out of the health insurance market due to pre-existing conditions, but nationalized health care is not only unnecessary to accomplish this, it undermines the goal. Individuals should be allowed to join together voluntarily to pool risk through mechanisms such as Individual Membership Associations and Small Employer Membership Associations.

(3) **ACCESSIBILITY.**—Instead of Washington outlining for Americans the ways they cannot use their health insurance, reforms should make health coverage more portable. Individuals should be able to own their insurance and have it follow them in and out of jobs throughout their career. Small business owners should be permitted to band together across State lines through their membership in bona fide trade or professional associations to purchase health coverage for

their families and employees at a low cost. This will increase small businesses' bargaining power, volume discounts, and administrative efficiencies while giving them freedom from State-mandated benefit packages. Also, insurers licensed to sell policies in one State should be permitted to offer them to residents in any other State, and consumers should be permitted to shop for health insurance across State lines, as they are with other insurance products online, by mail, by phone, or in consultation with an insurance agent.

(4) **QUALITY.**—Incentives for providers to deliver high-quality, responsive, and coordinated care will promote patient outcomes and drive down health care costs. Likewise, reforms that work to restore the patient-physician relationship by reducing administrative burdens and allowing physicians to do what they do best: care for patients

(5) **CHOICES.**—Individuals and families should be free to secure the health care coverage that best meets their needs, rather than instituting one-size-fits-all directives from Federal bureaucracies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

(6) **INNOVATION.**—Instead of stifling innovation in health care technologies, treatments, medications, and therapies with Federal mandates, taxes, and price controls, a reformed health care system should encourage research, development and innovation.

(7) **RESPONSIVENESS.**—Reform should return authority to States wherever possible to make the system more responsive to patients and their needs. Instead of tying States' hands with Federal requirements for their Medicaid programs, the Federal Government should return control of this program to the States. Not only does the current Medicaid program drive up Federal debt and threaten to bankrupt State budgets, but States are better positioned to provide quality, affordable care to those who are eligible for the program and to track down and weed out waste, fraud and abuse. Beneficiary choices in the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) and Medicaid should be improved. States should make available the purchase of private insurance as an option to their Medicaid and SCHIP populations (though they should not require enrollment).

(8) **REFORMS.**—Reforms should be made to prevent lawsuit abuse and curb the practice of defensive medicine, which are significant drivers increasing health care costs. The burden of proof in medical malpractice cases should be based on compliance with best practice guidelines, and States should be free to implement those policies to best suit their needs.

#### SEC. 808. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2030 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two

decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program;

(D) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries;

(E) in 2013, the ratio was 3.2 workers per beneficiary, but this falls to 2.3 in 2030 and continues to decrease over time;

(F) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program; and

(G) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office's 2014 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2043 and 9.3 percent of GDP by 2089.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution to preserve the program for those in or near retirement and strengthen Medicare for future beneficiaries.

(c) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that—

(1) current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in or near retirement;

(2) permanent reform of the sustainable growth rate is responsibly accounted for to ensure physicians continue to participate in the Medicare program and provide quality health care for beneficiaries;

(3) when future generations reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs;

(4) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as a plan option;

(5) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

(6) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

#### SEC. 809. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY AND INNOVATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) For decades, the Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world, bringing life-saving drugs and devices to patients and well over a million high-paying jobs to local communities.

(2) Thanks to the visionary and determined leadership of innovators throughout America, including industry, academic medical centers, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the United States has led the way in early discovery. The United States leadership role is being threatened, however, as other countries contribute more to basic research from both public and private sources.

(3) The Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation predicts that China, for example, will outspend the United States in total research and development by the end of the decade.

(4) Federal policies should foster innovation in health care, not stifle it. America

should maintain its world leadership in medical science by encouraging competitive forces to work through the marketplace in delivering cures and therapies to patients.

(5) Too often the bureaucracy and red-tape in Washington hold back medical innovation and prevent new lifesaving treatments from reaching patients. This resolution recognizes the valuable role of the NIH and the indispensable contributions to medical research coming from outside Washington.

(6) America is the greatest, most innovative Nation on Earth. Her people are innovators, entrepreneurs, visionaries, and relentless builders of the future. Americans were responsible for the first telephone, the first airplane, the first computer, for putting the first man on the moon, for creating the first vaccine for polio and for legions of other scientific and medical breakthroughs that have improved and prolonged human health and life for countless people in America and around the world.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.**—

(1) It is the policy of this resolution to support the important work of medical innovators throughout the country, including private-sector innovators, medical centers and the National Institutes of Health.

(2) At the same time, the budget calls for continued strong funding for the agencies that engage in valuable research and development, while also urging Washington to get out of the way of researchers, discoverers and innovators all over the country.

#### SEC. 810. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing the Nation's recovery from the economic recession.

(2) Since President Obama's inauguration in 2009, the administration has issued more than 468,500 pages of regulations in the Federal Register including 70,066 pages in 2014.

(3) The National Association of Manufacturers estimates the total cost of regulations is as high as \$2.03 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated more than \$494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional \$87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111-203) has resulted in more than \$32 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 63 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing \$24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an \$8 billion cost burden on the States.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In June 2014, the EPA proposed a rule to cut carbon pollution from the Nation's power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly 40 percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto prohibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by the energy market analysis group Energy Ventures Analysis Inc. estimates the average energy bill in West Virginia will rise \$750 per household by 2020, due in part to EPA regulations. West Virginia receives 95 percent of its electricity from coal.

(10) The Heritage Foundation found that a phase-out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of \$2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by \$1,200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) promotes economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) requires the implementation of a regulatory budget to be allocated amongst Government agencies, which would require congressional approval and limit the maximum costs of regulations in a given year;

(3) requires congressional approval of all new major regulations (those with an impact of \$100 million or more) before enactment as opposed to current law in which Congress must expressly disapprove of regulation to prevent it from becoming law, which would keep Congress engaged as to pending regulatory policy and prevent costly and unsound policies from being implemented and becoming effective;

(4) requires a three year retrospective cost-benefit analysis of all new major regulations, to ensure that regulations operate as intended;

(5) reinforces the requirement of regulatory impact analysis for regulations proposed by executive branch agencies but also expands the requirement to independent agencies so that by law they consider the costs and benefits of proposed regulations rather than merely being encouraged to do so as is current practice; and

(6) requires a formal rulemaking process for all major regulations, which would increase transparency over the process and allow interested parties to communicate their views on proposed legislation to agency officials.

#### **SEC. 811. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) Roughly 20 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the past decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2004-2005 Academic Year and the 2014-2015 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees at public 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees at private nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.2 percent per year above the rate of inflation.

(4) Federal financial aid for higher education has also seen a dramatic increase. The portion of the Federal student aid portfolio composed of Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Perkins Loans with outstanding balances grew by 119 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2014.

(5) This spending has failed to make college more affordable.

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted: “We can’t just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we’ll run out of money”.

(7) American students are chasing ever-increasing tuition with ever-increasing debt. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student debt now stands at nearly \$1.2 trillion. This makes student loans the second largest balance of consumer debt, after mortgage debt.

(8) Students are carrying large debt loads and too many fail to complete college or end up defaulting on these loans due to their debt burden and a weak economy and job market.

(9) Based on estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, the Pell Grant Program will face a fiscal shortfall beginning in fiscal year 2017 and continuing in each subsequent year in the current budget window.

(10) Failing to address these problems will jeopardize access and affordability to higher education for America’s young people.

(b) **POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the root drivers of tuition inflation, by—

(1) targeting Federal financial aid to those most in need;

(2) streamlining programs that provide aid to make them more effective;

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at \$5,775 in each year of the budget window; and

(4) removing regulatory barriers in higher education that act to restrict flexibility and innovative teaching, particularly as it relates to non-traditional models such as online coursework and competency-based learning.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(3) The House Education and Workforce Committee successfully consolidated 15 job training programs in the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs; and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

#### **SEC. 812. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care and benefits.

(2) In 2014, reports started breaking across the Nation that VA medical centers were manipulating wait-list documents to hide long delays veterans were facing to receive health care. The VA hospital scandal led to the immediate resignation of then-Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric K. Shinseki.

(3) In 2015, for the first time ever, VA health care was added to the “high-risk” list of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), due to management and oversight failures that have directly resulted in risks to the timeliness, cost-effectiveness, and quality of health care.

(4) In response to the scandal, the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs held several oversight hearings and ultimately enacted the Veterans’ Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (VACAA) (Public Law 113-146) to address these problems. VACAA provided \$15 billion in emergency resources to fund internal health care needs within the department and provided veterans enhanced access to private-sector health care under the new Veterans Choice Program.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—This budget supports the continued oversight efforts by the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to ensure the VA is not only transparent and accountable, but also successful in achieving its goals in providing timely health care and benefits to America’s veterans. The Budget Committee will continue to closely monitor the VA’s progress to ensure resources provided by Congress are sufficient and efficiently used to provide needed benefits and services to veterans.

#### **SEC. 813. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Given the thousands of Federal programs and trillions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year, assessing and accounting for Federal fiscal activities and liabilities is a complex undertaking.

(2) Current methods of accounting leave much to be desired in capturing the full scope of government and in presenting information in a clear and compelling way that illuminates the best options going forward.

(3) Most fiscal analysis produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is conducted over a relatively short time horizon: 10 or 25 years. While this time frame is useful for most purposes, it fails to consider the fiscal consequences over the longer term.

(4) Additionally, current accounting methodology does not provide an analysis of how the Federal Government’s fiscal situation over the long run affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(5) Another consideration is how Federal programs should be accounted for. The “accrual method” of accounting records revenue when it is earned and expenses when they are incurred, while the “cash method” records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received.

(6) The Federal budget accounts for most programs using cash accounting. Some programs, however, particularly loan and loan guarantee programs, are accounted for using accrual methods.

(7) GAO has indicated that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimation of the Federal Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs specifically those that provide some form of insurance.

(8) Where accrual accounting is used, it is almost exclusively calculated by CBO according to the methodology outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA). CBO uses fair value methodology instead of FCRA to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example.

(9) FCRA methodology, however, understates the risk and thus the true cost of Federal programs. An alternative is fair value methodology, which uses discount rates that incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length.

(10) The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of federal assistance" than the current approach under FCRA.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the public affected by Federal budgetary choices, adopt Governmentwide reforms of budget and accounting practices so the American people and their representatives can more readily understand the fiscal situation of the Government of the United States and the options best suited to improving it. Such reforms may include but should not be limited to the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance our current analysis by considering our fiscal situation comprehensively, over an extended time horizon, and as it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair value accounting as opposed to the current approach under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

**SEC. 814. POLICY STATEMENT ON SCOREKEEPING FOR OUTYEAR BUDGETARY EFFECTS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Committee on the Budget to provide an allocation of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations for the budget year covered by a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations covers a period of one fiscal year only, which is effective for the budget year.

(3) An appropriation Act, joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon may contain changes to programs that result in direct budgetary effects that occur beyond the budget year and beyond the period for which the allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget is effective.

(4) The allocation of budgetary resources provided to the Committee on Appropriations does not currently anticipate or capture direct outyear budgetary effects to programs.

(5) Budget enforcement could be improved by capturing the direct outyear budgetary

effects caused by appropriation Acts and using this information to determine the appropriate allocations of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations when considering future concurrent resolutions on the budget.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of the House of Representatives to more effectively allocate budgetary resources and accurately enforce budget targets by agreeing to a procedure by which the Committee on the Budget should consider the direct out-year budgetary effects of changes to mandatory programs enacted in appropriations bills, joint resolutions, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon when setting the allocation of budgetary resources for the Committee on Appropriations in a concurrent resolution on the budget. The relevant committees of jurisdiction are directed to consult on a procedure during fiscal year 2016 and include recommendations for implementing such procedure in the fiscal year 2017 concurrent resolution on the budget.

**SEC. 815. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could "lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings."

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) two hundred nine Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of \$3 billion annually;

(B) two hundred separate Department of Justice crime prevention and victim services grant programs with an annual cost of \$3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) twenty different Federal entities administer 160 housing programs and other forms of Federal assistance for housing with a total cost of \$170 billion in 2010;

(D) seventeen separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent \$37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) fourteen grant and loan programs, and three tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) ninety-four different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage "green building" in the private sector; and

(G) twenty-three agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly \$15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends more than \$80 billion each year for approximately 1,400 information technology investments. GAO has identified broad acquisition failures, waste, and unnecessary duplication in the Government's information technology infrastructure. experts have estimated that eliminating these problems could save 25 percent or \$20 billion.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate more than \$50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$106 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2013.

(7) Under clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in \$693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(9) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) **POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules. If the strictures of the rules are deemed to be too rapid in prohibiting spending on unauthorized programs, then milder measures should be adopted and enforced until a return to the full prohibition of clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

**SEC. 816. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold \$844 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2015.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending previously made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an Act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Congressional committees should through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of



the Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) **DEFICIT REDUCTION.**—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

**SEC. 817. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$525 billion in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

**SEC. 818. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is \$188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—It is the policy of this resolution that:

(1) The House of Representatives must be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources and therefore must identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members and committees of the House, and should identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room.

(2) No taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

**SEC. 819. POLICY STATEMENT ON "NO BUDGET, NO PAY".**

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and should place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

**SEC. 820. POLICY STATEMENT ON NATIONAL SECURITY FUNDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Russian aggression, the growing threats of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in the Middle East, North Korean and Iranian nuclear and missile programs, and continued Chinese investments in high-end military capabilities and cyber warfare shape the parameters of an increasingly complex and challenging security environment.

(2) All four current service chiefs testified that the National Military Strategy could not be executed at sequestration levels.

(3) The independent and bipartisan National Defense Panel conducted risk assessments of force structure changes triggered by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and concluded that in addition to previous cuts to defense dating back to 2009, the sequestration of defense discretionary spending has "caused significant shortfalls in U.S. military readiness and both present and future capabilities".

(4) The President's fiscal year 2016 budget irresponsibly ignores current law and requests a defense budget \$38 billion above the caps for rhetorical gain. By creating an expectation of spending without a plan to avoid the BCA's guaranteed sequester upon breaching of its caps, the White House's proposal compounds the fiscal uncertainty that has affected the military's ability to adequately plan for future contingencies and make investments crucial for the Nation's defense.

(5) The President's budget proposes \$1.8 trillion in tax increases, in addition to the \$1.7 trillion in tax hikes the Administration has already imposed. The President's tax increases would further burden economic growth and is not a realistic source for offsets to fund defense sequester replacement.

(b) **POLICY ON FISCAL YEAR 2016 NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNDING.**—In fiscal year 2015, the House-passed budget resolution anticipated \$566 billion for national defense in the discretionary base budget for fiscal year 2016. With no necessary statutory change yet provided by Congress, the BCA statute would require limiting national defense discretionary base funding to \$523 billion in fiscal year 2016. However, in total with \$90 billion, the House Budget estimate for Overseas Contingency Operations funding for the Department of Defense, the fiscal year 2016 budget provides over \$613 billion total for defense spending that is higher than the President's budget request for the fiscal year. This concurrent resolution provides \$22 billion above the President's Five Year Defense Plan and \$151

billion above the 10-year totals. This would also be \$387 billion above the 10-year total for current levels.

(c) **DEFENSE READINESS AND MODERNIZATION FUND.**—(1) The budget resolution recognizes the need to ensure robust funding for national defense while maintaining overall fiscal discipline. The budget resolution prioritizes our national defense and the needs of the warfighter by providing needed dollars through the creation of the "Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund".

(2) The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund provides the mechanism for Congress to responsibly allocate in a deficit-neutral way the resources the military needs to secure the safety and liberty of United States citizens from threats at home and abroad. The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund will provide the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House the ability to increase allocations to support legislation that would provide for the Department of Defense warfighting capabilities, modernization, a temporary increase in end strength, training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, activities to reach full auditability of the Department of Defense's financial statements, and implementation of military and compensation reforms.

(d) **SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.**—This concurrent resolution encourages an immediate reevaluation of Federal Government priorities to maintain the strength of America's national security posture. In identifying policies to restructure and stabilize the Government's major entitlement programs which, along with net interest, will consume all Federal revenue in less than 20 years. The budget also charts a course that can ensure the availability of needed national security resources.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-49.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

If more than one such amendment is adopted, then only the one receiving the greater number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted.

In the case of a tie for the greater number of affirmative votes, then only the last amendment to receive that number of affirmative votes shall be considered as finally adopted.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

□ 1330

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), I have an amendment at the desk, and I rise to offer an alternative budget on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.**

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015 and for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

**TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING**

Sec. 201. Direct spending.

**TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT**

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance appropriations.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2025:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,397,906,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$3,011,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,363,689,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,484,023,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,611,419,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,764,354,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,936,524,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,113,414,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,305,297,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,511,276,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,723,308,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: -\$29,871,00,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$340,098,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$611,103,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$639,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$656,337,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$686,652,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$722,007,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$760,933,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$794,669,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$836,409,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$868,535,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$3,364,224,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016: \$3,700,423,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,671,036,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,715,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,879,230,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$4,055,790,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$4,200,058,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,434,308,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$4,575,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$4,705,499,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,935,827,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$3,307,153,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,688,702,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,630,273,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,676,002,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,851,980,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$4,012,330,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$4,165,094,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,401,070,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$4,524,231,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$4,636,441,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,881,361,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: -\$909,247,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: -\$677,102,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: -\$266,584,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: -\$191,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: -\$240,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: -\$247,976,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: -\$228,570,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: -\$287,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: -\$218,934,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: -\$125,165,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: -\$158,053,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The budgetary levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$18,874,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$20,193,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$20,607,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$21,061,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$21,522,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$21,964,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$22,442,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$22,872,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$23,231,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$23,610,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$13,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$14,503,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$14,827,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$15,421,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$15,785,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$16,156,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$16,613,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$17,039,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$17,411,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$17,867,000,000.

**SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority \$596,720,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$590,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$540,897,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$570,644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$550,795,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$555,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$560,791,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$552,067,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$571,839,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$562,468,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$586,141,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$573,944,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$600,467,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$586,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$615,501,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$605,662,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$630,886,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$615,621,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$648,903,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$627,135,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$647,739,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority \$64,111,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$54,445,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$58,607,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$58,004,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,812,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,796,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,354,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,995,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,785,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,073,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,155,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,905,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,489,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,595,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,282,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,741,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,136,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$64,267,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,014,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$65,907,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority \$33,555,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,588,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$37,823,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,918,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,364,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,711,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,815,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,677,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,547,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,054,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,282,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,588,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,048,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,159,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,156,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,309,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$43,225,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,477,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,349,000,000.  
(4) Energy (270):  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority \$13,057,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$9,783,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$19,255,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,944,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,526,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,945,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,929,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,982,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,414,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,166,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,494,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,771,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,596,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,852,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,698,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,879,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,511,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,382,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,331,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,151,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,185,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,978,000,000.  
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority \$40,203,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,149,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$45,346,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,322,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,757,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$48,914,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,001,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,788,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,904,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,699,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$50,582,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$50,736,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$51,124,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,328,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$52,129,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$52,147,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,509,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,412,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,023,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$54,171,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,690,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$55,718,000,000.  
(6) Agriculture (350):  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority \$20,856,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,038,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$19,874,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,785,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,441,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,332,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,444,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,695,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,083,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,257,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,090,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,512,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,536,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,994,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,415,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,860,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,062,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,505,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,142,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,558,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,462,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,934,000,000.  
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority -\$13,573,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$27,482,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$22,596,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$6,784,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,213,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$6,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,423,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,032,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,653,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$907,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,632,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,269,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,396,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$6,513,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,413,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$5,735,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,809,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,738,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,651,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,205,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,536,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$3,995,000,000.  
(8) Transportation (400):  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority \$160,537,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$164,218,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$201,058,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$205,978,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$171,812,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$177,425,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$172,680,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$177,406,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$163,577,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$168,774,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$159,506,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$165,356,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$150,440,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$156,858,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$152,880,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$159,980,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$155,363,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$163,113,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$157,903,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$166,022,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$160,484,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$169,482,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority \$21,665,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,322,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$19,549,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,333,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,631,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,763,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,963,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,471,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,029,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,094,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,120,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,152,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,116,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,773,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,129,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,473,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,530,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,273,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,008,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,686,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,534,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$22,108,000,000.  
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority \$272,498,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$272,495,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$328,498,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$323,907,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$200,312,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$195,293,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$173,602,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$171,432,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$168,570,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$167,804,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$173,767,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$172,246,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$177,659,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$176,414,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$181,815,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$179,952,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$186,704,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$184,267,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$190,822,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$188,075,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$194,350,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$191,490,000,000.  
(11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2015:  
(A) New budget authority \$495,569,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$486,108,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$534,967,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$541,531,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$585,819,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$585,963,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$609,092,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$610,103,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$632,934,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$634,452,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$666,788,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$657,365,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$690,145,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$690,026,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$726,916,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$726,254,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$763,443,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$762,573,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$802,035,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$801,277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$840,653,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$839,972,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority \$542,269,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$541,942,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$581,875,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$580,231,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$581,353,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$581,261,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$589,432,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$589,302,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$656,196,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$655,941,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$700,224,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$700,013,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$748,937,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$748,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$843,411,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$843,073,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$864,642,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$863,476,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$876,647,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$875,217,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$972,674,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$977,111,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority \$614,473,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$602,805,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$664,717,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$654,441,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$670,301,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$655,937,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$648,386,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$636,318,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$661,408,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$656,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$684,016,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$677,559,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$703,622,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$697,277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$728,814,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$727,605,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$747,206,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$740,590,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$768,296,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$755,384,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$795,550,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$787,126,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority \$31,554,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$31,621,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$33,885,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$33,928,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$36,563,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$39,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority \$160,579,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$159,625,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$181,292,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$182,078,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$184,608,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$184,426,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$180,332,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$179,790,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$189,726,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$189,769,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$194,649,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$193,880,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$198,924,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$197,982,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$211,288,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$210,116,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$208,612,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$207,036,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$206,159,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$204,371,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$220,777,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$218,909,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority \$59,793,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$56,048,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$77,732,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$59,566,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$69,470,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$61,795,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$67,904,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$61,498,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$68,310,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$64,295,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$70,010,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$65,460,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$71,895,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$65,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$74,399,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$66,997,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$76,600,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$68,698,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$78,856,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$70,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$84,772,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$75,860,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority \$24,945,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$24,831,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$25,248,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$24,908,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,566,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$25,282,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,307,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$25,939,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,072,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$26,534,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(B) Outlays, \$645,267,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$682,266,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$682,266,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$716,017,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$716,017,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$742,865,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$742,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$760,812,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$760,812,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority \$5,709,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,719,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$7,967,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,849,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,181,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$838,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,881,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, -\$2,043,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$398,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, -\$7,633,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$4,727,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$10,868,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$7,855,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$13,111,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$11,070,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, -\$13,541,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$12,146,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, -\$12,881,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$12,413,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$13,641,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$13,025,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority -\$106,825,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$106,825,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority -\$78,012,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$78,012,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, -\$88,445,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$88,445,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, -\$93,810,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$93,810,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, -\$90,497,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$90,497,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, -\$89,327,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$89,327,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$92,978,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$92,978,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$95,188,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$95,188,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, -\$97,408,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$97,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, -\$102,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$102,090,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$105,007,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$105,007,000,000.

## TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

### SEC. 201. DIRECT SPENDING.

#### (a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.1 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget implements a new tax credit to reward Americans for their hard work. This policy would provide a refundable tax credit for two years for up to \$800 for working individuals earning less than \$95,000 and up to \$1200 for households earning less than \$190,000. Modeled off the Making Work Pay tax credit, this targeted tax credit would immediately raise disposable income for low and middle-income families.

(B) The People's Budget adopts President Obama's Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to expand eligibility, including for childless workers. Continues enhanced credits originally implemented under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to target those most in need. This includes extending the Child and Dependent Care Credit and the American Opportunity Tax Credit through 2024.

(C) The People's Budget includes the President's proposal to boost the Child Tax Credit maximum deduction to \$3,000. It makes key expansions permanent to protect 50 million Americans who would otherwise be at jeopardy for losing part or all of their EITC or CTC.

(D) The People's Budget creates a debt free college that provides Federal matching program to supports state efforts to expand investments in higher education, bring down costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt. The program would encourage innovation by states and colleges to improve efficiency and enable speedy and less-costly degree completion. By treating higher education as a public good worth investing in, we can once again make higher education accessible to all.

(E) The People's Budget allows students refinance their student loans at low rates and allows private borrowers to shift to more affordable government loans. Allowing student borrowers to reduce the value of their debt will free up income for purchases and will create a job-creating ripple effect throughout the entire economy.

(F) The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The vast majority of SNAP recipients are households with children, seniors and individuals with disabilities, but recent cuts lowered average benefits by \$216 in 2014. Providing families with basic food security through SNAP is one of the most effective ways the Federal Government can stimulate the economy.

(G) The People's Budget provides an additional \$10 billion for child nutrition programs including program expansion and improvements for summer meals; essential improvements and expansion funding for pre-school nutrition including increases in meal

reimbursements to fulfill the new meal pattern, an additional meal or snack for children in long-term care, and expanded program eligibility; and investments in school meals and school kitchens.

(H) The People's Budget replaces the 40 percent excise tax with a public option to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to offer a public insurance option within the health insurance marketplaces. This ensures choice, competition, and stability in coverage. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the premium costs for Americans under the public option will be 7 to 8 percent lower than costs in private exchange plans. The repeal of the excise tax costs \$87 billion while savings from the public option are \$218 billion.

(I) The People's Budget continues funding for the entire CHIP program until 2019.

(J) The People's Budget protects States programs by fully retaining maintenance of effort requirements and eliminating any States ability to arbitrarily implement enrollment caps. Without action, Federal funding for CHIP will expire jeopardizing the health care coverage of more than 10 million children and pregnant women.

(K) The People's Budget permits the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers. Giving HHS the ability to negotiate prices, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, will save Medicare \$157 billion and will reduce costs for seniors.

#### (b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For non means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2015 is 5.4 percent.

(2) For non means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2014 is 5.5 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for non means-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits in high-unemployment states for up to two years. According to the Economic Policy Institute, this would boost real GDP growth by 0.4 percentage points and increase employment by 539,000 jobs in 2015.

(B) The People's Budget also adopts President Obama's reforms to improve system solvencies and incentivize job training.

(C) The People's Budget includes funding to replace SGR with a payment system that focuses on equity for primary care and protections for low-income beneficiaries. The budget pays for the reform through added overall revenues, which does not require cost to be passed to Medicare beneficiaries in any form.

(D) The People's Budget improves the Affordable Care Act by repealing the excise tax on high-priced health plans. Proponents of the provision hoped that this tax would slow the rate of growth of health costs, while raising revenue. However, in an effort to avoid the tax, employers who traditionally offer excellent benefits have started offering less generous plans. This is an ineffective tool to bend the cost curve. Since the tax is attached to premiums instead of coverage it has the potential to hit plans it wasn't intended to impact.

(E) The People's Budget establishes a representative democracy that truly reflects the diversity and values of our nation by

providing funding for the public financing of campaigns. This gives a voice to small donors that have been drowned out by dark money. Public financing keeps politicians accountable to the voters that elect them instead of to special interest money. In the era of the devastating Citizens United decision, big money has taken the reins of our election process. It is now more important than ever to provide candidates with effective alternatives to finance their campaigns.

(F) The People's Budget uses the Experimental Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to calculate Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) for Federal retirement programs other than Social Security. Affected programs include civil service retirement, military retirement, Supplemental Security Income, veteran's pensions and compensations. CPI-E is the most sensible and accurate measure of the real costs that seniors face in retirement, current underpricing of costs amount to cutting benefits for those on fixed incomes.

(G) The People's Budget makes a down payment of \$820 billion to help close the nation's infrastructure deficit while protecting against climate change and creating millions of living wage jobs. The budget also helps boost private financing for critical state and local projects by creating a public-private infrastructure bank. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) estimates that the United States will need to invest upwards of \$1 trillion above current levels over the next decade just to make required repairs to roads, bridges, water, and energy systems.

#### TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

##### SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided for all programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2016 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2016.

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015 and fiscal years 2017 through 2025."

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to stand while using this visual aid so that I can show clearly that the people's budget—the people's budget which we will enter today and will have debate on right now—is the right budget for the American people because it puts the American people first.

The people's budget has it firmly in mind, "We, the people"; and so when we think about how we should pull together a plan for the Nation's spending and the Nation's receipts, revenue, and how we plan out what we are going to spend money on, this people's budget is the thing.

Let me start just by talking about where we are now and how we must respond to the American people's needs.

Corporations are pocketing record profits by driving down wages with one hand and increasing the cost of building basic building blocks of a happy life on the other. Where does that leave working families? Huddled around a dinner table with their paychecks, doing the math in their head, wondering if they can make ends meet this month.

This shows, clearly, median income for all families down 8 percent between 2000 and 2012; price of rent is up; medical care is up; child care is up; higher education is way up.

The people's budget responds directly to the needs of the American people, first, by putting forth the most important thing and what we believe is the most important metric and measurement of any budget: How many jobs do you create? The people's budget creates 8.4 million jobs and raises wages by: investing \$820 billion in infrastructure and rebuilding our Nation's roads and bridges and our broadband and things like that; providing aid to States to help local governments rehire teachers, firefighters, police officers; supporting a minimum wage increase and increasing funding for worker protection agencies to enforce wage laws; and, finally, funding student loan programs that help businesses grow.

The people's budget brings down the cost for the building blocks of the American Dream. At a time when too many young people are getting priced out of a college education situation, our budget offers debt-free college for all; and for students who are already paying back their student loans, we offer affordable loan refinancing.

To reduce health care costs, the people's budget removes the 40 percent excise tax on high-cost health care plans and provides for a public option for consumers. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that a public option would offer premiums that are 7 to 8 percent lower than those offered by private plans.

To help parents take care of their children, our budget expands family tax credits and develops a fund to provide eligible low-income families with access to health care.

At the bottom line, Madam Chair, is this: the richest nation in the history of the world at what may well be argued its richest point in its history should be a place where working people can look forward to an American Dream, where they don't have to huddle

around the table at the end of the week and wonder if they are going to make it. So we offer the people's budget.

Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), my cochair.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank Mr. ELLISON for yielding me the time.

Madam Chair, in support of the people's budget, let me simply say, this budget places this Nation's greatest resource, its people, as the priority. It places value on the needs and hopes of regular working people in this country and the middle class, those aspiring to the middle class who are wanting to leave poverty and low-wage jobs behind.

You are going to hear from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle what a terrible scourge our people's budget is on raising taxes and spending, but our budget provides to the American people some very distinct and necessary support: jobs, it creates jobs; security in retirement and in difficult times for the American people; fair wages for a fair day's work; investments in our collective future: education, environment, children, and job training for the future; income stability and ending income inequality. Those are the priorities within the budget that reflect the needs of the American people. We offer opportunity to Americans who strive for a better life in this budget.

Republicans are clearly angry that we are ending the special treatment of Wall Street buddies. Meanwhile, they have no problem at ending tax credits for low- and middle-income families. Among the few specific tax proposals in the House Republican budget is a promise to spend hundreds of billions on high-income and corporate tax cuts. The trickle down has not trickled, and we continue that process.

Republicans are saying they are seeking to balance the budget. They are balancing this budget on the backs of the middle class, while cutting taxes for the wealthy and well connected, and getting to balance through irresponsible budget gimmicks.

We close corporate loopholes. Off-shore tax havens on profits are eliminated. We have a progressive tax rate for income above \$1 million. Our budget is about the American people.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to commend our friends in the Progressive Caucus for bringing forward a budget. It is not necessarily an easy thing to do, and so we want to thank them for bringing their budget forward.

There aren't many times in Congress when we actually get to compare like

products to like products side by side, so I think it is important to compare exactly where this budget that is being proposed would take us. These are the three budgets that are going to be offered this afternoon by our friends on the other side of the aisle. The Progressive Caucus is the first one. So how does it compare to the budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, that we have offered for this Chamber?

First, taxes; their budget would increase taxes over \$7 trillion over the next 10 years. Spending? Spending increases \$9.3 trillion over our budget. Deficits? \$2.4 trillion increase over the next 10 years. Debt? \$2.8 trillion increase in debt over the Republican option, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. Defense; decreasing defense spending by \$529 billion. When does it get to balance? Never. Never gets to balance.

Actually, Madam Chair, it clearly is not the direction that the American people desire or the American people need. So we stand strongly in favor of A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the dean of the House of Representatives and my good friend.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chair, I stand up to cheer for the Ellison-Grijalva Progressive Caucus budget and what it stands for, and especially for the full employment bill that is woven inside this very spectacular budget.

With 20 million Americans unemployed or underemployed or have given up, we put a fraction of a percent of tax on Wall Street speculators and fees on big polluters to finance more than a trillion dollars in investments to repair our roads and bridges, upgrade energy systems, and prepare our young people to thrive as citizens and workers. This budget will create 8.4 million jobs by 2018.

I came to Congress a number of decades ago to fight for Dr. Martin Luther King's priorities: jobs, justice, and peace. The Progressive Caucus does it.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, for the fifth year in a row, the Republicans have put forth a budget that devastates nondefense spending and dismantles Medicare, Medicaid, CHIP, and aid to college stu-

dents. It gives a \$200,000 tax break to the wealthiest Americans while imposing a \$2,000 tax increase on working families. It abandons our critical national infrastructure and the jobs it could create. The Republican budget makes a clear choice: billionaires and corporations before working Americans and seniors.

The Progressive Caucus people's budget offers a clear alternative. This budget creates 8.4 million jobs through investments in infrastructure, worker training, and clean energy. It repeals the devastating sequester cuts and gives the 46½ million Americans living in poverty a path back to prosperity. This alternative budget puts an end to a system where CEOs pay a lower tax rate than their secretaries. It closes tax loopholes that allow corporations to avoid taxes on overseas profits and makes it harder for American businesses to set up shop in low-tax countries.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLISON. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. NADLER. It makes it harder for American businesses to set up shop in low-tax countries to lower their tax burden. It supports middle-class families through paid parental leave, childcare, and debt-free college. It proves that Congress can pass a budget that supports working families and seniors, builds an economy that creates jobs and restores faith in the American Dream.

I urge my colleagues to invest in this country and its people. Support the people's budget.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time both sides have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 7¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, even though I disagree heartily with the budgets advanced by the Progressive Caucus, they do an invaluable service to the budget debate by bringing into sharp relief two very different visions of governance advanced by the two parties.

The Progressive budget is sincere and bold. Unfortunately, it is also wrong. It would hike taxes by \$7 trillion over the next 10 years relative to the Republican budget, hike spending by \$9.3 trillion, and run up \$2.8 trillion more in debt than the Republican budget over 10 years.

Now, let's begin with a reality check here. Divide \$1 trillion into the number of families in this country. Every trillion dollars we throw around here is roughly \$8,000 taken from an average

family's earnings. Some of that they see as direct taxes; some of that they see as increased prices or depressed wages as businesses pass along their costs to consumers and employees; but ultimately it is paid by working Americans because that is where the bulk of our economy rests.

So \$3.8 trillion in increased taxes means roughly \$30,000 taken from the earnings of an average family over the next 10 years; \$2.8 trillion in increased debt means another \$22,000 of debt added to that family's obligations that they will have to pay in future taxes. We are told, well, don't worry, rich people will pay all those taxes. The problem is, there aren't enough rich people in the country to begin to make more than a dent in these numbers. It turns out, many of the so-called rich people aren't rich, and they aren't even people. They are struggling small businesses filing under subchapter S.

And remember this dirty little secret of finance: businesses do not pay business taxes. The only three possible ways a business tax can be paid is by consumers through higher prices, by employees through lower wages, and by investors through lower earnings. That is your 401(k) or your pension plan that we are talking about.

We are told, well, don't worry. We are using that money to create wealth and jobs. Well, the problem is government doesn't create wealth because government cannot inject a dollar into the economy until it has first taken that same dollar out of the economy. True, we see the job that government creates when it puts the dollar back in. What we don't see as clearly is the job that is lost when government first takes that dollar out of the economy.

□ 1345

We see those lost jobs in the lowest labor participation rate in nearly 40 years and in declining median incomes for working Americans.

Here is what government can do—and what the Progressive Democratic budget proposes. It can transfer jobs from the private sector to the public sector by taxing one and expanding the other. It can transfer jobs from one sector of the private market to the other by taxing one and subsidizing the other.

In fact, that is precisely the difference between Apple Computer and Solyndra. It is the difference between FedEx and the post office. It is the difference between the Reagan recovery and the Obama recovery. In fact, it has been estimated that if the Obama recovery had mirrored the Reagan recovery, millions more Americans would be working today, and family incomes would be thousands of dollars higher than they are today.

But, of course, Reagan diagnosed the problem very differently than this administration. You remember his famous words: In this great economic crisis, government is not the solution to



our problems—government is the problem.

He dramatically reduced the tax burden from 70 percent down to 28 percent. He reduced spending by 2 percent of GDP. He rolled back many of the regulatory burdens imposed on our economy. And the result was one of the most dramatic and prolonged economic expansions in our Nation's history.

And it wasn't just Reagan. We forget that after the 1994 congressional election, Bill Clinton realized his policies weren't working. He came here to this floor in his State of the Union Address and proclaimed the era of Big Government is over. And he made good on that promise. He reached across the aisle to work with the Republican Congress and together they accomplished some amazing things.

They reduced Federal spending by 4 percent of GDP. They approved what amounted to the biggest capital gains tax cut in American history. They dramatically reduced entitlement spending by—in Clinton's words—"ending welfare as we know it."

The result was the only four budget surpluses in the last half century and another period of prolonged economic expansion. And the percentage of children living in poverty dropped dramatically.

The budget reported by the House Budget Committee employs these principles that worked when Reagan and Clinton used them and worked when John F. Kennedy and Harry Truman and Warren Harding used them.

The Republican House budget gradually reduces spending as a percentage of GDP. It calls for a lower, flatter tax rate. It puts our Nation back on a course to a balanced budget. It saves Medicare from bankrupting and collapsing on an entire generation of Americans.

It takes us off the path of debt and doubt and despair that this administration has dogmatically followed and restores us to policies that have repeatedly brought prosperity to our Nation.

Government cannot create jobs, but it can create conditions where jobs multiply and prosper, or where they stagnate and disappear. That it can do very well. And we have very consistent experience with the policies that create these conditions.

Increase the burdens on the economy and the economy contracts. Lighten the burdens on the economy and it grows and prospers. That is what is out of control with this administration. No nation has ever taxed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

We know what works. We know what doesn't work. The House Budget Committee's Balanced Budget for a Stronger America follows principles that have time and again consistently and rapidly produced economic expansion and prosperity.

The Obama budget, the House Democrats' budget, and the Progressive budget before us now double down on failed policies that have bankrupted nations throughout recorded history.

That is the choice before us today, and we are running out of time to make it. Let's choose wisely.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. McDERMOTT) of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Chairman, the last speaker said there are two visions for this country, and there are. There is the Republican vision, that is, give more to the wealthy, and there is the Progressive vision of investing in the future so that all Americans can do well.

The Republicans would want you to believe that millionaires and billionaires have the same tax problems as folks on the bottom of the scale, the hard-working Americans who are trying to make a living. But that is not the case.

While the Republican budget gives tax breaks to the wealthy and corporations, the CPC budget boosts and permanently extends the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit, which makes stronger working families.

The second thing the CPC budget does, and this is even more for the future, it takes on the issue of student debt, which is a crisis in this country.

We have \$1.3 trillion of debt wrapped around the necks of our children. Every student and parent knows that the cost of a college education is going up. Millions of students are stuck with loans at high interest rates of 10 percent or larger.

Rather than a Republican budget that keeps students and families indentured to Wall Street banks and the Federal student loan program, our alternative allows students to refinance their loan.

You can refinance your house. Why can't the millions of students in this country refinance their student loans to get a lower rate? It is because the Republicans are tied to the banks and won't let it happen.

Now, if the Republicans had their way, students would continue to choose between paying the rent and paying their student loan debt. That is where kids are today. They are paying more to the banks on their loans than they pay for their rent.

That is not the America I want. It is not the America anybody in this country really wants, except a very few people that the Republicans represent.

I urge you to vote "yes" on the Progressive budget.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Member from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Chairman, I would just make the point that as we have this debate on the so-called Progressive budget versus the House budget, that in fact it is Chairman PRICE's committee budget that is indeed the progressive budget. And I say that for this reason. If you stop and think about this notion of being progressive, it is to yield to innovation, to change to flexibility in one's own choice in the way that one does something. And I don't think that there is anything more sacred in that regard than the way that one spends one's own money.

If we were to go with this alternative, what we would see on the tax and spending side is going from 18 percent of GDP up to around 22 percent of GDP. Those are sort of amorphous numbers, but what does that equate to in 2025? It equates to about \$800 billion.

\$800 billion means that you could go and fund the State of South Carolina government 115 times. In other words, you could take that product, multiply it times 115. Think about what we spend on, for instance, transportation here at the Federal level. You could fund it 60 times.

It is a big number by any account. And fundamentally, it is a question of equity. Should 435 folks here in this Chamber decide how folks' money is spent, or should they decide how their money is spent?

I think it is also important because when you think about debt and deficit and interest payments, if we were to go with this alternative, what we are looking at is substantial increases on that front, so much so that I think that you are looking at the next generation that, to a degree, becomes an indentured servant to the Federal Government.

This isn't my thinking. If you go to the University of Boston, Laurence Kotlikoff has done a study on a thing called generational accounting. It says, What is the imputed cost for a child born in America in terms of tax and spending load? It is about 82 percent. That is 82 percent.

In fairness to Chairman PRICE, what he has done is try to stem that tide and moves us back in the direction so that people have more discretion on how they spend their money. And that is ultimately what is at play.

I would also say that it is progressive from the standpoint in the way that the House budget attempts to deal with entitlements.

Take, for instance, just the healthcare side. On Medicare, there is nothing crazier than trying to do the same thing over and over and expecting a different result because what all the actuaries have said is, if we continue on that road, we are going to see real shortfalls with regard to the Federal Government's ability to handle entitlements.

On ObamaCare, there is nothing progressive about forcing somebody to pay into a system that may or may not fit their needs. On the Medicaid level, there is nothing less progressive than not offering choices. Think about the diversity of the different States we have out there and how different the health care needs may be in South Carolina than the inner city of Los Angeles.

What Chairman PRICE's proposal does, is say: Let's give flexibility to different States so the Governors in those different States can look at what works best for them and their citizens.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 5¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), a member of the Budget Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. POCAN. I thank Mr. ELLISON for all his work with the Progressive Caucus.

Madam Chairman, I have got to tell you, I couldn't disagree more with the good Governor of South Carolina on the budget. To call the Republican Tea Party-infused budget progressive is like calling Velveeta a type of Wisconsin cheese. It just doesn't compare.

The Republican budget means Americans will work harder and earn less. It will be harder to buy a home, it will be harder to send your children to college, and harder to save for a secure retirement. It will do nothing to grow wages or help people get ahead. But it will do one thing for the people in the middle class. It will give you a \$2,000 tax increase so that the wealthiest in this country can get a tax break.

The Progressive Caucus budget is exactly the opposite. The people's budget boosts economic opportunity for more Americans and gives hard-working Americans a raise.

The Progressive Caucus Budget grows our economy and will create 8.4 million jobs by investing in the very things the economy needs most, things like infrastructure and teachers. It puts money into the pockets of workers so that you can get a raise and go out shopping or go to a movie and boost our economy and create jobs via that.

The Progressive budget puts our next generation on a better track by making college more affordable—even debt free—and more accessible for more people.

That is why I am supporting the people's budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, because it will grow your paycheck and create more jobs for hard-working Americans. I encourage my colleagues to join me in that support.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman

from California (Ms. LEE), former chairperson of the Progressive Caucus, the Black Caucus, and Appropriations Committee member.

Ms. LEE. Let me thank the gentleman for yielding, and also thanks to you and Congressman GRIJALVA for your tremendous leadership of the Progressive Caucus and for crafting this people's budget—which is a people's budget.

Today, millions of Americans are working hard and still struggling to make ends meet, and millions are working hard trying to find a job. Paychecks are shrinking while corporations reap record profits.

Instead of developing a budget to create jobs and help American families, the House Republican budget "balances" the budget once again on the backs of the most vulnerable to protect giveaways to special interests and the wealthy few.

The CPC's people's budget stands in stark contrast to the House Republican budget. This is a moral document. It reflects our values as a nation. It creates more than 8 million good-paying jobs. It includes a plan to lift more than 22 million Americans out of poverty over the next 10 years. It restores funding for SNAP and opens educational opportunity to all.

It ends the Pentagon's slush fund, known as the overseas contingency account, that for far too long has padded the wallets of defense contractors at taxpayer expense. It also tackles waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon by demanding audit readiness.

Make no mistake: the people's budget does what the House Republican budget does not. It works for American families, not special interests, defense contractors, or the 1 percent.

I urge my colleagues to do what is best for all American families, and that is support this amendment.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN), a freshman Member who is a very well-respected member of the Progressive Caucus.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Madam Chairman, I rise to urge support of the people's budget—the budget put forth by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. This budget is responsive to working people of this country who work hard every day and play by the rules in an attempt to accomplish the noble task of providing for their families in the midst of escalating costs and decreasing wages.

The people's budget recognizes that corporate profits are at their highest level in 85 years, but workers' wages are simultaneously at the lowest level in 65 years.

□ 1400

The Progressive budget was built with the working people of America in

mind. It is designed to allow working families to keep more of the money that they earn; access higher wages; and live healthy, productive lives by increasing access to health care and lowering taxes.

It recognizes it is not enough to fight against efforts to take from the middle class to give tax breaks to the rich. We must also fight for tax breaks for the middle class, expand family tax credits, fight for the cost-of-living increases for the retired, provide universal pre-K for children, and help students finance their student loans.

The people's budget makes real working people of this Nation its priority, and I would urge my colleagues to support this, the people's budget.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing us the time to talk about the people's budget. This is the budget that puts 8.4 million people back to work.

Early in this debate, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, Mr. PRICE, pulled up a chart, and he did a comparison between our budget and the Republican budget, but there was one category that I did not see on that chart, and that is: How many jobs do you create? How many jobs do you create?

This is the right number that we should be comparing budgets on, and I would say, for Americans all over this country looking for work, wanting to make a valuable contribution to themselves and their family, this is the right budget because this is the jobs budget, this is the good work budget, and this is the people's budget.

I would also like to give a big thanks to over 150,000 people who signed a petition in favor of the people's budget. Citizen activists know what is good for their government. They want the people's budget. The Economic Policy Institute, trained economists who have strict numbers and modeling, have come up to help us out, so the people's budget.

We urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my friend forgets the 8.4 million jobs that will be destroyed in the productive sector as government transfers those 8.4 million, through taxes, to the public sector.

I think the reason these times are so impassioned is because we have arrived at a moment when two very different visions of society are competing for our Nation's future, and they are very much reflected in the budgets put forward by the two parties in this House.

America's prosperity and greatness spring from uniquely American principles of individual freedom, personal responsibility, and constitutionally limited government.

America's Founders created a voluntary society where people are free to make their own decisions, enjoy the

fruit of their own labors, take responsibility for their own decisions, and lead their own lives with a minimum of government interference and intrusion.

When someone needs our help, we freely give that help, but we ask in return that they make the effort to support themselves to the extent they can. Our government views no one person or group as more or less worthy than any other.

We are Americans. We will be judged on our own merits, and we will make our own choices, including what kind of car we will drive or how we will raise our children or what kind of lightbulbs we prefer or what we will have for dinner.

Today, a very different vision competes with our future, that of a compulsory society, where our individual rights are subordinated to the mandates of government bureaucrats, where innocent taxpayers are forced to bail out the bad decisions of others, and where consumers are compelled to purchase products or underwrite the losses of politically favored companies.

Under this vision, the purpose of government is not to protect individual freedom, but it is to improve society however those in power decide that it should be improved, to take from those it declares are undeserving to give to those that it declares are deserving—or, to put it more succinctly, to take from each according to his abilities and to give to each according to his needs. That is what this is all about.

Not more than 100 steps from where we debate right now, Thomas Jefferson reviewed the bountiful resources of the Nation and asked:

With all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens, a wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread that it has earned. This is the sum of good government.

This is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America put forward by the House Budget Committee, and let us be clear, the various Democratic plans, including the one before us now, fundamentally reject these American principles and replace them with values that are alien and antithetical to those that built our Nation.

This is the question that our generation must decide in all of its forms, including the question put to us today by this substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) offered by the Congressional Progressive Caucus to H. Con. Res. 27, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016."

I support the CPC's ANS, "The People's Budget" because it fixes an economy that, for

too long, has failed to provide the opportunities American families need to get ahead.

Mr. Chair, if we reject the House Republicans' "Price Is Not Right" Budget with its discredited and unworkable economic gimmicks and unrealistic projections and adopt the CPC's People's Budget, here is what we can expect: 1. 8.4 million good paying jobs by 2018; 2. \$1.9 trillion investment in America's future; and 3. \$820 billion investment in infrastructure and transportation improvements.

The People's Budget will usher in a new era of broad-based and shared prosperity by: 1. repealing the draconian sequester and all Budget Control Act spending caps; 2. increasing discretionary funding to invest in working families; 3. reversing harmful cuts to social safety net; and 4. investing in veterans, women, and working families.

Under the People's Budget, millions of working families will see an increase in their purchasing power because the budget: 1. creates more than 8 million good jobs by 2018; 2. includes a four percent raise for federal workers; 3. provides for paid leave and child care; 4. supports an increase in the minimum wage increase and collective bargaining; and 5. fully funds programs to make housing affordable and accessible for all Americans.

Mr. Chair, Americans cannot reach their full potential if they lack educational opportunities, health security, or are saddled with crushing educational debts.

That is why the CPC's People's Budget invests in K-12 and provides free pre-school, and provides debt-free college to every student and refinancing of student loans on terms favorable to students trying to get ahead, not banks.

The CPC's People's Budget repeals the excise tax on high-priced workers plans, removes the prohibition barring CMS to negotiate lower prescription drug prices for Medicare recipients, and reauthorizes the Children's Health Insurance Program.

Mr. Chair, because the People's Budget is for all persons in our country, it adopts comprehensive immigration reform and welcomes the substantial economic benefits it will generate.

Everyone knows that our current outdated immigration laws have failed workers, families, businesses and increasingly, our nation's immigrants.

Employers are unable to hire the workers they need. Immigrant workers are exploited.

Families trying to reunite legally are separated for many years, and millions of individuals are forced to live in the shadows.

The People's Budget helps immigrants integrate into American society and participate in the economy by becoming entrepreneurs, small business owners, innovators and future job creators.

With comprehensive immigration reform, the federal budget deficit will be reduced by \$197 billion over the next decade and \$700 billion over the next 20 years according to a report by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Chair, I could go on at length explaining why the CPC's People's Budget is superior to the House Republican's "Worker Harder, Get Less" budget.

But let me conclude by noting that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not

enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards; the CPC's People's Budget does not.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the House Republicans' budget and voting for a better alternative, the CPC's People's Budget.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chair, I would like to submit a letter that was signed by over 4,800 faith leaders supporting the Congressional Progressive Caucus' alternative budget.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As clergy and faith leaders of many faiths, we urge you to support The People's Budget, introduced by the co-chairs of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressmen Keith Ellison and Raúl Grijalva. The Federal budget should reflect our values and shared priorities, and we believe that this proposal achieves that goal.

The teachings of our respective faiths are steeped in the understanding that we have a communal responsibility to care for the most vulnerable in society. Feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, ensuring that all workers receive a fair wage are not simply policy positions: they are sacred obligations.

The People's Budget would create desperately-needed, good paying jobs, repeal sequester and all Budget Control Act spending caps and end Corporate Inversions that allow U.S. companies to avoid paying taxes. The Budget's proposals invest in veterans, women, communities of color and their families and K-12 education. It expands the Earned Income Tax Credit and unemployment insurance and enhances the social safety net. It reauthorizes the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and implements comprehensive immigration reform, including a pathway to citizenship. In short, The People's Budget, if passed, would set our nation back on the path toward a fair and healthy economy.

These priorities were among those laid out by the Washington, DC Interfaith community in releasing our own Faithful Budget, which lays out how government spending could align with these moral priorities: <http://bit.ly/faithful-budget>. The "People's Budget" echoes many of the key proposals outlined in the Faithful Budget, so we're proud to support it. You can read more about the "People's Budget" here: <http://bit.ly/peoples-budget>.

Our government should serve all of its citizens. By bolstering the social safety net for those who most need it and prioritizing measures that reduce the growing inequality in our nation, The People's Budget does just that, and it deserves the support of Congress. We urge you to vote for it when it comes to the House Floor.

Thank you for your consideration.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Minnesota will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A  
SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an alternative budget on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE  
BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.**

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

Sec. 2. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 3. Major functional categories.

Sec. 4. Direct spending.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,885,946,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,001,837,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,122,928,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,262,675,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,412,112,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,570,317,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,739,136,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,923,276,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,117,015,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,321,625,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$209,444,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$226,261,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$253,208,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$280,546,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$305,165,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$323,097,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$346,345,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$369,052,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$393,236,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$415,719,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,491,530,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,462,637,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018: \$3,553,354,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,698,090,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,869,284,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$4,023,836,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,186,946,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,377,127,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,568,349,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,742,339,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,257,091,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017: \$3,452,451,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,568,341,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,707,443,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,848,991,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,990,253,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,163,913,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$4,336,870,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$4,513,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,700,933,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: -\$371,145,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: -\$450,614,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: -\$445,413,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: -\$444,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: -\$436,879,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: -\$419,936,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: -\$424,777,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: -\$413,594,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: -\$396,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: -\$379,308,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The budgetary levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,024,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$19,703,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$20,395,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$21,078,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$21,753,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$22,413,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$23,061,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$23,719,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$24,385,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$25,022,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,807,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$14,338,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$14,876,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$15,438,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$16,016,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$16,605,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$17,232,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$17,886,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$18,566,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$19,278,000,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$570,380,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$582,430,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$582,126,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$573,904,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$593,364,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$575,837,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$601,639,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$588,174,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$607,930,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$597,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$620,245,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$606,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$632,525,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$622,398,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$645,784,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$630,255,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$659,080,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$638,461,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$672,415,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$655,940,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,611,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$51,973,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,862,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,951,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,103,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,224,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,779,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,273,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,192,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,269,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,887,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$54,555,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$51,578,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,647,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$52,330,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,743,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$53,251,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,872,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$54,149,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,059,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,705,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,672,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,302,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,768,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,623,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,517,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,948,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,822,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,606,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,279,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,962,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,658,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,952,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,372,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,650,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,210,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,041,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,587,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,554,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,074,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,491,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,512,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,737,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,614,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,920,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,714,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,074,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,846,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,280,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,966,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,467,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,102,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,635,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,870,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,455,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,024,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,590,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,212,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,919,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,685,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,574,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,638,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,001,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,839,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,057,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,963,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,257,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,633,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,866,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,398,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,321,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,727,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,384,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,078,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,162,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,089,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,533,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,879,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,301,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,723,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,260,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,575,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,046,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,192,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,650,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,243,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,503,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,975,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,582,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,936,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,976,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$730,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,606,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,487,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,994,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,176,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,383,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,902,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,460,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,066,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,422,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,341,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,755,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,309,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,425,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,736,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$245,892,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$122,661,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,674,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$146,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$131,913,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$156,511,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$123,250,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$155,123,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$122,563,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$141,858,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,274,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$124,077,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$105,359,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$117,792,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$107,204,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$116,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$109,091,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$116,058,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$111,012,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$116,517,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,976,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,102,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,794,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,642,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,629,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,820,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,036,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,754,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,819,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,712,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,835,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,687,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,049,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,708,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,556,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,790,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,642,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,922,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,712,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$167,660,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$116,847,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$166,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$170,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$147,556,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$161,185,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$144,976,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$148,166,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$149,874,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$146,275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$147,897,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$149,495,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$152,965,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$149,868,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,609,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$153,664,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,238,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$157,731,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$159,178,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$160,116,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$523,793,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$534,537,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$567,859,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$571,527,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$592,821,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$594,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$618,482,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$619,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$650,054,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$640,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$669,658,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$669,578,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$703,692,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$702,828,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$736,968,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$736,533,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$772,527,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$772,045,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$808,904,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$808,818,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$597,870,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$578,208,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$582,723,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$582,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$592,008,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$591,924,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$659,492,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$659,296,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$705,139,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$704,988,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$755,603,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$755,441,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$853,270,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$852,997,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$876,724,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$875,621,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$891,991,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$890,628,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$989,930,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$994,440,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$552,562,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$542,072,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$562,214,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$553,285,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$565,415,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$554,225,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$578,484,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$574,423,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$591,965,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$586,272,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$605,932,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$599,737,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$626,224,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$625,034,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$637,171,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$631,084,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$648,928,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$636,719,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$671,986,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$664,262,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,885,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,928,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,563,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,424,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,445,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$178,175,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$177,617,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$177,070,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$179,863,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$173,734,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$173,836,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$182,946,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$183,353,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$187,113,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$186,926,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$190,682,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$190,233,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$202,554,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$201,895,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$198,729,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$197,995,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$195,068,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$194,255,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$208,439,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$207,621,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,250,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,064,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,731,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,147,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,804,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,595,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,227,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,039,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,656,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,043,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$63,787,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,359,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,489,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,777,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,525,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,622,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$67,581,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$67,525,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,547,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$72,319,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,301,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,743,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,432,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,122,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,244,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,463,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,966,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,318,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,683,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,130,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,267,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,679,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,835,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,245,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,396,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,795,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,729,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,155,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$35,308,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$368,027,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$368,027,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$421,270,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$421,270,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$495,009,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$495,009,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$560,645,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$560,645,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$620,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$620,300,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$666,257,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$666,257,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$712,670,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$712,670,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$756,488,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$756,488,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$794,483,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$794,483,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$824,027,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$824,027,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$36,770,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$36,776,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$20,241,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$9,339,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,161,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,429,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$6,425,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$5,314,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$10,498,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$7,449,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$165,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,458,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$52,229,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$52,706,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$5,072,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,647,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$78,623,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,180,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,333,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,313,000,000.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$78,016,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$78,016,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,445,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$88,445,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$93,810,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$93,810,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$90,497,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$90,497,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$89,327,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$89,327,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$92,987,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$92,987,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$95,188,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$95,188,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$97,408,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$97,408,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$102,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$102,090,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$105,007,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$105,007,000,000.  
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-  
al War on Terrorism (970):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,997,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,250,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,085,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$7,357,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$3,675,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,312,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$644,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$202,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,000,000.

#### SEC. 4. DIRECT SPENDING.

##### (a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 4.6 percent under current law.

(3) This concurrent resolution retains the social safety net that has lifted millions of Americans out of poverty and protects both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid from draconian spending cuts.

##### (b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 5.4 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-test direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 5.5 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health-care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals

of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare.

(B) Any savings derived from changes or reforms to Medicare and Social Security should be used to extend the solvency of these vital programs and not be used to offset the cost of cutting taxes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus has a long history of submitting fiscally sound and morally responsible budget alternatives that emphasize our commitment to eradicating poverty in America.

The budget, which is endorsed by groups such as the National Education Association, SEIU, AFSCME, Planned Parenthood, and PolicyLink, focuses on a fairer Tax Code, ending the sequestration battle, creating jobs, and eliminating poverty and reducing the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget is a plan that will work to protect and enhance the social safety net that continues to save millions from the ravages of poverty. Our goal is to increase economic opportunities for all Americans through significant and sustained investments in education and infrastructure, affordable housing, domestic manufacturing, small businesses, and job training.

We propose, Mr. Chairman, significant investments to further accelerate our economic recovery and ensure no community in America is left behind. Additionally, no other budget on Capitol Hill prioritizes the plight of voting rights enforcement into the Federal fiscal map or contemplates \$3 billion saved over 10 years by limiting mandatory minimum sentences for non-violent drug offenders.

Once again, the House Republican budget relies on partisan rhetoric and gimmicks instead of making the tough choices needed to invest in our Nation, grow our economy, and provide economic opportunities for hard-working Americans.

House Republicans' unrealistic and unworkable budget continues the sequester for domestic spending this year and cuts that spending drastically in future years, disinvesting in our Nation and asking the most vulnerable Americans to carry the burden of deficit reduction.

We cannot allow their budget to move forward on the backs of the American people. I request my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget, as it is a budget that reflects the priorities of our nation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Vir-

ginia (Mr. SCOTT), who really did the heavy lifting, along with Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congresswoman GWEN MOORE, in crafting our budget.

I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) be allowed to manage the time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I want to commend our friends in the CBC for coming forward with a budget. It is not an easy thing to do, having worked these last 10 or 11 weeks to try to fashion a budget that could be dealt with on the floor of the House.

I also want to just point out that this is one of the few opportunities that we have, as Congress, to look at a comparison of apples to apples, of similar work products with each other.

There are three budgets that will be offered by our friends on the other side. We have talked just now about the Progressive Caucus. In the middle is the CBC budget, the one that we are discussing right now.

I just want to highlight the differences between this budget, from a numerical standpoint, with the budget that has been offered by the Republican majority, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

In the area of taxes, what does the CBC budget do? Increases taxes by over \$3.2 trillion over the next 10 years. Spending? Increases spending by over \$7 trillion over the next 10 years, compared to the Republican budgets. Deficits? Increases deficits by over \$4 trillion over the next 10 years. Debt? Same, \$4 trillion added to the debt.

What do they spend on the defense of our Nation at these perilous times? Decreased spending on defense by \$314 billion.

The big question is: When does their budget ever get to balance? Because a balanced budget is what we need to get this economy rolling again. When does it ever get to balance? The answer is never.

It is a worthy endeavor that our friends in the CBC have undertaken; however, it is not right for the country and certainly doesn't stand up to the scrutiny of A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), and I ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to control the time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.



Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget.

A nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the Republican budget continues to highlight the wrong priorities. The underlying Republican budget is not a serious plan. It contains trillions of dollars in tax cuts, but claims to be revenue neutral, without showing a dime's worth of tax increases that will be necessary to make it revenue neutral.

It includes trillions of dollars in unspecified cuts, and many of the specified cuts will not be made. For example, are we really going to repeal Medicare as we know it?

If you actually believe that the Republican majority will carry out their plan, it would actually devastate our economy by balancing the budget on the backs of students, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities across the Nation.

The Republican budget assumes that sequestration cuts will be enacted and then adds an additional \$759 billion in nondefense discretionary spending cuts. That is the part of the budget that invests in education, workforce training, scientific research, transportation, and infrastructure.

In stark contrast to the Republican budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget actually puts real numbers on the page. We show our arithmetic. The CBC budget proposes \$2.7 trillion in additional revenue over the next decade, but our budget lays out \$5.6 trillion in specific revenue options and loophole closings that Congress could adopt to achieve that goal.

With this additional revenue, we eliminate sequestration; we propose a \$500 billion jobs package that will put millions of people back to work, and we include more than \$300 billion above the President's budget for significant and sustained investments in programs that have been instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

Our budget also calls for a raise in the minimum wage, adds a public option to the health insurance marketplace, and calls for the passage of comprehensive immigration reform. Factoring in the paid-for elimination of sequestration, our revenue enhancements, CBO's analysis of the deficit reduction impacts of both enacting a public option and comprehensive immigration reform, our budget credibly reduces the 10-year deficit by \$1.9 trillion when compared to CBO's March baseline.

Mr. Chairman, our budget is a credible alternative to the vague and unrealistic plan offered by our Republican colleagues, and I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in opposition to this substitute amendment.

Every day, I hear from my constituents in Tennessee who are still struggling to find work and make ends meet. This is the result of the slowest economic recovery in American history, and, in parts of my district, communities are still plagued by double-digit unemployment rates; yet this amendment would raise taxes on Americans by \$3.2 trillion. This would be on top of the \$1.6 trillion in new taxes already imposed under President Obama.

Raising taxes on small business is exactly the opposite of what is needed to reduce unemployment, get Americans back to work, and grow our economy.

Even with this \$3.2 trillion tax increase, which would be the largest in American history, this budget would never balance. In fact, compared to A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, this substitute amendment would add \$4 trillion to our debt over the next 10 years.

□ 1415

This is because this amendment would increase spending by \$7 trillion, compared to the House Republican budget. In fact, it increases spending for every category in the budget except for our national defense. This budget would take \$1 trillion of its proposed tax hikes and use all of this money to break the Budget Control Act spending caps for nondefense spending only. This is unacceptable.

At a time when we are faced with Russian aggression in the Ukraine, the threat of ISIS in the Middle East, and an increasingly unpredictable security environment, we need to adequately fund our servicemen and -women. That is why the House Republican budget would comply with the current spending caps in the law but still adds \$387 billion in defense spending over a 10-year window, all while balancing the budget without any tax increases.

Long before I served on the Budget Committee, I got a crash course on budgeting 101 as a single working mother. And in those years, I raised three children on a nurse's salary, teaching me how to live within my means and stretch my dollars.

Mr. Chair, I have had to work to make ends meet, so I know how important our social safety net is for those in need. I want to see this safety net strengthened and preserved for future generations.

However, this budget falls into the trap of measuring how much we care by how much we spend. Federal programs and initiatives should be evaluated based on their outcomes, by how many people we help get out of poverty, help to get back to work, and help to get the training and the education they need.

One example is our Federal job training program. In 2011, the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, issued a report that found 47 overlapping Federal job training programs, costing \$18 billion in 2009 alone. The report showed that this duplication was not serving workers that needed training and was not responsibly using Federal dollars. If we want to help workers who need training, there is a clear need to reform these programs to improve outcomes.

That is why last year, this House passed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. By the way, it was bipartisan legislation which was signed into law and made important reforms to Federal job training programs, better helping workers looking for a job while responsibly using taxpayer dollars. This substitute budget would take a step back from these reforms and simply spend an additional \$13 billion on these programs without any reform. Unfortunately, this is just one example of this substitute amendment doubling down on failed policies of the past.

Additionally, it would create a \$1 billion slush fund for a national stimulus program. Just like the previously failed stimulus program, this would do nothing to create new jobs and simply adds another \$100 billion to our debt, which our children and our grandchildren will have to pay.

It would also reverse bipartisan reforms made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, commonly called SNAP, and increase spending. If we want to protect those who are most in need, we need to find ways to reform the SNAP program.

The substitute amendment would go further than even ObamaCare has, calling for the creation of a public health insurance option, a backdoor way to nationalizing our health care system. This idea is so radical that when Democrats controlled both Chambers of Congress and the White House, it was not adopted. Health care should be patient-centered, allowing Americans to make decisions with their doctors and their families, not with the Federal Government.

Instead of doubling down on ObamaCare, House Republicans want to see greater choice, more affordability, increased quality, and innovation in health care, which is why our budget proposes a market-based, patient-centered reform.

We also will provide structural reforms to Medicare and Medicaid, which provide care to our Nation's seniors and those in need. The House Republican budget would make no changes for those who are near or currently in retirement, and provides States the flexibility to administer their Medicaid programs to meet the needs of the people in their own State.

Doing nothing to reform this unsustainable path that Medicare and

Medicaid are on, as this substitute amendment does, ensures that we will go bankrupt.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield myself 30 seconds before yielding to another speaker.

The case has been made that this budget raises taxes. Sure, it does. But the Republican budget also raises taxes.

They have cut the AMT. They have reduced the marginal rate. There are other tax extenders. And they say it is revenue-neutral. The only way you can make it revenue-neutral, Mr. Chair, is to raise taxes—trillions of dollars to make it revenue-neutral. They don't show a dime of taxes. The difference between that budget and ours is, we list specific options that could be used.

They also would repeal the Affordable Care Act, but they keep all the taxes that paid for it.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding, and I also thank him for his tremendous leadership in continuing to craft the Congressional Black Caucus' budget and also for his work as ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment and of the Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget. I want to, once again, commend Congressman BOBBY SCOTT for leading us to this point and for putting together a budget which really is a budget that reflects our values as a Nation.

As a member of the Budget and Appropriations Committees and as chair of our Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, I know that our national budget is a moral document and a statement of our national priorities. The budget that my Republican colleagues have put forward does nothing for families struggling to find a job or those living in poverty. Instead, it includes draconian cuts to programs which, over the last 50 years, cut poverty by one-third, thanks to the War on Poverty.

The Republican plan cuts the safety net while 45 million people still are living in poverty.

Mr. Chairman, poverty in the African American community is 27.2 percent. In the Latino community, it is 23.5 percent.

Our budget addresses this problem with the Half in Ten plan. By coordinating Federal programs and agencies under a national strategy, we will cut poverty by 50 percent in one decade. That is 22 million people lifted out of poverty in the next 10 years.

This budget outlines a clear package for eradicating poverty rather than

foolishly turning vital programs into block grants.

We expand food assistance for our children and seniors. We extend unemployment compensation for those still looking for work following the recent recession. We give America a raise and, thereby, boost our economy, because no one should be working and living in poverty.

With regard to the Pentagon, we require that we audit the Pentagon and encourage DOD to implement remaining GAO recommendations that would likely lead to tens of billions in cost savings by bringing a culture of financial accountability to the Pentagon.

As in the previous budgets, the CBC invests savings from cuts in the ballistic missile defense program to be used by the Defense Department to implement the remaining GAO recommendations.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Also, let me just say, our budget employs the 10-20-30 formula championed by our leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

By directing at least 10 percent of Federal spending into areas with poverty rates of more than 20 percent over the last 30 years, we will make progress toward ending entrenched and generational poverty that hurts families and communities.

A vote for the CBC budget really is a vote with the conscience of the Congress. It is a message to the American people that you stand with those who are working hard to find a job or working hard at a job with low wages. It is a message to the country that balancing the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable to keep giveaways to the superwealthy is unacceptable, and that is not the American way.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the best way to lift someone out of poverty is to give them an opportunity to have a job, and that is what A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America does. It does cut taxes, allowing for more job opportunities and an increase in wages for the workers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, could you advise us of the time remaining on both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 6¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I would like to engage the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) in a colloquy.

I was wondering if it were possible for the gentleman to yield the Congress-

sional Black Caucus maybe 4 to 6 minutes of his time. We have many speakers, and we have worked very hard on this budget. You know, the majority gets its way, but the minority ought to get its say.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentlelady yielding.

The gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) controls our time, and we do have another speaker or two. But as soon as your time expires and if we have time remaining, then we will be happy to yield some time to the CBC.

Ms. MOORE. Thank you so much for that courtesy.

Mr. Chair, it is really my privilege to discuss the social safety net programs that are at the heart of the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

The CBC acknowledges the efforts on the part of the majority to address debt and deficits, but we cannot do it on the backs of the poor.

Much has been made of jobs being the answer. We agree with that, but there are the disabled, elderly, and children who comprise the poor who cannot and do not work.

The Republican budget proposes \$759 billion in cuts to the nondefense discretionary budget below the already damaging sequester levels. That is in addition to the more than \$4 trillion in cuts to mandatory spending, a lifeline to benefits like food stamps, Medicaid, and Medicare.

The CBC budget offers Americans a choice. In stark contrast to the Republican budget, we invest in low-income families and students and provide security so that our impoverished, our infirm, and our elderly and children are treated with dignity and respect. It protects the social safety net.

It rejects the block granting of Medicaid and food stamps and voucherizing Medicare. It restores the TANF emergency contingency fund, rather than the \$34 billion OCO slush fund. We do \$2.5 billion rather than \$34 billion for a slush fund.

It also restores our emergency unemployment insurance for all Americans. Millions of Americans have exhausted these benefits. And it invests in so many other vital programs, such as WIC, LIHEAP, public housing, homeless assistance, Section 8 and rural housing programs, Social Services Block Grant, Child Care and Development Block Grant.

I want to thank the chair and my CBC colleagues for working with me on this very worthy budget. Please vote "yes" on this alternative budget.

Mrs. BLACK. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for diligently preparing this budget.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote for the CBC budget. Mr. Chair, the budget that we adopt will speak to our values as a Congress and our values as a country.

I am sad to say, Mr. Chair, that the Republican budget says that we are a country without values and lacking a conscience. The Republican budget makes severe cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, education, job training, and transportation so that it can fund tax cuts to the wealthy.

I want to be crystal clear. The Republican budget is a financial hocus pocus that will not put us on a path to financial stability.

□ 1430

However, Mr. Chairman, it is a certain path to a dire moral bankruptcy that is counter to the soul of our great country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, the CBC budget is a financially superior budget that invests in what makes this country exceptional. The CBC budget eradicates poverty by increasing economic opportunities through significant and sustained investments in education, infrastructure, affordable housing, manufacturing, small business, and job training.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side talk about the ability to lift people out of poverty. We have the ability today to lift 14 million people out of poverty simply by raising the minimum wage. If we create more minimum wage jobs, we are only increasing the number of people who will still live in poverty.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget rewards those who make political contributions, and the CBC budget rewards those who contribute to society and the greater good.

In closing, the CBC budget recognizes that working families in this country are getting shortchanged, so our budget tries to level the playing field and give more opportunities to those working families so that they can enjoy the economic prosperity that the investor class has enjoyed since our efforts to come out of the Great Recession.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), my fellow colleague of the Budget Committee and also fellow Tennessean.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Ms. MOORE. She is still on the floor and serves on the Budget Committee with us. She is such a good, productive, and contributory member of that committee. I appreciate the perspective that she brings, and I know that she has worked diligently on the budget that the CBC is bringing before us today.

I do not support that budget. I support the committee print that we have. Mr. Chairman, here is exactly why.

We all know Washington does not have a revenue problem; it has a spending problem. Last year, more revenues came into our Federal coffers than ever. It is always important, as we talk about the budget, to put in perspective where this money comes from. It comes from hard-working taxpayers, and the government has not one single penny to spend until a taxpayer sends that money in.

Now, the budget that we have brought out of committee does something quite significant. Number one, it will reduce Federal spending \$5.5 trillion over the next 10 years. That is an important thing to do, and here is why.

We are continuing to borrow somewhere around 30 cents for every dollar that we are spending. It is bouncing right now, I think, between 28 and 30 cents for every dollar. That is too much. It gets to be a fairness issue for future generations.

We have got \$18 trillion worth of debt, and \$9 trillion worth of that debt has come on our books in the past 6 years. That is not fair to future generations. It is not fair to our Nation's security.

Getting the debt under control is important. That is why a budget that saves \$5.5 trillion and comes to balance—comes to balance—for our annual outlays in 9 years is significantly important.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

You see, when we talk about what will be accomplished by our budget and we talk about fairness, it is imperative that the spending be brought under control. What we are bringing forward is a way for us to bring that into balance and to begin to get the agencies, even reducing the Federal workforce by 10 percent, making certain that we are rightsizing that workforce. Those are steps that should be taken. They are steps that we ought to be taking, and it is something that we all should support.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to offer my appreciation to Ranking Member SCOTT both for his service on the Education Committee as a ranking member, but also for his continuing efforts and work on a very, very positive step, great step, toward changing America.

There is a premise in the Republican budget, two premises or underlying thoughts that I vigorously disagree with. As I stand in explaining or supporting the Congressional Black Caucus budget, let me also say that I rise in support of the Congressional Pro-

gressive Caucus budget—and I will provide a statement into the Record—for its efforts in improving America.

But the premise of the budget of our friends on the other side of the aisle is that if you are poor, if you are in need of help, then it is either your fault or you are taking advantage of the government's charity and largess.

Walk a mile in the district that I represent—and many districts across America—and you will find parents who get up at 4 and 6 in the morning to jobs that are less than the minimum wage in some instances, or are the minimum wage, working very hard to support their families. Those individuals deserve an equal opportunity.

I am grateful that this budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget, talks about a comprehensive jobs program totaling some \$500 billion—a mere \$500 billion—over 3 years.

We understand that people want to work. This involves a national direct job creation program, a program to assist local government in hiring and retaining teachers and law enforcement, investing to rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, rebuilding neighborhoods, and, as well, understanding that you can't work harder and get less.

Mr. Chairman, one of the issues that I am very supportive of in this budget, one that others would not think of, is ending the Cradle to Prison Pipeline.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, in fact, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that limiting the imposition of mandatory minimum sentences on nonviolent drug offenders would have an overall net savings of \$3 billion over 10 years. This is a budget that goes to the heart of the concerns of Americans who may not have the right start in life but deserve an opportunity.

I want to be able to support a budget that, in essence, reduces the deficit and takes away sequestration, not piles taxes on persons who cannot afford them and creates very little jobs and undermines the social network that is necessary for those of us who believe we are, in fact, our brothers' and sisters' keeper.

I ask you to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget. It is smart, it is strong, and it leads America forward.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) offered by the Congressional Black Caucus to H. Con. Res. 27, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016."

I support the CBC Budget for four principal reasons: 1. It ends the threat of sequestration;

2. It will accelerate our economic recovery; 3. It will help eradicate poverty in America; and 4. It will reduce the deficit by approximately \$1.9 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, if we reject the House Republicans' "Price Is Not Right" and "Work Harder to Get Less" Budget with its discredited economic gimmicks and unrealistic projections and adopt the CBC Budget, we will get instead a comprehensive jobs program totaling \$500 billion over three years.

The jobs created will accelerate our economic recovery and ensure that it reaches every community in America, while also making the necessary investments to ensure America's longterm economic competitiveness.

Specifically, the CBC Budget will create jobs by providing: 1. \$100 billion to fund a National Direct Job Creation Program; 2. \$50 billion for school Modernization; 3. \$50 billion to assist local government hire and retain teachers, law enforcement and first responder Jobs; 4. \$230 billion in immediate investment to rebuild our nation's crumbling infrastructure; 5. \$50 billion to rebuilding neighborhoods and communities not fully recovered from the Great Recession of 2008; 6. \$13 billion for job training programs; and 7. \$7 billion for summer jobs so young persons can save money to attend college and plan for their futures.

Mr. Chair, when it comes to addressing the poverty that is still too prevalent in our country, the CBC Budget is clearly superior to the Republican's "Work Harder, Get Less" Budget.

The CBC Budget provides for \$300 billion for programs that have proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

The funding provided will be used to restore cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, extend emergency unemployment insurance, expand access to affordable housing, increase access to quality and affordable education, and increase funding for job training and trade adjustment assistance programs.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, to ensure that federal resources are targeted more efficiently towards eradicating poverty and are actually reaching communities most in need, the CBC budget proposes the codification of the "10–20–30" policy for federal spending.

Under the "10–20–30" policy at least 10 percent of the federal funds in certain accounts are to be directed to areas that have had a poverty rate of 20 percent for the last 30 years.

Finally, I support the CBC Budget because it puts an end to the draconian sequester burdening the economy and our people for the last several years.

In addition, according to an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$1.9 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, it is said often, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who

are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

The Republican budget resolution fails this moral test; the CBC Budget does not.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the House Republicans' budget and voting for a better alternative, the CBC Budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS).

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I thank the gentlewoman very much. I appreciate being given some time at the last minute.

Mr. Chairman, the wealth gap and racial wealth gap have reached record levels, and alarming statistics tell the story. Mr. Chairman, 46.5 million Americans are living in poverty, and comparable numbers are even worse in the African American community and other communities of color. For decades, we have had policies and made funding decisions that have benefited only a few at the expense of the middle class and minorities. The Great Recession and subsequent years of budget cuts have only made things worse for these communities.

While the Republicans' budget demonstrates their commitment to maintaining this inequality, the budget put forth by the Congressional Black Caucus today attempts to rebuild and restore what we lost, especially in the housing sector, which is why it has my support.

First, the CBC budget retains a robust Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which Congress created to protect all Americans from predatory loans that led to millions of foreclosures, many of which were in the African American community. The CBC budget also makes critical investments in affordable housing programs, including fully funding public housing and fully restoring Section 8 housing choice vouchers lost due to sequestration.

The CBC budget would also invest much-needed resources to add over 20,000 new beds for the homeless across our country. Investments in these important rental and homeless assistance programs is especially important given the fact that we have nearly 8 million

households in America for whom safe, decent, and affordable housing is not available to them.

Put simply, the Republican budget would widen the wealth gap in this country; the CBC budget would help eliminate it.

Further, the CBC budget strengthens our housing market, our financial system and economic stability as a whole. I urge that all Members of this House vote in favor of it and in favor of putting our country back on a sustainable economic path.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her courtesy in extending additional time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there is a percentage of the economy, the Republican underlying budget is 40 percent lower than the previous low in half a century. It is only balanced because it is missing a couple of trillion dollars where you cut taxes and say it is revenue neutral. There is no indication that the taxes will be restored. It is unrealistic because the level of cuts won't be made.

You are not going to repeal Medicare as you know it. We have tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act over 50 times and haven't been able to do it. It is interesting that they want to repeal the services but not the taxes. There are substantial cuts in Pell grants and increases in student loans. Transportation initiatives are just about zeroed out.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, the CBC budget has specific tax increases. It shows that we make money by comprehensive immigration reform and the public option. We pay to eliminate sequestration. We create jobs, eliminate poverty, and have a realistic budget.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that we would adopt the Congressional Black Caucus budget as a realistic priority, with the right priorities we would adopt the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to just contrast these two budgets just a little bit. As we look at a stronger America—and our balanced budget does provide for a stronger America—we see that the Congressional Black Caucus budget is one that will increase our debt for our children and our grandchildren and increase taxes. Neither one of these is going to help our economy grow nor get people out of poverty.

Our budget balances in less than 10 years. A balanced budget means a healthier economy today and greater opportunity for tomorrow, helping to raise people out of poverty.

The budget also repeals the unworkable and unfair ObamaCare plan and starts over with more choice.

The budget boosts our defense spending, helping to provide defense for our country and support for our men and women.

The budget eliminates the double dipping of the disability insurance and the unemployment insurance and establishes a plan that will strengthen the Social Security trust fund rather than having the trust fund be depleted.

The budget saves and strengthens Medicare, ending that \$700 billion ObamaCare raid that was in the President's proposal.

Mr. Chairman, all of these things help to get us on the path and on the course to a successful America where we can be proud to hand our children and our grandchildren a successful country whereby they can know the kinds of opportunities that we have had and live the American Dream. So I urge a "no" vote on this budget amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the CBC Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

As has been highlighted during today's debate, the Federal budget is a blueprint for our nation. It is a statement of our national priorities and of our national values.

Our budget should lay the groundwork to secure a strong middle class, create more jobs, and grow paychecks.

We should be working to create a level playing field for all Americans.

We cannot continue with these short-term fixes which lately have become all too common in Congress.

For instance, in May, the Highway Trust Fund is set to expire—again.

Yet, more than sixty-five percent of America's roads are in need of repair and the American Society of Civil Engineers has given our nation's infrastructure a D in its most recent report card.

We could be creating thousands of jobs—from real estate to construction work—if we got serious about investing in infrastructure.

As the conscious of the Congress. The CBC budget focuses on creating jobs and giving hard-working Americans families a fair-share.

Our CBC budget would provide \$230 billion for our nation's infrastructure—providing an immediate investment to help modernize our roads, bridges, and tunnels, as well as providing dollars to build new and improve existing commuter and public transportation systems.

We cannot delay or rely on short term funding patches that seem to become the norm in this Republican led Congress.

Mr. Chair, when we rebuild our roads and modernize our nation's transportation, we create and maintain good-paying jobs.

That's the best investment we can make of taxpayer dollars. Not only do we keep Americans safe, but we invest in our greatest resource—the American worker. That's what I call a bang for your buck.

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Chair, I support the CBC Alternative Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

As has been highlighted during today's debate, the Federal budget is a blueprint for our

nation. It is a statement of our national priorities and of our national values.

Our budget should lay the groundwork to secure a strong middle class, create more jobs, and grow paychecks.

We should be working to create a level playing field for all Americans.

We cannot continue with these short-term fixes which lately have become all too common in Congress.

For instance, in May, the Highway Trust Fund is set to expire—again.

Yet, more than sixty-five percent of America's roads are in need of repair and the American Society of Civil Engineers has given our nation's infrastructure a D in its most recent report card.

We could be creating thousands of jobs—from real estate to construction work—if we got serious about investing in infrastructure.

As the conscious of the Congress. The CBC budget focuses on creating jobs and giving hard-working Americans families a fair-share.

Our CBC budget would provide \$230 billion for our nation's infrastructure—providing an immediate investment to help modernize our roads, bridges, and tunnels, as well as providing dollars to build new and improve existing commuter and public transportation systems.

We cannot delay or rely on short term funding patches that seem to become the norm in this Republican led Congress.

Mr. Chair, when we rebuild our roads and modernize our nation's transportation, we create and maintain good-paying jobs.

That's the best investment we can make of taxpayer dollars. Not only do we keep Americans safe, but we invest in our greatest resource—the American worker. That's what I call a bang for your buck.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

□ 1445

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. STUTZMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent res-

olution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 202. Reconciliation procedures.

Sec. 203. Additional guidance for reconciliation.

Sec. 204. Policy statement on reconciliation to repeal Obamacare.

#### TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.

Sec. 302. Limitation on measures affecting Social Security solvency.

Sec. 303. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.

Sec. 304. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.

Sec. 305. Limitation on advance appropriations.

Sec. 306. Fair value credit estimates.

Sec. 307. Limitation on long-term spending.

Sec. 308. Allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

Sec. 309. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.

Sec. 310. Concepts, aggregates, allocations and application.

Sec. 311. Rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE IV—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 401. Direct spending.

#### TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 501. Reserve fund for the repeal of the 2010 health care laws.

Sec. 502. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the replacement of Obamacare.

Sec. 503. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the 2010 health care laws.

Sec. 504. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the sustainable growth rate of the Medicare program.

Sec. 505. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.

Sec. 506. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.

Sec. 507. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.

Sec. 508. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation reform.

Sec. 509. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.

Sec. 510. Implementation of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement.

Sec. 511. Deficit-neutral reserve account for reforming SNAP.

Sec. 512. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Social Security Disability Insurance Reform.

Sec. 513. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 514. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for graduate medical education.

Sec. 515. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.

Sec. 516. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.

#### TITLE VI—POLICY STATEMENTS

- Sec. 601. Policy statement on health care law repeal.
- Sec. 602. Policy statement on replacing the President's health care law.
- Sec. 603. Policy statement on Medicare.
- Sec. 604. Policy statement on Medicaid State flexibility block grants.
- Sec. 605. Policy statement on Social Security.
- Sec. 606. Policy statement on means-tested welfare programs.
- Sec. 607. Policy statement on reform of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
- Sec. 608. Policy statement on work requirements.
- Sec. 609. Policy statement on a carbon tax.
- Sec. 610. Policy statement on regulation of greenhouse gases by the Environmental Protection Agency.
- Sec. 611. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
- Sec. 612. Policy statement on tax reform.
- Sec. 613. Policy statement on trade.
- Sec. 614. Policy statement on energy production.
- Sec. 615. Policy statement on Federal regulatory policy.
- Sec. 616. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
- Sec. 617. Policy statement on Federal funding of abortion.
- Sec. 618. Policy statement on transportation reform.
- Sec. 619. Policy statement on Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 620. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.
- Sec. 621. Policy statement on balanced budget amendment.
- Sec. 622. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
- Sec. 623. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
- Sec. 624. Policy statement on creation of a Committee to Eliminate Duplication and Waste.
- Sec. 625. Policy statement on budget process and baseline reform.
- Sec. 626. Policy statement on Federal accounting methodologies.
- Sec. 627. Policy statement on scorekeeping for outyear budgetary effects in appropriation Acts.
- Sec. 628. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.
- Sec. 629. No Budget, no Pay.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$0.

Fiscal year 2017: \$0.

Fiscal year 2018: \$0.

Fiscal year 2019: \$0.

Fiscal year 2020: \$0.

Fiscal year 2021: \$0.

Fiscal year 2022: \$0.

Fiscal year 2023: \$0.

Fiscal year 2024: \$0.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,804,255,329,803.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,795,462,458,903.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,865,997,991,741.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,000,376,760,861.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,108,966,585,790.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,172,280,451,129.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,271,239,346,757.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,353,376,032,969.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,385,534,274,531.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,492,980,109,634.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,875,014,856,384.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,814,832,468,381.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,849,474,859,887.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,172,280,451,129.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,068,172,096,646.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,144,578,956,503.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,261,322,193,088.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,323,765,840,982.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,340,157,830,662.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,464,735,098,225.

(4) **DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: -\$208,259,856,384.

Fiscal year 2017: -\$51,504,468,381.

Fiscal year 2018: \$8,656,140,113.

Fiscal year 2019: \$1,830,898,711.

Fiscal year 2020: \$31,237,903,354.

Fiscal year 2021: \$97,384,043,497.

Fiscal year 2022: \$127,365,806,912.

Fiscal year 2023: \$226,622,159,018.

Fiscal year 2024: \$381,986,169,338.

Fiscal year 2025: \$440,912,901,775.

(5) **DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.**—The budgetary levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$18,913,744,958,460.

Fiscal year 2017: \$19,314,491,964,331.

Fiscal year 2018: \$19,563,830,455,326.

Fiscal year 2019: \$19,857,958,879,371.

Fiscal year 2020: \$20,123,855,366,287.

Fiscal year 2021: \$20,351,214,337,587.

Fiscal year 2022: \$20,715,329,820,423.

Fiscal year 2023: \$20,901,532,189,180.

Fiscal year 2024: \$20,717,769,565,646.

Fiscal year 2025: \$20,684,027,272,338.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,703,981,750,475.

Fiscal year 2017: \$13,960,949,960,296.

Fiscal year 2018: \$14,067,434,872,731.

Fiscal year 2019: \$14,248,184,941,570.

Fiscal year 2020: \$14,422,683,320,242.

Fiscal year 2021: \$14,587,672,210,472.

Fiscal year 2022: \$14,936,858,695,742.

Fiscal year 2023: \$15,125,854,409,576.

Fiscal year 2024: \$14,963,760,099,108.

Fiscal year 2025: \$15,014,505,127,509.

##### SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority

and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2024 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$578,280,777,857.

(B) Outlays, \$613,862,153,570.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$582,506,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$572,025,184,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$607,744,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$586,422,160,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$620,019,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$604,237,912,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$632,310,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$617,552,672,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,627,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$630,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$657,634,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$648,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$670,997,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$656,389,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$683,771,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$663,936,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$698,836,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$683,350,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$37,513,493,257.

(B) Outlays, \$41,995,505,479.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,762,853,450.

(B) Outlays, \$39,934,846,949.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,651,643,950.

(B) Outlays, \$38,866,220,775.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,528,536,020.

(B) Outlays, \$38,354,273,029.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,461,865,977.

(B) Outlays, \$38,697,741,578.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,925,063,701.

(B) Outlays, \$39,232,179,719.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,126,001,914.

(B) Outlays, \$39,982,610,336.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,095,485,241.

(B) Outlays, \$40,732,800,911.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,103,629,772.

(B) Outlays, \$41,553,888,595.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,133,401,274.

(B) Outlays, \$42,416,153,641.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$28,381,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,003,392,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,932,305,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,924,301,820.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,578,662,625.

(B) Outlays, \$29,357,268,851.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,226,743,853.

(B) Outlays, \$29,798,265,570.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,904,449,193.

(B) Outlays, \$30,387,989,039.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,583,742,872.

(B) Outlays, \$30,957,291,773.

- Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,292,588,187.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,636,998,973.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,002,947,480.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,338,214,946.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,741,782,114.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,058,954,535.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,488,239,558.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,794,801,398.
- (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$-5,761,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,930,371,957.
- Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,819,314,062.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,757,967,962.
- Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,728,702,937.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,111,452,050.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,096,589,163.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,078,305,078.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$5,254,611,266.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,969,957,520.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,171,638,088.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,763,905,675.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,599,805,029.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,680,623,026.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,195,039,484.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,596,392,352.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,064,102,846.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,606,962,951.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,109,301,299.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,918,880,787.
- (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$31,299,572,447.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,745,933,147.
- Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,804,397,584.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,763,424,433.
- Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,940,706,078.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,072,114,262.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,545,716,150.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,019,236,283.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,800,053,945.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,914,442,144.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,731,162,151.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,002,142,690.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,463,492,711.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,583,695,102.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,834,190,867.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,011,836,980.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,301,960,627.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,902,619,669.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,926,499,137.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,416,919,831.
- (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$19,898,010,335.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,942,095,280.
- Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,827,846,850.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,957,388,865.
- Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,738,376,840.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,154,062,249.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,657,292,553.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,032,522,337.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,587,456,346.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,144,471,168.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,048,816,297.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,608,414,371.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,995,149,863.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,586,093,026.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,569,077,258.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,145,484,076.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,766,828,555.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,306,333,800.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,999,880,260.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,600,090,000.
- (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority -\$3,269,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$16,616,676,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,373,102,500.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,620,296,710.
- Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,252,355,063.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,997,848,520.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,800,690,294.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,586,750,251.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,903,060,242.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$27,479,356,095.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,522,465,808.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,768,710,970.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$5,741,907,919.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,819,106,102.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,965,387,525.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,305,538,861.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,990,905,601.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,635,008,871.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,370,433,193.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,844,501,407.
- (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$32,470,539,628.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,973,708,016.
- Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,354,221,079.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,459,750,057.
- Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,202,314,885.  
 (B) Outlays, \$65,144,457,480.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,630,814,158.  
 (B) Outlays, \$67,324,272,537.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,886,671,678.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,004,790,643.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,163,658,354.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,472,273,861.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,515,161,060.  
 (B) Outlays, \$70,923,592,736.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,915,482,431.  
 (B) Outlays, \$72,212,261,043.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,164,815,548.  
 (B) Outlays, \$73,292,369,608.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,667,811,114.  
 (B) Outlays, \$74,468,932,745.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$7,082,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,927,516,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,688,082,500.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,753,320,710.
- Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,088,559,563.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,382,887,620.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,381,194,111.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,788,745,754.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,408,701,972.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,567,244,658.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,304,604,699.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,095,209,451.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,303,596,421.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,936,853,095.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,358,935,928.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,345,212,395.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,446,554,262.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,890,070,466.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,578,595,232.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,930,419,157.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$80,620,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$90,389,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,652,371,460.  
 (B) Outlays, \$90,413,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,829,771,467.  
 (B) Outlays, \$87,166,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,313,474,733.  
 (B) Outlays, \$85,090,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,600,206,105.  
 (B) Outlays, \$87,369,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,609,236,615.  
 (B) Outlays, \$88,976,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,849,057,844.  
 (B) Outlays, \$90,167,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,938,338,847.  
 (B) Outlays, \$91,346,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,345,533,818.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,701,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$94,001,410,265.  
 (B) Outlays, \$94,334,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$356,215,596,566.  
 (B) Outlays, \$365,098,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,899,454,985.  
 (B) Outlays, \$365,047,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$362,983,956,484.  
 (B) Outlays, \$364,881,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,685,568,372.  
 (B) Outlays, \$364,491,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$373,679,065,768.  
 (B) Outlays, \$364,281,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,974,828,600.  
 (B) Outlays, \$364,016,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:



(A) New budget authority, \$363,806,363,913.  
(B) Outlays, \$363,895,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$363,626,231,239.  
(B) Outlays, \$363,693,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$363,258,019,916.  
(B) Outlays, \$363,340,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$362,556,573,042.  
(B) Outlays, \$362,722,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$577,726,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$577,635,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$574,936,390,472.  
(B) Outlays, \$574,877,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$576,281,682,302.  
(B) Outlays, \$576,241,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$635,992,586,992.  
(B) Outlays, \$635,913,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$676,174,392,195.  
(B) Outlays, \$676,081,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$721,343,299,702.  
(B) Outlays, \$721,248,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$799,902,931,815.  
(B) Outlays, \$799,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$815,174,505,146.  
(B) Outlays, \$814,979,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$821,746,349,714.  
(B) Outlays, \$821,637,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$914,308,332,995.  
(B) Outlays, \$914,192,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$511,965,047,286.  
(B) Outlays, \$513,309,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$477,846,923,208.  
(B) Outlays, \$473,264,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$477,561,645,878.  
(B) Outlays, \$467,611,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$474,689,337,990.  
(B) Outlays, \$468,970,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$502,140,825,023.  
(B) Outlays, \$496,703,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$487,249,815,351.  
(B) Outlays, \$482,256,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$502,185,290,642.  
(B) Outlays, \$502,042,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$508,544,506,797.  
(B) Outlays, \$502,891,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$515,858,098,800.  
(B) Outlays, \$504,805,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$531,835,180,620.  
(B) Outlays, \$525,361,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$33,878,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$166,579,024,441.  
(B) Outlays, \$170,021,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$164,542,167,817.  
(B) Outlays, \$164,087,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$162,507,078,640.  
(B) Outlays, \$161,885,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$174,058,258,503.  
(B) Outlays, \$173,248,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$178,729,646,992.  
(B) Outlays, \$177,778,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$182,762,771,139.  
(B) Outlays, \$181,819,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$194,775,102,635.  
(B) Outlays, \$193,755,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$191,156,854,593.  
(B) Outlays, \$190,134,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$187,957,947,124.  
(B) Outlays, \$186,853,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$201,405,233,201.  
(B) Outlays, \$200,283,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$47,707,173,265.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,229,224,208.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$50,772,740,952.  
(B) Outlays, \$52,693,526,677.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$50,372,110,771.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,732,859,609.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$51,813,152,904.  
(B) Outlays, \$51,556,175,542.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,466,802,554.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,290,287,822.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,249,674,911.  
(B) Outlays, \$54,787,383,199.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,676,483,435.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,175,876,713.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$59,454,977,724.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,940,292,949.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,272,247,363.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,740,753,844.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,947,151,651.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,414,282,909.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$23,593,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,576,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,761,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,202,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,817,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,279,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,252,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,084,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,947,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,602,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,309,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,981,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,695,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,840,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,010,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,878,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,968,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,825,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$364,527,455,629.  
(B) Outlays, \$364,527,455,629.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$410,767,708,539.  
(B) Outlays, \$410,767,708,539.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$469,730,877,172.  
(B) Outlays, \$469,730,877,172.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$517,032,292,681.  
(B) Outlays, \$517,032,292,681.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$557,654,430,424.  
(B) Outlays, \$557,654,430,424.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$583,121,216,629.  
(B) Outlays, \$583,121,216,629.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$603,387,733,236.  
(B) Outlays, \$603,387,733,236.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$618,088,639,892.  
(B) Outlays, \$618,088,639,892.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$623,301,410,548.  
(B) Outlays, \$623,301,410,548.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$620,928,755,085.  
(B) Outlays, \$620,928,755,085.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority -\$85,168,180,447.  
(B) Outlays, -\$79,367,705,942.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,768,588,431.  
(B) Outlays, -\$73,377,282,997.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$99,007,336,916.  
(B) Outlays, -\$91,392,129,561.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$107,257,928,704.  
(B) Outlays, -\$101,115,606,117.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$120,538,310,875.  
(B) Outlays, -\$112,317,659,215.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$126,001,335,995.  
(B) Outlays, -\$119,487,538,544.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$176,422,893,971.  
(B) Outlays, -\$157,543,531,001.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$148,027,713,468.

(B) Outlays, -\$134,530,970,997.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, -\$149,789,895,183.

(B) Outlays, -\$138,129,598,581.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$178,976,219,310.

(B) Outlays, -\$156,393,874,346.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, -\$73,514,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$73,514,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, -\$83,832,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$83,832,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, -\$90,115,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$90,115,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, -\$90,594,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$90,594,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, -\$92,193,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$92,193,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$96,623,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$96,623,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$99,437,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$99,437,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, -\$104,343,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$104,343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, -\$111,213,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$111,213,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$117,896,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$117,896,000,000.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,289,626,954.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,715,564,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,758,382,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,117,067,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

### SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF OBAMACARE.—Not later than July 15, 2015, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce

the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(3) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

### SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES.

(a) ESTIMATING ASSUMPTIONS.—

(1) ASSUMPTIONS.—In the House, for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall use the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 (January 2015) when making estimates of any bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon. If adjustments to the baseline are made subsequent to the adoption of this concurrent resolution, then such chair shall determine whether to use any of these adjustments when making such estimates.

(2) INTENT.—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) should only be exercised if the estimates used to determine the compliance of such measures with the budgetary requirements included in the concurrent resolution are inaccurate because adjustments made to the baseline are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution. Such inaccurate adjustments made after the adoption of this concurrent resolution may include selected adjustments for rulemaking, judicial actions, adjudication, and interpretative rules that have major budgetary effects and are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House for any measure, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare an estimate based on the baseline determination made by such chair pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW THROUGH RECONCILIATION.—In preparing their submissions under section 201(a) to the Committee on the Budget, the committees named in section 201(b) shall—

(1) note the policies described in the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget that repeal the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(2) determine the most effective methods by which the health care laws referred to in paragraph (1) shall be repealed in their entirety.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) CONFERENCE REPORT.—Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with

its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) REVISION.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

### SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR RECONCILIATION.

(a) GUIDANCE.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may develop additional guidelines providing further information, budgetary levels and amounts, and other explanatory material to supplement the instructions included in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and set forth in section 201.

(b) PUBLICATION.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may cause the material prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to be printed in the Congressional Record on the appropriate date, but not later than the date set forth in this title on which committees must submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in order to comply with the reconciliation instructions set forth in section 201.

### SEC. 204. POLICY STATEMENT ON RECONCILIATION TO REPEAL OBAMACARE.

It is the policy of this resolution that the reconciliation submissions set forth in section 201 shall fully repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152).

## TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

### SEC. 301. COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) CBO ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, an estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation considered in the House or the Senate during fiscal year 2016 shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, any estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(c) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in this section shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (a) and (b)) of such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution sets forth budgetary levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—  
(1) the term “major legislation” means any bill or joint resolution—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(2) the term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, budget authority, outlays, and deficits.

#### SEC. 302. LIMITATION ON MEASURES AFFECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, it shall not be in order to consider in the House or the Senate a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

#### SEC. 303. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

#### SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of

the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

#### SEC. 305. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading:

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”; and

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) VETERANS.—\$63,271,000,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2016.

#### SEC. 306. FAIR VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate of the budgetary effects of a measure prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform” shall, as a supplement to such estimate, and to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares an estimate pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 of the budgetary effects which would be incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and if the Director determines that such bill or joint resolution has a budgetary effect related to a housing, residential mortgage or student loan program under title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, then the Director shall also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of such bill or joint resolution that result in such effect.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

#### SEC. 307. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amend-

ment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of \$5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning in the fiscal year following the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

#### SEC. 308. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE OCO/GWOT ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

(b) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2016. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays counting toward the allocation established by subsection (a) shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### SEC. 309. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—In the House, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or offers any amendment thereto or submits a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2016 and the period of fiscal years 2016 through fiscal year 2025 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

#### SEC. 310. CONCEPTS, AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.

(a) CONCEPTS, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPLICATION.—In the House—

(1) upon a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly;

(2) any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(A) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable;

(3) section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall have no force or effect for any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to instructions set forth in this concurrent resolution;

(4) the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from the most recently published or adjusted baseline of the Congressional Budget Office; and

(5) the term “budget year” means the most recent fiscal year for which a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted.

(b) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement—

(1) the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 207 of this concurrent resolution; and

(2) revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this concurrent resolution.

#### **SEC. 311. RULEMAKING POWERS.**

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

#### **TITLE IV—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING**

##### **SEC. 401. DIRECT SPENDING.**

(a) **MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.**—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 4.6 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic president reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the five years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This resolution applies the

lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this resolution recommends conversion from direct spending to a discretionary program subject to appropriation. Pending this reform, this resolution assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that has tied the hands of State governments. Instead, each State would have the freedom and flexibility to tailor a Medicaid program that fits the needs of its unique population. Moreover, this resolution assumes the repeal of the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of its crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, recommends conversion from direct spending to a discretionary program subject to appropriation. Pending this reform, this resolution assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth. Such a reform would provide incentives for States to ensure dollars will go towards those who need them most. Additionally, it requires that more stringent work requirements and time limits apply under the program.

(b) **NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.**—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 5.4 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 5.5 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this resolution advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions. Those in or near retirement will see no changes, while future retirees would be given a choice of private plans competing alongside the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program. Medicare would provide a premium-support payment either to pay for or offset the premium of the plan chosen by the senior, depending on the plan's cost. The Medicare premium-support payment would be adjusted so that the sick would receive higher payments if their conditions worsened; lower-income seniors would receive additional assistance to help cover out-of-pocket costs; and wealthier seniors would assume responsibility for a greater share of their premiums. Putting seniors in charge of how their health care dollars are spent will force providers to compete against each other on price and quality. This market competition will act as a real check on widespread waste and skyrocketing health care costs.

(B) In keeping with a recommendation from the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, this resolution calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

#### **TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS**

##### **SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that only consists of a full repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

##### **SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPLACEMENT OF OBAMACARE.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, replaces the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

##### **SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

##### **SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE SUSTAINABLE GROWTH RATE OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that includes provisions amending or superseding the system for updating payments under section 1848 of the Social Security Act, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

##### **SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.**

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025 when the macroeconomic effects of such reforms are taken into account.

##### **SEC. 506. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference

report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 507. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 508. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms the Federal transportation funding system, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 509. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 510. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution to accommodate the enactment of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement if it includes permanent spending reductions and reforms to direct spending programs.

**SEC. 511. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE ACCOUNT FOR REFORMING SNAP.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP).

**SEC. 512. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reforms the Social Security Disability Insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act.

**SEC. 513. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in

this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 514. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, expands access to, and improves, as determined by such chair, graduate medical education programs, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 515. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 516. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.**

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit reforms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**TITLE VI—POLICY STATEMENTS**

**SEC. 601. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE LAW REPEAL.**

It is the policy of this resolution that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152) should be repealed.

**SEC. 602. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The President's health care law put Washington's priorities first, and not patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised; instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500 a year; instead, according to the 2014 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 7 percent for individuals and families since 2012.

(2) The President pledged "If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan." Instead, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 9

million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans due to the President's health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Pelosi, said that the President's health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reduction in hours worked due to Obamacare represents a decline of about 2.0 to 2.5 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. The full impact on labor represents a reduction in employment by 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent, while additional studies show less modest results. A recent study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) The President has charged the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of unelected bureaucrats, with cutting Medicare by an additional \$20.9 billion over the next ten years, according to the President's most recent budget.

(5) Since ACA was signed into law, the administration has repeatedly failed to implement it as written. The President has unilaterally acted to make a total of 28 changes, delays, and exemptions. The President has signed into law another 17 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual "mandate" could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees if doing so violates these companies' religious beliefs. Even now, almost five years after enactment, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate the legality of how the President's administration has implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly underlying the entire program health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(6) The President's health care law is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. The law should be fully repealed, allowing for real, patient-centered health care reform: the development of real health care reforms that puts patients first, that make affordable, quality health care available to all Americans, and that build on the innovation and creativity of all the participants in the health care sector.

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law must not only be repealed, but also replaced by enacting the American Health Care Reform Act.

**SEC. 603. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2030 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two

decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program;

(D) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries;

(E) in 2013, the ratio was 3.2 workers per beneficiary, but this falls to 2.3 in 2030 and continues to decrease over time;

(F) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program; and

(G) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office's 2014 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2043 and 9.3 percent of GDP by 2089.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in or near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits and offer future beneficiaries the same health care options available to Members of Congress.

(c) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in or near retirement.

(2) For future generations, when they reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as an option.

(4) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

(6) The Medicare eligibility age is gradually increased to keep pace with increases in longevity.

(7) Medicare is simplified by combining parts A and B and reforms to Medigap plans are implemented.

#### **SEC. 604. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID STATE FLEXIBILITY BLOCK GRANTS.**

It is the policy of this resolution that Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) should be block granted to the States in a manner prescribed by the State Health Flexibility Act.

#### **SEC. 605. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the "three-legged stool" of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues

will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2033, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut nearly 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent CBO projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of \$1.7 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower-income Americans' retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by over 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. David Autor and Mark Duggan have found that the increase in individuals on disability does not reflect a decrease in self-reported health. CBO attributes program growth to changes in demographics, changes in the composition of the labor force and compensation, as well as Federal policies.

(6) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 25 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the "Greenspan Commission" which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for over a generation.

(8) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that bipartisan action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes these reforms will include the following:

(1) Adoption of a more accurate measure for calculating cost of living adjustments.

(2) Adoption of adjustments to the full retirement age to reflect longevity.

(3) Makes Social Security benefits more progressive over the long term, providing those most in need with a safety net in retirement.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes that reforms to the Disability Insurance program will include—

(1) encouraging work;

(2) updates of the eligibility rules;

(3) reducing fraud and abuse; and

(4) enactment of H.R. 918, the Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment Benefits Double Dip Elimination Act, to prohibit individuals from drawing benefits from both programs at the same time.

#### **SEC. 606. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that:

(1) Too many people are trapped at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder, and every citizen should have the opportunity to rise, escape from poverty, and achieve their own potential.

(2) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and congressional Republicans enacted reforms that have moved families off of Federal programs and enabled them to provide for themselves.

(3) According to the most recent projections, over the next 10 years we will spend approximately \$9.7 trillion on means-tested welfare programs.

(4) Today, there are approximately 92 Federal programs that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(5) Taxpayers deserve clear and transparent information on how well these programs are working, and how much the Federal Government is spending on means-tested welfare.

(6) It should be the goal of welfare programs to encourage work and put people on a path to self-reliance.

(b) **POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.**—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should be reformed to give states flexibility to implement and improve safety net programs and that to be eligible for benefits, able bodied adults without dependents should be required to work or be preparing for work, including enrolling in educational or job training programs, contributing community service, or participating in a supervised job search; and

(2) the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

#### **SEC. 607. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORM OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) **SNAP.**—It is the policy of the resolution that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program be reformed so that:

(1) Nutrition assistance funds should be distributed to the states as a block grant with funding subject to the annual discretionary appropriations process.

(2) Funds from the grant must be used by the states to establish and maintain a work activation program for able-bodied adults without dependents.

(3) It is the goal of this proposal to move those in need off of the assistance rolls and back into the workforce and towards self-sufficiency.

(4) In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget is permitted to revise allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels, including discretionary limits, accordingly.

(b) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This resolution assumes that, pending the enactment of reforms described in (a), the conversion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs.

**SEC. 608. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.**

It is the policy of this resolution that the work requirements in the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant program should be preserved as called for in H.R. 890, 113th Congress.

**SEC. 609. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.**

It is the policy of this resolution that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

**SEC. 610. POLICY STATEMENT ON REGULATION OF GREENHOUSE GASES BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.**

It is the policy of this resolution that the Environmental Protection Agency should be prohibited from promulgating any regulation concerning, taking action relating to, or taking into consideration the emission of a greenhouse gas to address climate change.

**SEC. 611. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession more than 5 years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product GDP growth over the past 5 years has averaged slightly more than 2 percent, well below the 3.2 percent historical trend rate of growth in the United States. Although the economy has shown some welcome signs of improvement of late, the Nation remains in the midst of the weakest economic recovery of the modern era.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 2.3 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country's fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher. Clearly, there is a dire need for policies that will spark higher rates of economic growth and greater, higher-quality job opportunities.

(4) Although job gains have been trending up of late, other aspects of the labor market remain weak. The labor force participation rate, for instance, is hovering just under 63 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. Long-term unemployment also remains a problem. Of the roughly 8.7 million people who are currently unemployed, 2.7 million (more than 30 percent) have been unemployed for more than 6 months. Long-term unemployment erodes an individual's job skills and detaches them from job opportunities. It also undermines the long-term productive capacity of the economy.

(5) Perhaps most important, wage gains and income growth have been subpar for middle-class Americans. Average hourly earnings of private-sector workers have increased by just 1.6 percent over the past year. Prior to the recession, average hourly earnings were tracking close to 4 percent. Likewise, average income levels have remained flat in recent years. Real median household income is just under \$52,000, one of the lowest levels since 1995.

(6) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country's economic outlook. Investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. They know

that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation and they act accordingly. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(7) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels) is a net positive for economic growth over time. The logic is that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(8) CBO analyzed the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and found it would increase real output per capita (a proxy for a country's standard of living) by about \$1,000 in 2025 and roughly \$5,000 by 2040 relative to the baseline path. That means more income and greater prosperity for all Americans.

(9) In contrast, if the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a "crowding out" of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(10) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(11) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$326 billion.

(12) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(b) POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code will put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

**SEC. 612. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all three counts – it is notoriously complex, patently unfair, and highly inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Over the past decade alone, there have been more than 4,400 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carving out special preferences, exclusions, or deductions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than \$1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and highly complex.

(3) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the

tax base. A narrow tax base, in turn, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(4) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending \$160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code – a waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(5) Standard economic theory shows that high marginal tax rates dampen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(6) Roughly half of United States active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a "pass-through" basis, meaning the income flows through to the tax returns of the individual owners and is taxed at the individual rate structure rather than at the corporate rate. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the top Federal rate on such small business income reaches 44.6 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(7) The United States corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to just over 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages and discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(8) By deterring potential investment, the United States corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The United States tax rate differential with other countries also fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate behaviors intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(9) The "worldwide" structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(10) Reforming the United States tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and it would also greatly reduce tax avoidance.

(11) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, on consumers in higher prices, and on investors in diminished returns.

(12) Revenues have averaged about 17.5 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 18.3 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

(13) Attempting to raise revenue through tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would damage the economy.

(14) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a "new" source of revenue. Such a plan would damage the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

(15) Closing tax loopholes to fund spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(16) The goal of tax reform should be to curb or eliminate loopholes and use those



savings to lower tax rates across the board—not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Tax reform should be revenue-neutral and should not be an excuse to raise taxes on the American people. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(b) **POLICY ON TAX REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform that is revenue-neutral on a dynamic basis that provides for the following:

(1) Targets revenue neutrality (relative to CBO's baseline revenue projection) based on a dynamic score that takes into account the macroeconomic effects of reform.

(2) Collapses the current seven brackets for individuals into just two, with a top rate of 25 percent.

(3) Simplifies the tax code to ensure that fewer Americans will be required to itemize deductions.

(4) Gives equal tax treatment to individual and employer healthcare expenditures modeled on the American Health Care Reform Act.

(5) Encourages charitable giving.

(6) Repeals the Death Tax.

(7) Eliminates marriage penalties and encourages families.

(8) Repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax.

(9) Reforms the current Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) that is given in a yearly lump-sum payment and replaces it with a program that would allow workers to exempt a portion of their payroll taxes every month.

(10) Reduces double taxation by lowering the top corporate rate to 25 percent and setting a maximum long-term capital gains tax rate at 15 percent.

(11) Sets a maximum dividend tax rate at 15 percent.

(12) Encourages net investment, savings, and entrepreneurial activity.

(13) Moves to a competitive international system of taxation.

(14) Ends distortionary special interest giveaways, such as the Wind Production Tax Credit.

#### **SEC. 613. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

(3) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage.

(4) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a "tax loophole," cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(5) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(6) The status quo of the current tax code undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(7) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to "hollow out" United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(8) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(b) **POLICY ON TRADE.**—It is the policy of this resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system in order to promote job creation in the United States.

#### **SEC. 614. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY PRODUCTION.**

It is the policy of this resolution that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and currently unavailable areas of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be open for energy exploration and production. To ensure States' rights, states are given the option to withdrawal from leasing within certain areas of the OCS. Specifically, a State, through enactment of a State statute, may withdrawal from leasing from all or part of any area within 75 miles of that State's coast.

#### **SEC. 615. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY POLICY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing our recovery from the economic recession.

(2) In the first two months of 2014 alone, the Administration issued 13,166 pages of regulations imposing more than \$13 billion in compliance costs on job creators and adding more than 16 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(3) The Small Business Administration estimates that the total cost of regulations is as high as \$1.75 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated over \$494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional \$87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111-203) resulted in more than \$17 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 58 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing \$24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an \$8 billion cost burden on the states.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protec-

tion Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In September 2013, the EPA proposed a rule regulating greenhouse gas emissions from new coal-fired power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants. Additional regulations for existing coal plants are expected in the summer of 2014.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly forty percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto prohibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by Purdue University estimates that electricity prices in Indiana will rise 32 percent by 2023, due in part to EPA regulations.

(10) The Heritage Foundation recently found that a phase out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of \$2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by \$1,200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATION.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) seeks to promote economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) pursues a cost-effective approach to regulation, without sacrificing environmental, health, safety benefits or other benefits, rejecting the premise that economic growth and environmental protection create an either/or proposition;

(3) ensures that regulations do not disproportionately disadvantage low-income Americans through a more rigorous cost-benefit analysis, which also considers who will be most affected by regulations and whether the harm caused is outweighed by the potential harm prevented;

(4) ensures that regulations are subject to an open and transparent process, rely on sound and publicly available scientific data, and that the data relied upon for any particular regulation is provided to Congress immediately upon request;

(5) frees the many commonsense energy and water projects currently trapped in complicated bureaucratic approval processes;

(6) maintains the benefits of landmark environmental, health safety, and other statutes while scaling back this administration's heavy-handed approach to regulation, which has added \$494 billion in mostly ideological regulatory activity since 2009, much of which flies in the face of these statutes' intended purposes; and

(7) seeks to promote a limited government, which will unshackle our economy and create millions of new jobs, providing our Nation with a strong and prosperous future and

expanding opportunities for the generations to come.

(8) Requires congressional approval of all new major regulations (those with an impact of \$50 million or more) before enactment as opposed to current law in which Congress must expressly disapprove of regulation to prevent it from becoming law, which would keep Congress engaged as to pending regulatory policy and prevent costly and unsound policies from being implemented and becoming effective.

**SEC. 616. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.**

(a) FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) Roughly 20 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the past decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2004-2005 Academic Year and the 2014-2015 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees at public 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees at private nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.2 percent per year above the rate of inflation.

(4) Federal financial aid for higher education has also seen a dramatic increase. The portion of the Federal student aid portfolio composed of Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Perkins Loans with outstanding balances grew by 119 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2014.

(5) This spending has failed to make college more affordable.

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted: “We can’t just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we’ll run out of money”.

(7) American students are chasing ever-increasing tuition with ever-increasing debt. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student debt now stands at nearly \$1.2 trillion. This makes student loans the second largest balance of consumer debt, after mortgage debt.

(8) Students are carrying large debt loads and too many fail to complete college or end up defaulting on these loans due to their debt burden and a weak economy and job market.

(9) Based on estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, the Pell Grant Program will face a fiscal shortfall beginning in fiscal year 2017 and continuing in each subsequent year in the current budget window.

(10) Failing to address these problems will jeopardize access and affordability to higher education for America’s young people.

(b) POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.—It is the policy of this resolution to address the root drivers of tuition inflation, by—

(1) targeting Federal financial aid to those most in need;

(2) streamlining programs that provide aid to make them more effective;

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at \$5,775 in each year of the budget window; and

(4) removing regulatory barriers in higher education that act to restrict flexibility and innovative teaching, particularly as it re-

lates to non-traditional models such as on-line coursework and competency-based learning.

(c) FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—The House finds the following:

(1) 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(3) The House Education and Workforce Committee successfully consolidated 15 job training programs in the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

(d) POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs; and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

**SEC. 617. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.**

It is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer dollars shall go to any entity that provides abortion services.

**SEC. 618. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRANSPORTATION REFORM.**

It is the policy of this resolution that State and local officials are in a much better position to understand the needs of local commuters, not bureaucrats in Washington. Federal funding for transportation should be phased down and limited to core Federal duties, including the interstate highway system, transportation infrastructure on Federal land, responding to emergencies, and research. As the level of Federal responsibility for transportation is reduced, Congress should also concurrently reduce the Federal gas tax.

**SEC. 619. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care and benefits.

(2) In 2014, reports started breaking across the Nation that VA medical centers were manipulating wait-list documents to hide long delays veterans were facing to receive health care. The VA hospital scandal led to the immediate resignation of then-Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric K. Shinseki.

(3) In 2015, for the first time ever, VA health care was added to the “high-risk” list of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), due to management and oversight failures that have directly resulted in risks to the timeliness, cost-effectiveness, and quality of health care.

(4) In response to the scandal, the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs held several oversight hearings and ultimately enacted the Veterans’ Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (VACAA) (Public Law 113-146) to address these problems. VACAA provided \$15 billion in emergency resources to fund internal health care needs within the department and provided veterans enhanced access to private-sector health care under the new Veterans Choice Program.

(b) POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—This budget supports the continued oversight efforts by the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to ensure

the VA is not only transparent and accountable, but also successful in achieving its goals in providing timely health care and benefits to America’s veterans. The Budget Committee will continue to closely monitor the VA’s progress to ensure resources provided by Congress are sufficient and efficiently used to provide needed benefits and services to veterans.

**SEC. 620. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could “lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings.”

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) two hundred nine Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of \$3 billion annually;

(B) two hundred separate Department of Justice crime prevention and victim services grant programs with an annual cost of \$3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) twenty different Federal entities administer 160 housing programs and other forms of Federal assistance for housing with a total cost of \$170 billion in 2010;

(D) seventeen separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent \$37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) fourteen grant and loan programs, and three tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) ninety-four different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage “green building” in the private sector; and

(G) twenty-three agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly \$15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends more than \$80 billion each year for approximately 1,400 information technology investments. GAO has identified broad acquisition failures, waste, and unnecessary duplication in the Government’s information technology infrastructure. Experts have estimated that eliminating these problems could save 25 percent or \$20 billion.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate more than \$50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$106 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2013.

(7) Under clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in \$693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(9) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) **POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules. If the strictures of the rules are deemed to be too rapid in prohibiting spending on unauthorized programs, then milder measures should be adopted and enforced until a return to the full prohibition of clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

**SEC. 621. POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government collects approximately \$3 trillion annually in taxes, but spends more than \$3.5 trillion to maintain the operations of government. The Federal Government must borrow 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of the year 2014, the national debt of the United States was more than \$18.1 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a Constitutional Convention for the consideration of adopting a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(4) Forty-nine States have fiscal limitations in their State Constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte (R-VA), was considered by the House of Representatives on November 18, 2011, though it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(6) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Twelve were introduced in the 113th Congress alone, including H.J. Res. 4 by Democratic Representative John J. Barrow of Georgia, and H.J. Res. 38 by Republican Representative Jackie Walorski of Indiana.

(7) The joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution referred to in paragraph (5) prohibited outlays for a fiscal year (except those for repayment of debt principal) from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year (except those derived from borrowing) unless Congress, by a three-fifths roll call vote of each chamber, authorizes a specific excess of outlays over receipts.

(8) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed of passage by one vote in the United States Senate.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pass a joint resolution incorporating the provisions set forth in subsection (b), and send such joint resolution to the States for their approval, to amend the Constitution of the United States to require an annual balanced budget.

**SEC. 622. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold \$844 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2015.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending previously made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an Act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Congressional committees should through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans' affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) **DEFICIT REDUCTION.**—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

**SEC. 623. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is \$188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—It is the policy of this resolution that:

(1) The House of Representatives must be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources and therefore must identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members and com-

mittees of the House, and should identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room.

(2) No taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

**SEC. 624. POLICY STATEMENT ON CREATION OF A COMMITTEE TO ELIMINATE DUPLICATION AND WASTE.**

It is the policy of this resolution that a new committee, styled after the post-World War II "Byrd Committee" shall be created to act on GAO's annual waste and duplication reports as well as Oversight and Government Reform Inspector General reports.

**SEC. 625. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS AND BASELINE REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—

(1) In 1974, after more than 50 years of executive dominance over fiscal policy, Congress acted to reassert its "power of the purse", and passed the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

(2) The measure explicitly sought to establish congressional control over the budget process, to provide for annual congressional determination of the appropriate level of taxes and spending, to set important national budget priorities, and to find ways in which Members of Congress could have access to the most accurate, objective, and highest quality information to assist them in discharging their duties.

(3) Far from achieving its intended purpose, however, the process has instituted a bias toward higher spending and larger government. The behemoth of the Federal Government has largely been financed through either borrowing or taking ever greater amounts of the national income through high taxation.

(4) The process does not treat programs and policies consistently and shows a bias toward higher spending and higher taxes.

(5) It assumes extension of spending programs (of more than \$50 million per year) scheduled to expire.

(6) Yet it does not assume the extension of tax policies in the same way, consequently, extending existing tax policies that may be scheduled to expire is characterized as a new tax reduction, requiring offsets to "pay for" merely keeping tax policy the same even though estimating conventions would not require similar treatment of spending programs.

(7) The original goals set for the congressional process are admirable in their intent, but because the essential mechanisms of the process have remained the same, and "reforms" enacted over the past 40 years have largely taken the form of layering greater levels of legal complexity without reforming or reassessing the very fundamental nature of the process.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that as the primary branch of Government, Congress must:

(1) Restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) Reassert Congress's "power of the purse", and reinforce the balance of powers between Congress and the President, as the 1974 Act intended.

(3) Create greater incentives for lawmakers to do budgeting as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially adopting a budget resolution every year.

(4) Encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending.

(5) Consider innovative fiscal tools such as: zero based budgeting, which would require a department or agency to justify its budget as if it were a new expenditure; and direct spending caps to enhance oversight of automatic pilot spending that increases each year without congressional approval.

(6) Promote efficient and timely budget actions, so that lawmakers complete their budget actions by the time the new fiscal year begins.

(7) Provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts overall economic growth and job creation.

(9) Remove layers of complexity that have complicated the procedures designed in 1974, and made budgeting more arcane and opaque.

(10) Remove existing biases that favor higher spending.

(11) Include procedures by which current tax laws may be extended and treated on a basis that is not different from the extension of entitlement programs.

(c) **BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**—Comprehensive budget process reform should also remove the bias in the baseline against the extension of current tax laws in the following ways:

(1) Permanent extension of tax laws should not be used as a means to increase taxes on other taxpayers;

(2) For those expiring tax provisions that are proposed to be permanently extended, Congress should use a more realistic baseline that does not require them to be offset; and,

(3) Tax-reform legislation should not include tax increases just to offset the extension of current tax laws.

(d) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget intends to draft legislation during the 114th Congress that will rewrite the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers' dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

#### **SEC. 626. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Given the thousands of Federal programs and trillions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year, assessing and accounting for Federal fiscal activities and liabilities is a complex undertaking.

(2) Current methods of accounting leave much to be desired in capturing the full scope of government and in presenting information in a clear and compelling way that illuminates the best options going forward.

(3) Most fiscal analysis produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is conducted over a relatively short time horizon: 10 or 25 years. While this time frame is useful for most purposes, it fails to consider the fiscal consequences over the longer term.

(4) Additionally, current accounting methodology does not provide an analysis of how the Federal Government's fiscal situation over the long run affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(5) Another consideration is how Federal programs should be accounted for. The "accrual method" of accounting records revenue when it is earned and expenses when they are incurred, while the "cash method" records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received.

(6) The Federal budget accounts for most programs using cash accounting. Some programs, however, particularly loan and loan guarantee programs, are accounted for using accrual methods.

(7) GAO has indicated that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimation of the Federal Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs specifically those that provide some form of insurance.

(8) Where accrual accounting is used, it is almost exclusively calculated by CBO according to the methodology outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA). CBO uses fair value methodology instead of FCRA to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example.

(9) FCRA methodology, however, understates the risk and thus the true cost of Federal programs. An alternative is fair value methodology, which uses discount rates that incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length.

(10) The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of federal assistance" than the current approach under FCRA.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the public affected by Federal budgetary choices, adopt Governmentwide reforms of budget and accounting practices so the American people and their representatives can more readily understand the fiscal situation of the Government of the United States and the options best suited to improving it. Such reforms may include but should not be limited to the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance our current analysis by considering our fiscal situation comprehensively, over an extended time horizon, and as it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair value accounting as opposed to the current approach under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

#### **SEC. 627. POLICY STATEMENT ON SCOREKEEPING FOR OUTYEAR BUDGETARY EFFECTS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Committee on the Budget to provide an allocation of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations for the budget year covered by a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations covers a period of one fiscal year only, which is effective for the budget year.

(3) An appropriation Act, joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon may contain changes to programs that result in direct budgetary effects that occur beyond the budget year and beyond the period for which the allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget is effective.

(4) The allocation of budgetary resources provided to the Committee on Appropria-

tions does not currently anticipate or capture direct outyear budgetary effects to programs.

(5) Budget enforcement could be improved by capturing the direct outyear budgetary effects caused by appropriation Acts and using this information to determine the appropriate allocations of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations when considering future concurrent resolutions on the budget.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of the House of Representatives to more effectively allocate budgetary resources and accurately enforce budget targets by agreeing to a procedure by which the Committee on the Budget should consider the direct outyear budgetary effects of changes to mandatory programs enacted in appropriations bills, joint resolutions, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon when setting the allocation of budgetary resources for the Committee on Appropriations in a concurrent resolution on the budget. The relevant committees of jurisdiction are directed to consult on a procedure during fiscal year 2016 and include recommendations for implementing such procedure in the fiscal year 2017 concurrent resolution on the budget.

#### **SEC. 628. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$525 billion in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

#### **SEC. 629. NO BUDGET, NO PAY.**

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman

from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, today, I rise in strong support of the Blueprint for a Balanced Budget, the Republican Study Committee's substitute amendment that will expand opportunities for middle class families, grow our economy, and strengthen our national defense.

First of all, I want to say I appreciate Chairman PRICE and his hard work on the budget that is being presented from the Republican Conference, and I am looking forward to the continued debate as we make sure that we look forward to strengthening our economy and America.

Mr. Chairman, it is very clear we are on the wrong path. Despite improving indicators, folks across the country know that our economic recovery has been sluggish at best. Over 90 million Americans are not participating in the workforce, wages are stagnant, and businesses are struggling with the uncertainty about what new tax or regulation is waiting for them just around the corner.

No matter how many stimulus packages, shovel-ready jobs, and summer recoveries the President promises, things aren't getting better fast enough. Unfortunately, on many fronts the fundamentals are getting worse.

Since President Obama took office, our national debt has increased by 70 percent and has now soared past \$18 trillion. To make matters worse, the President's recently proposed budget calls for even more taxes and even more spending, and never, ever balances.

Fortunately, we now have a choice. We can continue down the road President Obama wants us to with a reckless tax and spend agenda that will add \$8.5 trillion to our debt and does nothing to reform our soon-to-be bankrupt social safety nets, or we can decide to make the bold and necessary decisions our constituents sent us here to make.

With the Republican Study Committee's blueprint, we can fix our broken system, and we can build a better future for the American people. We do this by addressing our Nation's challenges head on.

First, it is clear we must change Washington's out-of-control spending habits. If we don't, by 2023, we could be spending more money paying off the interest on our debt than we do on our national defense.

I would like to show you a chart, Mr. Chairman. As you can see, under the President's plan, because of the addiction to borrowing, our Federal Government continues to rack up more interest payments year after year. Keep in mind, this is money that we have to pay as a Federal Government, that we

cannot go to a line item and say, We are going to cut that particular payment. We have to pay the interest on our debt. This is locked in due to our borrowing.

In fact, under CBO's projections, if our interest rates on government notes increase by just 1 percent for 10 years, this expense could go up by a whopping \$1.75 trillion.

I would like to show this in particular. Last year, in the 10-year window, this particular bar is \$785 billion alone, much more than what our defense spending would cost.

We have to act, and with the RSC blueprint we do. Our budget cuts \$7.1 trillion in Federal spending over the next decade and balances the budget in 6 years. The only way we are going to ever start paying our debt is if we get to a balanced budget.

By enacting commonsense reforms, we are able to have a surplus. By year 2021, we will have a surplus so we can start paying that debt down. If you look at the President's budget, you will never, ever see a balanced budget, and so we will never, ever deal with our debt.

In addition, our budget puts forward a pro-growth set of tax reforms that will make the Tax Code simpler, fairer, and more competitive. We do this by lowering rates and simplifying brackets. We reduce taxes on small businesses and corporations, and we encourage money that is setting overseas to return home by transitioning to a fairer, smarter territorial tax system.

To get the government out of one-sixth of America's economy, through reconciliation, our plan repeals ObamaCare in full. However, we replace it. We replace the failed law with the American Health Care Reform Act, a patient-centered, free market, and affordable way to provide health care for all Americans. This act allows individuals and families to deduct health care costs, expands access to health savings accounts, and creates options and choices for Americans to purchase their coverage across State lines.

Our budget also strengthens national defense. Our Federal Government's primary role, number one constitutional responsibility, is the defense of the Nation. By providing our men and women in uniform with \$570 billion in our base defense budget, we are able to ensure our military has the resources it needs to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, in 1962, discretionary programs made up a majority of government spending. Today, it is the reverse. So-called mandatory programs, like we see right here, are on autopilot, and this makes up two-thirds of the budget. As you can see, these programs are on a clock. We can see that Social Security Disability Insurance goes bankrupt in 2016. Social Security retirement for Americans all across the

country goes bankrupt in 2034. And, of course, Medicare isn't too far behind that; it is actually in front of Social Security, and goes bankrupt in 2030.

The clock is ticking, Mr. Chairman, and we need to do something sooner rather than later. This is very predictable and it is very preventable if we act now. The President doesn't do that. In contrast, our plan does, and it makes the critical structural reforms necessary to preserve these entitlement programs for current and future seniors.

Let's not let the solvable problems of today become the causes of decline tomorrow. Let's stand together and let's pass a serious budget through a serious conversation that reforms the way Washington operates. Let's pass a budget that will allow opportunities for middle class families to flourish. Let's pass a budget that will keep America strong for years to come at home and abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday, we debated the Republican budget proposal as it came to the floor. We saw that even as Americans are working even harder every day, their budget would squeeze them more. It would squeeze middle class families and those working to join the middle class. It would squeeze students trying to get an affordable college education. It would squeeze seniors by immediately increasing the cost of prescription drugs, immediately increasing the cost of copays for preventive health services.

This budget on the floor today squeezes those families even harder, even as both budgets provide another round of windfall tax cuts to the folks at the very top by cutting the top tax rate by over a third as they green light the Romney-Ryan plan.

This particular budget actually will slow down economic growth over the next couple of years, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Those are the nonpartisan professionals that analyze these budgets. They looked at the Republican budget and said: You know, it will slow down growth in the next couple of years.

This particular version of the Republican budget will do so even more. Why would we want to slow down economic growth just as the trends are picking up? Look, we have got a long way to go to get everybody back to work, but we are on the right path, on the right trajectory. Why would we want to put on the brakes, as the Republican budget does, as well as the RSC budget, in the coming years?

While the Republican budget we had on the floor just the other day has no answer, no immediate answer to the pending shortfall in the transportation trust fund, this particular budget unreservedly just divests the Federal Government of responsibility for most highways and transit projects that are currently supported by the Federal budget.

I will say in closing that there is one redeeming quality to this budget, which is that this budget does not play games with the overseas contingency accounts, like the Republican budget brought to the floor by the chairman does. This does not use the so-called "overseas contingency account" as a slush fund. This budget funds defense in the same straightforward way that the President of the United States' budget does.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to just mention that CBO is actually projecting that our economic growth is going to slow down. That is happening under this administration's policies, and it is not helping Americans recover as quickly as possible. This is a serious budget that does deal with those challenges, and it is straightforward. We believe we have to get to a balanced budget sooner rather than later so we can have a stronger economy.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), chairman of the RSC.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the Republican Study Committee budget for fiscal year 2016.

I also want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, for the great work that he has done in crafting the blueprint for a balanced budget, a robust and responsible plan to tackle \$18 trillion of national debt, along with the over \$100 trillion of unfunded obligations, which are crippling the futures of millions of hard-working Americans, their children, and their grandchildren.

I also want to thank Chairman PRICE and the Budget Committee for their great work on the Conference budget. But today, I am proud to support the budget proposal put forth by the Republican Study Committee.

The RSC budget will balance the Federal budget in just 6 years, providing a better future for our children and our grandchildren. It also reduces rampant government overspending by \$7.1 trillion compared to current policy, and it gets rid of redundant and unconstitutional government programs that waste billions of precious taxpayer dollars.

Hard-working American families know the importance of prioritizing to live within their means, and it is time the Federal Government learned that lesson as well.

This budget upholds the Congress' sacred constitutional duty to first pro-

vide for our national defense. Maintaining a strong military must be Congress' number one priority, especially in this increasingly dangerous world.

Our budget follows Ronald Reagan's successful strategy of "peace through strength" for our national security.

Defense spending should be determined first and foremost by our security needs, capabilities, and the threats facing our Nation. Acknowledging that, this plan allocates \$570 billion in base defense spending for fiscal year 2016 and provides for a total of \$6.4 trillion in defense spending over the next decade.

We also believe that we must work to grow America's economy, not Washington's bureaucracy. The best way that we can spur growth and encourage job creation is by getting the government out of the way of America's innovators and entrepreneurs. This means repealing ObamaCare through reconciliation and establishing patient-centered reforms for better American health care.

The RSC budget also calls for replacing the current Tax Code with a new pro-growth Tax Code that will benefit all taxpayers and families. We need a simpler, fairer, more competitive Tax Code that will help, not hinder, America's opportunity economy. We also sunset the IRS and we end the death tax.

Finally, this budget addresses the dire state of America's social safety net programs and puts them back on a path toward solvency and toward doing the right thing for America's families.

Unless Congress acts, Medicare will be bankrupt by 2013, Social Security retirement will be bankrupt by 2033, and Social Security Disability Insurance will be bankrupt next year, in 2016.

This budget introduces new reforms that strengthen America's social safety net so that it will be here for future generations. And we structure them in such a way to keep families together and to provide ladders of opportunity out of poverty. We don't keep people trapped in poverty.

We in Congress have an obligation to the American people to live within our means and to be trustworthy stewards of taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, Washington has fallen short.

Voting "yes" on the RSC budget is an opportunity for this Congress to restore the trust of the American people and to show that we are carrying out the important job that they sent us here to do.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the RSC budget and "yes" again on the House Budget Committee budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE), a terrific member of the Budget Committee.

□ 1500

Ms. MOORE. Let me thank the ranking member and my colleagues on the other side for the tremendous effort and work that they have put into this budget.

Mr. Chair, of course, I am opposed to the Republican Study Committee budget. This is the committee-adopted budget on steroids. The Republican Study Committee, to kind of outdo their Republican counterparts, balances this budget in 6 years instead of 10, and it cuts it by \$7.1 trillion in just 6 years.

I can tell you, while I am opposed to this budget, I have to commend the Republican Study Committee for putting it on the table here in a very transparent manner. Rather than raising the defense budget by \$9 billion above the President's budget and putting all of those funds into the OCO account, at least they end the sequester and do it in a transparent, budgetary way. I commend them for that, but I do urge my colleagues to reject this budget.

This budget raises taxes on the middle class. It divests in education for our students. It divests in infrastructure improvements for our roads, for our ports, for our bridges. There is much to be said for balancing a budget, but you not only can't do it on the backs of the poor, the elderly, the infirm, and children, but on the back of the economy.

I am also on the Financial Services Committee, and we have been warned that growing inequality is not only bad for morale in our country, but it will destroy our economy in the long run.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I will just point out really quickly that I appreciate the other side's compliments on how we budget for defense, but let's remember this, that defense is only 18 percent of the overall Federal Government spending.

As you see on this pie chart, this is defense discretionary spending right here, \$596 billion. This is nondefense discretionary spending. The rest of this pie, which is the rest of the \$3.5 trillion in Federal Government spending, is untouched. It is on autopilot. Here is the interest. All of these programs continue to grow.

If we don't protect these programs and reform them, this is only going to get squeezed more and more. If we want to protect the country, we have to recognize that we are going to have to do it in a way that puts our priorities in order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Thank you, Congressman STUTZMAN, for yielding me this time and for your hard work and leadership on the RSC's budget task force. Thank you, also, to Chairman FLORES for his great leadership.

Mr. Chairman, America's national debt is now well over \$18 trillion. Because of out-of-control spending, we add another \$1 million to the debt approximately every 30 seconds. The Republican Study Committee's Blueprint for a Balanced Budget takes important steps to rein in our bloated bureaucracy, cuts unnecessary regulations, and strengthens job creation while it increases transparency and oversight.

Here is our budget proposal. It cuts \$7.1 trillion in spending over 10 years. It balances the Federal budget in 6 years. Imagine that.

It repeals ObamaCare and replaces it with competitive reforms that will lower costs for all Americans while protecting the relationship between the patient and his doctor. It preserves Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and food stamps through commonsense reforms that bring these programs into the 21st century. It also addresses inadequacies in President Obama's budget by providing critical funding for our national security.

Since I have started speaking, Mr. Chairman, we have added \$2 million to the national debt. That is insanity. Our Founding Fathers never intended for Washington to provide massive, one-size-fits-all programs that will not create better opportunities for hard-working, tax-paying Americans. As well, we need to return control back to the States, where local leaders know the best solutions for their local problems.

As a member of the RSC's budget task force, I am honored to place the priorities of North Carolinians ahead of Washington's tax-and-spend schemes. Please join me in supporting the RSC's Blueprint for a Balanced Budget, which will restore fiscally accountable principles to our Federal Government and better opportunities for the American people.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, about the only thing any of the Republican budgets have done in recent years is to cut the deficit, ignoring altogether the desperate needs and declining wages of the people.

This year, the American people will give Congress no credit for a budget that does not grow jobs and good wages. The Republican budget cuts growth by 2.5 percent, and it devastates almost 3 million jobs.

Instead of using a readymade need in order to grow good jobs with good wages—the surface transportation bill that must be authorized this year—the Republican budget would, for the first time in our history, cut almost all new highway and transit funding. States

would be left able to fill potholes but unable to begin a single new project.

Infrastructure needs must be met at some point anyway, so we do ourselves no favor by our serial failure to meet the needs that also have been shown to be the best way to fuel the economy with good jobs.

There is no magical way to cut our way into good jobs and begin to repair income inequality. The old-fashioned, American way of building America's neglected infrastructure is the best way today, as it was when President Eisenhower initiated the surface transportation bill 70 years ago.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Maryland has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican Study Committee budget.

It is a conservative, progrowth document that balances in 6 years, that repeals ObamaCare and replaces it with a patient-centered solution, that stops the President's lawless executive amnesty, and that simplifies the Tax Code. The budget also offers commonsense reforms to strengthen America's entitlement programs.

The RSC budget accomplishes all of this while still fully funding our national security commitments by providing \$570 billion in base defense spending, not through budget gimmicks. In a time of weak and uncertain White House leadership on national security, bad actors are given incentive to be more aggressive. We must not underfund our military at this time.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support the RSC budget and return America to a position of fiscal strength and stability.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a wonderful member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank my colleague, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, we are debating the Federal budget at a time when America is experiencing an economic recovery—unemployment is down; gas prices are lower, and retirement accounts are healthier—yet that is at risk if the Republican budget is adopted.

It would weaken America's recovery. How? The Republican budget turns its back on what makes America grow and on what makes America strong, including our students, medical and scientific research, and modern transportation systems and infrastructure.

Democrats will offer a more optimistic vision for America that builds

on our economic recovery. Democrats want everyone to succeed while Republicans shower tax breaks on the wealthy at the expense of hard-working families.

The people I know and meet work hard every day. They value good jobs, good schools, safe communities, and the promise of, when they retire, that they can live their retirement years in dignity.

The Republican budget is not one for the hard-working people of America. The Republican budget is crafted by the special interests for the special interests. Republicans stack the deck against working families and small businesses. They refuse to find one tax loophole to close or change. If you are incredibly rich, then you are incredibly lucky because this Republican budget is for you; you pay less.

If you are like the vast majority of Americans, hold on because you are going to pay more. If you are a student who wants to attend college, Republicans make it harder by cutting Pell grants and student loans. If you have a job in transportation, infrastructure, or at a port or at an airport, the Republican budget could cost you your job. It will, at the very least, put us farther behind.

If you believe that America should remain the world leader in medical research and innovation, sorry, as the Republican budget slashes research at the National Institutes of Health, at our universities, and at research institutions.

If you are an older American, the Republicans ask you to pay much more for Medicare and long-term care. Republicans take away that secure lifeline that has existed for decades since the Democratic Congress passed Medicare and Medicaid.

In doing so, the Republicans break the promise to older Americans that, after working hard all of your life, you can live your retirement years in dignity, without the fear of poverty in your old age; you will pay more.

The Republican budget is a cynical, special interest driven vision of America. In contrast, the Democratic budget invests in what makes America great and in what makes America strong.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. One noted economist recently advised that America has the strongest economy in the developed world right now, but the Republican budget puts that at risk in order to boost a special few.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic plan and what makes America great: a growing, healthy economy; our students; scientific research; modern infrastructure in America; and the great promise of our country.



Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. I want to thank my colleague from Maryland, the great ranking member and leader of the Budget Committee.

Mr. Chairman, when I took this office, I vowed to work in a bipartisan fashion, and I am committed to doing that. I have been pleasantly surprised at how many Republicans are willing—even eager—to work across party lines. Unfortunately, that is not the case with the Republican budget before us today.

The Republican budget not only fails to grow our economy, but it deprives many Americans of the resources and support they need to succeed. A budget is a value statement, and it is clear that what the Republicans are proposing today is bad for our working families, for our students, and for our veterans.

I was proud to offer two amendments last week during the House Budget Committee markup, addressing issues that should have broad bipartisan support: our veterans and our students. Unbelievably, my Republican colleagues voted against funding to protect the VA from future government shutdowns and to provide more financial support to help students get the vocational training they need to succeed in a 21st century workplace.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, no budget is ever perfect, but the Democratic resolution invests the most in our future by placing American families, students, and military service-members first.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Is the gentleman prepared to close?

Mr. STUTZMAN. Yes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As I said in my comments earlier, this budget suffers from all of the problems that the earlier Republican budget suffered from, but it does have one redeeming quality, which is that it does not use the overseas contingency account as a slush fund. It actually funds defense in a straightforward manner.

In listening to the advocates of this budget, I thought maybe their account-

ing had been more sound on other fronts, but as I look at it—I look at the Republican budget and how much revenue it raises over 10 years, and I look at the Republican study group's budget, which has the identical amount of revenue over 10 years—what that means is that we see the same budget quackery in claiming to balance because that revenue includes revenue from the Affordable Care Act, almost \$1 trillion worth.

□ 1515

It includes the savings from the Affordable Care Act, which both Republican budgets claim to repeal.

You know what it doesn't include? It does not include the costs of all the tax bills that are coming out of the Committee on Ways and Means, including one being marked up today which would entirely get rid of the estate tax, meaning that it will benefit 5,500 people in this country at the cost of \$269 billion a year. Seventy-five percent of this tax break is going to go to the inheritors of estates valued at more than \$20 million. You add that to this budget, and it is even more out of balance.

But it does point to the underlying theme in all the Republican budgets, which is let's give another tax break to the very wealthiest in this country; right? Let's cut the top rate for millionaires while we squeeze middle class families and those working their way into the middle class. They are going to increase the tax burden on them.

The chairman of the committee, I think he went to Emory University. I think they have got about 5,500 students, maybe a little bit more undergraduate. This would provide almost \$269 billion to a population of 5,500 households in the country—the folks at the very top—while they are cutting our investment in our kids' education dramatically, while they are cutting our investment in innovation and research that has helped power our economy, while they are devolving most of our transportation system away from the Federal Government, even though our Federal transportation system has helped power our economy and make us competitive in this very competitive world.

So from the budget gimmicks that apparently are the same in both budgets to the fact that both budgets say to folks at the very top: You know what? We are going to give you another tax break while we squeeze everybody else in America; right?

They increase the costs of student loans. You have got over a trillion dollars in student debt. Why would we be increasing the cost of student loans? They are going to start charging students interest while they are in college.

They are going to require seniors on Medicare to immediately pay more for prescription drugs by reopening the doughnut hole.

So hard-working families, students trying to go to college, seniors who are trying to have a secure retirement, they all get hit on the same day that they provide a huge tax break to 5,500 people. That says it all about what both these Republican budgets do. They disinvest in our future; they squeeze hard-working families, students, and seniors, while saying to the folks who are already at the top of the ladder: We are going to give you just one more break. And go ahead and pull up that ladder of opportunity behind you; it doesn't matter. We are going to leave everybody else behind.

That is not what America stands for. I thought this was the land of opportunity. But while they cut our investment in education, they don't cut a single tax break for the purpose of reducing the deficit, and then they go and claim a balance that is phony.

Mr. Chairman, I ask everyone to reject both these Republican budgets. They are wrong for the country.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would first of all just like to thank the RNC members for helping to put this budget together. It is a blueprint for a balanced budget. There are no gimmicks.

What the gentleman is referring to is our revenue line highlights the benefit that Americans receive when we have tax reform. For example, you know, the gimmick that was sold in the health care law was that people were going to pay less in health care costs. I was at a Cracker Barrel a couple of weeks ago in Auburn in my district, and a lady comes up to me and says: Mr. Congressman, I would like to show you my story. I am now paying more in premiums. My premiums doubled. My out-of-pocket expense went from \$500 to \$5,000.

That is more than a tax increase, Mr. Chairman.

Our foreign policy is on the wrong path; our spending is on the wrong path; our economy is on the wrong path. We have got to get back to priorities and recognize, for our country to be strong economically, to be strong with our defense, that we have got to get our budget back into balance to make sure that we can pay off the \$18 trillion of debt that our kids have to face. I have two boys, Payton and Preston, 13 and 9 years old. They are going to have to pay the interest on this debt and the debt for years and years to come.

I ask the Members of this body to take a serious look at the RNC budget, and I ask for their support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A  
SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE  
BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.**

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2015 and for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND  
AMOUNTS**

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

**TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS**

Sec. 201. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for job creation through investments and incentives.

Sec. 202. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reform the tax system to work for hard working Americans.

Sec. 203. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the extension of expired or expiring tax provisions.

Sec. 204. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicare improvement.

Sec. 205. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicaid and children's health improvement.

Sec. 206. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for initiatives that benefit children.

Sec. 207. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for college affordability and completion.

Sec. 208. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for a competitive workforce.

Sec. 209. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and service members.

Sec. 210. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for modernizing unemployment compensation.

Sec. 211. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing energy independence and security.

Sec. 212. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Sec. 213. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for rural counties and schools.

Sec. 214. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for additional funding for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

Sec. 215. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the health care workforce.

Sec. 216. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for improving the availability of long-term care services and supports.

**TITLE III—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT  
SPENDING**

Sec. 301. Direct spending.

**TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS**

Sec. 401. Point of order against advance appropriations.

Sec. 402. Adjustments to discretionary spending limits.

Sec. 403. Costs of emergency needs, Overseas Contingency Operations and disaster relief.

Sec. 404. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 405. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 406. Reinstatement of pay-as-you-go.

Sec. 407. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

**TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS**

Sec. 501. Policy of the House on job creation.

Sec. 502. Policy of the House on surface transportation.

Sec. 503. Policy of the House on tax reform that works for hardworking families.

Sec. 504. Policy of the House on building ladders of opportunity to help hardworking families join the middle class.

Sec. 505. Policy of the House on women's economic empowerment, and health and safety improvement.

Sec. 506. Policy of the House on the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 507. Policy of the House on the Federal workforce.

Sec. 508. Policy of the House on a national strategy to eradicate poverty and increase opportunity.

Sec. 509. Policy of the House on rejecting the sequester.

Sec. 510. Policy of the House on Social Security.

Sec. 511. Policy of the House on protecting the Medicare guarantee for seniors.

Sec. 512. Policy of the House on affordable health care coverage for working families.

Sec. 513. Policy of the House on Medicaid.

Sec. 514. Policy of the House on investments that help children succeed.

Sec. 515. Policy of the House on immigration reform.

Sec. 516. Policy of the House on national security.

Sec. 517. Policy of the House on climate change science.

Sec. 518. Policy of the House on financial consumer protection.

Sec. 519. Policy of the House on the use of taxpayer funds.

Sec. 520. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the reduction of unnecessary and wasteful spending.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND  
AMOUNTS**

**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND  
AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2025:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,439,277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,775,502,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,882,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,989,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,114,729,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,251,847,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,398,020,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,561,491,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,783,024,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$4,010,679,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,426,906,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$11,000,000,000

Fiscal year 2016: \$99,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$106,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$120,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$132,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$144,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$150,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$168,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$228,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$286,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$341,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,961,412,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,211,302,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,292,123,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,468,445,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,650,176,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,828,418,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,993,651,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,162,919,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$4,357,628,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$4,550,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,725,021,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$2,941,778,000,000

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,165,536,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,288,919,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,422,685,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,603,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,776,636,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,947,247,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,138,897,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$4,318,454,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$4,497,245,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,685,225,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: -\$502,501,000,000

Fiscal year 2016: -\$390,034,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: -\$406,643,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: -\$432,965,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: -\$488,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: -\$524,789,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: -\$549,227,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: -\$577,406,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: -\$535,430,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: -\$486,566,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: -\$438,319,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$18,468,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,032,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$19,667,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$20,347,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$21,074,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$21,836,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$22,625,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$23,426,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$24,206,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$24,963,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$25,659,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2015: \$13,360,000,000,000

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,815,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017: \$14,302,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$14,828,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,433,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,099,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,818,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,597,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,373,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$19,143,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,915,000,000,000.

#### SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2015 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

##### (1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$596,720,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$590,195,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,380,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$582,430,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$582,126,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$573,904,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$593,364,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$575,837,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$601,639,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$588,174,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$607,930,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$597,134,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$620,245,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$606,885,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$632,525,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$622,398,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$645,784,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$630,255,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$659,080,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$638,461,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$672,414,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$655,940,000,000.

##### (2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,611,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,492,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,443,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,338,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,862,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,904,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,103,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,923,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,779,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,193,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,192,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,467,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,269,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,904,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,555,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,595,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$54,647,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,347,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,743,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,232,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,872,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,166,000,000.

##### (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,805,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,612,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,059,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,489,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,672,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,226,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,302,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,881,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,623,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,250,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,948,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,619,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,606,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,030,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,279,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,635,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,962,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,293,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,658,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,969,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,372,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,667,000,000.

##### (4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,557,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,830,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,210,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,933,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,587,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,811,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,559,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,867,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,491,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,378,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,512,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,673,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,641,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,937,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,714,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,091,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,846,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,927,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,966,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,484,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,102,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,652,000,000.

##### (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

##### Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,453,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,173,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,870,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,239,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,024,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,523,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,212,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,593,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,685,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,721,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,638,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,611,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,839,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,935,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,463,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,510,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,133,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,298,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,898,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,394,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,821,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,222,000,000.

##### (6) Agriculture (350):

##### Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,856,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,038,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,384,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,024,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,162,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,954,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,514,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,879,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,073,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,801,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,247,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,223,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,692,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,075,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,525,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,692,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,145,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,743,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,168,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,003,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,483,000,000.

##### (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

##### Fiscal year 2015:

(A) New budget authority, -\$17,323,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$29,458,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,582,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,936,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,976,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$730,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,606,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,487,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,994,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,176,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,383,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,656,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,902,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$406,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,460,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,066,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,422,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,341,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,755,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,309,000,000.

##### Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,425,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$4,736,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,569,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$89,236,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$107,892,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$95,061,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$108,674,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$98,765,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$109,913,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$100,611,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$111,250,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$102,623,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$112,563,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$103,958,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$114,274,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$105,377,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,359,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$106,192,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,204,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$106,234,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$99,091,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$106,058,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,012,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$106,517,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,915,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,346,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,976,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,511,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,127,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,794,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,677,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,694,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,865,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,894,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,754,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,758,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,712,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,687,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,858,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,708,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,573,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,790,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,659,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,922,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$14,979,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,248,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$107,566,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$107,660,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$101,847,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$121,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$114,742,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$127,556,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$122,435,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$134,976,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$130,666,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$139,874,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$136,275,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$142,897,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$140,745,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$147,965,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$144,868,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$151,609,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$148,664,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$153,238,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$152,731,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$154,178,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$155,116,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$487,040,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$481,126,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$515,793,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$529,317,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$565,428,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$567,738,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$590,501,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$592,459,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$616,322,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$617,964,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$647,554,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$638,478,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$667,158,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$667,120,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$701,192,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$700,370,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$734,468,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$734,075,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$770,027,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$769,587,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$806,404,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$806,360,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$539,669,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$539,342,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$583,270,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$581,608,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$584,123,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$584,052,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$588,208,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$588,124,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$656,892,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$656,696,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$704,939,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$704,788,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$756,903,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$756,741,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$854,870,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$854,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$877,624,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$876,521,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$890,991,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$889,628,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$986,230,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$990,740,000,000.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$516,580,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$512,007,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$539,209,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$533,999,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$548,714,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$542,073,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$553,915,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$543,191,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$573,984,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$567,378,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$587,465,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$580,673,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$601,432,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$594,862,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$621,724,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$620,430,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$632,671,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$626,669,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$644,428,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$632,304,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$667,486,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$659,847,000,000.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,554,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,621,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,885,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,928,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,563,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,424,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 2015:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$153,079,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$155,672,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$168,175,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$172,347,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$169,070,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$172,607,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$166,734,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$166,775,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$177,946,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$177,528,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$182,113,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$181,595,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$185,682,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$185,175,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$197,554,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$196,926,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$193,729,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$193,080,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$190,068,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$189,340,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$203,439,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$202,706,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$56,043,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,048,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$58,250,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$60,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$61,731,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$62,350,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$60,804,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$60,253,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$61,227,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$60,498,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$61,656,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$61,823,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$62,787,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$63,291,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,489,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$64,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,525,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$65,639,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$66,581,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,542,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$71,547,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$71,336,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,920,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,806,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,876,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,938,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,007,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,819,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,295,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$28,541,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,044,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,258,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,763,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,842,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,312,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$30,410,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,878,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$30,971,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,428,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,304,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,788,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,883,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,299,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$325,962,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$325,962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$368,173,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$368,173,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$420,786,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$420,786,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$493,610,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$493,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$559,871,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$559,871,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$622,059,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$622,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$672,197,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$672,197,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$723,968,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$723,968,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$773,014,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$773,014,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$815,026,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$815,026,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$847,334,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$847,334,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$21,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$11,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$36,770,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$36,776,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$23,340,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$11,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$28,661,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,139,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$6,925,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$6,058,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$10,998,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$8,030,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$665,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$2,028,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$52,729,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$53,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$4,572,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$4,147,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$78,123,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$77,680,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,833,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,813,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$106,825,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$106,825,000,000.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$78,012,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$78,012,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$88,445,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$88,445,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$93,810,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$93,810,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$90,497,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$90,497,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$89,327,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$89,327,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$92,978,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$92,978,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$95,188,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$95,188,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$97,408,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$97,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$102,090,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$102,090,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$105,007,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$105,007,000,000.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-  
al War on Terrorism (970):

Fiscal year 2015:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, \$57,997,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$7,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$3,675,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,312,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$40,000,000.

## TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

### SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR JOB CREATION THROUGH INVEST- MENTS AND INCENTIVES.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities or other measures that create jobs for Americans and boost the economy. The revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) provide for additional investments in rail, aviation, harbors (including harbor maintenance dredging), seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure;

(2) provide for additional investments in other areas that would help businesses and other employers create new jobs; and

(3) provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to help small businesses, non-profits, States, and communities expand investment, train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE TAX SYSTEM TO WORK FOR HARD WORKING AMERICANS.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that reforms the tax system to reward American workers, incentivize higher pay, and increase the after-tax take home income of working families, such as paycheck tax credits for American workers; incentives for workers to save a portion of their income; incentives for corporations to raise employee pay and/or provide employees with ownership and profit-sharing opportunities; incentives for investments in apprenticeships and other training programs that result in higher skills and better pay; provide tax relief to offset the additional and unique costs faced by two-earner families; a modernized and expanded Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit; or other reforms to the tax system to make it work for the middle class and those working to join the middle class, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE EXTENSION OF EXPIRED OR EXPIRING TAX PROVISIONS.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends provisions of the tax code that have expired or will expire in the future, including tax incentives for research and development, renewable energy investments, charitable giving, economic and community development, and tax relief for working families and small businesses, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENT.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes improvements to Medicare, such as—

(1) new incentives to encourage efficiency and higher quality care in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability;

(2) payment accuracy improvements to encourage efficient use of resources;

(3) innovative programs to improve coordination of care among all providers serving a patient in all appropriate settings;

(4) policies to hold providers accountable for their utilization patterns and quality of care;

(5) improvements to Medicare's benefit design to make care more affordable and accessible for people with Medicare, including improvements to programs that provide assist-

ance with premiums and cost-sharing to beneficiaries with limited incomes; and

(6) extension of expiring provisions; excluding any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes any changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare; by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID AND CHILDREN'S HEALTH IMPROVEMENT.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves Medicaid or other children's health programs, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025. Such improvements may include—

(1) restoring the enhanced Medicaid reimbursement rates for certain primary care services to Medicare levels using Federal funds, and expanding the enhanced rates to rates to additional health care providers;

(2) providing States with tools to streamline enrollment into Medicaid and CHIP and ensure continuity of care, and may include permanently extending the Express Lane Eligibility option for children or creating an option to provide 12-month continuous eligibility for adults in Medicaid; and

(3) providing more options for States to expand access to home and community based long-term care services for seniors and persons with disabilities, and to improve benefits.

**SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INITIATIVES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of children by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025. Improvements may include any of the following:

(1) Changes to foster care to expand the number of at-risk children for whom effective supportive, prevention, and post-permanency services are provided to promote safety, well-being, and permanency for vulnerable children.

(2) Changes to encourage increased parental support for children, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child and policies to encourages States to provide access and visitation services to improve fathers' relationships with their children. Such changes could reflect efforts to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty.

(3) Regular increases in funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to put the Federal Government on a 10-year path to fulfill its commitment to America's children and schools by providing 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for special education.

(4) Funding for research designed to improve program effectiveness in creating positive outcomes for low-income children and families.

**SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY AND COMPLETION.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable and increases college completion, including efforts to: encourage States and higher education institutions to improve educational outcomes and access for low- and moderate-income students; ensure continued full funding for Pell grants; or help borrowers lower and manage their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded repayment options, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 208. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR A COMPETITIVE WORKFORCE.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that helps ensure that all Americans have access to good-paying jobs, including: fully reauthorizing the Trade Adjustment Assistance program; funding proven effective job training and employment programs, such as year-round and summer jobs for youth; or new initiatives such as apprenticeships involving collaborations between employers, educators, and providers and job training services, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 209. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) improves access and enhances the delivery of timely health care to the Nation's veterans and service members;

(2) improves the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental illnesses, and increasing the capacity to address health care needs unique to women veterans;

(3) makes improvements to the Post 9/11 GI Bill to ensure that veterans receive the educational benefits they need to maximize their employment opportunities;

(4) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(5) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt); or

(6) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 210. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MODERNIZING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that modernizes unemployment compensation, including providing additional learning opportunities and training for unemployed workers, expanding program eligibility to more workers, or making the program more responsive to economic downturns, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 211. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency;

(2) encourages investment in emerging clean energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration;

(3) provides additional resources for oversight and expanded enforcement activities to crack down on speculation in and manipulation of oil and gas markets, including derivatives markets;

(4) limits and provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;

(5) assists businesses, industries, States, communities, the environment, workers, or households as the United States moves toward reducing and offsetting the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; or

(6) facilitates the training of workers for these industries (“clean energy jobs”);

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 212. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FULL FUNDING OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 213. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RURAL COUNTIES AND SCHOOLS.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes changes to or provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-393) by the amounts provided by that legislation for those purposes, if such legislation requires sustained yield timber harvests obviating the need for funding under Public Law 106-393 in the future and would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to

fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 214. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides additional funding for the Affordable Housing Trust Fund beyond the base levels provided by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 215. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE HEALTH CARE WORKFORCE.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the contemporary health care workforce's ability to meet emerging demands, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2015 to fiscal year 2025.

**SEC. 216. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMPROVING THE AVAILABILITY OF LONG-TERM CARE SERVICES AND SUPPORTS.**

The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the availability of long-term care services and supports for senior citizens and individuals with disabilities, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2016 to fiscal year 2020 or fiscal year 2016 to fiscal year 2025. Such improvements may include creation of a comprehensive long-term care insurance program; pilot programs or studies to determine the best options for improving access to long-term care services; or other improvements to Medicare, Medicaid, or other programs to provide increased access to long-term care.

**TITLE III—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING**

**SEC. 301. DIRECT SPENDING.**

**(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—**

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.1 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending: The resolution rejects cuts to the social safety net that lifts millions of people out of poverty. It assumes extension of the tax credits from the American Taxpayer Relief Act due to expire at the end of 2017. These credits include an increase in refundability of the child tax credit, relief for married earned income tax credit filers, and a larger earned income tax credit for larger families. It also assumes expansion of the earned income tax credit for childless

workers, a group that has seen limited support from safety net programs, and other impacts of a middle class and pro-work tax reform.

**(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—**

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 5.4 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015 is 5.5 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending: For Medicare, this budget rejects proposals to end the Medicare guarantee and shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of private insurance. Such proposals will expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks, and they will weaken the traditional Medicare program. Instead, this budget builds on the success of the Affordable Care Act, which made significant strides in health care cost containment and put into place a framework for continuous innovation. This budget supports comprehensive reforms to give physicians and other care providers incentives to provide high-quality, coordinated, efficient care, in a manner consistent with the goals of fiscal sustainability. It makes no changes that reduce benefits available to seniors and individuals with disabilities in Medicare. In other areas, the resolution assumes additional funding for child care, early education, and children's health; extension and expansion of the American Opportunity Tax Credit, which assists with higher education expenses; and funding certain tribal support costs that have been previously annually appropriated. It also would create a National Infrastructure Bank, an Apprenticeship Training Fund, and a Paid Leave Partnership Initiative, which would help States establish paid leave programs. The resolution repeals the mandatory sequester required under the Budget Control Act.

**TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS**

**SEC. 401. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2017 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2018, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for all discretionary programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2016 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2016.



**SEC. 402. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.**

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES UNDER THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2016 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2016.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2016 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2016.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2016 that appropriates \$9,572,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced enforcement to address the Federal tax gap (taxes owed but not paid) and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$667,000,000, to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2016.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2016 that appropriates \$151,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to \$30,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2016.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

**SEC. 403. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AND DISASTER RELIEF.**

(a) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report

makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or this resolution.

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for Overseas Contingency Operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the Chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to, but not to exceed, the total amount of budget authority specified in section 102(21).

(2) LIMITATION.—Adjustments made pursuant to paragraph (1) shall only include funding appropriated to the Overseas Contingency Operations title of an appropriations bill for war activities and related diplomatic and development operations, or for activities related to countering urgent national security threats, and shall not include funding for regular, base budget activities.

(c) DISASTER RELIEF.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated for disaster relief pursuant to this subsection, then the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and as necessary, the aggregates in this resolution, shall be adjusted by the amount of new budget authority and outlays up to the amounts provided under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as adjusted by subsection (d).

(d) WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION OPERATIONS.—

(1) CAP ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for wildfire suppression operations for fiscal year 2016 that appropriates a base amount equal to 70 percent of the average cost of wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years and provides an additional appropriation of up to but not to exceed \$1.5 billion for wildfire suppression operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the additional amount of budget authority above the base amount and the outlays resulting from that additional budget authority.

(2) DEFICIT-NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENT.—The total allowable discretionary adjustment for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the sum of allocation increases made pursuant to paragraph (1) in the previous year.

(e) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

**SEC. 404. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congress-

sional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

**SEC. 405. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The chairman of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

**SEC. 406. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.**

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 114th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of “CUTGO” rules and principles:

(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the terms “budget year”, “current year”, and “direct spending” have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term “direct spending” shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4)(C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House directing the Clerk to add as a new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate

measure as passed by the House shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

- (i) a bill or joint resolution;
- (ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business;
- (iii) a conference report; or
- (iv) an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a bill or joint resolution, the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

#### SEC. 407. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

### TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS

#### SEC. 501. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON JOB CREATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) the economy entered a deep recession in December 2007 that was worsened by a financial crisis in 2008—by January 2009, the private sector was shedding nearly 800,000 jobs per month;

(2) actions by the President, Congress, and the Federal Reserve helped stem the crisis, and job creation resumed in 2010, with the economy creating 12 million private jobs over the past 60 consecutive months;

(3) United States manufacturing has shared in this recovery with manufacturing employment having grown over the last five years, the first such extended period of growth since the 1990s;

(4) despite the job gains already made, job growth needs to accelerate and continue for an extended period for the economy to fully recover from the recession;

(5) millions of Americans remain unemployed or underemployed, in danger of seeing a middle-class lifestyle slip away or remain out of reach, and this issue is especially acute in the African-American and Latino communities, making it imperative that we push for extended job creation which is broadly shared; and

(6) further job creation is vital to ensure that the economy continues to recover and that the benefits of the recovery are more broadly shared.

(b) POLICY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should make it a priority to enact legislation to help create jobs in the United States, remove incentives to out-source jobs overseas and instead support

incentives that bring jobs back to the United States.

(2) JOBS.—This resolution—

(A) supports funding for President Obama's six-year, \$478 billion surface transportation reauthorization proposal;

(B) supports efforts for additional job creation measures, including further infrastructure improvements, such as a National Infrastructure Bank that can be used for a wide range of infrastructure investments, including investments in expanding clean energy production and energy efficiency, and support for biomedical and other research that both creates jobs and advances scientific knowledge and health, or other spending or revenue proposals;

(C) protects jobs in the United States by eliminating unjustified corporate tax breaks that encourage firms to ship jobs and capital overseas and shelter their profits in foreign tax havens, including provisions that permit U.S. companies to "invert" and pretend to move overseas purely to reduce taxes—revenues raised by the elimination or reduction of such tax breaks can then be invested in infrastructure improvements and other job creation efforts; and

(D) supports a "Make it in America" agenda that seeks to expand on the recent recovery in manufacturing jobs and help encourage a resurgence of manufacturing in the United States through job creation measures, including the development of new domestic manufacturing institutes to conduct research into innovative products and materials, the establishment of a new investment fund of up to \$10 billion to help American-made advanced manufacturing technologies reach commercial scale production, and passage of other legislation to support manufacturing in the United States.

#### SEC. 502. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Supporting the President's six-year, \$478 billion surface transportation reauthorization investment will sharpen America's global competitive edge in the 21st century by allowing infrastructure expansion and modernization.

(2) Many of our roads, bridges, and transit systems are in disrepair, and fail to move as many goods and people as the economy demands. The American Society of Engineers gives the United States infrastructure an overall grade of D+.

(3) Deep cuts to our transportation funding over the next 10 years will hurt families and businesses at a time when we have major infrastructure needs and workers ready to do the job.

(4) Increasing transportation investments improves our quality of life by building new ladders of opportunity—improving our competitive edge, facilitating American exports, creating new jobs and increasing access to existing ones, and fostering economic growth, while also providing critical safety improvements and reduced commute times.

(5) The highway trust fund provides critical funding for repairing, expanding, and modernizing roads, bridges, and transit systems, and according to recent CBO projections, it is expected to become insolvent this summer. This could force a halt to construction projects, which would put hundreds of thousands of jobs at risk.

(a) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to provide funding in support of the President's proposed six-year, \$478 billion surface transportation reauthorization that prevents the imminent insolvency of the highway trust

fund and increases investment in our highway and transit programs. Such an investment sharpens our competitive edge, increases access to jobs, reduces commute times, makes our highways and transit systems safer, facilitates American exports, creates jobs, and fosters economic growth.

#### SEC. 503. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM THAT WORKS FOR HARD-WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Americans today are working harder than ever, but their paychecks are flat.

(2) American families lost economic ground during the 2000s and the Great Recession. U.S. Census data shows that median household income fell 8.6 percent in real terms between 2000 and 2013, and is still no higher than it was in 1989.

(3) Studies by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and Standard and Poor's, among others, have concluded that increased income inequality is a threat to economic growth.

(4) American workers are getting a smaller share of the growing economic pie. For the period 1948-1973, labor productivity increased 97 percent, and real hourly compensation for workers increased at a similar rate: 91 percent. But from 1973-2013, productivity rose by 146 percent and workers' compensation rose by only 18 percent.

(5) Since the 1970s, economic gains have gone overwhelmingly to the highest-income Americans, while the middle class and most other hard working Americans have been left behind. According to the Congressional Budget Office, between 1979 and 2011, after-tax incomes rose five times as fast for the top one percent of households, whose annual incomes average more than \$1 million, than they did for the middle 60 percent of Americans.

(6) The tax code treats income from wealth more favorably than income from work by giving preferential tax rates on unearned income, and contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests.

(7) The top one percent of households receives a disproportionate share—17 percent—of the benefit of major tax expenditures, according to the Congressional Budget Office. These preferences have exacerbated income and wealth inequality.

(8) Past Republican tax plans have made reducing taxes for the wealthiest Americans the top priority. Republicans also would repeal Affordable Care Act tax credits which help millions of families buy affordable health insurance, abandon important expansions to the Earned Income Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit, and cut higher education benefits by allowing the American Opportunity Tax Credit to expire. The result has been legislation that increased deficits while giving a disproportionate share of any tax cuts to the wealthy. Such a tax increase would—

(A) make it even harder for working families to make ends meet;

(B) cost the economy millions of jobs over the coming years by reducing consumer spending, which will greatly weaken economic growth; and

(C) further widen the income gap between the wealthiest households and the middle class by making the tax code more regressive.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of this resolution to reform the tax code to work for hard working Americans, to cut special interest tax breaks for the top one percent, and to

close unproductive special interest corporate tax breaks and loopholes, without increasing the tax burden on middle-class taxpayers.

**SEC. 504. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON BUILDING LADDERS OF OPPORTUNITY TO HELP HARDWORKING FAMILIES JOIN THE MIDDLE CLASS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Even as the economy grows, wage stagnation and income inequality persist, requiring additional ladders of opportunity to help hard-working families join the middle class.

(2) Young adults with a college degree are much more likely to be employed than those with just a high school diploma. In 2013, the unemployment rate for young college graduates was 7 percent versus 17 percent for those with only a high school degree, but the difference was even bigger during the economic downturn.

(3) More than 8 million low-income students each year rely on Federal Pell grants to help pay for college. Pell grants are well-targeted; more than 73 percent of Pell grant recipients have family incomes of less than \$30,000 per year. More than 10 million college students also rely on the American Opportunity Tax Credit to help defray the cost of college, but that tax credit expires at the end of 2017.

(4) As college costs have continued to rise, total student loan debt has quadrupled over the past ten years to more than \$1.3 trillion. More than 80 percent of that debt is from Federal student loans. In 2013, more than two thirds of those graduating from college had student loan debt, and the average debt had grown to \$28,400.

(5) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the Child Tax Credit (CTC) encourage work and are some of our most effective anti-poverty programs, and they have generally enjoyed strong, bipartisan support from Members of Congress and Presidents of each party.

(6) Enhancements to the EITC and CTC enacted in 2009 lifted 1.6 million people out of poverty, including nearly one million children. Many military families are among the beneficiaries of these vital policies.

(7) Wage inequality still exists in this country. Women make only 78 cents for every dollar earned by men, and the pay gap for African American women and Latinas is even larger.

(8) More than 40 million private sector workers in this country - including more than 13 million working women - are not able to take a paid sick day when they are ill. Millions more lack paid sick time to care for a sick child.

(9) Nearly one-quarter of adults in the United States report that they have lost a job or have been threatened with job loss for taking time off due to illness or to care for a sick child or relative, and 87 percent of the United States workforce does not have paid family leave through their employer.

(10) The real value of the Federal minimum wage today is at historically low levels, and has not been increased since 2009.

(11) Increasing the minimum wage would give a raise to millions of workers, lift many Americans out of poverty, and put more money in the pockets of individuals who are likely to spend additional income. This would help expand the economy and create jobs.

(12) A higher minimum wage will reduce Government spending on Medicaid, public housing, nutrition assistance and other income-support programs that provide assistance to minimum wage workers. A higher minimum wage will also benefit businesses

by increasing productivity, reducing absenteeism, and reducing turnover.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of this resolution to accomplish the following:

(1) That the House should broaden access to college, including through new initiatives to make college more affordable, increase college completion rates, and lower student debt. This includes, but is not limited to, helping millions of families afford the cost of college by: permanently extending and improving the American Opportunity Tax Credit; maintaining Pell grants as the primary source of Federal grant aid; and accommodating legislation to help borrowers lower and manage their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded repayment options.

(2) That the House should preserve key work and family supports by permanently extending enhanced refundability of the Child Tax Credit, permanently extending the increased Earned Income Tax Credit benefits for married couples and families with 3 or more children, and expanding the Earned Income Tax Credit for childless workers and non-custodial parents.

(3) That the House should make a positive difference in the lives of women, enacting measures to address economic equality and support work and family balance through earned paid sick leave, and earned paid and expanded family and medical leave. The resolution provides funding to help States establish paid leave programs.

(4) That women receive equal pay for equal work.

(5) That the House should pass an increase in the minimum wage. A higher minimum wage will benefit both workers and the economy as a whole.

**SEC. 505. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT, AND HEALTH AND SAFETY IMPROVEMENT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Wage inequality still exists in this country. Women make only 78 cents for every dollar earned by men, and the pay gap for African American women and Latinas is even larger.

(2) Nearly two-thirds of minimum wage workers are women, and the minimum wage has not kept up with inflation over the last 45 years.

(3) More than 40 million private sector workers in this country—including more than 13 million working women—are not able to take a paid sick day when they are ill. Millions more lack paid sick time to care for a sick child.

(4) Nearly one-quarter of adults in the U.S. report that they have lost a job or have been threatened with job loss for taking time off due to illness or to care for a sick child or relative.

(5) Fully 87 percent of the U.S. workforce does not have paid family leave through their employers, and more than 60 percent of the workforce does not have paid personal medical leave through an employer-provided temporary disability program, which some new mothers use.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Congress should make a positive difference in the lives of women, enacting measures to address economic equality and women's health and safety. Those measures include the following:

(1) To address economic fairness, Congress should enact the Paycheck Fairness Act, increase the minimum wage, support women entrepreneurs and small businesses, and support work and family balance through

earned paid sick leave, and earned paid and expanded Family and Medical leave.

(2) To address health and safety concerns, Congress should increase funding for the prevention and treatment of women's health issues such as breast cancer and heart disease, support access to family planning, and enact measures to prevent and protect women from domestic violence.

**SEC. 506. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Over the years, the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) has faced funding shortfalls and was unprepared to meet the demands of a new generation of returning veterans.

(2) Access to quality health care and veterans' benefits has been an ongoing challenge for the VA, highlighted most recently in the ongoing claims backlog and veterans waiting months for health care appointments.

(3) Providing health care where veterans live and ensuring a sufficient number of health care professionals, especially in the area of mental health treatment, have also been challenges.

(4) The Government shutdown in the fall of 2013 led to furloughs at the VA that slowed the processing of benefit claims.

(5) The President's budget includes an 8 percent increase over current year funding, which provides the resources to improve the timely delivery and the quality of health care services, and to address other urgent issues, such as ending veterans' homelessness.

(6) The VA currently has advance appropriations for 85 percent of its discretionary budget. The residual 15 percent, which includes funding for the day-to-day operations at the Veterans Benefits Administration, remains vulnerable to a Government shutdown.

(7) Congress provided the authority to expand advance appropriations for VA's three largest mandatory programs in the FY 2015 Omnibus; Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act (Public Law 113-235).

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the President's requested level for veterans' discretionary programs be fully supported so that the VA has the resources it needs to ensure veterans get the benefits they earned in a timely fashion;

(2) advance appropriations be expanded to cover all of VA's discretionary budget to prevent delays in veterans' benefits and services during a Government shutdown;

(3) the VA submit along with its annual budget a "Future-Years Veterans Program" that projects its needs over five years to help facilitate the appropriations and oversight processes; and

(4) sufficient resources are provided for the VA's Office of the Inspector General to guarantee veterans are properly served and that resources are spent efficiently.

**SEC. 507. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal workforce provides vital services to our nation on a daily basis. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cyber-attacks, find cures to deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe.

(2) Last year alone, Federal employees addressed a wide range of national priorities,

from responding to the Ebola outbreak to helping reduce veterans' homelessness to helping millions obtain affordable health care.

(3) Veterans make up 30 percent of the Federal workforce.

(4) Many Federal workers are paid at a rate that is far below their private sector counterparts.

(5) The Federal workforce is older than in past decades and older than the private sector workforce. It is estimated that twenty-five percent of the Federal workforce intends to retire over the next five years.

(6) Over the last five years, the Federal workforce has contributed more than \$150 billion toward reducing the country's deficits in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, and increased retirement contributions.

(7) The Federal workforce endured furloughs from sequestration and the 16-day Government shutdown.

(8) Since 1975, the security and non-security parts of the Federal workforce have declined 33 and 38 percent, respectively, relative to the population.

(9) Nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 and 2014 is due to increases at security-related agencies, including the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Justice.

(10) Proposals to reduce the size of the workforce at non-security agencies by 10 percent have excluded an assessment of their impact on Government services.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that Federal employees should not be targeted to achieve further reductions in the deficit as they have already contributed more than their fair share, that Federal workers should be compensated with pay and benefits at a level that enables the Government to attract high quality people—which is especially important during this period when more workers will be retiring—and that no proposal to reduce the size of the workforce should be considered without an assessment of its impact on Government services.

**SEC. 508. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON A NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ERADICATE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Access to opportunity should be the right of every American.

(2) Poverty has declined by more than one-third since 1967. Federal programs and tax policies that strengthen economic security and increase opportunity have played an important role in this decline. Continued Federal support is essential to build on these gains.

(3) Social Security has played a major role in reducing poverty. Without it, the poverty rate in 2013 would have been 8.6 percentage points higher. Its positive impact on older Americans is even starker, lowering the poverty rate among this group by nearly 40 percentage points.

(4) The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program alone lifts nearly 5 million people out of poverty, including over 2 million children. School breakfast and lunch programs help keep children ready to learn, allowing them to reach their full potential.

(5) Medicaid improves health, access to health care, and financial security. Medicaid coverage lowers infant, child, and adult mortality rates. Medicaid coverage virtually eliminates catastrophic out-of-pocket med-

ical expenditures, providing much needed financial security and peace of mind.

(6) The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and Child Tax Credit (CTC) together lift over 9 million people, including 5 million children, out of poverty. President Ronald Reagan proposed the major EITC expansion in the 1986 Tax Reform Act, which he referred to as "the best antipoverty, the best pro-family, the best job creation measure to come out of Congress". Studies indicate that children in families that receive the type of income supports EITC and CTC offer do better at school and have higher incomes as adults.

(7) Antipoverty programs have increasingly been focused on encouraging and rewarding work for those who are able. The programs can empower their beneficiaries to rise to the middle class through job training, educational assistance, adequate nutrition, housing and health care.

(8) Despite our progress, there is still work to be done. Nearly 50 million Americans still live below the poverty line. Parental income still has a major impact on children's income after they become adults.

(9) There remain significant disparities across racial and ethnic lines. At the end of 2013, the unemployment rate for whites was 6.0 percent but was 8.4 percent for Hispanics and 11.8 percent for African Americans. The poverty rate among African Americans and Hispanics is nearly double that for whites. Disparities in wealth are even starker, with white households having nearly 13 times the median wealth of African American households and 11 times the median wealth of Hispanic households.

(10) The minimum wage has not changed since 2007 and is worth less today than it was in real terms at the beginning of 1950. Raising the minimum could lift millions out of poverty.

(11) Some areas of the country have been left behind. They face persistent high levels of poverty and joblessness. Residents of these areas often lack access to quality schools, affordable health care, and adequate job opportunities.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the sense of the House to support a goal of developing a national strategy to eliminate poverty, with the initial goal of cutting poverty in half in ten years, and to extend equitable access to economic opportunity to all Americans. The strategy must include a multi-pronged approach that would:

(1) Ensure a livable wage for workers, including raising the minimum wage so that a full time worker earns enough to be above the poverty line.

(2) Provide education and job training to make sure workers have the skills to succeed.

(3) Provide supports for struggling families in difficult economic times and while developing skills.

(4) Remove barriers and obstacles that prevent individuals from taking advantage of economic and educational opportunities.

(5) Provide supports for the most vulnerable who are not able to work: seniors, the severely disabled, and children.

As the strategy is developed and implemented, Congress must work to protect low-income and middle-class Americans from the negative impacts of budget cuts on the critical domestic programs that help millions of struggling American families. The strategy should maximize the impact of antipoverty programs across Federal, state, and local governments. Improving the effective coordination and oversight across agencies and im-

plementing a true unity of programs under a "whole of government" approach to shared goals and client-based outcomes will help to streamline access, improve service delivery, and strengthen and extend the reach of every Federal dollar to fight poverty. The plan should consider additional targeting of spending toward persistent poverty areas to revitalize these areas of pervasive historical poverty, unemployment, and general distress. For example, the idea of targeting ten percent of certain Federal funding to areas where twenty percent or more of the population has been living below the poverty line for at least thirty years should be explored.

**SEC. 509. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON REJECTING THE SEQUESTER.**

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Reductions to discretionary programs necessitated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 caps will harm national security and important domestic investments.

(2) The caps took effect when Congress could not reach agreement on the deficit reduction goal established in that Act. They were never intended to be implemented. Rather they were designed to be a sword of Damocles, so austere and infeasible that they would motivate compromise on spending reductions and revenue increases.

(3) An important feature of the Act was its equal treatment for the defense and non-defense portions of the budget, which was to serve as an incentive to reach agreement for Members with varying priorities.

(4) The Act provided special procedures for certain program integrity efforts to encourage full funding. These efforts pay for themselves by making sure benefits go only to those who are eligible and taxes are paid as required by law. These procedures should be expanded where there is well documented evidence of effective efforts.

(4) Providing relief from unrealistically low spending caps by circumventing existing law is neither responsible nor transparent. Emergency and overseas contingency operations adjustments, which are not controlled by the caps, should not be used to fund base spending.

(5) The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 took an important first step in correcting the overly restrictive caps, providing relief in 2014 and 2015 in a fiscally responsible way. This budget continues that effort.

(a) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the Budget Control Act should be amended to increase its overly austere spending limits to the levels included in this resolution;

(2) increases in both defense and non-defense will make room for a range of domestic and security investments that will accelerate growth and expand opportunity; and

(3) additional special procedures should be established to improve tax code enforcement and to reduce improper payments in the unemployment insurance program as permitted in this resolution.

**SEC. 510. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 59 million Americans currently receive earned Social Security benefits and, for most, Social Security's modest benefits provide the majority of their income.

(2) Social Security benefits are becoming more critical to providing retirement income as fewer and fewer workers have access to traditional defined benefit retirement plans

and many workers are unable to save adequate resources in retirement savings accounts.

(3) More than half of disabled workers receiving Social Security insurance payments would have fallen into poverty if they had not earned Social Security to protect them when they became severely disabled or terminally ill.

(4) The Social Security trust funds have a combined balance of \$2.8 trillion, built by contributions from American workers, enough to pay 100 percent of earned benefits until 2033.

(5) Social Security's Disability Insurance (DI) and Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) systems are intertwined both in their benefit structure and in their revenues—DI recipients who reach retirement age receive OASI benefits and beneficiaries in each category have helped finance the other category even if they will never receive those benefits.

(6) In the short-term, the projected shortfall in the DI trust fund should be addressed through changes that permit Social Security to use its existing overall resources to fund DI benefits.

(a) **POLICY.**—This resolution assumes action by the House of Representatives to enact legislation that uses Social Security's existing reserves to prevent cuts in Social Security's earned benefits, and makes no changes to Social Security that involve reductions in earned Social Security benefits.

**SEC. 511. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security;

(2) in 2015, 55,300,000 people will rely on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services;

(3) the Medicare program has lower administrative costs than private insurance, and Medicare program costs per enrollee have grown at a slower rate than private insurance for a given level of benefits;

(4) people with Medicare already have the ability to choose a private insurance plan within Medicare through the Medicare Advantage option, yet more than 70 percent of Medicare beneficiaries chose the traditional fee-for-service program instead of a private plan in 2014;

(5) rising health care costs are not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, they are endemic to the entire health care system;

(6) converting Medicare into a voucher for the purchase of health insurance will merely force seniors and individuals with disabilities to pay much higher premiums if they want to use their voucher to purchase traditional Medicare coverage;

(7) a voucher system in which the voucher payment fails to keep pace with growth in health costs would expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks;

(8) shifting more health care costs onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both; and

(9) versions of voucher policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely set it up for a death spiral as private plans siphon off healthier and less expensive beneficiaries, leaving the sickliest beneficiaries in a program that will wither away.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities should be preserved and strengthened, and that any legislation to end the Medicare guarantee, financially penalize people for choosing traditional Medicare, or shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of health insurance, should be rejected.

**SEC. 512. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all American families will improve families' health and economic security, which will make the economy stronger;

(2) 16,400,000 uninsured individuals have gained health coverage so far as a result of the Affordable Care Act, and the uninsured rate for working-age adults has dropped from 20.3 percent to 13.2 percent since October 2013, when the ACA marketplaces opened for business;

(3) the Affordable Care Act will expand affordable coverage for up to 25,000,000 people by the end of the decade who would otherwise be uninsured;

(4) the Affordable Care Act ensures the right to equal treatment for people who have preexisting health conditions and for women;

(5) the Affordable Care Act ensures that health insurance coverage will always include basic necessary services such as prescription drugs, mental health care, and maternity care and that insurance companies cannot impose lifetime or annual limits on these benefits;

(6) the Affordable Care Act increases transparency in health care, helping to reduce health care cost growth by requiring transparency around hospital charges, insurer cost-sharing, and kick-back payments from pharmaceutical companies to physicians;

(7) the Affordable Care Act reforms Federal health entitlements by using nearly every health cost-containment provision experts recommend, including new incentives to reward quality and coordination of care rather than simply quantity of services provided, new tools to crack down on fraud, and the elimination of excessive taxpayer subsidies to private insurance plans, and since 2011, national health expenditures have grown at the slowest rate on record;

(8) health care spending per capita in the United States grew in 2011, 2012, and 2013 at the lowest rates on record, and the Congressional Budget Office now projects that the Affordable Care Act's coverage provisions will cost a full 33 percent less in 2019 than the agency originally estimated when the Act became law in 2010; and

(7) the Affordable Care Act will reduce the Federal deficit by more than \$1,000,000,000,000 over the next 20 years.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the law of the land should support making affordable health care coverage available to every American family, and therefore the Affordable Care Act should not be repealed.

**SEC. 513. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON MEDICAID.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) Medicaid is a central component of the Nation's health care safety net, and will provide health coverage to 69,000,000 Americans in 2015, including 1 in 3 children;

(2) Medicaid improves health outcomes, access to health services, and financial security;

(3) seniors, people with disabilities, and children account for about three-fourths of Medicaid program spending and would be at

risk of losing access to health care under any policy to sever the link between Medicaid funding and the actual costs of providing services to the currently eligible Medicaid population;

(4) Medicaid is the primary payer for long-term care in the United States, providing financial assistance to seniors and people with disabilities facing significant out-of-pocket costs for in-home and nursing home services; and

(5) an estimated 7 in 10 Americans aged 65 or older will need long-term services and supports at some point in their lives.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that the important health care safety net for children, senior citizens, people with disabilities, and vulnerable Americans provided by Medicaid should be preserved and should not be dismantled by converting Medicaid into a block grant, per capita cap, or other financing arrangement that would limit Federal contributions and render the program incapable of responding to increased need that may result from trends in demographics or health care costs or from economic conditions.

**SEC. 514. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INVESTMENTS THAT HELP CHILDREN SUCCEED.**

(b) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Investments in early childhood benefit the economy as a whole, generating at least \$7 in return for every \$1 invested by lowering the need for spending on other services—such as remedial education, grade repetition, and special education—and increasing productivity and earnings for those children as adults.

(2) High-quality, affordable child care helps two generations to succeed, increasing employment and earnings for parents while promoting a healthy growing and learning environment for children.

(3) Unfortunately, only one out of every six eligible children is able to access care through the child care and development block grant, and only three out of every ten 4-year-olds are enrolled in high-quality early childhood education programs in the United States.

(4) In particular, children from low-income families are less likely to have access to high-quality, affordable preschool programs that will prepare them for kindergarten. By third grade, children from low-income families who are not reading at grade level are six times less likely to graduate from high school than students who are proficient.

(5) Voluntary home visits to families with young children in at-risk communities have been shown to improve maternal and child health, promote child development and school readiness, and help prevent child abuse and neglect. Home visiting programs have created savings, reducing Medicaid costs by lowering the number of preterm births and use of hospital emergency rooms, reducing the need for public benefits and child protective services, and increasing tax revenues through higher parental earnings.

(6) The Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) is an important source of health care coverage for more than 8 million children in families who earn too much to qualify for Medicaid but who struggle to meet everyday expenses. Due in large part to CHIP, the rate of uninsured children in the U.S. fell from 13.9 percent to 7.1 percent between 1997 and 2012.

(a) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that this resolution supports funding for, and assumes enactment of, the following:

(1) A 10-year child care initiative that would ensure that all low- and moderate-income working families with children aged three and below would have access to affordable, quality child care.

(2) A 10-year investment to provide access to high-quality early education for all 4-year-olds. Early education programs must meet quality benchmarks that are linked to better outcomes for children, including a rigorous curriculum tied to State-level standards, qualified teachers, small class sizes, and effective evaluation and review of programs.

(3) Extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and extension and expansion of the existing highly effective voluntary home-visiting program for at-risk children.

#### SEC. 515. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Fixing the country's broken immigration system will mean a stronger economy and lower budget deficits.

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates that enacting the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, as introduced by House Democrats in the 113th Congress, will reduce the deficit by \$900 billion over the next two decades, boost the economy by 5.4 percent, and increase productivity by 1.0 percent.

(3) The Social Security Actuary estimates that immigration reform will reduce the Social Security shortfall by 8 percent and will extend the life of the Social Security Trust Fund by two years.

(4) The passage of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act recognizes that the primary tenets of its success depend on securing the sovereignty of the United States of America and establishing a coherent and just system for integrating those who seek to join American society.

(5) We have a right, and duty, to maintain and secure our borders, and to keep our country safe and prosperous. As a Nation founded, built and sustained by immigrants we also have a responsibility to harness the power of that tradition in a balanced way that secures a more prosperous future for America.

(6) We have always welcomed newcomers to the United States and will continue to do so. But in order to qualify for the honor and privilege of eventual citizenship, our laws must be followed. The world depends on America to be strong—economically, militarily and ethically. The establishment of a stable, just, and efficient immigration system only supports those goals. As a Nation, we have the right and responsibility to make our borders safe, to establish clear and just rules for seeking citizenship, to control the flow of legal immigration, and to eliminate illegal immigration, which in some cases has become a threat to our national security.

(7) All parts of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act are premised on the right and need of the United States to achieve these goals, and to protect its borders and maintain its sovereignty.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the full House vote on comprehensive immigration reform—such as the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act—to boost our economy, lower deficits, establish clear and just rules for citizenship, and secure our borders.

#### SEC. 516. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that—

(1) we must continue to support a strong military that is second to none and the size and the structure of our military have to be driven by a strategy;

(2) those who serve in uniform are our most important security resource and the Administration and Congress shall continue to provide the support they need to successfully carry out the missions the country gives them;

(3) in testimony before the House Armed Service Committee on March 18, 2015, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter stated that the Defense Department needs funding it requests for regular, "base budget" activities appropriated in the base budget because it provides stability in planning for the future;

(4) in testimony before the House Armed Service Committee on March 18, 2015, Under Secretary of Defense Michael McCord said the Pentagon does not need \$36 billion or \$38 billion extra in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) budget;

(5) OCO designation has been used as a backdoor loophole to fund regular base budget activities. This gimmick avoids confronting the problem of sequestration and does not address the country's priorities in a comprehensive and transparent manner. In addition to undermining the integrity of the budget process, it perpetuates funding uncertainty for all Government agencies, including the Department of Defense;

(6) a growing economy is the foundation of our security and enables the country to provide the resources for a strong military, sound homeland security agencies, and effective diplomacy and international development;

(7) the Nation's projected long-term debt could have serious consequences for our economy and security, and that more efficient military spending has to be part of an overall plan that effectively deals with this problem;

(8) reining in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense—the last department still unable to pass an audit—such as the elimination of duplicative programs that have been identified by the Government Accountability Office needs to continue as a priority;

(9) according to GAO, 42 percent of the Department of Defense's major weapons system acquisition programs had unit cost growth of 25 percent or more and effective implementation of weapons acquisition reforms at the Department of Defense can help control excessive cost growth in the development of new weapons systems and help ensure that weapons systems are delivered on time and in adequate quantities to equip our servicemen and servicewomen;

(10) the Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans and requirements to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats, which should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization;

(11) weapons technologies should be proven to work through adequate testing before advancing them to the production phase of the acquisition process;

(12) the Pentagon's operation and maintenance budget has grown for decades between 2.5 percent and 3.0 percent above inflation

each year on a per service member basis, and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this area;

(13) nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 to 2014 is due to increases at security-related agencies—Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Veterans Affairs, and Department of Justice—and the increase, in part, represents a transition to ensure civil servants, as opposed to private contractors, are performing inherently governmental work and an increase to a long-depleted acquisition and auditing workforce at the Pentagon to ensure effective management of weapons systems programs, to eliminate the use of contractors to oversee other contractors, and to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse;

(14) proposals to implement an indiscriminate 10 percent across-the-board cut to the Federal civilian workforce would adversely affect security agencies, leaving them unable to manage their total workforce, which includes contractors, and their operations in a cost-effective manner; and

(15) cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing "loose nukes" and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the sequester required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 for fiscal years 2016 through 2021 should be rescinded and replaced by a deficit reduction plan that is balanced, that makes smart spending cuts, that requires everyone to pay their fair share, and that takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs; and

(2) efficiencies can be achieved in the national defense budget without compromising our security through greater emphasis on eliminating duplicative and wasteful programs, reforming the acquisition process, identifying and constraining unsustainable operating costs, and through careful analysis of our national security needs.

#### SEC. 517. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The United States Government Accountability Office described climate change as, "a complex, crosscutting issue that poses risks to many environmental and economic systems—including agriculture, infrastructure, ecosystems, and human health—and presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government".

(2) The Department of Defense's Climate Change Adaptation Roadmap warns, "Climate change will affect the Department of Defense's ability to defend the Nation and poses immediate risks to U.S. national security".

(3) The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Climatic Data Center reported 14 of the 15 warmest years on record occurred in the first 15 years of this century. Furthermore, 2014 was the warmest year on record across global land and ocean surfaces.

(4) The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded the effects of climate change are occurring worldwide, "The impacts of climate change have already been felt in recent decades on all continents and across the oceans".



(5) The United States National Research Council's National Climate Assessment and Development Advisory Committee found climate change affects, "human health, water supply, agriculture, transportation, energy, coastal areas, and many other sectors of society, with increasingly adverse impacts on the American economy and quality of life".

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House that climate change presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government. Climate change science provides critical information for protecting human health, defending the United States, and preserving economic and environmental systems throughout the world.

**SEC. 518. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON FINANCIAL CONSUMER PROTECTION.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds that—

(1) the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (the Bureau) created by the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 is an important component of the country's response to the financial crisis and recession;

(2) the Bureau is playing a critical role in protecting student loan borrowers, older Americans, service members, and other consumers, especially in minority and low-income communities. It has implemented new rules for mortgage markets and prepaid cards, and also successfully recovered \$5.3 billion on behalf of more than 15 million consumers and service members;

(3) the Bureau's funding from the Federal Reserve's operations help give it important independence from efforts to interfere with its vital mission and activities, independence on par with every other banking regulator; and

(4) the Bureau has already faced and overcome efforts to obstruct its operations.

(b) **POLICY.**—It is the policy of the House Congress will continue to support the vital work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and retain its current financing structure to fund its resource needs.

**SEC. 519. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE USE OF TAXPAYER FUNDS.**

It is the policy of this resolution that the House should lead by example and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration shall review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members of Congress and House Committees, and shall identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, Barbershop, Salon, and the House dining room. Further, it is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

**SEC. 520. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE REDUCTION OF UNNECESSARY AND WASTEFUL SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office ("GAO") is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) The Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplica-

tion, and overlap in Federal programs "could lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings, with significant opportunities for improved efficiencies, cost savings, or revenue enhancements".

(3) The Federal Government spends about \$80 billion each year for information technology. GAO has identified opportunities for savings and improved efficiencies in the Government's information technology infrastructure.

(4) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$125 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2014.

(5) Under clause 2 of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(6) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2016, 35 laws will expire. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(7) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs may result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) **POLICY.**—Each authorizing committee annually shall include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be changed.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am putting forward the Democratic alternative budget on behalf of my colleagues. It is based on a very different view of how our economy in this country has grown historically and how it should grow in the future.

As we have heard from our Republican colleagues, their theory of the economy is top down, trickle down. They want to cut the top tax rates for folks at the very top, the millionaires, on the hope that the benefits will trickle down and lift everybody up. We tried that under President Bush. It lifted up folks who were already at the top of the ladder. Everybody else was running in place or falling behind.

We believe that you accelerate economic growth through more opportunity and more shared prosperity, not from the top down, but by making sure that hard-working Americans can earn a little bit more and go out and spend it at the shopping center and in any way they want to support their families and have a good standard of living.

So while the Republican budget helps folks at the very top with additional tax rate cuts and squeezes working families, our budget provides more relief to those working families. How?

We adopt, for example, the President's proposed expanded child and dependent care tax credit. So if you are a working family and you want to make sure your child has a safe and secure environment with quality care, like every family would who is working, we provide a much bigger tax credit so that you can ensure that quality and safer environment for your child. Or if you have a loved one at home, an elderly loved one at home, but you are working, we want to make sure that you have a tax credit so that the costs you pay for that care don't come out of your paycheck at the end.

The Democratic budget is in stark contrast to the Republican budget, which actually increases the costs on working families. They get rid of the college tax deduction; they get rid of the step-up on the child tax credit; they get rid of the step-up on the Making Work Pay earned income tax credit; and of course they wipe out the Affordable Care tax credits that help millions of Americans have affordable health care. So their budget is squeezing folks in the middle and working toward the middle.

They raise the interest rates on college students. We provide additional resources to help make college more affordable, and we adopt the President's plan for income-based student loan repayments.

They will immediately increase the cost for prescription drugs for seniors on Medicare and increase the copays for preventive care, for people who have worked hard for a secure environment. We don't do that in our budget.

So this is a budget that supports working families in America and invests in our future, not one that squeezes those families harder and disinvests in America.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before I begin, I want to join with my colleague on the Committee on the Budget, the ranking member, in providing a letter for the RECORD commending Doug Elmendorf, Director of the Congressional Budget Office, whose time at the CBO is coming to a close. His final day is March 31. He has served this Nation for the last 6 years as the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the ranking member, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and I will be inserting a letter into the RECORD to commend him for his service.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland to say a few words about Director Elmendorf.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me and us working together to salute Dr. Elmendorf,



who, by all accounts, has done a terrific job at the Congressional Budget Office. He has led that office with great professionalism, and I think he has continued to uphold the integrity of CBO. I think we have all benefited from his wisdom over the years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, March 24, 2015.

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN TOM PRICE, M.D.  
AND RANKING MEMBER CHRIS VAN HOLLEN  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

RECOGNIZING DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF, DIRECTOR  
OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Douglas W. Elmendorf is the eighth Director of the Congressional Budget Office who was initially appointed on January 22, 2009, to complete the previous four-year term of office; he was later reappointed to serve through January 3, 2015. Dr. Elmendorf graciously agreed to remain at CBO beyond the end of his term to ensure CBO's smooth and steady operations while the process of appointing his successor was completed. His tenure as CBO Director is the second longest of all CBO's directors, behind only CBO's first director, Alice Rivlin.

Before he came to CBO, Dr. Elmendorf was a senior fellow and the Edward M. Bernstein Scholar in the Economic Studies program at the Brookings Institution. He was previously an assistant professor at Harvard University, a principal analyst at CBO, a senior economist at the White House's Council of Economic Advisers, a deputy assistant secretary for economic policy at the Treasury Department, and an assistant director of the Division of Research and Statistics at the Federal Reserve Board. In those positions, he worked on budget policy, Social Security, Medicare, health care issues, financial markets, macroeconomic analysis and forecasting, and other topics. He earned his Ph.D. and A.M. in economics from Harvard University, where he was a National Science Foundation graduate fellow, and his A.B. summa cum laude from Princeton University.

While Dr. Elmendorf's credentials clearly qualified him to be the CBO Director, he would probably be the first to say that nothing can really prepare you for the job. We in Congress place heavy and sometimes unreasonable demands on CBO to produce non-partisan, high-quality analyses in a timely fashion. Under his leadership, CBO has consistently responded to these demands and helped us to understand the budgetary and economic implications of our actions. The legislative issues have been contentious and complex. But throughout his tenure, CBO has remained true to its nonpartisan tradition and has provided the high-quality, cutting-edge analysis that we need under extremely challenging circumstances.

Under his leadership, CBO has been a consistent and dependable source of objective information and analysis on a range of critically important issues. For example, as Congress grappled with the aftermath of the fiscal crisis and recession, he enhanced CBO's capacity to perform cutting-edge analysis of the economic effects of various policy responses, and he has continued to strengthen CBO's capabilities in that area and in many others. Along with high-quality analysis, he was worked hard to be sure that CBO provided clear explanations of both the basis and results of those analyses—through the clarity of its reports and, on many occasions, through his clear and cogent testimony before Congressional committees. And he has

made himself personally available—at all times of day and night—to Members on both sides of the aisle to receive our urgent requests for estimates, to answer our questions, or to hear our complaints.

Dr. Elmendorf has never shied away from delivering tough and sometimes blunt messages to lawmakers about the fiscal challenges that the nation is facing. He has never stepped over the line to tell us what we should do, but he has made very clear that the status quo is not an option over the long term. In the end, his professionalism and conviction are the hallmarks of a strong CBO director.

As CBO transitions to new leadership, we thank Doug for his time as director and for the dedication, energy, and commitment he has brought to the position. CBO, the Congress, and the people of this nation have been served well by the outstanding leadership of Douglas W. Elmendorf.

TOM PRICE, M.D.,  
Chairman, House  
Budget Committee.

CHRIS VAN HOLLEN,  
Ranking Democrat,  
House Budget Committee.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do want to commend my Democratic colleagues for coming forward with a budget. It is important to have contrasting visions that are able to be debated here on the floor of the House.

I am not surprised, but I am often-times amused by the misinformation and the distortion that comes from our colleagues on the other side. Mr. Chairman, we have had now three separate budgets that have been offered by our friends on the other side: first, the Progressive Caucus budget, then the CBC budget, now the Democratic Caucus budget.

I want to have our colleagues focus on the comparison, side by side, of this budget that is being offered to that of the Republican budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. These numbers on the far column there of the Democratic budget identify specific areas in their budget and how they compare to the Republican budget.

In taxes, how do they compare in taxes? You hear our friends talking about taxes all the time. \$1.9 trillion in new taxes—\$1.9 trillion. Spending, what do they do on spending? \$6.3 trillion in spending over the Republican budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. What about deficits? \$4.6 trillion in increased deficits. Debt? \$4.7 trillion in increased debt over a 10-year period of time. What do they do to defense in these perilous times in our Nation and in our world? Decrease spending on defense compared to the Republican budget by \$314 billion.

You would think with all of those taxes and all of that spending that you would get to balance, you would get to a point where the revenue that is coming into the Federal Government would equal the spending that is going out, but their budget never, ever, ever,

balances. I guess they take their lead from the President.

So let's take a little closer look at a couple of these issues.

Tax increases. Taxes, taxes, taxes, taxes; that is what we hear from the folks on the other side. After raising over a trillion dollars in taxes for ObamaCare and forcing through over \$600 billion in new taxes during the fiscal cliff discussion and debate, now they are calling for another massive tax increase of \$1.9 trillion. Even with these huge tax increases already enacted into law, the Democrat budget never balances—ever, ever, ever—because it refuses to reduce spending, and it refuses to address the biggest drivers of our debt.

Their substitute calls for more taxes on families, more taxes on small businesses. Even though, Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Budget Office tells us that the Federal revenue collection will exceed, will be greater than the 40-year average level—about 17.4 percent of gross domestic product, every year greater than that number, every year for the next decade—that is not enough for our friends on the other side. In other words, Washington is on track to collect more taxes from the American people than it ever has in the past, but Democrats want Washington to take even more.

□ 1530

As has been said so many times, Washington doesn't have a revenue problem; we have got a spending problem—and there is no doubt about it that the American people understand that.

The Democratic budget rhetoric claims to raise an additional \$1.9 trillion by "rejecting tax breaks for the wealthy and closing special interest loopholes."

Look out, ladies and gentlemen. What that clever rhetoric really means is that they are going to hit small businesses with even more taxes. Why? Why is that? Because the majority of small businesses, non-C corp businesses, the majority of those businesses that create jobs around this country pay taxes under the individual income system. That is how they do it. That is who those folks want to punish—the job creators.

These tax hike ideas end up impacting successful small businesses all across this country. As I mentioned, they represent the job creation engine of our economy, over 60 percent of the jobs being created—two-thirds of the jobs being created—for all private sector jobs generated by small businesses.

So, despite the facts that we present, the Democrat budget would continue the failed policy of Washington picking winners and losers, rewarding their friends, punishing their political enemies, distorting the free market, further distorting an already overly complex Tax Code, all of which would have

disastrous results of subsidizing private investors' profits and socializing what should be private investors' losses. So, more taxes.

What about spending cuts? Any spending cuts?

Despite their call for a balanced approach, the Democrat budget never, ever balances. In fact, it doesn't even come close to passing the Democrats' prior test of balance, which they defined as having equal parts tax increases and spending reductions.

Interestingly, the Democrats continue to be moving away from their previously described balanced approach. Under this approach, their latest budget, a balanced approach appears to be requiring both tax increases and spending increases. In fact, the Democratic substitute would increase spending by \$855 billion more than just staying on our current path.

In other words, their substitute contains zero spending reductions and contains \$1.9 trillion in tax increases and \$855 billion in spending increases.

It is not the direction the American people desire, clearly; not the direction that gets on a path to balance; not the direction that get us on a positive solution to addressing the challenges that we face.

A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America is the direction in which we need to go, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let's just dispel with a myth from the start, which is that the Republican budget balances.

As we have heard, only if you believe in budget quackery does it do this. Even a newspaper like USA Today, which has no partisan bent to it, blew the whistle on all the accounting gimmicks in the Republican budget.

Now, let me just say a word about revenues and taxes. The Democratic budget doesn't call for any increase in any tax rate on anybody, unlike the Republican budget that refuses to close one special interest tax break to reduce the deficit, which they say is the primary objective. Rather than close one special interest tax break to reduce the deficit, they don't touch a single one—not for corporate jets, not for hedge fund managers.

I want everybody to look at this chart. This is from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. What they say is that each year there are outlays. We spend \$1.4 trillion on tax breaks in the United States—more than on Social Security in any year, more than on Medicaid and Medicare combined.

Well, if I give you, Mr. Speaker, a thousand dollars from the government, I can also deliver that same benefit by telling you that of the taxes you owe me, pay me a thousand dollars less.

Maybe you have got a great powerful lobbyist who is getting you a special break, so that when the normal person has to pay regular tax rates, you get a special deduction.

Now, some of the deductions are for good causes, but many are not. And where do most of those tax breaks go—or should I say a disproportionate amount of those tax benefits, often put there by powerful lobbyists? Again, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that 17 percent of the benefits of those tax breaks, special deductions, 17 percent go to the top 1 percent of income earners.

So it is true. The Democratic budget does want to close some of those special interest tax breaks that go to folks at the very top rather than cut our kids' education, rather than slash our investment innovation.

And lo and behold, we saw the most recent example of the Republican plan to provide more tax breaks to the folks at the very top end of the income scale just today in the Ways and Means Committee.

Right now you don't have any estate tax obligation as a couple if your estate is lower than \$10 million. If your estate is lower than \$10 million per couple, your estate is exempt. But we do have a tax rate on the amount over \$10 million because I thought in this country we do not believe that people should get ahead just by the wealth they inherited from others, but through their hard work and labor.

So we proposed to change the Tax Code in a way that rewards work rather than in a way that just rewards inherited wealth of \$10 million, an estate that is going to help just 5,000 families.

That is why the Democratic budget rewards hard-working families rather than other tax rates for folks at the top.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend from Maryland will be pleased to know that our vision for tax reform is positive, robust, and makes certain that all Americans benefit. That is what our budget does. It lifts up all Americans. We don't pick winners and losers. We are not interested in dividing the country.

What our friends on the other side seem to have as their stock in trade is dividing, pitting one American against another. That is not America. Good gracious almighty.

Let's talk about taxes. They want to increase taxes as far as the eye can see. They don't want to bring about any spending reductions, understanding that what is happening right now in terms of the debt in this country, what we have got is a level of debt that was only surpassed during World War II.

This is a chart that demonstrates the debt of this country from 1940 through

2040, projections from 2015 on. Our debt right now is at a level that was only surpassed at the end of World War II.

And where does current law take it? Where does the budget that our friends on the other side of the aisle propose take the debt? Higher than ever before—ever in the history of the country.

What does that red line mean? It means fewer jobs, fewer opportunity choices for individuals, fewer dreams realized, Mr. Chairman. This red line is the destruction of the American Dream. That is what it is.

That is why our Balanced Budget for a Stronger America is the way to go. It gets our economy under control, gets the economy rolling again, gets the debt under control, gets us to balance, and puts us on a path to paying off the debt.

What do they want to do with spending? It follows the same tried and failed plan of more spending, with the promise of deficit reduction and economic growth later, which never occurs. We have tried it before. We know the results.

What did we achieve for all the spending that our friends on the other side of the aisle have brought about? The lowest labor force participation rates in decades. What does that mean? Fewer people working, Mr. Chairman. Poverty rates stuck at high levels. Twenty percent of the kids in this country are living in poverty right now. That is under the policies that these folks want to double down on.

We have seen the Washington metropolitan area is the home of 6 of the 10 richest counties in all of America. That is a Federal Government that has grown beyond all proportion. And we have seen, as I mentioned, levels of debt that haven't been seen since the end of World War II.

So, if more government spending led to higher growth in job creation, we would be experiencing an economic boom the likes of which we have never seen. But the economic track record of recent years clearly has been abysmal.

Real GDP growth over the past 4 years averaged just over 2 percent, where the average of the last 40 years is over 30 percent. Those are real jobs, Mr. Chairman, that have been lost by this administration and by our friends who want to double down. It is the slowest recovery that we have ever had coming out of an economic downturn.

The labor force participation rate is at 62.8 percent, the lowest level in over 35 years. Roughly 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed, and those who are working have seen meager, meager real wage growth.

So more taxes, no spending reductions, more spending, more debt, more destruction of jobs, more destruction of dreams. Sadly, that is what our friends on the other side of the aisle are proposing.

A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America is the way to go, Mr. Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting listening to the chairman, since the nonpartisan CBO says the Republican budget will slow down economic growth in the next couple of years.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), a terrific new member of the Budget Committee.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Democratic alternative budget we are discussing today, which addresses the many issues working families are dealing with, but there is one provision in particular that I want to highlight on long-term care.

As the ranking member and too many Americans know, long-term care is a concern that nearly every American family is confronting or will confront in the coming years. We have made great strides to improve our health care system in the last few years, but what we have a strong need for is a comprehensive, long-term plan for how seniors can get the day-to-day help they need for the basic tasks of living, like meal preparation, eating, bathing, and getting dressed in the morning.

Too many seniors today are relying on a complex, disconnected system full of barriers that doesn't work. It is a system designed for the 20th century, while we are living in the 21st century. Addressing it will save money and can improve the quality of life for many.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. DINGELL. So, to address this problem, the Democratic budget contains revenue-neutral language that would allow the House to consider legislation today to begin to resolve the long-term care crisis in our country. It is an important priority, and it is important that it has been included in our alternative budget.

My hope is that we can all work together on this soon in a bipartisan way. Not dealing with it is not going to make it go away, I thank the ranking member for working with us.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS), another of our great new members of the Budget Committee.

Mr. NORCROSS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a Democratic statehouse where we had to find common ground with a Republican Governor in order to make a budget pass that made sense. Now I sit on the Budget Committee as a freshman here in Washington where we are asked to vote on a budget that makes no sense at all.

We all agree that students are now saddled with too much debt, and certainly my colleagues across the aisle want to cut \$220 billion from education funding, freeze Pell grants, and limit students' access to loan programs. That doesn't make sense.

We all agree that we need to create jobs and get businesses to reinvest here in America, and the best way to do that is to invest here, in ourselves, in America. Yet their budget provides no new resources to upgrade our transportation and water systems, expand access to high speed Internet, or harden our electric grid, which is at risk. That doesn't make sense.

Instead, I urge my colleagues to vote for the Democratic alternative that will provide the tools students and families will need to survive and succeed in our economy, create jobs by investing in research and infrastructure, properly fund a strong national defense, and make good on our promise to our seniors by strengthening Medicaid and Social Security.

That makes sense. This is why I am asking for my colleagues to join with me and vote for the Democratic alternative.

□ 1545

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chairman of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chairman for this process.

All day today, we have been considering substitute budgets, laid bare, in the people's House, in this Chamber, for everyone to view and critique; and I think that is a good thing.

Considering the Democrat substitute amendment, their budget, it adds an additional \$4.7 trillion to the debt versus our budget. As we stand here today, we already have \$18 trillion worth of debt and another at least \$100 trillion on the way over the next several decades, completely unsustainable.

This comes despite, under their plan, a \$1.9 trillion tax hike that we have already talked about. This shows, once again, that you can't solve our debt problems by chasing ever higher spending with ever higher taxes.

The fact of the matter is, right now, we take in, as a Federal Government, over \$2.5 trillion of the people's property. It is the people's property that we

confiscate, some of it rightly so, to run the things that we need—but \$2.5 trillion, Mr. Chairman, we have a spending problem, not a revenue problem when you consider that we—excuse me. It is probably nearly \$3 trillion now when we kick in nearly \$3.5 trillion of spending also.

When you analyze this, if you look at it, the CBO said—and this was in a letter to former Chairman RYAN—that tax rates would have to nearly double by 2030 if we are to stabilize our debt by using tax increases alone, as this Democratic substitute would do.

Now, here is what CBO says about rates. By 2023, everyone's income tax would have to increase by 33 percent; by 2030, rates would have to increase by 48 percent, and by 2050, rates would have to increase by 86 percent in order to account for the debt load that the Democratic budget wants to put not only on us, but our children and grandchildren.

We stand here today as the first generation in American history that, by any objective measure, is going to leave the next one worse off.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an extra 1 minute.

Mr. ROKITA. We cannot let that happen. This is what we came to Congress to solve, at least for many of us, hopefully, Republicans and Democrats, so that we are not the first generation in American history to leave the next one worse off.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As we have heard throughout the debate, there is a fundamental difference in how the United States grows our economy. I think if you look, historically, the reason we have grown the economy over time is because, for a long period, especially in the postwar period, as Americans worked harder, they were able to translate that harder work into higher incomes.

We are supporting a tax system that rewards hard work. Our colleagues continue to stand by a tax system that actually gives better treatment to what is called unearned income, compared to earned income. In other words, if you earn income simply through making money off of money, you actually get a lower rate than money earned from hard work, like most Americans do every day.

When you look at the fact that 17 percent of the tax breaks in the country go to people in the top 1 percent, it is the Tax Code itself that is currently rigged in favor of powerful special interests.

Why should it be rigged against working people and in favor of people who can afford to hire powerful lobbyists to get tax breaks for themselves that benefit nobody else? That doesn't make any sense.

Today, just today, in the Ways and Means Committee, as I said, the committee that deals with taxes, our Republican colleagues are saying that they want to get rid entirely of the estate tax. Right now, if you are a couple, \$10 million of your estate is exempt. You don't pay a penny; but, yes, we do ask people who have accumulated lots of wealth to contribute a little bit to the country that helped them develop such a great lifestyle.

I thought we were a country where we wanted to reward people who pulled themselves up by their bootstraps through hard work; yet we have a Republican budget that says we are going to provide 5,500 families with this huge tax break today.

At the same time, we are cutting our investment in education, an investment that we know helps millions and millions of American families earn a better living over time; but, no, let's cut that. Let's increase the cost of student loans. Let's give 5,500 families a huge tax break.

Teddy Roosevelt would be turning in his grave at this Republican budget. He would support the Democratic budget that lifts up everybody, makes sure everybody gets a fair shake.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me just, again, underscore a couple of key points here. We saw, during the early years of the 2000s, what an economy based on the trickle-down theory looks like, right?

Under President Bush, the theory was, okay, we are just going to cut tax rates for millionaires, thinking that the benefits were going to lift up everybody in the economy. What happened in the real world to that economic theory? It crashed and burned.

The reality was that people at the top did very well. God bless them; they did great, but everybody else, they were running in place. Paychecks flatlined, wages stagnant, and this has been a chronic problem for some period of time; then we went off the cliff.

When President Obama was sworn in, we were losing 800,000 jobs every month. Now, we are coming out of that. Millions of people have gone back to work. We have got a long way to go, but we are coming out.

The Republican budget, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, will slow down economic growth in the next couple of years. Why would we want to do that?

Again, their theory is let's accelerate economic growth by trying, again, what failed before. Look, the definition of insanity is trying the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result.

They want to cut top tax rates for folks at the top again. They want to eliminate the estate tax that will benefit 5,500 households, run up \$269 billion on the deficit. That is what they want to do.

The Democratic budget does something very different. We want to empower hard-working American families. We want to change the incentives in the Tax Code to incentivize higher pay.

For example, we say that corporations should not be able to deduct CEO and executive bonuses over \$1 million unless they are giving their workers a pay increase, right? Pay your CEOs whatever you want, but you don't get a taxpayer subsidy for those deductions if you are laying off workers or you are cutting their wages.

Corporations deducted about \$70 billion in CEO bonuses over a 3-year period, from 2007 to 2010. We say: Why should the taxpayers be doing that for corporations that are cutting pay for their employees?

Our Republican colleagues continue to embrace a tax code that is rigged in favor of folks who have powerful lobbyists here to get special interest deductions. That is why the top 1 percent get 17 percent of the value of all those tax breaks.

Let's have a tax system that incentivizes higher pay. Let's invest in our kids' future, not slash our investment in education and innovation. Let's invest in the future of America. That is what the Democratic budget does.

I urge adoption of the Democratic alternative.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I think it is important to recognize that the Congressional Budget Office actually says that our budget grows GDP at the end of the 10-year window that we talk about. In order to turn this battleship in a direction, it takes a little while, but we are prepared to do that. We are offering positive solutions.

I want to revisit, though, the debt. Admiral Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked just a few years ago what the greatest security threat to the United States was. The highest ranking military officer in the land was asked what the greatest threat to the United States was, and he said the debt.

This red line right here, this is what he was talking about, increasing debt beyond as far as the eye can see, more than we have ever had; and that is what the Democrat budget does.

This is the current path that we are on right now, unless it has changed: fewer jobs, fewer dreams realized, fewer opportunities, fewer choices for the American people.

What does a debt crisis look like? We haven't seen one here. What does it look like? Higher interest rates on everything from mortgages to credit cards to car loans, lower business investments and opportunities, lower wages for people struggling just to hold on to their jobs, fewer resources for critical government services, a crowding out of all the things that folks on both sides of the aisle say they want to use—in short, less opportunity, less hope, fewer dreams realized, a very sad future for America.

That is not us. That is not America. That is not the people that we are. What we are is a balanced budget, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America, positive solutions.

Our budget proposes that we balance in less than 10 years, reduce spending by \$5.5 trillion over that period of time, strong support for our national defense, higher spending for national defense than the President or the Democrats proposed in these very dangerous times, repealing all of ObamaCare in its entirety—not just because it is harmful to the economy, it is harmful to the health of this Nation.

As a formerly practicing physician, I can attest to that. All you have to do is listen to my former professional colleagues.

We secure economic opportunity, fair and simple tax reform, ending the too-big-to-fail bank bailouts. We cut corporate welfare. We embrace federalism, including increasing opportunity and choices for folks, whether it is in the healthcare arena, whether it is in nutritional assistance, whether it is in education, getting those decisions back in the States and local communities where they belong.

To hold Washington accountable, we cut waste and fraud and abuse, make certain that we support the rights of conscience for healthcare providers and physicians across this land. We push back on the incredible overreach of this administration.

We stop the President's war on coal. We prevent his carbon tax increase. We hold the IRS accountable and make certain that they stop targeting the American taxpayers.

There is a positive vision for our country, Mr. Chair, a positive vision. It will deliver real results for the American people, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America.

I urge a "no" vote on the substitute and a "yes" on Price 2 and the final passage of the budget at the end of all this. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of the House Democratic

budget, which invests in hardworking American families. Our budget gives Americans the opportunities they need to get ahead.

I also rise in opposition to the House Republican budget, which asks the American people to work harder for less money. It offers the same job-killing, paycheck-shrinking policies that Americans have opposed time and time again.

When you compare these two budgets, the choice becomes clear. The Democratic budget will grow our economy and create jobs. The Republican budget will slash our economic growth by 2.5 percent and cost our nation nearly three million jobs in 2017 alone.

The Democratic budget will preserve the Affordable Care Act, which has enabled more than 16 million Americans to obtain quality, affordable health coverage. The Republican budget will repeal the Affordable Care Act and eliminate this health coverage.

The Democratic budget makes room for comprehensive immigration reform, which will bring clarity to our immigration system, secure our borders, and foster economic growth. The Republican budget continues to ignore the critical issue of comprehensive immigration reform.

The Democratic budget will provide tax relief to hardworking families, including extensions of the Child Tax Credit, the Earned Income Tax Credit, and tax credits for higher education. The Republican budget will raise taxes by \$2,000 for a typical working family, while millionaires will get an average tax cut of more than \$200,000.

The Democratic budget will protect Medicaid for working families and preserve nutrition assistance for families with low incomes. The Republican budget will make steep cuts to Medicaid and nutrition assistance, which will jeopardize the health of millions of Americans, including children, the elderly, and people with disabilities.

The Democratic budget will preserve the Medicare guarantee. The Republican budget will eliminate the Medicare guarantee and raise traditional Medicare premiums by an average of 50 percent.

The Democratic budget will ensure access to a high quality education for all, and give students the assistance they need to pay for college. The Republican budget will end tax cuts that help millions of working families afford college, slash more than \$220 billion in funding for student loans and college aid, and gut investments in K–12 education.

The Republican budget does not come close to addressing the needs of our nation; on the contrary, their budget contains devastating cuts that will make life harder for the American people.

America needs the Democratic budget, which champions the interests of all Americans, rather than a fortunate few. The Democratic budget makes it easier for hardworking Americans to send their children to college, own a home, and have a secure and enjoyable retirement. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. VAN HOLLEN for his leadership as our Ranking Member on the Budget Committee and I thank him for his commitment to helping America's working families.

Mr. Chair, as I've said—our budget is a statement of our national priorities.

The Republican budget tells the American people that our priority lies with the wealthy, special interests, and the top one-percent.

The House Republican Budget is rigged against American families.

It continues the failed austerity cuts that drive families further into poverty.

It forces draconian cuts on the poor, while offering more handouts to the wealthiest Americans.

It keeps special interest tax breaks while claiming that there is not enough left to educate our young people.

It is really unconscionable.

By contrast, the Democratic Alternative Budget demonstrates a true commitment to our American ideal of opportunity for all.

Our budget invests in families—too many of whom are making low wages and living below the poverty line.

Our budget invests in our future by providing much-needed investments in our roads and bridges.

It expands proven anti-poverty programs like the Earned Income Tax Credit and the Child Tax Credit to create pathways out of poverty.

And it increases funding for early childhood education, including the President's Early Childhood Education Initiative, so every toddler is prepared to start and succeed in school.

Finally—it includes comprehensive Immigration reform, which House Republicans have allowed to languish for two years since the Senate passed bipartisan reforms—so families can come out of shadows and have a shot at the American Dream.

This budget says that every single American—not just the wealthy few—deserves a chance to succeed.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-49 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. STUTZMAN of Indiana.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. VAN HOLLEN of Maryland.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 96, noes 330, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

#### AYES—96

Adams	Farr	Nadler
Bass	Fattah	Napolitano
Beatty	Fudge	Nolan
Becerra	Gallego	Pallone
Beyer	Grayson	Pingree
Blumenauer	Green, Al	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Gutiérrez	Rangel
Butterfield	Hahn	Roybal-Allard
Capuano	Hastings	Sánchez, Linda
Cárdenas	Higgins	T.
Carson (IN)	Honda	Sarbanes
Castor (FL)	Huffman	Schakowsky
Chu, Judy	Jackson Lee	Scott (VA)
Ciциline	Jeffries	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Serrano
Clarke (NY)	Johnson, E. B.	Sires
Clay	Kaptur	Slaughter
Cleaver	Kelly (IL)	Takano
Clyburn	Lawrence	Thompson (MS)
Cohen	Lee	Tonko
Conyers	Lewis	Vargas
Crowley	Lofgren	Veasey
Cummings	Lowenthal	Vela
Davis, Danny	Luján, Ben Ray	Velázquez
DeFazio	(NM)	Wasserman
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Schultz
Deutch	Matsui	Waters, Maxine
Dingell	McCollum	Watson Coleman
Doyle, Michael	McDermott	Welch
F.	McGovern	Wilson (FL)
Edwards	Meeks	Yarmuth
Ellison	Meng	
Engel	Moore	

#### NOES—330

Abraham	Brownley (CA)	Crawford
Aderholt	Buchanan	Crenshaw
Aguilar	Buck	Cuellar
Allen	Bucshon	Culberson
Amash	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Amodei	Bustos	Davis (CA)
Ashford	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Babin	Calvert	DeGette
Barletta	Capps	Delaney
Barr	Carney	DeLauro
Barton	Carter (GA)	DeBene
Benishiek	Carter (TX)	Denham
Bera	Cartwright	Dent
Bilirakis	Castro (TX)	DeSantis
Bishop (GA)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bishop (MI)	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bishop (UT)	Clawson (FL)	Doggett
Black	Coffman	Dold
Blackburn	Cole	Duckworth
Blum	Collins (GA)	Duffy
Bonamici	Collins (NY)	Duncan (SC)
Bost	Comstock	Duncan (TN)
Boustany	Conaway	Ellmers (NC)
Boyle, Brendan	Connolly	Emmer (MN)
F.	Cook	Eshoo
Brady (TX)	Cooper	Esty
Brat	Costa	Farenthold
Bridenstine	Costello (PA)	Fincher
Brooks (AL)	Courtney	Fitzpatrick
Brooks (IN)	Cramer	Fleischmann

Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Israel  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Knight  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Levin

Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neal  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pascarella  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Quigley  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)

## NOT VOTING—6

Hinojosa  
O'Rourke

□ 1624

Messrs. DOGGETT, PITTENGER, LARSON of Connecticut, STIVERS, GENE GREEN of Texas, FINCHER, FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms.

Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schiff  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Sewell (AL)  
Smith (WA)

SPEIER, and Mr. HOYER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 136 on H. Con. Res. 27 Ellison Amendment 1, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

## AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 120, noes 306, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

## AYES—120

Adams  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Ciocline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Farr

Fattah  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gallego  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hastings  
Higgins  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Lewis  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Nadler  
Napolitano

Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Pelosi  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Price (NC)  
Rangel  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (MS)  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishiek  
Bera  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capps  
Carney  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Rodney  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gabbard  
Garamendi  
Garrett

## NOES—306

Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Graham  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jolly  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (PA)  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Knight  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Latta  
Levin  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebach  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows

Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Quigley  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Luetkemeyer  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Torres  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton

Valadao	Weber (TX)	Womack
Visclosky	Webster (FL)	Woodall
Wagner	Wenstrup	Yoder
Walberg	Westerman	Yoho
Walden	Westmoreland	Young (AK)
Walker	Whitfield	Young (IA)
Walorski	Williams	Young (IN)
Walters, Mimi	Wilson (SC)	Zeldin
Walz	Wittman	Zinke

## NOT VOTING—6

Hinojosa	Payne	Sewell (AL)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Smith (WA)

□ 1634

Messrs. NEAL and GENE GREEN of Texas changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote No. 137 on H. Con. Res. 27 Butterfield Amendment 2, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “no” when I should have voted “yes.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A  
SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. STUTZMAN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DENHAM). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 132, noes 294, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

## AYES—132

Aderholt	Fleischmann	Labrador
Amash	Fleming	LaMalfa
Babin	Flores	Lamborn
Barr	Franks (AZ)	Lance
Barton	Garrett	Latta
Bishop (MI)	Gohmert	Long
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Black	Gosar	Love
Blackburn	Gowdy	Lummis
Blum	Granger	Marchant
Brady (TX)	Graves (GA)	Massie
Brat	Graves (LA)	McCarthy
Bridenstine	Graves (MO)	McCaul
Brooks (AL)	Grothman	McClintock
Buck	Guthrie	McHenry
Burgess	Harris	McMorris
Byrne	Hartzler	Rodgers
Carter (GA)	Hensarling	Meadows
Carter (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Messer
Chabot	Hill	Miller (FL)
Chaffetz	Holding	Moolenaar
Clawson (FL)	Hudson	Mullin
Collins (GA)	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Conaway	Huizenga (MI)	Neugebauer
DeSantis	Hultgren	Olson
DesJarlais	Hunter	Palazzo
Duncan (SC)	Jenkins (KS)	Palmer
Ellmers (NC)	Johnson, Sam	Perry
Emmer (MN)	Jordan	Pittenger
Farenthold	King (IA)	Pitts
Fincher	Kline	Poe (TX)

Pompeo	Scalise	Walberg
Ratcliffe	Schweikert	Walker
Ribble	Scott, Austin	Walorski
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Weber (TX)
Roe (TN)	Sessions	Wenstrup
Rogers (AL)	Shimkus	Westerman
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Westmoreland
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Williams
Rooney (FL)	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Ross	Stewart	Woodall
Rouzer	Stutzman	Yoder
Ryan (WI)	Thornberry	Yoho
Salmon	Tipton	
Sanford	Trott	

## NOES—294

Abraham	Doggett	Lee
Adams	Dold	Levin
Aguilar	Doyle, Michael	Lewis
Allen	F.	Lieu, Ted
Amodei	Duckworth	Lipinski
Ashford	Duffy	LoBiondo
Barletta	Duncan (TN)	Loeb
Bass	Edwards	Lofgren
Beatty	Ellison	Lowenthal
Becerra	Engel	Lowey
Benish	Eshoo	Lucas
Bera	Esty	Luetkemeyer
Beyer	Farr	Lujan Grisham
Bilirakis	Fattah	(NM)
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Luján, Ben Ray
Blumenauer	Forbes	(NM)
Bonamici	Fortenberry	Lynch
Bost	Foster	MacArthur
Boustany	Fox	Maloney,
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn
F.	Frelinghuysen	Maloney, Sean
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Marino
Brooks (IN)	Gabbard	Matsui
Brown (FL)	Gallego	McCollum
Brownley (CA)	Garamendi	McDermott
Buchanan	Gibbs	McGovern
Bucshon	Gibson	McKinley
Bustos	Graham	McNerney
Butterfield	Grayson	McSally
Calvert	Green, Al	Meehan
Capps	Green, Gene	Meeks
Capuano	Griffith	Meng
Cárdenas	Grijalva	Mica
Carney	Guinta	Miller (MI)
Carson (IN)	Gutiérrez	Mooney (WV)
Cartwright	Hahn	Moore
Castor (FL)	Hanna	Moulton
Castro (TX)	Hardy	Murphy (FL)
Chu, Judy	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Cicilline	Hastings	Nadler
Clark (MA)	Heck (NV)	Napolitano
Clarke (NY)	Heck (WA)	Neal
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Cleaver	Higgins	Noem
Clyburn	Himes	Nolan
Coffman	Honda	Norcross
Cohen	Hoyer	Nugent
Cole	Huffman	Nunes
Collins (NY)	Hurd (TX)	Pallone
Comstock	Hurt (VA)	Pascarell
Connolly	Israel	Paulsen
Conyers	Issa	Pearce
Cook	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Cooper	Jeffries	Perlmutter
Costa	Jenkins (WV)	Peters
Costello (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Courtney	Johnson (OH)	Pingree
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Crawford	Jolly	Poliquin
Crenshaw	Jones	Polis
Crowley	Joyce	Posey
Cuellar	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Culberson	Katko	Price, Tom
Cummings	Keating	Quigley
Curbelo (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Rangel
Davis (CA)	Kelly (PA)	Reed
Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Reichert
Davis, Rodney	Kildee	Renacci
DeFazio	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Kind	Richmond
Delaney	King (NY)	Rigell
DeLauro	Kinzinger (IL)	Roby
DelBene	Kirkpatrick	Rogers (KY)
Denham	Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
Dent	Kuster	Roskam
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Rothfus
Deutsch	Larsen (WA)	Roybal-Allard
Diaz-Balart	Larson (CT)	Royce
Dingell	Lawrence	Ruppersberger

## NOT VOTING—8

Hinojosa	Payne	Sewell (AL)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Smith (WA)

□ 1641

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from “aye” to “no.” Mr. PITTINGER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Chair, during the vote on the Butterfield/Scott (VA)/Lee/Moore Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 27 and the Van Hollen Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 27, I was inescapably detained in my congressional district attending vitally important district events commemorating the voting rights movement. If I had been present I would have voted “yes” on both of the aforementioned amendments in the nature of a Substitute to H. Con. Res. 27. Additionally, had I been present I would have voted “no” on the Stutzman/Flores Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute H. Con. Res. 27.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A  
SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 264, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]

## AYES—160

Adams	Becerra	Bonamici
Aguilar	Beyer	Boyle, Brendan
Bass	Bishop (GA)	F.
Beatty	Blumenauer	Brady (PA)



Brown (FL)  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutsch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fattah  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez

## NOES—264

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodel  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishkek  
Bera  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Bustos  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carney  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)

Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert

Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takai  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Knight  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse

Burgess  
Collins (NY)  
Hinojosa

Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner

## NOT VOTING—8

O'Rourke  
Payne  
Ruiz

Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stutzman  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.  
Sec. 202. Reconciliation procedures.  
Sec. 203. Additional guidance for reconciliation.

## TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Sec. 301. Submissions of findings for the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

## TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macro-economic effects.  
Sec. 402. Limitation on measures affecting Social Security solvency.  
Sec. 403. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.  
Sec. 404. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.  
Sec. 405. Limitation on advance appropriations.  
Sec. 406. Fair value credit estimates.  
Sec. 407. Limitation on long-term spending.  
Sec. 408. Allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

Sec. 409. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.  
Sec. 410. Concepts, aggregates, allocations and application.

Sec. 411. Rulemaking powers.

## TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 501. Reserve fund for the repeal of the President's health care law.  
Sec. 502. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for promoting real health care reform.  
Sec. 503. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the President's health care law.  
Sec. 504. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 505. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for graduate medical education.  
Sec. 506. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.

Sec. 507. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.

Sec. 508. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.

Sec. 509. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.

Sec. 510. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation.

Sec. 511. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.

Sec. 512. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.

Sec. 513. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.

## TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 601. Direct spending.

## TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

Sec. 701. Long-term budgeting.

## TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

Sec. 801. Policy statement on balanced budget amendment.

Sec. 802. Policy statement on budget process and baseline reform.

□ 1652

Ms. GRANGER changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

## SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

- Sec. 803. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
- Sec. 804. Policy statement on tax reform.
- Sec. 805. Policy statement on trade.
- Sec. 806. Policy statement on Social Security.
- Sec. 807. Policy statement on repealing the President's health care law and promoting real health care reform.
- Sec. 808. Policy statement on Medicare.
- Sec. 809. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery and innovation.
- Sec. 810. Policy statement on Federal regulatory reform.
- Sec. 811. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
- Sec. 812. Policy statement on Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 813. Policy statement on Federal accounting methodologies.
- Sec. 814. Policy statement on scorekeeping for outyear budgetary effects in appropriation Acts.
- Sec. 815. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.
- Sec. 816. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
- Sec. 817. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.
- Sec. 818. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
- Sec. 819. Policy statement on "No Budget, No Pay".
- Sec. 820. Policy statement on national security funding.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$0.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,934,975,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,873,969,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,013,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,091,040,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,248,109,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,327,968,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,462,962,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,529,073,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,586,467,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,715,272,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,009,033,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,893,883,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,927,040,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,062,131,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,205,489,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,298,907,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,452,463,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,497,911,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,538,398,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,685,320,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: -\$342,278,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: -\$130,555,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$68,909,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$87,984,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$106,079,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$56,944,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$63,775,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$52,477,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$183,746,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$220,418,000,000.

(5) **DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.**—The budgetary levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,047,763,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,393,542,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$19,641,396,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$19,947,774,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$20,261,172,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$20,505,542,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$20,906,471,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$21,075,678,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$20,916,009,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$20,904,522,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,838,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$14,040,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$14,145,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$14,338,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$14,560,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$14,742,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$15,128,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$15,300,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$15,162,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$15,235,000,000,000.

##### SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$531,334,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$564,027,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$582,506,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$572,025,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$607,744,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$586,422,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$620,019,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$604,238,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$632,310,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$617,553,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$644,627,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$630,610,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$657,634,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$648,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$670,997,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$656,389,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$683,771,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$663,936,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$698,836,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$683,350,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$38,342,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,923,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,623,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,821,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,539,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,736,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,437,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,214,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,390,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,564,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,861,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,108,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,081,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,868,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,070,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,633,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,098,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,148,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,349,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$28,381,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,003,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,932,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,924,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,579,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,227,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,798,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,904,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,584,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,293,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,003,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,742,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,488,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,795,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority -\$3,581,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,410,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,189,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,196,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$307,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,259,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$472,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,309,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$728,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,335,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$863,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,375,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,332,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,037,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$964,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,215,000,000.  
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$35,350,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,113,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,047,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,268,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,385,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,674,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$37,206,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,747,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,171,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,304,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$38,367,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,685,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,221,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,361,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,108,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,319,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,962,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,486,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,095,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,471,000,000.  
(6) Agriculture (350):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$20,109,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,164,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,064,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,194,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,987,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,396,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,907,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,275,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,835,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,386,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,296,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,849,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,245,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,830,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,821,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,391,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,020,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,553,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,256,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,851,000,000.  
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority -\$3,269,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$16,617,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$12,373,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$26,620,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$10,252,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$24,998,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$8,801,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$28,587,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$6,903,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$27,479,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$6,522,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$21,769,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$5,742,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$22,819,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$4,965,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,306,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$3,991,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,635,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$3,370,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,845,000,000.  
(8) Transportation (400):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$36,743,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,181,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$69,381,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,298,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$73,623,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,397,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,051,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$77,763,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,767,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$79,149,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,369,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$80,613,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,946,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$82,128,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$81,336,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$83,709,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$82,724,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$85,335,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$83,983,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$7,082,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,928,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$7,688,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,753,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,089,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$15,383,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,381,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,789,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,409,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,567,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,305,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,095,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,304,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$10,937,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,359,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$9,345,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,447,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$8,890,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$8,579,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$8,930,000,000.  
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$80,620,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$90,389,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$84,746,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$90,513,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$87,029,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$87,366,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$85,514,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$85,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$87,901,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$87,669,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$88,908,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$89,276,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$90,148,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$90,467,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$91,237,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$91,646,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$92,744,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$93,101,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$94,734,000,000.  
(11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$416,475,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$426,860,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$360,678,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$364,823,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$358,594,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$360,468,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$367,103,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$367,916,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$387,076,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$377,341,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$388,981,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$389,025,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$398,136,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$398,233,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$408,454,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$408,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$425,381,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$425,477,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$433,945,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$434,143,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$577,726,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$577,635,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$580,837,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$580,777,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$580,782,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$580,741,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$639,293,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$639,213,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$680,575,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$680,481,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$726,644,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$726,548,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$808,204,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$808,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$825,577,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$825,379,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$834,148,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$834,037,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$927,410,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$927,292,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$512,364,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$513,709,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$479,836,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$475,234,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$481,994,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$471,951,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$483,293,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$477,470,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$516,193,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$510,603,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$502,001,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$496,856,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$518,690,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$518,542,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$525,230,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$519,391,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$532,515,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$521,105,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$550,057,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$543,361,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$33,878,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$166,677,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$170,121,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$164,387,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$163,009,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$162,385,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$174,862,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$174,048,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$179,735,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$178,778,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$183,969,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$183,019,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$196,283,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$195,255,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$192,866,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$191,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$189,668,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$188,553,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$203,517,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$202,383,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$52,156,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,006,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,450,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,547,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$55,169,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,659,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,854,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,572,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$58,585,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,392,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,498,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$59,992,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$63,032,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,485,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,917,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,355,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,844,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,264,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$68,632,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$68,051,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$23,593,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,576,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,761,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,202,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,817,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,279,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,252,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,084,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,947,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,602,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,309,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,981,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,695,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,840,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,010,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,878,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,968,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,825,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$366,527,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$366,527,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$414,768,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$414,768,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$477,731,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$477,731,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$531,032,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$531,032,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$578,654,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$578,654,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$612,121,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$612,121,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$642,388,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$642,388,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$667,089,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$667,089,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$684,301,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$684,301,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$695,929,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$695,929,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority -\$33,462,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$17,275,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$29,863,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$24,277,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$32,175,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$28,249,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$34,261,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$31,078,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$39,009,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$35,136,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$42,221,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$38,438,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$46,013,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$42,205,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$49,123,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$45,430,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$50,652,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$47,736,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$48,913,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$48,058,000,000.  
(20) Government-wide savings (930):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority \$27,465,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,416,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$15,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$3,005,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$32,429,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$20,148,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$41,554,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$32,383,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$50,240,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$42,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$55,831,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$50,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$63,954,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$57,849,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$71,850,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$65,124,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$78,889,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$71,689,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$113,903,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$93,829,000,000.

(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$73,514,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$73,514,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$83,832,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$83,832,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$90,115,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$90,115,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$90,594,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$90,594,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$92,193,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$92,193,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$96,623,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$96,623,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$99,437,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$99,437,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$104,343,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$104,343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$111,213,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$111,213,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$117,896,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$117,896,000,000.

(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$94,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$44,304,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,716,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,758,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,862,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,776,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$9,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$278,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

(23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):

Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$21,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$17,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$22,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$20,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$21,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$22,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$25,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$24,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, -\$27,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$26,000,000.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

### SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than July 15, 2015, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(9) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction suffi-

cient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(10) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(11) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(12) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(13) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

### SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES.

(a) ESTIMATING ASSUMPTIONS.—

(1) ASSUMPTIONS.—In the House, for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall use the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 (January 2015) when making estimates of any bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon. If adjustments to the baseline are made subsequent to the adoption of this concurrent resolution, then such chair shall determine whether to use any of these adjustments when making such estimates.

(2) INTENT.—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) should only be exercised if the estimates used to determine the compliance of such measures with the budgetary requirements included in the concurrent resolution are inaccurate because adjustments made to the baseline are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution. Such inaccurate adjustments made after the adoption of this concurrent resolution may include selected adjustments for rulemaking, judicial actions, adjudication, and interpretative rules that have major budgetary effects and are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House for any measure, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare an estimate based on the baseline determination made by such chair pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW THROUGH RECONCILIATION.—In preparing their submissions under section 201(a) to the Committee on the Budget, the committees named in section 201(b) shall—

(1) note the policies described in the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget that repeal the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(2) determine the most effective methods by which the health care laws referred to in paragraph (1) shall be repealed in their entirety.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of

a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) CONFERENCE REPORT.—Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) REVISION.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

#### SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR RECONCILIATION.

(a) GUIDANCE.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may develop additional guidelines providing further information, budgetary levels and amounts, and other explanatory material to supplement the instructions included in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and set forth in section 201.

(b) PUBLICATION.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may cause the material prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to be printed in the Congressional Record on the appropriate date, but not later than the date set forth in this title on which committees must submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in order to comply with the reconciliation instructions set forth in section 201.

#### TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

##### SEC. 301. SUBMISSIONS OF FINDINGS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.—In the House, not later than October 1, 2015, the committees named in subsection (d) shall submit to the Committee on the Budget findings that identify changes in law within their jurisdictions that would achieve the specified level of savings through the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED.—After receiving those recommendations—

(1) the Committee on the Budget may use them in the development of future concurrent resolutions on the budget; and

(2) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make such recommendations publicly available in electronic form and cause them to be placed in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after receipt.

(c) SPECIFIED LEVELS OF SAVINGS.—For purposes of this section, a specified level of savings for each committee may be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(d) HOUSE COMMITTEES.—The following committees shall submit findings to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (a): the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee

on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(e) REPORT BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—By August 1, 2015, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report identifying instances in which the committees referred to in subsection (d) may make legislative changes to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of programs within their jurisdiction.

#### TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

##### SEC. 401. COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) CBO ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, an estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation considered in the House or the Senate during fiscal year 2016 shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, any estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(c) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in this section shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (a) and (b)) of such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution sets forth budgetary levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term “major legislation” means any bill or joint resolution—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(2) the term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, budget authority, outlays, and deficits.

##### SEC. 402. LIMITATION ON MEASURES AFFECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, it shall not be in order to consider in the House or the Senate a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

##### SEC. 403. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

##### SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

##### SEC. 405. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading:

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”; and

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) VETERANS.—\$63,271,000,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2016.

**SEC. 406. FAIR VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.**

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, any estimate of the budgetary effects of a measure prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform” shall, as a supplement to such estimate, and to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares an estimate pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 of the budgetary effects which would be incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and if the Director determines that such bill or joint resolution has a budgetary effect related to a housing, residential mortgage or student loan program under title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, then the Director shall also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of such bill or joint resolution that result in such effect.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

**SEC. 407. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of \$5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning in the fiscal year following the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 408. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**

(a) SEPARATE OCO/GWOT ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

(b) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in

subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2016. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays counting toward the allocation established by subsection (a) shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**SEC. 409. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.**

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—In the House, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or offers any amendment thereto or submits a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2016 and the period of fiscal years 2016 through fiscal year 2025 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 410. CONCEPTS, AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**

(a) CONCEPTS, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPLICATION.—In the House—

(1) upon a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly;

(2) any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(A) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable;

(3) section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall have no force or effect for any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to instructions set forth in this concurrent resolution;

(4) the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from the most recently published or adjusted baseline of the Congressional Budget Office; and

(5) the term “budget year” means the most recent fiscal year for which a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted.

(b) AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.—In the House, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement—

(1) the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 407 of this concurrent resolution; and

(2) revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 411. RULEMAKING POWERS.**

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

**TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS**

**SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that consists solely of the full repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 or measures that make modifications to such law.

**SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that promotes real health care reform, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.



**SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, expands access to, and improves, as determined by such chair, graduate medical education programs, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 506. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 507. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.**

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 508. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 509. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 510. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations,

aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 511. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 512. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.**

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit reforms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 513. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure is related to the support of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism by the amounts provided in such legislation in excess of \$73.5 billion but not to exceed \$94 billion, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING**

**SEC. 601. DIRECT SPENDING.**

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 4.6 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic president reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the five years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This budget applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this budget assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into flexible State allotments, which States will be able to tailor to meet their unique needs. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that ties the hands of State governments and would provide States with the freedom and flexibility they have long requested in the Medicaid program. Moreover, this budget assumes the repeal of the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of the crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates, as well as the overwhelming pressure the law's Medicaid expansion puts on an already-strained system.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth. Such a reform would provide incentives for States to ensure dollars will go towards those who need them most.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 5.4 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 5.5 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions. Future retirees would be able to choose from a range of guaranteed coverage options, with private plans competing alongside the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program. Medicare would provide a premium-support payment either to pay for or offset the premium of the plan chosen by the senior, depending on the plan's cost. The Medicare premium-support payment would be adjusted so that the sick would receive higher payments if their conditions worsened; lower-income seniors would receive additional assistance to help cover out-of-pocket costs; and wealthier seniors would assume responsibility for a greater share of their premiums. Putting seniors in charge of how their health care dollars are spent will force providers to compete against each other on price and quality. This market competition will act as a real check on widespread waste and skyrocketing health care costs. As with previous budgets, this program will begin in 2024 and makes no changes to those in or near retirement.

(B) In keeping with a recommendation from the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, this budget calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

**TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS**

**SEC. 701. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.**

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2035, and 2040 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) REVENUES.—The budgetary levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 18.7 percent.  
Fiscal year 2035: 19.0 percent.  
Fiscal year 2040: 19.0 percent.

(2) **OUTLAYS.**—The budgetary levels of total budget outlays are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 18.4 percent.  
Fiscal year 2035: 17.8 percent.  
Fiscal year 2040: 16.9 percent.

(3) **DEFICITS.**—The budgetary levels of deficits are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: -0.3 percent.  
Fiscal year 2035: -1.2 percent.  
Fiscal year 2040: -2.1 percent.

(4) **DEBT.**—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 44.0 percent.  
Fiscal year 2035: 32.0 percent.  
Fiscal year 2040: 18.0 percent.

#### TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

##### SEC. 801. POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government collects approximately \$3 trillion annually in taxes, but spends more than \$3.5 trillion to maintain the operations of government. The Federal Government must borrow 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of the year 2014, the national debt of the United States was more than \$18.1 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a Constitutional Convention for the consideration of adopting a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(4) Forty-nine States have fiscal limitations in their State Constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte (R-VA), was considered by the House of Representatives on November 18, 2011, though it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(6) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Twelve were introduced in the 113th Congress alone, including H.J. Res. 4 by Democratic Representative John J. Barrow of Georgia, and H.J. Res. 38 by Republican Representative Jackie Walorski of Indiana.

(7) The joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution referred to in paragraph (5) prohibited outlays for a fiscal year (except those for repayment of debt principal) from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year (except those derived from borrowing) unless Congress, by a three-fifths roll call vote of each chamber, authorizes a specific excess of outlays over receipts.

(8) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed of passage by one vote in the United States Senate.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pass a joint resolution incorporating the provisions set forth in subsection (b), and send such joint resolution to the States for their approval, to amend the Constitution of the United States to require an annual balanced budget.

##### SEC. 802. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS AND BASELINE REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—

(1) In 1974, after more than 50 years of executive dominance over fiscal policy, Congress acted to reassert its “power of the purse”, and passed the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

(2) The measure explicitly sought to establish congressional control over the budget process, to provide for annual congressional determination of the appropriate level of taxes and spending, to set important national budget priorities, and to find ways in which Members of Congress could have access to the most accurate, objective, and highest quality information to assist them in discharging their duties.

(3) Far from achieving its intended purpose, however, the process has instituted a bias toward higher spending and larger government. The behemoth of the Federal Government has largely been financed through either borrowing or taking ever greater amounts of the national income through high taxation.

(4) The process does not treat programs and policies consistently and shows a bias toward higher spending and higher taxes.

(5) It assumes extension of spending programs (of more than \$50 million per year) scheduled to expire.

(6) Yet it does not assume the extension of tax policies in the same way. Consequently, extending existing tax policies that may be scheduled to expire is characterized as a new tax reduction, requiring offsets to “pay for” merely keeping tax policy the same even though estimating conventions would not require similar treatment of spending programs.

(7) The original goals set for the congressional process are admirable in their intent, but because the essential mechanisms of the process have remained the same, and “reforms” enacted over the past 40 years have largely taken the form of layering greater levels of legal complexity without reforming or reassessing the very fundamental nature of the process.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that as the primary branch of Government, Congress must:

(1) Restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) Reassert Congress’s “power of the purse”, and reinforce the balance of powers between Congress and the President, as the 1974 Act intended.

(3) Create greater incentives for lawmakers to do budgeting as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially adopting a budget resolution every year.

(4) Encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending.

(5) Consider innovative fiscal tools such as: zero based budgeting, which would require a department or agency to justify its budget as if it were a new expenditure; and direct spending caps to enhance oversight of automatic pilot spending that increases each year without congressional approval.

(6) Promote efficient and timely budget actions, so that lawmakers complete their budget actions by the time the new fiscal year begins.

(7) Provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts overall economic growth and job creation.

(8) Remove layers of complexity that have complicated the procedures designed in 1974, and made budgeting more arcane and opaque.

(9) Remove existing biases that favor higher spending.

(10) Include procedures by which current tax laws may be extended and treated on a basis that is not different from the extension of entitlement programs.

(c) **BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**—Comprehensive budget process reform should also remove the bias in the baseline against the extension of current tax laws in the following ways:

(1) Permanent extension of tax laws should not be used as a means to increase taxes on other taxpayers;

(2) For those expiring tax provisions that are proposed to be permanently extended, Congress should use a more realistic baseline that does not require them to be offset; and,

(3) Tax-reform legislation should not include tax increases just to offset the extension of current tax laws.

(d) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget intends to draft legislation during the 114th Congress that will rewrite the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers’ dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

##### SEC. 803. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession more than 5 years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product GDP growth over the past 5 years has averaged slightly more than 2 percent, well below the 3.2 percent historical trend rate of growth in the United States. Although the economy has shown some welcome signs of improvement of late, the Nation remains in the midst of the weakest economic recovery of the modern era.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 2.3 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country’s fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher. Clearly, there is a dire need for policies that will spark higher rates of economic growth and greater, higher-quality job opportunities.

(4) Although job gains have been trending up of late, other aspects of the labor market remain weak. The labor force participation rate, for instance, is hovering just under 63 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. Long-term unemployment also remains a problem. Of the roughly 8.7 million people who are currently unemployed, 2.7 million (more than 30 percent) have been unemployed for more than 6 months. Long-term unemployment erodes an individual’s job skills and detaches them from job opportunities. It also undermines the long-term productive capacity of the economy.

(5) Perhaps most important, wage gains and income growth have been subpar for middle-class Americans. Average hourly earnings of private-sector workers have increased by just 1.6 percent over the past year. Prior to the recession, average hourly earnings were tracking close to 4 percent. Likewise, average income levels have remained flat in recent years. Real median household income is just under \$52,000, one of the lowest levels since 1995.

(6) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country’s economic outlook. Investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. They know

that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation and they act accordingly. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(7) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels is a net positive for economic growth over time. The logic is that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(8) CBO analyzed the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and found it would increase real output per capita (a proxy for a country's standard of living) by about \$1,000 in 2025 and roughly \$5,000 by 2040 relative to the baseline path. That means more income and greater prosperity for all Americans.

(9) In contrast, if the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a "crowding out" of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(10) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(11) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$326 billion.

(12) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(b) **POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.**—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code will put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

#### SEC. 804. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all three counts: It is notoriously complex, patently unfair, and highly inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Over the past decade alone, there have been 4,107 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carving out special preferences, exclusions, or deductions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than \$1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and highly complex.

(3) In addition, these tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals.

(4) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the tax base. A narrow tax base, in turn, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(5) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending \$160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(6) Standard economic theory shows that high marginal tax rates dampen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(7) Roughly half of U.S. active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a "pass-through" basis, meaning the income flows through to the tax returns of the individual owners and is taxed at the individual rate structure rather than at the corporate rate. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the top Federal rate on such small business income can reach nearly 45 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(8) The U.S. corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages and discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(9) By deterring potential investment, the U.S. corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The U.S. tax rate differential with other countries also fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate behaviors intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(10) The "worldwide" structure of U.S. international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the United States tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and it would also greatly reduce tax avoidance.

(12) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, on consumers in higher prices, and on investors in diminished returns.

(13) Revenues have averaged about 17.4 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 18.3 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through new tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans' ability to save for their retirement and their children's education.

(15) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a new source of revenue. Such a plan would damage

the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

(16) Closing tax loopholes to fund spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(17) The goal of tax reform should be to curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(18) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform (i.e. a broader tax base and lower tax rates) would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which, over time, would have a positive impact on total national output.

(19) Heretofore, the congressional scorekeepers the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

(20) Static scoring implicitly assumes that the size of the economy (and therefore key economic variables such as labor supply and investment) remains fixed throughout the considered budget horizon. This is an abstraction from reality.

(21) A new House rule was adopted at the beginning of the 114th Congress to help correct this problem. This rule requires CBO and JCT to incorporate the macroeconomic effects of major legislation into their official cost estimates.

(22) This rule seeks to bridge the divide between static estimates and scoring that incorporates economic feedback effects by providing policymakers with a greater amount of information about the likely economic impact of policies under their consideration while at the same time preserving traditional scoring methods and reporting conventions.

(b) **POLICY ON TAX REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform that—

(1) simplifies the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reduces the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowers tax rates for individuals and consolidates the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular type of income or industry.

#### SEC. 805. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade, adherence to trade agreement rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) Trade Promotion Authority is a bipartisan and bicameral effort to strengthen the

role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

(4) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to “hollow out” United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(5) Trade agreements have saved the average American family of four more than \$10,000 per year, as a result of lower duties. Trade agreements also lower the cost of manufacturing inputs by removing duties.

(6) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(7) When negotiating trade agreements, United States laws on Intellectual Property (IP) protection should be used as a benchmark for establishing global IP frameworks. Strong IP protections have contributed significantly to the United States status as a world leader in innovation across sectors, including in the development of life-saving biologic medicines. The data protections afforded to biologics in United States law, including 12 years of data protection, allow continued development of pioneering medicines to benefit patients both in the United States and abroad. To maintain the cycle of innovation and achieve truly 21st century trade agreements, it is vital that our negotiators insist on the highest standards for IP protections.

(8) The status quo of the current tax code also undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(9) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage. A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

(10) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a “tax loophole,” cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(11) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(b) **POLICY ON TRADE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system to promote job creation

in the United States. The United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade opportunities, adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and by enforcing United States rights. To that end, Congress should pass Trade Promotion Authority to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

#### **SEC. 806. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the “three-legged stool” of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2033, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut nearly 23 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$2 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower income Americans’ retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to the CBO, between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by more than 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. David Autor and Mark Duggan have found that the increase in individuals on disability does not reflect a decrease in self-reported health. CBO attributes program growth to changes in demographics, changes in the composition of the labor force and compensation, as well as Federal policies.

(6) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifetime that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 20 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the “Greenspan Commission” which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(8) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that bipartisan action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes reform of a current law trigger, such that:

(1) If in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. Recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees.

(2) Not later than 1 December of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit their recommendations, the President should promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including his recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House should introduce the President’s legislation upon receipt.

(3) Within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been referred should report a bill, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on, and provide certainty for, future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes reform that—

(1) ensure benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(2) prevents a 20 percent across-the-board benefit cut;

(3) makes the Disability Insurance program work better; and

(4) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—Any legislation that Congress considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance trust fund also must improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance (OASDI) trust fund.

**SEC. 807. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPEALING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW AND PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The President's health care law put Washington's priorities first, and not patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised; instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500 a year; instead, according to the 2014 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 7 percent for individuals and families since 2012.

(2) The President pledged "If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan." Instead, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 9 million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans due to the President's health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Pelosi, said that the President's health care law would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reduction in hours worked due to Obamacare represents a decline of about 2.0 to 2.5 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. The full impact on labor represents a reduction in employment by 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent, while additional studies show less modest results. A recent study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) The President has charged the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of unelected bureaucrats, with cutting Medicare by an additional \$20.9 billion over the next ten years, according to the President's most recent budget.

(5) Since ACA was signed into law, the administration has repeatedly failed to implement it as written. The President has unilaterally acted to make a total of 28 changes, delays, and exemptions. The President has signed into law another 17 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual "mandate" could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees if doing so violates these companies' religious beliefs. Even now, almost five years after enactment, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate the legality of how the President's administration has implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly underlying the entire program health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(6) The President's health care law is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. The law should be fully repealed, allowing for real, patient-centered health care reform: the development of real health care reforms that puts patients first, that make affordable, quality health care available to all Americans, and that build on the innovation and creativity of all the participants in the health care sector.

(b) **POLICY ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law should be fully repealed and real health care reform promoted in accordance with the following principles:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Health care reform should enhance affordability, accessibility, quality, innovation, choices and responsiveness in health care coverage for all Americans, putting patients, families, and doctors in charge, not Washington, DC. These reforms should encourage increased competition and transparency. Under the President's health care law, government controls Americans' health care choices. Under true, patient-centered reform, Americans would.

(2) **AFFORDABILITY.**—Real reform should be centered on ensuring that all Americans, no matter their age, income, or health status, have the ability to afford health care coverage. The health care delivery structure should be improved, and individuals should not be priced out of the health insurance market due to pre-existing conditions, but nationalized health care is not only unnecessary to accomplish this, it undermines the goal. Individuals should be allowed to join together voluntarily to pool risk through mechanisms such as Individual Membership Associations and Small Employer Membership Associations.

(3) **ACCESSABILITY.**—Instead of Washington outlining for Americans the ways they cannot use their health insurance, reforms should make health coverage more portable. Individuals should be able to own their insurance and have it follow them in and out of jobs throughout their career. Small business owners should be permitted to band together across State lines through their membership in bona fide trade or professional associations to purchase health coverage for their families and employees at a low cost. This will increase small businesses' bargaining power, volume discounts, and administrative efficiencies while giving them freedom from State-mandated benefit packages. Also, insurers licensed to sell policies in one State should be permitted to offer them to residents in any other State, and consumers should be permitted to shop for health insurance across State lines, as they are with other insurance products online, by mail, by phone, or in consultation with an insurance agent.

(4) **QUALITY.**—Incentives for providers to deliver high-quality, responsive, and coordinated care will promote patient outcomes and drive down health care costs. Likewise, reforms that work to restore the patient-physician relationship by reducing administrative burdens and allowing physicians to do what they do best: care for patients

(5) **CHOICES.**—Individuals and families should be free to secure the health care coverage that best meets their needs, rather than instituting one-size-fits-all directives from Federal bureaucracies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

(6) **INNOVATION.**—Instead of stifling innovation in health care technologies, treatments,

medications, and therapies with Federal mandates, taxes, and price controls, a reformed health care system should encourage research, development and innovation.

(7) **RESPONSIVENESS.**—Reform should return authority to States wherever possible to make the system more responsive to patients and their needs. Instead of tying States' hands with Federal requirements for their Medicaid programs, the Federal Government should return control of this program to the States. Not only does the current Medicaid program drive up Federal debt and threaten to bankrupt State budgets, but States are better positioned to provide quality, affordable care to those who are eligible for the program and to track down and weed out waste, fraud and abuse. Beneficiary choices in the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) and Medicaid should be improved. States should make available the purchase of private insurance as an option to their Medicaid and SCHIP populations (though they should not require enrollment).

(8) **REFORMS.**—Reforms should be made to prevent lawsuit abuse and curb the practice of defensive medicine, which are significant drivers increasing health care costs. The burden of proof in medical malpractice cases should be based on compliance with best practice guidelines, and States should be free to implement those policies to best suit their needs.

**SEC. 808. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2030 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program;

(D) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries;

(E) in 2013, the ratio was 3.2 workers per beneficiary, but this falls to 2.3 in 2030 and continues to decrease over time;

(F) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program; and

(G) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office's 2014 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2043 and 9.3 percent of GDP by 2089.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution to preserve the program for those in or near retirement and strengthen Medicare for future beneficiaries.

(c) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that—

(1) current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in or near retirement;

(2) permanent reform of the sustainable growth rate is responsibly accounted for to ensure physicians continue to participate in the Medicare program and provide quality health care for beneficiaries;

(3) when future generations reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs;

(4) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as a plan option;

(5) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

(6) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

#### **SEC. 809. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY AND INNOVATION.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) For decades, the Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world, bringing life-saving drugs and devices to patients and well over a million high-paying jobs to local communities.

(2) Thanks to the visionary and determined leadership of innovators throughout America, including industry, academic medical centers, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the United States has led the way in early discovery. The United States leadership role is being threatened, however, as other countries contribute more to basic research from both public and private sources.

(3) The Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation predicts that China, for example, will outspend the United States in total research and development by the end of the decade.

(4) Federal policies should foster innovation in health care, not stifle it. America should maintain its world leadership in medical science by encouraging competitive forces to work through the marketplace in delivering cures and therapies to patients.

(5) Too often the bureaucracy and red-tape in Washington hold back medical innovation and prevent new lifesaving treatments from reaching patients. This resolution recognizes the valuable role of the NIH and the indispensable contributions to medical research coming from outside Washington.

(6) America is the greatest, most innovative Nation on Earth. Her people are innovators, entrepreneurs, visionaries, and relentless builders of the future. Americans were responsible for the first telephone, the first airplane, the first computer, for putting the first man on the moon, for creating the first vaccine for polio and for legions of other scientific and medical breakthroughs that have improved and prolonged human health and life for countless people in America and around the world.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.—

(1) It is the policy of this resolution to support the important work of medical innovators throughout the country, including private-sector innovators, medical centers and the National Institutes of Health.

(2) At the same time, the budget calls for continued strong funding for the agencies that engage in valuable research and development, while also urging Washington to get

out of the way of researchers, discoverers and innovators all over the country.

#### **SEC. 810. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing the Nation's recovery from the economic recession.

(2) Since President Obama's inauguration in 2009, the administration has issued more than 468,500 pages of regulations in the Federal Register including 70,066 pages in 2014.

(3) The National Association of Manufacturers estimates the total cost of regulations is as high as \$2.03 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated more than \$494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional \$87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111-203) has resulted in more than \$32 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 63 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing \$24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an \$8 billion cost burden on the States.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In June 2014, the EPA proposed a rule to cut carbon pollution from the Nation's power plants. The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly 40 percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto prohibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by the energy market analysis group Energy Ventures Analysis Inc. estimates the average energy bill in West Virginia will rise \$750 per household by 2020, due in part to EPA regulations. West Virginia receives 95 percent of its electricity from coal.

(10) The Heritage Foundation found that a phase-out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of \$2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by \$1,200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) promotes economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape

and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) requires the implementation of a regulatory budget to be allocated amongst Government agencies, which would require congressional approval and limit the maximum costs of regulations in a given year;

(3) requires congressional approval of all new major regulations (those with an impact of \$100 million or more) before enactment as opposed to current law in which Congress must expressly disapprove of regulation to prevent it from becoming law, which would keep Congress engaged as to pending regulatory policy and prevent costly and unsound policies from being implemented and becoming effective;

(4) requires a three year retrospective cost-benefit analysis of all new major regulations, to ensure that regulations operate as intended;

(5) reinforces the requirement of regulatory impact analysis for regulations proposed by executive branch agencies but also expands the requirement to independent agencies so that by law they consider the costs and benefits of proposed regulations rather than merely being encouraged to do so as is current practice; and

(6) requires a formal rulemaking process for all major regulations, which would increase transparency over the process and allow interested parties to communicate their views on proposed legislation to agency officials.

#### **SEC. 811. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.**

(a) FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) Roughly 20 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the past decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2004-2005 Academic Year and the 2014-2015 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees at public 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees at private nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.2 percent per year above the rate of inflation.

(4) Federal financial aid for higher education has also seen a dramatic increase. The portion of the Federal student aid portfolio composed of Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Perkins Loans with outstanding balances grew by 119 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2014.

(5) This spending has failed to make college more affordable.

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted: "We can't just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we'll run out of money".

(7) American students are chasing ever-increasing tuition with ever-increasing debt. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student debt now stands at nearly \$1.2 trillion. This makes student loans the second largest balance of consumer debt, after mortgage debt.

(8) Students are carrying large debt loads and too many fail to complete college or end up defaulting on these loans due to their debt burden and a weak economy and job market.

(9) Based on estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, the Pell Grant Program will face a fiscal shortfall beginning in fiscal year 2017 and continuing in each subsequent year in the current budget window.

(10) Failing to address these problems will jeopardize access and affordability to higher education for America's young people.

(b) **POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the root drivers of tuition inflation, by—

(1) targeting Federal financial aid to those most in need;

(2) streamlining programs that provide aid to make them more effective;

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at \$5,775 in each year of the budget window; and

(4) removing regulatory barriers in higher education that act to restrict flexibility and innovative teaching, particularly as it relates to non-traditional models such as online coursework and competency-based learning.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(3) The House Education and Workforce Committee successfully consolidated 15 job training programs in the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs; and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

#### **SEC. 812. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care and benefits.

(2) In 2014, reports started breaking across the Nation that VA medical centers were manipulating wait-list documents to hide long delays veterans were facing to receive health care. The VA hospital scandal led to the immediate resignation of then-Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric K. Shinseki.

(3) In 2015, for the first time ever, VA health care was added to the “high-risk” list of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), due to management and oversight failures that have directly resulted in risks to the timeliness, cost-effectiveness, and quality of health care.

(4) In response to the scandal, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs held several oversight hearings and ultimately enacted the Veterans' Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (VACAA) (Public Law 113-146) to address these problems. VACAA provided \$15 billion in emergency resources to fund internal health care needs within the department and provided veterans enhanced access to private-sector health care under the new Veterans Choice Program.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—This budget supports the

continued oversight efforts by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to ensure the VA is not only transparent and accountable, but also successful in achieving its goals in providing timely health care and benefits to America's veterans. The Budget Committee will continue to closely monitor the VA's progress to ensure resources provided by Congress are sufficient and efficiently used to provide needed benefits and services to veterans.

#### **SEC. 813. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Given the thousands of Federal programs and trillions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year, assessing and accounting for Federal fiscal activities and liabilities is a complex undertaking.

(2) Current methods of accounting leave much to be desired in capturing the full scope of government and in presenting information in a clear and compelling way that illuminates the best options going forward.

(3) Most fiscal analysis produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is conducted over a relatively short time horizon: 10 or 25 years. While this time frame is useful for most purposes, it fails to consider the fiscal consequences over the longer term.

(4) Additionally, current accounting methodology does not provide an analysis of how the Federal Government's fiscal situation over the long run affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(5) Another consideration is how Federal programs should be accounted for. The “accrual method” of accounting records revenue when it is earned and expenses when they are incurred, while the “cash method” records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received.

(6) The Federal budget accounts for most programs using cash accounting. Some programs, however, particularly loan and loan guarantee programs, are accounted for using accrual methods.

(7) GAO has indicated that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimation of the Federal Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs specifically those that provide some form of insurance.

(8) Where accrual accounting is used, it is almost exclusively calculated by CBO according to the methodology outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA). CBO uses fair value methodology instead of FCRA to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example.

(9) FCRA methodology, however, understates the risk and thus the true cost of Federal programs. An alternative is fair value methodology, which uses discount rates that incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length.

(10) The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that “adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of federal assistance” than the current approach under FCRA.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the public affected by Federal budgetary choices, adopt Governmentwide reforms of budget and accounting practices so the American

people and their representatives can more readily understand the fiscal situation of the Government of the United States and the options best suited to improving it. Such reforms may include but should not be limited to the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance our current analysis by considering our fiscal situation comprehensively, over an extended time horizon, and as it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair value accounting as opposed to the current approach under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

#### **SEC. 814. POLICY STATEMENT ON SCOREKEEPING FOR OUTYEAR BUDGETARY EFFECTS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Committee on the Budget to provide an allocation of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations for the budget year covered by a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations covers a period of one fiscal year only, which is effective for the budget year.

(3) An appropriation Act, joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon may contain changes to programs that result in direct budgetary effects that occur beyond the budget year and beyond the period for which the allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget is effective.

(4) The allocation of budgetary resources provided to the Committee on Appropriations does not currently anticipate or capture direct outyear budgetary effects to programs.

(5) Budget enforcement could be improved by capturing the direct outyear budgetary effects caused by appropriation Acts and using this information to determine the appropriate allocations of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations when considering future concurrent resolutions on the budget.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of the House of Representatives to more effectively allocate budgetary resources and accurately enforce budget targets by agreeing to a procedure by which the Committee on the Budget should consider the direct outyear budgetary effects of changes to mandatory programs enacted in appropriations bills, joint resolutions, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon when setting the allocation of budgetary resources for the Committee on Appropriations in a concurrent resolution on the budget. The relevant committees of jurisdiction are directed to consult on a procedure during fiscal year 2016 and include recommendations for implementing such procedure in the fiscal year 2017 concurrent resolution on the budget.

#### **SEC. 815. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the



Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could “lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings.”

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) two hundred nine Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of \$3 billion annually;

(B) two hundred separate Department of Justice crime prevention and victim services grant programs with an annual cost of \$3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) twenty different Federal entities administer 160 housing programs and other forms of Federal assistance for housing with a total cost of \$170 billion in 2010;

(D) seventeen separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent \$37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) fourteen grant and loan programs, and three tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) ninety-four different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage “green building” in the private sector; and

(G) twenty-three agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly \$15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends more than \$80 billion each year for approximately 1,400 information technology investments. GAO has identified broad acquisition failures, waste, and unnecessary duplication in the Government’s information technology infrastructure. Experts have estimated that eliminating these problems could save 25 percent or \$20 billion.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate more than \$50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$106 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2013.

(7) Under clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in \$693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(9) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) **POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees’ judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules. If the strictures of the rules are deemed to be too rapid in prohibiting spending on unauthorized programs, then milder measures should be adopted and enforced until a return to the full prohibition of clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

#### **SEC. 816. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold \$844 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2015.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending previously made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an Act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Congressional committees should through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans’ affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) **DEFICIT REDUCTION.**—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

#### **SEC. 817. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$525 billion in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact

legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

#### **SEC. 818. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is \$188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—It is the policy of this resolution that:

(1) The House of Representatives must be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources and therefore must identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members and committees of the House, and should identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room.

(2) No taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

#### **SEC. 819. POLICY STATEMENT ON “NO BUDGET, NO PAY”.**

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and should place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

#### **SEC. 820. POLICY STATEMENT ON NATIONAL SECURITY FUNDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Russian aggression, the growing threats of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in the Middle East, North Korean and Iranian nuclear and missile programs, and continued Chinese investments in high-end military capabilities and cyber warfare shape the parameters of an increasingly complex and challenging security environment.

(2) All four current service chiefs testified that the National Military Strategy could not be executed at sequestration levels.

(3) The independent and bipartisan National Defense Panel conducted risk assessments of force structure changes triggered by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and concluded that in addition to previous cuts to defense dating back to 2009, the sequestration of defense discretionary spending has "caused significant shortfalls in U.S. military readiness and both present and future capabilities".

(4) The President's fiscal year 2016 budget irresponsibly ignores current law and requests a defense budget \$38 billion above the caps for rhetorical gain. By creating an expectation of spending without a plan to avoid the BCA's guaranteed sequester upon breaching of its caps, the White House's proposal compounds the fiscal uncertainty that has affected the military's ability to adequately plan for future contingencies and make investments crucial for the Nation's defense.

(5) The President's budget proposes \$1.8 trillion in tax increases, in addition to the \$1.7 trillion in tax hikes the Administration has already imposed. The President's tax increases would further burden economic growth and is not a realistic source for offsets to fund defense sequester replacement.

(b) **POLICY ON FISCAL YEAR 2016 NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNDING.**—In fiscal year 2015, the House-passed budget resolution anticipated \$566 billion for national defense in the discretionary base budget for fiscal year 2016. With no necessary statutory change yet provided by Congress, the BCA statute would require limiting national defense discretionary base funding to \$523 billion in fiscal year 2016. However, in total with \$90 billion, the House Budget estimate for Overseas Contingency Operations funding for the Department of Defense, the fiscal year 2016 budget provides over \$613 billion total for defense spending that is higher than the President's budget request for the fiscal year. This concurrent resolution provides \$22 billion above the President's Five Year Defense Plan and \$151 billion above the 10-year totals. This would also be \$387 billion above the 10-year total for current levels.

(c) **DEFENSE READINESS AND MODERNIZATION FUND.**—(1) The budget resolution recognizes the need to ensure robust funding for national defense while maintaining overall fiscal discipline. The budget resolution prioritizes our national defense and the needs of the warfighter by providing needed dollars through the creation of the "Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund".

(2) The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund provides the mechanism for Congress to responsibly allocate in a deficit-neutral way the resources the military needs to secure the safety and liberty of United States citizens from threats at home and abroad. The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund will provide the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House the ability to increase allocations to support legislation that would provide for the Department of Defense warfighting capabilities, modernization, a temporary increase in end strength, training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, activities to reach full auditability of the Department of Defense's financial statements, and implementation of military and compensation reforms.

(d) **SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.**—This concurrent resolution encourages an immediate reevaluation of Fed-

eral Government priorities to maintain the strength of America's national security posture. In identifying policies to restructure and stabilize the Government's major entitlement programs which, along with net interest, will consume all Federal revenue in less than 20 years. The budget also charts a course that can ensure the availability of needed national security resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for their participation yesterday. We had extensive debate on the committee mark yesterday; so I will review, very briefly, the committee mark and then touch on the differences between this and the next substitute amendment.

This amendment is the committee mark. It is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. As we have talked about, this balances the budget in less than 10 years. It does so without raising taxes, which is absolutely vital.

All of the other alternatives that were brought from our friends on the other side of the aisle to the floor today, every one of them, raised significant taxes on the American people. We set out a path to be able to provide for a fairer, simpler, a more appropriate tax code where Washington isn't picking winners and losers.

Our underlying resolution repeals all of ObamaCare. It eliminates the Independent Payment Advisory Board. It lays out a path for patient-centered health care, where patients and families and doctors are making medical decisions, not Washington, D.C.

We ensure a strong national defense. Our numbers, when you combine the base budget with the global war on terror budget, are above the President's numbers required for making certain that our men and women who stand in harm's way have the resources available to make certain they can protect not just us, but protect themselves.

We secure our future by laying out a path to save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid. It is so incredibly important. Medicare, itself, has been estimated by the trustees to go insolvent—to go broke—in 2033. It is absolutely vital that this Congress recognize the challenge before us and lay out a path for saving and strengthening and securing Medicare, and we do just that.

We restore federalism. We think it is important to increase choices and opportunities for the men and women back home. It is imperative that we have increased flexibility for States, not just in the area of health care and in the area of Medicaid, but also in the area of nutritional assistance and in the area of education. Folks in our

States and in our local communities know better how to respond to the needs of their citizens; and we cut corporate waste, fraud, and abuse and corporate welfare.

Positive solutions, Mr. Chairman, in a bill that we label "A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America," solutions that will get us on track to revive this economy, get folks back to work, and make certain that we put a cap on the debt and begin to put us on a path to paying off the debt, we can only do that if we get to balance.

This is A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. I encourage our colleagues to adopt and to support this substitute.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, let me start with something. I think, Members who are listening to this debate should know already, which is that the Republican budget does not balance, not by a long shot.

It assumes the revenue from the Affordable Care Act even though they claim to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It doesn't account for the costs of additional tax cuts that are coming through this House as we speak, and, if the revenue from that were lost, their budget would be even further out of balance.

In fact, just today, in the Ways and Means Committee, they are increasing the deficit by over \$250 billion over 10 years by giving a huge tax cut to 5,500 families in getting rid of the estate tax.

Now, everyone should understand that the estate tax only applies to couples with estates worth over \$10 million. They are saying that people with estates worth \$10 million, who have done really well, shouldn't contribute anything toward investments in our country, even toward deficit reduction. That increases the deficit right away and puts their budget even more out of balance, so this doesn't come close to balancing.

While it is actually cutting special interest tax breaks for folks at the very high end of the income scale, it actually disinvests in the rest of the country. They dramatically cut the portion of our budget that we use to invest in our kids' futures, in early education, in kindergarten through grade 12.

They make it harder for students to afford college. They say they are going to start charging students interest while they are still in college, even though we have record student debt of over \$1 trillion in this country.

□ 1700

They make it harder on seniors right away. Seniors will pay more for prescription drugs, seniors on Medicare; seniors will pay more in copays for preventive care. If they really got rid of the Affordable Care entirely, seniors would also be paying higher part B premiums. That is what they say they want to do, get rid of it entirely.

The Democratic budget which we put forward presents an alternative. We were disappointed that this body voted against that and decided, instead, to support a budget that squeezes hard-working families and is hard on everyone in America except for those who are already at the very top.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I ask the Chair how much time remains on each side.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 2¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I am prepared to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just emphasize a couple of specifics in the Republican budget that is before us.

We haven't talked a lot about seniors in nursing homes. You know, two-thirds of Medicaid goes to help seniors and disabled individuals in nursing homes, and yet the Republican budget cuts \$900 billion from Medicaid. The Congressional Budget Office says one of two things will happen: either States will increase taxes back home or seniors will get less care.

The Republican budget provides less for our veterans this year than the President's budget, less by \$1.9 billion, \$19 billion less for the Veterans Administration over the next 10 years compared to the President's budget.

At the same time, their budget plays games with defense spending. That is why we have so-called Price 1 and Price 2. Neither Price is right here. They both play games with our defense spending by using our defense overseas contingency account as a slush fund, something the Republican-led Committee on the Budget said last year they would not do. In fact, they said it was a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process.

This is the committee report. This is the Republican-drafted committee report when Mr. RYAN was chairman of the committee 1 year ago. Tear it up. Just as they said what they are doing would violate the integrity of the budget process, it does. That is exactly what it does. It plays games with our defense spending.

The President's budget, the Democratic budget, did this in a straightforward way. We said, look, Joint

Chiefs of Staff, our military leadership says that they need a certain amount for funding our defense needs in our base budget and a certain amount for overseas contingencies. The President's budget and Democratic budget funded that. Republican budgets, all of them, all of the ones here, play games with that.

Mr. Chairman, I hope as we consider this Republican budget that plays games with defense spending, which disinvests in America and in our future, and which squeezes hard-working Americans every day even harder, working families, seniors, students—the only people it says, “Don't worry. You don't have to do more to help this country move forward” are folks at the very top. They get a tax rate cut, and they don't cut a single special interest tax break. That is the wrong way for America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday, somewhere across this land somebody has turned to their wife at home and said: “Hide the kids and pets, dear. They are talking about the budget.”

I really am amazed. Well, I shouldn't be amazed, but I really am amazed at the level of misinformation and hyperbole that goes on. The gentleman on the other side knows that the way that we treat the defense spending, \$613 billion with base defense and global war on terror funding, is exactly the way it has to be treated until the law is changed. The gentleman on the other side didn't even recognize that, the Democrats don't recognize that, the President doesn't recognize that. He puts a phony number in his budget that will snap right back down to the sequester level of \$523 billion unless the law is changed—something that we actually support, something in our budget that we provide a path to be able to do. We provide the path to a solution. The other folks are just providing rhetoric.

What about balance? Here are the deficits over the next 10 years, Mr. Chairman. The red line is current policy. What the President and our friends on the other side do actually mirrors, basically, that line. You will notice that at the end of this, this gets near to a trillion dollars of deficit in 1 year. These folks think you can just spend and spend and spend.

This is our line. This gets us down to balance. This is how you begin to pay off the debt. This is how you begin to provide greater opportunities for the American people, a budget of real hope, real opportunity. Our friends on the other side say it is harder on seniors and students and workers and Medicaid—not true. What we actually do is propose solutions to the challenges that we face.

We can't stick our head in the sand and expect these problems are going to

get solved. I just wish that our friends on the other side would join us together and help solve these challenges. The challenges are huge. The American people know it.

What our budget does, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America actually lays out a path to be able to solve these challenges, positive solutions for the American people. They recognize that. We are standing up on behalf of all Americans to solve the challenges that we have. I urge a “yes” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-49.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2016 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

Sec. 202. Reconciliation procedures.

Sec. 203. Additional guidance for reconciliation.

#### TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

Sec. 301. Submissions of findings for the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

#### TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.

Sec. 402. Limitation on measures affecting Social Security solvency.

- Sec. 403. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
- Sec. 404. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.
- Sec. 405. Limitation on advance appropriations.
- Sec. 406. Fair value credit estimates.
- Sec. 407. Limitation on long-term spending.
- Sec. 408. Allocation for overseas contingency operations/global war on terrorism.
- Sec. 409. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.
- Sec. 410. Concepts, aggregates, allocations and application.
- Sec. 411. Rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS

- Sec. 501. Reserve fund for the repeal of the President's health care law.
- Sec. 502. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for promoting real health care reform.
- Sec. 503. Deficit-neutral reserve fund related to the Medicare provisions of the President's health care law.
- Sec. 504. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
- Sec. 505. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for graduate medical education.
- Sec. 506. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade agreements.
- Sec. 507. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reforming the tax code.
- Sec. 508. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for revenue measures.
- Sec. 509. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility.
- Sec. 510. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for transportation.
- Sec. 511. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Federal retirement reform.
- Sec. 512. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for defense sequester replacement.

#### TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

- Sec. 601. Direct spending.

#### TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS

- Sec. 701. Long-term budgeting.

#### TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS

- Sec. 801. Policy statement on balanced budget amendment.
- Sec. 802. Policy statement on budget process and baseline reform.
- Sec. 803. Policy statement on economic growth and job creation.
- Sec. 804. Policy statement on tax reform.
- Sec. 805. Policy statement on trade.
- Sec. 806. Policy statement on Social Security.
- Sec. 807. Policy statement on repealing the President's health care law and promoting real health care reform.
- Sec. 808. Policy statement on Medicare.
- Sec. 809. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery and innovation.
- Sec. 810. Policy statement on Federal regulatory reform.
- Sec. 811. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
- Sec. 812. Policy statement on Department of Veterans Affairs.
- Sec. 813. Policy statement on Federal accounting methodologies.
- Sec. 814. Policy statement on scorekeeping for outyear budgetary effects in appropriation Acts.

- Sec. 815. Policy statement on reducing unnecessary, wasteful, and unauthorized spending.
- Sec. 816. Policy statement on deficit reduction through the cancellation of unobligated balances.
- Sec. 817. Policy statement on agency fees and spending.
- Sec. 818. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
- Sec. 819. Policy statement on "No Budget, No Pay".
- Sec. 820. Policy statement on national security funding.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2025:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,666,755,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,763,328,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,858,131,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,974,147,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,099,410,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,241,963,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,388,688,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,550,388,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,722,144,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,905,648,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$0.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$0.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$2,936,989,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,874,003,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,067,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,091,104,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,248,181,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,328,045,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,463,044,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,529,161,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,586,560,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,715,369,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$3,010,185,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$2,894,439,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$2,927,276,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,062,270,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,205,614,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,298,984,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,452,546,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,497,999,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,538,491,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,685,327,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: -\$343,430,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: -\$131,111,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$69,145,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: -\$88,123,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$106,204,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$57,021,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$63,858,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$52,389,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$183,653,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$220,321,000,000.

(5) **DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.**—The budgetary levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$19,048,915,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$19,395,251,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$19,643,341,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$19,949,858,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$20,263,382,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$20,507,829,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$20,908,840,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$21,078,135,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$20,918,559,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$20,907,169,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2016: \$13,839,152,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2017: \$14,041,709,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$14,146,945,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$14,340,084,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$14,562,210,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$14,744,287,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$15,130,369,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$15,302,457,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$15,164,550,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$15,237,647,000,000.

##### SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2025 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$531,334,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$564,027,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$582,506,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$572,025,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$607,744,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$586,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$620,019,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$604,238,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$632,310,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$617,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,627,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$630,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$657,634,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$648,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$670,997,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$656,389,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$683,771,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$663,936,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$698,836,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$683,350,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority \$38,342,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,923,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,623,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,821,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,539,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,736,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,437,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,214,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,390,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,564,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,861,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,108,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,081,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,868,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,070,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,633,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,098,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,148,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,349,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$28,381,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,003,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,932,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28,924,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,579,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,357,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,227,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,798,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,904,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,584,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,957,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,293,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,003,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,742,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,059,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,488,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,795,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority -\$3,581,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,410,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,189,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$234,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,196,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$307,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,259,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$472,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,309,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$728,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,335,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$863,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,375,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,332,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,037,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$964,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,215,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$35,350,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,113,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,047,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,385,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,674,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,206,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,171,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,304,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,367,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,685,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,221,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,361,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,108,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,319,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,962,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,486,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,095,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,471,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$20,109,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,164,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,064,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,987,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,396,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,907,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,275,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,835,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,386,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,296,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,849,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,245,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,821,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,391,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,020,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,256,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,851,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority -\$3,269,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$16,617,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,373,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$26,620,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,252,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,998,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$8,801,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$28,587,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,903,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$27,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,522,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$21,769,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$5,742,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,819,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,965,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,306,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,991,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,370,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,845,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$36,743,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$79,181,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,381,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,298,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$73,623,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,397,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,051,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,763,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,149,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$78,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,613,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$79,946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,128,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$81,336,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$83,709,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$82,724,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,335,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$83,983,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$7,082,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,928,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,688,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,753,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,089,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,383,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,381,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,789,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,409,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,567,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,305,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,095,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$10,937,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,359,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,345,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,447,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,890,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,579,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,930,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2016:  
 (A) New budget authority \$80,620,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$90,389,000,000.

Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,746,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$90,513,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,029,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$87,366,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$85,514,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$85,290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,901,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$87,669,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$88,908,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$89,276,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$90,148,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$90,467,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$91,237,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$91,646,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$92,744,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$93,101,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$94,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$94,734,000,000.

## (11) Health (550):

## Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$416,475,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$426,860,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$360,678,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$364,823,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$358,594,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$360,468,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$367,103,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$367,916,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$387,076,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$377,341,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$388,981,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$389,025,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$398,136,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$398,233,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$408,454,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$408,529,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$425,381,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$425,477,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$433,945,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$434,143,000,000.

## (12) Medicare (570):

## Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$577,726,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$577,635,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$580,837,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$580,777,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$580,782,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$580,741,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$639,293,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$639,213,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$680,575,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$680,481,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$726,644,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$726,548,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$808,204,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$808,100,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$825,577,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$825,379,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$834,148,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$834,037,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$927,410,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$927,292,000,000.

## (13) Income Security (600):

## Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$512,364,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$513,709,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$479,836,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$475,234,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$481,994,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$471,951,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$483,293,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$477,470,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$516,193,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$510,603,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$502,001,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$496,856,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$518,690,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$518,542,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$525,230,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$519,391,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$532,515,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$521,105,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$550,057,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$543,361,000,000.

## (14) Social Security (650):

## Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$33,878,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,919,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$36,535,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$36,535,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$39,407,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,407,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$42,634,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$42,634,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,104,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,104,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,712,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$49,712,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$53,547,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$53,547,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$57,455,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,455,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$61,546,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$61,546,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,751,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$65,751,000,000.

## (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

## Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$166,677,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$170,121,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$164,387,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$163,009,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$162,385,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$174,862,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$174,048,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$179,735,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$178,778,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$183,969,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$183,019,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$196,283,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$195,255,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$192,866,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$191,834,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$189,668,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$188,553,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$203,517,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$202,383,000,000.

## (16) Administration of Justice (750):

## Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$52,156,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,006,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$55,450,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,547,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$55,169,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,659,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$56,854,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$56,572,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$58,585,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$58,392,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$60,498,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$59,992,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$63,032,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$62,485,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$64,917,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$64,355,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$66,844,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,264,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$68,632,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,051,000,000.

## (17) General Government (800):

## Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$23,593,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,576,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,761,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,202,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,817,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,279,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,252,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,084,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$23,947,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$23,602,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,192,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$24,309,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$24,981,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,114,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$25,695,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,840,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,010,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,878,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$26,968,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,825,000,000.

## (18) Net Interest (900):

## Fiscal year 2016:

- (A) New budget authority \$366,542,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$366,542,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2017:

- (A) New budget authority, \$414,802,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$414,802,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$477,785,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$477,785,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$531,097,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$531,097,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$578,726,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$578,726,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$612,198,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$612,198,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$642,470,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$642,470,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$667,176,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$667,176,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$684,394,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$684,394,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$696,025,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$696,025,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$33,462,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$17,275,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$29,863,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$24,277,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$32,175,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$28,249,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$34,261,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$31,078,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$39,009,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$35,136,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$42,221,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$38,438,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$46,013,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$42,205,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$49,123,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$45,430,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$50,652,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$47,736,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$48,913,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$48,058,000,000.  
(20) Government-wide savings (930):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,465,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,416,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$15,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$3,005,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$32,429,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$20,148,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$41,554,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$32,383,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$50,240,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$42,168,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,831,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$50,276,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$63,954,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$57,849,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$71,850,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$65,124,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$78,889,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$71,689,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$113,903,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$93,929,000,000.  
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$73,514,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$73,514,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,832,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$83,832,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$90,115,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$90,115,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, -\$90,594,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$90,594,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$92,193,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$92,193,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$96,623,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$96,623,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$99,437,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$99,437,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$104,343,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$104,343,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$111,213,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$111,213,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$117,896,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$117,896,000,000.  
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/  
Global War on Terrorism (970):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, \$96,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,442,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,238,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,940,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,191,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,916,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,666,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,776,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$9,956,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$278,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.  
(23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):  
Fiscal year 2016:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$21,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$17,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$22,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$20,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$21,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$23,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$22,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$24,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$25,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$24,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$26,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$25,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$27,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$26,000,000.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

### SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than July 15, 2015, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

#### (b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(9) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(10) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY.—The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$15,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(11) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(12) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(13) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000



for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

## SEC. 202. RECONCILIATION PROCEDURES.

### (a) ESTIMATING ASSUMPTIONS.—

(1) ASSUMPTIONS.—In the House, for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget shall use the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's Budget and Economic Outlook: 2015 to 2025 (January 2015) when making estimates of any bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon. If adjustments to the baseline are made subsequent to the adoption of this concurrent resolution, then such chair shall determine whether to use any of these adjustments when making such estimates.

(2) INTENT.—The authority set forth in paragraph (1) should only be exercised if the estimates used to determine the compliance of such measures with the budgetary requirements included in the concurrent resolution are inaccurate because adjustments made to the baseline are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution. Such inaccurate adjustments made after the adoption of this concurrent resolution may include selected adjustments for rulemaking, judicial actions, adjudication, and interpretative rules that have major budgetary effects and are inconsistent with the assumptions underlying the budgetary levels set forth in this concurrent resolution.

(3) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House for any measure, the Congressional Budget Office shall prepare an estimate based on the baseline determination made by such chair pursuant to paragraph (1).

(b) REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW THROUGH RECONCILIATION.—In preparing their submissions under section 201(a) to the Committee on the Budget, the committees named in section 201(b) shall—

(1) note the policies described in the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget that repeal the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010; and

(2) determine the most effective methods by which the health care laws referred to in paragraph (1) shall be repealed in their entirety.

### (c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

(1) SUBMISSION.—Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget of the House of a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of section 310(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) CONFERENCE REPORT.—Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) REVISION.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

## SEC. 203. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE FOR RECONCILIATION.

(a) GUIDANCE.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may develop additional guidelines providing further information, budgetary levels and amounts, and other explanatory material to supplement the instructions included in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and set forth in section 201.

(b) PUBLICATION.—In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may cause the material prepared pursuant to subsection (a) to be printed in the Congressional Record on the appropriate date, but not later than the date set forth in this title on which committees must submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget in order to comply with the reconciliation instructions set forth in section 201.

## TITLE III—SUBMISSIONS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

### SEC. 301. SUBMISSIONS OF FINDINGS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.—In the House, not later than October 1, 2015, the committees named in subsection (d) shall submit to the Committee on the Budget findings that identify changes in law within their jurisdictions that would achieve the specified level of savings through the elimination of waste, fraud, and abuse.

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED.—After receiving those recommendations—

(1) the Committee on the Budget may use them in the development of future concurrent resolutions on the budget; and

(2) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House shall make such recommendations publicly available in electronic form and cause them to be placed in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after receipt.

(c) SPECIFIED LEVELS OF SAVINGS.—For purposes of this section, a specified level of savings for each committee may be inserted in the Congressional Record by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(d) HOUSE COMMITTEES.—The following committees shall submit findings to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives pursuant to subsection (a): the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

(e) REPORT BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.—By August 1, 2015, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives a comprehensive report identifying instances in which the committees referred to in subsection (d) may make legislative changes to improve the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of programs within their jurisdiction.

## TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

### SEC. 401. COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.

(a) CBO ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, an estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation considered in the House or the Senate during fiscal year 2016 shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(b) JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION ESTIMATES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, any estimate provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for any major legislation shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such legislation.

(c) CONTENTS.—Any estimate referred to in this section shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsections (a) and (b)) of such legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution sets forth budgetary levels required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term "major legislation" means any bill or joint resolution—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects) in any fiscal year over the years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by the chair of the Committee on the Budget for all direct spending legislation other than revenue legislation or the Member who is chair or vice chair, as applicable, of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(2) the term "budgetary effects" means changes in revenues, budget authority, outlays, and deficits.

### SEC. 402. LIMITATION ON MEASURES AFFECTING SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, upon its adoption until the end of fiscal year 2016, it shall not be in order to consider in the House or the Senate a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that reduces the actuarial balance by at least .01 percent of the present value of future taxable payroll of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201(a) of the Social Security Act for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a measure that would improve the

actuarial balance of the combined balance in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for the 75-year period utilized in the most recent annual report of the Board of Trustees provided pursuant to section 201(c)(2) of the Social Security Act.

**SEC. 403. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the report accompanying this concurrent resolution on the budget or the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 404. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**

For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

**SEC. 405. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided for in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this concurrent resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this concurrent resolution under the heading:

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”; and

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1); and

(2) VETERANS.—\$63,271,000,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2016.

**SEC. 406. FAIR VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.**

(a) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES.—Upon the request of the chair or ranking member of the

Committee on the Budget, any estimate of the budgetary effects of a measure prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under the terms of title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, “credit reform” shall, as a supplement to such estimate, and to the extent practicable, also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by such measure.

(b) FAIR VALUE ESTIMATES FOR HOUSING AND STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepares an estimate pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 of the budgetary effects which would be incurred in carrying out any bill or joint resolution and if the Director determines that such bill or joint resolution has a budgetary effect related to a housing, residential mortgage or student loan program under title V of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, then the Director shall also provide an estimate of the current actual or estimated market values representing the “fair value” of assets and liabilities affected by the provisions of such bill or joint resolution that result in such effect.

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budgetary enforcement controls.

**SEC. 407. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, if the provisions of such measure have the net effect of increasing direct spending in excess of \$5,000,000,000 for any period described in subsection (b).

(b) TIME PERIODS.—The applicable periods for purposes of this section are any of the four consecutive ten fiscal-year periods beginning in the fiscal year following the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 408. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**

(a) SEPARATE OCO/GWOT ALLOCATION.—In the House, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

(b) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2016. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays counting toward the allocation established by subsection (a) shall be designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2016, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**SEC. 409. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.**

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—In the House, if a

committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or offers any amendment thereto or submits a conference report thereon, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to such committee and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2016 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2016 and the period of fiscal years 2016 through fiscal year 2025 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust applicable levels of this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 410. CONCEPTS, AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**

(a) CONCEPTS, ALLOCATIONS, AND APPLICATION.—In the House—

(1) upon a change in budgetary concepts or definitions, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust any allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution accordingly;

(2) any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(A) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable;

(3) section 202 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) shall have no force or effect for any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to instructions set forth in this concurrent resolution;

(4) the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels to reflect changes resulting from the most recently published or adjusted baseline of the Congressional Budget Office; and

(5) the term “budget year” means the most recent fiscal year for which a concurrent resolution on the budget has been adopted.

(b) AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.—In the House, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement—

(1) the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 407 of this concurrent resolution; and

(2) revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates included in this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 411. RULEMAKING POWERS.**

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

**TITLE V—RESERVE FUNDS****SEC. 501. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that consists solely of the full repeal of the Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 or measures that make modifications to such law.

**SEC. 502. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that promotes real health care reform, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 503. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 504. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 505. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, expands access to, and improves, as determined by such chair, graduate medical

education programs, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 506. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that implements a trade agreement, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 507. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.**

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 508. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 509. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 510. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRANSPORTATION.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure maintains the solvency of the Highway Trust Fund, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 511. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.**

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SEC. 512. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.**

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit reforms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**TITLE VI—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING****SEC. 601. DIRECT SPENDING.**

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 4.6 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic president reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the five years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This budget applies the lessons of welfare reform to both the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Medicaid.

(B) For Medicaid, this budget assumes the conversion of the Federal share of Medicaid spending into flexible State allotments, which States will be able to tailor to meet their unique needs. Such a reform would end the misguided one-size-fits-all approach that ties the hands of State governments and would provide States with the freedom and flexibility they have long requested in the Medicaid program. Moreover, this budget assumes the repeal of the Medicaid expansions in the President's health care law, relieving State governments of the crippling one-size-fits-all enrollment mandates, as well as the overwhelming pressure the law's Medicaid expansion puts on an already-strained system.

(C) For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, this budget assumes the conversion of the program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs. The allotment would increase based on the Department of Agriculture Thrifty Food Plan index and beneficiary growth. Such a reform would provide incentives for States to ensure dollars will go towards those who need them most.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2016 is 5.4 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period beginning with fiscal year 2016 is 5.5 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) For Medicare, this budget advances policies to put seniors, not the Federal Government, in control of their health care decisions. Future retirees would be able to choose from a range of guaranteed coverage options, with private plans competing alongside the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program. Medicare would provide a premium-support payment either to pay for or offset the premium of the plan chosen by the senior, depending on the plan's cost. The Medicare premium-support payment would be adjusted so that the sick would receive higher payments if their conditions worsened; lower-income seniors would receive additional assistance to help cover out-of-pocket costs; and wealthier seniors would assume responsibility for a greater share of their premiums. Putting seniors in charge of how their health care dollars are spent will force providers to compete against each other on price and quality. This market competition will act as a real check on widespread waste and skyrocketing health care costs. As with previous budgets, this program will begin in 2024 and makes no changes to those in or near retirement.

(B) In keeping with a recommendation from the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform, this budget calls for Federal employees—including Members of Congress and congressional staff—to make greater contributions toward their own retirement.

#### **TITLE VII—RECOMMENDED LONG-TERM LEVELS**

##### **SEC. 701. LONG-TERM BUDGETING.**

The following are the recommended revenue, spending, and deficit levels for each of fiscal years 2030, 2035, and 2040 as a percent of the gross domestic product of the United States:

(1) **REVENUES.**—The budgetary levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2030: 18.7 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 19.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 19.0 percent.

(2) **OUTLAYS.**—The budgetary levels of total budget outlays are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 18.4 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 17.8 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 16.9 percent.

(3) **DEFICITS.**—The budgetary levels of deficits are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: -0.3 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: -1.2 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: -2.1 percent.

(4) **DEBT.**—The budgetary levels of debt held by the public are not to exceed:

Fiscal year 2030: 44.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2035: 32.0 percent.

Fiscal year 2040: 18.0 percent.

#### **TITLE VIII—POLICY STATEMENTS**

##### **SEC. 801. POLICY STATEMENT ON BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government collects approximately \$3 trillion annually in taxes, but spends more than \$3.5 trillion to maintain the operations of government. The Federal Government must borrow 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of the year 2014, the national debt of the United States was more than \$18.1 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a Constitutional Convention for the consideration of adopting a Balanced Budget Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(4) Forty-nine States have fiscal limitations in their State Constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) H.J. Res. 2, sponsored by Rep. Robert W. Goodlatte (R-VA), was considered by the House of Representatives on November 18, 2011, though it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(6) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Twelve were introduced in the 113th Congress alone, including H.J. Res. 4 by Democratic Representative John J. Barrow of Georgia, and H.J. Res. 38 by Republican Representative Jackie Walorski of Indiana.

(7) The joint resolution providing for a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution referred to in paragraph (5) prohibited outlays for a fiscal year (except those for repayment of debt principal) from exceeding total receipts for that fiscal year (except those derived from borrowing) unless Congress, by a three-fifths roll call vote of each chamber, authorizes a specific excess of outlays over receipts.

(8) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed of passage by one vote in the United States Senate.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should pass a joint resolution incorporating the provisions set forth in subsection (b), and send such joint resolution to the States for their approval, to amend the Constitution of the United States to require an annual balanced budget.

##### **SEC. 802. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS AND BASELINE REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—

(1) In 1974, after more than 50 years of executive dominance over fiscal policy, Congress acted to reassert its “power of the purse”, and passed the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act.

(2) The measure explicitly sought to establish congressional control over the budget process, to provide for annual congressional determination of the appropriate level of taxes and spending, to set important national budget priorities, and to find ways in which Members of Congress could have access to the most accurate, objective, and highest quality information to assist them in discharging their duties.

(3) Far from achieving its intended purpose, however, the process has instituted a bias toward higher spending and larger government. The behemoth of the Federal Government has largely been financed through either borrowing or taking ever greater amounts of the national income through high taxation.

(4) The process does not treat programs and policies consistently and shows a bias toward higher spending and higher taxes.

(5) It assumes extension of spending programs (of more than \$50 million per year) scheduled to expire.

(6) Yet it does not assume the extension of tax policies in the same way, consequently, extending existing tax policies that may be scheduled to expire is characterized as a new tax reduction, requiring offsets to “pay for” merely keeping tax policy the same even though estimating conventions would not require similar treatment of spending programs.

(7) The original goals set for the congressional process are admirable in their intent, but because the essential mechanisms of the

process have remained the same, and “reforms” enacted over the past 40 years have largely taken the form of layering greater levels of legal complexity without reforming or reassessing the very fundamental nature of the process.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that as the primary branch of Government, Congress must:

(1) Restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) Reassert Congress’s “power of the purse”, and reinforce the balance of powers between Congress and the President, as the 1974 Act intended.

(3) Create greater incentives for lawmakers to do budgeting as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially adopting a budget resolution every year.

(4) Encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending.

(5) Consider innovative fiscal tools such as: zero based budgeting, which would require a department or agency to justify its budget as if it were a new expenditure; and direct spending caps to enhance oversight of automatic pilot spending that increases each year without congressional approval.

(6) Promote efficient and timely budget actions, so that lawmakers complete their budget actions by the time the new fiscal year begins.

(7) Provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts overall economic growth and job creation.

(9) Remove layers of complexity that have complicated the procedures designed in 1974, and made budgeting more arcane and opaque.

(10) Remove existing biases that favor higher spending.

(11) Include procedures by which current tax laws may be extended and treated on a basis that is not different from the extension of entitlement programs.

(c) **BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**—Comprehensive budget process reform should also remove the bias in the baseline against the extension of current tax laws in the following ways:

(1) Permanent extension of tax laws should not be used as a means to increase taxes on other taxpayers;

(2) For those expiring tax provisions that are proposed to be permanently extended, Congress should use a more realistic baseline that does not require them to be offset; and,

(3) Tax-reform legislation should not include tax increases just to offset the extension of current tax laws.

(d) **LEGISLATION.**—The Committee on the Budget intends to draft legislation during the 114th Congress that will rewrite the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers’ dollars are spent wisely and efficiently.

##### **SEC. 803. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Although the United States economy technically emerged from recession more than 5 years ago, the subsequent recovery has felt more like a malaise than a rebound. Real gross domestic product GDP growth over the past 5 years has averaged slightly more than 2 percent, well below the 3.2 percent historical trend rate of growth in the

United States. Although the economy has shown some welcome signs of improvement of late, the Nation remains in the midst of the weakest economic recovery of the modern era.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 2.3 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country's fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher. Clearly, there is a dire need for policies that will spark higher rates of economic growth and greater, higher-quality job opportunities.

(4) Although job gains have been trending up of late, other aspects of the labor market remain weak. The labor force participation rate, for instance, is hovering just under 63 percent, close to the lowest level since 1978. Long-term unemployment also remains a problem. Of the roughly 8.7 million people who are currently unemployed, 2.7 million (more than 30 percent) have been unemployed for more than 6 months. Long-term unemployment erodes an individual's job skills and detaches them from job opportunities. It also undermines the long-term productive capacity of the economy.

(5) Perhaps most important, wage gains and income growth have been subpar for middle-class Americans. Average hourly earnings of private-sector workers have increased by just 1.6 percent over the past year. Prior to the recession, average hourly earnings were tracking close to 4 percent. Likewise, average income levels have remained flat in recent years. Real median household income is just under \$52,000, one of the lowest levels since 1995.

(6) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country's economic outlook, investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis, they know that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation and they act accordingly. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(7) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels is a net positive for economic growth over time. The logic is that deficit reduction creates long-term economic benefits because it increases the pool of national savings and boosts investment, thereby raising economic growth and job creation.

(8) CBO analyzed the House Republican fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and found it would increase real output per capita (a proxy for a country's standard of living) by about \$1,000 in 2025 and roughly \$5,000 by 2040 relative to the baseline path. That means more income and greater prosperity for all Americans.

(9) In contrast, if the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a "crowding out" of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(10) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(11) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by \$326 billion.

(12) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(b) **POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.**—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code will put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

#### **SEC. 804. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all three counts: It is notoriously complex, patently unfair, and highly inefficient. The tax code's complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Over the past decade alone, there have been 4,107 changes to the tax code, more than one per day. Many of the major changes over the years have involved carving out special preferences, exclusions, or deductions for various activities or groups. These loopholes add up to more than \$1 trillion per year and make the code unfair, inefficient, and highly complex.

(3) In addition, these tax preferences are disproportionately used by upper-income individuals.

(4) The large amount of tax preferences that pervade the code end up narrowing the tax base. A narrow tax base, in turn, requires much higher tax rates to raise a given amount of revenue.

(5) It is estimated that American taxpayers end up spending \$160 billion and roughly 6 billion hours a year complying with the tax code waste of time and resources that could be used in more productive activities.

(6) Standard economic theory shows that high marginal tax rates dampen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(7) Roughly half of U.S. active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a "pass-through" basis, meaning the income flows through to the tax returns of the individual owners and is taxed at the individual rate structure rather than at the corporate rate. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the top Federal rate on such small business income can reach nearly 45 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(8) The U.S. corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) sums to slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages and discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(9) By deterring potential investment, the U.S. corporate tax restrains economic growth and job creation. The U.S. tax rate differential with other countries also fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate behaviors intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(10) The "worldwide" structure of U.S. international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors with more competitive international tax systems.

(11) Reforming the United States tax code to a more competitive international system would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and it would also greatly reduce tax avoidance.

(12) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, on consumers in higher prices, and on investors in diminished returns.

(13) Revenues have averaged about 17.4 percent of the economy throughout modern American history. Revenues rise above this level under current law to 18.3 percent of the economy by the end of the 10-year budget window.

(14) Attempting to raise revenue through new tax increases to meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans' ability to save for their retirement and their children's education.

(15) This resolution also rejects the idea of instituting a carbon tax in the United States, which some have offered as a new source of revenue. Such a plan would damage the economy, cost jobs, and raise prices on American consumers.

(16) Closing tax loopholes to fund spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(17) The goal of tax reform should be to curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(18) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform (i.e. a broader tax base and lower tax rates) would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which, over time, would have a positive impact on total national output.

(19) Heretofore, the congressional scorekeepers the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

(20) Static scoring implicitly assumes that the size of the economy (and therefore key economic variables such as labor supply and investment) remains fixed throughout the considered budget horizon. This is an abstraction from reality.

(21) A new House rule was adopted at the beginning of the 114th Congress to help correct this problem. This rule requires CBO and JCT to incorporate the macroeconomic effects of major legislation into their official cost estimates.

(22) This rule seeks to bridge the divide between static estimates and scoring that incorporates economic feedback effects by providing policymakers with a greater amount

of information about the likely economic impact of policies under their consideration while at the same time preserving traditional scoring methods and reporting conventions.

(b) **POLICY ON TAX REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform that—

(1) simplifies the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reduces the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowers tax rates for individuals and consolidates the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repeals the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reduces the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitions the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation in a manner that does not discriminate against any particular type of income or industry.

#### **SEC. 805. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Commerce Department estimates that every \$1 billion of United States exports supports more than 5,000 jobs here at home.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade, adherence to trade agreement rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) Trade Promotion Authority is a bipartisan and bicameral effort to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

(4) Global trade and commerce is not a zero-sum game. The idea that global expansion tends to “hollow out” United States operations is incorrect. Foreign-affiliate activity tends to complement, not substitute for, key parent activities in the United States such as employment, worker compensation, and capital investment. When United States headquartered multinationals invest and expand operations abroad it often leads to more jobs and economic growth at home.

(5) Trade agreements have saved the average American family of four more than \$10,000 per year, as a result of lower duties. Trade agreements also lower the cost of manufacturing inputs by removing duties.

(6) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass the international competition.

(7) When negotiating trade agreements, United States laws on Intellectual Property (IP) protection should be used as a benchmark for establishing global IP frameworks. Strong IP protections have contributed significantly to the United States status as a world leader in innovation across sectors, including in the development of life-saving biologic medicines. The data protections afforded to biologics in United States law, including 12 years of data protection, allow continued development of pioneering medi-

cines to benefit patients both in the United States and abroad. To maintain the cycle of innovation and achieve truly 21st century trade agreements, it is vital that our negotiators insist on the highest standards for IP protections.

(8) The status quo of the current tax code also undermines the competitiveness of United States businesses and costs the United States economy investment and jobs.

(9) The United States currently has an antiquated system of international taxation whereby United States multinationals operating abroad pay both the foreign-country tax and United States corporate taxes. They are essentially taxed twice. This puts them at an obvious competitive disadvantage. A modern and competitive international tax system would facilitate global commerce for United States multinational companies and would encourage foreign business investment and job creation in the United States.

(10) The ability to defer United States taxes on their foreign operations, which some erroneously refer to as a “tax loophole,” cushions this disadvantage to a certain extent. Eliminating or restricting this provision (and others like it) would harm United States competitiveness.

(11) This budget resolution advocates fundamental tax reform that would lower the United States corporate rate, now the highest in the industrialized world, and switch to a more competitive system of international taxation. This would make the United States a much more attractive place to invest and station business activity and would chip away at the incentives for United States companies to keep their profits overseas (because the United States corporate rate is so high).

(b) **POLICY ON TRADE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive United States international tax system to promote job creation in the United States. The United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the expansion of trade opportunities, adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and by enforcing United States rights. To that end, Congress should pass Trade Promotion Authority to strengthen the role of Congress in setting negotiating objectives for trade agreements, to improve consultation with Congress by the Administration, and to provide a clear framework for congressional consideration and implementation of trade agreements.

#### **SEC. 806. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the “three-legged stool” of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2016, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program reve-

nues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2033, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2033, benefits will be cut nearly 23 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$2 trillion over the next 10 years.

(4) Lower income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower income Americans’ retirement security.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to the CBO, between 1970 and 2012, the number of people receiving disability benefits (both disabled workers and their dependent family members) has increased by more than 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. David Autor and Mark Duggan have found that the increase in individuals on disability does not reflect a decrease in self-reported health. CBO attributes program growth to changes in demographics, changes in the composition of the labor force and compensation, as well as Federal policies.

(6) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 20 percent in 2016, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(7) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the “Greenspan Commission” which helped to address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(8) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that bipartisan action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security. In this spirit, this resolution creates a bipartisan opportunity to find solutions by requiring policymakers to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work on a bipartisan basis to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes reform of a current law trigger, such that:

(1) If in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. Recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees.

(2) Not later than 1 December of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees



submit their recommendations, the President should promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including his recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Majority Leader of the House should introduce the President's legislation upon receipt.

(3) Within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction to which the legislation has been referred should report a bill, which should be considered by the full House or Senate under expedited procedures.

(4) Legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on, and provide certainty for, future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolution assumes reform that—

(1) ensure benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(2) prevents a 20 percent across-the-board benefit cut;

(3) makes the Disability Insurance program work better; and

(4) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—Any legislation that Congress considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance trust fund also must improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance (OASDI) trust fund.

**SEC. 807. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPEALING THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH CARE LAW AND PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The President's health care law put Washington's priorities first, and not patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised; instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by \$2,500 a year; instead, according to the 2014 Employer Health Benefits Survey, health care premiums have increased by 7 percent for individuals and families since 2012.

(2) The President pledged "If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan." Instead, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office now estimates 9 million Americans with employment-based health coverage will lose those plans due to the President's health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House, Pelosi, said that the President's health care law would

create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the reduction in hours worked due to Obamacare represents a decline of about 2.0 to 2.5 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. The full impact on labor represents a reduction in employment by 1.5 percent to 2.0 percent, while additional studies show less modest results. A recent study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimates that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) The President has charged the Independent Payment Advisory Board, a panel of unelected bureaucrats, with cutting Medicare by an additional \$20.9 billion over the next ten years, according to the President's most recent budget.

(5) Since ACA was signed into law, the administration has repeatedly failed to implement it as written. The President has unilaterally acted to make a total of 28 changes, delays, and exemptions. The President has signed into law another 17 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual "mandate" could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees if doing so violates these companies' religious beliefs. Even now, almost five years after enactment, the Supreme Court continues to evaluate the legality of how the President's administration has implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly underlying the entire program health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(6) The President's health care law is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. The law should be fully repealed, allowing for real, patient-centered health care reform: the development of real health care reforms that puts patients first, that make affordable, quality health care available to all Americans, and that build on the innovation and creativity of all the participants in the health care sector.

(b) **POLICY ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that the President's health care law should be fully repealed and real health care reform promoted in accordance with the following principles:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Health care reform should enhance affordability, accessibility, quality, innovation, choices and responsiveness in health care coverage for all Americans, putting patients, families, and doctors in charge, not Washington, DC. These reforms should encourage increased competition and transparency. Under the President's health care law, government controls Americans' health care choices. Under true, patient-centered reform, Americans would.

(2) **AFFORDABILITY.**—Real reform should be centered on ensuring that all Americans, no matter their age, income, or health status, have the ability to afford health care coverage. The health care delivery structure should be improved, and individuals should not be priced out of the health insurance market due to pre-existing conditions, but nationalized health care is not only unnecessary to accomplish this, it undermines the goal. Individuals should be allowed to join together voluntarily to pool risk through

mechanisms such as Individual Membership Associations and Small Employer Membership Associations.

(3) **ACCESSABILITY.**—Instead of Washington outlining for Americans the ways they cannot use their health insurance, reforms should make health coverage more portable. Individuals should be able to own their insurance and have it follow them in and out of jobs throughout their career. Small business owners should be permitted to band together across State lines through their membership in bona fide trade or professional associations to purchase health coverage for their families and employees at a low cost. This will increase small businesses' bargaining power, volume discounts, and administrative efficiencies while giving them freedom from State-mandated benefit packages. Also, insurers licensed to sell policies in one State should be permitted to offer them to residents in any other State, and consumers should be permitted to shop for health insurance across State lines, as they are with other insurance products online, by mail, by phone, or in consultation with an insurance agent.

(4) **QUALITY.**—Incentives for providers to deliver high-quality, responsive, and coordinated care will promote patient outcomes and drive down health care costs. Likewise, reforms that work to restore the patient-physician relationship by reducing administrative burdens and allowing physicians to do what they do best: care for patients

(5) **CHOICES.**—Individuals and families should be free to secure the health care coverage that best meets their needs, rather than instituting one-size-fits-all directives from Federal bureaucracies such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

(6) **INNOVATION.**—Instead of stifling innovation in health care technologies, treatments, medications, and therapies with Federal mandates, taxes, and price controls, a reformed health care system should encourage research, development and innovation.

(7) **RESPONSIVENESS.**—Reform should return authority to States wherever possible to make the system more responsive to patients and their needs. Instead of tying States' hands with Federal requirements for their Medicaid programs, the Federal Government should return control of this program to the States. Not only does the current Medicaid program drive up Federal debt and threaten to bankrupt State budgets, but States are better positioned to provide quality, affordable care to those who are eligible for the program and to track down and weed out waste, fraud and abuse. Beneficiary choices in the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) and Medicaid should be improved. States should make available the purchase of private insurance as an option to their Medicaid and SCHIP populations (though they should not require enrollment).

(8) **REFORMS.**—Reforms should be made to prevent lawsuit abuse and curb the practice of defensive medicine, which are significant drivers increasing health care costs. The burden of proof in medical malpractice cases should be based on compliance with best practice guidelines, and States should be free to implement those policies to best suit their needs.

**SEC. 808. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.



(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2030 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program;

(D) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries;

(E) in 2013, the ratio was 3.2 workers per beneficiary, but this falls to 2.3 in 2030 and continues to decrease over time;

(F) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program; and

(G) Medicare spending is growing faster than the economy and Medicare outlays are currently rising at a rate of 6.5 percent per year over the next 10 years. According to the Congressional Budget Office's 2014 Long-Term Budget Outlook, spending on Medicare is projected to reach 5 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) by 2043 and 9.3 percent of GDP by 2089.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution to preserve the program for those in or near retirement and strengthen Medicare for future beneficiaries.

(c) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that—

(1) current Medicare benefits are preserved for those in or near retirement;

(2) permanent reform of the sustainable growth rate is responsibly accounted for to ensure physicians continue to participate in the Medicare program and provide quality health care for beneficiaries;

(3) when future generations reach eligibility, Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs;

(4) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as a plan option;

(5) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

(6) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

#### **SEC. 809. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY AND INNOVATION.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) For decades, the Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world, bringing life-saving drugs and devices to patients and well over a million high-paying jobs to local communities.

(2) Thanks to the visionary and determined leadership of innovators throughout America, including industry, academic medical centers, and the National Institutes of

Health (NIH), the United States has led the way in early discovery. The United States leadership role is being threatened, however, as other countries contribute more to basic research from both public and private sources.

(3) The Organisation for Economic Development and Cooperation predicts that China, for example, will outspend the United States in total research and development by the end of the decade.

(4) Federal policies should foster innovation in health care, not stifle it. America should maintain its world leadership in medical science by encouraging competitive forces to work through the marketplace in delivering cures and therapies to patients.

(5) Too often the bureaucracy and red-tape in Washington hold back medical innovation and prevent new lifesaving treatments from reaching patients. This resolution recognizes the valuable role of the NIH and the indispensable contributions to medical research coming from outside Washington.

(6) America is the greatest, most innovative Nation on Earth. Her people are innovators, entrepreneurs, visionaries, and relentless builders of the future. Americans were responsible for the first telephone, the first airplane, the first computer, for putting the first man on the moon, for creating the first vaccine for polio and for legions of other scientific and medical breakthroughs that have improved and prolonged human health and life for countless people in America and around the world.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.**—

(1) It is the policy of this resolution to support the important work of medical innovators throughout the country, including private-sector innovators, medical centers and the National Institutes of Health.

(2) At the same time, the budget calls for continued strong funding for the agencies that engage in valuable research and development, while also urging Washington to get out of the way of researchers, discoverers and innovators all over the country.

#### **SEC. 810. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive regulation at the Federal level has hurt job creation and dampened the economy, slowing the Nation's recovery from the economic recession.

(2) Since President Obama's inauguration in 2009, the administration has issued more than 468,500 pages of regulations in the Federal Register including 70,066 pages in 2014.

(3) The National Association of Manufacturers estimates the total cost of regulations is as high as \$2.03 trillion per year. Since 2009, the White House has generated more than \$494 billion in regulatory activity, with an additional \$87.6 billion in regulatory costs currently pending.

(4) The Dodd-Frank financial services legislation (Public Law 111-203) has resulted in more than \$32 billion in compliance costs and saddled job creators with more than 63 million hours of compliance paperwork.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act to date has added 132.9 million annual hours of compliance paperwork, imposing \$24.3 billion of compliance costs on the private sector and an \$8 billion cost burden on the States.

(6) The highest regulatory costs come from rules issued by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); these regulations are primarily targeted at the coal industry. In June 2014, the EPA proposed a rule to cut carbon pollution from the Nation's power plants.

The proposed standards are unachievable with current commercially available technology, resulting in a de-facto ban on new coal-fired power plants.

(7) Coal-fired power plants provide roughly 40 percent of the United States electricity at a low cost. Unfairly targeting the coal industry with costly and unachievable regulations will increase energy prices, disproportionately disadvantaging energy-intensive industries like manufacturing and construction, and will make life more difficult for millions of low-income and middle class families already struggling to pay their bills.

(8) Three hundred and thirty coal units are being retired or converted as a result of EPA regulations. Combined with the de-facto prohibition on new plants, these retirements and conversions may further increase the cost of electricity.

(9) A recent study by the energy market analysis group Energy Ventures Analysis Inc. estimates the average energy bill in West Virginia will rise \$750 per household by 2020, due in part to EPA regulations. West Virginia receives 95 percent of its electricity from coal.

(10) The Heritage Foundation found that a phase-out of coal would cost 600,000 jobs by the end of 2023, resulting in an aggregate gross domestic product decrease of \$2.23 trillion over the entire period and reducing the income of a family of four by \$1,200 per year. Of these jobs, 330,000 will come from the manufacturing sector, with California, Texas, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, New York, Indiana, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Georgia seeing the highest job losses.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY REFORM.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the public burdened by excessive regulation, enact legislation that—

(1) promotes economic growth and job creation by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining and simplifying Federal regulations;

(2) requires the implementation of a regulatory budget to be allocated amongst Government agencies, which would require congressional approval and limit the maximum costs of regulations in a given year;

(3) requires congressional approval of all new major regulations (those with an impact of \$100 million or more) before enactment as opposed to current law in which Congress must expressly disapprove of regulation to prevent it from becoming law, which would keep Congress engaged as to pending regulatory policy and prevent costly and unsound policies from being implemented and becoming effective;

(4) requires a three year retrospective cost-benefit analysis of all new major regulations, to ensure that regulations operate as intended;

(5) reinforces the requirement of regulatory impact analysis for regulations proposed by executive branch agencies but also expands the requirement to independent agencies so that by law they consider the costs and benefits of proposed regulations rather than merely being encouraged to do so as is current practice; and

(6) requires a formal rulemaking process for all major regulations, which would increase transparency over the process and allow interested parties to communicate their views on proposed legislation to agency officials.

**SEC. 811. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) Roughly 20 million students are enrolled in American colleges and universities.

(3) Over the past decade, tuition and fees have been growing at an unsustainable rate. Between the 2004-2005 Academic Year and the 2014-2015 Academic Year—

(A) published tuition and fees at public 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 3.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation;

(B) published tuition and fees at public two-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.5 percent per year above the rate of inflation; and

(C) published tuition and fees at private nonprofit 4-year colleges and universities increased at an average rate of 2.2 percent per year above the rate of inflation.

(4) Federal financial aid for higher education has also seen a dramatic increase. The portion of the Federal student aid portfolio composed of Direct Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Perkins Loans with outstanding balances grew by 119 percent between fiscal year 2007 and fiscal year 2014.

(5) This spending has failed to make college more affordable.

(6) In his 2012 State of the Union Address, President Obama noted: “We can’t just keep subsidizing skyrocketing tuition; we’ll run out of money”.

(7) American students are chasing ever-increasing tuition with ever-increasing debt. According to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, student debt now stands at nearly \$1.2 trillion. This makes student loans the second largest balance of consumer debt, after mortgage debt.

(8) Students are carrying large debt loads and too many fail to complete college or end up defaulting on these loans due to their debt burden and a weak economy and job market.

(9) Based on estimates from the Congressional Budget Office, the Pell Grant Program will face a fiscal shortfall beginning in fiscal year 2017 and continuing in each subsequent year in the current budget window.

(10) Failing to address these problems will jeopardize access and affordability to higher education for America’s young people.

(b) **POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION AFFORDABILITY.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the root drivers of tuition inflation, by—

(1) targeting Federal financial aid to those most in need;

(2) streamlining programs that provide aid to make them more effective;

(3) maintaining the maximum Pell grant award level at \$5,775 in each year of the budget window; and

(4) removing regulatory barriers in higher education that act to restrict flexibility and innovative teaching, particularly as it relates to non-traditional models such as online coursework and competency-based learning.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 8.7 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with trained personnel.

(3) The House Education and Workforce Committee successfully consolidated 15 job training programs in the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this resolution to address the failings in the current workforce development system, by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal job training programs; and

(2) empowering states with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce, including the development of career scholarships.

**SEC. 812. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care and benefits.

(2) In 2014, reports started breaking across the Nation that VA medical centers were manipulating wait-list documents to hide long delays veterans were facing to receive health care. The VA hospital scandal led to the immediate resignation of then-Secretary of Veterans Affairs Eric K. Shinseki.

(3) In 2015, for the first time ever, VA health care was added to the “high-risk” list of the Government Accountability Office (GAO), due to management and oversight failures that have directly resulted in risks to the timeliness, cost-effectiveness, and quality of health care.

(4) In response to the scandal, the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs held several oversight hearings and ultimately enacted the Veterans’ Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (VACAA) (Public Law 113-146) to address these problems. VACAA provided \$15 billion in emergency resources to fund internal health care needs within the department and provided veterans enhanced access to private-sector health care under the new Veterans Choice Program.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—This budget supports the continued oversight efforts by the House Committee on Veterans’ Affairs to ensure the VA is not only transparent and accountable, but also successful in achieving its goals in providing timely health care and benefits to America’s veterans. The Budget Committee will continue to closely monitor the VA’s progress to ensure resources provided by Congress are sufficient and efficiently used to provide needed benefits and services to veterans.

**SEC. 813. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Given the thousands of Federal programs and trillions of dollars the Federal Government spends each year, assessing and accounting for Federal fiscal activities and liabilities is a complex undertaking.

(2) Current methods of accounting leave much to be desired in capturing the full scope of government and in presenting information in a clear and compelling way that illuminates the best options going forward.

(3) Most fiscal analysis produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is conducted over a relatively short time horizon: 10 or 25 years. While this time frame is useful for most purposes, it fails to consider the fiscal consequences over the longer term.

(4) Additionally, current accounting methodology does not provide an analysis of how the Federal Government’s fiscal situation

over the long run affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(5) Another consideration is how Federal programs should be accounted for. The “accrual method” of accounting records revenue when it is earned and expenses when they are incurred, while the “cash method” records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received.

(6) The Federal budget accounts for most programs using cash accounting. Some programs, however, particularly loan and loan guarantee programs, are accounted for using accrual methods.

(7) GAO has indicated that accrual accounting may provide a more accurate estimation of the Federal Government’s liabilities than cash accounting for some programs specifically those that provide some form of insurance.

(8) Where accrual accounting is used, it is almost exclusively calculated by CBO according to the methodology outlined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA). CBO uses fair value methodology instead of FCRA to measure the cost of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, for example.

(9) FCRA methodology, however, understates the risk and thus the true cost of Federal programs. An alternative is fair value methodology, which uses discount rates that incorporate the risk inherent to the type of liability being estimated in addition to Treasury discount rates of the proper maturity length.

(10) The Congressional Budget Office has concluded that “adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of federal assistance” than the current approach under FCRA.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should, in consultation with the Congressional Budget Office and the public affected by Federal budgetary choices, adopt Governmentwide reforms of budget and accounting practices so the American people and their representatives can more readily understand the fiscal situation of the Government of the United States and the options best suited to improving it. Such reforms may include but should not be limited to the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance our current analysis by considering our fiscal situation comprehensively, over an extended time horizon, and as it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair value accounting as opposed to the current approach under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990.

**SEC. 814. POLICY STATEMENT ON SCOREKEEPING FOR OUTYEAR BUDGETARY EFFECTS IN APPROPRIATION ACTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 directs the Committee on the Budget to provide an allocation of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations for the budget year covered by a concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) The allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations covers a period of one fiscal year only, which is effective for the budget year.

(3) An appropriation Act, joint resolution, amendment thereto or conference report thereon may contain changes to programs that result in direct budgetary effects that occur beyond the budget year and beyond the period for which the allocation of budgetary resources provided by the Committee on the Budget is effective.

(4) The allocation of budgetary resources provided to the Committee on Appropriations does not currently anticipate or capture direct outyear budgetary effects to programs.

(5) Budget enforcement could be improved by capturing the direct outyear budgetary effects caused by appropriation Acts and using this information to determine the appropriate allocations of budgetary resources to the Committee on Appropriations when considering future concurrent resolutions on the budget.

(b) **POLICY STATEMENT.**—It is the policy of the House of Representatives to more effectively allocate budgetary resources and accurately enforce budget targets by agreeing to a procedure by which the Committee on the Budget should consider the direct outyear budgetary effects of changes to mandatory programs enacted in appropriations bills, joint resolutions, amendments thereto or conference reports thereon when setting the allocation of budgetary resources for the Committee on Appropriations in a concurrent resolution on the budget. The relevant committees of jurisdiction are directed to consult on a procedure during fiscal year 2016 and include recommendations for implementing such procedure in the fiscal year 2017 concurrent resolution on the budget.

**SEC. 815. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could “lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings.”

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014 the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs including—

(A) two hundred nine Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education programs in 13 different Federal agencies at a cost of \$3 billion annually;

(B) two hundred separate Department of Justice crime prevention and victim services grant programs with an annual cost of \$3.9 billion in 2010;

(C) twenty different Federal entities administer 160 housing programs and other forms of Federal assistance for housing with a total cost of \$170 billion in 2010;

(D) seventeen separate Homeland Security preparedness grant programs that spent \$37 billion between fiscal year 2011 and 2012;

(E) fourteen grant and loan programs, and three tax benefits to reduce diesel emissions;

(F) ninety-four different initiatives run by 11 different agencies to encourage “green building” in the private sector; and

(G) twenty-three agencies implemented approximately 670 renewable energy initiatives in fiscal year 2010 at a cost of nearly \$15 billion.

(4) The Federal Government spends more than \$80 billion each year for approximately 1,400 information technology investments. GAO has identified broad acquisition failures, waste, and unnecessary duplication in the Government’s information technology infrastructure. Experts have estimated that eliminating these problems could save 25 percent or \$20 billion.

(5) GAO has identified strategic sourcing as a potential source of spending reductions. In 2011 GAO estimated that saving 10 percent of the total or all Federal procurement could generate more than \$50 billion in savings annually.

(6) Federal agencies reported an estimated \$106 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2013.

(7) Under clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120 day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(8) According to the Congressional Budget Office, by fiscal year 2015, 32 laws will expire, possibly resulting in \$693 billion in unauthorized appropriations. Timely reauthorizations of these laws would ensure assessments of program justification and effectiveness.

(9) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) **POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.**—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees’ judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules. If the strictures of the rules are deemed to be too rapid in prohibiting spending on unauthorized programs, then milder measures should be adopted and enforced until a return to the full prohibition of clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

**SEC. 816. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies were expected to hold \$844 billion in unobligated balances at the close of fiscal year 2015.

(2) These funds represent direct and discretionary spending previously made available by Congress that remains available for expenditure.

(3) In some cases, agencies are granted funding and it remains available for obligation indefinitely.

(4) The Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds

available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the Administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an Act of Congress.

(5) Greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed.

(b) **POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.**—Congressional committees should through their oversight activities identify and achieve savings through the cancellation or rescission of unobligated balances that neither abrogate contractual obligations of the Government nor reduce or disrupt Federal commitments under programs such as Social Security, veterans’ affairs, national security, and Treasury authority to finance the national debt.

(c) **DEFICIT REDUCTION.**—Congress, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and other appropriate agencies should continue to make it a high priority to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction.

**SEC. 817. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget to be \$525 billion in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable government.

(b) **POLICY ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

**SEC. 818. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The budget for the House of Representatives is \$188 million less than it was when Republicans became the majority in 2011.

(2) The House of Representatives has achieved significant savings by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) **POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**—It is the policy of this resolution that:

(1) The House of Representatives must be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources and therefore must identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources like printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent. This should include a review of policies

and procedures for acquisition of goods and services to eliminate any unnecessary spending. The Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to the services provided to Members and committees of the House, and should identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room.

(2) No taxpayer funds may be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress.

(3) Retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

**SEC. 819. POLICY STATEMENT ON "NO BUDGET, NO PAY".**

It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should agree to a concurrent resolution on the budget every year pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. If by April 15, a House of Congress has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget, the payroll administrator of that House should carry out this policy in the same manner as the provisions of Public Law 113-3, the No Budget, No Pay Act of 2013, and should place in an escrow account all compensation otherwise required to be made for Members of that House of Congress. Withheld compensation should be released to Members of that House of Congress the earlier of the day on which that House of Congress agrees to a concurrent resolution on the budget, pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or the last day of that Congress.

**SEC. 820. POLICY STATEMENT ON NATIONAL SECURITY FUNDING.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Russian aggression, the growing threats of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in the Middle East, North Korean and Iranian nuclear and missile programs, and continued Chinese investments in high-end military capabilities and cyber warfare shape the parameters of an increasingly complex and challenging security environment.

(2) All four current service chiefs testified that the National Military Strategy could not be executed at sequestration levels.

(3) The independent and bipartisan National Defense Panel conducted risk assessments of force structure changes triggered by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) and concluded that in addition to previous cuts to defense dating back to 2009, the sequestration of defense discretionary spending has "caused significant shortfalls in U.S. military readiness and both present and future capabilities".

(4) The President's fiscal year 2016 budget irresponsibly ignores current law and requests a defense budget \$38 billion above the caps for rhetorical gain. By creating an expectation of spending without a plan to avoid the BCA's guaranteed sequester upon breaching of its caps, the White House's proposal compounds the fiscal uncertainty that has affected the military's ability to adequately plan for future contingencies and make investments crucial for the Nation's defense.

(5) The President's budget proposes \$1.8 trillion in tax increases, in addition to the \$1.7 trillion in tax hikes the Administration has already imposed. The President's tax increases would further burden economic growth and is not a realistic source for offsets to fund defense sequester replacement.

(b) POLICY ON FISCAL YEAR 2016 NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNDING.—In fiscal year 2015, the House-passed budget resolution anticipated

\$566 billion for national defense in the discretionary base budget for fiscal year 2016. With no necessary statutory change yet provided by Congress, the BCA statute would require limiting national defense discretionary base funding to \$523 billion in fiscal year 2016. However, in total with \$90 billion, the House Budget estimate for Overseas Contingency Operations funding for the Department of Defense, the fiscal year 2016 budget provides over \$613 billion total for defense spending that is higher than the President's budget request for the fiscal year. This concurrent resolution provides \$22 billion above the President's Five Year Defense Plan and \$151 billion above the 10-year totals. This would also be \$387 billion above the 10-year total for current levels.

(c) DEFENSE READINESS AND MODERNIZATION FUND.—(1) The budget resolution recognizes the need to ensure robust funding for national defense while maintaining overall fiscal discipline. The budget resolution prioritizes our national defense and the needs of the warfighter by providing needed dollars through the creation of the "Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund".

(2) The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund provides the mechanism for Congress to responsibly allocate in a deficit-neutral way the resources the military needs to secure the safety and liberty of United States citizens from threats at home and abroad. The Defense Readiness and Modernization Fund will provide the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House the ability to increase allocations to support legislation that would provide for the Department of Defense warfighting capabilities, modernization, a temporary increase in end strength, training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, activities to reach full auditability of the Department of Defense's financial statements, and implementation of military and compensation reforms.

(d) SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE.—This concurrent resolution encourages an immediate reevaluation of Federal Government priorities to maintain the strength of America's national security posture. In identifying policies to restructure and stabilize the Government's major entitlement programs which, along with net interest, will consume all Federal revenue in less than 20 years. The budget also charts a course that can ensure the availability of needed national security resources.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 163, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment labeled Price 2 is an important amendment, important substitute. It is important for our colleagues, it is important for the Members of this Chamber, and it is important for the American people to know the differences between this amendment and the substitute amendment that we just talked about.

There are two changes in this amendment, two changes in this substitute. This is an important debate. The first change is that, in this substitute, we increase global war on terror spending

from \$94 billion in fiscal year 2016 to \$96 billion in 2016, an increase of \$2 billion in the global war on terror. The second change from the underlying resolution is that we remove the requirement for an offset of any of the funding in the global war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, this is an absolutely vital substitute amendment so that the House can work its will, so that the Members of the conference are able to stipulate and say what they believe is to be most appropriate. Regardless, the level of spending for defense is north of the President's. The level of spending for defense when you look at base spending and global war on terror spending is where it needs to be to assist our men and women in accomplishing the mission.

So, significant changes, yes, but changes in a positive direction to be able to make certain that this House is able to adopt a budget, work with the Senate to come forward with a unified budget. So I am pleased to offer what has become known as Price 2.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough that the Republican budget uses games and gimmicks that would make Enron accountants blush with respect to their basic budget. It is not just me who says that. People, independent observers from all over the country have said that. USA Today is not a partisan newspaper. Here is what they said about the Republican budget quackery: But "pretend" is the operative word because the Republicans supposed path to balance is fanciful at best. That is USA Today.

Now, why do they say that? They say that because Republicans claim in the ninth and tenth years of their budget that they have this balance, but their budget depends on revenue from the Affordable Care Act. That is the ObamaCare that they say they are repealing. It depends on savings from the Affordable Care Act. It assumes that the costs of the tax cuts that this body is enacting by the day—for corporations and very wealthy individuals, mostly—aren't happening; right? That is a whole different universe. In fact, as we heard today, they just passed, worked on a bill in the Committee on Ways and Means, they are marking it up, \$280 billion more to the deficit for the benefit of 5,500 American families, 75 percent of whom have \$20 million-plus estates.

So their budget accounting is all wrong. In my view, their priorities and values are all wrong, too. But that same phony accounting that they are

using for their big budget, now they are doing it to the defense budget as well. They are pretending that we need more in the overseas contingency account than the military leadership says it needs. In fact, they have been here testifying, saying that that is the wrong way to go. And yes, last year, as I read earlier, Republicans said the same thing in the Committee on the Budget report. They said that doing what Republicans are doing in this amendment is a backdoor loophole that undermines the integrity of the budget process. I didn't write that. Former chairman of the Committee on the Budget PAUL RYAN wrote that. So we have got budget quackery in the main part of the budget, and now we have got games with defense spending. That is just the beginning of the story because, despite all that quackery and not balancing, what they do is hit hard at working families in America.

We have had this debate now over the last 2 days. The good news with the economy is things are getting better; more people are getting back to work. We have got a long way to go, but trends are good; yet people are working harder than ever and feel like they are running in place, and some falling behind, and this Republican budget just makes it harder on them. In fact, it eliminates the college tax deduction, gets rid of the bump-up in the child tax credit, and gets rid of all the Affordable Care tax credits that help people afford health care. In fact, the irony is they keep the parts of the Affordable Care Act that raise revenue and get rid of the parts of the Affordable Care Act that help people afford health insurance. What a deal.

So it is an unfortunate day for the country, Mr. Chairman, and I think Members, when they look at this, will recognize that the Republican budget takes us in the wrong direction.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the Republican majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for his leadership and for the hard work of his entire committee. When we talk about this budget that is on the floor, I rise in strong support of this budget that restores fiscal sanity back to Washington.

If you talk about one of the greatest threats facing our Nation right now, it is the fact that out-of-control spending and the lack of ability to set priorities and make those tough decisions to get our economy moving again have held our economy back, and it has also held back the opportunities for so many young people that deserve the same opportunity to achieve the American Dream that we and every generation that has come before us have been able to achieve.

□ 1715

And so, Mr. Chairman, what is so important about this budget is not just the fact that we get back to balance within 10 years. Balancing the Federal budget—we can do it. We actually lay it out in this budget. But it is all of the underlying policies, the great reforms that have been so desperately needed by Washington for so long, actually confronting challenges facing our country in a way that puts us on a path to get the economy moving again.

Let's talk about Medicare. Medicare is on a path to bankruptcy, Mr. Chairman. And what is so important with this budget is we actually lay out a plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy and strengthen it for future generations. That is in this budget.

We repeal the President's health care law, ObamaCare, something that has cost millions of people the good health care they like. It caused doctors to leave the practice of medicine and killed jobs across this country.

We lay out the process for tax reform. We lay out really good reforms that people have been asking Washington to make. These are things that families have been doing for years, sitting around the kitchen table, making the tough decisions to ultimately live within their means and make sure that they can go forward and provide better opportunities for their children. That is what this budget does.

And let's contrast that, Mr. Chairman, to President Obama's budget. President Obama lays out a budget that never, ever gets to balance. And not only that, he adds another \$2.1 trillion in new taxes, taxes that will kill economic growth even more and that will take jobs out of this country and ship them overseas.

The President always talks about raising taxes on people as if it is the only way to balance the budget. I would think the President's budget, with those new taxes, would get to balance in 2 or 3 years. Yet his budget never gets to balance.

We don't raise a dime in new taxes in our budget. We just empower American people again. We let families have control over their health care decisions again. And with that empowerment, we get to balance in less than 10 years.

This is the direction we need to head for our country, Mr. Chairman. This is the reason we all came here to Washington, to tackle the big problems in a way that restores opportunities for all Americans.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have heard that, despite all these claims, the Republican budget doesn't balance. I just read from USA Today. They don't have a stake in this battle. They said it is "fanciful at best."

And it is interesting that if that is the number one priority of our Republican colleagues, why is it they don't cut one single special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit? Not one.

There are \$1.4 trillion a year in what the Congressional Budget Office classifies as tax expenditures. These are tax breaks. That is \$1.4 trillion a year. That is more than we spend on Social Security every year. It is more than we spend on Medicare and Medicaid combined every year. They don't cut a single one of those. Maybe it is because 17 percent of those tax breaks go to the top 1 percent of income earners. And this is in a budget where their whole economic theory is based on the idea we are going to cut tax rates for the folks at the very top.

The Ways and Means Committee just added over \$280 billion to the deficit—or is in the process of doing it—to help 5,500 American families. So they don't cut a single tax break. In fact, they are giving bigger ones to families with estates over \$10 million, 75 percent of whom have estates over \$20 million. But they cut education. They don't fund the Veterans Administration at the level the President does this year. It is \$1.9 billion less—\$19 billion less than the President for the Veterans Administration over 10 years.

And how about the folks that are working hard every day in our veterans hospitals, those nurses, Federal employees? How about the Border Control Agents? How about the FBI? How about the folks in the intelligence community who helped track down Osama bin Laden? How about all of them?

You know what the big thank you to them is? They cut Federal employee pay by 5 percent. They don't want to do that in a straightforward manner either. Here is how they do it. They are going to require all those Federal employees to put about 5 percent more into their pension without increasing the pension by a penny. That is what they do.

Thank you. Thank you to the folks who are taking care of veterans in those hospitals. Thank you to folks in the foreign service who are putting their lives at risk. A lot of those people in the foreign service have given their lives overseas for this country.

The big thank you from the Republican budget is not just no COLA. It is cut by 5½ percent, effectively, in a budget that doesn't cut a single tax break, where 17 percent of those tax breaks go to the folks at the very top, where a lot of those tax breaks are in this Tax Code because someone had a powerful lobbyist who got them a special break that is not available for other Americans.

This budget is wrong for America, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the misinformation and outright errors are phenomenal. The fact of the matter is the gentleman knows that it is the Ways and Means Committee that handles tax reform. It is not the Budget Committee. What we do is lay out a path to be able to allow the Ways and Means Committee to come up with a positive, pro-growth tax reform. That is the plan that is laid out in this budget.

I would be so concerned about the gentleman's comments about getting to balance—I don't buy a thing that he is saying about our balance because we do get to balance within less than 10 years by reducing spending by \$5.5 trillion. I would be concerned about his statements if I believed for one second that the other side thought that getting to balance was even important. The fact of the matter is that they don't. In fact, their budget never, ever, ever gets to balance, nor does the President's. So the crocodile tears that I see on the other side about us allegedly not getting to balance just is absolutely not credible.

And what we request of Federal employees is that they be treated exactly like folks in the private sector. That is what the American people think is fair, appropriate treatment for all Americans, not favorite treatment, not picking winners and losers, like the other side enjoys doing.

I am so proud now to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), who is the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, a gentleman with whom I have worked closely over these last 10 or 11 weeks on this budget and for whom I have the utmost respect for his positive contributions to our Conference and to our Nation.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I want to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee not only for yielding, but for all of his work in putting this budget together.

Mr. Chairman, I spent some time on the Budget Committee. Putting a budget together is never easy. And I believe that the committee has done excellent work in putting together a budget that, as the whip just described, helps increase economic opportunity for the whole country.

I particularly appreciate the chairman as he has had to navigate through a variety of interests and a variety of concerns in putting that budget together.

I know firsthand that Chairman PRICE and other members of the committee are very concerned about national security. And so I want to take a moment to explain why I believe the amendment we are considering now, Price 2, is better than Price 1 when it comes to national security. I think Members deserve that explanation.

The amount of funding that the President has asked for our military this year ends up being \$612 billion

when you add the base and the overseas contingency account or the global war on terrorism account, whichever you want to call it. When you add them together, it is \$612 billion.

All of our military leaders have testified that that is the lower ragged edge of what it takes to defend the country, and my opinion is that it would be rather reckless of us to ignore those warnings and do less. Now, I am for more than the lower ragged edge, but that is a base minimum, at least, that our military leaders have said is required.

So if you look at Price 1, it has \$613 billion. But the problem I have is that \$20-something billion of that is conditional upon, first, the House and the Senate and President Obama reaching agreement on how to fund the reserve fund before the military can spend that money.

Now, we have a track record here, and I am not at all convinced that President Obama really wants to find those savings. And if that happens, then that reserve fund is never funded, and we don't have the \$20 billion.

Price 2, on the other hand, fully funds that military up to that basic minimum level, and there is still a reserve fund.

So, if there can be an agreement that reduces the deficit, I am for it. I have no doubt I will vote for it. But it doesn't make our equipping, training of our military dependent upon doing that first. And it just seems to me it would be hard to look a spouse or a parent in the eye and say: Oh, we can only train your son or daughter for the mission they are about to be sent on conditional upon this reserve fund being funded.

Now, I think that there have been several misconceptions that are going around. Price 2, the budget before us, still balances in 10 years. Removing that condition does not change that in any way.

Our committee, the Armed Services Committee, is going to authorize the overseas contingency account just like we authorize the base account. And that is different from what happened before. But we are going to do it program by program, just like we do the base.

So, some notion that there is a giant slush fund out there so the Pentagon can do what they want is just not true. It is going to be authorized and appropriated program by program just like the base budget is.

I think Members ought to know that our committee, on a bipartisan basis, is absolutely committed to reforms to make sure that we all get value for the money we spend for everything in defense. The same is true on the other side of the Capitol as well.

We hear that it would be better to put this money in the base—and that is right, it would be better—but the prob-

lem is the law of sequestration can't be fixed in a budget. We have got to live under the law as it is now.

Now, I would like to change that law. I would like to remove the cap on defense spending because it turns out there is no cap on the dangers that we are facing around the world. But in the meantime, we have got to live under the law.

The way to do that is to increase the OCO fund. And really, if we authorized and appropriated, it doesn't really matter what we call those funds. It still meets that minimum threshold that the President and the military leaders have said is necessary.

Let me make one other point. I am concerned that the President is going to try to use defense spending as a hostage to force increased spending in other areas or higher taxes. And I think that we need to say right now that is absolutely wrong.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. THORNBERRY. It is important for the House and it is especially important for the Commander in Chief to fully fund our military without conditions and not try to use it as leverage for other parts of his political agenda.

I hope Members will vote for Price 2 and for the final budget.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman just recognized, this is a huge departure from the way this House of Representatives has dealt with our military spending in the past. In fact, it is a departure that the Republican-controlled Budget Committee said violated the integrity of the process.

The Budget Committee specifically said it would oppose increases above the levels the administration and our military commanders say are needed to carry out operations. That is what the Budget Committee said last year—Republicans. This year, forget it. Just have some amnesia. Let's play games with our defense spending.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to an issue that has come up a couple of times during this debate regarding economic growth.

As I said, the Congressional Budget Office has indicated that the Republican budget will actually slow down economic growth in the next couple of years. Just after we are regaining momentum, they are going to slow it down.

The Congressional Budget Office said something else that is interesting. It says, as you look ahead over the next 10 years, the biggest single factor with respect to growth rates that don't keep up with the past averages are demographic changes; the fact that baby boomers are going to be retiring, and they are not going to be in the workforce. You just have to look at the CBO report from this budget year.



So, you would think that one way to deal with that would be to pass immigration reform.

□ 1730

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says that that will help spur economic growth. It will also help add to the solvency of Social Security because you will have more workers today supporting the baby boomers who are retiring over the next couple of years.

If you really want a progrowth budget, you would support the Democratic approach that provides help to struggling families working every day, invest in our future by investing in our kids' education, and pass comprehensive immigration reform.

There was a bipartisan bill that passed the Senate last year. Over here in the House, what happened to it? It is not that there was a vote on it and it went down. We never even had a vote here in this body on comprehensive immigration reform, one of the things that the budget pros and the economists say could help spur our economy in the years ahead, something that is supported by the Chamber of Commerce, as well as folks in the labor community.

No, Republicans didn't want to do that. They didn't even allow a vote on that bill here in the House of Representatives. That would have been a progrowth effort, too.

Mr. Chairman, instead of those progrowth efforts, efforts that will help shore up Social Security, all we get is the same old-same old, another budget that refuses to cut a single special interest tax break to help reduce the deficit, provides more tax breaks for folks at the top, and is based on a failed theory of top-down/trickle-down economics. We can do a lot better.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to what amount of time remains on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from the great State of California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, especially to Chairman PRICE, for his work.

Budgets are never easy. Lots of times, some don't even bring a budget to the floor, and I want to thank you for your work, and thank you to everybody else.

Also, I know the work is hard on the other side of the aisle. I may not agree with your argument, and part of me feels sorry for you that nobody else in your conference is down here to even join you, but you are making the fight

by yourself very strongly, and I thank the gentleman for that. This is a body to debate, and I thank you for filling the time.

Today, the House will adopt a budget. A budget is a vision for the future, and Republicans are making our vision very clear. In our vision, Washington lives within its means. In our vision, we don't raise taxes on the American people. In our vision, we set the stage for a strong American future.

Our vision looks to the road ahead, not to the rear view behind us. We face many challenges here at home and abroad, but we can tackle those challenges and create a more prosperous America if we choose a better path. This budget is a better path.

Today, we look forward to a simpler and fairer tax code. Today, we look forward to an end of ObamaCare. Today, we look forward to saving our children and grandchildren from reckless spending by balancing the budget in less than 10 years. Today, we start growing America's economy, not Washington's. That is the big contrast between what the Republican and Democrats have to offer.

You see, the Democrats continue to call for higher taxes, more spending, and more debt. In fact, the Democrats' budget has all the same tax increases that President Obama's budget has, but I want to give them credit—at least they actually submitted a budget this year.

You see, it was only in 2010 when the Democrats became the very first majority party since the Budget Act of 1974 had passed, when they didn't even offer a budget here, when they were in the majority, let alone get one out of committee. I think the American public saw their vision and made a change in who was the majority after that.

At least the President has actually submitted a budget every year, eventually; he did that, but just like the Democrats' budgets, none of the President's budgets even balanced. They didn't balance in 10; they didn't balance in 100 years.

His budgets, the President's, Mr. Chairman, has been so bad that altogether, on this floor, he has only gotten two votes in the House for his entire Presidency. I understand why my friend on the other side of the aisle has more difficulty with those coming down to join him.

While Republicans are attacking the debt seriously, the President and the congressional Democrats are not. Their budgets, in my view, are propaganda, not a path to the future. To get a better future, Republicans understand that we have to make tough choices, choices today to create opportunities for us tomorrow.

You see, I believe the best days are in front of us. We are an exceptional nation. We are too strong and too good to ever be kept down. Sometimes, we

might have leadership in the White House that doesn't want to make the tough choices, but Americans are remarkably resilient, and America will always be better than our faults.

America is an idea, and as long as we have the wisdom to listen, but the courage to lead, that idea will never fail. I ask my Members to join with me, and I hope my talk today helped my friend on the other side get some others to join him.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, to the Republican leader, let me just say I think there is a lot of confusion on the Republican side. This is the first time since I have been on the Budget Committee that we have had two official Republican budgets on the floor of the House. That is a little bit of confusion here.

I am really pleased to be joined by super-reinforcements, a gentlewoman who understands that we power our economy by making sure we have an economy that works for all people, not just folks at the very top; that economic growth is based on an economy where hard work translates into higher incomes for everybody; and that we have a tax system that rewards work, not one riddled with tax breaks where 17 percent of those tax breaks goes to the top 1 percent.

That is a tax code written by lobbyists. We want a tax code that is fair to the American people and the American worker.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I say with great pride how impressed all of us are by his statement of values that he has put forth in this House Democratic budget; the breadth of knowledge, the depth of commitment, the vision for a strong way to keep America number one.

Thank you, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and thank you to members of the House Budget Committee.

We say it all the time. A budget should be a statement of our values. What is important to us as a nation should be reflected in how we allocate our resources.

Are we allocating them as investments in the future, the education of our children, the building of our infrastructure, to promote commerce, to protect the environment, to improve the quality of life of all Americans? Or is it a budget that subscribes to trickle-down economics of the Republican Party, which have never been successful for America's hard-working families?

Instead, we have a budget that subscribes to what President Obama spoke about in the State of the Union Address: middle class economics. That is a better set of values to build a strong



and prosperous future for America that is reflected in the House Democratic budget, but, as I said, this budget should be a statement of our values.

And I just ask you, Mr. Chairman—I am allowed to ask our colleagues—is that correct, Mr. Chairman?—to address a comment?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HOLDING). The gentlewoman's remarks must be addressed to the Chair.

Ms. PELOSI. Okay. So you are the one, Mr. Chair.

For you and for all you represent, I ask you: Do you think it is a statement of values of the American people to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country while increasing taxes on the middle class by around \$2,000?

We don't begrudge the wealthy their success and their achievement; but why should people come forth and say we are going to balance our budget by giving tax increases to the middle class and tax decreases to the very wealthy?

By the way, it doesn't balance the budget. The Republican budgets are not balanced.

Is it a statement of value to end the boost in child tax credit; end higher education tax credit; freeze Pell grants for 10 years, thereby curbing the opportunity for people not only to reach their fulfillment, but for our country to be competitive and keep America number one?

It is not just about personal aspirations. That would be reason enough. This is also about keeping America number one because we know that innovation begins in the classroom. If we want to have great innovation, we have to have access to education to many more people; then again, this budget—the Republican budget—does not invest in innovation in any way.

Is it a statement of value to say to seniors we are now going to end your Medicare guarantee and focus on for you to pay more for preventive care and high prescription drug costs, instead of keeping what we have now—which is free preventive care for seniors—and reducing their prescription drug care?

Infrastructure—the Republican budget abandons the Nation's crumbling infrastructure by cutting \$187 billion, or more than 19 percent, from transportation funding over the coming decades. How could that be a statement of values when we are not building the infrastructure of our country?

By the way, infrastructure and transportation have, in years past, not been partisan issues. This is the place where you come together because it made all the sense in the world to build the infrastructure of America, to know that no maintenance is the most expensive maintenance.

Their bill, it is just stunning to see that, once again, the Republican budget repeals the Affordable Care Act. Now, mind you, the Affordable Care

Act has nearly \$1 trillion in savings. They take the savings and spend it on other things like tax cuts for the rich, but they repeal the bill. It just doesn't make any sense at all. I just don't understand how you can't see that that doesn't add up.

This budget savages the investments needed to keep America number one in the global economy with even deeper cuts than the already devastating sequester.

I know that, if you are sitting at home and watching this on TV, you are thinking: What does this mean to me?

Well, what this means to you is that this is a budget that—our House Democratic budget works for hard-working Americans, making it easier to own a home, easier to send a child to college, easier to have a secure and enjoyable retirement. Even if your child does not want to go to college, you can enable your child to reach his or her aspirations because of your own financial security.

For us to achieve a bright and durable future for our country, we must embrace the fact that financial security of our working families is both the measure and the engine of our Nation's success.

Democrats are proud to offer a budget that grows opportunity, prosperity, and dignity for every American, not just the wealthy and the well connected.

It is time for Republicans to abandon their fuzzy math and their broken priorities and come together with Democrats to pass a budget dedicated to the future of hard-working American families.

□ 1745

I think that is what we all came here to do, Democrats and Republicans, but you would never know it to see not one but two of the Republican budgets they have put forth today.

That is why I am so proud of the work of the House Budget members on the Democratic side. That is why I commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) for his superior work on this subject and for having a budget that reflects the values of the American people for a brighter future.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, as Leader PELOSI just said, this really comes down to what vision you have for what has helped power our economy.

The Republican theory of the case is that our economy is powered by providing tax rate cuts to people at the very high end of the income scale and somehow the benefits of that will trickle down and lift everybody up. The problem with that theory is it already crashed in the real world. Right in the

early 2000s, that is what President Bush did. Incomes for folks at the top went up even more, but everybody else was running aground, running in place, or falling behind.

That is why we presented a budget based on an economy that accelerates because more Americans are able to make bigger paychecks through harder work, and that is why we proposed to change the Tax Code from one that is currently skewed and tilted in favor of unearned income and simply making money off of money and against people who make money off of hard work.

Why is the Tax Code skewed that way today? Probably because a lot of people who could afford to pay a lot of wealthy lobbyists made it that way.

Yet the Republican budget doesn't close a single tax break for the purposes of reducing the deficit—not corporate jets, not the tax provisions that perversely encourage American companies to move jobs and capital overseas. We proposed to close those tax loopholes and bring those jobs and that capital back here to the United States to help power our economy, not the economies of our global economic competitors.

So I hope that this Congress will reject a view of the economy that is based on the idea that everyone can only do well when the folks at the top get a tax cut as opposed to an economy where we are all in it together.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, my friend on the other side talks about the two budgets that we have before us, and I would remind him, as the majority leader did, about the debacle of 2010 when no budget came. So we would say that two budgets are better than none.

I continue to be saddened, though, by the politics of division of our friends on the other side, dividing Americans, pitting Americans one against the other. In order for their vision to be true, one would have to believe that the government doesn't take enough of the American people's money and that the government isn't big enough. Those are the things you have to believe to believe that their vision is correct.

Let me set the record straight on a couple of items that have just been brought up:

One, our budget allows for over \$300 billion in spending on innovation and research over the next 10 years. Our budget provides for a Medicare program that is guaranteed for all seniors, and with greater choices for those seniors. Our budget provides for a path in terms of infrastructure to actually find real money for transportation, not just painting a rosy picture for folks. And our budget believes that health care ought to be controlled by patients and families and doctors, not by Washington, D.C.

What we do is responsibly lay out a plan for a healthy economy, an opportunity economy, one that opens doors for people, doesn't subject them to the dictates of Washington, D.C. You see, we believe in America, and we believe in Americans—all Americans.

We understand our problems are significant. There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman. We hear the people of this Nation crying out, crying out for leadership here in Washington.

This Balanced Budget for a Stronger America will result in a government that is more efficient and more effective and more accountable, one that frees up the American spirit, that of optimism and enthusiasm to do great things and to meet great challenges.

I ask my colleagues for their strong support for this Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. I encourage a "yes" vote on the amendment and a "yes" vote on final passage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I come to the floor to speak in ardent opposition to the Republican Budget. This budget fails to deliver for the majority of hard-working Americans, many of whom are scraping by, living paycheck to paycheck. The House Republican budget would bring us back to the same top-down economics that have failed time and time again—tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, while slashing investments in the middle class.

The GOP budget significantly undermines the economic and health security of the people of Texas. In the state of Texas alone the proposed budget would place an unnecessary economic burden on seniors by increasing the cost of prescriptions in the future and eliminating guaranteed access to Medicare. Although statistics show that the Affordable Care Act is working through the 16 million Americans that have gained coverage, the GOP budget would eliminate coverage for more than 1.2 million Texans receiving coverage through the marketplace.

The House Republican budget ransacks our nation's commitment to education—the foundation for economic opportunity and a successful future—with severe cuts in elementary and secondary education and early learning programs, including measures which make college less affordable for millions of students who rely on Pell Grants, federal student loans, and higher education tax credits.

In addition to students, the proposed Republican budget threatens workers, women and children. Under the Republican budget, middle class families will see higher taxes and millions will see fewer jobs. The last thing that hard-working Texas families can afford right now is higher taxes, fewer jobs and less growth. This budget would cut our investments in our nation's R&D and innovation enterprise—the investments that have allowed us to be a world leader in these fields. If we shortchange those accounts in an attempt to cut a few more dollars from the deficit over the short-term, the reality is that we will wind up shortchanging our future economy and quality of life for decades to come.

We need a better plan and a better set of values to build a strong and prosperous Amer-

ica. I support a budget that would aid the American people by advancing our healthcare system, securing a pathway to proper funding for medical advancements and ensuring affordable healthcare for all. I support a budget that values the future of America's role in STEM advancements through technological innovation and scientific research. I support a budget that would lower taxes for working families and students; and a budget that would make sound investments in programs like Head Start. I support a budget that would reinvigorate our infrastructure through highway and mass transit planning and investment. As it stands, the Republican budget does not bring all of these options to the table.

Though we may not always agree, as lawmakers, we must set aside our own political agendas by joining together to pass legislation that benefits all Americans. I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in strong opposition to the Republican Budget, and instead to support the President's FY16 and to commit to more robust investments in our future economic prosperity.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, our national debt continues to pose a serious threat to our future economic growth and national security. If we fail to act, these threats will grow and the risk to our country will be far greater.

Like so many American households know all too well, balancing a budget is never easy. The budget process requires us to make a number of hard choices between priorities we all support. However, there is no doubt that if we fail to make these difficult decisions today, we will face even more ominous options in the years ahead.

If we followed President Obama's budget plan that's exactly where it would take us—more spending, more debt, and more kicking the can down the road. That's not leadership.

Thankfully, House Republicans have chosen to once again pursue a responsible path that leads to a truly balanced budget. I want to applaud Budget Committee Chairman TOM PRICE and the rest of our colleagues on the committee for drafting a budget that cuts more than \$5 trillion in spending and balances the budget in less than 10 years without raising taxes.

The House budget will enhance our economic future by calling for a fairer, simpler tax code and repealing the job-killing provisions in ObamaCare, including its taxes, regulations and mandates. The plan promotes freedom of choice, affordability, and patient-centered health care solutions.

In order to protect our national security, the House budget will ensure necessary funding is provided for troop training, equipment and compensation. Defense spending under the plan will be greater than the level proposed in the President's budget and will ensure readiness. The budget also includes provisions that will improve the efficiency in the Defense Department, including the civilian workforce. Specifically, the budget contains language that echoes the REDUCE Act, legislation that I have introduced that would require any reductions in military end strength be accompanied by appropriate reductions in the civilian workforce in order to maintain a ratio that more closely resembles the historical average.

There's no question that the House budget requires a number of sacrifices, but American

families make and live with similar sacrifices every day and they expect our government to do the same. President Obama may not understand that, but I do and I encourage all of my colleagues to support the House Republican budget and its path towards a brighter economic future and a more secure America.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-49 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 6 by Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 5 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 105, noes 319, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

#### AYES—105

Allen	DesJarlais	Hice, Jody B.
Amash	Duffy	Hill
Barton	Duncan (SC)	Hudson
Benishek	Duncan (TN)	Huelskamp
Billirakis	Ellmers (NC)	Hultgren (MI)
Bishop (MI)	Fincher	Hultgren
Black	Fleischmann	Hurt (VA)
Blackburn	Fox	Issa
Blum	Garrett	Jenkins (KS)
Brat	Gohmert	Johnson, Sam
Buchanan	Goodlatte	Jordan
Burgess	Gosar	King (IA)
Carter (GA)	Gowdy	Labrador
Chabot	Graves (GA)	Lance
Chaffetz	Griffith	Latta
Clawson (FL)	Grothman	Loudermilk
Coffman	Hardy	Luetkemeyer
Cole	Harris	Lummis
Collins (GA)	Hensarling	Marchant
DeSantis	Herrera Beutler	McClintock

Rice (SC)	Stutzman	Pittenger	Schakowsky	Tsongas	Bucshon	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Messer	Tiberi	Pitts	Schiff	Turner	Burgess	Hurd (TX)	Rigell
Mooleenaar	Rohrabacher	Pocan	Schrader	Upton	Byrne	Hurt (VA)	Roby
Mooney (WV)	Rokita	Polis	Scott (VA)	Valadao	Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Mulvaney	Roskam	Pompeo	Scott, Austin	Van Hollen	Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Neugebauer	Rothfus	Price (NC)	Scott, David	Vargas	Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Newhouse	Royce	Quigley	Serrano	Veasey	Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Palmer	Ryan (WI)	Rangel	Sherman	Vela	Chaffetz	Jordan	Rooney (FL)
Perry	Salmon	Reed	Shimkus	Velázquez	Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Ros-Lehtinen
Poe (TX)	Sanford	Reichert	Shuster	Visclosky	Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Roskam
Poliquin	Schock	Renacci	Simpson	Wagner	Cole	King (IA)	Ross
Posey	Schweikert	Rice (NY)	Sinema	Walberg	Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Rothfus
Price, Tom	Sensenbrenner	Richmond	Sires	Walorski	Collins (NY)	Kinzinger (IL)	Rouzer
Ratcliffe	Sessions	Rigell	Slaughter	Walters, Mimi	Conaway	Kline	Royce
Ribble	Smith (NE)	Roby	Smith (MO)	Walz	Cook	Knight	Russell
		Rogers (AL)	Smith (NJ)	Wasserman	Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Ryan (WI)
		Rogers (KY)	Smith (TX)	Schultz	Cramer	Lamborn	Salmon
		Rooney (FL)	Speier	Waters, Maxine	Crenshaw	Lance	Sanford
		Ros-Lehtinen	Stefanik	Watson Coleman	Culberson	Latta	Scalise
		Ross	Stewart	Welch	Curbelo (FL)	Long	Schock
		Rouzer	Stivers	Wenstrup	Davis, Rodney	Love	Scott, Austin
		Royal-Ballard	Swalwell (CA)	Whitfield	Denham	Lucas	Sessions
		Ruppersberger	Takai	Williams	Dent	Luetkemeyer	Shimkus
		Rush	Takano	Wilson (FL)	DeSantis	Shuster	Smith (MO)
		Russell	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (SC)	DesJarlais	Lummis	Smith (NJ)
		Ryan (OH)	Thompson (MS)	Wittman	Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Smith (TX)
		Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (PA)	Yarmuth	Dold	Marchant	Stefanik
		T.	Thornberry	Young (AK)	Duffy	Marino	Stivers
		Sanchez, Loretta	Titus	Young (IN)	Duncan (SC)	McCarthy	Stutzman
		Sarbanes	Tonko	Zeldin	Duncan (TN)	McCauley	Thompson (PA)
		Scalise	Torres	Zinke	Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Thornberry
					Emmer (MN)	McMorris	Tiberi
					Farenthold	Rodgers	Tipton
					Fincher	Meadows	Trott
					Fitzpatrick	Meehan	Turner
					Fleischmann	Messer	Upton
					Fleming	Mica	Valadao
					Flores	Miller (FL)	Wagner
					Forbes	Miller (MI)	Walberg
					Fortenberry	Mooleenaar	Walden
					Fox	Mooney (WV)	Walker
					Franks (AZ)	Mullin	Walorski
					Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Walters, Mimi
					Gibbs	Neugebauer	Weber (TX)
					Gohmert	Newhouse	Webster (FL)
					Goodlatte	Noem	Wenstrup
					Growd	Nugent	Westerman
					Granger	Nunes	Westmoreland
					Graves (GA)	Olson	Whitfield
					Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Williams
					Graves (MO)	Palmer	Wilson (SC)
					Grothman	Paulsen	Wittman
					Guinta	Pearce	Womack
					Guthrie	Perry	Yoder
					Hanna	Pittenger	Yoho
					Hardy	Pitts	Young (AK)
					Harper	Poe (TX)	Young (IA)
					Hartzler	Poliquin	Young (IN)
					Heck (NV)	Pompeo	Zeldin
					Hensarling	Posey	Zinke
					Herrera Beutler	Price, Tom	
					Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe	
					Hill	Reed	
					Holding	Reichert	
					Hudson	Renacci	
					Huizenga (MI)	Ribble	

Grijalva	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Gutiérrez	Lujan Grisham	Rush
Hahn	(NM)	Ryan (OH)
Harris	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sánchez, Linda
Hastings	(NM)	T.
Heck (WA)	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Higgins	Maloney,	Sarbanes
Himes	Carolyn	Schakowsky
Honda	Maloney, Sean	Schiff
Hoyer	Massie	Schrader
Huelskamp	Matsui	Schweikert
Huffman	McClintock	Scott (VA)
Hultgren	McCollum	Scott, David
Israel	McDermott	Sensenbrenner
Issa	McGovern	Serrano
Jackson Lee	McKinley	Sherman
Jeffries	McNerney	Sinema
Johnson (GA)	McSally	Sires
Johnson, E. B.	Meeks	Slaughter
Jolly	Meng	Speier
Jones	Moore	Swalwell (CA)
Kaptur	Moulton	Takai
Katko	Mulvaney	Takano
Keating	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy	Napolitano	Titus
Kildee	Neal	Tonko
Kilmer	Nolan	Torres
Kind	Norcross	Tsongas
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Van Hollen
Kuster	Pascarell	Vargas
Labrador	Pelosi	Veasey
Langevin	Perlmutter	Vela
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Velázquez
Larson (CT)	Peterson	Viscosky
Lawrence	Pingree	Walz
Lee	Pocan	Wasserman
Levin	Polis	Schultz
Lewis	Price (NC)	Waters, Maxine
Lieu, Ted	Quigley	Watson Coleman
Lipinski	Rangel	Welch
LoBiondo	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)
Loeback	Richmond	Woodall
Lofgren	Rohrabacher	Yarmuth
Lowenthal	Roybal-Allard	

## NOT VOTING—6

Hinojosa	Payne	Sewell (AL)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Smith (WA)

## □ 1825

Mr. ROYCE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all of my colleagues for their work on this. Budgets aren't easy things, clearly. We have navigated some interesting times over the past couple of weeks. But I want to thank my colleagues for their wonderful and remarkable support.

I especially want to thank the staff on the Budget Committee, both the majority and the minority staff. They worked tirelessly to get these work products forward. So I just want to say before all the Members of the House of Representatives how proud I am of the staff work that has been done.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chair, I want to start by joining the chairman of the committee in thanking all Members for a vigorous debate, and especially to thank the staff of the Budget Committee.

As for the Republican budget itself, nothing has changed since we began the debate yesterday to make it any better. It is the wrong direction for America.

Madam Chair, when we gather here today, there is good news and bad news and some very bad news.

The good news is the economy has been picking up. More Americans are going back to work. Not everything is rosy. We have a long way to go, but the trends are in the right direction.

## □ 1830

The bad news is that Americans are working harder than ever, but a lot of them feel like they are running in place, and many are falling behind.

This is not a new problem. It is a chronic problem. We have seen worker productivity in this country go up and up and up over the last several decades, but that additional hard work and productivity has not translated into higher wages for most working Americans. They have seen flat paychecks.

If it is not going into higher wages for most workers, where is it going? It has gone disproportionately to the folks at the very, very top. They have been doing just great, but everybody else has been falling behind.

Now, we had some good news after the election. The Speaker of this House and the Republican leader said they understood this issue. In fact, they both wrote that they were looking forward to helping struggling middle class Americans and were looking forward to dealing with wage stagnation.

The very bad news for the country, Madam Chair, is, when you look at this Republican budget, it turns out they were just kidding because this Republican budget is very hard on hard-working Americans and on those looking to find a job. It says one message: work even harder; take home even less.

It does absolutely nothing to increase the take home pay of workers or to increase their wages. It will increase the tax burden on millions of working families. Amazingly, it eliminates the college tax deduction. It increases the costs for working Americans by getting rid of the bump up in the child tax credit. It gets rid of the rate bump up in the "make work pay" earned income tax credit.

For students, it makes college much more expensive. This Republican budget actually increases the costs of going to college. It increases the costs of student loans even as we hit over \$1 trillion in student debt. It eliminates \$90 billion worth of Pell grants.

For seniors, they will immediately see higher prescription drug costs by

reopening the doughnut hole. They will immediately see higher copays for preventative care, and seniors in nursing homes will see much worse care as they cut \$900 billion from Medicaid.

Now, while this budget squeezes working families and students and seniors, it paves the way for the Romney-Ryan tax cut plan—to cut tax rates for the folks at the very top—on the theory that somehow that is going to trickle down and boost the economy. It is a theory that crashed in the real world under President Bush when incomes for folks at the top went up but when everybody else's fell behind.

While it makes life harder on working Americans right now, it also disinvests in the future of America. It dramatically cuts our investment in early education and K-12. It dramatically cuts our investment in innovation and science and research, which has helped power our economy. It assumes that the transportation trust fund will begin to run dry in a month and a half and that construction jobs will come short in a few months.

The one thing it doesn't cut is any of the special interest tax breaks for the purpose of reducing the deficit—not one—not for corporate jets. In fact, today, the Ways and Means Committee worked to provide a big tax break for 5,500 American families, and an average of 75 percent of them have \$20 million estates. They didn't want to touch that for the purpose of reducing the deficit, so they don't cut a single tax break.

Despite all of that disinvestment in America, here is the thing: the budget never balances; it doesn't come close.

Look at the USA Today editorial. They are not a partisan paper. They said it is pure fantasy to claim that this balances; it doesn't balance, but it does disinvest in America.

We can do a lot better. We can do a lot better than a budget that continues to rig the rules for the folks who have already made it and one that makes life harder for everybody else. Let's reject this Republican budget, and let's get started back to work for the American people.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chair, it has been said that budgets are about visions and that they are moral documents, and they are.

What is our vision? We believe in promoting the greatest amount of opportunity and the greatest amount of success for the greatest number of Americans so that the greatest number of American dreams can be realized and doing so in a way that demonstrates real hope and real compassion and real fairness without Washington's picking winners and losers.

Many of our friends here on this floor have talked about budgets being moral documents, and they are. Let me ask, Madam Chair: Where is the morality in trapping disadvantaged people in a web

of welfare programs that discourage self-sufficiency and, instead, shackle them to government dependency?

Where is the morality, Madam Chair, in committing retirees to a health coverage program that is going bankrupt and that can't keep its promises if its so-called protectors keep blocking reform?

Where is the morality, Madam Chair, in forcing low-income people into second rate health programs in which many can't get appointments and in which doctors are grossly under-reimbursed by the government?

Where is the morality, Madam Chair, in stifling medical innovation and preventing new treatments from reaching patients because of ever-expanding Washington bureaucracy and red tape?

Where is the morality, Madam Chair, in tying college students to years of crippling debt because of a government-run program loan that drives up tuitions?

Where is the morality in heaping trillions of dollars of debt onto future generations to finance today's government spending because today's policymakers refuse to stop overspending?

Those are only a few examples of the regrettable consequences of well-intentioned, government-sponsored compassion. This Republican budget aims to break that pattern. It is not about cutting programs. It is about saving and strengthening programs to ensure a sustainable safety net for those who need it while encouraging and helping others to sustain themselves, the most truly compassionate thing that one can do for another. That is the morality of this budget.

What does this budget do? It balances in less than 10 years without raising taxes. It reduces spending by over \$5.5 trillion. It repeals ObamaCare and the Independent Payment Advisory Board. It ensures a strong defense.

It makes sure that we save and strengthen and secure Medicare and Medicaid. We restore federalism and provide greater opportunity and greater choices for individuals in our States across this Nation, and we cut waste and corporate welfare.

These are positive solutions for the American people, A Balanced Budget for a Stronger America. I encourage a "yes" vote so we can get the economy rolling again.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. DELAURO. Madam Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this budget. Hardworking American families are in deep trouble. Their wages have been stagnant or in decline for 30 years. Their jobs have been sent overseas by bad trade deals. They have seen none of the benefit of the economic recovery. These families are struggling to put bread on their tables and heat their homes, let alone take a vacation or start a college fund. Many are just one big expense away from disaster.

We should be working to support these families, and make sure that they do not fall deep-

er into poverty. Instead, this radical and regressive budget would pull the rug out from under them.

It would cut \$1.8 trillion from Medicaid, and rob 14 million people of their coverage. It would turn the whole program into a block grant, leaving millions of families in limbo.

It would repeal the Affordable Care Act, increasing by millions the number of uninsured people in this country.

It would partly privatize Medicare, allowing private insurers to cherry pick healthy seniors and leaving the rest of the program in ruins.

It would block-grant the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, reducing benefits and barring access to this lifeline for millions of people.

It would freeze the maximum Pell grant, denying low-income students a chance at college just as they need it more than ever to get into the middle class.

All this at a time when we are spending close to \$1.5 trillion every year on tax breaks and loopholes—much of it directed toward the wealthy and special interests. That is the spending we should be going after.

Hardworking Americans need our help. After years of neglect, we should be investing in them once more. Instead, this budget leaves them out in the cold. We cannot allow this to happen. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 163, amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 6, offered by Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, is finally adopted and shall be reported to the House.

Under the rule, the Committee rises. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 27) establishing the budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, and, pursuant to House Resolution 163, she reported the concurrent resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on H. Con. Res. 27 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 199, not voting 6, as follows:

Abraham	Griffith	Poliquin
Aderholt	Grothman	Pompeo
Allen	Guinta	Posey
Amodei	Guthrie	Price, Tom
Babin	Hanna	Ratcliffe
Barletta	Hardy	Reed
Barr	Harper	Reichert
Barton	Harris	Renacci
Benishek	Hartzler	Ribble
Bilirakis	Heck (NV)	Rice (SC)
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Rigell
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Roby
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Boehner	Hudson	Rohrabacher
Bost	Huizenga (MI)	Rokita
Boustany	Hultgren	Rooney (FL)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Brat	Hurd (TX)	Roskam
Bridenstine	Hurt (VA)	Ross
Brooks (AL)	Issa	Rothfus
Brooks (IN)	Jenkins (KS)	Rouzer
Buchanan	Jenkins (WV)	Royce
Buchanan	Johnson (OH)	Russell
Bucshon	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Jordan	Salmon
Byrne	Joyce	Sanford
Calvert	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	King (IA)	Schock
Carter (TX)	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Chabot	Kinzing (IL)	Sessions
Chaffetz	Klaine	Shimkus
Clawson (FL)	Knight	Shuster
Coffman	LaMalfa	Simpson
Cole	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Collins (GA)	Lance	Smith (NE)
Collins (NY)	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Conaway	Long	Smith (TX)
Cook	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Costello (PA)	Love	Stewart
Cramer	Lucas	Stivers
Crenshaw	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
Culberson	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	MacArthur	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Tiberi
Denham	Marino	Tipton
Dent	McCarthy	Trott
DeSantis	McCaul	Turner
DesJarlais	McClintock	Upton
Diaz-Balart	McHenry	Valadao
Dold	McMorris	Wagner
Duffy	Rodgers	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	Meadows	Walden
Duncan (TN)	Meehan	Walker
Ellmers (NC)	Messer	Walorski
Emmer (MN)	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Farenthold	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Fincher	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Fleming	Mullin	Westmoreland
Flores	Murphy (PA)	Whitfield
Forbes	Neugebauer	Williams
Fortenberry	Newhouse	Wilson (SC)
Fox	Noem	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Nugent	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Nunes	Woodall
Garrett	Olson	Yoder
Gibbs	Palazzo	Yoho
Gohmert	Palmer	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Paulsen	Young (IA)
Gosar	Pearce	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Perry	Zeldin
Granger	Pittenger	Zinke
Graves (GA)	Pitts	
Graves (LA)	Poe (TX)	
Graves (MO)		

#### NAYS—199

Adams	Boyle, Brendan	Cartwright
Aguilar	F.	Castor (FL)
Amash	Brady (PA)	Castro (TX)
Ashford	Brown (FL)	Chu, Judy
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Beatty	Buck	Clark (MA)
Becerra	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bera	Butterfield	Clay
Beyer	Capps	Cleaver
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Clyburn
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cohen
Bonamici	Carney	Comstock
	Carson (IN)	Connolly

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—228

Conyers	Jolly	Pelosi
Cooper	Jones	Perlmutter
Costa	Kaptur	Peters
Courtney	Katko	Peterson
Crawford	Keating	Pingree
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Cuellar	Kennedy	Polis
Cummings	Kildee	Price (NC)
Davis (CA)	Kilmer	Quigley
Davis, Danny	Kind	Rangel
DeFazio	Kirkpatrick	Rice (NY)
DeGette	Kuster	Richmond
Delaney	Labrador	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeSaulnier	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda
Dingell	Lee	T.
Doggett	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta
Doyle, Michael	Lewis	Sarbanes
F.	Lieu, Ted	Schakowsky
Duckworth	Lipinski	Schiff
Edwards	LoBiondo	Schrader
Ellison	Loeb	Schweikert
Engel	Lofgren	Scott (VA)
Eshoo	Lowenthal	Scott, David
Esty	Lowe	Sensenbrenner
Farr	Lujan Grisham	Serrano
Fattah	(NM)	Sherman
Foster	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sinema
Frankel (FL)	(NM)	Sires
Fudge	Lynch	Slaughter
Gabbard	Maloney,	Speier
Gallo	Carolyn	Swalwell (CA)
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Takai
Gibson	Massie	Takano
Graham	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
Grayson	McCollum	Thompson (MS)
Green, Al	McDermott	Titus
Green, Gene	McGovern	Tonko
Grijalva	McKinley	Torres
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Tsongas
Hahn	McSally	Van Hollen
Hastings	Meeks	Vargas
Heck (WA)	Meng	Veasey
Higgins	Moore	Vela
Himes	Moulton	Velázquez
Honda	Mulvaney	Visclosky
Hoyer	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Huelskamp	Nadler	Wasserman
Huffman	Napolitano	Schultz
Israel	Neal	Waters, Maxine
Jackson Lee	Nolan	Watson Coleman
Jeffries	Norcross	Welch
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarella	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—

Hinojosa	Payne	Sewell (AL)
O'Rourke	Ruiz	Smith (WA)

□ 1854

So the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

# REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, MEDICARE ACCESS AND CHIP REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM MARCH 27, 2015, THROUGH APRIL 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-50) on the resolution (H. Res. 173) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from March 27, 2015, through April 10, 2015, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECERRA. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 172

*Resolved*, That the following named Member be and is hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—Mr. Moulton.

Mr. BECERRA (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 612

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 612.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

## HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later.

## SLAIN OFFICER FAMILY SUPPORT ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1527) to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1527

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Slain Officer Family Support Act of 2015".

### SEC. 2. ACCELERATION OF INCOME TAX BENEFITS FOR CHARITABLE CASH CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RELIEF OF THE FAMILIES OF NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT DETECTIVES WENJIAN LIU AND RAFAEL RAMOS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 a taxpayer may treat any contribution described in subsection (b) made between January 1, 2015, and April 15, 2015, as if such contribution was made on December 31, 2014, and not in 2015.

(b) CONTRIBUTION DESCRIBED.—A contribution is described in this subsection if such contribution is a cash contribution made for the relief of the families of slain New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, for which a charitable contribution deduction is allowable under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—In the case of a contribution described in subsection (b), a telephone bill showing the name of the donee organization, the date of the contribution, and the amount of the contribution shall be treated as meeting the recordkeeping requirements of section 170(f)(17) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) CLARIFICATION THAT CONTRIBUTION WILL NOT FAIL TO QUALIFY AS A CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTION.—A cash contribution made for the relief of the families of slain New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos shall not fail to be treated as a charitable contribution for purposes of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and subsection (b) of this section merely because such contribution is for the exclusive benefit of such families. The preceding sentence shall apply to contributions made on or after December 20, 2014.

(e) CLARIFICATION THAT PAYMENTS BY CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS TO FAMILIES

TREATED AS EXEMPT PAYMENTS.—For purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, payments made on or after December 20, 2014, and on or before October 15, 2015, to the spouse or any dependent (as defined in section 152 of such Code) of slain New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu or Rafael Ramos by an organization which (determined without regard to any such payments) would be an organization exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code shall—

(1) be treated as related to the purpose or function constituting the basis for such organization's exemption under such section, and

(2) shall not be treated as inuring to the benefit of any private individual, if such payments are made in good faith using a reasonable and objective formula which is consistently applied with respect to such Detectives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

□ 1900

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1527, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am going to let Mr. JEFFRIES from New York explain what the bill does. This is something that I want to thank the gentleman from New York for bringing to our attention. This is the kind of thing we have done in the past under certain situations in emergencies such as this.

I would simply like to thank the gentleman for bringing it to our attention, and I think Mr. JEFFRIES can explain the bill very well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first thank Chairman RYAN for his leadership and his support in bringing this important legislation, the Slain Officer Family Support Act of 2015, to the floor of the House of Representatives.

Let me also thank my good friend, the lead Republican cosponsor, Representative PETER KING, for his partnership on this bill, which is of great importance to the people of New York, as well as law enforcement throughout the entire Nation.

It is an honor and a privilege for me to represent the Eighth Congressional

District in New York City, proud home of the New York Police Department, one of the finest in the world.

On December 20, 2014, unspeakable tragedy struck the Bedford Stuyvesant community that I represent. While sitting in their marked patrol car, Detectives Wen Jian Liu and Rafael Ramos were approached from behind and, without warning, assassinated at pointblank range through the passenger side window.

Liu and Ramos, both Brooklyn residents, had been assigned to patrol the Tompkins public housing development in Bedford Stuyvesant as part of a "critical-response detail" responding to an increase in violence over the previous year. They volunteered to be there as part of their willingness to protect and serve the people of New York City. They were killed simply for wearing that blue uniform.

Detective Liu, age 32, who moved to Brooklyn's Gravesend section earlier that year, was the only son of Chinese American immigrants and came to the United States with his family at the age of 12. He is survived by his parents and his new wife, whom he just married a month prior to that fateful day.

Committed to his adopted New York City, Mr. Liu was inspired to become a police officer after witnessing the attacks on September 11. After studying at both Kingsboro Community College and the College of Staten Island, he joined the auxiliary police in 2006 and in 2007 graduated from the police academy. Detective Liu served as a New York Police Department officer for 7 years.

Detective Ramos, a 2-year veteran of the NYPD, had recently celebrated his 40th birthday. He was a lifelong Brooklyn resident. He was committed to his community and active in his church in Glendale, Queens.

Rafael Ramos first served as a school safety agent before realizing his long-time dream of becoming a police officer in January 2012. He then decided that he also wanted to become a police chaplain. He spent 10 weeks studying to get his certification. His chaplain class was scheduled to graduate at 4 p.m. on the day he was killed. Detective Ramos had intended on going into full-time ministry after retiring from the New York Police Department.

He is survived by his wife and two sons, Jaden, 13, and Justin, a 19-year-old college student.

Throughout New York and across this Nation, there was an outpouring of love and support for these two men and the families that they left behind.

Under current law, individuals contributing to organizations that provide financial support to the families of the slain detectives were required to make their contributions by December 31 of last year in order to qualify for a tax deduction in connection with a 2015 filing.

Those officers were assassinated on December 20. This bill extends the date of eligibility. Upon enactment, charitable contributions made by this year's April 15 tax deadline would be deductible immediately.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has scored the bill as having a negligible budgetary impact of \$500,000 or less over 10 years. It is similar, as Chairman RYAN pointed out, to legislation this Congress passed in 2014 and in 2010 in the wake of natural disasters in the Philippines and Haiti.

The assassinations of Detective Ramos and Detective Liu were a national tragedy that shocked the conscience of America and shook New York City to its core. In the aftermath, we cannot forget the families left behind when these two brave heroes were killed tragically in the line of duty. As part of that effort, this legislation will take a significant step in that direction.

Let me again thank Chairman RYAN and Representative KING, as well as the other cosponsors of the bill, for their support in bringing this legislation to the floor.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to support H.R. 1527, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from New York said it very, very well. I think this is the right and appropriate thing to do, and I thank him for bringing it to our attention.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Slain Officer Family Support Act of 2015. This bill, championed by Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES, which I was proud to co-sponsor, will encourage charitable contributions to the families of slain New York Police Department (NYPD) Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos by extending the tax deduction period for such contributions. I have been fortunate to meet and talk with the families of these two heroes.

The government has a moral duty to reward those who step forward in times of tragedy. The Slain Officer Family Support Act is critical to ensuring that those who kindly assist the families of slain NYPD Officers Liu and Ramos are rewarded. I commend Representative JEFFRIES for his hard work on this important bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, every day hundreds of thousands of federal, state, and local law enforcement officers put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe. Unfortunately, the grave risk that our law enforcement officers face was tragically confirmed again this past Christmas when on-duty NYPD officers Ramos and Liu were murdered while simply sitting in their squad car. Regrettably, attacks against our nation's law enforcement officials are too common. Just yesterday, we read the news about two more law enforcement officers, San Jose Police Officer Michael Johnson and a state trooper in Wisconsin,



who were shot and killed responding to incidents. Every loss of life is tragic. Our communities are particularly heartbroken when the life of a law enforcement official is taken. But when the funerals are over and the news subsides, it is families and coworkers who must continue to cope with the tragic loss.

Thankfully, many Americans did what they could to ease the burden of the family members that Detectives Ramos and Liu left behind. That is why I am proud to support the Slain Officer Family Support Act. This bill would provide those who have opened their hearts to the families of these slain officers with a corresponding charitable deduction on their 2014 tax returns. We must continue to honor and remember the sacrifice of these officers and support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1527.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### STAFF SERGEANT JOSEPH D'AUGUSTINE UNITED STATES POST OFFICE RENAMING

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and legacy of one of New Jersey's sons, Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine of Waldwick, New Jersey.

Staff Sergeant D'Augustine was killed almost 3 years ago this week, on March 27, 2012, while conducting combat operations in Afghanistan. In the greatest act of sacrifice possible, he gave his life while protecting his fellow men and women in uniform. He was just 29 years old.

Today, I come to the floor of the House to introduce legislation that will ensure that Staff Sergeant D'Augustine's legacy lives on for generations to come.

This legislation will designate the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building.

Understandably, no action by this Congress could ever repay Staff Sergeant D'Augustine's sacrifice. This bill, however, will create a permanent and visible memory of his heroism.

Although this bill passed this House last Congress, unfortunately, my colleagues in the Senate did not take it up. So I come here tonight, hopeful that my colleagues in both the House and Senate will take action to get this bill passed and signed into law so that his legacy will live on.

#### JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING ACT

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, sex trafficking is one of the world's most monstrous, pervasive, and underpenalized crimes. Up to 300,000 American children are at risk of being trafficked annually.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, which I coauthored with Congressman POE and which passed this House unanimously in January, clarifies that the true criminals are the traffickers who enslave adolescents and the johns who prey upon them.

The bill would create stiffer penalties and enforcement for the demand side of human trafficking and provide restitution to the survivors.

The bill has strong support in the other body, but it is being complicated by a proposed expansion of the Hyde amendment, which I do not support.

We must pass this bill. The Senate should either take up the House-passed version or find some other compromise. The voiceless victims of modern-day slavery in its most horrific form of cruelty cannot afford to wait any longer.

#### REMEMBERING DAVID MARSH

(Mrs. LOVE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to stand with others in my district—my constituents—and offer my heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of David Marsh, who passed away early Monday.

David became the victim of a senseless act of violence as he stood behind the counter of Lee Mart, the convenience store where he worked for 25 years in Murray, Utah. He was shot during a robbery.

Many individuals are honored on this floor after receiving accolades and publicity, but I wish to honor David because of his consistent positive impact on others. He made a profound impression on those he met through his hard work and dedication. He was a wonderful father and role model who became a fixture in the community. His kind and loving nature made his family, friends, and acquaintances smile.

It is people like David who make our Nation great. I hope that we can all honor the life of David Marsh by being engaged citizens and connecting with love and understanding to the people around us.

#### GERMANWINGS FLIGHT 9525

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening with deep sadness in the wake of the terrible tragedy involving Germanwings Flight 9525.

While the investigation is still ongoing, it is believed that all 150 passengers on board have been lost, including three American citizens. Also on board were 16 German students who were on their way back to Germany following their 10th-grade class trip to Spain.

Mr. Speaker, every tragedy of this magnitude brings heartbreak, but we are especially saddened by the loss of so many young people full of hope and promise.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that investigators can quickly determine the cause of this tragedy for the victims' families.

As cochair of the bipartisan German-American Congressional Caucus, I want to offer my heartfelt thoughts and prayers to all the victims and their families, and our allies in the several countries currently addressing this tragedy.

#### CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: THE BUDGET'S IMPACT ON WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, my colleagues and I debated and passed a budget about which I have quite a few concerns.

Budgets are statements of values. They should map out the priorities we have for our Nation. The resolution that the House adopted earlier suggests that our priorities are the interests of the top 1 percent of earners, the interests of corporations. Certainly, not the interests of working families.

□ 1915

Mr. Speaker, according to a Pew Center analysis of census data, 4 out of every 10 households with children now have a mother who is either the sole or primary bread winner. That means that 40 percent of families are led by woman.

As we approach the end of Women's History Month, my Congressional Progressive Caucus colleague and I have

come to the floor this evening to talk about the impacts of the Republican budget on women.

As I have said, women now lead 40 percent of our Nation's households with children, a huge socioeconomic shift for this country; but when you dig deeper, 25 percent of those households are single-parent homes where women are the only provider. Those women need health care to be able to keep going to work. As we know, Mr. Speaker, not every employer offers health care.

Fortunately, 5 years ago, we passed the Affordable Care Act, and now, more than 16 million Americans have access to health insurance, many of them for the first time.

The Affordable Care Act gave women more control over their health than they have ever had before, with free preventative care, including annual screenings, and free coverage for contraceptives. There were also a host of benefits, economic and otherwise.

The Congressional Budget Office projects that combined Federal spending for Medicare, Medicaid, and the Children's Health Insurance Program, commonly referred to as CHIP, will be \$682 billion less over the 2011–2020 period than projected in 2010 without the Affordable Care Act.

Our national healthcare costs have, indeed, slowed dramatically. The uninsured rate for working-age adults dropped 35 percent, from 20.3 to 13.2 percent; but it seems that all the bill's benefits don't mean much to my Republican colleagues who have found a huge and factually questionable portion of their budget's "savings" from repealing the law.

Mr. Speaker, we have just discussed the impact of health care and the Republicans' budget repeal of the ACA. Without access to the health care they need for themselves and their families, Republicans must be assuming that women will be able to take paid time off for work. Unfortunately, we passed the wrong budget for that.

To tell you a little more about this problem, it is my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE).

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to support the people's budget.

The Federal budget is not just a financial document; it is a moral document. The best way to grow our economy is to ensure that Americans have good jobs that pay a livable wage.

The numbers that you just heard is a fact. In 40 percent of households with children under 18, mothers are either the only or the primary source of income for the family. Many of these mothers do not have the support of affordable childcare, paid family leave, or paid sick days.

Increasing the minimum wage and providing paid medical or sick leave

will have a direct positive impact on millions of working mothers. As of last month, 3 States and 17 cities will soon have or now have paid sick leave day laws. This is a good start, but, as Members of Congress, we need to set a national standard, and we need to do it now.

Our Nation's failure to establish a basic workplace standard of paid sick days is hurting workers, is hurting families and the public health. Nearly 4 in 10 private sector workers and 80 percent of the low wage workers do not have a single paid sick day. Is that what we want our budget to reflect?

The Republicans say they are for families; yet their budget represents more of the same. The budget that the Republicans have introduced doesn't invest in growing our infrastructure. It cuts vital programs like Medicaid and helps keep working families in poverty. This is totally unacceptable. Paid sick days keep families financially secure, workplaces and communities healthy and productive.

The Institute for Women's Policy Research calculates that the Federal Government could prevent over 2,600 lost jobs for women. Why? Because 2,600 women left their jobs because they were not offered paid parental leave.

The people's budget will create over 8 million good-paying new jobs by 2018. The people's budget also ensures that our tax codes work for everyone by closing tax loopholes and expanding the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit.

Mr. Speaker, I support the people's budget because deficit reduction should not be fixed on the backs of hard-working Americans. We must put people first. Do you pay your car note before you buy groceries for your family? No.

I agree that we must pay down the deficit; but at what cost?

There are many things we must cover in our Federal budget, but, Mr. Speaker, people must be first.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, with more women as the primary breadwinners than ever, it is important to point out that two-thirds of the minimum wage workers are women.

Women are notoriously underrepresented with equal pay for equal work. The Federal minimum wage right now is only \$7.25 per hour. A woman working full time would make just \$14,500. That is below the poverty line for a family of three.

If we want to make sure American families can work hard to get ahead, it seems that we would want to make sure they are getting paid enough to do so; yet this issue is completely absent from the Republican budget, and still, women will be notoriously underpaid for the work that they do.

Mr. Speaker, women are also notoriously underrepresented in science,

technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. These are the jobs of tomorrow. These are the jobs that will grow our economy, that will make us globally competitive.

Unfortunately, we cannot address these issues of underrepresentation of women in those areas—science, technology, engineering, and mathematics—because the Republican budget that we passed today does not think it is important.

The people's budget, on the other hand, would lift the minimum wage, would increase the opportunities for women in educational fields where they have been underrepresented and would result in a raise for more than 27.8 million workers, including the 15.3 million women.

There are broader societal impacts to raising the minimum wage as well. For starters, since women are the majority of minimum wage workers, lifting that Federal minimum wage would close the pay gap by nearly 5 percent. I know it has been said time and again, Mr. Speaker, but raising the minimum wage will also boost our economy.

For these workers, additional wages aren't dropping into savings accounts; they are paying for things they need right now. Research indicates that for every \$1 added to minimum wage, low wage worker households spent an additional \$2,800 the following year. That is a win-win situation.

Unfortunately, we didn't adopt the budget that included the minimum wage increase. We adopted the budget that included new tax cuts for the top 1 percent at the expense of the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, the point that we have tried to make here is that we have passed the wrong budget. The Republican budget is wrong for women. It is wrong for the middle class. It is wrong for the Nation's economy.

The foundations of the American Dream are crumbling beneath our feet just right as we speak, with stagnant wages, struggling schools, and a wealth gap that is only getting bigger.

We can't move forward with policies that are only going to make matters worse. We need to open our eyes and fight together for policies that will build an economy that works for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### THE FUTURE FORUM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SWALWELL) for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address one of the greatest moral crises of our time:

student loan debt on my generation. Because of student loan debt, an entire generation is in financial quicksand.

Here are some startling facts of the student loan debt that our generation carries today. Approximately 40 million Americans had one or more student loans. The average amount owed on student loans is \$33,000, and 70 percent of students graduating this year will be burdened with this debt.

On average, it will take a student with this debt, graduating with a bachelor's degree, over 19 years to pay off their loans.

This evening, the House Democratic Caucus' Future Forum will address this moral crisis, and we have got a number of Members who will work with us this evening to talk about their personal stories or stories that they are hearing in their district.

We have also asked Americans across our country, including in my congressional district in the East Bay, to tweet or Facebook at us under #mystudentdebt or #futureforum; and we will answer some of their tweets this evening.

First, I am going to yield to a colleague of mine who came in, in the 113th Congress, somebody who had student loan debt himself and represents a district in Washington, Mr. KILMER.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a small town in Washington State that I now have the opportunity and the honor of representing.

My folks were schoolteachers. My father, actually, this year, is in his 50th year as a teacher in the classroom. The reality is I couldn't have gone to college if it hadn't been for the support of my community and the assistance of financial aid.

I got grants and I got loans that made the dream of college a reality, and I had a community that had my back, that literally passed the hat by providing me with scholarships to help me fulfill my own dreams of a college education.

I believe that education is the door to opportunity, and for a lot of families, including mine, financial aid is the key to that door; but the reality is, for too many families today, that door is locked. We have got work to do.

In 2013, Democrats and Republicans came together to pass legislation to protect student borrowers so that they can obtain low interest rates, but our work isn't done. We need to continue to have a commitment to quality and affordable education.

That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of a bill that would allow those with outstanding student loan debt to be able to refinance at the same low rate as new borrowers.

□ 1930

Two and a half centuries ago, Benjamin Franklin wrote: "An investment in knowledge pays the greatest inter-

est." I think that was true when he wrote it, and I think it remains true today. We know this.

Not every student is going to go to college, but we know that college is a door-opener. We know that. And we know that America's competitiveness depends on our ability to have a good, skilled, qualified workforce, to have quality educational opportunities for our workforce. We know that as educational attainment rises, so do wages and so do employment levels.

We know that it is wiser to invest in education on the front end than it is to pay for prisons and unemployment on the back end; and that, to a large degree, is a decision that we make as a country and as a society. But that only works if we provide opportunities for students, if we ensure that they don't drown in debt.

In our Nation, student loan debt now surpasses credit card debt. We need to make sure that when young people graduate college, they have an opportunity to join the workforce, to start a business, or to teach the next generation, not simply to be bogged down with debt.

One of the coolest parts of this job is the opportunity to get to meet with young people, to get to meet with college students and high school students, people who have a long way ahead of them. And I think about what I want for those students. I think about what I want for my own kids. I want them to be able to look at the future not with fear of debt and fear of astronomical financial obligations but with hope for their future.

I know that the college education that I was afforded and the financial aid that I received that paid for that college opportunity enabled me to live a lifetime that was filled with hope. So we have got work to do. And I, for one, am committed to working with the good gentleman from California and others in this Congress—hopefully from both sides of the aisle—to address this opportunity and make sure that all young people and, frankly, all who want to pursue educational opportunity see that door open to them.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I know there are a number of colleges in your district in Washington or around your district. And when you talk to young people today and they are thinking about going to college, how much are you hearing that the potential of debt is weighing on that decision?

Mr. KILMER. I appreciate the question. It is the main concern that we hear.

I was in a high school classroom just last month and heard concerns from students who said: I want to go to college. I want to pursue that opportunity, but I am fearful that I won't be able to afford it.

We have seen in my State and in States all throughout this country that

as States faced difficult budget times, two things happened. One, State support for our educational institutions got cut, and tuition rose. Oftentimes, financial aid—either from the institutions or from other sources—didn't keep up with those increases in tuition. So young people are concerned about that. They recognize that further education is going to be really important for their chances of getting a good job. Again, not every job requires higher education, but as we look at those fastest-growing jobs in our economy, more and more of those jobs require at least some postsecondary education.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. And is it just young people who are concerned about it? What do you hear from their parents as far as what the debt means if they have got a child who has just graduated college and is out there in the job market? Are you hearing from the parents as well?

Mr. KILMER. It is certainly a huge concern.

In nearly every town hall meeting I have, concerns around student loan debt and access to affordable, quality education come up. But even outside of parents, there are folks in my community who have, unfortunately, lost their jobs and want to go back to school.

I was at Olympic College in my district in Bremerton, Washington, and their foundation had a luncheon that was to support students and their ability to pay for college. We heard from one of the students who was a more mature student who had started her college career either sleeping in her car or sleeping in the student center. And that, for too many people, is a reality these days. We need to make sure that education is affordable, that education is quality, and that the key that financial aid represents to that door of opportunity is available for everybody.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I thank the gentleman from Washington, and I look forward to seeing your good work across Washington and in this Congress to address this moral crisis of our generation.

Mr. KILMER. Thank you.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I mentioned that we are going to be having a conversation not just here on the House floor, but we have been talking to young Americans and people with student debt across America. So you can tweet on your phone at #mystudentdebt or on Facebook at #mystudentdebt or also tweet under #futureforum.

I just want to read one of the first tweets that came in on this, and this came from Natalie Collier. She is from my hometown in Dublin, California. It is a place where, when I was growing up there, only less than 30 percent of the high school graduates were going on to 4-year universities. That number has more than doubled today. But

young people like Natalie who have gone on to college have this to say.

She is in college now and she said that she pays \$300 each month to reduce her interest payments, and without such payments, she could save to buy a house.

So we are asking on social media, first: What is your monthly payment for your student loan debt? For some student loans, you have to start paying them immediately while you are still in college, especially for many of the private ones. Others you have to pay them immediately upon graduation.

The second question is: What would you do with that money if you weren't spending it on your student loan debt? How would you spend that money?

With Natalie's \$300, we can imagine if she didn't have to spend that on her student loan debt, that would be spent in the economy, hopefully allowing her to save to buy a home, pay her auto payment, pay her rent, hopefully near where she works, and she doesn't have to spend as much time on the road.

So there is a ripple effect that goes out into the economy if we can lessen the burden that the student loan debt has on younger people in our country.

This issue is one that is personal to me because I have student loan debt. My student loan story is that I was fortunate to go to college on an athletic scholarship. That was the only reason I was able to go to college.

My parents were not able to afford to send me to college, and I knew that I had to work hard and play soccer well, and that would be my ticket and that I would be the first in my family to go to college. But like many young athletes, I got injured. I wanted to stay in college, so I had to take out student loans. About 90 percent of the student loans I took out were Federal student loans, but there had to be a bridge between the Federal student loans I had and the tuition that I owed. So we had to take out some higher interest private loans.

Over \$100,000 is what I have today, and I never complained about it. I knew it was an investment in my future. And I worked every job I could to try to make it work and to meet the tuition demands that I had every semester.

But I have talked to young people from where I grew up and across our country, and I have realized that this isn't something that is just affecting me. I pay roughly \$400 a month still on my student loan debt. It is something that is weighing like an anchor on young people across our country—41 million young people, approximately, with over \$1 trillion in student debt.

It weighs on every major decision they have to make in their formative years: when or whether to start a family, being able to buy their first home, leaving the job they have to take a risk and go out and start a business on their own.

Of all of these decisions, the biggest factor for young people today is that student debt that they carry. And it is weighing them down. It is weighing an entire generation down, and it is something that this United States Congress must do.

I am glad to see here for his second Future Forum appearance my colleague from Colorado, Congressman JARED POLIS.

And I would be interested, Congressman POLIS, in what you think and what you are hearing from young people as far as how this weighs on decisions they have to make and what we can do here in the Congress.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from California for his leadership on this issue and for raising public awareness about the role that Congress should play and is failing to play with regard to making college more affordable.

This morning I had the opportunity to meet with the chancellor of one of our flagship State universities in the district I represent, the University of Colorado at Boulder. Chancellor Phil DiStefano came by, and we talked a lot about college affordability.

Now, the university, in its own right, I am proud to say, is doing what they can. They are creating a new 3-year program, where students can graduate in 3 years and only have to pay for 3 years of tuition. They are also creating an interest-free installment program, where students can pay their fees spread out over a longer period of time without interest, financed through the university.

And I am very proud to report that CU will only increase student tuition by 3 percent this year, which is the lowest increase in several decades.

Now, moving from what many of our universities are trying to do in their own right to what Congress can do is where we need to shift the discussion here. Making student loans more affordable, reducing the interest rate, and in some cases, raising the cap available are all absolutely, absolutely critical to help young people afford a higher education that enables them to succeed in the workforce.

We are not doing enough. We ought to address some of the cost drivers within higher education. I think we took a good first step with the Affordable Care Act, with looking at some of the costs of health care in education.

Another example is looking at some of the costs of content acquisition. Dr. Phil DiStefano was telling me that their library costs of acquiring material and keeping their professional journal subscriptions is increasing at 15 percent a year. One of their cost drivers. That is why some of us here supported a bill—and President Obama took the first steps on this—to make sure that taxpayer-supported research, money that is funded through NIH re-

search—it is funded through NIH or NASA, taxpayer-funded research—is made freely available to the public and is not only available in prescription journals that not only raise the costs for our universities but make access to the very science that we, the people, financed less egalitarian by limiting it to those who can pay for it.

In addition, we talked about open source textbooks. Would you believe that after you pay tuition, after you finally, you know—oh, my gosh, with this debt and my parents' help and my job—oh, but then guess what? \$1,100 for textbooks. I kid you not.

I had heard from a lot of students that their textbooks were \$1,100, \$1,200. And I asked the chancellor today. I said, Am I hearing from the students in the worst-case scenario? He said, No, that is average. That is average. It is costing the average student \$1,100 a semester for the textbooks they need to succeed. We don't need that. We can, through innovation, disintermediate that and have collaborative open source content of the same or superior quality that professors put together for students and is available for free or near free.

It doesn't matter if people want it online or as a textbook. The physical act of producing a textbook is only \$3 or \$4, not \$50 or \$100. Most of that profit margin goes to textbook companies. Very little is with the authors or the professors who contributed the work. They largely do it for professional consideration and prestige. And if we can build a culture that supports and empowers content platforms that are open source, we can truly bring down those textbook costs which are so onerous for students in higher education.

So we should challenge Congress to do something about the looming student debt crisis, not just for the students that are accruing it today, but for people who graduated 5 or 10 years ago and are still suffering under the yoke of the debt that they incurred that allowed them to have a decent job in America.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I mean, this seems like a problem of, What do you do with the student today and the student tomorrow? And that revolves around what the interest rates are going to be.

And you just alluded to, this isn't just about today and tomorrow. This is about the generation that took on the debt and is carrying it now and is in the workforce.

We have just introduced in the Congress the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act, introduced by our colleague from Connecticut, JOE COURTNEY, which kind of goes to this. And maybe you could talk a little bit about what can we do for students who already have this debt and they hear most of the focus being on the interest rate for the future. What can we try to

help them as they try to navigate with this debt?

Mr. POLIS. We can't forget students who financed their education at higher interest rates, when inflation was higher, who years after their graduation still suffer under the yoke of debt. That is the reason why Representative COURTNEY brought forth his bill.

And when I hear from constituents, that is one of the top things that I hear. I hear from people who might have graduated 3 years ago, 5 years ago, even 20 years ago, but their debt load is impacting their ability to live their lives; their ability to buy a home, which they can't do because of it; their ability to have a family simply because of the way or the manner that they financed it or the time they financed it.

So I think it is absolutely appropriate for us to find a way to make sure that people are rewarded for their educational achievement and not penalized.

□ 1945

The greatest asset our country has is our intellectual capital. It is the ideas and knowledge of our people. That is our greatest asset. Yet in this day and age the fact that we are penalizing people for bettering themselves and for acquiring knowledge that is needed for our economy to succeed is absolutely ridiculous, and that is exactly what we need to do.

I invite the gentleman from California to talk about how some of these issues were highlighted in the recent budget debates we had because when a lot of people hear, oh, the Democrats and Republicans are fighting about the budget, it seems very esoteric. They say: What is this budget? What is that budget? Well, these are very important statements because it shows how each party would govern. Specifically, the visions that each budget set forth with regard to higher education, college and how to afford it are night and day.

I am hoping that you can talk about, just moments before on the floor of this very House, the budget that, unfortunately, our Republican colleagues passed and then contrast that with the budget that you and I voted for which would have made college more affordable and helped families afford college.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Just looking at the Twitter feed, we see @hi\_moya saying: As graduation approaches, my student debt looms over me like an oncoming storm. It makes me hesitant to start grad school.

I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado alluding to the budget that we, just moments ago on this House floor, voted on. We had two competing budgets when it came to many issues that are important to this country. But for my generation, looking at the generation of 18- to 35-year-olds, there is no issue that is more important and affects more people than student loan debt.

The Republican budget would cut \$220 billion in funds for college accessibility. It would cut Pell grants. It would cut subsidized student loan programs, and it cuts income-based repayment. These backward policies not only are hurting students, they are hurting the progress of our economy. They would make college more unaffordable for millions of prospective students.

Nine million students today benefit from Pell grants. Two-thirds of African American students receive Pell grants, and half of Latino students receive Pell grants. Nine out of 10 Pell grant recipients are already taking out student loans. These students need more help from their government.

I want to make it clear that no student that I have ever talked to, no student who has ever taken on the debt believes that this should just be a handout or a gift from the government. The position of the Future Forum, the position of the House Democratic Caucus is that if you believe in young people, if you take a chance on them, and if they are hard-working and qualified, they will take that investment, they will take that risk, and they will pay back their student loan debt. But we don't have to gouge them. The government doesn't have to make money on young people looking for a way up. The government doesn't have to make money on people who are looking for and seeking to seize upon opportunity.

Speaking of young people, just joining us now here in the House Chamber is a first-term Member of Congress, someone who is also making a second Future Forum appearance and someone who cares deeply about what student loan debt means for the constituents in his Pennsylvania district.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to BRENDAN BOYLE.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I very much appreciate the leadership that the gentleman from California has shown in forming our caucus, and also especially when it comes to this issue which is near and dear to my heart. I have talked many times during my campaign about the fact that I thought it would change the dynamic to now have a Member of Congress who himself has tens of thousands of dollars of student loan debt because I wanted to do exactly what we are doing tonight, be able to speak on the House floor and say, yes, this is an incredibly serious issue that needs to be dealt with as the national problem that it is.

Depending on how you judge mortgages, student loans are considered either the largest source of debt or the second largest source of debt in America today, a tenfold increase in the last 20 years—tenfold increase. That is unsustainable. I believe that it is unfair and a tremendous burden to those who are young and, frankly, not so

young and raising families of their own. But not only is there the fairness argument, there is also the argument that it just makes no sense for the United States of America in the 21st century to be going in this direction, to be penalizing those who are attempting to better themselves and become better workers, become better trained and ensure that they can participate in the workforce of the 21st century.

So I believe that this is an issue, frankly, that has been undercovered and underfocused on over the last several years. I believe that there is a danger of this actually being a student loan debt bubble. And I believe that it is about time that this Congress, the House and the Senate, finally dealt with this as the national crisis that it is.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. So I would ask the gentleman, I am looking through our Twitter feed here, and we have got a number of people who have kind of chimed in on it. One young person just tweeted at us, Dolores Tejada. She is a child of immigrants from Guatemala, and she is the first in her family to go to college. Her parents, she said, make the minimum wage, and she has been working for 6 years at a non-profit and pays \$350 a month on her student loan debt. She said without this payment, she would buy a car—she currently has to share one with the entire family—and she would move out of her parents' house.

Have you heard stories like Dolores' in your district or across our country?

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Well, first, I couldn't help identify with the tweet from Dolores. Like she, I am a first-generation American. My father is an immigrant. And like Dolores, I am the first in my family to go to college. Student loans played an important part in enabling me to go to college. So I don't in any way use my own personal experience as a woe is me. I consider myself one of the very fortunate ones.

But the fact that I had the benefit of winning scholarships and piecing together student loans and tens of thousands of them along with every work-study job you can imagine, the fact that I am actually one of the lucky ones and it was that difficult, I know so many people in the neighborhood where I grew up in Philadelphia who weren't as fortunate. I know so many people today in my neighborhood and all throughout the country who have exactly the same story that Dolores had in that she says: Well, with this extra \$350 a month, I would be buying a car; I would be saving for a down payment on a home.

It is interesting. I hear these kinds of stories not just from those who are in repayment, I hear them from Realtors who have been in the business two, three, or four decades. They will say to

me: BRENDAN, I can't tell you what a difference it is today. Back when I was starting out, I would sell so many homes to younger people, 24, 25, 26. Now I don't have one customer in their twenties. Why? Because the student loan payments are taking that up.

So that means that it doesn't only hurt the graduate who is in repayment; it also has a spillover effect in our overall economy. It hurts the Realtors. It hurts the contractors who would have done work once that young couple or the young person bought a house. It hurts the Home Depot down the street. There is this spillover effect in our economy. And it is getting to the larger point I was talking about that this is not just a problem for young people. This is a problem for families who want to send their kids to college. This is a problem for Realtors. This is a problem for anyone who wants economic development to be spurred in our country. Essentially, this is a national issue.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We are looking at Twitter, and I see Jenna on Twitter from New York City, who says: I chose a State school as the affordable choice over better schools where I was accepted and still have \$30,000 in student loan debt.

Are you seeing that in Pennsylvania where the State universities are starting to see their tuitions go up almost as much as the tuition at private universities?

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Well, unfortunately, yes. While I am a born and raised and proud Pennsylvanian, I am sad to say on this score we are the second worst in the country. We have the second most expensive public colleges and universities in the Nation. Sure enough, our Pennsylvania residents have the second highest amount of student loan debt in the country. So this is a problem affecting my State. It affects all 50 States, but, unfortunately, it is worse in my home State than almost every other State in the country.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Now, we are talking about student loan debt as well as student loan interest rates, two separate issues, but both affecting essentially the same generation. We saw just this week our colleague, JOE COURTNEY, within the past week introduced his bill. I want to see if the gentleman has a position on this. It is the Bank on Students Emergency Loan Refinancing Act. What it would do is it would allow eligible student loan borrowers to refinance their private and Federal loans. As the gentleman knows, if you have an auto loan or if you have a home loan and if you have a business loan, you can often, if qualified, refinance those loans as interest rates change and the markets change. Right now, you can't do that with student loans.

How do you think this would change the debt load that young people are

carrying today if they could take that student loan to the marketplace and find competitive refinancing rates.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I am proud to be a cosponsor of Representative COURTNEY's bill. ELIZABETH WARREN is the sponsor in the Senate of the companion legislation.

This would have a transformative effect on helping those who right now are struggling with the student loan payment. So many of the ideas that we have are more geared toward those who will be going to college and aren't yet college age. This is the one idea that can actually help those who are living today under the burden of higher student loan debt.

It is important to note that neither of us are talking about forgiving debt or eliminating debt or giving people a free ride or allowing them to get away from the debts they incur. We are simply saying allow them to have the market mechanism that so many others have; allow them to refinance at the current low rates. This would be a tremendous savings, literally tens of billions of dollars saved. And then that is money that in turn will be repumped into our economy. So I believe it would have an incredibly positive effect, and I am a strong supporter of it.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I am glad you mentioned the effect it would have on the economy. I just heard 2 minutes ago from Andreas Giraldo. He said with the \$389 that is going to student loan debt, I could be buying a house. If you just imagine, you take 40 million people who have debt right now, and if we found a way for them to refinance it or reduce it and save them hundreds a month, they are not going to just sit on that money or put it under the mattress. They are going to put that money back into the economy.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I am thinking of you being in California in a much more expensive area than, while Pennsylvania is not cheap, by California standards, it is much more affordable. How much of an effect would it have for the young, bright, well-educated folks in northern California if they could suddenly have an extra, 3, 400 a month to help them afford the cost of living there and save for a down payment?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. The bay area is a beautiful place to live. It is 80 degrees there this week. It is one of the most educated places in the world. It has an innovation economy that is charting the course for the new American economy and is really defining how the American worker is going to work going forward. But the biggest downfall, the downside, if there is any in the bay area right now, is the cost of living. It costs so much to own a house. It costs so much for health care and starting a business. There are so many costs to be in the bay area today that it is pricing out young people.

So if you go to a good school, you are qualified, you make it to a good school, you take on the student loan debt, and you want to go into the workforce, with the debt that you carry, first, chances are you are not going to be able to live anywhere near where you are going to work because you are not going to be able to afford it.

I had the California Association of Realtors in my office today. Our local rep, Otto Catrina, was telling me how hard it is for him. He told me the story today of somebody who works at one of the largest tech companies in America. This person makes, he said, over \$100,000 a year. And because of the student loan debt that she has, she is having a very, very difficult time buying a house. That is somebody who makes over \$100,000 a year, and that is in the upper echelon of incomes in our country.

Can you imagine the middle class worker, the hard-working American who is making \$40,000, \$50,000 a year, wants to maybe go do some good and teach in a classroom? How is that person going to live near where they work? How is that person going to buy a home? How is that person going to start a family and have kids?

So I am glad the gentleman asked that, because those are the stories I see back where I grew up. That is why people care about that issue.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. You actually just referenced another point of this that I think is such a good point, and that is that this student loan debt is actually preventing young people from going out and starting their own businesses, which is a personal tragedy for them, but also has, again, tremendously negative effects on our overall economy. I am wondering, particularly in an entrepreneurial area like the bay area, you must hear similar stories.

□ 2000

Mr. SWALWELL of California. We have become in the Bay Area a place where approximately 75 percent of the venture funding is going right now. There are a lot of smart, young, energetic determined people with good ideas, but they don't have a lot of funding. And for them the decision becomes, well, I have got this job right now that pays my student loan debt and pays my other bills, but I have this great idea, which is my passion, which is my dream. But if I leave my job and I risk it all, I still have this debt; it is going to follow me, and it is going to be really hard if this doesn't take off. I see that decision point so often across the Bay Area.

I just think, as you said, we are not asking to just completely say to every bank, You no longer can collect on this debt. I think what we are asking is, Let's start the conversation. How do we reduce it? How do we refinance it?

How do we give people more money in their pocket every month so that they can help themselves lift up their families and help our economy?

I see in the Chamber here with us our former caucus chair JOHN LARSON, the gentleman from Connecticut. I am putting him on the spot a little bit here. But I know he cares just as much as the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I do about what young people in his district are doing and how student loan debt affects him. So I am just wondering if our former chair could weigh in on what we can do in the Congress to help young people with student loan debt.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Well, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Pennsylvania for their hard work in this subject matter area.

Certainly we know that all credit debt combined is exceeded by the amount of debt that those who attend and receive a college education are currently bearing and the awful burden that that has created on the working members of the middle class and how difficult a burden it is, so I commend the gentlemen for their efforts here on the floor.

First of all, it starts with our budget that we debated today in making sure that there are not cuts to Pell grants, but there are investments made in Pell grants.

Frankly, as people talk about repatriation, that is, as both the gentlemen from Pennsylvania and California know, where money has been sent overseas, and there is a lot of talk about bringing money back and what will we do with that, what about a trust fund that will allow an opportunity for young people all across America to refinance and restructure their ability to pay off their college debt? It is not a novel idea.

After all, isn't that what we did for Wall Street after 2008? Isn't that what we did to make sure that banks and financial institutions didn't fail? Shouldn't we do this for the human infrastructure, for all those hard-working families who have refinanced their home, who have gone into their personal savings, who are saddled with enormous amounts of debt?

What a great thing for the country and how valuable that would be for people to once again be able to have completed a college education, place themselves in a position to be more productive members of society, but also in a position where they are not burdened with the debt that prevents them from carrying on a life, to get married, to purchase a first home, to buy a new automobile, all the things that help our economy grow, all the reasons that they went to college in the first place.

So I commend the two gentlemen for their continuous work in this area,

your support of the Democratic budget. What a great job that CHRIS VAN HOLLEN did today articulating the values that this side of the aisle has been putting forward not only in terms of the morality of the issue, but also the economic impact that it has on so many working families.

I hope that our distinguished colleagues from California and Pennsylvania will join us in the second hour in a discussion on all generations on Social Security.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. I was just going to say how happy I am to welcome Mr. LARSON as the newest member to the Future Caucus. There aren't many of us that have such wonderful white hair in the future caucus.

But what is interesting is this is an exact linkage to the subject that we are going to talk about next with respect to Social Security. And that is, it is all part of the same system. The idea that you give opportunity to people, you demand responsibility, they pay into a system, they benefit at some point, and then the next generation benefits.

People on Social Security today are able to benefit because of the workers of today. Thirty, 40 years from now, those students who are worrying about student loans will probably still be in the workforce and making, hopefully, more money that will pay into Social Security that will help the workers of today, who will be the retirees of tomorrow. So this is all actually linked and part of making America work.

So I am proud to be with the two gentlemen.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Thank you. I don't think we could end on a more inspirational note than the eloquent words from our former chairman from Connecticut, Mr. LARSON.

This is about the future. I am proud to be a sponsor of the Social Security Fairness Act. I am glad that is getting some attention this evening.

To summarize, the Future Forum and what we aspire for young people to have is not a handout when it comes to student loan debt, not a complete free pass where you just take on government investments and you don't give anything back.

What we are saying is that if you are qualified and you worked hard and you have the student loan debt, it should be easier than it is today. We should be able to pass JOE COURTNEY's bill and allow you to refinance. We should find every way possible to reduce this debt for each person as low as we can.

And if you are a student today, the government should not make money on your student interest loan. They shouldn't make money. If you are qualified and able to go to college, especially if you are like the gentleman from Pennsylvania or myself and you are the first person in your family to

go to college, we should reduce every barrier to college because it is a part of achieving that American Dream of starting a family, owning a home, buying a new automobile, and saving for a secure golden retirement.

So I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for his help this evening and coming down as a special cameo guest appearance. And I also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for, again, being a part of our Future Forum.

You can tweet us at #futureforum and we will continue this conversation until we address what is the greatest moral crisis of our generation—student loan debt.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY 2100 ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be here this evening to talk about and to follow two distinguished colleagues from California and Pennsylvania who spoke with great eloquence about the future, who were addressing the issue of student loans and student loan debt that we are experiencing all across the country.

This evening, I am here to discuss Social Security. Currently, before the Ways and Means Committee, we are addressing the issue of Social Security that, as everybody knows, not only covers old age and survivorship, but also disability.

That fund is due to expire in 2016 if Congress does not take action, due to be cut severely and have an impact on so many Americans. And yet all across this country, frankly, on a bipartisan basis on the committee and from without the committee, people are talking about coming up with solutions for Social Security.

That is why we have introduced the Social Security 2100 Act. Why 2100? Well, because we want to make sure that the program of Social Security, which by law is required to make sure that it is solvent for 75 years, in fact, is, and that is what our proposal does.

But I want to talk about this in terms of a pragmatic, practical, commonsense path forward to make sure that Social Security is not only there for seniors who are currently receiving it, but for future generations, as well.

Social Security is uniquely the most indispensable plan that the government has been committed to.

We have a slide that I would like to put up that demonstrates exactly how indispensable Social Security is.

Today, two-thirds of seniors rely on Social Security for the majority of their income. Think about that for a moment. Of all the people that you



know, of all the retirees that you are associated with, two-thirds of them rely on Social Security for a majority of their income.

The median retirement account balance for all Americans—all Americans—is \$2,500. Ask yourself, America: Is there anyone that could sustain themselves or a family or a spouse with \$2,500 in their retirement accounts and savings?

Only 14 percent of private sector workers are participating in defined benefit pensions. Well, what does that mean? That means that 86 percent of Americans are not. So what we are faced with in the United States Congress really isn't a Social Security problem, because we all know that Social Security works. Social Security has never missed a payment, and Social Security is there to both help people who are disabled, to help the spouse and the children who are survivors after an untimely death, and it is there in retirement and serves as a pension, as I said before, almost exclusively, for two-thirds of all of America.

So simply stated, it makes no sense at all to cut Social Security. It makes no sense at all to raise the age of Social Security.

Since 2008 and the Great Recession and the devastation that so many Americans went through, people who had worked hard and played by the rules and had invested their money in 401Ks, well, the reality is that they saw their 401K become a 101K. So it is long overdue for Congress to come together in a nonpartisan way to fully address this issue.

□ 2015

At the start of this session, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle developed a rule. I commend them for this rule. The rule says that you can't just address, simply, disability with respect to the Social Security trust fund.

You have to address both disability and old age and survivors' benefits collectively. That is the way the program has always been addressed, and I commend them for underscoring what is a retirement crisis and why we need to take these bold steps.

I say "retirement crisis" because you saw the statistic before where only 14 percent of the private sector workers are participating in defined benefit contributions. That simply cannot sustain us. What this particular chart shows is that more seniors than ever are also paying taxes on their Social Security benefits. So we have this retirement crisis in which two-thirds of Americans are retiring with just about Social Security as their only means of moving forward, their only means of sustaining themselves.

To further compound that problem, the way the Social Security Act was changed in 1983 has now found us in a situation in which taxable income over

\$25,000 for a single person is subject to being taxed and \$32,000 for a married couple. This is only escalating as more and more baby boomers retire into the system.

For example, in 1998—that was not that long ago—26 percent of all seniors came under this law and were taxed under the current law. Just last year, in 2014, that figure rose to 49 percent, and it is only growing.

We need to address this issue. Why? Because more seniors, out of necessity, are finding themselves working—working to make up for the loss that they incurred from 2008 forward in their 401(k)'s and in their investment portfolios, working to make ends meet.

One thing seniors understand and, I think, America understands is this: Social Security is not an entitlement. Certainly, you are entitled to Social Security payments; but why? You are entitled to them because they are the insurance that you paid for.

It is the earned compensation that people, through their hard work and sweat of their brow, have put into the system. The system is called FICA, the Federal Insurance Contributions Act. Those contributions have been made by all Americans, and as I said earlier, they remain the bulk work for the Nation's retirement program and are the safety net that prevents seniors from retiring into poverty, that allows them to exist.

This is the time to focus on strengthening the Social Security Program. This is the time we should be talking about expanding the Social Security Program. It is because of the retirement crisis that we find ourselves here, not for lack of contribution, not for lack of effort, but because of the real economic conditions most families have found themselves in. That is why we introduced the Social Security 2100 Act.

What does it do? First and foremost, it doesn't raise the national debt at all. It is completely paid for. How do we know this? Because we have an actuarial report.

The chief actuary for Social Security has determined that it exceeds the 75-year limits in terms of its solvency so that Social Security will not only be here now, tomorrow, and well into the future, but Justin Bieber will be 106 years old, and Social Security will still be there for him and for those of his generation as well.

It is that important and vital a program for our Nation so that it needs our very specific and direct focus and attention.

With so many relying on Social Security, we also need to expand its benefits. We are proposing a modest 2 percent increase across the board, but we are also proposing what senior citizens know already, which is that the system that we have of calculating the COLA is inadequate and does not work.

Most importantly, it doesn't reflect what seniors actually pay, what they actually have to go through in terms of the costs of heating their homes, of buying prescription drugs, and of paying for the escalating costs of food and heat and energy.

We have devised a system—endorsed widely by groups that embrace it—that we call the CPIE, the consumer price index based on the actual costs of the elderly, with the E standing for elderly in this circumstance. It makes sure that there are sufficient amounts of money that are there to provide for our senior citizens.

The next thing that we do is to make sure that nobody can retire into poverty. We raise the minimum benefit to 125 percent of poverty, which would amount to—in so many cases, at the lower end of the economic scale—a 50 percent increase in benefits for the poorest amongst us.

When I say "poor," I mean the working poor, people who are pulled into the system. Again, this is not an entitlement. This is earned compensation. This is the insurance that so many have already paid for and why this has become so important and so vital a test.

We also provide a tax cut for 11 million working seniors. Let me repeat that. We provide a tax cut for 11 million seniors.

How do we do that? As we said earlier, people, out of necessity, have found themselves in this system. They have found themselves in a position in which, in retirement, they are finding themselves working. They work hard for their money, but as I said earlier, if they are single and if their combined incomes are more than \$25,000, they are taxed. If they are a couple and their combined incomes are \$32,000, they are taxed.

These numbers are easily reached and are being exceeded, and that is why we are recommending the tax cut by raising those limits and by providing those to working seniors, and there is a value that they bring to all of our communities with the break that they need so that they can sustain themselves and can also continue to pay their way in retirement with the benefits that they have earned, with the benefits that they have paid for but that haven't kept pace with the economic times.

It provides an across-the-board benefit increase of 2 percent for every senior, and it improves the cost-of-living adjustments by going to CPIE. As I said before, a new minimum benefit to ensure that no one who has paid into the system retires into poverty is flat out fair.

You may ask: How do you pay for this? Certainly, at the outset of this, we made the boast that this is solvent into the next century, beyond the 75 years that is required, signed off by the

Social Security chief actuary, who has determined the solvency of the program.

How do we do this? First and foremost, we say that we ought to increase the contribution to the fund by 1 percent. Now, 1 percent may not seem like a lot; but, when you have the whole country contributing, in fact, it is. Even at that 1 percent level, though, we believe that, especially in dealing with the times in which we are today, we ought to phase that in over a 25-year period.

What does that mean? What that means is that, for a worker who is making \$50,000 a year, for 50 cents a week, as part of his or her contribution, they get the most valuable governmental program in the history of this Nation, the program that keeps people out of poverty, the program that for more than two-thirds of them is the only retirement vehicle that they will have, the program that is also there in disability and for survivors' benefits.

We have so many Members in this body who can tell their stories about how they would not have made it without Social Security. Both the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, PAUL RYAN, and probably one of the foremost authorities on the issue, RICHARD NEAL of Massachusetts, benefited from Social Security. It made it possible for their mothers to help them and their families into college and beyond, and look how successful both of them have been.

This is America's story. This is about America coming together, and that is why it is around modest, pragmatic, straightforward proposals that don't shy away from the cost but address it head on, that address it head on in a simple, pragmatic, commonsense manner.

These aren't taxes. These are contributions that people are making and that they are receiving a direct benefit from. It is unique amongst all of the programs that we have.

Along with the 1 percent increase phased in over 25 years, which amounts to .05 percent, or 50 cents a week for someone earning \$50,000 or more—less if you are earning less and a little bit more if you are earning more—we are also asking the top .4 percent to pay the same rate as everyone else.

As you may know, Social Security is taxed currently only up to \$118,000. After that, people stop paying into the system. What we are saying is: listen, the country is going through some difficult times.

People, especially those who work hard and play by the rules—the working class, the middle class, who are suffering under this—we ought to give them a little bit of a break.

Not until \$400,000 do we start taxing Social Security again—excuse me—asking those who are paying into the

system to pay the same rate as everybody else at that level. Only .4 percent, we ask to pay to make this fund solvent, in conjunction with raising the percentage by 1 percent, for the next 75 years and beyond.

□ 2030

We keep Social Security strong for generations to come, and that is why this is such a vital and important benefit for this great Nation of ours.

At the end of the day, what has made our country great, going back to those first settlers who all gathered together to help one another raise their homes and their barns and plow and sow and reap the benefits of their fields, Americans have rallied to come together, rallied with one another from the time the Thirteen Colonies formed the Union to today of our 50 States. Our States are unique, our States all have special qualities, but the one quality that we all share is that we are Americans.

Social Security is America's program. It is what Roosevelt recognized, as did the Congresses back then, the importance of dealing in our system of entrepreneurialism and capitalism and risk taking, that that gives us an unbelievable strength in a global and world economy, but it has to be balanced off with the value and the notion that if you work hard and play by the rules that your Nation is there for you as well, and that you can't retire into poverty after working all your life, that some calamity or misfortune, a disability, a tragic death can't ruin you or your family because it is part of a larger family, the United States of America.

God bless you. God bless America. Thank you for listening to this presentation.

We have 56 original cosponsors of this bill, and we know all across this country, the more that we talk about this straightforward, commonsense, practical solution to Social Security, Americans are going to require that Congress steps up to the plate and meets its responsibility and obligation to make sure that no senior, no individual can retire into poverty, and the system that has worked so extraordinarily well for every American is there not only today and tomorrow, but well into the future without raising the national debt and only calling upon Americans to do what they have done traditionally: contribute to a program that guarantees a secure retirement and pension and benefits that they will reap throughout a lifetime.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 8. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PAYNE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of foot surgery.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 26, 2015, at 9 a.m.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURGESS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 173. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes, and providing for proceedings during the period from March 27, 2015, through April 10, 2015 (Rept. 114-50). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 1597. A bill to reform the acquisition system of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Science, Space, and Technology, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. COFF-

MAN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HANNA, Mr. JOLLY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WALZ, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 1598. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to amend the definition of the term "spouse" to recognize new State definitions of such term for the purpose of the laws

administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. BLUM):

H.R. 1599. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to food produced from, containing, or consisting of a bioengineered organism, the labeling of natural foods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HARPER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. TITUS, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KEATING, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FARR, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 1600. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to limit copayment, coinsurance, or other cost-sharing requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a specialty drug tier to the dollar amount (or its equivalent) of such requirements applicable to prescription drugs in a non-preferred brand drug tier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. HECK of Washington):

H.R. 1601. A bill to clarify membership requirements for the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1602. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LANCE, Mr. GIBSON, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 1603. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to improve the private treatment of veterans who are victims of military sexual assault; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 1604. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to expand the eligibility of veterans to receive mental health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 1605. A bill to abolish the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 1606. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a national intersection and interchange safety construction program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. POLIQUIN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. GUINTA):

H.R. 1607. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANCE, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 1608. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1609. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to regulate tax return preparers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBBLE (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARTON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. BERA, Mrs. BLACK, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUM, Mr. BOST, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUCSHON, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. COOK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. DOLD, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr.

JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. JONES, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KIND, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. REED, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. TROTT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. WALDEN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. YOHO, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1610. A bill to establish biennial budgets for the United States Government; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 1611. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to physician supervision of therapeutic hospital outpatient services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. HARDY, Ms. TITUS, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 1612. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to extend Interstate Route 11; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan (for himself and Mr. ASHFORD):

H.R. 1613. A bill to reduce the operation and maintenance costs associated with the Federal fleet by encouraging the use of remanufactured parts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. BRIDENSTEINE):

H.R. 1614. A bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1615. A bill to direct the Chief FOIA Officer of the Department of Homeland Security to make certain improvements in the implementation of section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. FARENTHOLD):

H.R. 1616. A bill to authorize the approval of natural gas pipelines and establish deadlines and expedite permits for certain natural gas gathering lines on Federal land and Indian land; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1617. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit certain State election administration officials from actively participating in electoral campaigns; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1618. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms.

PELOSI, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WALZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. VARGAS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. TONKO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr.

SWALWELL of California, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PETERSON, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BERA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SIREs, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. NEAL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. VELA):

H.R. 1619. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1620. A bill to expedite the deployment of highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FORBES (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 1621. A bill to modify the boundary of Petersburg National Battlefield in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 1622. A bill to provide a Federal charter to the Fab Foundation for the National Fab Lab Network, a national network of local digital fabrication facilities providing community access to advanced manufacturing tools for learning skills, developing inventions, creating businesses, and producing personalized products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LONG, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 1623. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the length of time for a certain permit; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MULLIN, and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 1624. A bill to amend title I of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to revise the definition of small employer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HIMES (for himself, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. CLEAVER):

H.R. 1625. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HURD of Texas (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1626. A bill to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. ROSLEHTINEN):

H.R. 1627. A bill to modify the prohibition on recognition by United States courts of certain rights relating to certain marks, trade names, or commercial names; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. RIBBLE):

H.R. 1628. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in each Veterans Integrated Service Network a pain management board; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1629. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1630. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to provide guidance on utility energy service contracts used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. HARPER):

H.R. 1631. A bill to improve, coordinate, and enhance rehabilitation research at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COLE, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 1632. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to place certain lands in Skagit and San Juan Counties, Washington, into trust for the Samish Indian Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1633. A bill to provide for certain improvements relating to the tracking and reporting of employees of the Department of Homeland Security placed on administrative leave, or any other type of paid non-duty status without charge to leave, for personnel matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1634. A bill to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. NOR-TON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. JONES, Mr. BARR, Mr. DOLD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HANNA, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 1635. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 1636. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct or support a comprehensive study comparing total health outcomes, including risk of autism, in vaccinated populations in the United States with such outcomes in unvaccinated populations in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Ms. MCSALLY):

H.R. 1637. A bill to require annual reports on the activities and accomplishments of federally funded research and development centers within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1638. A bill to assure that the services of a nonemergency department physician are available to hospital patients 24 hours a day, seven days a week in all non-Federal hospitals with at least 100 licensed beds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1639. A bill to amend the charter school programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. RATCLIFFE):

H.R. 1640. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress a report on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. LEE:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution recognizing the disparate impact of climate change on women and the efforts of women globally to address climate change; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H. Res. 171. A resolution electing Members to the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library and the Joint Committee on Printing; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H. Res. 172. A resolution electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HIGGINS (for himself, Ms. NOR-TON, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 174. A resolution expressing support for designation of March as "National Multiple Myeloma Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 1597.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 1598.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution, and Section 5 of Amendment XIV to the Constitution.

By Mr. POMPEO:

H.R. 1599.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1600.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H.R. 1601.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution states that Congress shall have the power to "to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution states the Congress shall have the power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1602.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 1603.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 12 and 13, which gives Congress the power "To raise and support Armies," and "To provide and maintain a Navy."

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 1604.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. AMASH:

H.R. 1605.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Export-Import Bank is purported to be authorized under the congressional power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations" in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States. Congress has the implied power to repeal laws that exceed its constitutional authority as well as laws within its constitutional authority.

By Mr. EMMER of Minnesota:

H.R. 1606.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 7—  
The Congress shall have Power . . . To establish Post Offices and Post Roads

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 1607.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section I, Article 8

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 1608.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

"The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, section 3, clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States)."

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 1609.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 1610.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1611.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1612.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses:

1) "The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States"

3) "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes"

7) "To establish Post Offices and post Roads"

18) "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other

Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan:

H.R. 1613.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. BORDALLO:

H.R. 1614.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 16

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1615.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 1616.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States, as enumerated in Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 4:

“The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations . . .”

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 4:

“The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations . . .”

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18

By Mr. FORBES:

H.R. 1621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 and Article, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 1622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution, The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 1623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

“The Congress shall have the power to . . . provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States”

Congress enacted the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to help set water quality standards and permitting requirements. Making adjustments to this process, which provides for the general welfare, falls within Congress’ authority to legislative on items affecting the general welfare.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 1624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 1625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HURD of Texas:

H.R. 1626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 1627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3, “to regulate Commerce with Foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;” and Article 1, Section 8, clause 8, “to promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Rights to their respective Writings and Discoveries.”

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 1629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 1630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 1631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1 “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 1633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 1634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 1635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 1636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States:

The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 1637.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1638.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 1639.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 1640.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for

carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 12: Mr. WALZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 27: Mr. DESANTIS.

H.R. 140: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 217: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 232: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H.R. 237: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 335: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 444: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 448: Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. TED LIEU, of California.

H.R. 471: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 499: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 500: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 501: Mr. NEAL, Ms. ESTY, and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 509: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 546: Mr. POE of Texas, and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 592: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 595: Mr. PALMER and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 601: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 610: Mr. SALMON and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 619: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 653: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 662: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 663: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 670: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 685: Mr. TROTT and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 721: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 727: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 742: Mr. DOGETT.

H.R. 767: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 825: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 829: Mr. WALZ and Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 842: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 868: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 902: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 906: Mr. BUCSHON and Mr. BLUM.

H.R. 919: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 940: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 969: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GUINTA, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 985: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 1058: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1096: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1105: Mr. HARDY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. POMPEO, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BENISHKEK, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 1114: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 1125: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1151: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1161: Ms. LEE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1180: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1193: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1197: Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HANNA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1206: Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, and Mr. ZINKE.

H.R. 1210: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 1212: Mr. DENT and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1221: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LANDEVIN, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. RIBBLE.

H.R. 1233: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1247: Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 1249: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1259: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1265: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1271: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1282: Mr. POLIS and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1299: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1301: Mr. PIERLUISI and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1323: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 1339: Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1340: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. DENT, Ms. MATSUI and Mr. DOGETT.

H.R. 1349: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1365: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 1384: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 1389: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 1391: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1399: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1401: Ms. KUSTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TITUS, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. HIGGINS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. HARDY, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

H.R. 1404: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1408: Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1415: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1416: Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 1427: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1458: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1460: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1465: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 1470: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1476: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. PITTS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. YOHIO.

H.R. 1484: Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 1488: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 1498: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1500: Mr. WALZ and Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 1502: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1506: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1515: Mr. SARBANES and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1527: Mr. PASCRELL and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1528: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 1550: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1559: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. VELA, Mr. LEWIS, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1560: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1579: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. SANFORD, Mr. FLORES, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. POMPEO.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. FLORES.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BOUTSTANY, and Mr. TIPTON.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H. Res. 28: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 67: Ms. ESTY.

H. Res. 139: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 156: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

##### OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP

The provisions in Section 524 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Natural Resources in H.R. 2, "To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes" do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 612: Mr. HULTGREN.



**SENATE—Wednesday, March 25, 2015**

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

**PRAYER**

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Mighty God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, thank You for the honor of being made in Your image, personally formed by You for Your glory.

Today, shower Your grace upon our lawmakers, making them sufficient for these grand and challenging times. Lord, inspire them to walk humbly with You as You bless and strengthen them. Please don't remove the mountains in their lives, but give them the strength to climb them. May they not forget that in everything You are working for the good of those who love You and are called according to Your purposes. Give our Senators the insight, wisdom, and courage to serve Your purpose for their lives in this generation.

And, Lord, we ask that You would comfort the families of the victims of the plane crash in the French Alps.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). The majority leader is recognized.

**A BALANCED BUDGET**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will pass a balanced budget. It is an important moment for our country. I know a lot of Americans are excited to see it finally happen.

Our friends across the aisle don't seem to be sharing in the enthusiasm, however. Instead, we seem to hear demands for more taxes, more regulations, more overspending—basically, more failed policies of the past.

These are odd demands, but in the spirit of budget week, we figured: Why not give our friends what they are asking for? So last night we offered them a chance to support President Obama's

budget. It drops tax after tax on the American people to the tune of almost \$2 trillion. It piles on the regulations. It overspends by trillions and trillions, never balancing, ever—never balancing, ever.

No wonder a DC newspaper implied it was a manifestation of the left's "dream version of Obama."

One would think our friends would have supported this dream budget overwhelmingly but, actually, hardly any were brave enough to do so. Apparently, the President's budget is just so unserious and embarrassing that only a single Member of his party could be seen supporting it in public.

What a contrast to the balanced budget before us today. It balances without raising taxes. It acknowledges the obvious truth that Washington has a spending problem and takes responsible action to get spending under control.

It also recognizes the undeniable fact that government programs cannot meet their mandate to the vulnerable if left unreformed, and it proposes improvements to programs such as Medicaid.

This balanced budget aims to make government more efficient, more effective, and more accountable. It will go a long way toward getting our fiscal house in order.

But that is not all this balanced budget is about. It is also about growing the economy. It is also about raising incomes. It is also about creating jobs. In short, it is about promoting an economy that works better for the middle class of today and that leaves a more prosperous future for the middle class of tomorrow.

One way to do that is by embracing the energy revolution by lifting barriers to responsible energy development, just as this budget proposes. Another way is by replacing our outdated and ineffective Tax Code with one that is simple and effective. So this budget proposes to repeal unfair taxes, such as those in ObamaCare, and then sets the table for comprehensive tax reform instead.

Ideas such as these are just common sense. No wonder the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office says that our balanced budget would accelerate economic growth.

The truth is middle-class Americans have seen a lot of unfairness out of Washington during the Obama years. The middle class has had to play by one set of rules and make tough choices while a big-spending Obama administration got to play by its own rules.

It is time for that inequality to come to an end. It is time for Washington to make tough choices and balance its own budget just as the middle class has to.

Now is the time for Washington to move beyond failed ideas of the past, as we saw in the White House's leftwing dream budget, and support a balanced budget instead—one that is focused on boosting the economy, creating jobs, and raising wages.

That balanced budget is before us right now. I am calling on every Senator to support it, including our friends on the other side. We know they don't have a budget proposal of their own. We know they are too embarrassed to support the President's budget. So why not show their support for the middle class by voting for this balanced budget proposal.

**RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

**PAST ATTEMPTS AT DEFICIT REDUCTION**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to give those within the sound of my voice a very brief tutorial on how serious the Republicans are about balancing the budget.

I led a trip to South America. We had 10 or 12 Senators, equally divided between Democrats and Republicans. It was a wonderful trip. I chose purposely Kent Conrad, who was the No. 1 person on the Democratic side of the aisle at the time on numbers, and I also decided to see if Judd Gregg, who was the Republican's No. 1 person on numbers, could go. These two good men sat together that whole trip, hour after hour. They had their yellow tablets, and they were doing what they loved to do—play around with numbers.

When the trip ended, they had an idea. They were both experienced legislators. They had been here when we did something that hadn't been done before. We had military bases in America going back to World War I that should have been closed, but we couldn't do it because of the politics of the Senate. But we decided long ago to try something different. We appointed a commission, they would report back to the Senate and the House, and they would make a decision as to which bases should be closed—no filibuster, no tricky procedural rules; yes or no on what they recommended. We did two rounds of base closings and we closed

scores of bases, saving the country billions of dollars.

Conrad and Judd decided to do the same thing with this deficit we have. They drafted legislation based on the base closing commission legislation, and they brought it before the Senate. It had a like number of Democrats and Republicans supporting this Conrad-Gregg legislation. We had seven Republican cosponsors. Even the Republican leader today, at that time didn't cosponsor it, but he said he liked it. He said publicly that he liked it. In fact, he said: "This proposal is our best hope for addressing the out-of-control spending and debt levels that are threatening our Nation's fiscal future."

What a tremendous idea. I was so happy to have had something to do with setting this program up.

But look at what happened. Seven of those Republicans who cosponsored the legislation voted against proceeding to it. We couldn't even get on the bill because the Republicans ran away from it. They ran away from doing something about the deficit. Why? Ask them. I have ideas, but that is the way it is. Even my friend, the now Republican leader, voted against it. It failed by 7 votes—7 votes of the Republicans who cosponsored it but who no longer voted for it.

So, based upon that, we were in a quandary. What should we do? So a number of us, Democrats and Republicans, asked President Obama if he could do something with a commission of his own. Now, it wouldn't be as good as what we had tried because that was pretty specific—to bring it back for an up-or-down vote.

So the President did what was the right thing to do. He found two stunningly good people who are good with money, good with numbers, including the former Senator from the State of Wyoming, who is such a great guy, Senator Simpson. He is just a fine man with a great sense of humor, and he knew his numbers. Senator Simpson teamed with Erskine Bowles, who had been the President's Chief of Staff. They set up the Bowles-Simpson Commission. It was terrific. It gave us some hope that maybe something could be done. They had long hearings. It was really good. The hearings included people from the private sector and from the House and the Senate—Democrats and Republicans.

Now, even before that, when the Conrad-Judd effort failed, we thought that we had some hope. Once again, the Republicans on the Bowles-Simpson Commission walked away from it. It really is unfortunate, but that is what happened. It was quite interesting. People who had been criticized over the years for being too liberal, big spenders—someone such as DICK DURBIN from Illinois—voted for the Bowles-Simpson Commission. It took a lot of courage for him to do that, but he did. But Re-

publicans who we thought would have been for it voted against it, and it failed.

Then, Senator BIDEN, because of his close relationship having served in the Senate for 36 years, got with some Republicans, and they made a run at it. There were all kinds of press that they were making progress. What happened? The Republicans took a hike. They broke up the meeting, wouldn't go any further, and that ended that.

So then, we had one last attempt. I worked hard on this. Others worked hard on this. It passed. It passed the Congress. We set up a supercommittee: the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction. The committee had an equal number of Democrats and Republicans—six of each. What happened? The Republicans, once again, walked away from it.

So all of this happy talk I heard this morning and I am going to hear over this week and over the next couple of days about this great budget the Republicans have is an absolute farce. Pundits have written accordingly. Talk about a balanced budget—they have revenue coming in. One example—of course, Republicans want to repeal ObamaCare, but they want to use the revenue coming from ObamaCare for this fake budget of theirs.

Any time the Republicans are asked to close tax breaks for companies shipping jobs overseas—no—but they are happy to cut Social Security, Medicare, and of course, never focus on middle class priorities. They use the words, but it is just a joke. They want a loophole for wealthy hedge fund managers. They want unlimited tax breaks for the oil and gas industry. In this budget, they have not asked millionaires and billionaires to pay one extra penny.

So all this talk about this great budget we have is an absolute farce. There are editorials all over the country. I read a number of them yesterday, what they say about this.

#### ANTIQUITIES ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know people are anxious to go to work on other things, but I want to talk about something called the Antiquities Act. It passed in 1906. President Theodore Roosevelt was the President at the time. Congress wanted to give him the authority to designate special lands and cultural resources as national monuments, and he did that. Since then, 16 Presidents—8 Democrats and 8 Republicans—have used this 1906 act to protect America's treasures.

For example, way back in 1922, President Harding used the Antiquities Act to protect the Lehman Caves. It is now a beautiful facility. I have been down there. They are certainly not the deepest or the biggest caves in the world, but they are unique and good, and we have enjoyed them in Nevada. That

was the basis for the 1986 legislation I initiated to create a national park in Nevada. The only national park we have in Nevada is the result of the 1922 action of President Harding. That is why we have Great Basin National Park. It is a wonderful facility. It has a glacier, the oldest living things in the world, the bristlecone pines. It is a great park, and people from all over the world visit this wonderful facility. So Nevada's lone national park exists today because President Harding used the Antiquities Act to first designate the Lehman Caves.

Some Members of Congress—frankly, it is a minority—believe we should repeal or gut this bill. They advocate weakening the Presidential authority that in the past has protected the Grand Canyon and even the Statue of Liberty. Who in this body thinks America has suffered because Presidents in the past have protected the Petrified Forest in Arizona, the Craters of the Moon in Idaho, and Capitol Reef, Bryce Canyon, and Arches in Utah? I have been to all of them, and even though Utah is an extremely conservative State, I have not heard one single Member of Congress or governmental authority say they were a huge mistake. They draw millions of visitors to the State of Utah with the beautiful lands they have there. What about Muir Woods in California? It is just stunningly important, and it came about as a result of a President designating them a national treasure under the Antiquities Act.

Sixteen Presidents—eight of each party—have used this act to protect America's treasures.

I am proud of what President Obama has been able to accomplish through the work he has done under the Antiquities Act. He has moved where Congress has failed to act.

Caesar Chavez and the Chicano labor movement were honored by creating the Caesar Chavez National Monument in California.

He protected Fort Monroe in Virginia in recognition of its storied history in defense of our Nation and the struggle for freedom for African Americans. It is a beautiful facility.

We have in Honolulu the Honouliuli National Monument to remember the terrible internment of Japanese Americans during World War II.

Last month, President Obama protected by proclamation Pullman National Monument, which celebrates the history of the African-American labor movement in America.

As a westerner, I appreciate what he has done to protect America's beautiful landscapes, such as the Rio Grande Del Norte and the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monuments in New Mexico, the Browns Canyon National Monument in Colorado, and western landscapes in California, Washington, and Hawaii.

This is something which is so important to be done, so I am disappointed that I hear that on the budget bill there is going to be an effort made to cut the Antiquities Act. I hope not. I absolutely will do everything I can to protect this act. It has been in law since 1906 and has been used by 16 Presidents.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 11, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

Pending:

Cotton amendment No. 481, to establish a deficit-neutral fund relating to supporting Israel.

Enzi (for Kirk) amendment No. 545, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to reimposing waived sanctions and imposing new sanctions against Iran for violations of the Joint Plan of Action or a comprehensive nuclear agreement.

Rounds/Inhofe amendment No. 412, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service from engaging in closed-door settlement agreements that ignore impacted States and counties.

Rubio modified amendment No. 423, to increase new budget authority fiscal years 2016 and 2017 and modify outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2022 for National Defense (budget function 050).

Daines amendment No. 388, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the designation of national monuments.

Daines amendment No. 389, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to holding Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives accountable for failing to pass a balanced budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. will be equally divided and controlled by the two managers or their designees.

The Senator from Oregon.

MR. WYDEN. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to thank Chairman ENZI for his courtesy in allowing me to take a few minutes to discuss a bipartisan amendment I will be offering on this bill. It deals with what I think is going to be an enormous challenge this summer for the West, and that is dealing with this wildfire challenge and the prospect that we could literally have enormous fires—what could be virtually infernos—throughout the West this summer.

I make that judgment because recently when I was home, I got a briefing. For example, in Medford, OR, they told me it was the driest it had been for 25 years. In Medford, when you get an update on the fires—and, colleagues, it is worth noting that nobody used to have a fire briefing in March. That is just unheard of. We have fire briefings well into the summer. But fires are getting to be a year-round occurrence. I was there in March, and the fire experts said it is going to be very dry. When you look southward to California, all you see is dry, dry, dry.

The fact is that as it gets drier and as it gets hotter on the forest floor, should lightning strike, which is very common in rural America, all of a sudden you can have an inferno on your hands and one that really knows no boundaries and can affect private property owners, State lands, and Federal lands. We had an important hearing in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee the other day on the sportsmen's bill. It looked as if there were a lot of good ideas in the bipartisan bill, but it will be pretty hard to go hunting and fishing in the forests this summer if the forests are burning up.

So what a bipartisan group of us from the West want to do—and I particularly commend our colleague Senator CRAPO of Idaho. He and I have teamed up on this effort. We have a large bipartisan coalition of Senators who have joined us. We want to fix the broken system of fighting wildfire in America.

What happens today, colleagues, is that the accounts for prevention get short shrift. In effect, the work that needs to be done with the smaller trees and thinning out the underbrush doesn't get the funding that is needed, so what happens is, as a result of the lack of prevention, you have these bigger fires and you have to put them out. The accounts for dealing with fire suppression are also short of money, so what happens at that point is the agencies borrow from the prevention fund to put the fire out, and the problem just gets worse and worse.

So what Senator CRAPO and I, with, as I have indicated, a large bipartisan coalition of Senators, are seeking to do is to end that kind of fire borrowing. What we are proposing is that the biggest fires—perhaps the 1 percent of the fires that really turn into infernos—you would fight those from the disaster fund because they are, in fact, disasters.

We have received an analysis from the budget officials indicating that this would really be a wash from a budgeting standpoint because, in effect, while you do spend a bit of money from the disaster fund putting out these infernos, you also generate some real savings from the prevention fund by not having as many fires in the first place.

What our bipartisan amendment will do is give the Departments of Agriculture and Interior the opportunity to access the disaster fund for that 1 percent of the fires that can really break a community apart. It seems to me that Americans across the country who live in communities where there are these fires deserve to know their homes and lives are not going to be threatened needlessly. That is what we will be able to prevent with this bipartisan amendment.

Freeing up the Forest Service funds that our proposal will do will ensure that the natural resources agencies have the resources they need to improve forest health and fund the very preventive work that is needed to reduce the size and severity of future fires.

We are going to be joined in this amendment. As I have indicated, Senator CRAPO and I base it on our bipartisan bill. Senators STABENOW and BALDWIN will be cosponsors, and I believe others will as well.

It is an important amendment and it is an urgent amendment because we need to have this in place quickly so as to give the natural resources agencies and our communities the tools they need this summer.

It is a real wake-up call when you get a fire briefing in March. That is an indication that we have a very, very difficult fire season coming up. This bipartisan amendment ensures that in a cost-effective way we give our natural resources agencies the tools they need to fight these infernos and protect our communities.

Once again, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator ENZI, for giving me this time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MR. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his comments.

One of the things that has concerned me since I came to the Senate is the fact that, in my first year alone, I believe we spent about \$3 billion in disaster relief. Subsequently, it increased to \$5 billion for disasters per year, and now it is about \$7 billion in disasters a year. As an accountant, one of the things I have always said is, if you know something is going to happen, you ought to put it in the budget. So now you will find that there is \$7 billion in disaster relief funding for each of the 10 years in this budget. Using these funds for fires and major disasters sounds like a good idea to me.

I am a little bit rankled when I hear somebody say this budget is a farce. It is as good an effort as a person can put together in 6 weeks when there hasn't been one for 8 years. That effort involves a lot of research, going back to find out where the problems were, why it wasn't done, and what needed to be done. I am pleased with the budget.

But, of course, the reason we have this process—in which we had the committee mark-up last week and considered a number of amendments and now will consider many more amendments here on the floor—is so that everybody can participate in seeing if we can complete the budget. It won't be perfect when we finish, but it will be better than it is right now, and it will be better when we start tomorrow morning.

Before we continue consideration of our balanced budget resolution today, I think it is worthwhile to reflect on what we accomplished yesterday for America's hard-working families. It was a good day yesterday as we approved amendments to prevent workplace retaliation against employees who ask or talk about salaries; to oppose cuts to Medicaid; to coordinate care for medically complex children with multiple serious, rare, or chronic illnesses; and to help our veterans gain timely access to health care. As Senator AYOTTE said yesterday, her amendment would “ensure veterans don't have to wait in line, that they can exercise private care options when they want to.” I am proud to say that is something we all support.

The debate this week is a unique opportunity for hard-working taxpayers to see an open and transparent legislative process, with Members from both sides of the aisle offering, debating, and voting on amendments to this resolution. This is something we haven't had in the past 8 years, and I think Members are energized to be able to do what they were sent here to do—the people's business.

Among the topics we will consider today are: enhancing America's energy security, protecting personal property rights from such agencies as the EPA, defending taxpayers against efforts to impose a carbon tax, helping veterans get better access to VA medical facilities, simplifying student loan repayment options, and saving Medicare.

I again thank Members for offering amendments that will help make our government more efficient, effective, and accountable to America's hard-working taxpayers. It is what the American people want and deserve.

I look forward to a strong and vigorous debate about our policies today.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that I be allowed to call up my amendment No. 347 and that the amendment be made pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRASSO], for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr.

ROUNDS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. COATS, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. VITTER, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. MORAN, proposes an amendment numbered 347.

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a spending-neutral reserve fund to keep the Federal Water Pollution Control Act focused on protection of water quality, to establish bright lines for Federal jurisdiction, and to create clear and unambiguous exemptions for features that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, claim they are not seeking to regulate)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO KEEPING THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT FOCUSED ON THE PROTECTION OF WATER QUALITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal jurisdiction under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) is focused on water quality, which may include limiting jurisdiction based on the movement of birds, mammals, or insects through the air or over the land, the movement of water through the ground, or the movement of rainwater or snowmelt over the land, or limiting jurisdiction over puddles, isolated ponds, roadside ditches, irrigation ditches, stormwater systems, wastewater systems, or water delivery, reuse, or reclamation systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this amendment that was just called up and made pending deals with the regulations the Obama administration has proposed that would expand the Clean Water Act. The rule is an attempt to change the definition of what the law calls waters of the United States.

The Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers first proposed the rule last year. They expect to have it finalized in the next few months. Well, under this rule, the definition of “waters of the United States” would include ditches, would include dry areas where water flows only for a short period of time after it rains.

Federal regulations have never before listed ditches and other manmade features as “waters of the United States.” This would be an alarming step. It would have a huge impact on farmers, ranchers, families, and small

businesses all across America. People whose livelihood requires that they put a shovel in the ground would suddenly find it much more difficult to make a living. The rule would amount to a tax on family farmers and ranchers to use their own land after it rains. These are people who just want to grow crops, raise cattle, take care of their families, maybe even just enjoy their own backyards. I hear this every weekend at home in Wyoming. I heard about it today from students from Lusk, WY, in Niobrara County. Now, Washington bureaucrats would have a say in how all of these people use their property.

I oppose this rule. I would like to see it scrapped entirely. That is why last year I introduced the Protecting Water and Property Rights Act of 2014 to block the rule, to roll back this dangerous Washington overreach.

My bill had 38 cosponsors in the Senate. Members who heard from their constituents back home about how worried they were about this harmful new rule. We heard from business owners, who told us the uncertainty the rule creates only delays economic investment and delays job creation. Well, the Environmental Protection Agency says our concerns are overblown. The administration says there is a lot of misunderstanding about what this regulation covers.

Gina McCarthy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, gave a speech last week. She said, “We're not interested in the vast majority of ditches—roadside ditches, irrigation ditches—those were never covered.” She also went on to say that the Agency could have been, as she said, “more crystal clear out of the gate about what we were and were not proposing.”

Well, my amendment would help make sure this rule is crystal clear. It simply lists things that the Environmental Protection Agency Administrator and others in the Obama administration have already said would not be regulated under this proposed rule. That is it.

My amendment would put limits on how the Environmental Protection Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers determines the extent of Washington control. The limits would include not allowing the agencies to control water based on the movement of birds, mammals, or insects.

The amendment would prevent determinations based upon the movement of water through the ground or the movement of rainwater or snowmelt over the land.

Finally, my amendment would specifically say that Federal jurisdiction under the Water Pollution Control Act does not extend to things such as puddles, isolated ponds, roadside ditches, and wastewater systems. The Obama administration has said it does not intend for its rules to cover any of these

features. Well, this amendment spells it out. There will be no more room for uncertainty and no more room for misunderstandings. It will then be crystal clear.

Of course, some people may not want the rule to be crystal clear. They may want to have some uncertainty in the rule. They may want to have unaccountable, unelected bureaucrats in Washington to be able to change their minds and then go back on their word—as we have seen them do in the past—about what the regulation covers and what it does not. If there is a Senator here who favors that kind of uncertainty, then they can vote against my amendment.

As I said, I have been opposed to this rule from the very beginning. This amendment does not block the rule, and it does nothing to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency or the Army Corps of Engineers from regulating the true waters of the United States. It simply takes the administration at their word. If they say the rule is not meant to cover something, this just spells it out.

I urge Senators to vote in favor of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, will the Chair notify me when I have used 5 minutes of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the budget resolution offered by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. This budget charts the wrong path for our Nation. It does not spur economic growth or help the middle class because it does not focus on creating high-quality jobs, boosting wages, or reducing inequality. It fails to address the cuts to government investments, which threatens our Nation's economic and national security. Instead, this budget stacks the deck against middle-class families by slashing government investments. It stacks the deck in favor of special interests by paving the way for huge tax giveaways to powerful special interests and the wealthiest Americans.

In order to claim the budget will balance in 10 years, it relies on accounting gimmicks and \$5.8 trillion in draconian cuts. It kicks millions off the health insurance rolls and dismantles health care reform. But, ironically, it takes credit for the savings that are part and parcel of the Affordable Care Act, all the while setting the stage for massive tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires.

It would also put powerful special interests ahead of seniors by forcing Medicare recipients to pay more for prescription drugs and preventive care. It does not provide adequate safeguards

for Social Security and Medicare. By saying no to closing egregious tax loopholes, it only increases the pressure to cut programs for seniors and others.

You know, frankly, we have been talking for years here in Washington about the deficit. But, this budget proposed by my colleagues has a credibility deficit. So I think most of the observers and commentators are looking and saying: Well, that is impossible. No one is going to believe that you can repeal the Affordable Care Act but keep the savings. No one is going to believe you can do all of those things and still continue to keep a straight face.

So I think the credibility of the budget is highly questionable.

We should have engaged in a balanced approach to growing our economy and towards fiscal responsibility. A balanced approach requires not only making wise reductions in spending, but it also requires raising revenue. That is the way most government entities operate. Mayors and Governors have to do it, and they do it, but here, we are avoiding very difficult, tough choices.

It is obvious there are things that have to be done. They cannot be wished away. Look at our crumbling infrastructure. As I drive around Rhode Island and the Northeast after a series of storms, I see the worst highway situation I think I recall in perhaps my lifetime, but at least in a long time. Potholes and disruptions are all over our roads. Americans expect it will be fixed, but you cannot fix it simply by wishing, you have to have the resources and the investment to make those corrections.

As we go forward, it is important to go ahead and deal with all of these issues in a balanced way—not through creative accounting techniques but by making difficult choices. Programs that are not working should be cut back. Revenue should be provided for investment in this country. That is what I think we should and we must do.

I have been particularly active with my colleague Senator McCain on the Armed Services Committee because the Defense Department is facing serious financial challenges. All of our service sectors have warned that if sequestration remains in place, if the Budget Control Act remains in place, together they will not provide the resources necessary to adequately fund the readiness, the modernization of our forces and the welfare of our forces.

Admiral Gortney, for example, who is the commander of NORTHCOM, has made this point along with everyone else, but he also went further to make the point that I think is critical when we are talking about defense and non-defense spending. You cannot draw this bright line between the Department of Defense and everybody else in terms of

our national security. NORTHCOM, which is responsible for our security in the United States, depends upon border control agents at our border. They depend upon the Department of Homeland Security. If that agency is not adequately funded, if they are suffering through sequestration and the BCA levels, then we will not have the kind of national security we need. If it translates to further cuts in TSA agents at our airports, that will undermine our security.

So this notion that we can draw a nice neat line between the Department of Defense and give them some more money through different techniques but ignore the other side of the equation does not work.

One of the most significant examples comes from General John Kelly of Southern Command. They have the capability of, through satellite imagery, through other intelligence means, identifying these fast boats coming out of South America that have drugs and might have human cargo, possibly terrorists. Knowing where they are and where they are headed is fine, but unless you have Coast Guard cutters to intercept them, you will not interdict this traffic. As a result, what we will have is a hole in our national security. The Coast Guard cutters come from the Department of Homeland Security.

So I know there has been an effort to use the Overseas Contingency Operation Fund. Senator GRAHAM, in particular, has been very, very aggressive with that. But I will try to explain later, if not now: There are limitations. This fund is directed at our operations against Al Qaeda and the Taliban under the authorization for the use of military force. To try to stretch this to build facilities in Alaska for missile defense—that is quite a stretch. That is not what OCO was designed for.

I think it has become a valiant effort to put more money in, but the reality is, we have to face up, as Senator McCain and I suggested in our letter to the Budget Committee, and raise the baseline number for the Department of Defense to a total—at least to a total that avoids sequestration or beyond. That is a realistic way to do it, and revenue is a way to pay for it. And I don't think the cuts should come out of nondefense to fund defense. This is an issue—again, are you going to shortchange Homeland Security? Are you going to shortchange other agencies that are critical to the defense of the United States? Are you going to shortchange the people of the United States? I do not think we should.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is amendment No. 347.

## AMENDMENT NO. 622

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside in order for me to call up amendment No. 622.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BURR], for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. AYOTTE, proposes an amendment numbered 622.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to manageable Federal student loan repayment options)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A SIMPLIFIED INCOME-DRIVEN STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT OPTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing student loan debt, which may include reducing overlapping student loan repayment programs and creating a simplified income-driven student loan repayment option by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to offer a deficit-neutral reserve fund amendment to the budget that will allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to revise allocations to provide for a simplified income-driven repayment program for Federal student loans.

This budget amendment is offered with the hope that it would allow for legislation similar to the Repay Act, which I introduced earlier in this Congress with Senator KING, Senator ALEXANDER, Senator WARNER, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator AYOTTE, Senator RUBIO, Senator CAPITO, Senator COLLINS, and Senator CARPER.

I wish to spend a moment telling my colleagues what the Repay Act would do.

It is very simple. It would streamline the numerous loan repayment programs into two easily understood options for those who take out student loans.

No. 1, it would create a fixed repayment program similar to the current law's 10-year standard repayment.

No. 2, it would create a new simplified income-driven repayment program that consolidates numerous in-

come-based programs into one program.

As we know today, students who go to college have to take out a number of different loans. It is confusing in the system to know exactly what that repayment system looks like—especially for somebody who is trying to determine their job opportunities and the income they need to meet their debt. This allows consolidation and simplification so that if students understand exactly what their exposure is almost from the very beginning, they would be left with a simple set of choices upon graduation. Do I choose a fixed payment plan that would pay off my loans in a straight 10 years? Or do I take the simplified income-driven repayment plan, pay a little longer, and have the remaining loan balance forgiven after 20 or 25 years, depending upon whether it is undergraduate or graduate loans?

Now, this is important for a few reasons, which I will illustrate from the quotes that have been made by many associations and financial aid administrators who endorsed the Repay Act.

They say, No. 1: "Consolidating the various federal income-based programs into a single plan will help borrowers understand the benefits and protections inherent in our federal student loan system . . ."

No. 2:

Despite many protections in [existing] repayment plans, a frustrating number of student loan borrowers continue to default. This is due in part to the fact that the options require borrowers to take proactive and cumbersome steps to enroll.

And, No. 3: "This proposal to collapse the different plans into one single income-based repayment plan should help ease the enrollment process for borrowers."

Not only does it sort out the repayment obligations that a student has, it makes the enrollment easier. And this comes from the individuals who are responsible for the implementation of these programs.

Those quotes are from associations representing financial aid administrators across the country. They are people who are on the frontlines of helping students as they prepare for payment after college. We should listen to them, and I say that strongly to my colleagues. We should listen to them.

The other benefits of this legislation is that students will know, prior to entering college, based on the amount that they borrow, what options will be available to them once they graduate from college. I know that seems like common sense to a lot of folks, but if you haven't been through the student loan process today, then you don't realize they don't have that clarity today—as they enter college—that this will allow them to have.

This will promote better consumer behavior. It will lessen the chance stu-

dents default based upon the confusion of the viable options that they have available to them.

Now, I would think, from policy-makers, our intent would always be, No. 1: Does the plan fit the need of the individuals to whom it is targeted? Clearly the student loan program does, but, No. 2: Have we done this in a way that is simple, understandable, and workable?

If we can't answer that question, and we don't check that box, the likelihood is that the net result is that we have defaults, individuals who don't live up to repaying their obligation. When a student graduates, they face up to 12 repayment options available to them, all with some overlapping purpose or benefit and with great complexity in how you actually sign up for the options.

Again, with the Repay Act, there are two options: 10 years straight repayment or a repayment that is structured based on what your income is.

Senator KING and I think the Repay Act makes for good policy, but we think it makes for bad policy to have 12 cumbersome options that overlap in some cases.

Based on some preliminary scores from CBO and estimates from President Obama—since he has proposed much of what we do in the Repay Act—we believe this legislation will save in the area of \$4 billion over the next 10 years and \$1 billion to \$2 billion over the next 5 years. That is up to \$6 billion in savings in the student loan program that we could pump back into additional loan value for students in the future.

Now, unlike other options we have, which we will be voting on today, that cost money—and pay for it by raising taxes—we save money by making our program more efficient and better suited for students' needs.

I say this to my colleagues who might be asking: How do I vote? I have to tell you: You have to wait to have a comparison bill. There will be one.

I want you to ask yourselves: Which one saves \$4 billion, and which one costs more money? Which one uses the allocations that are currently there, and which one raises taxes to put in place a new plan?

This amendment and the Repay Act is bipartisan—overwhelmingly so. If the bipartisan list of cosponsors to the Repay Act isn't enough, many of the recommendations that are formed in this legislation came from the President's very own budget.

This legislation also has the support of the Education Finance Council, the American Council on Education, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, as well as the University of North Carolina System, which is important to me, since I represent North Carolina.

In short, this amendment represents legislation that, No. 1, is bipartisan;

No. 2, saves money; No. 3, is based on the ideas and proposals of the President; and, No. 4, has the support of the financial aid industry, which is responsible for the success of student loan programs.

Success means easy enrollment. Success means repayment of the outstanding debt.

I urge my colleagues, when given the opportunity, to vote for Amendment No. 622, a bipartisan-sponsored initiative.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to notify me when 6 minutes are consumed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, last week the Senate Budget Committee gave a green light to the Republican budget. A caution light, a yellow light, was more in order. It calls for \$4.7 trillion in non-defense spending cuts over the next 10 years and no increases in revenue. Where would those cuts come from? They would be piled on the backs of the middle class, the elderly, and children.

They would cut the earned-income tax credit, slash Medicare and Medicaid, child care, Head Start, education, public safety, and law enforcement.

And—just for good measure—the Republican budget rolls back reforms on Wall Street—and on and on. All this and more is to pay for lower taxes for millionaires and billionaires.

When I first came to the Senate, our economy was in a free fall. We were losing 20,000 jobs a day, every day. Thousands of jobs were gone. Our financial system was crashing. Deficits were at historic highs.

That was 6 years ago. It has been a long road back. We asked the wealthy to pay their fair share. We passed long-needed reforms to Wall Street. We have seen 12 million more private sector jobs, the deficit cut in half, and Wall Street at historic highs. Profits are up; unemployment and deficits are down.

That is the story, but it isn't over. We are not done yet. Not everyone has found solid ground.

My State still faces great challenges. Many New Mexicans are still struggling, still pulling out of the worst recession in 75 years. How do we go forward? How do we build on the progress we have made?

Those are the questions the voters elected us to solve. The short answer is we have to work together. We have to get past the shutdowns and the showdowns. Politics is the art of standing your ground but also finding common ground.

That is why the Republican budget is so troubling. It doesn't start a conversation. It doesn't reach across the aisle.

This budget is bad for working families, bad for the middle class, bad for our economy. It makes a U-turn right back to failed policies of the past. This budget says no to the middle class, no to the most vulnerable, and no to the critical investments we know we need—but yes to lower taxes for hedge funds. It is Robin Hood in reverse, and it will hurt so many people who have suffered so much for so long.

This is the wrong way to go at the worst possible time, because—make no mistake about it—this budget is one big yes for those at the top and one big no for everybody else.

In my State, one in three children is in poverty. For Native American children, it is even higher. It is 44 percent. One in five children goes to bed hungry. Their parents can't find adequate child care. They can't get quality medical care when they need it. They lack access to safe housing and clean water.

This just isn't the case in New Mexico. We see it across the Nation. Children and families are falling behind. This has to change. The future—not only for our children but for our economy—depends on changing it. We need to be doing more, but the Republican budget does less.

It would cut programs for low-income children, seniors, and families by up to \$660 billion over 10 years, including SNAP and child nutrition programs.

Healthy kids are an investment in our future economy. We need renewed commitment—not draconian cuts—to the programs that help children reach their full potential. That means infant and toddler care, preschool, and home-visiting programs. We know that they work and they can help in a big way.

A recent White House report tells the story. These programs make a difference, get results and save money—more than \$8 for every \$1 invested.

That is why I introduced the Saving Our Next Generation Act, or SONG Act. We should fully pay for what works. That is why I am a cosponsor of the PRE-K Act to expand high-quality, early learning programs for children from birth to age 5.

Children should be our priority. They should not take a back seat to billionaires and neither should the elderly, who depend on Medicare, not a voucher program.

The Republican budget cuts \$2.5 trillion from health care for low- and moderate-income people.

Repealing the Affordable Care Act, block-granting Medicaid—seniors would pay more for prescription drugs and more for preventive services. Crucial support for nursing care and home health care would be slashed.

We have a lot to do to get America's economy back on track. The Republican budget—at every turn—fails to do it. A budget isn't just numbers. It is about choices, and it is about priorities.

That means investing in infrastructure. We have to upgrade our roads and manage our water resources. Federal dollars are almost half of New Mexico's total transportation budget and 70 percent of funding for our highways and bridges.

It means making sure we have an educated workforce—not cutting Pell grants by 30 percent.

It means full funding for the PILT program—to help communities pay for law enforcement, schools, and other services folks depend on.

It means making sure our national labs and our military bases have the resources they need.

All of this makes a difference for the people of my State. It makes a difference for hardworking families. It makes a difference for the future of our country.

These should be our priorities, including doing more for small businesses. They are the engine of our economy. They create most new jobs. They need a fair tax policy—because they pay their fair share—and don't have an army of lawyers working to find tax loopholes.

We cannot ask Main Street to keep sacrificing while we fail to close a single tax loophole on Wall Street.

We need a tax system that supports the middle class—not corporations sending jobs overseas. Our economy is recovering, but the benefit needs to go to all Americans, not just those at the top.

These are the choices we should be making. These are the choices the Republican budget fails to make.

We need to invest in the programs that help all Americans get ahead—and strengthen our economy—so that every hardworking American has the opportunity to build a better future.

I hope we can work together and find common ground with a budget that makes sense, with a fair tax policy, and with smart investments. We need to look to the future—and move forward.

Now is not the time to return to the failed policies of the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 6 minutes.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.



## AMENDMENT NO. 652

(Purpose: To make college more affordable for middle-class families by allowing borrowers with outstanding Federal and private student loans to refinance at the equivalent interest rates that were offered to Federal student loan borrowers during the 2013–2014 school year and to fully offset the cost of such a program by requiring millionaires to pay at least a 30 percent effective Federal tax rate)

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator WARREN, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up her amendment No. 652.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for Ms. WARREN, for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. PETERS, proposes an amendment numbered 652.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for up to 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 11 following the joint meeting; that the time until 12:15 p.m. today be equally divided between the managers or their designees; and that at 12:15 p.m., the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Burr No. 622, Warren No. 652.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the managers or their designees prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ISAKSON. For the information of all Senators, there will be up to two rollcall votes at 12:15 p.m. today.

# JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF AFGHANISTAN

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:33 a.m., took a recess subject to the call of the Chair, and the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Julie E. Adams; the Deputy Sergeant at Arms, James Morhard; and the Vice President of the United States, JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr., proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear an address delivered by His Excellency Mohammad Ashraf Ghani, President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

(The address delivered by the President of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to the joint meeting of the two Houses of Congress is printed in the Proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

At 12:12 p.m., the Senate, having returned to its Chamber, reassembled and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FLAKE).

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes scheduled for 12:15 p.m. now take place at 12:30 p.m., with the Democrats controlling 15 minutes and the majority controlling the remaining time, with all provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AMENDMENT NO. 652

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the amendment we are going to be discussing now—and I will say a few words about it in a moment—deals with one of the most important issues facing our country; that is, the lack of affordability of college and the reality that when millions of our young people graduate school, they are left in crushing debt year after year after year, and they are unable to refinance that debt which has a huge impact on their lives.

I give time now to Senator WARREN, who has played a great role in focusing on this issue and has brought forth what I think is an excellent amendment.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support amendment No. 652, to refinance exist-

ing student loans and bring down the high interest rates that are dragging down millions of Americans.

When rates are low, people refinance their mortgages. When rates are low, businesses refinance their debt. Well, rates are low, and we want to give the 40 million Americans who are dealing with student loans the same chance to refinance their loans.

Last year, Republicans blocked our efforts to lower student loan interest rates. They said there were other, better ways to deal with student loan debt, but they did nothing. So tens of millions of borrowers got nothing, and millions of borrowers are still stuck paying interest rates at 6 percent, 8 percent, 10 percent, and even higher.

While Republicans were busy blocking student loan refinancing, our country's student debt problem got worse—much worse. In the last year, outstanding student debt has increased by \$100 billion dollars. Nearly 1 million more borrowers have fallen behind on their student loans. The interest rate on new student loans only got higher.

This amendment offers us a chance to actually do something for the millions of Americans who are dealing with student loan debt. The idea is simple: Refinance outstanding student loans down to 3.9 percent for undergraduates, a little higher for graduate students. The amendment would save borrowers hundreds and in some cases thousands of dollars a year, all without adding a dime to our deficit. It is fully paid for by closing a tax loophole that allows millionaires and billionaires to pay a lower tax rate than middle-class families.

We have a choice—protect a tax loophole for billionaires or give tens of millions of people a chance to refinance their student loans. A choice—protect a tax loophole for billionaires or give millions of middle-class people a chance to build some real economic security.

Congress has worked far too long for the billionaires. Now it is time for Congress to work for hard-working people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let's be frank. We live in a global economy. We need the best educated workforce in the world to compete. Yet we are making it harder and harder for middle-class families to send their kids to college. At the same time, we are saying to those young people who go to college: You are going to be living with an oppressive debt for decades—for decades.

Several months ago, I talked to a young woman in Burlington, VT. Her crime was that she went to medical school in order to become a primary care physician. Those are exactly the people we need. She left medical school with \$300,000 in debt. Does anybody think that makes any sense at all?

Right now, if you want to go out and buy a new car, you can get interest rates in some cases of 0 percent, 1 percent, 2 percent. If you want to refinance your home, you can pay 3 percent, 4 percent, 5 percent. Yet, when parents want to send their kids to college or young people themselves take out loans, they are forced to pay 6 percent, 8 percent, or even a higher percent for the crime of wanting to get a higher education.

Senator WARREN's amendment is eminently sensible. It significantly lowers interest rates, cutting them almost in half to 3.9 percent. This would be a huge blessing for millions of young people who are having a hard time buying homes, a hard time even starting families because they are dealing with this oppressive debt.

The last point I would make—and I hope everybody remembers this—when Wall Street, because of their greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior, needed to be bailed out, the Fed provided them with zero and one-half of 1 percent interest rates by the trillions of dollars. If we could bail out Wall Street—if the Fed could bail out Wall Street with extremely low interest rates, it is time for us to treat the young people in this country and their parents with the same respect. We need to substantially lower interest rates on student debt, and the Warren amendment would do that.

I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I appreciate and support the comments from my colleague, my neighbor from Vermont, Senator SANDERS. I am pleased to be here to support Senator WARREN's bill, which I am cosponsoring.

This amendment would allow our young people to refinance their student loans. Student loan debt has now surpassed credit card debt in this country. This is an issue about the economy of this country, but even more important it is an issue about the future of our young people.

In New Hampshire, we have the second highest student loan debt in the country. I have talked to young people and their families, who say they are delaying getting married, they are delaying having children, and they are delaying buying houses because of their student loan debt. Yet, families can refinance their houses and they can refinance their cars. They should be able to refinance their student loans.

This is critical to getting our economy moving again in the way it should. It is critical to ensuring that our young people have a future. I hope all of our colleagues will take a look at this legislation and will agree that it makes sense. We need to do this for our

families, for our students, and for our country.

I yield back to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. The Senator from Rhode Island, 3 minutes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I will be even briefer than that.

Mr. SANDERS. The Senator from Rhode Island gets 2 minutes, then.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to Senator WARREN's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Rhode Island is the very proud location of some of the best universities in the country. We have very high university density in our small State. We have everything from Brown University in Providence, to our wonderful State universities led by the University of Rhode Island, to leading Catholic colleges such as Providence College and Salve Regina in Newport, RI. To support kids in getting their college educations and to bring down the cost is a priority for us in Rhode Island. I am proud to cosponsor this amendment.

I yield back any further time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. I thank the Presiding Officer for recognizing me.

Mr. President, I, too, wish to rise in support of this amendment. In a nation that is finding itself increasingly with global competitors, where other nations—some of the most active economic competitors we have—are doing everything they can to keep the cost of college low. In Germany, 4 percent to 5 percent of median income is the cost of college. In Canada, 5 percent to 6 percent of median income is the cost of college. In England, 6 percent to 7 percent of median income is the cost of college. Other competitive democracies know to widen the avenues to greater college education. But here in the United States, the cost of college is over 50 percent of the median income.

We are raising barriers to our children getting in the game, being on the field, and playing. I say that when you field a team—when Stanford would compete in football, we didn't leave four or five of our players on the side lines; we got everybody on the field. That is what we need.

This amendment is common sense. We should not be profiting as a government off the backs of our students. We should allow them to refinance their student debt. That is why I support it, and I am grateful for my colleagues' support as well.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, how much time do we have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats have 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, over the last several months, I have had

three town meetings in Vermont with young people on this issue. It is an issue of huge concern to them and their parents. As Senator BOOKER just mentioned, we are competing with countries all over the world that say to their young people: If you have the ability and you have the desire, you can go to college regardless of your income.

In Germany, tuition for college is now zero. In many Scandinavian countries, it is now zero. What they are saying to the young people is, we need you to get the best education to help us create the strongest economy, to create the jobs we need.

How insane is it for us to literally discourage bright young people from attending college or to tell others that if they graduate college or graduate school, they are going to be \$70,000, \$80,000, \$100,000 in debt? What sense does this make for the well-being of the middle class of this country or for our economic competitiveness?

In the next month, I will be personally introducing legislation that will cut and do away with tuition in public colleges and universities, but today what we are focusing on is legislation that is so sensible, so obvious, it is hard for me to imagine that anybody can vote against it. I have in my office at least two attorneys who are struggling with huge student debts. This is true all over this country. They graduated from college 15 years ago. They are still paying off that debt, and it impacts what they can do. We have evidence out there that families are not having children because of student debt, not buying homes because of student debt. Why is it that people have to pay double or triple interest rates because they got an education as opposed to what they would pay when they purchase a car or a home? Does anybody think that makes sense?

Today we have an opportunity to stand up for the young people of this country and say we want them to get an education and we want them to have the freedom to live their lives after they leave school. That is what this amendment is about.

I yield time to the Senator from Virginia, Mr. Kaine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I also rise to speak on behalf of this budget amendment. I will be brief.

There is a wonderful organization that analyzes education in this country called the Lumina Foundation. Their main area of research is the percentage of adults in the country and competitor countries who have higher education degrees. Because of the GI bill, the United States rocketed ahead of other nations and became the clear leading country in the world in the percentage of adults with higher education degrees. There wasn't a close

second. But now we are 10th to 15th in the world and slipping.

I would argue that the economic future for this country is not one that we would like if the United States continues to slip further and further behind other nations in the percentage of our folks with higher education degrees. That is why I support this amendment.

I yield back my time.

Mr. SANDERS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be here on the floor of the Senate with Senator WARREN, Senator SANDERS, and all of my colleagues on the Democratic side who feel very strongly that if young people are going to have a fair shot to get ahead, to enter the middle class, to be a part of a thriving economy, they have to come out of college without mountains of debt so they can go and buy a house and a car and have a family and a career and not be saddled with outrageous debt. That is what this amendment is about.

If there were ever an amendment that said we want middle-class opportunity for everybody, it is this one. I hope we will have a unanimous vote.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me conclude by saying this: The high cost of college and student debt is one of the great issues facing our country. We are trying to lower student debt significantly. Our Republican colleagues' response to the crisis is to cut \$90 billion in mandatory funding for Pell grants. The choice is pretty clear. We are looking at the future of this country and the need for our young people to get the best education possible and to not graduate college deeply in debt. That is what this amendment is about. I hope we will have strong bipartisan support for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I don't think there is anybody on either side of the aisle who isn't concerned about student debt, the cost of interest and college and the number of people graduating with debt. Addressing college costs and the burden of high student debt loans must be a priority, but it can't be done on a budget bill. We can't have policy on a budget resolution. I know this doesn't include all of her policy, so it is an incomplete bill.

The Office of Management and Budget last month disclosed that participation in the existing income-based repayment plan has been much higher than was anticipated, and the administration is currently in the process of extending those existing repayment options to all the eligible borrowers with outstanding student loans. Therefore, the OMB now projects that the existing

student loan portfolio will cost taxpayers an additional \$22 billion. That is \$22 billion more being spent to alleviate the repayment burden of borrowers with outstanding debt. We can find that number in the President's budget.

The CBO did score the bill that Senator WARREN introduced last Congress on which this amendment is based. The CBO projected that the government will make billions in profit—listen to this—from buying tens of billions worth of private student loans from banks and refinancing them at lower rates. They are going to buy up loans and then refinance those loans at lower rates, and somehow the way that scores is positive for the Federal Government? Wow. That is why we are talking about needing some changes in the way we do scoring around here. Think about that. If the government can make money from buying up private loans while charging the borrower a lower rate, why stop there? We can make trillions for the country.

CBO, as well as leading academic economists and think tanks, all believe credit reform accounting is seriously flawed. They favor fair value accounting under which loans are valued at what they are worth to the private sector. Last year CBO showed that under fair value accounting, the Federal student loan portfolio does not make a big profit. It actually has a significant cost. One of the reasons for some of the high interest rates is that when the Affordable Care Act was passed, it set those rates higher so there would be revenue for the Affordable Care Act.

I hope we will defeat this amendment and support the bipartisan King-Burr proposal.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 622

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 622, offered by the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. BURR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Burr-King amendment No. 622, which creates a deficit-neutral reserve fund to reduce overlapping student loan repayment programs.

The student repayment system is a mess right now. There are nine different alternatives and they are very confusing. Even the names are confusing. There is the income-based repayment, the income-contingent repayment, the income-sensitive repayment, and the pay-as-you-earn repayment. In other words, it is very complicated and it is one of the things that makes it confusing and hard for students.

Senator BURR and I have introduced this amendment in order to simplify this decision. Basically we have taken

suggestions from individuals—students, institutions, as well as the President—to simplify the loan repayment provision to reduce it to basically two options, a fixed repayment over 10 years or an income-related repayment over a longer period of time.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment. I believe it is an overdue simplification of this process, and I believe it will enable the students of America to deal with this issue in a more constructive way.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, we think the Burr-King amendment is a sensible, noncontroversial amendment, and I don't believe we have any objection to it on this side of the aisle.

I suggest a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any further debate?

Without any further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 622) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 652

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 652, offered by the Senator from Massachusetts, Ms. WARREN.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, not seeing the Senator from Massachusetts, I will make this point: If there is an eminently sensible amendment to come before us, this is it. It addresses the crisis that exists all over this country where young people are graduating college deeply in debt and have that onerous debt around their necks for decades.

This amendment simply gives these young people the opportunity to refinance their debts so they can substantially lower their student debt, and in some cases cut their student debt in half. It is hard for me to imagine how anybody could vote against an amendment as sensible as this amendment but so important to millions of families in this country who want to be able to send their kids to college and for the young people who want to graduate college without this oppressive debt.

I strongly ask for a "yes" vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, the proper way to do this is to consider the full bill and run it through committee and then the floor and not try to make policy in a budget resolution.

I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield back any remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the Warren amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 86 Leg.]

#### YEAS—46

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Nelson	

#### NAYS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 652) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the Federal budget is a pressing concern for everybody in this body, including myself, especially given the political climate we have in Congress. We have been two Houses divided for some time.

Back in 2011, the Republican House and the Democratic Senate agreed that Federal spending was out of control. They just couldn't agree on what to do about it. So Members from both Chambers came together to give Congress two options: either pass a responsible budget to help reduce the deficit or face drastic cuts to every discretionary Federal department.

That threat of sequester was supposed to represent the end of the road, forcing Congress to put differences

aside and to work together, but sometimes even a dead end is not enough to motivate some folks to do the right thing. Congress failed to come up with a bipartisan, long-term spending plan and sequestration went into effect 2 years ago.

Sequestration has had devastating effects nationally and in my home State of Nevada. Take, for instance, sequestration's impact on our national forests. We have 17 million acres of national forest managed by the U.S. Forest Service. Under its current structure, the Forest Service uses the same pool of funds to manage our national forests that it does to fight wildfires. In bad fire years, suppression can use over 40 percent of the U.S. Forest Service's budget. So it is no surprise that their budget is still in disarray 2 years after sequestration cuts \$200 million during the hot, dry summer that saw millions of acres of trees burn across the West.

Sequestration proved to be irresponsible and its impacts long-lasting, and our forests weren't the own casualties. The Indian Country was slammed from education to health care, to infrastructure. Indian Health Service saw its budget cut by a similar amount. Health care in Indian Country is chronically underfunded anyway. The additional 5-percent cut to the IHS budget resulted in 800,000 fewer outpatient visits for Native Americans. Indian schools—many of which are in such bad shape that nobody in this body would send their kids there—saw their budgets cut by \$67 million, which resulted in bigger class size, cutbacks to academic programs, cutbacks to building maintenance, and reduction in technology upgrades. Sequestration was almost as devastating to the public education system in this country, and it had its impact on seniors and low-income children and families. It will be again if Congress doesn't act.

Between now and September 30, Congress must pass a responsible budget that reduces our deficit, and we have time to agree on that or we will face greater cuts than we saw last time. The President's budget proposal makes significant investments in infrastructure and education and our outdoors. These initiatives will help grow our economy, particularly in rural States such as Montana, but there is one big problem. The President's budget fails to reduce the deficit in a smart and meaningful way, but the other options on the table are worse.

The House last week unveiled its budget proposal. It is the height of irresponsibility. The House wants to privatize Medicare by turning it into a voucher program. It wants to turn Medicaid into block grants and cut those. They want to cut taxes for millionaires and big corporations while they phase out portions of the earned-income tax credit, squeezing the wal-

lets of millions of working-class Americans. The House's plan also cuts the Pell Grant Program.

It repeals the Affordable Care Act—that is no surprise. The House has voted over 50 times to repeal the ACA, ignoring the fact that we have some 16 million more Americans that have affordable access to health care than before the law was passed, but in a show of boundless hypocrisy, the House balances its budget by counting the \$700 billion in Medicare savings and the \$1 trillion in new revenue that the Affordable Care Act provides.

Now some folks might say, well, that is the House of Representatives. Look at how they handled the funding for the Department of Homeland Security this year. They nearly shut down the agency tasked with protecting our borders and preventing terrorist attacks on America. The House gave up on responsible governing years ago. But the fact is the budget before us today in the Senate isn't much different. It repeals the Affordable Care Act, but again pretends to keep the \$700 billion in savings to Medicare and the \$1 trillion of revenue created by the Affordable Care Act—after it has been repealed. Now, I am a farmer, not an accountant, but I want to state that this is the kind of new math that doesn't add up to me.

The Senate budget—similar to the House—also guts the Pell Grant Program by one-third. Why is that important? Well, in Montana, students are graduating from college with more than \$27,000 in debt in student loans. The last thing they need are less Pell grants and more student debt, which is exactly what will happen if this Senate budget passes.

It also puts States on the hook for over \$1 trillion in Medicaid funding. What does that mean? It means we are not going to take care of it anymore. We are going to push it off on States and act like it doesn't exist. Just like the House, it raises taxes on the lowest rung of the economic ladder by repealing the extension of the earned-income tax credit and child tax credit. These credits keep over 13 million Americans—working families with relatively low incomes—out of poverty.

While this rhetoric about passing a balanced budget sounds good—and I do support a balanced budget—the reality is this budget doesn't cut it. It does not balance. Why? Because this budget relies on gimmicks such as using the Overseas Contingency Fund, which is supposed to fund the war on Afghanistan and action against ISIS but instead has become a slush fund for the Department of Defense. This budget assumes hundreds of billions of dollars in “unallocated cuts.” That is great messaging. We are going to slash the budget by hundreds of billions of dollars, but we are not going to tell you where we cut it out. We can talk about cuts,

but when it gets to specifics—the real tough decisions—we are not going to talk about those. We are not even going to tell you where they are. It is not only secretive, but it is bad policy, and these kinds of smoke and mirrors are the worst Washington has to offer.

While the President's budget spends far too much, at least it is honest, open, and transparent. The House and Senate budgets are just a display of bad mathematics. They lack any sort of realistic plan to keep our economy growing by investing in America. Instead of balancing the budget on the backs of middle-class families and seniors and students and our Nation's most vulnerable, we need to fully invest in the measures that will help this economy go, such as roads, bridges, our outdoor economy, education for our kids and our grandkids because that is the only way they are going to be able to compete in this global economy. In 2015, every nation is interconnected. Business transactions occur between multinational corporations, scientific discovery is shared between universities on different continents, clean air and clean water and carbon emission standards are achieved by international agreements, but global security seems to be a battle that we—the United States—are fighting alone—and at what cost?

Last week, my Appropriations subcommittee on military construction held a hearing on the Defense Department's construction budget. The United States spends more on defense than the next nine nations combined. Let me say it one more time. The United States spends more on defense than the next nine nations combined, including the United Kingdom, Germany, India, and—yes—China. Two of America's greatest international threats, ISIS and a nuclear Iran, pose a grave threat to us but also to our allies in the Middle East and Europe. Yet we are the ones paying the overwhelming majority of these costs. This budget hides those costs from the American people. With 47 Senators pushing us to go to war with Iran, I think the American people deserve to know how we are spending their dollars overseas.

Do not misunderstand me. Congress's foremost concern should be with protecting our Nation and in keeping our communities safe, but that should also be the foremost concern of our allies around the world. Time and time again, though, it is the U.S. taxpayer and American lives who are on the line, and that price is far too high. It is not just dollars and cents. It is the lives of our kids. It is the wounds they will face when they return from war, if they return from war at all. These are pricetags we cannot afford.

While we send our troops and our treasures overseas, our allies are free to invest significantly in more public education, health care, infrastructure,

research and development, and lower taxes. Why? Because we are paying the bill. Their economies grow in relation to our deficit. As Congress looks to responsibly cut spending, we must look at the billions we waste overseas, and we need to level with the American people about the true cost of war. While caring for our veterans is a cost we absolutely should bear, we can no longer afford to fight and fund every international conflict. We have to stop paying for war on our children's credit.

We need to think about the future and invest in public education, health care, and infrastructure, in sound forest management, and in lower taxes. A global economy and a global defense will allow us to invest in middle-class families, educating our children, protecting our seniors, and making sure Americans can afford food and shelter. These are investments we must make, but the budget before us stops investing in America.

We can do better, and we must do better.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 601

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Bennet-Stabenow amendment No. 601.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW], for Mr. BENNET, for himself and Ms. STABENOW, proposes an amendment numbered 601.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would privatize Medicare, cut guaranteed benefits, increase out-of-pocket spending, or turn Medicare into a premium support plan)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE MEDICARE, CUT GUARANTEED BENEFITS, INCREASE OUT-OF-POCKET SPENDING, OR TURN MEDICARE INTO A PREMIUM SUPPORT PLAN.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) privatize or change the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) into a system that provides a payment either to pay for or offset private plan premiums or the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program;

(2) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program; or

(3) increase out-of-pocket spending for prescription drugs or preventive services under the Medicare program.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of

the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, Medicare turns 50 years old this year. This is not the time to turn our back on Medicare and the universal nature of Medicare. We all understand and are confident that after paying into the system year after year or turning age 65 or meeting the other qualifications that we have means that health care will be available to everyone, regardless of where you live, regardless of who you are.

Medicare is a great American success story. Before Medicare became law, only half of Americans who were 65 years of age or older had any type of health insurance. They could not find health insurance. Those who found health insurance were paying through the roof to be able to get that insurance. Often times they were paying—they lacked coverage for surgery or health expenses that occurred outside the hospital. You could have one single surgery or illness and be totally wiped out.

So our country came together and said: We are going to make sure that for seniors in this country, health care will be available to everyone. We have done that. It is extremely successful. I am very, very concerned about what this budget does to Medicare, as well as the budget in the House of Representatives. First of all, let me say that there is no question that Medicare, as with every other public program, was designed to improve and evolve and be strengthened and add new things—certainly for the security of future generations.

That is why the prescription drug bill was passed. That is why the Affordable Care Act—we took even better steps forward to make sure there were no gaps in coverage under prescription drugs. Seniors today are spending thousands of dollars less out of pocket to get critically needed medicines than they did before the Affordable Care Act. They now have no out-of-pocket costs for annual wellness visits or for other prevention.

Now, in this bill that is undermined in two different ways. First of all, there is the Affordable Care Act, which 16.4 million people are now using to get health care for themselves and their families, and most of them, by the way, are people who could not afford health care in the past, just as seniors could not 50 years ago. All of them will lose their health care under this budget, the House and the Senate budget. The changes that we made to improve prescription drug coverage and lower the costs to seniors will be gone. That was part of the ACA. There are the changes to protect people, to be able to know that when they have insurance, they

are going to be covered when they get sick and not dropped. If they are sick, if they have a serious disease, they can still get insurance even if they have a preexisting condition. All of the things in the Affordable Care Act are gone under this budget.

Now, interestingly, and as the distinguished Senator from Montana said, all of the revenue raised under the Affordable Care Act stays in this bill. So they keep the money, but they take away your medical care. To add insult to injury, because actually repealing the Affordable Care Act increases the deficit, the Affordable Care Act is exempted from the point of order that is required in the budget when an action actually increases the deficit.

So then you add to that what is being done in Medicare. The House cuts \$150 billion from Medicare for senior citizens, by moving away from what has been the foundation of Medicare—which is a guaranteed benefit. You pay in, and it is a guaranteed benefit. They turn it into something they call premium support.

The Senate proposes even more than that—\$434 billion in cuts to Medicare over the next 10 years. They are not specified, but they are using the same kind of language that relates to the security of the program and issues that in the past have been called vouchers—or some other change that all ends up in the same place, which is cutting Medicare.

Our children, our grandchildren know that grandpas and grandmas, aunts and uncles, and moms and dads right now have health care because of this wonderful American success story called Medicare. It is seriously undermined in this budget. I would urge my colleagues to come together and send a clear message that we stand together in a bipartisan way to continue to support Medicare and say: Hands off the Medicare program and the promise made to our seniors now and to those in the future.

The Bennet-Stabenow amendment would create a point of order against legislation and would require a supermajority vote on anything that would privatize Medicare, would cut guaranteed benefits, increase out-of-pocket spending or use premium support schemes to undermine the fundamental nature of what Medicare is.

Now, I also find it quite extraordinary that in the House budget, which is more specific, when the Affordable Care Act health exchanges are eliminated, two pages later in their budget, they create health exchanges for Medicare. Some would say: ObamaCare and Medicare.

This is a very strange debate we are having on health care. So we want to make it very clear: Hands off Medicare. Hands off Medicare. Whether you are trying to privatize it in some way, turn it over to private insurance companies,

vouchers, cut guaranteed benefits, increase out-of-pocket costs, use what has been called premium support schemes to undermine Medicare's universal nature of what it is, stop it. Hands off Medicare.

That is what we need to be doing in this budget. I hope colleagues will come together and vote for the Bennet-Stabenow amendment to guarantee that happens.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 755

Mr. President, I have a second amendment that is a side-by-side amendment for the Barrasso amendment that will be called up later. I have been asked also to move forward on that amendment as well.

I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Stabenow amendment No. 755.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW] proposes an amendment numbered 755.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to keeping the Federal Water Pollution Control Act focused on protection of water quality, to establish bright lines for Federal jurisdiction, and to create clear and unambiguous exemptions for features that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency or the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, claim they are not seeking to regulate)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF CLEAN WATER USING SCIENTIFIC STANDARDS WHILE MAINTAINING THE TRADITIONAL ROLE OF AGRICULTURE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting watersheds, including the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay, the Mississippi River system, the Colorado River system, or other sources of drinking water of the United States, which may include clarifying the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) to provide certainty for landowners or rural communities, or preserving existing exemptions for agriculture, ranching, or forestry, or to rely on the scientific evidence of impacts on water quality of different types of water bodies by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, obviously, I care very passionately about Medicare and about health care, and I believe strongly that this is a fundamental right of every American. We do not decide when we are going to get

sick. We do not decide when our children are going to get sick or what is going to happen to us as it relates to our health.

But another important part of health relates to the ability to have clean, drinkable water. The Clean Water Act has been a vital tool for promoting the health and livelihood—the economy—of Americans for the past 40 years. In fact, according to the EPA, the Clean Water Act has kept tens of billions of pounds of sewage and chemicals and trash out of our waterways. It has helped double the number of American waters that meet standards for fishing and swimming. I can tell you that in Michigan, we love the Great Lakes. They are in our DNA. The ability to fish, the ability to swim—in fact, we have a \$7 billion fishing industry, in which my family has been a proud participant, and a \$16 billion recreational boating industry. The jobs of more than 800,000 residents are supported by the economic asset of our Great Lakes, and we want to make sure the Clean Water Act is strong.

Now, we also are very proud of agriculture in Michigan. We have more diversity of crops than any other State in the country other than California. We are working on that. So we are able to do that, in part, because of the abundance of water, frankly. Unlike friends in other States, the issues around water—clean abundance of water for agriculture, for ranchers, for forests, for farmers—have not been issues for us. We certainly want to keep it that way.

Now, last year the EPA proposed a rule to define the waters of the United States, basically to clarify two different Supreme Court rulings—one in 2001. After that ruling in 2001, the former administration, the Bush administration, began working on a rule to clarify this question of the waters and regulating the waters of the United States.

Then there was an even more complicated, confusing decision. I never thought you could actually have five different decisions out of a nine-member Supreme Court. But that is what happened. We ended up with even more confusion in 2006. So both administrations—the Bush administration and the Obama administration—understood, as does everyone, that we have to fix this. We have to clarify this, for farmers and ranchers and for citizens and communities. I started in county government. I understand for local governments how important that is as well.

So the rule that is before us now—the proposed rule—has been debated for over 200 days, including 400 public meetings and over one million comments. I am not sure that is a record, but it is pretty close—87 percent of which have been positive to moving forward. Now, the proposal was not meant to target agriculture, but it has



led to a lot of legitimate questions in my mind about the standing of agriculture's historic exemption under the clean water regulations.

So my amendment would help to clarify agriculture's role, while maintaining important clean water protections. This is very important. We can do both. We need to do both. We need to make clear the historic role in agriculture as it relates to separate actions from the Clean Water Act, and we also need to have a Clean Water Act. So this would establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation that would ensure that the Clean Water Act is focused on protecting water quality, upholds existing exemptions in the Clean Water Act for agriculture and ranching that have existed for decades.

Our farmers and ranchers deserve to have the certainty of getting this done and having it done right and knowing that what has been going on for decades for them will be the law of the land. It also ensures we rely on scientific evidence as we examine the impact that water quality has on the different types of water bodies, and it provides certainty—as I said before—to landowners in rural communities regarding the scope of the Clean Water Act.

We had an important hearing on that yesterday in the Agriculture Committee. Clearly, we need to provide that certainty for our farmers and our ranchers. Now, unfortunately, my colleague from Wyoming has an amendment that appears to attempt to address this, but it is overly broad and, frankly, unclear. It does not even mention agriculture. It does not mention the historic exemptions of agriculture, ranching, and forestry. It does not mention rural communities that may be affected.

So I do not believe that is the direction this Senate should go. We need to be clear. We do not need more confusion; we need less confusion. So my amendment clarifies the scope of any changes made to the Clean Water Act so that exemptions important to agriculture are maintained. The Barrasso amendment, unfortunately, would also roll back efforts to protect the health of the Great Lakes. All of us who represent the Great Lakes should be concerned about that—and the Chesapeake Bay, the Mississippi River system, the Colorado River system and so many other systems around the country and all our sources of drinking water for the United States.

I would encourage colleagues, when this comes up, to vote no on the Barrasso amendment, to vote yes on the Stabenow amendment, and to make it clear that we support the Clean Water Act, we support decisions being made based on science, and we also want to make sure that the historic relationship with agriculture and the Clean Water Act is maintained.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

AMENDMENT NO. 350

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendments and call up my amendment No. 350.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT] for himself and Mr. THUNE, proposes an amendment numbered 350.

Mr. BLUNT. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a point of order against legislation that would create a Federal tax or fee on carbon emissions)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A TAX OR FEE ON CARBON EMISSIONS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) would result in revenues that would be greater than the level of revenues set forth for the first fiscal year or the total of that fiscal year and the ensuing fiscal years under the concurrent resolution on the budget then in effect for which allocations are provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) for any year covered by such resolution, includes a Federal tax or fee imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of the emissions.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I rise today in support of this amendment. This amendment is designed to create a point of order against a carbon tax.

This point of order would protect American families and workers from attacks on carbon, and attacks on their utility bills, attacks on things that are absolutely essential for families—and for opportunities for families as we look at utilities and energy.

A carbon tax would increase the cost on energy. It would kill jobs as it increased the cost on energy, and make life for families more difficult than it needs to be.

At a time when we are struggling to see our economy move forward, families and job creators in Missouri and across the country need to be able to continue to count on affordable and abundant energy resources.

We have tremendous opportunities and more American energy. We need to use that in a way that benefits families and benefits the future.

According to a 2013 Congressional Budget Office report, a tax of about \$21 per metric ton on carbon would raise the price of electricity by an average of about 16 percent in the country. In the State of Missouri, my State, it would increase, according to that 2013 CBO report, the utility bill by 27 percent.

We are more coal dependent than many of our States, but apparently if the average in the United States is 16 percent, all you have to do is add that to your utility bill to see what kind of problem that creates for a bill that, in many cases, families are struggling to pay already.

Twenty-seven percent in the fifth most coal-dependent State, Missouri, where 82 percent of our electricity comes from coal, adds a huge and new burden that wouldn't be there otherwise as people try to respond to this decision that the government could make to decide to make it impossible to have the kinds of utilities that are now available to families.

The National Association of Manufacturers, in that same year, 2013, found that a carbon tax would lead to a loss of worker income and, in fact, would lead to the loss of jobs—the equivalent of about 1.3 million to 1.5 million jobs in the first year and as many as 21 million jobs by 2053.

Now, more than ever, we need to send a clear message to the Obama administration that we don't support a carbon tax as the administration moves forward with regulations that, in fact, would have exactly the same impact a carbon tax would have.

The Congress has said no repeatedly, privately, publicly, over and over again, to a carbon tax, but it doesn't seem to slow down the constant desire to look at a regulation that could produce the same thing. These regulations are regressive, they have the most negative impact on families that are struggling to pay their utility bill now, they have a negative impact on the elderly, they have a negative impact on people on fixed incomes, and they have a negative impact on public institutions such as schools and hospitals.

There is nobody but the ratepayer, the person who gets the utility bill—you and I, when we get our utility bill, everybody whom we know who gets a utility bill—there is nobody to pay that utility bill but them. These costs are passed along by the laws of every State. There is no mythical utility company that is going to absorb these new costs if we allow them to happen.

The recently proposed clean power plan would, under section 111 of the Clean Air Act, act as a tax on energy by making affordable and reliable means of electricity, such as coal-fired



and natural gas-fired plants, more expensive.

Also, it would take plants that clearly had lots of life left in them and somebody has to pay for them. If those plants aren't usable, they don't go away. Somebody still has to pay the bill, and the somebody is everybody who gets a utility bill.

These costs go directly to ratepayers, they go directly to consumers, and they have a real negative impact on the kinds of things we should be looking for—ways to have a positive impact. These costs ripple through our economy. They inflict damage on consumers at all levels.

We saw what happened when gas prices went down just a little bit. The decline in gas prices, with the opportunity we see now with more American energy, suddenly families felt as though they had the first increase that many families have had in the last 6 or 7 years, where incomes have been flat but outgo has been on the increase. When you saw gas prices go down, suddenly people were able to do things they couldn't do before: one more meal out a week, newer shoes quicker than you thought you might get newer shoes for your kids or yourself.

Those things begin to happen. But if you increase the utility bill by 17 percent or 27 percent or more than that—if all of your utilities come from coal right now, your utility bill is going to go up higher than that if we go in this direction.

A carbon tax would have the same impact. The similarities are clear. They are so clear, in fact, that under the so-called Clean Power Act, regional authorities and States were supposed to come up with their own plan as to how to implement it.

One regional transmission organization, the PJM Interconnection, simply created an explicit price for carbon in the models it was using. Whether the administration calls it a carbon tax or not, everybody who looks at how they are going to provide utilities knows that is exactly what it is.

If we want to grow our economy, we need to increase rather than decrease. We need to encourage rather than discourage access to low-cost, abundant, available fuels, and find the cleanest possible way to use those fuels.

We have seen great progress in this direction. We need to be doing things that encourage that progress to occur rather than things that will absolutely and with certainty increase utility bills for families and decrease job opportunities for young people.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment that will make a difference. I am certainly grateful that my friend Senator THUNE, the chairman of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, is cosponsoring this amendment with me.

I urge my colleagues to support its adoption.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to try to, as we are about halfway through the budget debate, summarize where we are and the very clear differences that exist between my Republican colleagues and those of us on this side. I think if the American people pay attention, the differences are very clear.

What some of us are trying to do is to take a hard look at the very serious problems facing our Nation and do our best to come up with sensible solutions to those problems. I think that is what the budget process should be about. What are the problems facing this country? What are the best solutions that we go forward with?

But, already, we have strong disagreements as to how we even look at the problems facing the country. From my perspective, and I think from the perspective, quite honestly, of the vast majority of the American people, the major economic problem we face is a disappearing middle class.

The good news is that compared to where we were 6½ years ago, we have made significant progress. I think most Americans remember that after the Wall Street crash—caused by the greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior on Wall Street—that at that point, as President Bush was leaving office, we were hemorrhaging 800,000 jobs a month. That is hard to imagine, 800,000 jobs a month.

My Republican colleagues and I would agree and say the job creation now is not as strong as it should be. Fair enough. I wish to see more than 200,000 jobs a month being created. But no one will deny that 200,000 jobs a month being created is a heck of a lot better than losing 800,000 jobs a month, which is where we were when President Bush left office.

My Republican friends say the deficit is too high. I think they have a point. It is about \$483 billion, a very high deficit. But I hope no one denies that a \$483 billion deficit is a heck of a lot less than the \$1.3 trillion deficit that existed when President Bush left office.

When President Bush left office, the financial system not only in America but all over the world was teetering on collapse. We learned later, actually, that economists literally believed the system would collapse. If you put your credit card into the ATM machine, nothing comes out. That is where we were 6½ years ago.

Today, for better or worse, the stock market is soaring and the financial

system today seems reasonably solid. No one denies it is a lot better than it was 6½ years ago.

So we have made some progress despite, I must say, consistent Republican obstructionism, but we have made some progress. But I would be the first to agree, with my Republican friends or anybody else, that we are not anywhere near where we should be.

Unemployment has gone down. The official unemployment rate is about 5½ right now. But let me tell you, the official unemployment rate is not the real unemployment rate. When you include those people who have been given up looking for work and those who are looking for part time, real unemployment in this country today is about 11 percent. Youth unemployment—which we never talk about, but it is a very serious problem—is about 17 percent. African-American youth unemployment, which we never talk about, is much higher than that.

So what we are trying to do, as we look out and we recognize a problem that says—the American people tell us in every poll I have seen that their most serious issue is jobs and wages. How do we create jobs? How do those jobs pay us a decent wage?

Does anyone disagree with that? I don't think so. That is the issue. So what have we tried to do in this process? What we on this side have tried to do is say: OK, how do we create jobs? What is the fastest way we can create the millions of jobs our country and our economy need?

What economists tell us is the fastest way to create jobs is through investment in our infrastructure.

Does anybody, any Republican, Democrat, progressive, conservative, disagree that our infrastructure is in a state of terrible disrepair—that is, our roads, our bridges, our water systems, our wastewater plants, our airports, our rail systems, our levees, our dams. I don't think there is any disagreement.

What the experts tell us—and I speak as a former mayor and concur with the experts—is that when you delay work on infrastructure, it only gets worse. If you do not rebuild a crumbling road, it gets worse. If you do not rebuild a decaying water system, it becomes worse and more expensive to repair.

So what have we said here on this side? What we have said is, let's not kick this can down the road, which we have done for many years. Let's acknowledge the problem, and let's make serious investments in infrastructure—rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges and rail systems and water plants and wastewater plants, et cetera. That is what we have said. And we brought forth an amendment, which I offered, which would create some 9 million jobs in rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure—9 million jobs over a period of 6 years. I think the

way we paid for that \$478 billion investment makes sense to most Americans, who understand we have major corporation after major corporation that pays zero in Federal income taxes because they take advantage of absurd loopholes—loopholes that allow them to invest their money and put their money in the Cayman Islands, in Bermuda, in Luxembourg, and in other tax havens and pay nothing in Federal income taxes. So we have said: Let's repeal those loopholes. Let's raise the revenue we need. Let's invest it in the infrastructure. In the process, let's create millions of decent-paying jobs. I would say that is a sensible response to the job crisis.

In terms of income and wages, I think everybody or almost everybody understands that the Federal minimum wage today of \$7.25 an hour is literally a starvation wage. It has to be raised. What we are trying to do on our side is to raise the minimum wage, and I will have an amendment to do that.

We are trying to deal with the serious inequities regarding pay differentiation in America between male and female workers. Women workers are making 78 cents an hour compared to the wages paid to men. That makes no sense. We brought forth an amendment—Senator MIKULSKI brought forth an amendment to bring pay equity. That is an important issue.

We are also going to fight for reform of overtime rules so that people who are making \$25,000 a year—so-called supervisors at McDonald's or Burger King—are not earning time and a half despite the fact they are working 50 to 60 hours a week.

So those are a few of the issues we are trying to focus on—creating jobs and raising wages. I have to say, unhappily, that my Republican colleagues have not been supportive of those efforts. What they have been absolutely persistent about is doing anything to cut Medicare, cut Medicaid, cut education, and cut nutrition. They will do anything other than ask the wealthiest people in this country, who are doing phenomenally well, the largest corporations, which are enjoying record-breaking profits—they will do anything to prevent those groups from paying more in taxes even if it means massive cuts to programs working families desperately depend upon.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 777

Mr. President, with that, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and call up amendment No. 777.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE, proposes an amendment numbered 777.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to recognize that climate change is real and caused by human activity and that Congress needs to take action to cut carbon pollution)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CUTTING CARBON POLLUTION TO PREVENT HUMAN-INDUCED CLIMATE CHANGE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting Americans from the impacts of human-induced climate change, which may include action on policies that reduce emissions by the amounts that the scientific community says are needed to avert catastrophic climate change, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 356

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up the amendment I am offering, which is amendment No. 356.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. MORAN], for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. KING, proposes an amendment numbered 356.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to providing health care to veterans who reside more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provides the care sought by the veteran)

At the end of title III, add the following:

#### SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING HEALTH CARE TO VETERANS WHO HAVE GEOGRAPHIC INACCESSIBILITY TO CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing health care to veterans

who reside more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provides the care sought by the veteran, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I would remind the Presiding Officer of the hearing we had yesterday dealing with veterans affairs and the opportunity we had to discuss the implementation of something we now refer to as the choice act.

One of the successes and, in my view, one of the few successes we had last term—in fact, with Senator SANDERS being on the floor as well—was the passage of the choice act. That legislation was Congress responding to scandal within the Department of Veterans Affairs—the fraudulent wait lists, the lack of services available to veterans who were waiting, and a number of veterans falling through the cracks. Congress responded and passed legislation now referred to as the choice act.

What that choice act said in simple terms is that if you are a veteran and you are unable to receive the services you need from the Department of Veterans Affairs within 30 days or if you are a veteran who lives more than 40 miles from a VA facility, the choice act allows you—in fact, requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide you with services at home if you so choose. It is your choice.

That bill was passed by Congress in August of 2014, signed by the President in September, implemented since then beginning in November, and it is now March of 2015. What we have discovered during that period of implementation is there are a number of pitfalls by which veterans are not receiving the care we indicated they would receive following the passage of that legislation. A lot of that problem is related to the 40-mile provision. Again, if you live more than 40 miles from a VA facility, the law says the Department of Veterans Affairs will provide you with service, if you so choose, with a local provider.

A couple of things have happened. The interpretation by the Department of Veterans Affairs of a couple of provisions has precluded a significant number, in my view, of veterans from being able to utilize this choice program.

Yesterday, the Department of Veterans Affairs, to their own credit, decided that they had been interpreting the law incorrectly. That provision related to as the crow flies, meaning that the 40 miles was to be computed as the crow flies, and that was the way the VA determined they were required to interpret that provision. Yesterday, the Department of Veterans Affairs decided they had the authority to really make that 40 miles highway miles. So

if you happen to live on one side of a lake or one side of a mountain, it is no longer as the crow flies. That is a piece of good news.

But here is the issue I have raised numerous times, and here is the issue that still remains a problem for many veterans. I smile when I say this because there are not many lakes in Kansas and there are no mountains in Kansas, so "as the crow flies" is not a significant issue to most Kansans as it is in many other places in the country. But yesterday's decision by the Department does increase the number of veterans who may qualify for the choice act.

Among other things, what is still missing is the idea of a facility within 40 miles. The problem is this: The Department of Veterans Affairs has interpreted and continues to interpret that to mean even though there is a VA facility within the 40 miles that does not provide the service the veteran needs, it is still a facility within 40 miles, and thus the veteran will be required to transport themselves to a hospital 2, 3, 4 hours away.

I have said this before on the Senate floor. As a House Member before coming to the Senate, I represented a congressional district made up of tens of thousands of square miles, larger than the State of Illinois. There is no VA hospital within that congressional district. We worked hard to create outpatient clinics where routine services could be provided closer to home for those veterans. Now we are saying: If you can't access the care that is more than 40 miles from your home, the VA is going to give you the option of seeing your hometown doctor, being admitted to your hometown hospital. But here is one of the problems: If there is an outpatient clinic within that 40 miles, even though it doesn't provide the service you as a veteran need, the VA says you don't qualify for the choice act.

I am of the view that they have the ability to interpret that law differently. They say it takes a legislative change. I am not sure there is a lot of value in continuing to have the debate about who is right about that. What I do know is there are many veterans in Kansas and across the country who are not receiving the services promised by the choice act because there is an outpatient clinic within the 40 miles, but it doesn't provide the service they need.

To give folks an understanding of what I am talking about, most outpatient clinics don't provide colonoscopies. So we have a veteran who needs a colonoscopy. The VA is to provide that service. Yet, in the case of where I come from, my hometown, the VA hospital is 3 hours away and the outpatient clinic is half an hour away, and because there is an outpatient clinic half an hour away, that veteran

can't utilize the choice act. But the outpatient clinic doesn't provide colonoscopies, so that veteran is told by the VA that he or she has to drive the 3 hours to the hospital in Wichita to get the colonoscopy. Well, there is a community hospital within that area, within that veteran's hometown that provides colonoscopy.

That situation is what the choice act was designed to accomplish—service provided at home. So this amendment creates a deficit-neutral reserve fund that requires the VA to utilize its current authorities to offer community care to veterans who are currently unable to receive the health care services they need from a VA medical facility within 40 miles of where they live because the facility they have won't or can't provide the services they need.

This is something we ought to be able to resolve. This amendment is widely supported.

There is legislation—S. 207—which I have introduced and which has many cosponsors, Republicans and Democrats, and we will continue to push this legislation. In fact, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has indicated they will not only have the hearing we had yesterday on this topic, but also the chairman and the ranking member and their staffs will work over the recess to get this legislation front and center in our committee and, presumably, on the Senate floor.

This amendment is cosponsored by Senator COLLINS and Senator KING of Maine. Senator TESTER, Senator BLUNT, Senator TOOMEY, Senator HOEVEN, and Senator VITTER—Republicans and Democrats from States across the country—realize this is something which needs to be resolved.

While I believe the Department of Veterans Affairs should resolve this, they haven't. While the Department of Veterans Affairs believes Congress should resolve this, we haven't. What I do know is veterans who are entitled to care are not receiving it, and, in a sense, false promises were made until we get this issue corrected and the VA then implements the choice act as intended.

This is an important issue. I would say to my colleagues, particularly those who served in the Senate with me in the last 4 years, in my view, we haven't accomplished much in those 4 years, but one of the areas in which we did come together and did pass significant legislation was the choice act. Now we need to make certain that accomplishment results in those who are entitled to those benefits receiving them.

Who, I would ask, in this country would we expect to have the best quality health care? Who would we expect? I think it would be those who served our country—our military men and women, those who retired and became veterans. And I would say that the em-

ployees and Members of Congress have the opportunity of choosing a hospital or a doctor, and our veterans ought to have the same opportunity.

Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to explain this amendment. I ask for support when it is considered during the budget consideration. I would ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the underlying legislation that will follow.

I thank my colleagues on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, particularly the chairman, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. ISAKSON, and the ranking member, the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, for their commitment to seeing that this is accomplished.

I appreciate the opportunity to explain one more time why this is something of significance and how the quality of life of our veterans is affected not because we don't want to care for them but because we lack common sense to implement a law when we know how it should work, we know what it should say, and yet we are impeded from accomplishing what matters so much. This is not a Republican issue; this is not a Democratic issue; this is an American issue that mostly calls for common sense.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are engaged in an annual ritual on the floor of the Senate—the budget resolution.

The budget resolution comes to the floor, and Senator ENZI of Wyoming and Senator SANDERS of Vermont lead the effort to debate the budget resolution. This is not a law because it is never sent to the President. It is something passed by the House and the Senate that kind of says: The President told us we couldn't spend anything more than X; we will tell you how we would spend it. It always is different from what the President suggested. So we get into a debate about how we are going to spend our Federal budget.

That is what a budget resolution is all about, and we have to make choices—just as families make choices when it comes to things they buy for their families and for their homes.

So I will talk about an amendment I am going to offer which gives us a choice.

First, today on Capitol Hill we have visitors walking the corridors wearing purple sashes. If we look closely, written on those sashes it says Alzheimer's Association. It is not unusual for us to get visits from people who are interested in medical issues—cancer, diabetes, Alzheimer's. The list goes on. They come here basically with very fundamental requests: Can you find more research dollars to help us find a cure? Can you provide support to the families

who are facing this disease? I have faced that so many times as a Congressman and as a Senator.

I use this as an illustration, because Alzheimer's is a disease and an issue which is becoming more dominant in America. I am about to state a statistic which I didn't believe when I heard it, and I went back and checked and double checked, and it is true. I have spoken on the floor here about 3 minutes. In that 3-minute period of time, three Americans have been diagnosed with Alzheimer's. One American is diagnosed with Alzheimer's every 68 seconds in America. It is a disease which is starting to gallop across our Nation and affect more and more families. It is expensive, costly—costly, of course, to the victim who loses touch with the people they love and the life they want to lead; costly, too, to the caregivers—the children, the spouses, and others—who turn their lives around and start to care for the person with Alzheimer's.

Last year in America we spent \$200 billion on Medicare and Medicaid for Alzheimer's victims, and, sadly, the projection is that in just a few years, we are going to see this figure surpass \$1 trillion. It will literally eat up the Medicare and Medicaid programs as we know them. That is one disease, but it is one that is so serious that we have to take it seriously.

I can speak in personal terms—and I bet everyone can—about cancer, what it has meant to my family, what it means to families all across America.

Here is what it gets down to: Will we make a decision as a nation to make the right investment in biomedical research? We have the best biomedical research agency in the world—the National Institutes of Health. Nobody questions that. The Centers for Disease Control is right by its side in the work that it does. The Department of Defense, Veterans Administration, even the Department of Energy, all do work in relation to medical research and medical technology.

So the question that is posed to us—to this generation of Senators sitting on the floor—is this: Are we going to do further research in areas that can cure disease, alleviate human suffering, and, yes, reduce the cost to the government?

I have found this is the most bipartisan issue in the world. I have been all over Illinois, and we have a lot of Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. When I stop to talk about biomedical research, everybody is on board. The mother with the diabetic son, the father with a wife suffering from some form of cancer—they are all on board, they are listening. And they should.

What I will offer as an amendment here is generally just a marker. It doesn't mean that medical research will be enhanced or grow in size, but it

basically puts us on record as to whether the United States Senate believes that we should invest additional money into biomedical research.

Why should we put more money into it? I went out to the National Institutes of Health. There is a doctor out there named Dr. Francis Collins. I think he is one of the best. Francis Collins, back in 1988—if I am not mistaken—was given the task of mapping the human genome. I am a liberal arts lawyer, so I am lost. The human genome has something to do with our DNA and tells the people who research it a lot about us and diseases we are likely or not likely to have. So they mapped the human genome, which took years to do, and with that information they are making giant strides now in finding cures for diseases and breakthroughs and identifying some of these issues.

We all read about Angelina Jolie and what she is going through with her fear of cancer. It is based on a family history, medical advice, and, yes, something that has been found in her DNA through the human genome project that leads her to be more sensitive and worried about her own health. She is a famous actress, and that is why we pay close attention. But it applies to families across the board.

Here is the point I am getting to. We are falling behind in biomedical research. In the last 10 years we have lost 23 percent of our spending power to fund medical research. That means that, 10 years ago, one out of every three promising research projects was funded. Today, it is one out of six. I don't need to tell the Senator from Maryland, Mr. CARDIN, because NIH is in his State, and he knows what they do and he knows the researchers and Dr. Collins.

I went to Dr. Collins, and I said to him: What can we in the Congress do to help you find cures for diseases?

Senator, he said, it is very basic: Give us 5-percent real growth in our appropriation for 10 straight years—5 percent over inflation. Give me that, Senator, and I promise you—I promise you, we will pay for it over and over in saving money on medical treatment, in alleviating the suffering of disease that we face in this country.

That is what I am trying to do. The American Cures Act is legislation I put in to do that.

Well, what will it cost, Senator? It is easy to come up with some idea on the floor that is going to cost a lot of money and not pay for it. What will it cost us?

Over a 10-year period of time, a 5-percent real growth increase in NIH, CDC, and the other departments I mentioned, over a 10-year period of time as additional spending comes to \$150 billion.

In that 10-year period of time, we will appropriate more than \$15 trillion in

Federal spending. Work the decimal points. I am talking about a tiny sliver of a small percentage that goes into medical research. And I am also saying that I am willing to stand here as a Senator and promise you that medical research will pay for itself over and over and over again.

I am of an age that I can remember the fear of polio—some folks with gray hair may remember that too—when, as a kid, kids were coming down with polio, crippled by it, many of them living in iron lungs, and parents were scared to death. We didn't know where it was coming from. My mother had a theory that it had something to do with water standing in the street:

Don't you go play in that puddle. You may get polio.

Who knew? No one knew. But we were afraid because we knew fellow classmates who were getting polio.

And then, 60 years ago, along comes Jonas Salk. Every school child in America knew that name. We didn't look forward to that shot; that is for sure. But the notion that we would be liberated from the fear of polio, that was such an amazing discovery that it was national and international news. Medical research can do that. Jonas Salk did that. We have done it over and over again.

So now, will our generation give up on biomedical research? Will we decide that balancing the budget, eliminating the deficit is more important than a small contribution toward the National Institutes of Health? I hope not. The amendment I will offer will ask the Senate to go on record to support this effort.

Senator MORAN from Kansas was here earlier. He has a similar amendment. I am going to vote for Senator MORAN's amendment. I hope he votes for mine.

Let's be bipartisan about this. Let's find something we can agree on. Let's make it biomedical research. Let's make it a commitment to the NIH.

I know that people we represent in every State of the Union will say: You did the right thing, Senator. Put politics aside. Give the money to those researchers to find cures for those diseases. It is not only going to save us money; it is going to save lives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the budget proposal that has been offered by Senate Republicans, which will help Nebraska families—and all American families—have a brighter future.

For far too long, families have been paying more and forced to expect less from an increasingly inefficient and out-of-touch Federal Government. While we have made progress, our economy is not where it should be, and, unfortunately, the government's spending habits remain unsustainable.

Our \$18 trillion debt isn't just a threat to our economic security. It is a

threat to our national security. It is time to offer bold solutions and tackle these problems.

Republicans were sent to Congress to stop this irresponsible mentality—to stop wasteful spending, to balance our budget, and to allow our economy to grow and flourish. Families all across this Nation have been forced to tighten their belts. Now it is Washington's turn.

I am here today to highlight some of these initiatives and to show what Senate Republicans are doing to safeguard the hard-earned tax dollars entrusted to us by the American people.

Back home, many Nebraskans are wondering how this budget will affect their families and their daily lives. With that in mind, the budget we have presented will adhere to three basic rules—cut spending, balance the budget, and do it all without raising taxes.

This budget cuts \$5.1 trillion in spending over 10 years. The budget preserves the spending caps put in place by the Budget Control Act.

Like many of my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, I believe national defense must be the Federal Government's No. 1 top priority.

I have the honor of serving as chairman of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I fully understand the very real threats that our Nation faces each and every day. But in order for us to ensure our military men and women have the resources and training they need to fulfill the missions that we give them, we must make hard decisions and we must set priorities.

Some red lines just won't disappear. The red ink of our debt is here to stay unless we make some real changes.

Our budget preserves the needed pressure to compel Congress to make those hard decisions in order to properly fund the security of our Nation. This budget also provides much-needed resources for infrastructure improvements all across our Nation. It does this through a deficit-neutral reserve fund to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure with a new highway bill in May.

The budget resolution provides this mechanism so that a bill can move forward, allowing authorizers to find either new revenue or offsets in order to extend the life of the highway trust fund.

Ultimately, the committees of jurisdiction have to write the policies and the deficit-neutral reserve fund gives them the flexibility to do so.

As chairman of the commerce Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security, I know there is much work to do on our roads, our bridges, our ports, and our harbors. I also believe that infrastructure is another core duty and responsibility of the Federal Government. For us to meet that responsibility, we have to learn to live within our means.

Second, this budget doesn't raise a dime in taxes—not one dime. The answer to our debt crisis isn't taxing hardworking Americans more. Rather, the answer rests in a government that is wiser—a more prudent steward of those tax dollars that every American entrusts us to spend wisely.

This is a very timely topic because millions of Americans are preparing to file their taxes right now. An estimate from the National Taxpayer Advocate in 2013 indicates that Americans collectively spend 6.1 billion hours and \$168 billion on efforts to navigate through our very confusing Tax Code and to file their taxes.

Hard-working Americans—including many who work two or three jobs to support their families—should not be expected to dedicate these countless hours to comply with all these burdensome requirements, nor should they spend their money and have to hire expensive accountants to do so. When the income tax was first ratified in 1913, the entire Tax Code was 400 pages. Today's Tax Code and the regulated rules now total more than 73,000 pages. While these regulations cause stress and frustration for families, they also create financial hardships that hold back businesses, and they hold back job creators.

Tax day is an annual reminder that our complex laws desperately need to be reformed. I remain committed to promoting a simpler, fairer tax system that provides certainty and one that encourages economic growth. Moreover, the vast majority of economists agree the single best way to create jobs and the single best way to generate economic growth is through comprehensive tax reform.

This budget sets us on a path toward that needed reform. It is my hope that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will work with us so we can accomplish this. Let's take a moment now and look at the President's budget proposal. His plan would raise taxes by \$1.8 trillion to pay for new spending projects.

I think the President's budget is tone deaf. It is tired. It is the same old tax-and-spend policies that got us into this mess in the first place. There is nothing in it that actually cuts spending or addresses this mounting debt.

Under the President's budget, interest rates alone will triple from the \$229 billion we currently spend to more than \$769 billion a year. Let me repeat that. We currently spend more than \$229 billion per year on our interest alone. That is going to triple to over three-quarters of a trillion dollars by 2025. That is money we could use to reinvest in our military, we could use to pay down our national debt or that we could use to improve the Nation's infrastructure. I think the President's proposal is a recipe for a national disaster.

Our budget offers a realistic way forward. Importantly, this budget helps to keep Congress on track regarding the appropriations process. For the first time in a long time, Congress is meeting the budgetary deadlines as prescribed by law. Passing appropriations bills on time allows us to provide the American people with more certainty in planning for their futures.

I have been a Member of the Senate for 2 years. In that time, I have seen firsthand the regulatory burden that is hindering our small businesses and preventing growth. I have seen the regulatory burden that hurts families and makes it hard for them to get ahead. Our budget provides a framework to lighten that burden, to lighten that burden of government and reduce the cost of responding to Washington bureaucrats. Because of the spending reductions in this budget, the CBO has estimated the size of the economy will grow by 1.5 percent per person in 2025. That is going to provide an additional \$1,200 in income to families each year. That is the type of growth Nebraskans care about. With additional money in their pocket, middle-class families can save more and they can reinvest in their children and their future potential. They can buy a home. They can save for their kids' education. They can put something away for their retirement or maybe take a family vacation.

In order to make this budget work, we have to address things that don't work. This week marks the fifth anniversary of ObamaCare. That is a law that does not work. ObamaCare has been harming our economy and millions of families ever since it was signed into law. I have been contacted by over 19,000 Nebraskans who have expressed to me their concerns and their frustrations with this law.

Passage of this budget provides Congress the chance to send a bill to the President's desk to repeal and replace ObamaCare once and for all.

I would also like to touch on some of the amendments I will be offering and explain how they will help Nebraska's families and Americans all across this Nation. My amendments cover a broad range of topics from national defense to pay equity, education, and regulatory relief. My amendments help families. They help families have more economic security, and they ensure our own national security.

One amendment, which passed yesterday with bipartisan support, will bolster the basic principle of equal pay for equal work. It reinforces and it updates existing law to protect employees from retaliation for seeking information or discussing their salaries. My nonretaliation language closely tracks one of President Obama's April 2014 Executive orders on that very same issue. This is a commonsense approach to a very important issue that impacts women all across our Nation.

I have also worked across the aisle with Senator ANGUS KING from Maine on an incentive-based paid family and medical leave proposal. Our idea is not more one-size-fits-all redtape. It is a tax incentive for employers, particularly employers of hourly and low-wage workers. It offers a limited amount of paid leave so workers can meet the complex family needs they have.

A common complaint I hear from Nebraskans is regulatory overreach, particularly with the EPA. That is why I have offered an amendment that would prohibit the consideration of greenhouse gas emissions under the National Environmental Policy Act. The Obama administration has proposed guidance on how Federal agencies should consider greenhouse gas emissions and climate change impacts while conducting NEPA reviews. This was not the intent of NEPA, and regulations like these could cause significant project delays.

In my home State of Nebraska, NEPA reviews already take far too long, especially when it comes to our highway projects. Time and resources are being wasted on bureaucratic paperwork that adds no meaningful environmental benefit. My amendment would stop these burdens and end the unnecessary process that would delay operations without improving environmental outcomes.

The American people want a government that abides by commonsense principles. It is our responsibility to ensure their money is being responsibly used by this government, by us. Every day that we move forward and that we move our country forward, if we can not add the burdens onto the American people, that is a good day. This budget is a step in that direction. It provides the right tools to rescue a prosperous America for future generations. We have a responsibility to offer a better future, to offer a better future than the one we were handed. Let's step up to the plate and make that happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, a budget is the statement of the principles and priorities of our country. I have heard a lot of my colleagues talk about specific amendments, some of which I support and some of which I oppose. But I think it is important first to talk about the underlying budget and what it stands for as far as the principles and priorities of America. On all counts, a review of the budget that is before us fails middle-income families in America. It doesn't invest in job growth or opportunity or U.S. competitiveness. It doesn't allow for a growing middle class, particularly to narrow the wealth disparities in America. It doesn't end sequestration.

Let me talk for a moment about sequestration. We have had a lot of de-

bate about this on the floor. Sequestration should never take place. It is across-the-board, mindless cuts, no priorities. When we have been subject to sequestration, we have heard from all of our agencies, how they can't plan, how they can't enter into long-term agreements in order to carry out the missions they are responsible to carry out. It does not allow them the flexibility to deal with the current needs. It is wasteful. It costs taxpayers money, and they are not getting the benefits of those dollars. When we take a look at the budget that is before us, it not only would maintain those levels, it actually accelerates some of the levels that would be established through these across-the-board cuts.

Let me just give you the observations from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, which is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research organization which wrote that the Senate budget "cut[s] funding below the already-damaging sequestration levels in the years after 2016 for non-defense discretionary programs—the part of the budget that funds education, job training, early intervention programs for children, basic scientific and medical research, and transportation, all of which are important to increasing opportunity, raising productivity, and boosting long-term economic growth."

This budget is also not right for our Federal workforce. It does not give them the resources they need to carry out their very important missions to the American people.

I want to underscore the fact that our Federal workers are the best in the world. They carry out their mission more efficiently and effectively than anyone in the world. My colleague Senator DURBIN was talking about the National Institutes of Health. He talked about the important research being done there, and they need greater tools in order to get the job done. I was meeting with constituents today on Parkinson's who say, look, there are exciting things happening, but we need to fund the research. If we don't fund the research, we are not going to get the answers. We have the capacity. Today at NIH, one out of every six eligible grants goes forward, five out of six do not. A few years ago, it was one out of three. We are moving in the wrong direction. This budget continues moving us in the wrong direction on research. I can mention, I will be talking to the Alzheimer's groups, as Senator DURBIN did. They need to understand. Last week, the cancer advocates were here to find a cure for cancer. They encouraged us to increase this year's budget at NIH by \$2 billion in order to get back to where we were. That will not get us back to where we were, but if we continue with a \$2 billion increase for a few years, we could get back to where we were a few years ago. The budget does not allow us to do it.

This past week, I was visiting AstraZeneca at their biologics lab located in Frederick, MD. They are doing exciting things. I mention that because the research at NIH that will not go forward, as Senator DURBIN pointed out when he was on the floor, not only affects NIH, it affects all the life science companies located in our communities. These are great jobs. This is job growth that is being held down.

At AstraZeneca, they are working on the answers to deal with the diseases based upon our own individual DNA. That is what biologics lets us do. That is being slowed down because of a budget that will not allow NIH to reach its full potential. The budget we have will not give NIH the tools it needs.

I could go to the FDA, which protects our food supply. We have the safest food supply in the world, but they need the resources to carry out their mission.

I could go to the EPA. We all like clean water and clean air. The Chesapeake Bay is critically important to my State, our region, and this country. They depend upon the Environmental Protection Agency having the tools to protect our clean water and clean air. This budget does not allow for that type of resource so that we can reasonably expect the mission to be accomplished.

As I pointed out earlier, it is also costing us economic growth because the partnership with the private sector is not there.

I will point out another part of the environmental risk of this budget, and that is the EPA's popular Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Funds. All of us are fighting for those loan funds because our local governments need them to improve their drinking water capacity, wastewater treatment facility issues. And we have had a majority of Senators say: Let's increase those funds.

In Maryland, those funds improve critical water infrastructure, which in turn helps us protect the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay. A healthy bay is critical to healthy Marylanders and a healthy Maryland economy. Without the support from the State revolving fund, many small communities—and these funds go to small communities—that are working hard to reduce their wastewater discharge in the bay will be without the critical financial resources they need to help protect the bay.

Our large jurisdiction, the city of Baltimore, has used the State Water Quality Revolving Loan Fund that has funded the EPA's Clean Water State Revolving Fund to upgrade the Back River wastewater treatment work. Without adequate resources, they cannot move forward on that.

My point is, take a look at this budget. I understand their numbers, but it doesn't tell us how we spend the money. We can't get the funds we need



under the caps that are imposed on the nondefense discretionary spending, including the programs I just mentioned.

This budget ignores tax expenditures. I think Americans would be surprised to learn that we spend more money in the Tax Code than we do in the appropriations bills that are passed every year by Congress. Yet, there is no attempt in this budget to rein in those tax expenditures. There are many loopholes that benefit the wealthiest and give incentives to companies to take their jobs overseas. There is no effort to rein in those types of wasteful tax expenditures. In fact, it has made it worse because it makes room for additional tax breaks for America's wealthiest. That is not what we should be doing. This is at the cost of our most vulnerable. Because we have made more room for those tax breaks, our most vulnerable are at risk.

I will give one example in this budget document, which is Function 600. This category includes items such as SNAP, formerly known as food stamps, school lunch, and child nutrition programs. In the tax bill, this category includes the earned-income tax credit, the low-income part of the child tax credit. The budget allows the expansion of these tax credits to expire in 2017, thereby resulting in tax hikes for tens of millions of working families and their children. The budget would make major cuts in Pell grants, making it harder for low-income and middle-income families to send their children to college.

We had a debate on the floor about the cost of a college education. It is much more difficult with this budget resolution, adding to the staggering debt American families are currently incurring.

The budget fails to provide the resources so we can rebuild America, the infrastructure investments. We talked on both sides of the aisle about the need to increase transportation spending in this country so the United States can be more competitive, create more jobs, and maintain our existing systems.

In Maryland, we have two major transit systems we want to move forward. Anyone who has experienced the traffic in this region knows how congested the traffic is in our part of the country. We have some help on the way with the Purple Line, but the budget that is submitted makes it difficult for these projects to move forward.

I met with the people in regard to the modernization of our ports. The Port of Baltimore is critical to the economy of our State. It is important for U.S. competitiveness. It creates a lot of jobs. The dredging needs of the Port of Baltimore and other ports around our country will be difficult to meet under the budget caps in this budget agreement.

Lastly, I have some initial observations about the overall budget agree-

ment. It is partisan. There was really no effort made to come up with a bipartisan budget. We should have done that. The American people want us to have a bipartisan budget. It will not be the budget I want, it will not be the budget the Democratic Party wants, it will not be the budget the President wants, but it will be a budget that will allow us to move forward, Democrats and Republicans working with the White House, to give the predictability this country needs and provide the investments so important for the growth of our middle class and for job growth.

I heard my colleague talk about the ability of this budget to allow for the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. We just celebrated the fifth anniversary of the Affordable Care Act this past month. The budget allows for the repeal, but it is interesting in that it doesn't repeal the revenues. It takes the revenues we put in place but repeals the benefits. There is a little bit of irony in that. And it will clearly add to the deficit. I will give the reason why, but they use a magic wand, so we don't have to worry about that. Why would the repeal of the Affordable Care Act add to the deficit? Because the Affordable Care Act has helped us reduce the growth rate of health care spending in this country. You don't have to take my word for it; the Congressional Budget Office said that Federal health care spending between 2011 and 2020 will be \$600 billion less than they previously estimated. The Affordable Care Act is bringing down health care costs. It is bringing down the Federal deficit. The Federal deficit through 2025 was adjusted down by \$400 billion since the January projection.

It is saving health care consumers, those of us who buy our insurance and use our health care system—it is now projected that because of the savings between 2010 and 2014, the years of the Affordable Care Act, the average family is saving \$1,800 a year. These are results from the Affordable Care Act that this budget will allow us to repeal.

Look at the number of uninsured. It has been reduced by 16.4 million. We reduced the uninsured rate by 35 percent.

We increased the number of individuals enrolled in Medicaid and CHIP. The increased rate is at 17.5 percent. In Maryland, that is 300,000 more in those programs.

We improved insurance coverage. We now have much better coverage, such as coverage for preventive care and screening tests.

There are no caps. There are no annual caps or lifetime caps.

Parents can keep their children on their policy until age 26.

Those enrolled in the program get value for their premiums. If not, the insurance company has to rebate the excess charges. Since 2011, \$9 billion has been rebated to health care consumers.

We ended preexisting conditions. If anyone doesn't think that makes a difference, I have a story about two Marylanders, Jack and Akisha. They came to my office last year for help in navigating the Maryland health marketplace. In August of 2014, they were able to apply for insurance through a special enrollment period, but while waiting to hear back about the status of their application, Jack suffered an injury. If that had happened in 1995 or 2005, that might have prevented Jack and Akisha from obtaining the coverage they so badly needed. But thanks to the Affordable Care Act, they got coverage and it covered everything. There was no exclusion.

Coverage is now affordable. Seventy-one percent of the people who got insurance through the Maryland exchange got premium tax credits so they could afford their coverage.

In Maryland, we reduced our uninsured rate from 12.3 percent in 2013 to 7.8 percent in 2015. We all benefit from that. It is not just people who have insurance who benefit. Our premiums cover the cost of people who don't have insurance. We don't have to pay for those people because they now have insurance. There are fewer people using emergency rooms. We are making health care more affordable.

Since we closed the doughnut hole, 8.2 million seniors have saved \$11.5 billion. In Maryland, the average savings for a Medicare beneficiary is \$1,400.

There are no copayments under the Medicare system. The solvency of the Medicare system is stronger today.

I think the most exciting thing about the Affordable Care Act is how we are changing the delivery system in this country. Take a look at it. Deaths as a result of hospital-acquired conditions have been reduced by 17 percent since 2010. These are circumstances such as ulcers, infections, traumas, and falls—that has been reduced dramatically as a result of the Affordable Care Act. Medicare hospital readmissions are down. From 2012 until 2013, there were 150,000 fewer readmissions.

The Affordable Care Act is working. All of these facts make one point abundantly clear: The Affordable Care Act has transformed our country for the better. It has brought quality, affordable care to millions of Americans. It has expanded coverage for young people, minorities, and working families. In a span of only 5 years, it has saved seniors billions of dollars on their prescriptions, strengthened our safety net, and recovered a recordbreaking \$19.2 billion in taxpayer funds from those committing health care fraud. The Affordable Care Act will continue to save our country billions of dollars into the future, and the budget we are acting upon would repeal that progress.

There are other aspects of the health care program that are affected by the budget, including the attempt to turn



Medicaid into a voucher program—Medicaid, which is for our most vulnerable, our seniors, and their long-term care needs. I hope we would not want to do that, but the budget allows that.

The budget just doesn't add up. It creates deficits far beyond what we can do other than to use a magic wand to deal with it. This is not a budget we should be acting upon. A lot of amendments will be offered. I will be offering some amendments. I know some of my colleagues have offered amendments.

First, I will point out that there are a lot of amendments that I hope we will not take up and pass. I urge my colleagues to take a good look at them. I will mention one, although I could mention many that give me a heartache.

Senator BARRASSO, my good friend, has introduced a bill concerning the waters of the United States. To me, it sends a signal that Congress is uninterested in providing the regulatory community clarity on the scope of the Clean Water Act. The proponents of this amendment used the vote to justify passing legislation, either through appropriation riders or stand-alone measures, to undermine the process the EPA is undertaking to provide clarification on the scope of the Clean Water Act. I question the stated purpose of the amendment to protect water quality.

We have a better choice. I thank Senator STABENOW for offering what I expect to be a side-by-side amendment. The Stabenow amendment clarifies the agriculture exemptions under the Clean Water Act while maintaining important clean water protections. These two goals are not mutually exclusive.

There are many amendments that have been offered. Senator DURBIN mentioned one that I hope everyone will support on NIH funding and medical research. I am working on amendments dealing with small business. I am the ranking Democrat on the small business committee. We need to help provide more credit to our companies.

The Affordable Care Act advanced oral health. I will be offering some additional amendments on oral health and racial profiling. I hope the Senate will go on record on voter enfranchisement. I hope we will go on record to make it easier for us to reach the consensus we need to pass these important bills.

When the amendment process is over, I must urge my colleagues to reject the underlying budget. What we need is a bipartisan budget, one that invests in America's future with a growing middle class, keeps jobs in America, and reforms our Tax Code. Working together, we can build a stronger, more prosperous America for all Americans.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 796

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 796.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes an amendment numbered 796.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to saving Medicare)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SAVING MEDICARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which may include the creation of a point of order against legislation that accelerates the insolvency of such Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I will take a few minutes to talk about the current debate of the fiscal year 2016 budget. Isn't it wonderful we have a budget that we have brought to the floor—something we haven't had for I think it has been the last 5 years under Democratic leadership. Naturally, there are differences between both sides, but it is great that we are using this budget process and, hopefully, we will pass this budget and go on from there. The House is going to pass theirs, so I appreciate what they are trying to do over there as well.

First and foremost, I wish to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for all his hard work in putting this product together. He has done great work in producing a budget that I believe most Senators can support, as well as finding a way to navigate some pretty treacherous minefields along the way.

Let's look at just some of what Senator ENZI's budget will accomplish.

The most striking thing about this budget is it balances in the 10-year window, eventually reaching a \$3 billion surplus. This shouldn't be all that surprising, but given our Nation's recent budgetary history, to some, it is. President Obama likes to brag about all of the deficit reduction that has

taken place under his administration, yet the President has yet to send a balanced budget to Congress. More often than not, his claims of deficit reduction are measured against an inflation baseline that routinely ignores the fact that almost all of the reduction can be attributed to increased revenues extracted from hard-working American taxpayers with precious little coming in the way of any spending cuts. The Senate Republican budget prepared by the chairman of the Budget Committee would achieve \$4.4 trillion more in deficit reduction than President Obama's most recent budget proposal. This is a statement about fiscal policy, with the recognition that now is the time to get our Nation's fiscal house in order.

The budget accomplishes its objectives in a number of ways, most notably by providing a path toward reining in our unsustainable entitlement programs. Let's keep in mind that when we are talking about our entitlements—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security in particular, just to mention a few—we are talking about tens of trillions of dollars in unfunded liabilities over the long term. Ever-growing programs have us on a path toward a fiscal crisis that threatens to swallow up our government and take our economy down with it.

The Senate Republican budget would allow us to begin to tackle each of these programs' shortfalls, offsetting much of the deficits, and giving policymakers in Congress and the administration more room to work toward lasting solutions to these problems. With each of these three major programs, the budget would help stave off fiscal calamity and give us a real opportunity for long-term reforms.

Entitlement reform is one of the great causes of our time. If we are serious about bringing down our deficits and debt and ensuring the solvency of our safety net programs, we cannot continue to kick the proverbial can down the road.

I have been disappointed with each of President Obama's budgets, none of which would make a dent in our entitlement programs. This budget before us this week would enable us to begin the process of finding long-term fixes to these programs to ensure Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security still exist in the future for our children and our grandchildren.

In addition to putting our government on a more fiscally sustainable path, this budget would support strong economic growth and job creation. Most notably, it contains a reserve fund designed specifically for this purpose, which includes, among other things, lowering the cost of investment, reducing the costs to businesses and individuals from the Internal Revenue Code, creating a competitive financial sector, and improving congressional budgetary scorekeeping.

Of course, the budget gives us a path forward on repealing the so-called Affordable Care Act, which continues to be an albatross on our economy and on the well-being of hard-working taxpayers. I don't see how anybody can make out a case that it is not going to take us right into real difficulties, financially. It isn't going to work, either.

The budget specifically includes a repeal of Obama's tax on medical devices. There is one for us. They needed \$30 billion more, so they stuck in a gross sales tax on sales for all medical device companies. That is an idea I am totally opposed to, and the repeal of ObamaCare's tax on medical devices is something I have been pushing for since the law was first enacted. Sooner or later we are going to win on that because it has to be taken care of. This budget does that. An overwhelming majority of Senators—79, to be exact—voted to repeal this tax the last time we debated a budget in this Chamber. So I should not be the only one who is pleased to see this particular provision included in the budget.

The budget also includes provisions specifically to repeal the individual and employer mandates—causes that I have also championed here in the Senate. As I said, Senator ENZI and his fellow members of the committee deserve a lot of credit for the work he and they have done thus far on the budget. I am very pleased to offer my support.

I am aware that given the partisan climate we are working in, this budget has some detractors on the other side of the aisle. As I have listened to their arguments against the budget over the past few days, one thing has become pretty clear: My Democratic friends haven't come up with any new arguments in a long time. Rather than constructive proposals to help address our Nation's fiscal difficulties, our friends on the other side of the aisle are content to simply continue pretending that raising taxes is a fix-all elixir for all of our budgetary problems.

Indeed, they have continued with the tired, debunked talking points, arguing that every problem will be solved if Republicans will simply allow for modest tax hikes on the so-called rich. How many times have we heard that? Yet even though our debt as a share of our economy is at levels not seen since the years surrounding World War II, it is most often the case that when my friends call for more taxes, often under the guise of closing unspecified "loop-holes," they want to immediately spend it, ignoring the pile of debt the current administration has accumulated.

We have been through that over and over and it is time for the American people to wake up and realize what they are doing to us. This budget helps us to understand that better.

I would wager that few reasonable people, if put on the spot, would seri-

ously argue that the American people are undertaxed. Yet if we hear the arguments coming from the other side, that appears to be their position. Yet we are taxed at the highest percentage of the total budget than we have ever been. So we have heard our colleagues lament the lack of tax hikes in Chairman ENZI's budget, and we have already had some votes on amendments to raise taxes. What we have not heard, however, is a plan that would line up all of my colleagues' spending priorities, which are vast and numerous, with enough tax hikes to cover the cost. Until my friends on the other side of the aisle either produce such a plan or acknowledge that there are not enough palatable tax hikes out there to pay for all the spending they support, no one should take their arguments against the budget seriously.

Let's take a look at this chart. By my staff's reckoning, if we look at all the tax hikes my friends on the other side of the aisle put to a vote in the last Congress, including the so-called Buffett rule, taxes on corporate jets, oil and gas, and others, they are on the record for supporting about \$69 billion in specific tax hikes that have not yet been enacted into law. Yet the first Democratic amendment to this budget purported to raise taxes by \$478 billion. That is \$408 billion more than what my friends on the other side have specified in the recent past.

Now what does that mean? The Sanders amendment, which we voted on yesterday and almost all Democrats supported, essentially proposed to raise taxes by over \$400 billion with unspecified tax policy. Perhaps my Democratic friends would care to tell the American people how they propose to raise that \$400 billion in additional revenue, where the tax hikes will come from, and who is going to get hit by them. I will not be holding my breath waiting for an answer.

So the Senate Democrats' revenue raisers well is almost completely dry, as we see on this chart: revenue necessary for spending increases, \$478 billion; the Buffett rule, \$45.151 billion; the oil and gas, \$16 billion; tax compliance they say is \$4.28 billion. If we look at the whole thing, the total offsets are \$69.5 billion. That is a new bill. That is the total offsets they are talking about. It is unbelievable to me.

As I said, there are definitely people who want to criticize this budget, but when it comes to taxes and revenues, the critics don't have a leg to stand on.

I wish to speak for a few moments about an amendment to the budget I plan to offer this week. My amendment addresses the need for comprehensive tax reform. The budget already includes a deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax reform and administration. My amendment would add more detail to this fund to more fully describe what our tax reform efforts should look like.

Specifically, it would make clear that tax reform should be comprehensive and address individual, business, and international provisions of the Tax Code. It would also state that our reform efforts should be aimed at creating a Tax Code that is more efficient, pro-growth, fair, and simple. It would put in place other principles for reform as well; namely, permanence, competitiveness, and promoting savings and investment. It would set forth goals to reduce income tax rates while remaining revenue neutral.

As most of my colleagues know, I have been advocating for tax reform for some time now. This amendment would set this effort off on the right path.

I will have other priorities to discuss when it comes to this budget. I look forward to working with my colleagues to get them adopted.

The Senate is doing good work with this budget. It is thankfully working to fulfill its responsibilities. Once again, I wish to thank our distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for his efforts on the budget. I urge all of my colleagues in the Senate to join me in supporting this product.

#### MEDICARE SGR FORMULA

Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to speak about the ongoing efforts in the House of Representatives to address the Medicare sustainable growth rate, or SGR, formula.

As we all know, the House is poised to pass legislation that would permanently repeal and replace the SGR with an improved payment system that rewards quality, efficiency, and innovation. This bipartisan exercise represents what Congress is truly capable of when Members decide to set aside their differences and work together.

Since SGR first went into effect, Congress has continually acted to prevent its reimbursement cuts from taking place. This has meant numerous and repetitive SGR patches, usually cobbled together at the last minute behind closed doors, much to the tremendous concern of our physicians throughout this country. For years, this cycle has bothered Members of Congress in both parties. That is why over 2 years ago, former Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus and I set out to fix this problem once and for all on the Senate side.

People said it was a lost cause and that our efforts were doomed from the beginning. But in late 2013, we introduced our legislation and got it reported out of the Finance Committee on a voice vote. That bill, which was also drafted with the input and support of the leaders on the relevant committees in the House of Representatives, formed the basis for the legislation the House will be voting on this week. They deserve a lot of credit for this. It has taken a lot of work to get to this point, and we are not there yet, but we are getting close. We just need to finish the job.

The House bill is important for a number of reasons. Yes, it includes the plan to repeal and replace the broken SGR system. I think everybody around here would like to do that, but there is more to it. The bill also includes a 2-year extension of CHIP, the Child Health Insurance Program that Senator Kennedy and I put through a number of years ago and a temporary extension of key Medicare extenders that need immediate congressional action. This will give the relevant committees time to reform these programs in a responsible manner. It also includes provisions to strengthen Medicare's ability to fight fraud and bolster existing program integrity efforts. Most importantly, the bill includes a downpayment on entitlement reform without any tax hikes.

For years, Members of Congress have been pushing for legislative fixes that will help rein in our unsustainable entitlement programs to ensure they will be around for future generations. I personally have been working very hard in this effort.

In 2013, I put forward five separate reform proposals to Medicare and Medicaid that were designed to be bipartisan in hopes that I could jump-start the legislation on entitlement reform. I shared those proposals with anyone who would listen and even some, including President Obama, who would not.

Today, I am happy to say that two of those ideas—the limitation on the so-called Medigap first-dollar coverage and more robust means testing for Medicare Parts B and D—are included in the House's SGR bill. For years, the idea of bipartisan Medicare reform seemed like a pipedream, particularly since President Obama and allies in Congress demanded that any changes to the program be coupled with significant tax hikes. But here we are, just a few votes away from enacting meaningful Medicare reforms into law.

I commend Speaker BOEHNER and Minority Leader PELOSI for their efforts to reach a bipartisan deal on this legislation. They both deserve a lot of credit, as do those who are voting with them in the House. In addition to the leaders of the relevant committees, their work and their willingness to set aside partisanship for the greater good has been vital to this effort. This has not been easy by any stretch of the imagination.

It was also encouraging to hear today that President Obama says he intends to sign the bill. Think about that. Specifically, he said about the SGR legislation: "I've got my pen ready to sign a good bipartisan bill." I commend him for that. It is my understanding that an official statement of administration policy will be forthcoming. This is super. This is something we ought to all applaud and be ready to do.

I am not here to say the House bill is perfect; of course, it is not. I am aware

that some of my colleagues in the Senate are hesitant to support this package and have made public statements indicating as much. Ultimately, I think anyone who is looking for a reason to vote no on the House bill could probably dig through it and find something to oppose. This is true of any bill of this magnitude, especially in a divided government. Although I do have to say that some of the straw man arguments raised in the past week or so against this legislation have been interesting, to say the least.

I know there are Senators who have a vision of what for them would be an ideal solution for SGR, CHIP or any other parts of this legislation. Indeed, I have my own thoughts as to how I would like to improve this bill, but I have been around long enough to know that anyone who waits around for a perfect bill better be prepared to wait for a very long time. We waited long enough for a solution on SGR. It is time to get this done. This is a good bill and it is coming at the right time.

The time to act is now. I can't imagine another bipartisan opportunity like this coming around again any time soon, and I have been informed by Members of the House, that this is the last time they are going to increase SGR and take care of it. So we have to take this and get it through. Anyone who thinks we can continue to put this off to wait around for the perfect bill to come together is fooling themselves. Make no mistake, if we don't do this now, we are looking at many more years of last-minute costly SGR patches, and I have been told the House is through. They have done their job, and it may be a long time before you can get another patch, which means we have to do the job here or every physician in this country is going to hate everybody in this Senate. Well, they shouldn't hate everybody; there are some of us who are pushing hard to get this done.

Let's get this done.

I hope all my colleagues will support the House's SGR package, especially if it is as big a vote as I have been indicating here today. I think it will be a big vote. I think they deserve a lot of credit. It solves some problems we couldn't otherwise solve, and it also makes good changes to some of our entitlement programs that are long overdue.

I want to commend Speaker BOEHNER and Minority Leader PELOSI. I want to commend them for the work they are doing.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Over the course of the next few days, we are likely going to debate a series of amendments relative to the ongoing

nuclear negotiations with Iran. It is my hope that over the course of this debate, on a handful of amendments that may be offered, that the way in which we conduct this debate and the way in which these votes come out is going to unify us rather than divide us.

A lot has been made over the partisan division that has been created over the past few weeks with respect to our support for negotiations, despite the fact that we have all said—Republicans and Democrats—that our priority, our hope, is that we can divorce Iran from a nuclear weapons future through negotiation rather than through military action, despite the fact that historically we have all tried to keep close to the idea that politics stops at the water's edge, that we understand the limitations of our ability to substitute ourselves for the administration when negotiating foreign policy with foreign powers. So my hope is that this debate unites us because there is a lot to be united about.

The fact is we all understand the catastrophe that would be wrought if Iran was able to obtain a nuclear weapon. This is a country that has pledged over and over again to wipe Israel, America's sacred ally, off the map. This is a regime that has killed Americans, has sponsored, funded, and organized terrorism all over the world. It is also not just about Iran because we know what would happen in the region. Their Sunni rivals would have no choice but to become nuclear powers themselves.

The stakes are high and we are all united around the common belief that it should be the policy of the United States and the policy of the Senate to make sure Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon, but I just want to make a couple of additional points clear that should underscore the debate we are going to have about that simple, unifying principle.

The first is that these negotiations that are occurring are about the future of Iran's nuclear program. They aren't negotiations about Iran's support for terrorism or Iran's role in fighting ISIS or Iran's other weapons programs. I know this is hard to hear because the resolution of these other pressing issues is instrumental to preserving the security of America and our allies. But let's all be clear that this set of negotiations is about the future of Iran's nuclear program, and for Congress at this point to step in and essentially move the goalposts and say we will only support the outcome of these negotiations if they satisfy another set of concerns that we have—grave concerns about Iran's policy in the region and the world—is disingenuous because we all supported a sanctions regime intended to get them to come to the table and talk about their nuclear program. Frankly, it becomes easier to solve many of these other vital issues

if we remove the question of Iran's potential nuclear weapons program from the laundry list of items with which we have great concerns about.

Second, let's talk about the role Congress can play and how, again, that can be unifying if we choose to do it in the right way. If the negotiations fall apart, then we are likely all going to stand together in imposing a new set of sanctions on Iran. I don't think there is disagreement at all within this body about the fact that within days of those negotiations failing, we will be back here imposing new crippling costs on the Iranian economy. If this agreement succeeds and there is ink put to paper, then this Congress reserves the right—has the right, has the ability—to statutorily stop the implementation of that agreement from going forward, once we are able to review it and look at its parameters, conditions, and elements.

We don't need to vote on sanctions legislation today. We don't need to vote on legislation establishing our ability to review the agreement because we already reserve those powers. We already have the ability to pass sanctions in the event of failure or to vote on approval or disapproval in the event of success. But we aren't in the room negotiating this deal, so if we want to respect our proper place in the constitutional order, then I think it makes sense for us to look at those who are negotiating who have said that a bright, bold, blinking signal of division within the American political system would be detrimental to negotiations.

I want to see the product of these negotiations so I can use my power as a U.S. Senator to vote them up or down, but if we take steps now, if we vote on budget amendments that signal our support to take steps to undermine those negotiations by either precipitously passing sanctions legislation or setting up a process of approval or disapproval before the negotiations take place, then I am limiting and I am decreasing the likelihood that I will see that deal. We have a role to play, but that role comes at the end of these negotiations rather than in the middle.

Lastly, if we are serious that the policy of the United States is to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, then we have to be serious about what the consequences of the failure of negotiations truly are. It is disingenuous to suggest that there are credible and likely options other than military action should these negotiations fail, especially if the U.S. Congress takes steps that allow the world community to blame us for the failure of those negotiations. Why is that? Well, because the easy thing to do would be to simply reinstate global sanctions if the negotiations fall apart, try to squeeze Iran even more tightly. But that is unlikely to happen if it is the United States

that gets blamed for the failure of the negotiations. Why? Because our partners in those sanctions will not join us. They will walk away and either lift the sanctions or look to cut their own deals with Iran.

It is easy to say we will just put the sanctions back in place, but it is impossible, at best very difficult, to do if we are doing that unilaterally. Let's be honest about what military action really means. It means setting back Iran's nuclear program by 3 to 5 years, but it also means setting off a catastrophic series of events in the region that will do great harm to our allies, great harm to U.S. security interests, dragging us into a conflict that in the end will not serve U.S. national security interests, especially given the fact that it will only temporarily halt Iranian nuclear ambitions.

Now I still say we should keep on the table the potential of military action, but we should just be honest about the fact that if we take steps to undermine these negotiations today, if we, the U.S. Congress are blamed for these negotiations falling apart, then it becomes virtually impossible to put these sanctions back together; thus, giving us only one option, a military option, one that has grave and consequential aftershocks for the United States and for our allies.

I simply come down to the floor knowing we are going to set forth in motion a series of amendments, many of them surrounding the question of Iran's nuclear program, tomorrow. I am hopeful the result of those will be to signal this Congress's unity, a unity that we have expressed many times over that we will not allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon and that a negotiated settlement is the preferable way to do that, reserving for ourselves all of the inherent powers of this body to pass sanctions if they fail, to approve or disapprove the deal if the negotiations succeed. The best way to disabuse Iran of the notion that they can ever obtain a nuclear weapon is in the next 48 hours for this Congress to stand united—united in our position to guarantee a nonnuclear weapons future for Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 352

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and call up Roberts amendment No. 352.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], for himself and Mr. FLAKE, proposes an amendment numbered 352.

Mr. ROBERTS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to Federal employee performance awards)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE AWARDS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reform of Federal employee performance award and bonus programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, to get right to the subject, this amendment would restrict Federal Government employees from receiving bonuses when they are delinquent in paying their Federal taxes.

During this time of budgetary constraint, Federal agencies are looking for cost savings in order to avoid staff furloughs and cuts to important Federal programs. Given these constraints, the government should not spend scarce taxpayer dollars by giving bonuses to Federal employees unwilling—let me underscore “unwilling”—to pay their tax bills.

We just learned this week that, according to the Internal Revenue Service, as of September 2014, 304,000 Federal employees owe \$3.5 billion in Federal taxes. That is an increase of over \$200 million in delinquent taxes owed by Federal employees from last year. While most Federal employees play by the rules—the great majority—it is incredible that the delinquent tax debt of Federal employees has reached this level.

Let's look at one agency, everybody's favorite agency, the Internal Revenue Service. Last year the Treasury Department's Inspector General for Tax Administration issued a report on the Internal Revenue Service bonuses awarded to personnel who have violated the tax laws or who have been subject to serious infractions of employee policy.

According to the Inspector General, close to \$3 million was awarded to staff with violations on their records, with about half of that amount going to people who have violated the Tax Code. Other personnel at the IRS received cash bonuses or other awards despite being cited for drug use, making violent threats, fraudulently claiming unemployment benefits, and misusing government credit cards.

In fact, the report indicates that close to 70 percent of the IRS personnel

received some sort of personal reward. That is incredible. That is remarkable when you think about the sorts of problems your average taxpayer has in getting help from this agency. Under my amendment, seriously delinquent—let me underscore that again—seriously delinquent people who will not pay their back taxes, Federal employees, regardless of agency, would be ineligible to receive a bonus or cash award. However, if you make even the most minimal effort to pay your debt or you are suffering a hardship, the amendment would not block a bonus from being made. Awarding personnel bonuses to employees who have continued tax liabilities today is unconscionable and should be stopped. I look forward to support for this sensible restriction on awards given to employees who owe the Federal Government.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 462

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up Roberts amendment No. 462.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] proposes an amendment numbered 462.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to over-the-counter medications)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE ACCESS TO MEDICATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to over-the-counter medications, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, this amendment would repeal ObamaCare's medicine cabinet tax. The health care law now prohibits individuals from using funds in their medical savings accounts, such as an FSA or an HSA, to purchase over-the-counter medications without a prescription. Fifty million Americans participate in FSAs and other health savings accounts. These accounts allow individuals to set aside their own money each year on a pretax basis to pay for health care expenses such as copayments and prescriptions, or over-the-counter medications.

Rather than promoting cost effectiveness and accessibility, this provi-

sion instead directs participants to potentially more costly, less convenient, more time-consuming alternatives. Further, it injects unnecessary confusion and complexity into a system that was previously straightforward and easy for consumers to utilize. This provision of ObamaCare restricts Americans' choice and flexibility in how they manage their health care expenses and adds yet another burden on our physicians. It should be repealed. Folks should be allowed to spend the funds in these accounts as they see fit.

I hope for support for these two amendments when we begin the proceedings.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 515

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 515.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER], for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 515.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a spending-neutral reserve fund relating to requiring the Federal Government to allow states to opt out of Common Core without penalty)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ALLOW STATES TO OPT OUT OF COMMON CORE WITHOUT PENALTY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the Federal Government from mandating, incentivizing, or coercing States to adopt the Common Core State Standards or any other specific academic standards, instructional content, curricula, assessments, or programs of instruction and allowing States to opt out of the Common Core State Standards without penalty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this amendment No. 515 is in response to a clear and a growing and a dangerous trend, specifically for the Department of Education to inappropriately intervene and use carrots and sticks, and weapons sometimes, to intervene in

State education policy to promote certain agendas over the rights of the States.

This began in earnest in 2010 when the U.S. Department of Education began offering funding through Race to the Top grants to States participating in a State consortium working toward a "common set of K-12 standards." Over time, it became increasingly clear that this was all about mandating common core and forcing it on States.

In 2011, the Department of Education took the next step. It offered waivers to No Child Left Behind in exchange for the adoption of "college- and career-ready standards in reading/language arts and mathematics and aligned assessments." Again, this is clearly all about common core.

Now, during a time when States are facing increasing budget shortfalls and an inability to meet the progress requirements outlined in No Child Left Behind, funding and waivers were a very enticing option. They were a set of carrots and sticks that had an impact. This heavyhanded coercion of States to adopt specific standards and assessments is unprecedented and it is something we should all be against. It goes against the tradition of State and local control of public education.

My amendment specifically would create a spending-neutral reserve fund to rightly prohibit the Federal Government from taking similar actions to mandate, incent, or coerce States to adopt the common core State standards or any specific set of standards, instructional content, curriculum, assessments, or programs of instruction.

My amendment would also allow States who have already adopted certain standards to opt out without fear of the Federal Government pulling back those incentives or grants or waivers. I firmly believe these decisions should be in State and local hands. This is really crossing the line into the Federal Government using coercive tactics in that regard. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 811

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 811.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 811.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to ending Washington's illegal exemption from Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING WASHINGTON'S ILLEGAL EXEMPTION FROM THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to developing methods that ensure that all Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, and all political appointees of the Administration procure their health insurance on the individual exchange in the same way as Americans at the same income level, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, this separate amendment is about a different but equally important topic. It restores our pledge to America that Congress as well as the President and the Vice President and their political appointees live under the same rules Washington passes on America, specifically with regard to ObamaCare.

This amendment is my "no exemptions for Washington from ObamaCare" amendment. It says that Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, their political appointees go to the exchange for their health care just like every other American does who is going to the exchange. No special rules, no special exemptions, no special subsidies. We live by the law going to the exchange just like all Americans.

This amendment specifically does not apply to congressional staff. It is about Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, their political appointees. I think it should be the first rule of American democracy that what Washington passes on America, it lives with itself. Same way, same rules, no special exemptions, no special subsidies, no special rules.

We specifically passed that with regard to ObamaCare and the exchanges when we passed a Senate floor amendment in this regard. Unfortunately, after the passage of ObamaCare, and when Washington folks understood what that language meant, there was a furious attempt to get out from under that language. That ended up resulting in a special Executive order and OPM rule promulgated by President Obama that completely frustrates the clear language and intent of that Senate floor amendment.

This budget amendment would say: No, we are going to live by what we said, and we are going to apply to ourselves ObamaCare and getting our health insurance on the exchanges, just as we would have that operate with regard to all other Americans.

I urge support for this amendment as well.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I can utilize a felt pen during my presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, today I rise to discuss the budget blueprint we are debating here in this Chamber and that we will be voting on here on the floor of the Senate shortly. In evaluating this budget, this budget produced by my Republican colleagues, I am asking the question: Is this a budget designed to work for working Americans? That is just a simple core question.

If your vision of America is that you want families to thrive, then you are going to design a budget for those working families to thrive. So that is a key question as we discuss this blueprint. It is certainly clear that a budget designed to work for working Americans means jobs. It means quality, affordable education. It means retirement security. It means financial fairness for consumers. It means fixing a Tax Code that is stuffed full of favors for the wealthy and well-connected and instead directing resources to establish a foundation for working families to do well and provide us all the foundation for raising their children so they can get a good start in life.

I thought we should go through and evaluate how this budget performs on basic items related to the success of working families. We have here a little scorecard so we can keep track. The middle-class budget report card, Senate GOP budget. How does it do?

Well, let's start at looking at investment in infrastructure. Europe is spending 5 percent of its gross domestic product on infrastructure. China is spending 10 percent. In America, only 2 percent. We are vastly underbuilding our infrastructure, which means we are failing to create good-paying jobs now, which is a foundation for the success of working families, and we are imperiling the success of our future economy by failing to make this investment.

Indeed, we have a huge infrastructure deficit. There is no effort to address this deficit in this budget. Oh, the budget does have symbolic language that recognizes theoretically the need to invest in infrastructure but does not direct resources to that effect. So in committee and on the floor, we have offered amendments to say: Let's make a real investment in this effort, not just happy words.

Well, in committee, it was rejected on a party-line vote, 10 to 12. Then yesterday on the floor Senator SANDERS offered an amendment that would take and direct a substantial investment to taking—closing egregious tax loopholes—and directing those resources to building the infrastructure in America. It would create 9 million jobs across this country. And what happened? The Republicans resoundingly rejected it.

Why is that the case? Why do they not see the need to invest in infrastructure in America—voting, as we have, 45 Democrats saying yes, let's invest in infrastructure, let's create jobs, and 52 of my colleagues across the aisle saying, No way, no how, we are not going to do the important work to address the deficit in infrastructure?

So, unfortunately, this budget gets an F when it comes to infrastructure.

Surely, as we turn to education, we will find this budget does a somewhat better job. We all understand that early childhood education has an incredible return, so surely this budget invests in Head Start to give our children of challenged families the ability to start on a path to success. We know we have a world knowledge economy in which education is essential. So, surely, this budget provides for more eligible children to participate in the Head Start Program.

But if that was your assumption, you will be sorely disappointed, because this budget makes cuts to Head Start that would kick 110,000 children off the program over a 10-year period. It is direct damage to the success of 110,000 children, and that is before you combine it with sequestration cuts. At that point the estimate is it would cut 620,000 American children out of Head Start over this coming decade. That is just wrong.

Let's turn to higher education. One of the biggest stresses for American families is the galloping inflation in tuition and the declining ability of Pell grants to cover a small portion of that tuition for our most financially challenged families. So, surely, this budget invests in Pell grants. I certainly would have expected it to. But, indeed, we find it cuts \$101 billion over 10 years out of Pell grants. In other words, this budget is designed to continue to close the doors of opportunity for our students from financially challenged families across this country.

I believe in opportunity. I believe in the American dream. But this budget, the Republican budget, believes in closing the doors on opportunity in this Nation. That is just wrong.

Well, Pell grants aren't the only component of higher education that helps make college affordable. Another piece is low-interest loans. Most families are going to have to borrow to help finance higher education. In fact, of those students who have college debt, the average debt today, coming out of college, is about \$26,000. That is the average. Many of our children have debts at \$50,000 or \$75,000 or \$100,000 coming out of a 4-year college. That kind of feels like the size of a home mortgage as a millstone around their neck. So surely this budget lowers interest rates on our students' loans so they can refinance their loans to take advantage of the current low interest rates. Wouldn't that be a wonderful thing to do, to create opportunity?



We had a vote on this floor for an amendment to do just that, to enable our students to refinance, to take advantage of the current lower interest rates—and my Republican colleagues defeated that amendment 53 to 46.

Not only that, but their budget has a provision that gets rid of the no-interest period when a student on a Stafford loan is in college and gets rid of the 6-month grace period—no-interest rate period—when a student graduates from college. This is estimated, for a student who is starting college in 2015, to increase the cost of their interest payments by about \$5,000 to \$7,000 as they repay their loan.

So, Head Start, savaged in this budget—just simply wrong. Pell grants, savaged in this budget—just simply wrong. Interest accruing increased—and that is just wrong.

It is clear there is no commitment to education in this budget, the foundation for opportunity. This budget, no question about it, that is an F on education.

Let's turn to another area. Hopefully we can get a better grade. Food security. Food security for American families. A lot of families are having a very tough time putting food on the table. But what do we find? We find this budget has a \$660 billion reduction over 10 years in programs that support low-income Americans, explicitly including the SNAP program—the SNAP program, the name we now use for food stamps.

There is a quote attributed to Queen Marie Antoinette, who was the wife of Louis XVI. During the French Revolution, she was reported to have said, when told that the citizens were protesting the high price of bread because they were spending 50 percent of their income just on bread: "Let them eat cake."

That has become a symbol of a ruler completely out of touch with the challenges faced by ordinary citizens.

So what do we have in this budget? We have in this budget provisions that say to hungry children across America, to children of challenged families across America: Let them go hungry.

So here, too, only one grade is earned by this budget in food security, and that is an F for failing our children on food.

Let's turn from our children to our seniors on Medicare, for example. This budget recreates the Medicare doughnut hole. This is the doughnut hole seniors fall into when they get no coverage to help them buy drugs after an initial period in which they got some subsidies, and then they fall off a cliff into the doughnut hole.

Well, 53,000 seniors would pay more for their drugs in just my State next year. That is about 5 million seniors across the course of this country who are now going to be ensnared in this doughnut hole.

Moreover, this budget cuts \$430 billion out of Medicare. So whether it is getting rid of key provisions designed to help our seniors, such as eliminating the doughnut hole or simply solid investment in our health care program for seniors, this budget too gets a failing grade. That is an F for failing our seniors on Medicare.

How about consumer protection? We have made a lot of progress in consumer protection. We used to have consumer protection split between a whole series of agencies. Of course, the key agency in all of it was the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve has monetary personnel in the penthouse—that was really what they were paying most attention to—and folks kept coming to the Federal Reserve and saying: Hey, there are these new predatory home mortgages that are going to do enormous damage to families across the country, and the Federal Reserve had no response to this. They did not act. In fact, they had consumer protection locked in the basement of the Federal Reserve, and they threw away the key. They were simply totally uninterested.

So back in 2009 and 2010, we said: Let's consolidate these programs that have responsibility for consumer protection to one agency, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, and let's make sure this agency has the funding, like every other financial regulator, so that it can't be essentially starved to death by those legislators who, on behalf of powerful special interests, don't believe in consumer protection. The CFPB, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, has returned \$5 billion back to consumers who were cheated, and it has prevented billions more from being stripped away through other predatory practices.

So you would think that all 100 Members of this Senate would stand and say: We want a budget that strengthens the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau because it does so much that is right in America in ending cheating, ending predatory practices against working Americans.

But, no, what we have in this budget is an effort to eliminate the financial independence of the CFPB. If you can think about it as oxygen to a scuba diver—folks want to be able to step on that air hose or constrict that air hose, starve that agency to death. So this budget gets an F on consumer protection.

Well, certainly, since this budget does so much to cut food, cut Head Start, cut Pell grants, increase interest rates, fails to invest in infrastructure, and it does so much damage to our seniors on Medicare, certainly it is asking for some sacrifice from our richest Americans, some bit of sacrifice from the corporate fat cats who are getting egregious tax loophole benefits.

In particular, one loophole that I think drives every American citizen

nuts is a loophole that subsidizes the shipment of our jobs overseas. Can't we all agree to shut down that loophole?

Well, you would think so. But we had a vote on shutting down this loophole in committee, and a party-line vote said: No, we are going to leave this loophole in place.

So in terms of protecting American jobs by shutting down a loophole that funds our adversaries overseas or our competitors overseas, this budget gets an F.

How about tax fairness for the middle class? I have heard a lot of happy words about fighting for the middle class. Is there something in this budget that proceeds to say the best off are going to pay their fair share so that middle-class Americans get a better break?

In 1995, the richest Americans paid about 30 percent of their adjusted gross income in taxes. But by 2012, that rate had dropped to 17 percent.

So does this budget rectify that? Does this budget say folks at the top end should pay their fair share? No, it doesn't, not one slim dime extracted on behalf of fairness from the best off in our society.

So what we have here, attack the middle class, no tax fairness, so there is an F grade on tax fairness.

Attack the middle class in every possible way. Attack the children, attack food security, fail on infrastructure, fail on consumer protection, and proceed to protect all the egregious provisions for the very best off in our society.

It is unfortunate to see such a dramatically terrible budget put before this body. I think the American citizens can only be deeply disappointed to see a budget put forward intended to accelerate and increase inequality in our Nation, destroy our jobs, ship them overseas, underfund food security, failure on investment for our infrastructure, a failing grade all around.

We can do much better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Oregon is right. We can do much better. We sure as hell didn't do any better for the last 6 years.

#### SEQUESTRATION

Mr. President, I wish to talk for a few minutes—and I have a couple of my colleagues waiting, so I won't take as long as perhaps I would—about sequestration.

Sequestration was a poison pill that originally was designed to force Republicans and Democrats to sit down together and reach a bargain that would entail increasing some revenues and also budget cuts. And the looming axe that would fall out there was sequestration, which was believed at the time that because sequestration was so terrible it would force the two parties together to come to an agreement. Well,



we know they never did, and we know now, ever since 2011, we have been living with sequestration.

While we have been living with sequestration, the world has turned into a place of enormous turmoil and threats to the security of our Nation, which has escalated dramatically in those intervening years. At some point, I would like to come to the floor, maybe later, showing the world in 2011 and the world in 2015.

Thanks to a feckless foreign policy, leading from behind and abandoning our allies, this administration has caused the world to be in more turmoil and not in just the opinion of this Senator. Every witness before our Committee on Armed Services has agreed on one thing. These witnesses have been Madeleine Albright, Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, Brent Scowcroft, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and I could go on and on. We have had the smartest minds in America before our committee and every one of them has said exactly the same thing, no matter whether they served under Republican or Democratic administrations, they said they have never seen the world in more turmoil.

So sequestration, if there ever was a reason for it, is long gone. The fact is not only are we not going to be able to defend this Nation, but we are going to put American lives at risk. That is not the opinion of this Senator from Arizona, it is the opinion of every one of our service leaders who have, again, been before our committee.

So now we are not repealing sequestration, but we have this—and it is a gimmick—overseas contingency operations, which was not designed for this but is now a way of increasing our spending on defense. I would much rather have had us face the issues square head-on and increase our defense spending in the normal way in the budgetary process. That didn't happen. So now as we begin our votes on the budget, I am faced with two choices, and this body is faced with two choices: either the increases in overseas contingency operations or go back to sequestration. Those numbers are not acceptable.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to go ahead and pass this budget and give our military what they need. In fact, they need more than what is in the budget before us, but at least it is some ability to address the challenges to our Nation.

I just want to mention we are not only talking about the defense of our Nation, we are talking about the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military. In the view of our military commanders, their lives are being put at risk. I don't know how anyone in this body, no matter how they feel about defense, could vote in a way that would put the lives of the men and women serving in the military at

greater risk. I don't know how anyone would do that.

All four service chiefs agreed, during questioning from Senator KING of Maine, that "American lives are being put at risk." The Secretary of Defense testified before the committee, "Sequestration threatens our military's readiness, the size of our warfighting forces, the capabilities of our air-naval fleets, and ultimately the lives of our men and women in uniform."

The National Defense Panel, put together with some of the brightest minds in America, said unless sequestration is reversed, "the United States could find itself in a position where it must either abandon an important national interest or enter a conflict for which it is not fully prepared."

I don't know anybody who is more respected than Lt. Gen. Brent Scowcroft by all, and he said:

Absolutely, I would [repeal sequestration]. It is a terrible way to determine force structure strategy, or anything like it. It's undermining our ability to do what we need to do to retain . . . alert for the contingencies of the world.

General James Mattis: "No foe in the field can [wreak] such havoc on our security that mindless sequestration is achieving."

General Jack Keane: "Sequestration is not only irresponsible, in the face of emerging challenges, it is downright reckless."

GEN Ray Odierno said the following:

Sequestration is the single greatest barrier to the effectiveness of our Armed Forces—to its Training, Readiness, and Modernization. I assure you that ending sequestration is the most prudent measure we can take for ensuring that our military is able to meet the demands of global security now and in the future.

General Odierno went on to say:

The choices we must make to meet sequestration-level funding are forcing us to reduce our Army to a size and with limited capabilities that I am not comfortable with. If we follow this path to its end, we will find a hollow Army.

If we do not have the resources to train and equip the force, our Soldiers, our young men and women, are the ones who will pay the price, potentially with their lives.

That is from the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. The young men and women are the ones who will pay the price, potentially with their lives.

Gen. Mark Welsh, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, said: "The vulnerabilities sequestration introduces into our force will encourage our adversaries, worry our allies, limit the number of concurrent operations we can conduct, and increase risk to the men and women who fight America's next war."

Secretary of State George Shultz, one of the most revered men in America, had this to say: "Sequestration seems to me like legislative insanity."

Secretary of State Madeleine Albright: "I'm very concerned about sequestration and the deep cuts that

have been taken . . . I think it jeopardizes America's military reach."

The Director of National Intelligence said:

. . . just based on my best professional judgment and having served in this business for a long time I'm very concerned about it. And if we revert to sequestration in 2016, the damage to the intelligence community will be quite profound.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

In an age when we are less certain about what will happen next, but quite certain it will happen more quickly, we will be further away and less ready than we need to be. Simply stated, sequestration will result in a dramatic change in how we protect our nation and how we promote our national interests.

Lt. Gen. John Kelly, the commander of U.S. Southern Command:

If sequestration returns in FY16, our ability to support national security objectives, including conducting many of our essential missions, will be significantly undermined.

. . . I would tell you in Latin America, in Southern Command, [sequestration] will be, just simply put, a catastrophe. It will essentially put me out of business.

The commander of our Southern Command, who is responsible for our Southern Hemisphere, goes on to say:

If sequestrations happen, I will be down to maybe one Coast Guard, maybe two Coast Guard cutters. That means of the 158 [metric] tons [of cocaine] I would expect to get this year, I probably if I'm lucky will get 20 tons.

Admiral William Gortney, Commander of the Northern Command: "Sequestration targets both current and future readiness and risks a hollow force undertrained and underprepared for today's emerging threats."

My friends, I will come to the floor one more time with a map—a map of the Middle East and a map of other parts of the world where the United States is under almost unprecedented threat.

We are faced with the prospect of threats to the United States of America and the men and women who are serving it in uniform. We are moving forward with OCO, which is very unsatisfactory but a way through this at least for 1 year. I would point out this is only for 1 year and that the ability of the Defense Department to plan is in great jeopardy. This makes it incredibly difficult, but we are where we are.

I understand, as do my friends on both sides of the aisle, that we need to increase defense spending and that there are a lot of needs in the country. All of them are serious and compelling, but I don't know anything more compelling right now than what our military leaders have told us, which is that we are putting the lives of the men and women serving in uniform at risk.

So I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as dire as the deficit is, and it is a challenge to the future of our children as well, right now we are facing a far greater risk. I hope we can

pass this budget with the OCO in it and then sit down and seriously work to repeal this Damocles sword called sequestration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the quotes I read from earlier.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL SERVICE CHIEFS (1/28/15)

Each of the four service chiefs agreed during questioning from Senator King (I-ME) that "American lives are being put at risk" by sequestration.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ASH CARTER (3/4/15)

"Sequestration threatens our military's readiness, the size of our warfighting forces, the capabilities of our air-naval fleets, and ultimately the lives of our men and women in uniform."

NATIONAL DEFENSE PANEL (2014)

"The defense budget cuts mandated by the Budget Control Act (BCA) of 2011, coupled with the additional cuts and constraints on defense management under the law's sequestration provision, constitute a serious strategic misstep on the part of the United States. Not only have they caused significant investment shortfalls in U.S. military readiness and both present and future capabilities, they have prompted our current and potential allies and adversaries to question our commitment and resolve. Unless reversed, these shortfalls will lead to a high risk force in the near future."

Unless sequestration is reversed, "the United States could find itself in a position where it must either abandon an important national interest or enter a conflict for which it is not fully prepared."

BRENT SCOWCROFT (1/21/15)

"Absolutely, I would [repeal sequestration]. It is a terrible way to determine force structure strategy, or anything like it. It is undermining our ability to do what we need to do to retain . . . alert for the contingencies of the world."

GENERAL JAMES MATTIS (1/27/15)

"No foe in the field can [wreak] such havoc on our security that mindless sequestration is achieving."

GENERAL JACK KEANE (1/27/15)

"Sequestration, is not only irresponsible, in the face of emerging challenges, it is downright reckless."

GENERAL RAY ODIERNO (1/28/15)

"Sequestration is the single greatest barrier to the effectiveness of our Armed Forces—to its Training, Readiness, and Modernization. I assure you that ending sequestration is the most prudent measure we can take for ensuring that our military is able to meet the demands of global security now and in the future."

"Should sequestration or sequester funding levels return in FY16, the Army will have to further limit the readiness of forces around the world while slashing Army modernization, extending and postponing maintenance cycles, and standing by as the conditions of our facilities deteriorate."

"With an increase in threats around the world that have rendered some of our planning assumptions optimistic, we must acknowledge that the FY16 post-sequestration spending cap, which was set almost four years ago, has not kept pace or accounted for an increasingly complex and dangerous world . . . With the velocity of instability in-

creasing around the world . . . now is not the time to be dramatically reducing capability and capacity."

"If we are forced to take further endstrength reductions beyond the planned levels in the President's budget due to sequestration, our flexibility deteriorates, as does our ability to react to strategic surprise. We are witnessing firsthand mistaken assumptions about the number, duration, location, and size of future conflicts and the need to conduct post-stability operations. These miscalculations translate directly into increased military risk."

"A return to sequestration-level funding would require the Army to size and equip the force based on what we can afford, not what we need, increasing the risk that when called to deploy, we will either not have enough Soldiers or will send Soldiers that are not properly trained and equipped."

"The choices we must make to meet sequestration-level funding are forcing us to reduce our Army to a size and with limited capabilities that I am not comfortable with. If we follow this path to its end, we will find a hollow Army."

"If we do not have the resources to train and equip the force, our Soldiers, our young men and women, are the ones who will pay the price, potentially with their lives."

ADMIRAL JONATHAN GREENERT (1/28/15)

"A return to sequestration in FY 2016 would necessitate a revisit and revision of the DSG. Required cuts will force us to further delay critical warfighting capabilities, reduce readiness of forces needed for contingency response, forego or stretch procurement of ships and submarines, and further downsize weapons capacity."

"We will be compelled to go to fewer places, and do fewer things. Most importantly, when facing major contingencies, our ability to fight and win will neither be quick nor decisive."

GENERAL MARK WELSH (1/28/15)

"A return to sequestered levels of funding in FY16 will reverse any progress we made in addressing our infrastructure and facility maintenance and exacerbate our problems with readiness and modernization. It will also make it impossible for us to meet the operational requirements of the Defense Strategic Guidance."

"Our overall readiness as a force is already significantly impacted by the size and age of our current aircraft fleet. It is now the smallest and oldest in the history of our service. It is also the least ready—less than half of our combat coded units are fully combat capable. As Secretary James and I testified a year ago, a return to sequestered levels of funding in FY16 will multiply the number of very tough choices we will be forced to make in our FY16 POM recommendations. All of them impact our ability to do the jobs the Nation, and the joint force, expect of us."

"We will not have sufficient force structure to meet the fundamental requirement to simultaneously Defeat an adversary, Deny a second adversary, and Defend the Homeland."

"The vulnerabilities sequestration introduces into our force will encourage our adversaries, worry our allies, limit the number of concurrent operations we can conduct, and increase risk to the men and women who fight America's next war."

GENERAL JOSEPH DUNFORD (1/28/15)

"In order to maintain the readiness of our forward deployed forces, we've assumed risk in our home station readiness, moderniza-

tion, infrastructure sustainment, and quality of life programs. As a result, approximately half of our non-deployed unites, those who provide the bench to respond to the unexpected, are suffering personnel, equipment and training shortfalls. In a major conflict, those shortfalls will result in a delayed response and/or additional casualties. We're investing in modernization at an historically low level."

"BCA funding levels with sequester rules will preclude the Marine Corps from meeting the requirements of the Defense Strategic Guidance. Sequester will exacerbate the challenges we have today. It will also result in a Marine Corps with fewer active duty battalions and squadrons than would be required for a single major contingency. Perhaps disconcerting, it will result in fewer Marines and sailors being forward deployed in a position to immediately respond to crises involving our diplomatic posts, American citizens or interest overseas."

"The foundation of the all-volunteer force . . . is trust. Sequestration will erode the trust that our young men and women in uniform, civil servants and families have in their leadership. And the cost of losing that trust is incalculable."

SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE SHULTZ (1/29/15)

"Sequestration seems to me like legislative insanity."

SECRETARY OF STATE MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

(1/29/15)

"I'm very concerned about sequestration and the deep cuts that have been taken . . . I do think it jeopardizes America's military reach."

DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

JAMES CLAPPER (2/26/15)

In the case of the Intelligence Community, the impacts "are more insidious in that predicting when we have a lesser capability will eventuate in a failure is hard to quantify. But just based on my best professional judgment and having served in this business for a long time I'm very concerned about it. And if we revert to sequestration in 2016, the damage to the intelligence community will be quite profound."

ASH CARTER (3/4/15)

"The prospect of sequestration's serious damage to our national security and economy is tragically not a result of an economic emergency or recession. It is not because these budget cuts are a mathematical solution to the nation's overall fiscal challenge—they are not. It is not because paths of curbing nondiscretionary spending and reforming our tax system have been explored and exhausted—they have not. It is not due to a breakthrough in military technology or a new strategic insight that somehow makes continued defense spending unnecessary—there has been no such silver bullet. And it is not because the world has suddenly become more peaceful—for it is abundantly clear that it has not. Instead, sequestration is purely the collateral damage of political gridlock. And friends and potential enemies around the world are watching."

"Under sequestration, our military—and our national security—would have to take on irresponsible and unnecessary risk—risk that previous Administrations and Congressional leaders have wisely chosen to avoid."

"Allowing sequestration to return would deprive our troops of what they need to accomplish their missions."

"All who bemoan unnecessary Pentagon program delays and the associated cost overruns should know that sequestration will only make these problems worse."

MARTIN DEMPSEY (3/4/15)

"The PB16 budget . . . is what we need to remain at the lower ragged edge of manageable risk in our ability to execute the defense strategy. However, we have no slack, no margin left for error or strategic surprise."

"Funding lower than PB16, especially if sequestration-level cuts return next year, combined with a lack of flexibility to make the reforms we need, will render the overall risk to our defense strategy unmanageable. In other words, our Nation's current defense strategy will no longer be viable."

"In an age when we are less certain about what will happen next, but quite certain that it will happen more quickly, we will be further away and less ready than we need to be. Simply stated, sequestration will result in a dramatic change in how we protect our nation and how we promote our national interests."

GENERAL JOHN KELLY, COMMANDER,  
U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND (3/12/15)

"If sequestration returns in FY16, our ability to support national security objectives, including conducting many of our essential missions, will be significantly undermined."

"Limited tactical ISR allocation and national technical focus is impairing virtually every one of our assigned missions and exposing the southern approaches to the United States to significant risk. Sequestration will compound this challenge . . . [S]equestration will likely eviscerate our already limited ISR capacity."

"Its potential return in FY16 would jeopardize our progress; undermine our credibility and [Latin America's] trust in our commitments; and present renewed hardships for our civilian and military workforce."

"I would tell you in Latin America, in Southern Command, [sequestration] will be, just simply put, a catastrophe. It will essentially put me out of business."

"If sequestrations happen, I will be down to maybe one Coast Guard, maybe two Coast Guard cutters. That means of the 158 [metric] tons [of cocaine] I would expect to get this year, I probably if I'm lucky will get 20 tons."

ADMIRAL WILLIAM GORTNEY, COMMANDER,  
NORTHERN COMMAND, (3/12/15)

"Sequestration targets both current and future readiness and risks a hollow force undertrained and underprepared for today's emerging threats. The across-the-board cuts required to meet sequestration spending levels beginning again in FY 2016 mean critical capabilities USNORTHCOM and NORAD depend on to accomplish our missions could be in jeopardy, even as our potential adversaries remain persistent and innovative."

ADMIRAL CECIL HANEY, COMMANDER,  
U.S. STRATEGIC COMMAND, (3/19/15)

"The President's FY16 Budget supports my mission requirements, but there is no margin to absorb risk. Any cuts to that budget including those imposed by sequestration will hamper our ability to sustain and modernize our military forces, and will add significant risk to our strategic capabilities now and in the future."

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 443

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and I be al-

lowed to call up amendment No. 443 and that the amendment be made pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. GARDNER] proposes an amendment numbered 443.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting privately held water rights and permits)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING PRIVATELY HELD WATER RIGHTS AND PERMITS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting communities, businesses, recreationists, farmers, ranchers, or other groups that rely on privately held water rights and permits from Federal takings by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, when you walk into the capitol of Colorado, there in that great rotunda is a mural on the wall by Thomas Hornsby Ferril, and it starts out with a very simple phrase that reads: "Here is a land where life is written in water." So during this budget I will be offering amendment No. 443 to make sure we are protecting that lifeblood of Colorado—our water—and to make sure our State property rights, State law, is able to prevail against the intrusions by the Federal Government.

Over the past several decades, we have watched as the Federal Government has attempted to assert bypass flows or Federal reserve water rights that impede our ability to carry out private water rights and to, indeed, protect Colorado private water rights. Whether it is the imposition of a bypass flow on a ditch that is going through Forest Service ground or perhaps the new Forest Service ski area water rule or the groundwater rule they are now discussing, these are, once again, challenges to the supremacy of State water law.

This government has a long history of yielding to State water law—making sure that State water law is supreme when it comes to how we carry out and manage our State water rights. Over the years, bipartisan coalitions in Colorado, Wyoming, and beyond have

emerged to make sure we are protecting our water rights, to make sure the Federal Government isn't coming in outside of our system of water law.

Colorado is extremely complex. We are the only State in the Union that carries out our water law, our surface water rights in the way we do. Unfortunately, whether it is the Forest Service, the Department of Interior or the Department of Agriculture, other agencies have continued to seek their ways to impose a water right at the Federal level without going through the same channels, the same water law system that other people in Colorado do—people who by rights, by law, and by our constitution have the rightful ownership of Colorado water rights and water permits.

This amendment protects communities, businesses, recreationists, farmers, and ranchers that rely on these privately held water rights and permits from Federal takings. The amendment recognizes the longstanding authority to manage water according to our State law.

Today, water rights and permit holders face challenges, and this can come to an end when we put into our budget our principles, our purposes, and our efforts in making sure we put policies forward in the next several months that respects Colorado water law.

I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment, which is a vote to protect constitutionally held private water rights and permits.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT NO. 777, AS MODIFIED

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sanders amendment No. 777 be modified with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CUTTING CARBON POLLUTION TO PREVENT HUMAN-INDUCED CLIMATE CHANGE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting Americans from the impacts of human-induced climate change, which may include action on policies that reduce emissions by the amounts that the scientific community says are needed to avert catastrophic climate change, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following Senators added as cosponsors to his amendment: Senators BOXER, MARKEY, and SCHATZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 801

(Purpose: To build on the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 by restoring a below-sequester level cut of \$9,000,000,000 to nondefense discretionary spending in 2017, replacing sequestration in 2016 and 2017 and increasing funding above sequester levels by a total of \$148,000,000,000 for the 2 years, increasing defense and nondefense discretionary spending above sequester levels by equal amounts, eliminating the overseas contingency operations gimmick contained in the committee-reported resolution, and offsetting the net increase in defense and nondefense discretionary spending by closing tax loopholes).

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 801.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. KING, proposes an amendment numbered 801.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, as many of us here have said before, a budget is far more than simply numbers on a page. A budget is a statement of values, of priorities, the kind of Nation we are, and the kind of Nation we want to be.

For Democrats, that means our budget should help us move toward an economy that is built from the middle out, not from the top down, and a government that works for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

When Democrats wrote our budget last Congress, we made our values and priorities crystal clear. We put jobs, economic growth, and the middle class first. We replaced the automatic budget cuts evenly among defense and non-defense investments, with an equal mix of responsible spending cuts and revenue raised by closing wasteful tax loopholes used by the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations. We addressed our long-term deficit and debt challenges fairly and responsibly. And we kept our promises that we have made to our seniors and families.

The Republican House didn't simply accept our budget, of course. But I am very proud that coming out of the terrible government shutdown at the end

of 2013, we were finally able to break through the gridlock and dysfunction to reach a bipartisan budget deal that put in place a budget for 2 years, prevented another government shutdown, and rolled back the worst of the automatic cuts.

That deal wasn't the budget I would have written on my own and it wasn't the one Republicans would have written on their own, but it did end the lurching from crisis to crisis, it helped workers, it helped our economy, and made it clear that there is bipartisan support for rolling back sequestration in a balanced way.

Our bipartisan deal was a strong step in the right direction, and I was hopeful we could work together to build on it. But Republicans have taken a very different approach this year.

Instead of building on our bipartisan budget deal, this Republican budget would be a huge step backward. Instead of moving us toward a government that works for all of our families, this budget would push us toward a budget that works for the wealthy and well-connected, but actually leaves the middle class and working families behind.

We know there is bipartisan support to replace sequestration in a balanced and fair way. Not only did we prove that with our bipartisan budget deal last time, but Democrats and Republicans across the country have continued to come out against the senseless cuts to defense and nondefense investments.

But in this Republican budget—a budget that aims nearly 70 percent of all its spending cuts at programs that combat poverty, that cuts more than \$1 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, that calls for a total of \$5 trillion in spending cuts—in this budget, my Republican colleagues couldn't even find a single penny to pay for more investments in education, research, or defense investments for this coming year.

To put that in perspective, the budget agreement I reached with Chairman PAUL RYAN in 2013 found \$85 billion in savings to pay for sequester relief over 2 years. That is less than 2 percent of the total savings this Republican budget claims to have in it. And yet the across-the-board cuts to both defense and nondefense priorities remain in place. Why is that?

Well, instead of using a tiny fraction of the enormous cuts this budget has in it to pay for investments that both Republicans and Democrats agree must be made, it relies on a gimmick and increases OCO funding to appear to patch over the problem on the defense side, but then doesn't actually allow for the increased OCO funding to be even spent, and does nothing at all for non-defense investments such as education, research, jobs, and infrastructure.

I know our Republican colleagues are sincere when they say they want to find a way to increase the caps, espe-

cially for defense purposes, but this budget in front of us today simply does not do that. Gimmicks and lip service are not enough for me, and I don't see why they are enough for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, especially given the deliberate choice not to use any of the \$5 trillion in cuts in this to pay for some relief, a choice that should greatly concern anyone who genuinely wants to fix this problem.

So I come to the floor to offer another way—a way that would make it clear that we will in fact fix these senseless across-the-board cuts known as sequestration.

My amendment builds on the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and extends the replacement of sequestration through fiscal years 2016 and 2017. This amendment maintains the principle that Democrats will not abandon—that sequestration should be replaced evenly across defense and nondefense investments. And it builds on the idea that sequestration should be replaced with a mix of responsible spending cuts and new revenue raised by closing wasteful tax loopholes.

By providing Defense with real resources to replace the sequester cuts, it gets rid of the OCO gimmick that was added in committee.

Finally, it includes language to automatically release the additional defense and nondefense funding to the Appropriations Committee upon the increase in the statutory caps, similar to language that we passed in the previous budget.

Now we all know there is going to have to be a solution to these automatic cuts. President Obama has said he will not sign spending bills that lock in sequestration. And the fact is we simply can't make the investments we need to make on both defense and nondefense if these caps remain in place.

We should be able to give our appropriations committees the guidance they need to write responsible bills at bipartisan levels, and not wait for another crisis to hit before we come together and make a deal.

I know there are Republicans who understand how devastating the automatic cuts are for our defense and non-defense investments. I know there are Republicans who understand the value of investing in jobs, infrastructure, education, and research. I know there are Republicans who have seen the impact of sequestration in their States the way I have seen in my home State of Washington. And I know there are Republicans who look at this budget and wonder why it couldn't use some of the trillions of dollars in cuts to reinvest in American innovation or in our investments.

So I am ready to work with any Republican truly interested in building on our bipartisan budget deal in a balanced and responsible way. I know my

colleagues will stand with me because, to us, this is about middle-class economics, plain and simple.

We believe that when working families do well, they spend more, they boost demand, and they grow the economy in a healthy and sustainable way. We believe when low-income families are offered a hand up and an opportunity to get a job or earn more or join the middle class, that means more taxpayers, less need for housing, less need for nutrition support, and it means a growing economy. We believe the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations should pay just a bit more toward their fair share. And we believe that replacing these automatic cuts in a fair and responsible way is an important part of moving toward an economy that works for all families, not just the wealthiest few.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so we can agree now on responsible and realistic top-line spending numbers for this year, so we can restore these investments in critical defense and nondefense programs, and so we can start to allow the appropriations committees to do their work and not wait until September for another crisis, another government shutdown, and the whole country looking at us as if we can't manage our way anywhere.

If my Republican colleagues have any other ideas for how we get this done, my door is open, and I am ready to get to work. But I hope we can support this amendment when we vote on it later this afternoon so we can get to work and not have another summer, another fall where the American public looks at Congress wondering if we can't get our act together.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak briefly on an amendment I have already submitted in the budget bill, but which also qualifies as a "Waste of the Week." So I am going to do a two-for here.

As I have said previously, I am coming to the floor every week to point out a waste of funds that, if eliminated and addressed, can save the taxpayer a lot of money. We have the thermometer growing in terms of the amount of money we have been able to offer—in terms of programs that simply are not working, can be reformed or changed or dropped, and save the taxpayer a lot of dollars.

This week's waste addresses a well-intentioned Federal program that has moved away from its original intention of addressing an important social need. Officially known as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, this program is more commonly known to the American public as food stamps.

This program started under President Kennedy in the early 1960s as a temporary lifeline to those in need. Over time, the program grew. More than 30 years later, the Republican Congress, with a Democratic President—President Clinton—reformed welfare in 1996. During that reform, they made reforms to the SNAP program, or the food stamp program by adding some qualifying information.

These reforms required that in order to qualify for food stamps, able-bodied adults had to register for work and accept a job if it was offered to them or go to a training program in order to qualify for food stamps. That was in the law. It was a welfare reform program that was supported by both Democrats and Republicans, under a Democratic President and a Republican Congress, and history has shown that it worked.

In 2009, our current President, President Obama, as part of the stimulus law, modified this program and put it in a position where it now is spending a lot more money, and removed essentially those requirements that were agreed to by both Democrats and Republicans. As a journalist said: Today, SNAP is "an open-ended income-supplement program that discourages work."

According to the Wall Street Journal:

Between 2008 and 2013, SNAP recipients grew by nearly 69%. By contrast, the poverty rate increased just 16.5% during the same period.

With our economy recovering and more job opportunities becoming available, I have submitted this amendment to reinstate the requirements that was agreed to, as I said, in a bipartisan way under President Clinton.

This legislation, if we make this reform, has been scored as saving at least \$19 billion over a period of time—no small amount. It is good stewardship of our financial resources at a time when we need to have that stewardship because of the credit crunch we are now in.

What we add here to the ever-growing thermometer that tries to take us to \$100 billion of savings for taxpayers is a \$19 billion chunk of savings that has been documented as achievable simply by returning the program to the place where it was implemented by both Republicans' and Democrats' support.

In addition to the aforementioned amendment, I would also like to very briefly discuss two other important amendments I have submitted to the debate on the budget bill now before us.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 595

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that I be allowed to call up amendment No. 595, and that the amendment be made pending.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], for himself and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 595.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve cybersecurity)

At the end of title III, add the following:

#### SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE CYBERSECURITY.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increased sharing of cybersecurity threat information while protecting individual privacy and civil liberties interests, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, this amendment, which I will briefly state the intent of here and which I have offered, along with Senator WARNER, would help to strengthen our cyber security defenses by calling for increased sharing of information on cyber security attacks and threats.

Millions of Americans have been subject and impacted by cyber attacks on companies and universities, to mention a few, and the Coats-Warner amendment would help to strengthen our defenses against cyber attacks by calling for greater information sharing, but in a way that protects individual privacy and civil liberties.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 368

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that I be allowed to call up amendment No. 368, and that the amendment be made pending.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS] proposes an amendment numbered 368.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to providing States the Medicaid flexibility they need to implement innovative reforms to improve care and enhance access for our Nation's most vulnerable)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING STATES THE MEDICAID FLEXIBILITY THEY NEED IMPLEMENT INNOVATIVE REFORMS TO IMPROVE CARE AND ENHANCE ACCESS FOR OUR NATION'S MOST VULNERABLE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Medicaid that allows States the flexibility to build off of successful State innovations to ensure our Nation's most vulnerable Americans have improved access to quality care while reducing taxpayer costs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, this amendment calls for States to have the flexibility to seek innovative Medicaid reforms that can both strengthen the program and make more efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

My State of Indiana has been a leader in innovative Medicaid reforms and the advancement of consumer-driven health care under the leadership of our former Governor Mitch Daniels and our current Governor Mike Pence.

I believe States should have the opportunity to innovate the Medicaid Program by using flexible, accountable financing mechanisms that are transparent and that hold States accountable for efficiency and quality health care systems.

This program, carefully developed under two Governors, has now provided those in Indiana, of lower income, opportunities to enter into a program that uses innovative, cost-saving techniques, but provides quality health care with participation by our providers and the hospitals, with participation by our State, and with requirements that give the consumer more choices and provide for more quality of care. It is something that I think can serve as a model as we go forward trying to address our health care needs and reform of the Affordable Care Act or repeal with suggested substitutes that will achieve the goals of providing quality care to people who are of low income but at a much lower price and with much less regulation than is currently within the ACA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 545

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I would like to speak on my amendment, No.

545, which is an amendment that stands for the principle of building on the work of the bipartisan Menendez-Kirk legislation to call for consequences should Iran cheat on its obligations of the agreement with the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, we should stand for the principle remembering the 290 Americans who have died at the hands of Iranian terror, including 13 Americans from Illinois. Let me read their names: James Lewis from Illinois, William Sheil from Illinois, Alvin Belmer, David Gay from Illinois, Joseph Livingston from Illinois, John A. Phillips, Jr., who went to church with me, Eric Pullman, and Gary R. Scott—all killed at the hands of Iranian terror. In the memory of these Americans, we want to make sure we carry out a sense of the Senate that expresses our views that if Iran cheats on this agreement, there should be sanctions.

I call on all Members to make sure they back the old bipartisan coalition of Menendez-Kirk.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 4:45 p.m. today be equally divided between the managers or their designees, and that at 4:45 p.m., the Senate vote in relation to the following amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Stabenow No. 755; Barrasso No. 347; Sanders No. 777, as modified, on climate change; Blunt No. 350 on EPA; Hatch No. 796 on Medicare; Bennet-Stabenow No. 601 on Medicare; Murray No. 801 on sequester replacement; Cotton No. 481 on Israel.

I further ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the managers or their designees prior to each vote, and that all votes after the first in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. For the information of all Senators, there will be up to eight roll-call votes at 4:45 p.m. I allocate time to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 388

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, last night, I offered amendment No. 388, to ensure the States and local governments are the driving force behind the national monument designations. I ask unanimous consent to add Senator HATCH as a cosponsor to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAINES. This is a fair and commonsense proposal that I believe Members on both sides of the aisle can sup-

port. Before major land decisions are made by the Federal Government, the people affected most by these decisions should have a seat at the table and have their voices heard. I was confused when I heard the senior Senator from Nevada claim this morning that my amendment would in some way gut or repeal law, providing the ability for national monument designations to take place. That is simply false. In sharp contrast, it is designated to strengthen the law by ensuring that the voice of the people is heard as designations are considered. After all, it is the people who are affected by these decisions, not politicians in Washington.

As a fifth-generation Montanan and a lifelong sportsman, I treasure and am committed to protecting our public lands. I deeply appreciate that landmarks like Pompeys Pillar in Montana or Lehman's Cave in Nevada have been protected for future generations. But there is a difference between targeted designations to protect historic landmarks and designating hundreds or even thousands or millions of acres against the will of the States and local residents.

The Senator from Nevada is saying that Washington, DC, should have more influence over local land use decisions than the folks in Western States who live and work on this land every day. I disagree. I believe the farmers, the ranchers, the sportsmen, the community members, and the State and local governments should have a say in local land decisions. I remind him the 1906 act was designed to prevent damage to specific sites of historical, scientific or cultural significance.

As the law States, ". . . the smallest area compatible with the proper care in management of objects to be protected." The law was not intended to block out access or damage operation of nearby landowners. The law was not intended to be used as a way for a President, as they are leaving office, to unilaterally make decisions without consulting the States in the local communities.

Strengthening the role of locally impacted residents and States is vitally important because, unfortunately, Presidents of both parties have also abused the Antiquities Act, designating unjustifiably excessive, large-scale pieces of ground through unilateral action despite local opposition from land users.

Let me remind the Senator from Nevada of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument designation. Local residents oppose that designation. Since the monument was designated in 1996, there has been a reduction in grazing. Development of a large coal mine has stopped. Local rural communities are struggling.

Wouldn't it have been better to protect the Grand Staircase in a way that also protected local communities?



Look to New Mexico, where the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument was designated in 2014 May against the will of local communities.

Representative STEVE PEARCE had a bill to protect 50,000 acres of land, which he worked with local residents and affected communities to implement. That bill was ignored, and the administration instead introduced a monument of 500,000 acres that touches all the way to the Mexican border.

During President Obama's first term, an internal document surfaced from the Interior Department revealing the Obama administration's plans to use the Antiquities Act to designate 14 new national monuments, comprising millions of acres across our country. One of the areas on the list is 2.5 million acres of land across northern Montana, connecting Canada's Grasslands National Park to the Bitter Creek Wilderness Study Area. Right in the middle of this designation are significant swaths of public lands. This potential designation is very contentious in Montana, which I believe Montanans must have a voice in determining whether it goes forward.

During a recent House Natural Resources Committee hearing, Interior Secretary Sally Jewell confirmed that she wants public input and local input in Antiquities Act designations. So why would anyone oppose elevating State and local input in these designations?

Despite the claims made by the Senator from Nevada, my amendment will not repeal the Antiquities Act. It is not going to gut the law. It will not repeal existing protections on our national parks and national monuments. It will not prevent future designations from being made. My amendment simply ensures that local residents and the States have a meaningful voice in determining monument designations.

In 2010, former Interior Secretary Salazar stated during a Senate hearing that the administration would have a conversation and dialogue with people locally and across the country before any monument designations occur.

My amendment simply holds this and future administrations accountable to what they said they would do, and it protects the voice of the people in decisions such as this. Protecting the voice of the people should not offend Members of this body. It should be our abiding commitment. It should be our priority.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 465

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 465.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 465.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to Second Amendment rights)

At the end of title III, add the following:

#### SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to upholding Second Amendment rights, which shall include preventing the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives from impinging upon those rights, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, my amendment will establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation to make sure the ATF does not infringe on our Second Amendment freedoms. This amendment ensures that American sportsmen aren't left with empty relics good for nothing more than mounting on the mantel, symbols of a bygone era of American freedom, until even the relics are taken.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 387

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 387.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 387.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to postal reform)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO POSTAL REFORM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the United States Postal Service, which may include measures addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees, by the amounts

provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, article I, section 8, clause 7, of the U.S. Constitution specifically provides for the establishment of the U.S. Postal Service. However, the Postal Service currently teeters on the brink of insolvency. In fact, a January 2015 Congressional Research Service report states that the Postal Service has reached its statutory borrowing limit of \$15 billion and has run up more than \$40 billion in deficits since fiscal year 2007. However in the midst of the Postal Service's financially tenuous circumstance, State and national political committees are granted postal discounts which can amount to as high as a 26-percent reduction in the standard rate paid by nonprivileged users.

Congress would do well to put State and national local committees on the same playing field as ordinary Americans. The Postal Service would certainly benefit from these groups paying the ordinary postage rate. Particularly in rural States like Montana, the Postal Service plays an important role in the vitality of our communities, and it connects people. Accordingly, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting budget amendment No. 387, which would signal the Senate's willingness to address the postage discount it provides to State and national political committees.

I thank the Chair. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the Republican budget resolution. I would ask—there are time restraints here. I will go as far in my speech as I can and then ask the remainder be included in the RECORD.

Mr. SANDERS. The Senator has 8 minutes.

Mr. FRANKEN. Please let me know—is that done without objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Can the Presiding Officer tell me when 7 minutes have elapsed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, the budget the Republicans in the Senate have presented us with imagines a future where we give even more tax breaks to millionaires and special interests, while pulling the rug out from under working families. Instead of addressing the major challenge facing our Nation today—that middle-class families continue to face an economy rigged against them and their efforts to attain a better future for themselves



and their family—this budget is fundamentally misaligned with the values of working Americans.

Over the last 30 years, we have seen Wall Street and giant corporations make record profits and middle-class families have been left behind. According to the Economic Policy Institute, over the last 30 years, wages for the top 1 percent rose almost 10 times as fast as those for the bottom 90 percent. Last year, Oxfam calculated that the 400 wealthiest individuals in our country have more wealth than the bottom 150 million Americans. As a result, today the concentration of income at the very top has risen to levels last seen in the 1920s—a time of vast inequality that ended in economic disaster for our entire Nation.

We have a responsibility to turn back this dangerous trend, and Minnesotans know how to do it. We have done it in Minnesota. We know how to grow our economy. We know that we grow it from the middle out, not the top down.

Paul Wellstone had a saying: We all do better when we all do better. And we all do better when people in the middle have money to spend. A higher percentage of middle-class people are entrepreneurs. There is more social and economic mobility when there is a strong middle class. We all do better when we all do better. Even those at the top do better. We saw that during the Clinton administration when every quintile was helped.

Minnesotans know that a middle-class budget would ensure health care access and fair workplaces for all Americans so that families can concentrate on doing the best job they can as workers, community members, parents, daughters, and sons instead of worrying about whether taking time off for a sick child will get them fired or whether a long-term illness will bankrupt their family.

So we could and we should be crafting a budget that supports middle-class families and those aspiring to be in the middle class. Opening up economic opportunity, helping to lay the foundation for economic growth, and supporting innovation are key to a dynamic economy.

We could have a budget that makes smart investments, finds sensible savings, and makes sure everyone is paying their fair share of taxes, but that is not the budget the Republicans have crafted. Instead of stability and opportunity for the middle-class Minnesotans, the Republican budget proposal would slash billions of dollars in investments that grow our economy. The Republican budget would do nothing to close the loopholes that disproportionately benefit large corporations and superwealthy individuals.

Since 2010, we have seen more than \$4 in spending cuts for every \$1 in revenue. The new Republican budget would make that situation even worse.

This budget would bring that to \$10 in spending for every \$1 in revenue, and these cuts are coming directly at the expense of programs that serve middle and lower income families.

The budget would cut over \$6 million in job-creating research in my State of Minnesota alone, where we are making crucial investments in areas such as renewable energy and health innovations. In fact, the Economic Policy Institute says the cuts in the Republican budget would result in over 45,000 jobs lost in Minnesota. It would also cut funds for workforce training to help Minnesotans compete for 21st-century jobs. Over 35,000 workers would lose access to training opportunities, according to the Department of Labor. Considering the skills gap that every Senator on this floor acknowledges to me exists in their States, that just makes no sense whatsoever.

The Republicans would cut education in their budget. We are talking about Head Start Programs. The Republican budget would cut 620,000 children from Head Start. We would lose those slots over 10 years. In Minnesota, that means 883 fewer slots for preschoolers who would benefit from early childhood programs.

I will tell you something about Head Start. This quality early childhood education program has a return on investments of \$8 to \$16 per child, and I will explain why. A child who has had a quality early childhood education is less likely to be in special education, less likely to be left back a grade, and has better health care outcomes. The girls are less likely to get pregnant in adolescence. They graduate from high school at a higher rate. They are more likely to go to college, graduate from college, have better jobs, pay more taxes, and they are much less likely to go to prison. That is why you have an \$8 to \$16 return for each kid who has a quality early childhood education. This is wrong. It is also wrong because kids are only 3 years old once, and they are beautiful children. They deserve this, and their parents deserve this. This is wrongheaded.

The Republican budget not only hits early childhood education, it hits Pell grants. In Minnesota, 160,000 students last year were able to go to college because of the Pell Grant Program. When my wife Franni and I went to college, a full Pell grant paid for almost 80 percent of a full public college education. Today, it pays for less than 35 percent. Further cuts will make it even harder for students to pay for college. Yet my colleagues want to cut Pell grants further. We should not be doing that, and that is why I am offering an amendment to restore funding for Pell Grants in this budget.

And that is also why I have worked with Senator WARREN on the amendment to make higher education more affordable by allowing Americans to

refinance student debt. Student debt is now over \$1.3 trillion and this is holding back our economy because recent grads are less likely to buy a home, start a new business, or purchase other big-ticket items like a car because they are tied to this debt. Unfortunately, our amendment failed, but I am going to keep working with Senator WARREN on this commonsense issue.

One of the other keys to prosperity is infrastructure, and unfortunately, the Republican budget does nothing to address our Nation's crumbling roads, bridges, dams, levees, water systems, waste water plants, airports, and rail systems. And yet investing in infrastructure is one of the best ways to help businesses and create millions of middle-class jobs in the short and long-term.

As I said, the Republican budget also seeks to repeal the Affordable Care Act, even though we know that 16.5 million Americans now have health coverage because of the Affordable Care Act. In Minnesota, since the Affordable Care Act fully went into effect, the uninsured rate has dropped by over 40 percent, and now 95 percent of Minnesotans have health insurance. But under the Republican budget, we would go back to the days when someone with a pre-existing condition could not get health insurance. We would go back to the days when half the bankruptcies in this country were linked to someone getting sick, and back to the days when women were charged more than men for health insurance.

That is not what Americans want. Americans don't want to go back to the days of high-cost, low value health care.

Americans don't want a budget that will undercut the very sources of prosperity for the middle class. We can afford to make the investments we need for the future, and do it in a fiscally responsible way. Part of that is fixing our broken Tax Code. Our economy loses hundreds of billions of dollars from a wasteful, inefficient, and, frankly, unfair Tax Code riddled with loopholes. If we reform our Tax Code to make it fairer and more efficient—by doing things like closing the loophole on what is called carried interest—we can afford to invest in education, infrastructure, and innovation to help American workers compete in the global economy.

Instead, the Republican budget would allow U.S. companies to continue to shift billions in profits to tax havens and middle-class jobs overseas. It allows millionaires and billionaires to pay lower rates on their income than many middle-class taxpayers.

On top of this, the Republican budget leaves the deck stacked in favor of the rights of big corporations and Wall Street ahead of American workers. Americans want a fair chance. They want equal pay for equal work. They

want us to preserve the promise of Social Security for their generation and generations to come. And they want everyone who works full time to be able to keep their family out of poverty. These are the things that could be in a budget that supports the middle class.

Finally, let me note that the Republican budget is filled with fiscally irresponsible budget gimmicks. Not only is it very vague about a lot of the cuts it would make, the budget also uses an off the books account, the Overseas Contingency Operations Fund, which falls outside of the budget caps, to significantly increase defense spending without paying for it. And even as the Republican budget repeals the Affordable Care Act, it doesn't say how it will replace the savings and revenue from the bill. This isn't even smoke and mirrors, it is right out there for us to see. This budget also repeals a rule the Senate has had in place since 2007 to prohibit reconciliation legislation that would increase the deficit.

Again, the Republican's budget plan for America is fundamentally out of step with the values of working Americans. It's the same tired trickle-down plan we have seen fail time and time again. It's a plan that says we can reduce our deficit and spend billions more on defense without raising a nickel of new revenue. It's a plan that says we can grow our economy by cutting health care for seniors and children and the poorest in our society. It's a plan that says that cutting preschool and college aid is a better investment than closing tax loopholes that encourage giant, multinational corporations to use elaborate accounting tricks and ship jobs overseas. This plan just doesn't make sense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I will end by saying that this is not even smoke and mirrors; this is riddled with gimmicks and is fundamentally unfair to working Americans. It is the same trickle-down economics that we have seen fail time and time again.

I urge my colleagues to reject this budget and embrace a real plan that supports middle-class families and those aspiring to the middle class. We need a budget that builds on the progress we made since the great recession and takes us into a better future for all Americans.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. How much time does the Democratic side have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic side has 5 minutes remaining.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 350

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to respond and speak as to why I am in opposition to the Blunt amendment

which requires a point of order for a carbon tax.

The scientific community is not in debate. The scientific community tells us that climate change is real. It is caused by human activity and by a very significant increase in carbon emissions. The scientific community tells us that climate change is already causing devastating problems in our Nation and around the world. The scientific community tells us that if we do not get our act together—not just the United States but China, Russia, India, and the entire world—the planet we will be leaving for our kids and grandchildren will be substantially less habitable than the planet we enjoy.

We have a moral responsibility to respond to this crisis, and we have to use every tool we can in our arsenal. What does that mean? It means we need to invest heavily in weatherization and energy efficiency so we don't waste energy. It means we have to move aggressively toward wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, and other sustainable energies. It also means we have to tell those people who are producing carbon in significant amounts and are causing the problem that they cannot continue to do that with impunity. They will have to pay a tax on that.

We can argue about how we go forward in transforming our energy system and how we cut carbon pollution, but we should not pick out one particular approach and say that it is going to require 60 votes to go forward.

I strongly object to Senator BLUNT's amendment.

What we will be doing is offering a side-by-side. This side-by-side could not be simpler. The American people and the scientific community are pretty clear when it comes to climate change: It is, in fact, real, and it is caused by human activity. What we will do is offer a side-by-side to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to recognize that climate change is real, is caused by human activity, and that Congress needs to take action to cut carbon pollution.

Young people all over this country want action. While many of my Republican colleagues refuse to acknowledge the reality that climate change is caused by human activity, many Republicans outside of Capitol Hill, in fact, do understand that. We have prominent conservative economists and economic advisers, such as Nobel laureate economist Gary Becker, Mitt Romney's former economic adviser Gregory Mankiw, and former Reagan adviser Art Laffer, who have all called for taxing carbon. It is not a radical idea. These are conservative Republicans who understand that people who are causing the problem cannot do that with impunity.

More recently, George Shultz—I think we all know George Shultz is the former Secretary of the Treasury and

Secretary of State under Presidents Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan—published an op-ed in the Washington Post calling for a carbon tax. The idea of a carbon tax is something that is gaining more and more support from Democrats, Republicans, Independents, people who are very worried about what is happening to our environment.

In terms of the side-by-side, I personally am strongly opposed to Senator BLUNT's amendment, which just looks at a tax on carbon. I should also say that as a coauthor, along with Senator BOXER, with regard to a carbon tax, we put huge amounts of money into helping those families who might see higher utility bills. That is probably the main source of funding allocation. So we are aware of the problem, and we address it in our legislation, and it should be addressed in any legislation.

But once again, in terms of the side-by-side, we are going to give our Republican colleagues an opportunity—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrat's time has expired.

The Senator from Oregon.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 434

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 434.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself and Mr. CRAPO, proposes an amendment numbered 434.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for an adjustment to committee allocations for wildfire suppression funding)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.

If a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) for wildfire suppression funding, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 777, AS MODIFIED

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, since my friend from across the aisle raised the issue of climate change, I will use the

remainder of my time to talk about that issue because I will urge my colleagues to vote no on amendment No. 777.

We voted earlier—and it was a unanimous vote—that climate change is real. I believe virtually everyone agrees that over time the Earth's climate has shifted at various levels of speed and in various directions.

I had an opportunity to go on a trip to China, and we visited one of the country's labs researching climate change. I had the opportunity to tour the lab with the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN. One of the amazing things was—as we finished the tour after looking at five different ways the scientists were measuring what caused climate change and how real it was—when Senator DURBIN said to me: I am sure glad Senator INHOFE is not with us because this backs up everything Senator INHOFE has been saying.

So climate change is an issue that has not really been resolved among all the scientists, even in some countries that have different opinions than we do.

Every snowstorm, every heat wave that we have today—we have changed it from global warming to climate change because now we are blaming everything on this phenomenon. One of the comments I made is that instead of spending \$5 billion on one side to prove there is climate change and another \$5 billion on the other side to disprove climate change, maybe we ought to spend \$10 billion a year just on fixing things.

So I think there are some problems with the amendment, and I hope my colleagues will vote no.

I see that it is almost time for the vote, so I yield back our time.

Go ahead and start on the vote.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 755

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 755, offered by the Senator from Michigan, Ms. STABENOW.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the Stabenow amendment.

This amendment would establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund that would do a few things. First of all, it would ensure that the Clean Water Act is focused on protecting water quality, upholding the existing exemption in the Clean Water Act for agriculture, ranching, and forestry that has existed for decades so our foresters and ranchers have the certainty they need. It would ensure that we rely on scientific evidence as we examine the impact that water quality has on the different types of water bodies, and it provides certainty to landowners and rural communities that are guided by the scope of the Clean Water Act.

I appreciate my colleague from Wyoming and his approach. I believe mine

is much more specific. It is deficit neutral instead of spending neutral, so it allows us to offset any changes we would like to make to support these efforts through either revenues or spending cuts as opposed to a spending-neutral reserve fund. Most importantly, it makes very clear support for both the Clean Water Act and agriculture.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. We would be happy to take that amendment. We would prefer to do that by voice vote because we have a lot of votes pending.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I actually would prefer a recorded rollcall vote. I appreciate that offer, but I would ask for a recorded rollcall vote.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I support the Stabenow amendment. Ranchers and property owners in rural America think the EPA is out of control. I agree. It is right to rein in the EPA and restore current protections and exemptions for rural America.

A key area where the Stabenow amendment falls short is excluding cities, suburbs, and the job-creating businesses and working families that reside outside of rural America.

My amendment, which will be next, addresses concerns raised by the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Association of Counties, which want certainty regarding the EPA's power grab.

The Senator from Michigan does things to protect farmers and ranchers from the EPA. My amendment is supported by the American Farm Bureau. This support is because my amendment is specific and holds the EPA and the Corps to the promises they have already made.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we yield back the time in opposition.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if there is time remaining, I would simply say that I think our amendment is stronger and much more specific. Also, it upholds two goals: supporting the Clean Water Act, which has for 40 years protected us with clean fishing and drinking water—and in our beautiful Great Lakes, certainly all that we hold dear—but it also clarifies specifics for agriculture, ranchers, foresters, and communities.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 87 Leg.]

#### YEAS—99

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Reid
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Boxer	Heller	Roberts
Brown	Hirono	Rounds
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cardin	Johnson	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott
Cassidy	Kirk	Sessions
Coats	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cochran	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Corker	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Thune
Cotton	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Vitter
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Enzi	Mikulski	Warren
Ernst	Moran	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 755) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 347

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 347, offered by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. BARRASSO.

The Senator from Wyoming.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise in support of my amendment No. 347, an amendment to hold the EPA and the Army Corps to their word about the scope of their proposed waters of the United States rule. The administration says there is a lot of misunderstanding with their proposed waters of the United States regulation and what it covers.

Time and time again, we have heard from the EPA and the Corps that this rule would not cover things such as puddles, rainwater, snowmelt, and irrigation ditches. The Barrasso amendment would help to make sure this rule is crystal clear by listing out those things the EPA and the Corps have indicated or led folks to believe would not be covered under the rule.

So if you believe the waters of the United States rule does not go far

enough, that the Federal Government should be in the business of regulating puddles in our constituents' backyards, then vote against my amendment. That is what voting against my amendment would mean. That is why I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment to protect the waters of the United States.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, we just voted together on a very specific amendment that makes it clear that all of our traditional agriculture, forestry efforts, all of the local government efforts that are occurring in this country right now will continue even under a revised clean water rule, which, by the way, is only having to be done because of two Supreme Court decisions that created a tremendous amount of confusion for communities and farmers and ranchers.

Unfortunately, regardless of what was just said, the Barrasso amendment is very general, very broad. It does not add any clarity. It would keep the confusion that is out there. I would urge that we vote no. We have already made a clear statement here in the Senate. We do not need to go back to what the Supreme Court did when in 2006 they had five different opinions coming from nine different Justices and created chaos. We do not need two different amendments that say two different things. We just did something very clear and specific. Let's hold that and vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Leg.]

#### YEAS—59

Alexander	Ernst	Manchin
Ayotte	Fischer	McCain
Barrasso	Flake	McCaskill
Blunt	Gardner	McConnell
Boozman	Graham	Moran
Burr	Grassley	Murkowski
Capito	Hatch	Paul
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Perdue
Coats	Heller	Portman
Cochran	Hoeven	Risch
Collins	Inhofe	Roberts
Corker	Isakson	Rounds
Cornyn	Johnson	Rubio
Cotton	King	Sasse
Crapo	Kirk	Scott
Daines	Klobuchar	Sessions
Donnelly	Lankford	Shelby
Enzi	Lee	

Sullivan  
Thune

Tillis  
Toomey

Vitter  
Wicker

#### NAYS—40

Baldwin  
Bennet  
Blumenthal  
Booker  
Boxer  
Brown  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Carper  
Casey  
Coons  
Durbin  
Feinstein  
Franken

Gillibrand  
Heinrich  
Hirono  
Kaine  
Leahy  
Markey  
Menendez  
Merkley  
Mikulski  
Murphy  
Murray  
Nelson  
Peters  
Reed

Reid  
Sanders  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Shaheen  
Stabenow  
Tester  
Udall  
Warner  
Warren  
Whitehouse  
Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 347) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 777, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 777, as modified, offered by the Senator from Vermont, Mr. SANDERS.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this amendment could not be simpler.

The scientific community has been very clear in telling us that climate change is the great environmental crisis of our time. It is caused by human activity, it is real, and it is already causing devastating problems in the United States and throughout the world.

This amendment establishes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to recognize that climate change is real, it is caused by human activity, and that Congress needs to take action to cut carbon pollution.

Let us stand with science. Let's pass this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 350 WITHDRAWN

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, without using the minute from our side, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw Blunt amendment No. 350.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is withdrawn.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 777, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this really wasn't the week of the Senator from Vermont. In an article in the Wall Street Journal on Monday, "The Myth of the Climate Change '97%,'" they say the 97 percent figure came from 79 respondents out of 3,146.

Secondly, today is the day they finalized the annual Gallup poll. The Gallup poll came out and made the statements that came to the conclusion that the current level of worry on global warming and climate remains at record lows, right behind the loss of tropical rain forests.

So don't vote for this based on the assumption that the 97 percent figure

is accurate or that people care that much.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the Sanders amendment No. 777, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 89 Leg.]

#### YEAS—49

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Peters
Baldwin	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Kirk	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McCaskill	Udall
Collins	Menendez	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warren
Donnelly	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	
Franken	Nelson	

#### NAYS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Corker	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Vitter
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The amendment (No. 777), as modified, was rejected.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 796

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 796, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, we all know Medicare is on an unsustainable course. Independent actuaries at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—CMS—estimate that, over the next 75 years, the program has \$35 trillion—that is with a T—in unfunded obligations.

CBO says that, without reforms, Medicare's hospital insurance trust

fund will be insolvent early in the decade following 2025. And according to the Medicare trustees themselves, the hospital insurance trust fund could be insolvent as early as 2021. At that time Medicare will no longer be able to pay out full benefits to seniors.

We need to reform Medicare in order to save Medicare. We have a moral obligation to put Medicare on a sustainable path. It is crucial we ensure its solvency into the decade if we want to keep the promise we have made to those at or near retirement.

That is where we are, and that is about all I am going to say about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

There is 45 seconds remaining in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I think there is no objection to the amendment on this side. If the Senator would like a voice vote, we would be fine with that.

Mr. HATCH. A voice vote would be fine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 796) was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 601

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 601.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise today in offering an amendment with Senator STABENOW to guarantee we keep a sacred promise to our Nation's seniors to protect the Medicare Program for years to come.

The budget we have in front of us doesn't balance our values or priorities as a country. Unfortunately, it misses the mark entirely for our seniors. To put it into perspective, the Senate Republican budget cuts the Medicare Program by almost three times as much as the House Republican budget.

My amendment ensures we protect our seniors from any effort to cut Medicare beneficiaries' guaranteed benefits, privatize Medicare into a premium support plan or increase out-of-pocket spending on drugs or prevention services.

In 2013, over half the Medicare beneficiaries had incomes below \$23,000 a year. We can't attempt to balance the Nation's budget on the backs of our seniors. There is a reason why the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare is urging a "yes" vote on this amendment and a "no" vote on the Republican budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the Bennet-Stabenow amendment, and I yield whatever time remains to the senior Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I will raise a point of order against this amend-

ment. The amendment offered by my friends across the aisle would prohibit consideration of certain Medicare legislation.

I know all my colleagues are committed to preserving Medicare. We all want Medicare to be there for today's and tomorrow's seniors, and right now its finances are deteriorating rapidly. However, my colleague's amendment is not germane to the budget resolution.

The Committee on Finance has jurisdiction over the Medicare program. The Committee on the Budget does not. The Bennet-Stabenow amendment instructs the Committee on Finance how to write a Medicare reform bill—language that is inappropriate to include in a budget resolution. In fact, adopting this amendment would kill the privilege of the budget resolution.

For this reason, I am compelled, as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, to raise a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. President, the pending amendment, No. 601, is not germane to the budget resolution now before the Senate. Therefore, I raise a point of order against this amendment under section 305(b)2 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act for the purpose of the pending amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays on protecting Medicare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 90 Leg.]

#### YEAS—46

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Heller	Reid
Boxer	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markley	Tester
Collins	McCaskey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Donnelly	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

#### NAYS—53

Alexander	Blunt	Capito
Ayotte	Boozman	Cassidy
Barrasso	Burr	Coats

Cochran	Inhofe	Roberts
Corker	Isakson	Rounds
Cornyn	Johnson	Rubio
Cotton	Kaine	Sasse
Crapo	Kirk	Scott
Daines	Lankford	Sessions
Enzi	Lee	Shelby
Ernst	McCain	Sullivan
Fischer	McConnell	Thune
Flake	Moran	Tillis
Gardner	Murkowski	Toomey
Graham	Paul	Vitter
Grassley	Perdue	Warner
Hatch	Portman	Wicker
Hoeven	Risch	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Cruz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 46, the nays are 53.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 801

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 801, offered by the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, Democrats and Republicans agree that the automatic spending cuts across defense and nondefense investments are terrible policy, and it has to be fixed.

I am proud that the bipartisan budget act that we passed last Congress did exactly that for the past 2 years. It offered us a template for how we can tackle this challenge in a bipartisan way once again. That deal succeeded because it rolled back cuts to defense and nondefense equally, and it did it with a balanced and responsible mix of savings and new revenue.

The amendment before us builds on that deal and extends the sequester relief for 2 more years. We don't need to rely on gimmicks in this budget or the hopes that we are going to solve this later. We need to fix this now.

In 2013, it took a government shutdown to bring both sides to the table to get a deal for this. I am hoping we don't have to wait for another crisis, and I encourage our colleagues who oppose sequestration to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, if we want to change the Budget Control Act of 2011, we need to pass the bill to do so later in the year. The budget resolution cannot fix sequestration. This particular amendment increases both defense spending and nondefense spending. Without a justification, it calls for spending \$148 billion more than allowed by the BCA. The BCA requires the defense program to receive half of the reductions. That is not the case here. With nondefense limits, much work remains to eliminate inefficiencies in the nondefense side of the ledger.

According to the CBO, there are 260 programs spending \$293 billion in the 2015 budget that are not operating under a current authorization. That means the policy experts haven't done their work. So we can't tell if we need that much more money.

This amendment seeks more money for nondefense. This amendment calls for an increase in spending and pays for it by extracting more taxes from American taxpayers. The tax increases in this amendment total \$120 billion. Finally, perhaps the most important reason—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ENZI. I ask for a "no" vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 91 Leg.]

#### YEAS—46

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Heitkamp	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reid
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Boxer	King	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Manchin	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Cassey	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wyden
Franken	Murray	
Gillibrand	Nelson	

#### NAYS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Cochran	Isakson	Sessions
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Crux

The amendment (No. 801) was rejected.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 481

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 min-

utes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 481, offered by the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. COTTON.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, for decades, this Congress has provided bipartisan support to the U.S.-Israel alliance in part because the support of the American people for the Israeli people is so strong. Unfortunately, for almost as long, the United Nations has singled out Israel for unfair, discriminatory treatment, whether it is the 1975 Zionism is Racism Resolution or the recent obsession of the Human Rights Council.

It has been the longstanding U.S. policy to prevent unfair, discriminatory treatment against Israel at the United Nations and other international institutions. I believe it is urgent that this Congress reaffirm that policy.

This amendment will allow a funding mechanism to adjust funding to the United Nations or other international institutions should they target Israel for unfair, discriminatory treatment. I hope we never need this mechanism, but I believe it is critical that Congress reaffirm our commitment to the U.S.-Israel alliance in preventing unfair, discriminatory treatment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I believe there is general support on this side of the floor for that amendment, and I suggest a voice vote.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. COTTON.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Leg.]

#### YEAS—99

Alexander	Coats	Gillibrand
Ayotte	Cochran	Graham
Baldwin	Collins	Grassley
Barrasso	Coons	Hatch
Bennet	Corker	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Cornyn	Heitkamp
Blunt	Cotton	Heller
Booker	Crapo	Hirono
Boozman	Daines	Hoeven
Boxer	Donnelly	Inhofe
Brown	Durbin	Isakson
Burr	Enzi	Johnson
Cantwell	Ernst	Kaine
Capito	Feinstein	King
Cardin	Fischer	Kirk
Carper	Flake	Klobuchar
Cassey	Franken	Lankford
Cassidy	Gardner	Leahy

Lee	Perdue	Shaheen
Manchin	Peters	Shelby
Markey	Portman	Stabenow
McCain	Reed	Sullivan
McCaskill	Reid	Tester
McConnell	Risch	Thune
Menendez	Roberts	Tillis
Merkley	Rounds	Toomey
Mikulski	Rubio	Udall
Moran	Sanders	Vitter
Murkowski	Sasse	Warner
Murphy	Schatz	Warren
Murray	Schumer	Whitehouse
Nelson	Scott	Wicker
Paul	Sessions	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Crux

The amendment (No. 481) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, just to get things in order here, I ask unanimous consent that first Senator PAUL be recognized to call up an amendment and then after that, that Senator WYDEN be recognized to call up an amendment and for 3 minutes; that Senator COONS be recognized to call up an amendment and for 3 minutes; that Senator BALDWIN be recognized to call up an amendment and for 2 minutes; that Senator MANCHIN be recognized to call up an amendment and for 3 minutes; and then I be recognized to call up an amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Reserving the right to object, I would like 1 minute to bring forth eight amendments.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Can we let Senator PAUL, who is simply calling up an amendment, proceed first?

Mr. SANDERS. Sure.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I so modify my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the request, as modified?

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, are they going back and forth or exactly in that order? Normally, we allow both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator restate?

Mr. ENZI. I was suggesting that he revise his unanimous consent request so that we would go back and forth from side to side, rather than a whole lot of people going on one side, and people waiting on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the further modification?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Just a clarification. As I understand it, the order I asked will be the order on the Democratic side. There will be an interspersing of Republicans as they come to the floor, but everybody is going to be kept to 2 or 3 minutes rather than there being long speeches because if someone is going to give a long speech, they should go to the end. We are just trying to call up a lot of amendments quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Kentucky and

I would just like to make our amendments pending. If we could just get that done.

Mr. SANDERS. So would we.

Mr. MCCAIN. Good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request as further modified is so ordered.

The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 940

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 940.

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase new budget authority for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 and modify outlays for fiscal years 2016 through 2022 for National Defense (budget function 050) with offsets)

On page 14, line 2, increase the amount by \$76,513,000,000.

On page 14, line 3, increase the amount by \$48,578,000,000.

On page 14, line 6, increase the amount by \$112,990,000,000.

On page 14, line 7, increase the amount by \$87,604,000,000.

On page 14, line 11, increase the amount by \$29,603,000,000.

On page 14, line 15, increase the amount by \$11,863,000,000.

On page 14, line 19, increase the amount by \$6,396,000,000.

On page 14, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,274,000,000.

On page 15, line 19, decrease the amount by \$21,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 20, decrease the amount by \$15,750,000,000.

On page 15, line 23, decrease the amount by \$21,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 24, decrease the amount by \$19,950,000,000.

On page 16, line 3, decrease the amount by \$4,998,000,000.

On page 16, line 7, decrease the amount by \$15,498,000,000.

On page 16, line 11, decrease the amount by \$14,700,000,000.

On page 17, line 12, decrease the amount by \$14,000,000,000.

On page 17, line 13, decrease the amount by \$9,100,000,000.

On page 17, line 16, decrease the amount by \$14,000,000,000.

On page 17, line 17, decrease the amount by \$11,900,000,000.

On page 17, line 21, decrease the amount by \$4,200,000,000.

On page 17, line 25, decrease the amount by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 18, line 4, decrease the amount by \$700,000,000.

On page 20, line 13, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 14, decrease the amount by \$6,500,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, decrease the amount by \$8,500,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, decrease the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 1, decrease the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 21, line 5, decrease the amount by \$500,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, decrease the amount by \$10,920,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, decrease the amount by \$13,720,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, decrease the amount by \$3,080,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, decrease the amount by \$280,000,000.

On page 33, line 19, decrease the amount by \$41,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 20, decrease the amount by \$29,520,000,000.

On page 33, line 23, decrease the amount by \$41,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 24, decrease the amount by \$41,000,000,000.

On page 34, line 3, decrease the amount by \$11,480,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 697, 798, 800, 812, 951, 345, AND  
817 EN BLOC

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up the following amendments en bloc: amendments Nos. 697, 798, 800, 812, 951, 345, and 817.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to calling up the amendments en bloc?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 697

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation that reforms and strengthens elementary and secondary education)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming and strengthening elementary and secondary education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 798

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation to allow Americans to earn paid sick time)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO ALLOW AMERICANS TO EARN PAID SICK TIME.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to improve workplace benefits and reduce health care costs, which may include measures to allow Americans to earn paid sick time to address their own health needs and the health needs of their families, and to promote equal employment opportunities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 800

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to a comprehensive approach to crude-by-rail safety)

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO CRUDE-BY-RAIL SAFETY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the safe movement of crude oil by rail, which may include—

(1) strengthening design standards for rail tank cars;

(2) rapidly phasing out the legacy rail tank car fleet for crude-by-rail operations;

(3) improving railroad operations to reduce derailments;

(4) limiting the volatility of crude oil shipped by rail;

(5) disclosing crude-by-rail train movements to States and first responders; or

(6) increasing resources that provide for the training and equipping of first responders to respond to worst-case accidents,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 812

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide women with affordable access to comprehensive health care, including preventive services (such as contraception and breast cancer screenings), improve maternal health, and ensure that a woman has the same benefits and services no matter what part of the United States she lives in, all of which is critical to improving the health and well-being of women, children, their families, and society as a whole, and is an essential part of a woman's economic security and opportunity)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADVANCE WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE INTO THE 21ST CENTURY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving women's healthcare services, which may include measures to—



(1) expand comprehensive preventive services, including full access to contraceptive coverage for all women;

(2) invest in access to women's primary care by investing in nurse practitioners and other health care providers;

(3) improve maternal safety and quality of care;

(4) provide compassionate assistance through emergency contraception and awareness for survivors of rape; or

(5) ensure that women have access, awareness, and are provided the full range of preventive services, including contraception, breast cancer screenings, mammograms, domestic violence screenings and counseling, and more as provided for by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 951

(Purpose: To establish and fund a new Federal-State partnership to expand access to high-quality preschool programs for children from low- and moderate-income families, offset with revenue from closing loopholes)

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$2,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$3,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,900,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$3,700,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,900,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,309,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$5,941,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,907,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$9,508,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$569,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$437,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$302,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$166,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$44,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,309,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$5,941,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$7,907,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$9,508,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$569,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$437,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$302,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$166,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$44,000,000.

On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,809,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,141,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,807,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, increase the amount by \$6,208,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by \$2,831,000,000.

On page 7, line 13, decrease the amount by \$4,063,000,000.

On page 7, line 14, decrease the amount by \$3,398,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, decrease the amount by \$3,734,000,000.

On page 7, line 16, decrease the amount by \$3,956,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,125,000,000.

On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$6,266,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$11,073,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$17,281,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$14,450,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$10,387,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$6,989,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,255,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, decrease the amount by \$701,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,125,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$6,266,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$11,073,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$17,281,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$14,450,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$10,387,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$6,989,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,255,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, decrease the amount by \$701,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,300,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,300,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,250,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by \$3,250,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,780,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$5,780,000,000.

On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$7,580,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,580,000,000.

On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$8,960,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$8,960,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$59,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$59,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$161,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$161,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$327,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$327,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$548,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$548,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$569,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$569,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$437,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$437,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$302,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$302,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$166,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$166,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by \$44,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by \$44,000,000.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 345

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to increasing funding for Federal investments in biomedical and basic scientific research)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR FEDERAL INVESTMENTS IN BIOMEDICAL AND BASIC SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for Federal investments in scientific research, which may include helping find cures for life-threatening and chronic illnesses, increasing our national security, supporting new energy technologies, or supporting innovative solutions that advance private sector efforts to

grow the economy and create millions of middle jobs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 817

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide tax benefits to patriot employers that invest in American jobs and provide fair pay and benefits to workers and to eliminate tax benefits for corporations that ship jobs or profits overseas)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE TAX BENEFITS TO PATRIOT EMPLOYERS THAT INVEST IN AMERICAN JOBS AND PROVIDE FAIR PAY AND BENEFITS TO WORKERS AND TO ELIMINATE TAX BENEFITS FOR CORPORATIONS THAT SHIP JOBS OR PROFITS OVERSEAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to income taxes paid by businesses, which may include measures providing tax breaks for companies that have not inverted, have maintained or expanded their United States workforce, or have provided livable wages and health care, and may also include measures ending tax breaks that encourage businesses to ship jobs offshore, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 360

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendments to call up my amendment No. 360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], for himself and Mr. FLAKE, proposes an amendment numbered 360.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to deterring the migration of unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DETERRING THE MIGRATION OF UNACCOMPANIED CHILDREN FROM EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, AND HONDURAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to deterring the attempted migration of unaccompanied children from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras into the United States, which may include the expedited removal of unlawful entrants from non-contiguous countries and for providing in-county consulate processing of refugee applications, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 708

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendment No. 708.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself and Mr. BENNET, proposes an amendment numbered 708.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to simplifying and expanding tax incentives for higher education to boost student attendance and completion)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SIMPLIFYING AND EXPANDING TAX INCENTIVES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to simplifying and expanding tax incentives for higher education to boost student attendance and completion at colleges and vocational schools, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. WYDEN. The first of the three amendments I call up would expand and simplify the tax credits to help students afford the sky-high costs of a college education.

Students and their families today spend hours wading through a Byzantine web of tax incentives for college and too often miss out on opportunities in the Tax Code to pay for their education. Students are taking on loan debt that weighs them down for years.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 791

Second, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amend-

ment be set aside in order to call up the Wyden, Murray, Stabenow amendment No. 791.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. STABENOW, proposes an amendment numbered 791.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike reconciliation instructions to the Committees on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions and Finance and require regular order)

Strike title II.

Mr. WYDEN. This amendment would delete the reconciliation instructions in Section 201 of the budget resolution.

When it comes to tackling the big economic challenges in this country, the best legislation is bipartisan legislation. Using the procedural tactic called budget reconciliation is a guaranteed path to partisanship and gridlock. It would be particularly damaging in the cause of tax reform, where Democrats and Republicans understand, just as in 1986, there is an opportunity for common ground.

I also think it would be very unfortunate to use reconciliation to appeal the Affordable Care Act. If it is repealed, America goes back to the dark days when health care was reserved for the healthy and the wealthy.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 870

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside in order to call up amendment No. 870.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. WARNER, proposes an amendment numbered 870.

Mr. WYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to extending tax provisions expiring in 2013 or 2014 for 2 years, such as those contained in the EXPIRE Act of 2014)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXTENDING TAX PROVISIONS EXPIRING IN 2013 OR 2014 FOR 2 YEARS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extending tax provisions that expired in 2013 or 2014 for 2 years, which may include provisions and policies like those contained in the EXPIRE Act of 2014, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. WYDEN. This amendment deals with the stop-and-go tax cuts known as extenders. Last December, the Senate approved a package of tax extenders for the 2014 year. That law expired before the ink could dry. By New Year's Day, taxpayers were thrown back in the dark about what they will owe in the future.

Let's not repeat that mistake. A grab bag of tax breaks is nobody's idea of perfect tax policy. My amendment will definitely move the ball forward on tax policy. It will send a clear signal that the Senate is ready to put these tax incentives in place through the year 2016.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 453, 452, 457, AND 456 EN BLOC

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up my amendments Nos. 453, 452, 457 and 456 en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 453

(Purpose: To establish a spending-neutral reserve fund relating to ensuring that the Secretary of Transportation prioritizes the construction of projects that are of national and regional significance and projects in high priority corridors on the National Highway System, which will improve the safe, secure, and efficient movement of people and goods through the United States and facilitate economic development and create jobs in the United States)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRIORITIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS THAT ARE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE AND PROJECTS IN HIGH PRIORITY CORRIDORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prioritization of the Federal investment in the infrastructure of the United States on projects that are of national and regional significance and projects in high priority corridors of the National Highway System by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided

that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 452

(Purpose: To establish a spending-neutral reserve fund relating to ensuring that the Secretary of the Interior enters into candidate conservation agreements with each of the relevant 11 Western States before the United States Fish and Wildlife Service makes a listing determination on the greater sage-grouse under the Endangered Species Act of 1973)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ENTERS INTO CERTAIN CANDIDATE CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS WITH WESTERN STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) determinations, which may include determining whether the greater sage-grouse warrants protection, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 457

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to prohibition of Veterans Benefits Administration executive bonuses until the backlog of disability claims for veterans is eliminated)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN BONUSES FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to bonuses paid by the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include prohibitions on awards to employees responsible for eliminating the backlog of claims, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 456

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to ensuring that medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs meet the privacy, dignity, and safety needs of women veterans)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** **DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT MEDICAL FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEET THE NEEDS OF WOMEN VETERANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs meet the needs of women veterans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, before I begin, I thank all of those involved with this intricate process. Senate Budget Committee chairman MIKE ENZI and ranking member BERNIE SANDERS have worked tirelessly leading up to this point. It certainly is not an easy process, and I do not want their efforts to go unnoticed.

I stand here today to discuss many important issues that concern my constituents across the great State of Nevada. These are issues that I hope to address during this year's budget process to improve the quality of life in the Silver State.

I have filed several amendments to this year's budget ranging from infrastructure and tourism, to medical care at VA facilities, and to protecting our way of life in Nevada with the support of the Second Amendment. These amendments will deliver needed solutions.

Developing critical infrastructure for Nevada is a top priority of mine. It remains the first step toward long-term job growth and sustainability. Trucking, tourism, and trade needs are met when proper infrastructure is in place.

In fact, I filed amendment No. 466 that would help promote travel and tourism here in the United States. Last year, over 40 million visitors came to the Silver State, supporting almost 400,000 jobs. The future Interstate 11, and the many other important highway projects throughout our Nation, have the potential to open more markets for tourism and trade, which will create jobs and improve our economy. In Nevada, we are a State that welcomes more visitors, both domestic and international, on a yearly basis. We want more people to experience all our State has to offer and strive to provide the best services to those already visiting Nevada.

I recognize there are limited resources dedicated for transportation and infrastructure. I believe it is important we prioritize roads and bridges that give us the biggest bang for our buck. It is important we expand high priority corridors and projects of regional and national significance, because those are the types of projects

that will spur long-term economic development.

One example of these critical projects is the proposed I-11 corridor. This future highway would connect Phoenix and Las Vegas, the two largest cities in the Nation not connected by an interstate, cutting the travel time by over 1 hour. It would provide new economic development opportunities in the Southwest and would play a large role in boosting the global competitiveness of the region. My amendment, amendment No. 453 would prioritize Federal investments in infrastructure projects with national and regional significance such as the I-11 corridor.

In Nevada, we have a local resident called the sage grouse. Listing the sage grouse as an endangered species would have a devastating impact on Nevada's economy. Like many of the other States, Nevada's Ecosystem Council has spent years diligently developing a robust action plan to avoid a listing. Further collaboration between the Federal Government, the State, and local stakeholders will go a much longer way to protect and balance both Nevadans' way of life and the sage grouse population. My amendment, amendment No. 452, says the Department of the Interior should enter into State conservation agreements with each of the 11 States with sage grouse populations. State plans should be given the opportunity to show results before the Federal Government intervenes.

If the Federal Government adds the sage grouse to the endangered species list, it would devastate rural economies across these affected States, including Nevada. States must be given an opportunity to show they can foster a sustainable sage grouse population.

Since becoming a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, addressing the backlog of disability claims has remained one of my top priorities. The fact that Nevada's veterans continue to have one of the longest waiting times in the Nation at 257 days on average is unacceptable. That is why I invited VA Secretary Robert McDonald to come and see what is going on in the Silver State. It is also why I offered amendment No. 457. This amendment says we should prohibit bonuses for certain VA executives until the backlog of veterans' disability claims is eliminated. Our veterans have been waiting too long, and my amendment brings us one step closer to eradicating the backlog.

Furthermore, ensuring America's veterans receive timely and quality health care is also a promise our nation must keep. And as our military continues to have more women in uniform, VA facilities must adapt to the meet their specific health care requirements. That is why my amendment No. 456 is so important because it keeps this promise by ensuring VA medical facilities properly meet the needs of

women veterans. Safety, privacy, and dignity should be accounted for in every VA hospital and clinic. As I continue holding the VA accountable in my role on the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, quality health care and timely benefits will remain a priority of mine, and it is a priority now as we consider the budget resolution.

As an avid sportsman and gun-owner, I enjoy our way of life in Nevada, but I am concerned by actions from this administration that would directly infringe on the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens.

Recently, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, ATF, issued a proposal that would ban popular .223 caliber ammunitions, severely limiting access to one of the most widely used cartridges in America for sporting purposes. That is why I filed amendment No. 454 to protect law-abiding American citizens' Second Amendment rights and prohibit the ATF from reclassifying ammunition primarily intended for sporting purposes. This issue is important to Nevadans, and it is important to me. Amendment No. 454 makes sure that the constitutional rights of Nevadans are protected.

There are an estimated 400,000 untested rape kits sitting in law enforcement and crime lab storage facilities across the Nation. Each one of these untested rape kits represents a missed opportunity to help bring justice and healing to a survivor of sexual assault. That is why I filed amendment No. 455. This amendment prioritizes the elimination of the rape kit backlog to hold perpetrators accountable and help prevent these despicable crimes from happening in the first place.

Finally, I would like to discuss a sense of the Senate amendment I filed regarding the bipartisan principles of no budget, no pay legislation, Amendment No. 451. My sense of the Senate would endorse the solutions in No Budget, No Pay that would encourage Members of Congress to come to the table and work together to pass their own budget and appropriations bills on time in order to receive pay. It just makes sense—if Members of Congress do not do their jobs, they should not get paid. And by the way, we also say pay is not retroactive.

My amendments take the needs of Nevadans into consideration and make them a national priority.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in order to make them a reality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 343, 391, 392, 394, AND 802 EN BLOC

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up the following amendments en bloc: Nos. 343, 391, 392, 394, and 802.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 343

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to preserving mandatory appropriations for agricultural conservation programs)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESERVING MANDATORY APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the importance of preserving mandatory appropriations for agricultural conservation programs, which may include financial and technical assistance, conservation easements, and working land management assistance, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 391

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the expansion of access to the income tax credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANSION OF ACCESS TO THE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES OF SMALL EMPLOYERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expansion of access to the income tax credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 392

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to promoting the use of college savings accounts while students are in elementary school and secondary school)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE USE OF COLLEGE SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to promoting the use of college savings accounts while students are in elementary school and secondary school, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 394

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to special treatment of the income tax credit for research expenditures for startup companies)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SPECIAL TREATMENT OF THE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR RESEARCH EXPENDITURES FOR STARTUP COMPANIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to special treatment of the income tax credit for research expenditures for startup companies by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 802

(Purpose: To offset the costs of the war against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria)

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$8,800,000,000.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about our Nation's war against ISIS and why we must pay for it responsibly. As our Nation's Armed Forces continue their critical mission to degrade and destroy ISIS, which is already months underway, we need to consider another part of our strategy—paying for the war. This is not a new concept. Our Nation has a long history of paying for our military missions. In fact, every war since the Revolutionary War, to the first Gulf War, was paid for.

Through each of our Nation's armed conflicts, new revenue streams not only provided the resources our military needed, they reminded the American people that our country was at war and we all needed to contribute to the effort. But after 14 years and 2 wars that have cost our Nation trillions of dollars, I fear we have forgotten this important lesson from our history.

We cannot write another blank check for a war. Paying for a war against ISIS is the right thing to do. It is fiscally, morally, and militarily responsible. As we continue to debate this war authorization in Congress, we need to be honest with the American people and each other about what it will cost our Nation. That is why, as we debate the budget this week, I have offered an amendment that requires us to raise the revenue to pay for the fight against

ISIS. The American people deserve no less.

I urge my colleagues to join me on this amendment to pay for a critically important war against ISIS and ensure we fight this battle together as one country.

Thank you.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

## AMENDMENT NO. 432

(Purpose: To provide additional resources to create the opportunity for more Americans to obtain a higher education and advanced job skills by supporting two free years of community college paid for by raising revenue through requiring millionaires and billionaires to pay their fair share)

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 432, which is cosponsored by Senators SCHUMER, SANDERS, and STABENOW.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Ms. BALDWIN], for herself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SCHUMER, proposes an amendment numbered 432.

Ms. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Tuesday, March 24, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, my amendment would create a free community college program, making a bold investment in our Nation's students, its workforce, and the future of our economy. It pays for this investment in a balanced way, and my amendment would actually reduce the deficit by enacting the Buffett rule—asking millionaires and billionaires to pay their fair share of taxes while giving our students a fair shot at the opportunities a higher education brings. I believe every student in America deserves a fair shot and an affordable education, and I believe a college education should be a path to the middle class, not a path into debt.

Inspired by programs in Tennessee and Chicago, this spring President Obama proposed a program that would allow students to attend community college for 2 years at no cost. This will give students who are willing to work hard the opportunity to obtain a certificate, an industry-recognized credential, or associate's degree. That provides the skills they need to access in-demand jobs or earn credits they can transfer into a 4-year institution.

I would urge all my colleagues to support the Baldwin, Schumer, Sanders, Stabenow amendment in order to support higher education, to support

free community college, and invest in our students and our workforce.

## AMENDMENT NO. 436

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside in order to call up Baldwin amendment No. 436.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Ms. BALDWIN], for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE, propose an amendment numbered 436.

Ms. BALDWIN. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To preserve the point of order against reconciliation legislation that would increase the deficit or reduce a surplus)

Strike section 405.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, amendment No. 436 is also cosponsored by Senators WARNER, MCCASKILL, and WHITEHOUSE. This amendment is very simple. It would strike section 405 of the chairman's mark. Section 405 eliminated a point of order against reconciliation legislation which either increases the deficit or would reduce a surplus.

I see no good reason why we should be making it easier to increase the debt and deficit that the majority claims to care so much about. If their reconciliation legislation is so important, then they ought to pay for it. If this amendment fails to be adopted, we will find ourselves in the same situation we were in the early 2000s.

In 2001 and 2003, the then-Republican majority used reconciliation to pass a \$1.3 trillion tax cut in 2001 and then another \$350 billion tax cut in 2003. Both of these efforts were entirely unpaid for. Not a single dime was offset. So much for fiscal responsibility. It was not until 2007, when Chairman Conrad took control of the Senate Budget Committee, when a point of order was put into place to stop reconciliation from being used as a tool to add to the deficit. Let's not use the reconciliation process to add to our deficit.

I urge my colleagues to support my commonsense amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

## AMENDMENT NO. 694

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and call up amendment No. 694.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. MANCHIN] proposes an amendment numbered 694.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to investing in advanced fossil energy technology research and development)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN ADVANCED FOSSIL ENERGY TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to investing in advanced fossil energy technology research and development at the Department of Energy, to reduce the impacts of climate change while ensuring the reliability of the electric grid, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I agree with my friends that we cannot deny that climate change is real and that humans do contribute to it. However, we also cannot deny that we will continue to rely on fossil fuels for decades to come, including for the bulk of our electricity. Coal, specifically, is one of the only two baseload fuels we have that we are able to run 24/7, rain or shine.

With new regulations, we are facing more pressure on our baseload coal. Last winter during the polar vortex, the PGM system that provides electricity for West Virginia and the electricity we are using right now in DC will be running full capacity. We saw a record number of plant outages when they were most needed.

Further threats to our reliability could result in rolling blackouts, which puts the lives of the most vulnerable, the elderly, the sick, and the poor at risk. The Fossil Energy Research and Development Program at the Department of Energy supports a group of 1,000 projects, including \$7 billion of private sector investment, representing 55,000 jobs across the United States. Research supported in this program has led to cleaner burning plants over the past decade, and we have reduced pollutants and increased the efficiency of coal-fired powerplants.

Right now, DOE has \$8 billion of fossil energy loan guarantees that need to be utilized. The best way to reduce impacts of climate change while still ensuring a reliable electric grid is to in-

vest in the research and development of advanced fossil fuel technology. To combat climate change, I would ask for the support of this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 578

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and call up amendment No. 578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. MANCHIN] proposes an amendment numbered 578.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to addressing methamphetamine abuse in the United States)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING METHAMPHETAMINE ABUSE IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing methamphetamine abuse in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, this amendment would encourage our country to increase our investment in combatting methamphetamine use. Meth abuse has devastated communities across the country. Meth can cause violent behavior and psychosis. In the long run, it changes the way the brain works, causing long-term emotional and cognitive problems.

Domestic meth labs, fueled by demand from addicts, endanger communities and the environment. In 2013, in West Virginia, law enforcement officials seized 533 meth labs. That was an 86-percent increase over 2012. I have fought in my State to address meth abuse from every angle: reducing access to the products that are used to make meth, taking down meth labs, and improving treatment for addicts.

But this is a national problem, not just a West Virginia problem. It requires a national response. During committee markup I had a similar amendment to enhance investments in efforts to reduce prescription drug abuse and heroin abuse, which passed by voice vote.

This drug addiction is devastating families and communities all over

America. Too many young people have lost before their lives begin, and too many adults are being pulled away from productive lives. We must change. Congress must do more to combat meth abuse. That is why I urge the support of my amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 700, 867, AND 895 EN BLOC

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside; further, that three amendments be called up en bloc. They are amendments Nos. 700, 867, and 895.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 700

(Purpose: To ensure high-income earners pay a fair share in taxes and to use the revenue to invest in repairing our Nation's bridges, coastal infrastructure, and damage from wildfires)

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 11, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 20, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 867

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to making it more difficult for corporations and billionaires to secretly influence elections by making unlimited undisclosed campaign expenditures, and to prevent such entities from evading campaign finance law, including through making false statements to government agencies)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT FOR CORPORATIONS TO SECRETLY INFLUENCE ELECTIONS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to campaign finance reform, including disclosure of campaign spending and the prevention and enforcement of false statements to the Government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 895

(Purpose: To prohibit budget resolutions that support cutting over \$1,000,000,000,000 in spending without identifying specific programmatic effects)

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

#### SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST BUDGET RESOLUTIONS THAT SUPPORT CUTTING OVER \$1,000,000,000,000 IN SPENDING WITHOUT IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC PROGRAMMATIC EFFECTS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget that would reduce new budget authority or outlays during the fiscal years covered under the resolution by more than \$1,000,000,000,000 (as compared to the fiscal year before the budget year for the resolution) unless the committee print accompanying the resolution identifies the specific programmatic effects proposed to meet the recommended levels and amounts in the resolution.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### AMENDMENTS NOS. 632 AND 633 EN BLOC

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside so I can call up amendments Nos. 632 and 633 en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 632

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to providing reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PREGNANT WORKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to increase employment opportunities and prevent employment discrimination, which may include measures to prevent employment discrimination against pregnant workers, to provide pregnant workers with a right to workplace accommodations, and to ensure that employers comply with requirements regarding such workplace accommodations for pregnant workers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 633

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to enhancing the child and dependent care tax credit)

At the end of title III, add the following:

#### SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENHANCING THE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing the child and dependent care tax credit in order to offset the growing costs of child care, including by making the credit fully refundable, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, just a brief description of both. Both are deficit-neutral reserve funds. The first provides reasonable accommodations for pregnant workers. That is No. 632. We have had a standard in place for a quarter century pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act that individuals who have a disability in the workplace are given reasonable accommodations at the worksite.

We should have the same for pregnant workers. We have a case that was decided today by the Supreme Court, *Young v. UPS*. This was a mixed result, but I think Peggy Young, the plaintiff in that case, got a good result. But there is still not a clear standard which we could place in the law, just like we have in the context of an individual with a disability in the workforce. So we need a clear standard to increase employment opportunities and prevent



employment discrimination against pregnant workers.

Secondly, amendment No. 633 is a further development of existing policies as it relates to childcare. We have had in the Tax Code now for a long time a tax credit for families who are paying for the cost of childcare.

That tax provision is a way to provide tax relief to offset childcare expenses for families. The problem, though, is under current law—as it is currently structured—it doesn't provide the kind of relief it should. In fact, the way it is designed now, very few families are able to benefit from it. I want to make it—I think it should be refundable. That is the best way to provide a measure of relief that is not there now for families.

Childcare for some families—if it is not the most expensive part of their budget, it is often second or third—thousands of dollars. It has gone up across the country by some 70 percent in less than 30 years. We need to help families be able to pay for something as essential as childcare. That is what that amendment is about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 842, 843, 952, AND 953 EN BLOC

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment to call up en bloc amendments Nos. 842, 843, 952, and 953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 842

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to consumer financial protection)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to consumer financial protection, which may include measures ensuring that the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection has authority and autonomy to continue to protect consumers from predatory lending, misleading or abusive behavior in the financial marketplace, or other unscrupulous practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 843

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to restoring reductions in the Republican budget to the Stafford loan program that would mandate that students currently in college pay interest on their loans before they have received their education benefits, to make college more affordable, to reduce the debt burden of students, and to help graduates afford to pay back student loans)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING THE COST OF ATTENDANCE AT AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND ENSURING THAT STUDENTS CAN AFFORD TO PAY BACK STUDENT LOANS BY AVOIDING NEW MANDATES THAT STUDENTS PAY INTEREST.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the cost of attending an institution of higher education and ensuring that students who graduate can afford to pay back their student loans, which may include avoiding new mandates that students pay interest on Stafford loans while attending an institution of higher education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 952

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to establishing a more level playing field in trade agreements)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TRADE AGREEMENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to trade agreements, which may include measures ensuring that trade agreements put United States manufacturers on a level playing field with manufacturers in foreign countries with low environmental and wage standards, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 953

(Purpose: To save student financial aid and reduce the student loan debt levels in the Republican budget by 15 percent by eliminating new mandated interest charged while students are still in school)

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,031,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,776,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$4,147,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,479,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,785,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$5,404,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,735,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$6,075,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$6,387,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,876,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,577,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,899,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,195,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,490,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$4,784,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$5,420,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,712,000,000.

On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$2,876,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,577,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,899,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,195,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, increase the amount by \$4,490,000,000.

On page 7, line 13, increase the amount by \$4,784,000,000.

On page 7, line 14, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,420,000,000.

On page 7, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,712,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,142,000,000.

On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,719,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$11,618,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$15,813,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$20,303,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$25,087,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$30,182,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$35,602,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, increase the amount by \$41,314,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,142,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,719,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$11,618,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$15,813,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$20,303,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$25,087,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$30,182,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$35,602,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, increase the amount by \$41,314,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,015,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,700,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by \$2,800,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,945,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,375,000,000.

On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,125,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,545,000,000.

On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,270,000,000.

On page 29, line 12, increase the amount by \$3,680,000,000.

On page 29, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,405,000,000.

On page 29, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,800,000,000.

On page 29, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,530,000,000.

On page 29, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,910,000,000.

On page 29, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,665,000,000.

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,025,000,000.

On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,795,000,000.

On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,140,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,925,000,000.

On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,250,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$76,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$76,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$202,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$202,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$354,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$354,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$515,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$515,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$690,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$690,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$874,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$874,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,070,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,070,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,462,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,462,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 825

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and that I be permitted to call up amendment No. 825.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BLUMENTHAL] proposes an amendment numbered 825.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To expand the deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and servicemembers)

On page 54, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(6) vocational programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include legislation that improves vocational rehabilitation and counseling for veterans with service-connected disabilities and members of the Armed Forces with severe injuries or illness;

(7) improving research at the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include legislation that expands research on post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, or toxic exposures;

(8) improving the delivery of health care and benefits to veterans or members of the Armed Forces, which may include legislation that improves delivery of health care and benefits to victims of military sexual trauma;

(9) improving the delivery of care and benefits to veterans, which may include legislation that enhances oversight and investigations by the Department of Veterans Affairs Office of Inspector General;

(10) maintaining and enhancing access, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146);

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, this amendment builds on the reserve fund in section 307 to provide for better medical research into the issues affecting women in our military, most particularly women who become veterans, which is a neglected aspect of health care in our Veterans Affairs health care system.

It focuses on military sexual trauma, which is continuing to be a scourge in the military, and its effects. But it also deals more generally with the need for research into post-traumatic stress and traumatic brain injury, which is unfortunately lagging in our Veterans Affairs system, as determined as our VA is to do more of it.

It would also build on existing programs for job training and vocational

rehabilitation so our veterans entering the job market and seeking to become productive in well-paying jobs will be able to fulfill that ambition. It essentially fills in some of the gaps left by the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act which this body passed not long ago, to meet the emergency as well as the sustained needs of our veterans that are unfulfilled by our present VA.

It is our obligation to do better for our Nation's heroes, keep faith with them and leave no veteran behind when it comes to jobs and health care.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly about four of the amendments I have brought up this evening to provide some background and detail.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 391

First, I would like to speak about amendment No. 391, an amendment I have offered that would help small businesses to provide health insurance to their employees.

The Affordable Care Act made important strides toward making health care more affordable and accessible to millions of Americans. One of the ways the ACA was intended to expand coverage was through business tax credits, to help business owners who want to do right by their workers and provide health insurance. These tax credits were a good first step.

But over the past 2 years, it has become clear we need to do more, to expand and simplify them to help more small businesses. Although many people I speak with have benefitted greatly from the new coverage afforded by the ACA, I have also spoken to many small business owners in Delaware who have wanted to take advantage of the tax credit but could not because it was too complicated or they did not qualify.

We need to listen to these concerns and strengthen our health care system so it works for everyone. That is why I am offering my amendment to expand access to the ACA's small business tax credit, which is based on legislation I have introduced with eight of my colleagues. The small business owners I speak with who do not see their employees as labor costs or lines on a balance sheet, who see them as members of their family and a key part of their business and community, those small business owners want to do right by their workers and help ensure that their health care needs are covered.

We should do everything we can to help them meet those goals. So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to expand health care tax credits for small business owners.

If I might very briefly speak to the three remaining amendments I have made pending.

## AMENDMENT NO. 394

Amendment No. 394 is cosponsored by Republican Senator PAT ROBERTS of Kansas and is also cosponsored by Senator SCHUMER. It is the startup innovation credit. It makes the research and development tax credit accessible to early-stage and startup companies, an important way that we can take a long-established tax credit that is of real benefit to significant, profitable companies that invest heavily in R&D and make it accessible to those fast-growing, early-stage companies in our economy.

## AMENDMENT NO. 392

Second, I have the college savings bill. This is amendment No. 392 with Senator RUBIO of Florida. It is a deficit-neutral reserve fund that encourages the use of college savings accounts. Study after study has shown that if young children have even as little as \$500 in a savings account for college, they are three times more likely to enroll in college.

Access is also reliant on affordability. College savings accounts make college more affordable and thus more accessible, but it also lifts young people's sights and helps them focus on the importance of a college education.

## AMENDMENT NO. 343

The last amendment is No. 343, which provides for support for farm bill conservation programs, which have been cut over the last 5 years by \$2 billion.

It is important that we preserve the long bipartisan-supported conservation programs in our farm bill that make a huge difference for farms of all kinds across our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support each of my amendments I discussed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

## AMENDMENT NOS. 341, 539, AND 795 EN BLOC

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up my amendment Nos. 341, 539, and 795 en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

## AMENDMENT NO. 341

(Purpose: To establish a spending-neutral reserve fund relating to the promotion of United States offshore energy production)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROMOTION OF UNITED STATES OFFSHORE ENERGY PRODUCTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the expansion of United States

offshore energy production that would result in American job growth, lower energy prices, economic growth, and stronger national security by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 539

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to improving Medicaid based on successful and bipartisan State demonstration projects)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING MEDICAID BASED ON SUCCESSFUL AND BIPARTISAN STATE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to initiatives that would improve the Medicaid program and provide stable and predictable funding for long-term services and supports under the program, including initiatives that are based on successful and bipartisan State demonstration projects, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 795

(Purpose: To establish a spending-neutral reserve fund relating to authorizing Federal permitting for manufacturing and energy construction projects relating to national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for ozone lower than a certain existing standard)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING FEDERAL PERMITTING FOR MANUFACTURING AND ENERGY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS RELATING TO NATIONAL PRIMARY OR SECONDARY AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD FOR OZONE LOWER THAN A CERTAIN EXISTING STANDARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the regulation by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency of the national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for ozone, which may include a prohibition on withholding Federal permits for manufacturing and energy construction projects in States that are in nonattainment with the most recent effective ozone national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, speaking first to amendment No. 341, a principal challenge in our society today is how do we create better jobs with better benefits for working families.

There are some industries that clearly have done that. Those include the energy industry and, by extension, the low cost energy being produced domestically that in turn is creating new manufacturing jobs.

To further this process, I will first point out that over 85 percent of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf is closed off to energy exploration and production.

Opening the American OCS, as it is called, will provide hundreds of thousands of jobs and increase our national security by increasing our energy security.

My amendment encourages the security and these jobs by opening up America's Outer Continental Shelf to energy exploration and production.

Amendment No. 539. I am a doctor. I have been working in the public hospital system of Louisiana for the last 25 years caring for the uninsured. I am so aware of the importance of safety-net programs such as Medicaid. I point out, though, that Medicaid is a broken program—so broken that it is bankrupting State governments and contributing to our runaway national debt.

The question is how do we preserve this important program but, at the same time, also preserve the financial integrity of our State government, of our Federal Government, and, if you will, ultimately the pocketbook of the taxpayer.

This amendment would build upon proven models that will provide financial security for the patients who benefit from Medicaid as well as for the States that provide those benefits for those Medicaid patients.

This is an important beginning to reform Medicaid to preserve its benefits, but, again, to protect the American taxpayer.

Lastly, amendment No. 795. I return to what I said earlier. A chief challenge now is how do we create better jobs with better benefits for working families. Those jobs oftentimes are in construction, mining, and manufacturing.

The EPA is promulgating new regulations which they estimate for ambient air quality standards, which they estimate the cost of compliance will be \$3.9 billion in the year 2025.

This is estimated to decrease our gross domestic product by \$140 billion, a \$3.9 billion cost, leading to a \$140 billion decrease in our economy. Inevitably, there are lost jobs associated with it, working families that are less well off.

The EPA would prevent construction of manufacturing and energy-intensive enterprises.

My amendment ensures the American energy and manufacturing renaissance is not interrupted by EPA's costly regulation. It preserves those jobs for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 715

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and on behalf of Senator BENNET call up amendment No. 715.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. COONS], for Mr. BENNET, proposes an amendment numbered 715.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create clean energy jobs through predictable and fair incentives for renewable energy)

On page 55, beginning with line 24, strike through line 2 on page 56 and insert the following:

tax on medical device manufacturers;

(4) operations and administration of the Department of the Treasury; or

(5) creating clean energy jobs, including extending over a reasonable period of time, as a bridge to tax reform, expired and expiring tax credits for renewable energy production and investment,

Mr. COONS. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENTS NOS. 607 AND 743 EN BLOC

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up Senator THUNE's amendments Nos. 607 and 743 en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 607

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to allow for the permanent elimination of the Federal estate tax)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PERMANENTLY ELIMINATE THE FEDERAL ESTATE TAX.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in the Federal income tax laws, which may include eliminating the Federal estate tax, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 743

(Purpose: To reduce funding for the General Services Administration by \$1,000,000 until 50 percent of counties in nonattainment for the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone as of January 30, 2015, achieve the air quality standard set forth in the 1997 NAAQS, and direct those funds to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for the purpose of helping municipalities reach attainment with the 2008 NAAQS for ground-level ozone, acknowledging that (1) given limited State and Federal resources and the delay of the Administrator in issuing to States implementation guidance for the 2008 ground-level ozone NAAQS, priority should be given to achieving the 2008 standard, (2) the Administrator has not sufficiently implemented that standard, (3) focusing by the Administrator on the most polluted areas that are in nonattainment with that standard would benefit public health, and (4) promulgating a lower standard at this time would impose undue costs on the economy and workforce of the United States)

On page 20, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 20, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 20, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 43, line 19, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 43, line 23, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 2, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 3, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 7, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 10, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 11, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 14, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 15, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 19, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 22, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 23, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 45, line 2, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 45, line 3, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 45, line 6, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 45, line 7, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

#### AMENDMENTS NOS. 838 AND 770 EN BLOC

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up my amendments Nos. 838 and 770 en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

#### AMENDMENT NO. 838

(Purpose: To establish a spending-neutral reserve fund relating to the disposal of certain Federal land)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to initiatives to sell or transfer to, or exchange with, a State or local government any Federal land that is not within the boundaries of a National Park, National Preserve, or National Monument, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 770

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the construction of Arctic polar icebreakers)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF ARCTIC POLAR ICEBREAKERS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the construction of Arctic polar icebreakers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have two amendments that I want to speak to very briefly this evening that I hope we will have an opportunity to consider tomorrow when we move to a very accelerated process. One of them relates to lands and one relates to water—our oceans and how we move about on our oceans.

The first amendment I would like to speak to is an amendment that would establish a neutral reserve fund for land sales, transfers, and exchanges.

Before I get to describing that, I want to take just a couple of minutes and speak to the overall budget itself in comparison and contrast to that submitted by the President. The budget before us is a stark contrast to the President's request, which simply pretended that sequestration didn't exist, never came remotely close to balancing, and would have led to the return of trillion dollar deficits by 2025.

The Republican budget we have in front of us, as compared to the President's request, while far from perfect—believe me, far from perfect—does present a very significant choice between a direction on energy that takes us backwards and a proposal that we see laid out in this Republican budget that gives us a clear choice when it comes to the future of our energy and natural resources policy.

The President's budget featured tens of billions of dollars of tax hikes and fees for our Nation's oil, gas, and coal producers. It would have stripped away offshore revenue sharing, which is a matter of fairness and should be expanded to all coastal producing States.

I know that is an issue the Chair and I agree on.

The President's budget also ignored basic responsibilities such as cleaning up abandoned legacy wells that the Federal Government drilled. They drilled these years ago, decades ago, and while we have seen major spending increases at most agencies and departments, in the one area where they are obligated to do the cleanup, we are not seeing that addressed. The President's budget would have done nothing to promote resource development even in places where there is overwhelming public support for it, such as my State of Alaska, which has seen restriction after restriction placed upon it by this administration. I have had an opportunity to speak many times on this floor about that.

Instead, the President sought new programs to subsidize the high costs of his regulatory plans, and he has tried to find ways to avert the serious consequences, such as the weakening of

the reliability of our electric grid that will consequently fall on its weight.

Ultimately, the President's budget would have led to lower energy and mineral production in our country. It would have lowered energy and mineral security. It would have led to fewer jobs, lower revenues, higher prices, and higher dependence on others. It would have lavished subsidies as it deepens our debt. It takes us in exactly the wrong direction when we talk about our energy future, our energy security.

The President's budget would have done nothing to turn around the negative trends we are seeing in production on Federal lands either. His energy proposals are about as balanced as the budget that he offered.

As we have seen increased oil production around the country, we have seen the benefits that it has yielded in terms of lower prices, we have seen the jobs that it has created, and we have seen the opportunities for us. Yet this oil production is not happening on our Federal lands. It is going gangbusters on State and private lands. Natural gas production has outright declined for years on Federal lands, and the President's regulators are now hard at work to ensure that coal follows suit.

We talk a lot about the conventional fuels—fossil fuels—and it is important to recognize that we are seeing similar patterns on Federal lands when it comes to other energy sources. The President talks a lot about increasing generation from our renewables. I agree. It is something we need to move towards. We are seeing increased renewable production, but are we seeing it on our Federal land? It may come as a surprise to the Chair and to others in this body what we heard from representatives of the wind industry.

My staff asked what percentage of wind projects are actually on Federal land? And surely, given the commitment we have to renewable energy, one would expect that to be a high percentage. The answer back was hardly any. Some 98.6 percent of wind projects are apparently on State and private land—98.6 percent. Not even 2 percent are on Federal land.

That stat shows what we mean and why we are right when we say it is incredibly hard to develop any type of energy on Federal lands. Secretary Jewell said as much in front of our committee. She said: It is just hard to do so on Federal lands.

So I am glad to be here as the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to affirm that we have a better way forward.

The energy revolution—renewable and petroleum—in this country has been on State and private lands. That is a fact. So I have filed an amendment that would complement language that is already in the resolution by focusing on sales, transfers or exchanges of land with State or local governments.

The budget resolution already contains language for land acquisition and conservation efforts. So nothing in the language that we have included in this amendment actually sells, transfers or exchanges a specifically identified piece of property. Any legislation enabled by this spending-neutral reserve fund will have to go through the process and be voted either up or down in regular order.

The language does specify what cannot be considered, and that is any land that is located within a national park, within a national preserve or a national monument. Those would continue to be protected.

This language would provide balance by enabling the types of exchanges, sales or transfers with States or local governments that are often used to craft balanced, comprehensive land policies, such as we did in the lands package on NDAA that we passed last Congress.

When we have an opportunity to consider this amendment, a vote for it is really a vote in support of—as a priority of this Congress—comprehensive approaches to land policies to facilitate economic development, empower States, and improve our conservation systems.

I would encourage Members to take a look at what I have offered here this evening and what I hope we will be able to take up for a vote tomorrow.

The second matter, very briefly—and I know the Senator from Colorado is here as well, and others wish to speak tonight—is an amendment I have offered just now that I hope we will have a chance to vote on which focuses our priorities as a nation on what is happening in the north.

We are an arctic nation. Now we are by virtue of my home State. But it is not just Alaska. We are an arctic nation, and as such we have responsibilities, we have obligations. There is activity happening in the north country that is without question.

What is also without question is that as an arctic nation, we are woefully behind in certain infrastructure related to our Arctic. What do most people think of when they think of the Arctic? Ice. How do we move through the Arctic Ocean filled with ice? An ice breaker. And it is not just for commerce, it is from a national security perspective, it is from a research perspective. It is for all those things that, again, would allow us to be a leader as an arctic nation.

This is not easy for us, because ice breakers don't come cheap. But it should be a priority for us, as a national asset, for an arctic nation.

I won't go through the list of what other nations have in terms of their assets, but suffice it to say our neighbors to the east in Russia have over 30 ice breakers. The ice breaker capacity our Canadian friends have is six.

But it is not just arctic nations that have arctic capacity through their ice breakers. It is nations such as China. Think how far away China is from the Arctic. India is considering building an ice breaker. Think how far away they are. It begs the question: Why, as an arctic nation, are we not stepping up? So I am challenging my colleagues: Think broader.

I invited all Members of the Senate to join the Arctic Caucus and understand again what it means for you and your respective States, the benefits, but also the obligations.

I look forward to the discussion on the issue of how we build out our arctic capacity and our infrastructure, and I also look forward to further discussion on how we can do more to ensure the opportunities we have for our economic development and our energy security can continue on the lands we are blessed to have as a nation, and the opportunities that will be made further available if we are able to move forward with the ideas I have proposed this evening.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 485, 490, AND 852 EN BLOC

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside to call up the Ayotte amendments numbered 485, 490, and 852 en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up en bloc.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 485

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide equity in the tax treatment of public safety officer death benefits)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE EQUITY IN THE TAX TREATMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER DEATH BENEFITS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing tax equity for death benefits paid to the families of public safety officers who lose their lives in the line of duty, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal

years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 490

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to address the disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE DISPROPORTIONATE REGULATORY BURDENS ON COMMUNITY BANKS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating disproportionate regulatory burdens on community banks, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 852

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to providing small business regulatory relief and preventing duplicative regulations for investment advisors)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY RELIEF AND PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE REGULATIONS FOR INVESTMENT ADVISORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating regulatory burdens on small businesses, fostering small business export growth, and preventing duplicative regulations for investment advisors by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, earlier today I came to the floor to talk about the danger this Republican budget poses to our economic and national security. I would like to expand on why this budget is out of balance and to further highlight the risks of using OCO, as some of my colleagues on the other side have proposed, instead of eliminating the sequester.

This budget, instead of taking a balanced approach to growing our economy and fiscal responsibility, like raising revenue by closing egregious tax loopholes and investing that revenue in job creation measures, doubles down on unrealistic and unfair cuts to programs that help grow and strengthen America's middle class. This perverse standard is evident across this budget and it reinforces a disturbing trend by my colleagues on the other side—if it is a broad-based investment in our econ-

omy, like investing in infrastructure or providing aid to jobseekers, then it must be paid for by cuts on the backs of middle-class Americans; but, if it is for a set of powerful special interests like the extension of tax expenditures then the deficit doesn't matter to many of my colleagues on the other side. This sort of double standard is what causes the American people to feel that Congress is out of touch.

Most alarmingly, this budget does not eliminate the automatic spending reductions, known as the sequester, contained in the Budget Control Act. The Senate Republican budget leaves hundreds of billions of dollars in devastating automatic cuts to discretionary spending in place and then makes an additional \$236 billion in cuts over 10 years to investments for middle-class families. These cuts to our non-defense and defense budgets will cause substantial harm to our economic and national security. That is why we have to eliminate the sequester—and why there must be balance in relief for non-defense and defense sides of the ledger.

Every senior civilian and military leader in the Department of Defense who has come before the Armed Services Committee has warned that if defense budgets are subject to sequestration, we will likely not be able to meet the national defense strategy without an unacceptable level of risk. It will have a damaging impact on our military readiness, modernization, and the welfare of our service members and their families.

Earlier today I mentioned the testimony of Admiral Gortney and General Kelly and how the non-defense and defense sides of the budget work together to protect our homeland. Indeed, helicopters and cutters from the Coast Guard, which falls on the non-defense side of the ledger, are critical to stopping drug smuggling and human trafficking into the homeland. And General Kelly made clear that, because of the limited number of Coast Guard cutters available, they are only stopping about 20 percent of the traffic—and there is a direct correlation: the more cutters they have, the more trafficking they can stop.

Senator MCCAIN and Senator GRAHAM have been trying repeatedly to increase spending for defense accounts. Their absolute commitment to the men and women of the armed services is without question. However, they have been compelled, by those opposed to an increase of the base budgets of the Armed Forces and who favor the continuation of sequestration, to resort to a budgetary gimmick.

They would use the Overseas Contingency Operation account to try and increase defense spending to the President's base level of \$561 billion.

First, I believe we should just eliminate the sequester all together, and



that means going to the Budget Control Act cap of \$577 billion for defense in FY16. Second, using OCO as an escape valve as my Republican colleagues have suggested isn't sustainable. It is a gimmick and as we have heard in testimony, OCO funding isn't flexible as discretionary spending and could damage our long-term readiness.

General Odierno, Chief of Staff of the Army, made this point:

So first, I would just say there's a risk to not funding the base, in putting it in OCO, because with that has to come flexibility within OCO for us to spend it on the things that are necessary. So . . . because OCO has limits and it has restrictions, and it has very strict rules that have to be followed. And so if we're inhibited by that, it might not help us. What might happen at the end of the year, we have a bunch of money we hand back because we're not able to spend it.

General Welsh, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, made a similar point in describing the Air Force's need for modernization and how one-off funding through OCO particularly constrains its platform-based force.

That is not how we should support the greatest fighting force in history. This may seem to be a clever way to bypass the Budget Control Act, but it has real ramifications for our men and women in uniform.

Indeed, the problem with these approaches is that they don't work. And, it seems even Senator GRAHAM's amendment to boost OCO funding in the budget runs into technical difficulties. Indeed, it does not appear to do what it purports to do—to boost defense spending—because it fails to lift the actual OCO cap. Now, it is true that a budget resolution isn't law, but plays an important role in the process of governing and setting the rules for our appropriations process.

Now, I expect there will be an attempt to correct that on the floor, but we shouldn't be engaging in these diversions to begin with. We should be crafting a budget that is serious and acknowledges our economic and security needs.

So my colleagues and I are offering several amendments in order to demonstrate there is a better path and to address some of the glaring problems with this budget. However, as we have seen with Senator SANDER's reasonable attempt to provide \$478 billion in transportation funding, paid-for by closing egregious offshore tax loopholes, my colleagues refuse to agree to the kind of commonsense proposals that I believe a vast majority of Americans would support.

But I hope my colleagues can join with me on some of these types of measures like ones to establish a budget point of order that will keep borrowing costs down for students; closing egregious offshore tax loopholes—which during our last budget debate was a bipartisan amendment adopted by voice vote; or lowering drug prices

for seniors by letting the Secretary of HHS negotiate drug prices—indeed, it is particularly troubling that many pharmaceutical companies dodge taxes through offshore tax loopholes, but profit off of Medicare, and are legally protected from having to negotiate drug prices with the government.

We have a blueprint for responsibly managing the budget and meeting the needs of a great and growing nation. It requires a balance of cuts, which we have done already, and new revenue. And as we see demonstrated by the Republican budget, we cannot cut our way to prosperity—much less cut our way towards a balanced budget. And we all know that the best way forward is to promote broad-based economic growth so that millions of hardworking Americans and their families can have a brighter and stable economic future.

So I hope my colleagues on the other side will join with us in supporting amendments that put middle-class families and broad-based economic growth first.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TAX EXPENDITURES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to correct the record on the matter of tax expenditures. Many myths have been created and reinforced by my friends on the other side of the aisle on the subject of tax expenditures. In my 4 years as ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee, I came to the floor several times to set the record straight. I am afraid I need to do it again today, this time as chairman. Today I will focus on the tax expenditures in the individual income tax. According to 2014 Congressional Budget Office data, the individual income tax accounts for 47.1 percent of Federal revenue. By contrast, the corporate income tax accounts for 11.9 percent of Federal revenue.

It boils down to three basic points. All points that can be derived from an objective, nonpartisan review of the data from Congress's nonpartisan official tax scorekeeper. I am referring to the Joint Committee on Taxation, of which I am the vicechair.

First point: Tax expenditures are not spending, with one exception. That exception is for refundable tax credits. They count as outlays under the Congressional Budget Act. Ironically, refundable tax credits are the policies my friends on the other side are most in favor of expanding. Just look at the slew of Democratic amendments filed

to that effect. My Democratic friends erroneously describe most tax expenditures as spending. Yet they seek to expand the minority of tax expenditures which score as spending. Go figure.

Second point: The vast bulk of tax expenditures tend to distribute disproportionately to middle and lower income taxpayers. A cursory examination of the Joint Committee on Taxation's annual tax expenditure pamphlet will lead an unbiased reader inevitably to that conclusion.

Third point: The vast bulk of tax expenditures are attributable to widely applicable tax benefits, like the charitable contribution deduction, mortgage interest deduction, and State and local tax deduction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis of Joint Committee on Taxation data, performed by the Finance Committee staff.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[March 25, 2015]

Fact Sheet: Who Benefits From Tax Expenditures?

Tax expenditures are often portrayed as "loopholes" that disproportionately benefit the wealthy. However, examination of the facts reveals that many of the largest tax expenditures disproportionately benefit middle class Americans or those with income below \$200,000.

According to recent (Feb. 2013) Joint Committee on Taxation estimates, those taxpayers with adjusted gross income exceeding \$200,000 collectively pay 57% of the individual income tax burden. The remaining 43% of the individual income tax burden is paid by those taxpayers with less than \$200,000 of adjusted gross income. The following summarizes how the benefit of various tax expenditure items is split between "high income" taxpayers with adjusted gross income exceeding \$200,000 and the remaining taxpayers with less than \$200,000 of adjusted gross income:

Mortgage Interest Itemized Deduction: 35% of the benefit of the mortgage interest tax expenditure goes to taxpayers with income exceeding \$200,000. Taxpayers with income below \$200,000 receive 65% of the benefit. By a ratio of almost 2 to 1, taxpayers under \$200,000 benefit from it.

Earned Income Credit: The earned income credit is fully refundable. This means that taxpayers receive it in full whether they pay income tax or not. The earned income credit is phased out as earned income rises. High income taxpayers are not eligible to receive any benefit from the earned income credit.

Child tax Credit: This credit is also limited to lower and middle income taxpayers. Again, none of it goes to higher income taxpayers.

Charitable Contribution Deduction: Of all of the tax expenditures listed, at 57% this one distributes in the highest proportion to taxpayers above \$200,000 in income. The tax savings benefit of the charitable contribution deduction is distributed to wealthy taxpayers in the exact same proportion as the share of total income taxes they pay. This result hardly seems unfair.

State and Local Income and Sales Tax Deduction: 55% of this broad-based deduction goes to high income families leaving the remaining 45% to middle class earners. High



income taxpayers receive most of the benefit from this tax expenditure because they also pay most of the state and local income and sales taxes.

**Tax-Free Portion of Social Security Benefits:** Just 2% of the tax benefit from favorable tax treatment of Social Security goes to recipients with income exceeding \$200,000.

**Real Property Taxes:** While some may say that only those with villas are taking the property tax deduction, 75% of the real property tax benefit goes to taxpayers with less than \$200,000 of income.

**Education Credits:** Once again, 100% of the benefit goes to taxpayers with income under \$200,000.

**Medical Expense Deduction:** 88% of this tax benefit goes to taxpayers with income under \$200,000.

**Child Care Credit:** This is a modest tax credit targeted for taxpayers that incur child care costs in order to work. Like the child tax credit, it mainly benefits low and middle income families. 95% of the benefit goes to taxpayers with income under \$200,000.

**Student Loan Interest Deduction:** This tax benefit is phased out as a taxpayer's income rises. All of the benefit goes to taxpayers earning less than \$200,000.

#### 10 LARGEST TAX EXPENDITURE ITEMS

JCT ESTIMATED 5 YEAR (2012–2016) AMOUNTS

1) \$707 Billion—Exclusion of Employer Provided Health Insurance and Health Care Benefits

Employer paid premiums for health insurance and other health benefits are generally not included in the employee recipient's taxable income and are also not subject to employment taxes. In addition, employees can usually pay for their share of employer provided health insurance and other health benefits with pretax earnings.

2) \$649 Billion—Tax Deferred Retirement Savings Plans

Both employer and employee contributions to pension plans are generally excluded from taxable employee compensation. Earnings on pension plan assets are also tax exempt. Employees are taxed upon receipt of pension plan distributions. Taxpayers accumulate savings for retirement more rapidly with this benefit of tax deferral.

3) \$596 Billion—Reduced Tax Rates on Long-term Capital Gains & Dividends

Recently enacted legislation has dramatically increased the taxation of both long-term capital gain and qualified dividend income for high income individuals. The tax rate for these high income individuals has increased from 15% to 20% beginning in 2013. This increased rate is lower than the maximum rate applied to ordinary income which is now 39.6%.

4) \$402 Billion—Deduction of Nonbusiness State & Local, Income, Sales, Personal Property and Real Property Taxes

Individual taxpayers can deduct amounts paid for non-business state and local income, sales, real estate and personal property taxes as an itemized deduction.

5) \$364 Billion—Deduction for Mortgage Interest on Owner Occupied Residences

Interest on home mortgage loans may be deducted. There is a \$1,000,000 limit on the maximum qualifying loan amount and it can be used to carry up to two taxpayer residences. Interest on additional indebtedness of up to \$100,000 is also deductible when such indebtedness is secured by the taxpayer's primary residence.

6) \$320 Billion—Earned Income Credit

The earned income tax credit is designed to subsidize the wages of low and moderate

income taxpayers. The credit is greatly enhanced when the taxpayer is also supporting children. This credit is fully refundable in the case of taxpayers that have no income tax liability because of other provisions in the tax system such as the standard deduction and personal and dependency exemptions.

7) \$289 Billion—Child Tax Credit

Under current law taxpayers are entitled to a partially refundable tax credit in the amount of \$1,000 for each qualifying child under the age of 17. The credit is phased out for high income taxpayers.

8) \$240 Billion—Exclusion of Cafeteria Plan & Other Employee Fringe Benefits

Under current law an employer's qualified cafeteria plan allows employee participants to voluntarily reduce their otherwise taxable compensation so that the reduction can be used to purchase certain benefits such as health insurance and dependent care with before-tax earnings. Repeal of this provision would cause employees to purchase these benefits with after-tax earnings.

9) \$236 Billion—Exclusion of Capital Gains at Death

Under current law the tax basis of property included in a decedent's estate is adjusted to fair market value on the date of death. Accordingly, the gain element in a decedent's appreciated property escapes income tax.

10) \$225 Billion—Deduction for Charitable Contributions

Individual taxpayers can deduct gifts to qualified charitable organizations as an itemized deduction. When a taxpayer makes a gift of long-term capital gain property (i.e., appreciated stock) the amount of deduction is equal to the value of the gift. Accordingly, the capital gain in the gifted property is not taxed.

[March 25, 2015]

#### DEBUNKING THE MYTHS OF SO-CALLED TAX EXPENDITURES

Some in Washington have claimed that eliminating tax expenditures is the same as getting rid of wasteful spending or closing unwanted loopholes. The reality is somewhat different. Middle-class families would hardly agree that incentives to save for college and retirement or to buy a home are loopholes. Here's a closer look at the myths of tax expenditures:

**Myth: Tax Expenditures Are Spending.**

Fact: The federal government cannot spend money that it never touched and never possessed. Tax expenditures let taxpayers keep more of their own money. And only by the public consent is the government permitted to take some of it in taxation to pay for certain public goods. When tax hike proponents say we are giving businesses and individuals all this money in tax expenditures, they are incorrectly assuming that the government has that money to give in the first place, when in fact it does not. To the contrary, the government never touches the money that a taxpayer keeps due to benefitting from a tax expenditure, whereas with spending, the government actually collects money from taxpayers and then spends it.

Another difference between tax expenditures and spending is that reducing or eliminating a tax expenditure without an offsetting tax cut to reach a revenue neutral level will cause the size of the federal government to grow, while reducing or eliminating spending causes the size of the federal government to shrink.

**Myth: Tax Expenditures are Loopholes.**

Fact: This is deliberately inaccurate. A loophole is something that Congress did not intend and would generally shut down, at least going forward, once it learned of the loophole. Tax expenditures, by contrast, were generally placed by Congress into the tax code deliberately. For example, the largest tax expenditure is the exclusion for employer-provided health insurance and benefits. The second-largest: the home mortgage interest deduction.

Whether you agree with a particular tax expenditure or not, an honest debate requires recognition that tax expenditures were designed by Congress with economic or social goals in mind and are not inadvertent loopholes.

#### TRIBUTE TO RICHARD F. CHOVANEC

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a dedicated public servant for his exemplary service on the Senate Finance Committee. Richard Chovanec will return to U.S. Customs and Border Protection after 3 years of service as a detailee on my staff.

During his tenure, Mr. Chovanec was instrumental in crafting the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Reauthorization Act of 2013 that I introduced with former Senator Max Baucus during the 113th Congress. This legislation would codify the important work that U.S. Customs and Border Protection does to facilitate trade, protect intellectual property, and enhance our economic security. I hope Mr. Chovanec's contributions will ultimately lead to successful reauthorization of the agency as we continue to work on this legislation.

Mr. Chovanec earned a bachelor's degree from Virginia Tech and a law degree from the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, VA. He later joined U.S. Customs and Border Protection as an attorney-advisor in the Office of International Trade. He concurrently serves as an adjunct professor of law at Georgetown University in Washington, DC.

I would like to wish Mr. Chovanec the very best and to thank him for his exemplary service.

#### TRIBUTE TO MARILYN CORMIER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, tucked away in the mountains, hills, and valleys of Vermont is a widely recognized, vibrant college campus that also happens to be my alma mater—Saint Michael's College. To students, faculty, staff, and alumni alike, the Saint Michael's community is almost like a family: once you become a part of it, it becomes part of your life. Later this year, one of our campus's family members—Marilyn Cormier—will leave the grounds of Saint Michael's, retiring after nearly 33 years of dedicated service to the college. Marilyn is known to many, and all who have worked with her have admired her tenacity, her love

for Saint Michael's, and her commitment to the institution she has called home for over three decades. I will miss her.

In 1982, Marilyn traveled halfway around the world from her home in Sri Lanka and landed at Saint Michael's. She started working in the Office of Academic Affairs, ultimately becoming the director of government and community relations and the secretary of the board of trustees, the position from which she will retire. Marilyn's passion for connecting the academic community of Saint Michael's with surrounding Vermont communities and communities across the country and abroad has made her a valued mentor to students and faculty alike. St. Mike's could not have had a more effective ambassador, champion, and problem-solver than Marilyn has been in this crucial role. Her energy is only matched by her creativity and her clear, sharp focus on what matters.

Marilyn's considerable talents also benefited the Vermont Council on World Affairs, an organization headquartered at Saint Michael's College. As a member of the board of directors, Marilyn has connected students with cross-cultural opportunities throughout Vermont and across the globe. In 2012, Marilyn helped to organize a delegation of representatives visiting the French city of Honfleur. It was a treat for both Marcelle and me to be a part of that special visit.

Over the years, I have crossed paths with many people connected to Saint Michael's, from public figures in the Nation's Capital, Vermont and across the country, to visitors in my office, to members of my own staff. One constant in each of these encounters is the praise they have for Marilyn for her work in helping so many students achieve their goals. She has empowered students to become leaders in their communities. I know these are commitments that will continue, even as Marilyn prepares for this exciting next chapter in her life.

Saint Michael's is a special place that many visit and come to call home. So it has been for Marilyn Cormier. Marcelle and I wish our dear friend all the very best.

#### NAACP LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATIONAL FUND, INC., 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this year marks the 75th anniversary of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., one of the great civil rights organizations in the Nation's history. Seventy-five years ago, Thurgood Marshall established LDF or the "Inc. Fund"—as it was commonly known then—as a separate legal entity. The efforts of the men and women of this organization throughout the years have transformed our Nation for the

better. I am grateful for the leaders who have dedicated their lives to the perennial effort to move this country toward a more perfect union. I would extend a special thanks to Sherrilyn Ifill, the current president and director-counsel of LDF; Leslie Proll, the director of the Washington, DC, office; and Debo Adegbile, the former acting director-counsel of LDF. Their dedication is emblematic of the hard-working staff of the Legal Defense Fund.

Most of us know about LDF's work to dismantle segregation in the historic *Brown v. Board of Education* case, but the organization's advocacy for civil rights extends far beyond litigating groundbreaking cases. The grass roots leaders of LDF have also helped achieve greater racial justice through its legislative efforts, including working with members from both sides of the aisle in Congress. The Legal Defense Fund has contributed its knowledge and expertise on issues such as voting rights, equal employment access, fair housing, education and criminal justice, and their efforts have resulted in legislation and policies that have improved the lives of millions of Americans.

This year, as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the march from Selma as well as the 75th anniversary of LDF, I once again urge my fellow Senators to join our effort to restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act that were gutted by the Supreme Court's narrow majority in *Shelby County v. Holder*. The best way to honor civil rights heroes such as Thurgood Marshall, and all the men and women of LDF, is to enact real and meaningful legislative reforms that advance the principles of equality for which those individuals dedicated their lives.

#### RECOGNIZING MOUNT SNOW'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to point out that we are completing another brisk ski season at one of Vermont's fabled slopes, Mount Snow. This year marks the 60th anniversary of winter sports at Mount Snow, and while the temperatures dropped well below zero for many weeks, outdoor enthusiasts of Vermont and from far beyond have descended on Dover, VT, to embrace Mother Nature's challenge, and they have enthusiastically embraced the joys and challenges of our gorgeous mountainous terrain.

Mount Snow was born in the 1950s as Alpine skiing solidified itself as a popular American sport. It has been a vital contributor to the economies of Vermont and New England ever since. Since its birth as one of Vermont's go-to ski slopes, Mount Snow has been an innovator and a pioneer, staying ahead of the industry and adding features to the resort that are now commonplace at ski areas throughout our country and the world.

As Mount Snow enters a new phase in its development, its future will include state-of-the-art advancements with a new ski lodge to meet skier needs and an expanded snowmaking infrastructure to ensure snowmaking is available across the mountain. As the closest mountain to Boston and New York City, these improvements will only encourage more people to choose Vermont as their primary destination for skiing and riding.

I want to congratulate the entire team at Mount Snow for 60 years of great and vibrant winter activity, and I look forward to all they have planned for the future. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the *Manchester Journal* sketching Mount Snow's history and planned growth be printed in the RECORD. •

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Manchester Journal*, Nov. 22, 2014]

#### MOUNT SNOW TO MAKE MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS

(By Brandon Canevari)

DOVER.—Mount Snow—which is celebrating its 60th anniversary this year—is about to undergo some significant changes.

The resort has had a master plan in place for a while now, which is now in motion.

"We're seeking financing for a couple of major capital projects," said Mount Snow Communications Director Dave Meeker. "Thus far it's been very successful and we're well on our way to reaching our goal. It's a total investment of about \$52 million dollars."

One of the two major projects that resort is looking to begin is the construction of a 20 million gallon snowmaking water reservoir called West Lake.

"That is really going to be the biggest step towards our goal of having 100 percent snowmaking coverage on the mountain," said Meeker.

Once they begin the project, Meeker said that it will probably take about two years to complete.

"It will take a couple years to get it completed because it's not just excavating the pond. It's installing the new pipes, installing the new facilities to push the water to the mountain," said Meeker. "There are just a lot of other components that go along with constructing a reservoir that size and with all the machinery and stuff that goes along with it."

The other components to the project are installing snowmaking pipes, pump houses, booster houses and the other components that are needed for snowmaking.

The other major component to the first phase of the plan is the construction of a 36,000 square foot base lodge at Carinthia Parks at Mount Snow.

"It'll have skier services, food and beverage, retail, all sorts of stuff. So, it will be a great improvement over to the base area at Carinthia," said Meeker.

Depending on how financing goes, Meeker said that the resort could break ground on West Lake as early as next summer. When they will be able to build the base lodge and make some of the other improvements that they are planning though is still uncertain.

"The timeline really depends on financing," said Meeker. "Our planning director, they've been globe-trotting basically, going

out and seeking investors and we've been very successful so far. So . . . if we had all of the investors today we'd be making plans to break ground as soon as possible. So, it really hinges upon when we are able to get enough investors to secure the financing to begin these projects."

The mountain installed 645 new low-energy snowmaking guns this year as part of their master plan as well.

"That would have been a big component to the improvements that we would be making in future after building West Lake, but we had the opportunity to take advantage of a program that was offered by Efficiency Vermont this year to upgrade our snowmaking system to all low-energy guns," said Meeker. "A lot of other resorts took advantage of it, but we took full advantage of it. It was the largest single snowgun update of any resort in Vermont's history and that was a big step in the right direction for our snowmaking system to run as efficiently as possible and also make the best product possible."

#### ANNIVERSARY

Mount Snow's 60th Anniversary is right around the corner and Meeker said that a weekend of festivities have been planned in celebration.

The celebration is going to be on Friday, Dec. 12, which is known as "Founder's Day." The date is the first day Mount Snow opened back in 1954, Meeker said.

"Since it's on a Friday and it is our 60th we're going to celebrate all weekend long. So, we're going to have stuff going on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Saturday we're going to have a party at the Snow Barn with Orange Crush, which is an 80s band, so we're going to have a throwback party. We're already encouraging people to wear retro gear all weekend long; whatever time period in which they have some clothes from the past."

Part of what the resort will be doing to celebrate is offering \$12 lift tickets when the tickets are purchased in advance online. The resort is also going to have a big historical display of Mount Snow memorabilia.

There are also going to be parties at Cousins and the Main Base Lodge.

On Sunday of that weekend, Meeker said they are also probably going to have an "old school" bamboo gate series.

"Back in the day when people would run gates they would be made of bamboo and so we're going to set some of those up. We're going to have a straight ski category," said Meeker. "It's just going to be a real focusing on our history."

While the Dec. 12 weekend is going to be the big celebration of the resort's 60th Anniversary, Meeker said that they will be celebrating throughout the winter with some other events as well.

"We love to celebrate things here at Mount Snow," said Meeker. "It's one of the things that we do so hopefully folks will come out and help us celebrate because it's not just about our history this season, it's about our future and we have a lot of great stuff to talk about with that."

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

##### LOUISIANA CASUALTIES

Mr. VITTER. I come to the floor today with a heavy heart to remember and commemorate the 11 soldiers, including 4 members of the Louisiana National Guard, who we lost this month

as a result of a helicopter training accident on the Santa Rosa Sound. These were brave men, having regularly risked their own lives while flying in combat and in responding to the numerous hurricanes Louisiana has been devastated by during the many years of service they gave. I agree with Major General Curtis, the Adjutant General of the Louisiana National Guard, in describing them as the best of us. They were selfless men willing to sacrifice their own safety and lives if it meant ensuring our security or saving the life of another. Nothing can ever fill the void left by their absence, an absence that makes it our duty to keep their memories alive, so that others may know of their bravery and sacrifice. Recognizing the valor that each of these men served with, today I submit for the record specifics regarding Louisiana's soldiers.

Chief Warrant Officer George Griffin joined the Louisiana National Guard in 1994 before deploying to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2004 and again in 2008. He is remembered as one of the most talented and respected warrant officers in the Louisiana National Guard, who routinely sought to teach his fellow aviators to be the best they could be. He also served during State deployments in response to Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Isaac; in support of Operation River Guardian in 2011, which sought to extend the levee protecting Klotz Springs; and in the response to the Deepwater Horizon spill. He is survived by his wife Becky, his four children, Marianne, Cody, Dylan, and Logan, and his father George.

Chief Warrant Officer George Strother joined the Louisiana National Guard in 1988, serving until 2007 before rejoining the Guard in 2009. In addition to his service in response to Hurricanes Katrina, Rita and Isaac, he deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2004, to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in 2011, and Kosovo in 2014 as a member of the NATO peacekeeping force. He was a devoted husband, father, and servicemember. An experienced combat aviator and instructor, he is remembered as a caring man with an outsized personality that touched the lives of everyone he met. He is survived by his wife Melissa; his children Chelsie and George II, and his mother Sara.

Staff Sergeant Lance Bergeron enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps in 1994, serving on Active Duty until 1998 and as a reservist until 2001, when he joined the Louisiana National Guard. He was a seasoned combat veteran, having deployed to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2004 and again in 2008. He also deployed in response to Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Isaac, and as a part of Operation River Guardian in 2011. He is remembered as an experienced crew chief that the members of his unit looked up to and aspired to be.

According to men in his unit, he served with an unparalleled excitement and dedication to his duty as a National Guard member, husband, and father. He is survived by his wife Monique, his two children Callie and Landon, and his parents Mark and Stella.

Staff Sergeant Thomas Florich enlisted in the Louisiana National Guard in 2007, and served as a Black Hawk repairman. He served in numerous State deployments, including Operation Deepwater Horizon and in response to Hurricane Isaac. He is remembered as a cheerful man dedicated to the National Guard and always willing to step up if it meant the unit would be able to better complete its mission. Staff Sergeant Florich is not only survived by his parents Stephen and Kimberley, but also his wife Meghan, who is pregnant with their first child.

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. MARVIN HOGAN

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend Dr. Marvin Hogan for his remarkable involvement with early childhood education, job training and workforce development in the State of Mississippi for more than 40 years.

Currently, Dr. Hogan serves as executive director of Friends of Children of Mississippi, based in Jackson. Friends of Children of Mississippi operates Head Start and Early Head Start Programs in Humphreys, Sharkey, Issaquena, Madison, Leake, Rankin, Copiah, Kemper, Newton, Clarke, Jasper, Smith, Jones, Wayne, and Green Counties.

Friends of Children of Mississippi has a notable record of providing quality early childhood development and educational services to low-income children in our State. In the organization's 48-year history, it has transitioned nearly 140,000 children into the public schools of Mississippi.

Friends of Children of Mississippi was recognized recently by the National Head Start Association for its accomplishments. Its two-generation model, which engages parents of Head Start and Early Head Start children to break the cycle of poverty and put families on the path to self-sufficiency, was featured in a National Association report as a case study for exceptionally effective two-generation programs. Since the Friends of Children of Mississippi two-generation program began in 2003, almost 97 percent of enrolled parents have successfully completed their GED or gone to college and transitioned to employment. This well-deserved honor is a credit to Dr. Hogan and his colleagues in the 15 counties they serve across Mississippi.

A native of Waynesboro, MS, Dr. Hogan has been recognized nationally for his work to break intergenerational cycles of poverty and to expand educational opportunities for African Americans in our State. I am pleased

to commend Dr. Hogan for his service and to wish him and his colleagues continued success in their work to provide a solid educational foundation for Mississippi's children.

#### RAIL SAFETY AND POSITIVE TRAIN CONTROL

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I voice my concerns on an important rail safety issue that we have been working on in the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. While railroads and commuter rails may face the immense challenge of implementing appropriate PTC precautions, now and always we must place the safety of our citizens above the fear of difficulties incurred by necessary technological change. We must face these difficulties head-on in order that our citizens' lives be ensured safety in public transportation.

New Jersey runs on rail. Our economy simply could not sustain itself without it. Our Northeast corridor alone moves more than 700,000 people a day. Without the necessary PTC safeguards, these people will face the threat of a devastating crash more so every day. The sheer volume of commuters itself presents momentous concern for the State to be able to successfully guarantee the well-being of its rail lines. Knowing now that crashes like the Metro-North accident could have been prevented by PTC protections, I can say with bursting resolve that it is time for us to do better. The application of PTC directly translates into lives saved. To me and for many, that is an easy trade—as easy as it ever gets.

But it is rarely ever that simple. I recognize that for many in the rail industry, who share my commitment to improving safety, the reality is that difficult investment decisions need to be made and the current timeline is not achievable, even for those with the best of intentions. Implementation will take time. We cannot expect these complex technological improvements to come overnight. In spite of this, we can still hold these improvements to a reasonably tight schedule, one that is attainable.

I am hopeful that in the time between today's committee vote and before the final passage of PTC legislation, we can work to shorten the extension and find a better balance. I look forward to working with the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee chairman, ranking member, and the rest of my colleagues to improve this initiative.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO EDWARD WILLIAMS

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Edward C. Williams,

Jr. Ed honorably served the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for more than 15 years, most recently as State director for my Senate office. Ed has been a trusted advisor and friend over the 8 years we worked together.

A native of Wilkes-Barre, an alumnus of the Head Start program in Luzerne County, and a graduate of Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Ed has deep roots in Pennsylvania. Prior to joining my staff, he served in the House of Representatives for Congressman Paul Kanjorski as a staff assistant, later earning a leading advisory role on House budgetary proceedings. When he was recommended to my staff following my election to the Senate in 2006, we knew right away that we wanted Ed on our team. He was the first legislative staffer hired for my Washington, DC office, serving as our projects and appropriations director.

Ed immediately became one of my most valued and effective legislative aides. To further his education he attended law school at night while working full-time in Washington, DC and passed the bar. He was promoted to senior counsel in my office shortly thereafter. In 2010, Ed accepted the position of State director for my Senate office. Overseeing seven district offices and serving as my primary liaison to many of the State's most prominent leaders, Ed has never failed to exceed expectations. Were it not for Ed, many of our most ambitious projects could never have been realized.

In my years of public service, I have had the privilege of working with many intelligent and hard-working professionals. Without question, Ed ranks among the top. He is one of the most capable and diligent people I have had the pleasure of working with, and his commitment to excellence is evident in all that he does.

On a personal note, getting to know Ed has been a privilege. A true champion for the people of our State, Ed should be extremely proud of the great work he has done for thousands of our constituents. I will forever be grateful to him for his public service.

My staff and I will miss Ed greatly, but we know that he will remain a close friend and trusted advisor. I wish him, his wife Lisa, and their son Matthan well in this exciting new chapter of their lives.●

##### TRIBUTE TO DAWN JUSTICE

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I honor Dawn Justice, who is retiring from serving as president and chief executive officer of the Idaho Bankers Association.

Dawn, who grew up in Sarasota, FL, began her career in the hotel industry working in hotel management for the Hilton and Hyatt hotels. Her work in this field took her to California, Texas, Singapore, and Thailand before we

were blessed that she chose to make Idaho her home 24 years ago. Prior to her work with the Idaho Bankers Association, she also worked as vice president of human resources for the Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry and special projects assistant for Boise State University, where she also earned her master of public administration degree.

For the past 11 years, Dawn has led the Idaho Bankers Association with remarkable skill and knowhow. Throughout her time with the association, Dawn has been instrumental in advancing a number of the organization's priorities, including initiatives involving the Idaho Bank Act, Personal Information Security Act, the Credit Report Protection Act, the Residential Mortgages Practices Act, the Uniform Prudent Investor Act, and much more. She has utilized her indispensable talents advocating for policy objectives of importance both at the State and national levels.

Dawn's efforts and advocacy on behalf of the Idaho banking community have been exceptionally helpful as we have worked together over the years. She has been an outstanding advocate in explaining the need for traditional banking and the costs of overregulation on consumers, small businesses and communities. She was instrumental in providing valuable insight and recommendations that helped me craft and advance my regulatory relief legislation into law. Additionally, her help pushing back against harmful Dodd-Frank rules and providing insight into how many of these rules would negatively impact credit and economic growth opportunities in Idaho has been especially appreciated.

Dawn, thank you for your hard work and effective leadership. You have been a great strength in advancing Federal policy changes of assistance to Idahoans. I commend you for your service to Idaho and our Nation. I wish you all the best and hope you have a retirement filled with many good times with your loved ones. Congratulations on your remarkable career and retirement.●

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:30 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 216. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1092. An act to designate the Federal building located at 2030 Southwest 145th Avenue in Miramar, Florida, as the "Benjamin P. Grogan and Jerry L. Dove Federal Building".

## ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

At 7:07 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution:

S.J. Res. 8. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to representation case procedures.

## MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 216. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a Future-Years Veterans Program and a quadrennial veterans review, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Chief Strategy Officer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Special Report entitled "History, Jurisdiction, and a Summary of Activities of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources during the 113th Congress" (Rept. No. 114-6).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

\*Patricia D. Cahill, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020.

\*Dava J. Newman, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

\*Willie E. May, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

\*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to

respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 857. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 858. A bill to amend the National Energy Conservation Policy Act to encourage the increased use of performance contracting in Federal facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 859. A bill to protect the public, communities across America, and the environment by increasing the safety of crude oil transportation by railroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COATS, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. HELLER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LEE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 860. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the estate and generation-skipping transfer taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. THUNE, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 861. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CASEY, Mr. NELSON, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 862. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 863. A bill to reauthorize and improve the Appalachian regional development pro-

gram, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 864. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish direct care registered nurse-to-patient staffing ratio requirements in hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 865. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 866. A bill to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of New York Police Department Detectives Wenjian Liu and Rafael Ramos, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 867. A bill to improve student academic achievement in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics subjects; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 111. A resolution designating March 2015 as "National Middle Level Education Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. Res. 112. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Internal Revenue Service should provide printed copies of Internal Revenue Service Publication 17 to taxpayers in the United States free of charge; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 113. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend the issuance of, and the United States Postal Service should issue, a commemorative stamp in honor of the holiday of Diwali; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 114. A resolution supporting the designation of March 2015, as "National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. Res. 115. A resolution designating April 2015 as "National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 125

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 125, a bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend the authorization of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program through fiscal year 2020, and for other purposes.

S. 207

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 207, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use existing authorities to furnish health care at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities to veterans who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest medical facility of the Department that furnishes the care sought by the veteran, and for other purposes.

S. 303

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 303, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment.

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 423

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 605

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 605, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to invest in innovation for education.

S. 626

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 626, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 665, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 756

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 756, a bill to require a report on accountability for war crimes and crimes against humanity in Syria.

S. 758

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to establish an Interagency Trade Enforcement Center in the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and for other purposes.

S. 793

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the refinancing of certain Federal student loans, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. CON. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 10, a concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the year of 2015 as the "International Year of Soils" and supporting locally led soil conservation.

AMENDMENT NO. 339

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 339 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the

congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 345

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 345 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 346

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 346 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 347

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 347 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 351

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 351 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

AMENDMENT NO. 352

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 352 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.



## AMENDMENT NO. 356

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 356 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 382

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 382 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 383

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 383 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 384

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 384 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 388

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 388 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 391

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 391 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 427

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Missouri

(Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 427 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 432

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 432 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 434

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 434 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 435

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 435 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 452

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 452 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 457

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 457 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 467

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 467 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 468

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 468 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 469

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 469 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 473

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 473 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 484

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 484 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 485

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 485 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.



## AMENDMENT NO. 490

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 490 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 491

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 491 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 522

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 522 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 545

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 545 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 553

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 553 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 573

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 573 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 580

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor

of amendment No. 580 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 585

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 585 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 600

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 600 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## AMENDMENT NO. 601

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 601 proposed to S. Con. Res. 11, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

## SENATE RESOLUTION 111—DESIGNATING MARCH 2015 AS “NATIONAL MIDDLE LEVEL EDUCATION MONTH”

Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

## S. RES. 111

Whereas the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Association for Middle Level Education, the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform, and the National Association of Elementary School Principals have declared March 2015 as “National Middle Level Education Month”;

Whereas schools that educate middle level students are responsible for educating nearly 24,000,000 young adolescents between the ages of 10 and 15, in grades 5 through 9, who are undergoing rapid and dramatic changes in their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, and moral development;

Whereas young adolescents deserve challenging and engaging instruction and knowledgeable teachers and administrators who are prepared to provide young adolescents

with a safe, challenging, and supportive learning environment;

Whereas young adolescents deserve organizational structures that banish anonymity and promote personalization, collaboration, and social equity;

Whereas the habits and values established during early adolescence have a lifelong influence that directly affects the future health and welfare of the United States;

Whereas research indicates that the academic achievement of a student in grade 8 has a larger impact on the readiness of that student for an institution of higher education at the end of high school than any academic achievement of that student in high school; and

Whereas in order to improve graduation rates and prepare students to be lifelong learners who are ready for an institution of higher education or a career and civic participation, the people of the United States must have a deeper understanding of the distinctive mission of middle level education: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2015 as “National Middle Level Education Month”;

(2) honors and recognizes the importance of middle level education and the contributions of the individuals who educate middle level students; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Middle Level Education Month by visiting and celebrating schools that are responsible for educating young adolescents in the United States.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 112—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE SHOULD PROVIDE PRINTED COPIES OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE PUBLICATION 17 TO TAXPAYERS IN THE UNITED STATES FREE OF CHARGE

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

## S. RES. 112

Whereas each year, Internal Revenue Service Publication 17, entitled “Your Federal Income Tax”, provides individuals with general instructions on how to file their taxes for the previous taxable year;

Whereas in each year prior to 2015, free printed versions of Internal Revenue Service Publication 17 were made widely available to taxpayers at libraries, post offices, and taxpayer service offices, and even by mail at the request of a taxpayer;

Whereas in an effort to save money, the Internal Revenue Service no longer disseminates a free printed version of Internal Revenue Service Publication 17 as it transitions to a fully electronic tax filing system, including an electronic system for providing instructions on filing taxes;

Whereas the Internal Revenue Service directs taxpayers to the Internet to download an electronic version of Internal Revenue Service Publication 17, even though the limited availability of a printed version of this publication burdens individuals who do not have access to a computer or printer and individuals who struggle to navigate a computer;

Whereas the dissemination of printed copies of Internal Revenue Service Publication

17 is a basic taxpayer service that the Internal Revenue Service is ignoring in an effort to reduce spending;

Whereas the Internal Revenue Service has experienced budget cuts for 5 consecutive fiscal years, amounting to a reduction in its budget of \$1,200,000,000, or 10 percent, since fiscal year 2010;

Whereas the Internal Revenue Service should prioritize its resources on areas that are critical to the ability of taxpayers to file their taxes in a timely and proper manner; and

Whereas the decision of the Internal Revenue Service to stop disseminating printed copies of Internal Revenue Service Publication 17 adversely impacts populations that do not have access to, or understand how to use, a computer, and the decision unnecessarily burdens and restricts the ability of taxpayers to comply with the convoluted and complicated provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate urges the Internal Revenue Service to—

(1) resume printing copies of Internal Revenue Service Publication 17; and

(2) provide free copies of such publication to the taxpayers of the United States.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 113—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CITIZENS' STAMP ADVISORY COMMITTEE SHOULD RECOMMEND THE ISSUANCE OF, AND THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE SHOULD ISSUE, A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP IN HONOR OF THE HOLIDAY OF DIWALI**

Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 113

Whereas Diwali, also referred to as the "festival of lights", is an Indian holiday that marks the beginning of the Hindu New Year;

Whereas Diwali celebrates the triumph of good over evil, the awareness of one's inner light, the dispelling of ignorance, and bringing peace and joy through the awakening gained from a higher knowledge;

Whereas Diwali is observed in the United States, and across the globe, by Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, Jains, and Buddhists;

Whereas as one of the world's oldest religious holidays, Diwali serves not only as a time for celebration, but also as a time for communities and families to come together in spiritual enlightenment;

Whereas the practice of celebrating Diwali has survived political, economic, and social changes throughout history, while always carrying the universal symbolism of the victory of light, goodness, knowledge, and truth;

Whereas the United States Postal Service, in accordance with recommendations of the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee, has issued stamps for other popular holidays in the United States, including Christmas, Kwanzaa, Hanukkah, and Eid al-Fitr;

Whereas the United States Postal Service has yet to issue a stamp in honor of Diwali; and

Whereas issuing a postage stamp honoring Diwali is fitting and proper: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Postal Service should issue a postage stamp honoring the holiday of Diwali; and

(2) the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee should recommend to the Postmaster General that such a stamp be issued.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 114—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 2015, AS "NATIONAL COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH"**

Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 114

Whereas colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of cancer death among men and women combined in the United States;

Whereas in 2015, more than 130,000 individuals in the United States will be diagnosed with colorectal cancer and approximately 50,000 more will die from it;

Whereas colorectal cancer is 1 of the most preventable forms of cancer because screening tests can find polyps that can be removed before becoming cancerous;

Whereas screening tests can detect colorectal cancer early, which is when treatment works best;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that if every individual aged 50 or older had regular screening tests, as many as 60 percent of deaths from colorectal cancer could be prevented;

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for patients with localized colorectal cancer is 90 percent, but only 39 percent of all diagnoses occur at that stage;

Whereas colorectal cancer screenings can effectively reduce the incidence of colorectal cancer and mortality, but 1 in 3 adults between the ages of 50 and 75 are not up to date with recommended colorectal cancer screening;

Whereas public awareness and education campaigns on colorectal cancer prevention, screening, and symptoms are held during the month of March each year; and

Whereas educational efforts can help provide to the public information on methods of prevention and screening, as well as symptoms for early detection: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of March 2015, as "National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month" and the goals and ideals of that Month; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate awareness and educational activities.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 115—DESIGNATING APRIL 2015 AS "NATIONAL CONGENITAL DIAPHRAGMATIC HERNIA AWARENESS MONTH"**

Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 115

Whereas congenital diaphragmatic hernia (referred to in this preamble as "CDH") oc-

curs when the diaphragm fails to fully form, allowing abdominal organs to migrate into the chest cavity and preventing lung growth;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recognizes CDH as a birth defect;

Whereas the majority of CDH patients suffer from underdeveloped lungs or poor pulmonary function;

Whereas babies born with CDH endure extended hospital stays in intensive care with multiple surgeries;

Whereas CDH patients often endure long-term complications, such as pulmonary hypertension, pulmonary hypoplasia, asthma, gastrointestinal reflex, feeding disorders, and developmental delays;

Whereas CDH survivors sometimes endure long-term mechanical ventilation dependency, skeletal malformations, supplemental oxygen dependency, enteral and parenteral nutrition, and hypoxic brain injury;

Whereas CDH is treated through mechanical ventilation, a heart and lung bypass (commonly known as "extracorporeal membrane oxygenation"), machines, and surgical repair;

Whereas surgical repair is often not a permanent solution for CDH and can lead to re-herniation and require additional surgery;

Whereas CDH is diagnosed in utero in less than 50 percent of cases;

Whereas infants born with CDH have a high mortality rate, ranging from 20 to 60 percent, depending on the severity of the defect and interventions available at delivery;

Whereas CDH has a rate of occurrence of 1 in every 3,800 live births worldwide;

Whereas CDH affects approximately 1,088 babies each year in the United States;

Whereas CDH has affected more than 700,000 babies worldwide since 2000;

Whereas CDH does not discriminate based on race, gender, or socioeconomic status;

Whereas the cause of CDH is unknown;

Whereas the average CDH survivor will face postnatal care of at least \$100,000; and

Whereas Federal support for CDH research at the National Institutes of Health for 2014 is estimated to be not more than \$2,500,000: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2015 as "National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month";

(2) encourages that steps should be taken to—

(A) raise awareness of and increase public knowledge about congenital diaphragmatic hernia (referred to in this resolution as "CDH");

(B) inform all Americans about the dangers of CDH, especially those groups that may be disproportionately affected by CDH or have lower survival rates;

(C) disseminate information on the importance of quality neonatal care of CDH patients;

(D) promote quality prenatal care and ultrasounds to detect CDH in utero; and

(E) support research funding of CDH to—

(i) improve screening and treatment for CDH;

(ii) discover the causes of CDH; and

(iii) develop a cure for CDH; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interest groups, and affected persons to—

(A) promote awareness of CDH;

(B) take an active role in the fight against this devastating birth defect; and

(C) observe National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

## AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 607. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. LEE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025.

SA 608. Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 609. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 610. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 611. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 612. Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 613. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 614. Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 615. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 616. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 617. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 618. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 619. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 620. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 621. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 622. Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. AYOTTE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 623. Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 624. Mr. COONS (for Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. COONS)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. COONS to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 625. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 626. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 627. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 628. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 629. Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 630. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 631. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 632. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 633. Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 634. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 635. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 636. Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 637. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 638. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 639. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 640. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 641. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 642. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the con-

current resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 643. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 644. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 645. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 646. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 647. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 648. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 649. Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 650. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 651. Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 652. Mr. REED (for Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MERKLEY)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 653. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 654. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 655. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 656. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 657. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 658. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 659. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 660. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

ment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 720. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs.

SA 761. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 741. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 742. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*, which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 743. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 744. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*, which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 745. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 746. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 747. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 748. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 749. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 750. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 751. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 752. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 753. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 754. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 755. Ms. STABENOW proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 757 Mr. INHOFF (for himself and Mr.

SEN. H. H. HAYES (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 758. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 759. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 760. Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 761. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 762. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TOOMEY, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 763. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 764. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 765. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra: which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 766. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 767. Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 768. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 769. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 770. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. KING, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11. *supra*.

SA 771. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 772. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 773. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 774. Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 775. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 776. Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 777. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11 *supra*.

SA 778. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 779. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended





SA 895. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11,



Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 951. Mr. SANDERS (for Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr.

FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SCHUMER)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 952. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 953. Mr. MERKLEY proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra.

SA 954. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 955. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 956. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 957. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 958. Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 959. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 960. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 961. Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 962. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 963. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 964. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 965. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 607.** Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. LEE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### **SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PERMANENTLY ELIMINATE THE FEDERAL ESTATE TAX.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in the Federal income tax laws, which may include eliminating the Federal estate tax, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 608.** Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### **SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SIMPLIFY AND STANDARDIZE STATE INCOME TAX COLLECTION FOR EMPLOYEES WHO TRAVEL OUTSIDE OF THEIR HOME STATE FOR TEMPORARY WORK ASSIGNMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would simplify and standardize State income tax collection for employees who travel outside of their home State for temporary work assignments, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 609.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### **SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT FUNDING TO IMPLEMENT, CREATE, APPLY, OR ENFORCE CERTAIN STANDARDS FOR INITIAL BARGAINING UNIT DETERMINATIONS GOVERNED BY THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to standards for initial bargaining

unit determinations that may include, but are not limited to, preventing the proliferation or fragmentation of bargaining units, prohibiting employees considered for such bargaining units from being excluded from the unit, or the consideration of the interests of the group or unit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 610.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### **SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEFINITION OF FIDUCIARY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening and reforming the pension system, which may include preventing the Department of Labor from promulgating any further definitions or expansions of the term "fiduciary" under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 611.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

#### **SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUBJECTING ALL FEES COLLECTED BY U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the use of fees collected by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, which may include prohibiting the expenditure of any such fees unless such expenditure has been approved through the annual appropriations process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal

years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 612.** Mr. ISAKSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUBJECTING ALL FEES COLLECTED BY U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES TO THE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the use of fees collected by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, which may include prohibiting the expenditure of any such fees unless such expenditure has been approved through the annual appropriations process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 613.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL DEFENSE COOPERATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to international defense cooperation, which may include expedited interagency approval of lethal arms and munitions to Ukraine, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 614.** Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE GROWING FISCAL THREAT OF ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting or encouraging research that leads to identifying an Alzheimer's disease biomarker, early diagnostics tool, or therapy to delay the onset or halt the progression of Alzheimer's disease in order to provide a significant cost savings to the Federal Government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 615.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE USE OF HARBOR MAINTENANCE USER FEES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to user fees and their intended purpose, which may include fees collected for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund to fund dredging, dredged material disposal areas, jetties, and breakwaters, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 616.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO SUBMIT THE RESULTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE TRUCK SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITS STUDY, AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 32801 OF MAP-21 BY APRIL 30, 2015.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Department of Transportation's Comprehensive Truck Size and Weight Limits Study by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 617.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INTERAGENCY COOPERATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to interagency cooperation, which may include expedited interagency cooperation to identify foreign nationals subject to sanctions under title IV of the Russia and Moldova Jackson-Vanik Repeal and Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-208), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 618.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING INTERNATIONAL ARMS CONTROL COMPLIANCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring international arms control compliance, which may include an annual interagency report to Congress on countries that are not meeting their international arms control treaty obligations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years

2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 619.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT'S CUTS TO THE MEDICAID AND MEDICARE DISPROPORTIONATE SHARE HOSPITAL PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing the negative impact of the Affordable Care Act's Medicaid and Medicare disproportionate share (DSH) cuts to hospitals by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 620.** Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO EXPEDITE AWARDS UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE WHISTLEBLOWER PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the processing of award submissions, which may include the Internal Revenue Service whistleblower program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 621.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REPEAL THE FOREIGN ACCOUNT TAX COMPLIANCE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to fairness of United States taxpayers, which may include the repeal of the provisions commonly known as the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 622.** Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. AYOTTE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A SIMPLIFIED INCOME-DRIVEN STUDENT LOAN REPAYMENT OPTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing student loan debt, which may include reducing overlapping student loan repayment programs and creating a simplified income-driven student loan repayment option by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 623.** Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. KIRK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEXT-GENERATION LEADERSHIP COMPUTERS IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to the development of next-generation leadership computers in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 624.** Mr. COONS (for Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself and Mr. COONS)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. COONS to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE COMPETITIVENESS OF THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving basic science research and development programs in the United States by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 625.** Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF THE FEDERAL REGULATORY PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the Federal regulatory process by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 626.** Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STREAMLINE, CONSOLIDATE, OR ELIMINATE DUPLICATIVE AND OVERLAPPING PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to streamlining, consolidating, or eliminating duplicative and overlapping programs identified by the Government Accountability Office by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 627.** Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR GOVERNMENT SPENDING TRANSPARENCY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing more transparency in Government spending, including through the establishment of a Federal program inventory, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 628.** Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT THE STEWARDSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES OVER THE DOMAIN NAME SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the continued stewardship role of the United States over the do-

main name system to ensure the security of the .gov and .mil domains and protect freedom of speech and expression internationally by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 629.** Mr. WICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL DEFENSE COOPERATION WITH TAIWAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to international defense cooperation, which may include interagency cooperation to facilitate technology transfers required for the indigenous construction of diesel submarines by the Republic of China, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 630.** Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE USE OF ENERGY-EFFICIENCY IN THE MAJOR ENERGY-CONSUMING SECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the use of energy efficiency in the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors of the economy of the United States and making the Federal Government more energy efficient, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 631.** Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TRAINING FOR FIRST RESPONDERS IN COMMUNITIES THROUGH WHICH CRUDE OIL IS TRANSPORTED BY RAIL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to legislation providing training and prepositioning of resources for first responders in communities that have high volume, or increased volumes, of crude oil moving by rail, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 632.** Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PREGNANT WORKERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to increase employment opportunities and prevent employment discrimination, which may include measures to prevent employment discrimination against pregnant workers, to provide pregnant workers with a right to workplace accommodations, and to ensure that employers comply with requirements regarding such workplace accommodations for pregnant workers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 633.** Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENHANCING THE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing the child and dependent care tax credit in order to offset the growing costs of child care, including by making the credit fully refundable, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 634.** Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTOMATIC IRAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that workers without a retirement plan through their employer have access to a retirement savings option, including by establishing automatic payroll deductions for contributions to Individual Retirement Accounts and providing employers additional tax incentives to establish retirement savings programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 635.** Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for the Office

of Administrative Law Judges of the Department of Labor, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 636.** Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE PERSONAL INFORMATION OF CONSUMERS FROM DATA BREACHES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the personal information of consumers from data breaches, which may include providing notification to affected consumers or enhancing data security programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 637.** Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADVANCING THE STATED GOALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS OF MEETING THE HEALTH CARE NEEDS OF VETERANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforms at the Department of Veterans Affairs that improve internal processes to meet the health care needs of veterans, which may include legislation that redesigns the human resources and recruitment process, prioritizes efforts to recruit, retain, and train clerical staff, develops a comprehensive human capital strategy that addresses impending health care provider shortages based on projected needs, creates a stronger financial incentive structure, accelerates steps to improve the agility, usability, and flexibility of scheduling-enabling technologies that also facilitate per-

formance measurement and reporting functions, takes steps to use fixed infrastructure more efficiently, evaluates the efficiency and patient support gained by centralizing the phone calling functions in facility-based call centers with extended hours of operation, invests in more current and usable telephone systems and provides adequate space for call center functions, takes steps to alleviate parking congestion, engages frontline staff in the process of change, or embraces a system-wide approach to process redesign, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 638.** Mr. WARNER (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR GOVERNMENT REFORM AND EFFICIENCY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving savings through the use of performance data or scientifically rigorous evaluation methodologies for the elimination, consolidation, or reform of Federal programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives, or the sale of Federal property, and reduce the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the deficit reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of deficit reduction achieved.

**SA 639.** Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING TRADE AND TRAVEL AT PORTS OF ENTRY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting trade and travel at ports of entry, which may include construction at ports of entry or increased staffing at



ports of entry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 640.** Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE IN ORDER TO ADDRESS UNIQUE SITUATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing additional flexibility to Federal agencies in order to meet workforce sustainability challenges related to special pay rates, locality pay, and retention, relocation, and recruitment bonuses by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 641.** Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FAIR MARKET RENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to housing needs, which may include conducting or funding local rent surveys of areas experiencing economic challenges or natural disasters, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 642.** Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting

forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO NATIVE CHILDREN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Native children, which may include establishing a commission to examine existing Federal programs to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of services delivered to Native children to improve outcomes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 643.** Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TRAINING AND RESOURCES FOR FIRST RESPONDERS RESPONDING TO HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INCIDENTS ON RAILROADS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the establishment of a public-private partnership tasked with reviewing training and funding allocations for first responders responding to hazardous materials incidents on railroads, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 644.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE SAFE TRANSPORTATION OF CRUDE BY RAIL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to existing and potential crude oil treatment processes, which could enhance the safe transportation of crude by rail, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 645.** Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO UNDERGROUND AND SURFACE MINING SAFETY AND HEALTH RESEARCH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to underground and surface mining safety and health research by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 646.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO H-1B VISAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to H-1B visas, which may include increasing the annual cap, exempting advanced STEM degree holders from the H-1B cap, recapturing unused green cards, allowing spouses of H-1B visa holders to work, and increasing STEM funding in the United States by raising the H-1B fee paid by employers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 647.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by



him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW NUCLEAR-CAPABLE CRUISE MISSILE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND THE NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the development of a new nuclear-capable cruise missile by the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 648.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE NUCLEAR FORCES AND MISSIONS OF THE AIR FORCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the nuclear force improvement program of the Air Force by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 649.** Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING FUNDING OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY PRIOR TO SENATE RATIFICATION AND ADOPTION OF IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting funding of international organizations during the implementation of the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty prior to Senate ratification and adoption of implementing legislation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 650.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCIES UNDER THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS MAY CONDUCT BACKGROUND CHECKS BEFORE ISSUING FOSTER CARE LICENSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that social services agencies under the Bureau of Indian Affairs may conduct background checks on all adults living in a home before issuing a foster care license, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 651.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION AND FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION TO ENTER INTO JOINT TASK FORCES WITH TRIBAL AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Drug Enforcement Administration and Federal Bureau of Investigation entering into joint task forces with tribal and local law enforcement agencies by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 652.** Mr. REED (for Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MERKLEY)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$17,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by \$4,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$6,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$6,900,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$8,200,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$8,600,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$9,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$17,100,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by \$4,400,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$5,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$6,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$6,900,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,300,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$7,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$8,200,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$8,600,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$9,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$61,447,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by \$1,385,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$715,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,128,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$965,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$773,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$574,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$341,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$73,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by \$213,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$61,448,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by \$1,385,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$715,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$1,128,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$965,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$774,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$574,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$342,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$73,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by \$212,000,000.

On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$44,348,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,015,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, decrease the amount by \$5,085,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, decrease the amount by \$5,172,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, decrease the amount by \$5,935,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by \$6,526,000,000.

On page 7, line 13, decrease the amount by \$7,126,000,000.

On page 7, line 14, decrease the amount by \$7,858,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, decrease the amount by \$8,527,000,000.

On page 7, line 16, decrease the amount by \$9,212,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$44,348,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$47,363,000,000.

On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$42,278,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$37,106,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$31,171,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$24,645,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$17,519,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$9,661,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,134,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, decrease the amount by \$8,078,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$44,348,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$47,363,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$42,278,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$37,106,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$31,171,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$24,645,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$17,519,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$9,661,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,134,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, decrease the amount by \$8,078,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$60,900,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$60,900,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, decrease the amount by \$2,400,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, decrease the amount by \$2,400,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, decrease the amount by \$500,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, decrease the amount by \$500,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$548,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$548,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,015,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,015,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,215,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,215,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,128,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,128,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$965,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$965,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$774,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$774,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$574,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$574,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$342,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$342,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$73,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$73,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, decrease the amount by \$212,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$212,000,000.

**SA 653.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING EPA TO LIMIT CONTROL MEASURE DETERMINATIONS TO COVERED SOURCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to environmental laws requiring pollution control technology, which may require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to limit the scope of control measure determinations to only those located at regulated sources under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 654.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING REGULATORY PRACTICES FOR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing practical and enforceable standards for cost-benefit analysis of significant rules and periodic review of existing regulations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 655.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PRESERVE AND PROTECT THE OPEN INTERNET.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the open Internet and promoting further innovation and investment in Internet services, content, infrastructure, and technologies by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 656.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 320, insert “making permanent” before “Payments”.

**SA 657.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING NON-DEFENSE RELATED SPENDING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Department of Defense, which may include measures eliminating non-defense related programs at the Department, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 658.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 659.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING PROPER ECONOMIC CONSIDERATION IN DESIGNATION OF CRITICAL HABITAT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to critical habitat designations, which may include requirements that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service examine the cumulative economic effects of the designation, such as on land or property uses or values, regional employment, or revenue impacts on States and units of local government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 660.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE USE OF FUNDS FOR COOPERATING WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN IN COMBATING THE ISLAMIC STATE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the use of funds for cooperating with the Government of Iran in combating the Islamic State by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 661.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO VIOLATIONS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION OF THE INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES TREATY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to violations by the Russian Federation of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, signed at Washington December 8, 1987, and entered into force June 1, 1988 (commonly referred to as the “Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty” or “INF Treaty”), which shall include defense of the allies of the United States in Europe, including member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 662.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE USE OF FUNDS FOR THE PREMATURE WITHDRAWAL OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM AFGHANISTAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the use of funds for the premature withdrawal of the United States Armed Forces from Afghanistan by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 663.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE USE OF FUNDS FOR NEGOTIATING WITH PRESIDENT OF SYRIA BASHAR AL ASSAD AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SYRIA TO RESOLVE THE SYRIAN CIVIL WAR AND COMBAT THE ISLAMIC STATE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the use of funds for negotiating with President of Syria Bashar al Assad and the Government of Syria to resolve the Syrian civil war and combat the Islamic State by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 664.** Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING FACILITIES AT THE DETENTION FACILITIES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.**

(a) **FINDING.**—The Senate finds that the detention facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, are an important tool in the counterterrorism efforts of the United States.

(b) **DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to construction of new facilities and improvements to existing facilities at the detention facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 665.** Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING AWARDING OF CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS BASED ON Awardees ENTERING OR NOT ENTERING INTO AGREEMENTS WITH LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a prohibition on the awarding of construction contracts on behalf of the Government based upon any solicitations, bid specifications, project agreements, or other controlling documents, that require or prohibit bidders, offerors, contractors, or subcontractors to enter into or adhere to agreements with one or more labor organizations or discriminate against or give preference to such bidders, offerors, contractors, or subcontractors based on their entering or refusing to enter into such agreements by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 666.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL PREMIUM SUPPORT FOR CROP INSURANCE POLICIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the level of Federal premium support for crop insurance policies, which may include limiting premium support for crop insurance for agricultural producers with an adjusted gross income of more than \$750,000 in fiscal year 2016, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 667.** Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE FINANCIAL SOLVENCY OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM AND THE SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the financial solvency of the unemployment compensation program and the social security disability insurance program, which may include ensuring that individuals do not simultaneously receive unemployment compensation and social security disability insurance benefits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 668.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO GOVERNMENT REFORM AND EFFICIENCY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to achieving savings through the use of performance data or scientifically rigorous evaluation methodologies for the elimination, consolidation, or reform of Federal programs, agencies, offices, and initiatives, the sale of Federal property, or the reduction of improper payments by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025. The Chairman may also make adjustments to the Senate's pay-as-you-go ledger over 6 and 11 years to ensure that the spending reduction achieved is used for deficit reduction only. The adjustments authorized under this section shall be of the amount of spending reduction achieved.

**SA 669.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, line 3, decrease the amount by \$4,200,000,000.

On page 19, line 4, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 19, line 8, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 19, line 11, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 19, line 14, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 19, line 20, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 20, line 1, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 20, line 5, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 20, line 9, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

**SA 670.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 4, decrease the amount by \$60,700,000.

On page 22, line 5, decrease the amount by \$60,700,000.

**SA 671.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 4, decrease the amount by \$1,665,000,000.

On page 22, line 5, decrease the amount by \$150,000,000.

**SA 672.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT CONTAINS EARMARKS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that includes an earmark.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the

Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) CONSIDERATION.—

(1) PROCEDURE.—Upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a) against an earmark, and such point of order being sustained, such earmark shall be deemed stricken.

(2) CONFERENCE REPORT AND AMENDMENT BETWEEN THE HOUSES PROCEDURE.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable under the same conditions as was the conference report. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) EARMARK.—For the purpose of this section, the term “earmark” means a provision or report language included primarily at the request of a Senator or Member of the House of Representatives as certified under paragraph 1(a)(1) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate—

(A) providing, authorizing, or recommending a specific amount of discretionary budget authority, credit authority, or other spending authority for a contract, loan, loan guarantee, grant, loan authority, or other expenditure with or to an entity, or targeted to a specific State, locality or Congressional district, other than through a statutory or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process; or

(B) that—

(i)(I) provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to a particular beneficiary or limited group of beneficiaries under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

(II) contains eligibility criteria that are not uniform in application with respect to potential beneficiaries of such provision; or

(ii) modifies the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities.

(2) DETERMINATION BY THE SENATE.—In the event the Chair is unable to ascertain whether or not the offending provision constitutes an earmark as defined in this subsection, the question of whether the provision constitutes an earmark shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(e) APPLICATION.—This section shall not apply to any authorization of appropriations to a Federal entity if such authorization is not specifically targeted to a State, locality, or congressional district.

**SA 673.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States

Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 27, line 2, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 27, line 6, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 27, line 7, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 27, line 10, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 27, line 11, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 27, line 14, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 27, line 15, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 27, line 18, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 27, line 19, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 27, line 22, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 28, line 3, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 28, line 6, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 28, line 10, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

On page 28, line 14, decrease the amount by \$254,000,000.

On page 28, line 15, decrease the amount by \$370,000,000.

**SA 674.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 25, line 9, decrease the amount by \$53,200,000.

On page 25, line 10, decrease the amount by \$53,200,000.

**SA 675.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 23, line 20, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000.

On page 23, line 21, decrease the amount by \$8,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, decrease the amount by \$2,000,000.

**SA 676.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 30, line 11, decrease the amount by \$6,270,000.

On page 30, line 12, decrease the amount by \$6,270,000.

**SA 677.** Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING POLITICAL TARGETING BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OF INDIVIDUALS AND SOCIAL WELFARE ORGANIZATIONS EXERCISING FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing political targeting by the Internal Revenue Service of individuals and social welfare organizations exercising free-speech rights, which may include maintaining current standards and definitions in defining political activity for the purpose of determining the tax status of individuals and social welfare organizations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 678.** Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FIRST-TIME ILLEGAL BORDER CROSSERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to decreasing the recidivism of illegal border crossers, including removing any prohibition on Federal prosecution of first-time border crossers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not

raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 679.** Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EMPOWERMENT OF STATES TO PROTECT CITIZENS OF THE STATE FROM DAMAGING REGULATIONS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY PURSUANT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing any State the option of opting out of the requirements of section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)) if a Governor or legislative body of a State determines that the requirements of that section would increase retail electricity prices with a disproportionate impact on low-income or fixed-income households, or present a risk to electric reliability, or impair investments in existing electric generating capacity, or impair manufacturing and other important sectors of the economy of the State, or decrease employment, or decrease State and local revenues, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 680.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FURLOUGHING FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WITH SERIOUS TAX DELINQUENCIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving the integrity of the Federal workforce, which may include furloughing Federal employees with serious tax delinquencies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided

that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 681.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEMOLISHING VACANT AND ABANDONED HOMES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding to improve the safety of neighborhoods in the United States, which may include demolishing blighted and abandoned homes, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 682.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD NOT ACHIEVE A UNIFIED BUDGET SURPLUS AFTER 2024.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year, motion amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would not achieve a unified budget surplus in every fiscal year after fiscal year 2024.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 683.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD CREATE A CARBON TAX OR A CAP-AND-TRADE POLICY RELATING TO CARBON EMISSIONS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would create a carbon tax or a cap-and-trade policy relating to carbon emissions.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 684.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPEALING ANY TAX INCREASES IMPOSED BY PRESIDENT OBAMA ON MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing any tax increases imposed after January 20, 2009, on any taxpayers whose gross income is less than \$200,000 and are filing as single, head of household, or married filing separately, or any taxpayers whose gross income is less than \$250,000 and are filing as married filing jointly, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 685.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAKING PERMANENT THE EXPENSING LIMITATIONS APPLICABLE FOR 2014 FOR SECTION 179 PROPERTY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making permanent the expensing limitations applicable for taxable years beginning after 2009 and before 2015 for section 179 property, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 686.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING THE AGE LIMITATION APPLICABLE TO DEPENDENT CARE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing the age limitation applicable to dependent care assistance programs under section 129 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 from 12 years of age to 16 years of age, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 687.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ALLOWING PRIVATE SECTOR EMPLOYEES THE ABILITY TO WORK FLEXIBLE SCHEDULES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to allowing employees of non-public entities who are eligible for overtime pay under section 7(a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207) to choose to receive compensatory time off instead of overtime compensation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 688.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CENTENNIAL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for the National Park Service Centennial by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 689.** Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 104, line 16, after “shall provide” insert “, in addition to the estimate of budgetary effects without macroeconomic effects, an estimate of the budgetary effects from changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, interest rates, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from the major legislation and”

**SA 690.** Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:



At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AVOIDING ELECTRICITY PRICE INCREASES IN STATES THAT ARE RELIANT ON NUCLEAR POWER UNDER THE CLEAN POWER PLAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to equitable treatment of the new and existing nuclear generating capacity of States and the solar, wind, and other renewable energy generation of States under regulations under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.), which may include revisions to the Clean Power Plan, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 691.** Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STATE FLEXIBILITY IN DETERMINING SIZE OF THE SMALL GROUP MARKET.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 692.** Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TRANSPARENCY IN HEALTH PREMIUM BILLING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increased disclosure of any Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148) tax in health insurance monthly premium statements, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 693.** Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 431, insert “in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General’s list of unimplemented recommendations and” before “on the Government Accountability Office’s”.

**SA 694.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN ADVANCED FOSSIL ENERGY TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to investing in advanced fossil energy technology research and development at the Department of Energy, to reduce the impacts of climate change while ensuring the reliability of the electric grid, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 695.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ATTENDANCE AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging institutions of higher education to make college more affordable by reducing the cost of attendance for students and families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 696.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 4, decrease the amount by \$219,000,000.

On page 22, line 5, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000.

On page 22, line 8, decrease the amount by \$223,000,000.

On page 22, line 9, decrease the amount by \$191,000,000.

On page 22, line 12, decrease the amount by \$234,000,000.

On page 22, line 13, decrease the amount by \$224,000,000.

On page 22, line 16, decrease the amount by \$244,000,000.

On page 22, line 17, decrease the amount by \$233,000,000.

On page 22, line 20, decrease the amount by \$248,000,000.

On page 22, line 21, decrease the amount by \$243,000,000.

On page 22, line 24, decrease the amount by \$250,000,000.

On page 22, line 25, decrease the amount by \$248,000,000.

On page 23, line 3, decrease the amount by \$253,000,000.

On page 23, line 4, decrease the amount by \$250,000,000.

On page 23, line 7, decrease the amount by \$255,000,000.

On page 23, line 8, decrease the amount by \$253,000,000.

On page 23, line 11, decrease the amount by \$258,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, decrease the amount by \$255,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, decrease the amount by \$260,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, decrease the amount by \$268,000,000.

**SA 697.** Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming and strengthening elementary and secondary education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 698.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENFORCEMENT BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding the regulatory work of the Environmental Protection Agency by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 699.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LEGISLATION TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE OCEANS AND COASTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the protection and preservation of oceans and coasts, which may include measures that address the harms caused by human-induced climate change, including acidification, sea level rise, warmer ocean temperatures, and shifting fish and shellfish habitats, by the amounts provided in such

legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 700.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$7,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 6, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 11, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 2, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 20, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 25, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.

**SA 701.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improvements to the appeals process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for claims relating to disability compensation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 702.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EFFORTS ASSOCIATED WITH COMBATING THE HEROIN ADDICTION EPIDEMIC.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to support prevention, enforcement, interdiction, and recovery efforts associated with combating the heroin addiction epidemic by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 703.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENHANCE DRUG TREATMENT COURTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the enhancement of drug treatment courts by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 704.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENHANCE DRUG TREATMENT COURTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the enhancement of drug treatment courts by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 705.** Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INDO-PACIFIC PARTNER CAPACITY BUILDING AND STRATEGY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting a comprehensive multi-year partner capacity building and security cooperation plan in the Indo-Pacific region, including for a regional maritime domain awareness architecture and for bilateral and multilateral exercises, port calls, and training activities of the United States Armed Forces and Coast Guard to further a comprehensive strategy to strengthen United States alliances and partnerships, freedom of navigation, and the unimpeded access to the maritime commons of the Asia-Pacific by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 706.** Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ACHIEVING SAVINGS IN THE NUCLEAR SECURITY ENTERPRISE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to nuclear weapons modernization, which may include legislation that reduces the number of ballistic missile submarines, delays development of a new long-range penetrating bomber aircraft, or prohibits the procurement of new intercontinental ballistic missiles, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 707.** Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING OVERDOSE DEATHS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prevention of prescription drug and opioid overdose deaths, which may include support of opioid overdose prevention activities, increased surveillance and monitoring for opioid prescription drugs and overdoses, expanded access to evidence-based treatments for opioid addiction, or enhanced research for alternatives to opioid pain medication, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 708.** Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SIMPLIFYING AND EXPANDING TAX INCENTIVES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to simplifying and expanding tax incentives for higher education to boost student attendance and completion at colleges and vocational schools, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 709.** Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE TO REDUCE OR ELIMINATE OVERLAPPING OR DUPLICATIVE FEDERAL PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing the annual report published by the Government Accountability Office relating to fragmentation, overlap, and duplication, which may include requiring the President to submit to Congress a proposed joint resolution implementing such recommendations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 710.** Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING HEAD START PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enhancing funding for programs carried out under the Head Start Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 711.** Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$6,772,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,408,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$9,762,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$10,362,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$10,958,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$11,280,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$11,901,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$12,540,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$13,212,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$13,814,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$6,285,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,615,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$9,741,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$10,224,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$10,829,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$11,373,000,000.  
 On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$11,787,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$12,425,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$13,096,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$13,694,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$6,285,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,615,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$9,741,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by \$10,224,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 11, increase the amount by \$10,829,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 12, increase the amount by \$11,373,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 13, increase the amount by \$11,787,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 14, increase the amount by \$12,425,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 15, increase the amount by \$13,096,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 16, increase the amount by \$13,694,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$6,285,000,000.  
 On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$13,900,000,000.

On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$23,641,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$33,865,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$44,694,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$56,067,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$67,854,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$80,279,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$93,375,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, increase the amount by \$107,069,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$6,285,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$13,900,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$23,641,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$33,865,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$44,694,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$56,067,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$67,854,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$80,279,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$93,375,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, increase the amount by \$107,069,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$6,695,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$6,207,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by \$9,144,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,350,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$9,140,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$9,118,000,000.

On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,329,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$9,191,000,000.

On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$9,504,000,000.

On page 29, line 12, increase the amount by \$9,374,000,000.

On page 29, line 15, increase the amount by \$9,374,000,000.

On page 29, line 16, increase the amount by \$9,467,000,000.

On page 29, line 19, increase the amount by \$9,534,000,000.

On page 29, line 20, increase the amount by \$9,419,000,000.

On page 29, line 23, increase the amount by \$9,689,000,000.

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$9,574,000,000.

On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by \$9,848,000,000.

On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by \$9,731,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$10,009,000,000.

On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,889,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$78,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$78,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$265,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$265,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$623,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$623,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,033,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,033,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$1,455,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,455,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$1,906,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,906,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,368,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,368,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,851,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$2,851,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,365,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$3,365,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,805,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,805,000,000.

**SA 712.** Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 59, line 13, insert “, including standardizing financial aid award letters,” after “(20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.)”.

**SA 713.** Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO COMPREHENSIVE MENTAL HEALTH REFORM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to comprehensive mental health reform, which may include legislation that provides increased access to individuals suffering from mental illness and greater workforce opportunities for mental health professionals, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 714.** Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CHEMICAL DISCLOSURE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to chemicals used in industrial processes, which may include the public disclosure of the chemicals used in the hydraulic fracturing process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 715.** Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 55, beginning with line 24, strike through line 2 on page 56 and insert the following:

tax on medical device manufacturers;

(4) operations and administration of the Department of the Treasury; or

(5) creating clean energy jobs, including extending over a reasonable period of time, as a bridge to tax reform, expired and expiring tax credits for renewable energy production and investment,

**SA 716.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SUPPORT THE ROBUST FUNDING OF THE COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES GRANT PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would promote the robust funding of the Community Oriented Policing Services (commonly referred to as “COPS”) grant program by the amounts provided in such

legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 717.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EFFECTIVENESS AND AVAILABILITY OF BUREAU OF PRISONS PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the effectiveness and availability of the Bureau of Prisons rehabilitation, education, and recidivism reduction programs, including the effectiveness of the policy of using medication assisted treatment, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 718.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING CHILD SAVINGS ACCOUNTS AND ASSET BUILDING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to child savings accounts, which may include measures ensuring that the Department of the Treasury establish a child savings account program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 719.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CLEANING UP FEDERALLY DESIGNATED SUPERFUND SITES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to cleaning up sites on the National Priorities List developed by the President in accordance with section 105(a)(8)(B) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9605(a)(8)(B)) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 720.** Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funds for programs that support workforce development through apprenticeships, and providing additional funds to the Office of Apprenticeship of the Department of Labor to expand apprenticeship programs nationally, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 721.** Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING FREIGHT PLANNING AND INVESTMENT THAT INCORPORATES ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION, INCLUDING RAIL, WATERWAYS, PORTS, AND HIGHWAYS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports to encourage freight planning and investment that incorporates all modes of transportation including rail, waterways, ports and highways, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 722.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING PAYMENTS FOR HARMFUL AND FRAUDULENT TREATMENTS UNDER MEDICARE AND MEDICAID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting payments for harmful and fraudulent treatments under the Medicare or Medicaid programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 723.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING THE AVERAGE ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR PERSONS OR LEGAL ENTITIES WHO QUALIFY FOR FARM SUBSIDY PROGRAM BENEFITS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the average adjusted gross income eligibility criteria for persons or legal entities who qualify for farm subsidy program benefits, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 724.** Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING UNITED STATES EXPORTS AND IMPROVING THE COMPETITIVENESS OF UNITED STATES BUSINESSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing United States exports and improving the competitiveness of United States businesses, including through a long-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 725.** Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING DIVERSITY IN PROCUREMENT AND HIRING AT ALL FEDERAL PENSION PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring diversity in procurement and hiring at all Federal pension plans by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 726.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S.



Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF STATE AND LOCAL ECONOMIES FROM STORM SURGES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing to States and units of local government emergency financial assistance for responding to the economic and public health impacts of human-induced climate change, including larger and higher storm surge events, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 727.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO BROADBAND EXPANSION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to broadband expansion, which may include aid to cities and municipalities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 728.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING MENTORING PROGRAMS FOR AT-RISK YOUTH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting mentoring programs for at-risk youth by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 729.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTMENTS IN SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making changes or providing for the authorization of programs to invest in freight movement, rail, highway, transit, transportation alternatives, and other surface transportation projects, including competitive grant programs, which will drive United States economic competitiveness, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 730.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT OF THE LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR OF THE MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to development of the Long Range Discrimination Radar by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 731.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO INCREASE ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would increase access to health care providers for Medicare beneficiaries without raising revenue, which may include allowing Medicare providers to privately negotiate with Medicare beneficiaries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 732.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to authorizing advance appropriations for the Indian Health Service and Indian Health Facilities accounts of the Indian Health Service by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 733.** Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:



**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AN ACTIVE DUTY END STRENGTH FOR THE ARMY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 OF 490,000 SOLDIERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an active duty end strength for the Army for fiscal year 2016 of 490,000 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 734.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INNOVATIVE READINESS TRAINING PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient funds for the Department of Defense Innovative Readiness Training Program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 735.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO OUTREACH AND DELIVERY OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROGRAMS AND SERVICES TO VETERANS RESIDING IN UNITED STATES COMMUNITIES NOT CONNECTED TO NORTH AMERICAN ROAD SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to outreach and the delivery of Department of Veterans Affairs programs and services to veterans residing in United

States communities not connected to the North American road system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 736.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 89, strike lines 15 through 19, and insert the following:  
casting;

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration; and

(4) for the Indian Health Services and Indian Health Facilities accounts of the Indian Health Service.

**SA 737.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FOR THE EXPANSION OF AMYOTROPHIC LATERAL SCLEROSIS (LOU GEHRIG'S DISEASE) RESEARCH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE'S PEER REVIEWED MEDICAL RESEARCH PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the expansion of Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (Lou Gehrig's Disease) research in the Department of Defense's Medical Research Program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 738.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION OF LAND TRANSFERRED UNDER CERTAIN ACTS THAT IS CONTAMINATED BY FEDERAL AGENCIES AND ACTIVITIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the identification and environmental remediation of land transferred under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), the Act of May 17, 1906 (commonly known as the "Alaska Native Allotment Act of 1906") (34 Stat. 197, chapter 2469), and the Act of May 25, 1926 (commonly known as the "Alaska Native Townsite Act of 1926") (44 Stat. 629, chapter 379), contaminated by Federal agencies and activities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 739.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ROBUST SEXUAL ASSAULT INVESTIGATIONS BY THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU OFFICE OF COMPLEX INVESTIGATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the National Guard Bureau Office of Complex Investigations for robust investigations of sexual assault by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 740.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FUNDING OF CERTAIN TRIBAL COURTS BY BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the funding by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of tribal courts located in the States listed in the table contained in section 1162(a) of title 18, United States Code, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 741.** Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR LONG-TERM BUDGET ANALYSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to long-term budget analyses, including generational accounting, to promote understanding of the fiscal and economic impacts that proposed policy changes would have on current and future generations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 742.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM IN A MANNER THAT INCENTIVIZES WORK AND WORKER TRAINING FOR THE LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED, HELPS THE LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED REENTER THE WORKFORCE, RECOGNIZES THE DEMANDS ON STATE BUDGETS, AND DOES NOT INCREASE FINANCIAL BURDENS ON EMPLOYERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the unemployment insurance program, which may include reforms in a manner that incentivizes work and worker training for the long-term unemployed, helps the long-term unemployed reenter the workforce, recognizes the demands on State budgets, and does not increase financial burdens on employers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 743.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 20, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 20, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 20, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 43, line 19, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 43, line 23, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 2, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 3, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 6, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 7, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 10, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 11, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 14, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 15, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 19, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 22, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 44, line 23, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 45, line 2, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 45, line 3, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 45, line 6, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

On page 45, line 7, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000.

**SA 744.** Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING TRANSPARENCY OF COSTS OF COMPLETING ANALYSES REQUIRED UNDER THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring transparency of costs of completing analyses required under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 745.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ALLOWING OIL SHALE DEVELOPMENT ON FEDERAL LAND.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to allowing oil shale development on Federal land, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 746.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING REASONABLE DEADLINES FOR PROCESSES UNDER THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing reasonable deadlines for the rejection of environmental impact statements and environmental assessments under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 747.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SELLING NON-ESSENTIAL FEDERAL LAND WITH THE PROCEEDS GOING TO FEDERAL DEFICIT REDUCTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the sale of nonessential Federal land sold for the purpose of reducing the Federal deficit by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 748.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4 . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD FURTHER RESTRICT THE RIGHT OF LAW-ABIDING AMERICANS TO OWN A FIREARM.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would place further restriction on the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm in any year covered by this resolution.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “further restriction on the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm” means any further restriction on the right of law-abiding individuals in the United States to own a firearm not contained in law prior to the adoption of this resolution, including any legislation that—

(1) prohibits, increases restrictions on, or regulates the manufacture or ownership of any firearm that is permitted under Federal law prior to the adoption of this resolution;

(2) prohibits the manufacture or possession of specified categories of firearms based on the characteristics of such firearms that are permitted to be manufacture or possessed under Federal law prior to the adoption of this resolution;

(3) prohibits specific firearms or categories of firearms that are permitted under Federal law prior to the adoption of this resolution;

(4) limits the size of ammunition feeding devices or prohibits categories of ammunition feeding devices that are permitted under Federal law prior to the adoption of this resolution;

(5) requires background checks through a Federal firearms licensee for private transfers of firearms if the transfers do not require a background check under Federal law prior to the adoption of this resolution;

(6) establishes a record-keeping system for the sale of firearms not established prior to the adoption of this resolution; or

(7) imposes prison sentences for sales, gifts, or raffles of firearms to veterans who are unknown to the transferor as a person prohibited from possessing a firearm that would not otherwise be imposed under Federal law prior to the adoption of this resolution.

**SA 749.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 50, line 17, strike “or reforming”.

**SA 750.** Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the

appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 64, lines 10 and 11, strike “Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT)” and insert “funding the payments in lieu of taxes program at levels roughly equivalent to lost tax revenues due to the presence of Federal land”.

**SA 751.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ALLOW FOR THE RENEWAL OF THE NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION'S CONTRACT WITH THE INTERNET CORPORATION FOR ASSIGNED NAMES AND NUMBERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the governance of the Internet and maintaining United States oversight over the management of the Internet until Congress votes to end such oversight by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 752.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENCOURAGING THE UNITED STATES' NATO ALLIES TO REVERSE DECLINES IN DEFENSE SPENDING AND BEAR A MORE PROPORTIONATE BURDEN FOR ENSURING THE SECURITY OF NATO.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging the United States' NATO allies to reverse declines in defense spending and bear a more proportionate burden for ensuring the security of NATO by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through

2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 753.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF UNIFORMED MAINTENANCE PERSONNEL IN THE AIR FORCE FOR F-35A AIRCRAFT PROGRAM TO REACH INITIAL OPERATIONAL CAPACITY AND FULL OPERATIONAL CAPACITY ON SCHEDULE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to permitting the Department of Defense to provide the necessary number of maintenance personnel in the Air Force for the F-35A aircraft program to reach Initial Operational Capacity (IOC) and Full Operational Capacity (FOC) on schedule by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 754.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING THE ELIMINATION OF PREVAILING WAGE MANDATES AND REQUIREMENTS FOR FEDERALLY FUNDED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting the elimination of prevailing wage mandates and requirements for federally funded construction projects by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 755.** Ms. STABENOW proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolu-

tion S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF CLEAN WATER USING SCIENTIFIC STANDARDS WHILE MAINTAINING THE TRADITIONAL ROLE OF AGRICULTURE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting watersheds, including the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay, the Mississippi River system, the Colorado River system, or other sources of drinking water of the United States, which may include clarifying the scope of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) to provide certainty for landowners or rural communities, or preserving existing exemptions for agriculture, ranching, or forestry, or to rely on the scientific evidence of impacts on water quality of different types of water bodies by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 756.** Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING TAXPAYER FUNDING OF CONGRESSIONAL LETTERS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to activities related to congressional expenses, which may include disallowing stationary or electronic devices to communicate with one or more foreign countries by interfering with the Executive Branch's role in international nuclear negotiations on behalf of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 757.** Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. VITTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11,

setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO GRANT PROGRAMS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to grant programs of the Environmental Protection Agency that may include prohibitions on awards to any entity that has an action pending against the Agency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 758.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING FLEXIBLE WORK SCHEDULES FOR EMPLOYEES AND EMPLOYERS IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting flexible work schedules in the private sector by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 759.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CLARIFYING FEDERAL JURISDICTION WITH RESPECT TO INTRASTATE SPECIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to limiting the Federal regulation of species found entirely within the borders of a single State by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 760.** Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY POWER PLANT RULES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an independent reliability assessment of the cumulative impacts of power plant rules of the Environmental Protection Agency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 761.** Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MEANS-TESTING MEDICARE PART B AND PART D PREMIUMS FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES WITH AN ANNUAL INCOME THAT EXCEEDS \$250,000.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the solvency of the Medicare program by the amounts provided

in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 762.** Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TOOMEY, and Ms. AYOTTE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE RESTORATION OF PURCHASING POWER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing funding for the National Institutes of Health, including increasing funding to account for inflation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 763.** Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUBJECTING ALL FEDERAL SPENDING TO SEQUESTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to subjecting all Federal spending, except spending relating to Social Security, to sequestration by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 764.** Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. PERDUE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels

for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREPARING PORTS OF THE UNITED STATES FOR POST-PANAMAX SHIPS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preparing the ports of the United States for larger, post-Panamax ships, provided that the legislation is consistent with dredging reforms under applicable Federal law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 765.** Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. SCOTT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MIXED OXIDE FUEL FABRICATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to mixed oxide fuel fabrication, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 766.** Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUBJECTING THE SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO SEQUESTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to exemptions of programs and activities from sequestration, which may include ending the exemption from sequestration of the salaries of Members of Congress,

by the amounts by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 767.** Ms. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE NATIONAL GUARD YOUTH CHALLENGE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient funds for the National Guard Youth Challenge Program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 768.** Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF CERTAIN AIR TRANSPORTATION SERVICES TO TRAVELERS RESIDING IN THE CONTIGUOUS UNITED STATES AND NOT SERVED BY THE ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to outreach and the delivery of Department of Homeland Security programs and services to travelers residing in the contiguous United States and not served by the essential air service program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 769.** Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S.

Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FISH.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the labeling of genetically engineered fish, without raising new revenue, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 770.** Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. KING, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF ARCTIC POLAR ICEBREAKERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the construction of Arctic polar icebreakers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 771.** Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT USE OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS FOR FIRST CLASS AIRPLANE TRAVEL BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions,

amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting use of taxpayer dollars for first class airplane travel by Members of Congress by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 772.** Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE PUBLIC COMMENTS ARE UTILIZED MORE EFFECTIVELY IN THE FEDERAL RULEMAKING PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring public comments are utilized more effectively in the Federal rulemaking process by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 773.** Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT TAXPAYERS BY REFORMING THE ALLOWANCE AND PERKS AVAILABLE TO FORMER PRESIDENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting taxpayers by reforming the allowance and perks available to former Presidents by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 774.** Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for



fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL SPECTRUM FOR COMMERCIAL WIRELESS SERVICES, INCLUDING UNLICENSED WI-FI.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the availability of Federal spectrum for commercial wireless services, including unlicensed Wi-Fi, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 775.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE IMPOSITION OF NEW SANCTIONS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN BECAUSE OF THAT GOVERNMENT'S SUPPORT FOR TERRORISM AND ITS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES AGAINST THE PEOPLE OF IRAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the imposition of new sanctions against the Government of Iran because of that Government's support for terrorism and its human rights abuses against the people of Iran, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 776.** Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT THE EXCLUSION OF INDIVIDUALS FROM SERVICE ON A FEDERAL JURY ON ACCOUNT OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION OR GENDER IDENTITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to jury selection in the Federal judiciary, which may include the prevention of discrimination of jurors on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 777.** Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CUTTING CARBON POLLUTION TO PREVENT HUMAN-INDUCED CLIMATE CHANGE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting Americans from the impacts of human-induced climate change, which may include action on policies that reduce emissions by the amounts that the scientific community says are needed to avert catastrophic climate change, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 778.** Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PATENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to the constitutional requirement that patents "promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts" by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 779.** Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENACT A TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS AND PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROTECTIONS FOR TAXPAYERS AGAINST ABUSES BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to enacting a taxpayer bill of rights and providing additional protections for taxpayers against abuses by the Internal Revenue Service, which may include reducing the compliance burden on taxpayers, strengthening the appeals process for taxpayers, increasing penalties on agents of the Internal Revenue Service who are found to have violated the law, and improving taxpayer access to the judicial system, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 780.** Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING THE BACKLOG OF SEXUAL ASSAULT EVIDENCE KITS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to eliminating the backlog of sexual assault evidence kits, which may include auditing the hidden backlog of untested sexual assault kits and ensuring that the collection and processing of DNA evidence by law enforcement agencies from crimes is carried out in an appropriate and timely manner, by the amounts provided in such legislation for



that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 781.** Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AND CERTAIN UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES AND INCREASING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR ISRAEL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing assistance for the United Nations Human Rights Council, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, and the Palestinian Authority because of these entities' anti-Israel behavior, and increasing foreign assistance for missile defense programs in Israel, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 782.** Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXTENDING THE HEALTH CARE TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extending the health care tax credit for workers who have lost their jobs or pensions through no fault of their own, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 783.** Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. WYDEN)

submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANSION OF THE EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT AND THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to expansion of the earned income tax credit for childless workers and adjustment for inflation of the child tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 784.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING A NATIONAL NETWORK FOR MANUFACTURING INNOVATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to accelerating the development and deployment of advanced manufacturing technologies, advancing competitiveness, improving the speed and infrastructure with which small and medium-sized enterprises and supply chains commercialize new processes and technologies, and informing industry-driven education and training, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 785.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT NO FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FUNDS ARE USED FOR MARKETING ACTIVITIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that no Federal financial aid funds are used for marketing activities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 786.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE 12-MONTHS OF CONTINUOUS ENROLLMENT IN MEDICAID AND THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing 12-months of continuous enrollment to all beneficiaries in Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program and performance bonuses to States that excel in enrollment, retention, and continuity of enrollment for such beneficiaries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 787.** Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ESTABLISH THE PRIORITIZATION OF CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION (CHGME) AS A PROVEN MEANS TO IMPLEMENT THE DEVELOPMENT OF A ROBUST PEDIATRIC MEDICAL WORKFORCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that pediatric medical residency training programs produce a strong physician workforce equipped to meet the needs of pediatric patients and hospitals, in rural and urban America, and in general pediatrics and specialty areas, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 788.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING SUFFICIENT TRADE ENFORCEMENT RESOURCES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing robust funding for the Enforcement and Compliance Unit of the International Trade Administration for the purposes of ensuring adequate resources to investigate antidumping and countervailing duty cases brought by petitioners from the United States that are facing unfairly traded imports by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 789.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING MISCLASSIFICATION OF WORKERS AS INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting workers from being misclassified as independent contractors to ensure that such workers have access to safeguards provided to employees, including fair labor standards under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), health and safety protections under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.), and unemployment and workers' compensation benefits under appli-

cable Federal law, and preventing employers from misclassifying workers as independent contractors to avoid paying their fair share of taxes under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 790.** Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD ALLOCATE ANY SAVINGS ACHIEVED THROUGH SPENDING CUTS OR NEW REVENUE THAT ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR ANY PURPOSE OTHER THAN DEFICIT REDUCTION OR INVESTMENT IN THE NATION'S INFRASTRUCTURE.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would allocate any savings achieved through spending cuts or new revenue that are not included in this resolution for any purpose other than deficit reduction or investment in the Nation's infrastructure.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 791.** Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

Strike title II.

**SA 792.** Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A NEW OUTCOME-BASED PROCESS FOR AUTHORIZING INNOVATIVE HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting innovation in higher education, which may include establishing a new outcome-based process for authorizing innovative higher education providers to participate in programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 793.** Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONSTRUCTION OF NATIVE AMERICAN SCHOOLS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to construction of Native American schools, which may include replacement school construction that replaces the entirety or majority of a school campus or replacement facility construction that replaces individual buildings that are beyond cost-effective repair measures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 794.** Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. BURR, and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING THE ABILITY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO RESPOND TO ACCUSATIONS OF UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES, WHICH MAY INCLUDE CURRENCY UNDERVALUATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening the ability of the Department of Commerce to respond to accusations of unfair trade practices, which may include currency undervaluation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 795.** Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING FEDERAL PERMITTING FOR MANUFACTURING AND ENERGY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS RELATING TO NATIONAL PRIMARY OR SECONDARY AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARD FOR OZONE LOWER THAN A CERTAIN EXISTING STANDARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the regulation by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency of the national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for ozone, which may include a prohibition on withholding Federal permits for manufacturing and energy construction projects in States that are in nonattainment with the most recent effective ozone national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 796.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SAVING MEDICARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which may include the creation of a point of order against legislation that accelerates the insolvency of such Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which may include the creation of a point of order against legislation that accelerates the insolvency of such Trust Fund, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 797.** Mrs. FISCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING HEADQUARTERS STAFF IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing headquarters staff in the Department of Defense in accordance with current Department goals by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 798.** Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO ALLOW AMERICANS TO EARN PAID SICK TIME.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efforts to improve workplace benefits and reduce health care costs, which may include measures to allow Americans to earn paid sick time to address their own health needs and the health needs of their families, and to promote equal employment opportunities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 799.** Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FUNDING FOR PROGRAMS RELATED TO GOVERNING JUSTLY AND DEMOCRATICALLY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Governing Justly and Democratically (GJD) programs, which establishes a funding floor and may include increasing United States contributions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 800.** Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO CRUDE-BY-RAIL SAFETY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the safe movement of crude oil by rail, which may include—

- (1) strengthening design standards for rail tank cars;
- (2) rapidly phasing out the legacy rail tank car fleet for crude-by-rail operations;
- (3) improving railroad operations to reduce derailments;
- (4) limiting the volatility of crude oil shipped by rail;
- (5) disclosing crude-by-rail train movements to States and first responders; or
- (6) increasing resources that provide for the training and equipping of first responders to respond to worst-case accidents, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 801.** Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr.

KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$10,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$12,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$12,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$8,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$10,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$12,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$12,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$13,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$37,144,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$84,095,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$2,228,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$2,515,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$2,403,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$2,173,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,884,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,520,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,119,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$765,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$19,643,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$60,080,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$27,386,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$10,946,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$6,197,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$5,117,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$3,073,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,520,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$1,119,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$765,000,000.

On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$11,643,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$50,080,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$15,386,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, decrease the amount by \$1,054,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, decrease the amount by \$6,803,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by \$7,883,000,000.

On page 7, line 13, decrease the amount by \$9,927,000,000.

On page 7, line 14, decrease the amount by \$11,480,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, decrease the amount by \$11,881,000,000.

On page 7, line 16, decrease the amount by \$12,235,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$11,643,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$61,723,000,000.

On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$77,109,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$76,055,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$69,252,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$61,369,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$51,442,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$39,962,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$28,081,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, increase the amount by \$15,846,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$11,643,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$61,723,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$77,109,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$76,055,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$69,252,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$61,369,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$51,442,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$39,962,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$28,081,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, increase the amount by \$15,846,000,000.

On page 14, line 6, increase the amount by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 14, line 7, increase the amount by \$23,495,000,000.

On page 14, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,696,000,000.

On page 14, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,960,000,000.

On page 14, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,369,000,000.

On page 14, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,073,000,000.

On page 15, line 3, increase the amount by \$407,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$144,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$144,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,095,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,095,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$2,228,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$2,228,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$2,515,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,515,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$2,403,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,403,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$2,173,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$2,173,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$1,884,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,884,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,520,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,520,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,119,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,119,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by \$765,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by \$765,000,000.

On page 43, line 19, increase the amount by \$37,000,000,000.

On page 43, line 20, increase the amount by \$19,499,000,000.

On page 43, line 23, increase the amount by \$46,000,000,000.

On page 43, line 24, increase the amount by \$35,490,000,000.

On page 44, line 3, increase the amount by \$17,462,000,000.

On page 44, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,471,000,000.

On page 44, line 11, increase the amount by \$2,425,000,000.

On page 44, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,871,000,000.

On page 44, line 19, increase the amount by \$782,000,000.

At the appropriate place insert the following:

#### SEC. \_\_\_\_ . ADJUSTMENTS FOR SEQUESTRATION REPLACEMENT.

(a) MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTING INCREASE IN DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.—If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the adjustments to discretionary spending limits under section 251(b) of that Act, or the enforcement procedures established under section 251A of that Act, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure, up to the amounts specified and reserved in subsection (b).

(b) AMOUNTS SPECIFIED AND RESERVED.—The amounts specified in this subsection (and to be reserved from the 302(a) allocation of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations until such time as the conditions specified in subsection (a) are met) are—

(1) for fiscal year 2016—

(A) for the revised security category, \$37,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays flowing therefrom); and

(B) for the revised nonsecurity category, \$37,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays flowing therefrom); and

(2) for fiscal year 2017—

(A) for the revised security category, \$37,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays flowing therefrom); and

(B) for the revised nonsecurity category, \$37,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays flowing therefrom).

At the appropriate place insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REVISE OR REPEAL SEQUESTRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that amend section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or the enforcement procedures under section 251A of that Act to revise or repeal the discretionary spending limits and enforcement procedures established under those sections, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025. For purposes of determining deficit-neutrality under this section, the Chairman may include the estimated effects of any amendment or amendments to the discretionary spending limits.

**SA 802.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$8,800,000,000.

**SA 803.** Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 56, line 16, insert after “United States” the following: “, including programs that expedite the deployment of broadband to rural areas.”.

**SA 804.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STUDENT LOANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the servicing and collection of private and Federal student loan debt, which may include ensuring that borrowers are treated fairly, that borrowers' account balances and payments are accurate, and that servicers and debt collectors are held accountable by the Department of Education or the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 805.** Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. VITTER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE SALE OF SENIOR PREFERRED STOCK OF FANNIE MAE AND FREDDIE MAC BY THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF CONGRESS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Congress determining the resolution of each enterprise, which may include preventing the Secretary of the Treasury from selling, transferring, or otherwise disposing of any outstanding shares acquired pursuant to the Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement without the consent of Congress, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section—  
(1) the term “enterprise” has the same meaning as in section 1303 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992; and

(2) the term “Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement” means—

(A) the Amended and Restated Senior Preferred Stock Purchase Agreement, dated September 26, 2008, as such Agreement has been amended on May 6, 2009, December 24, 2009, and August 17, 2012, respectively, and as such Agreement may be further amended and restated, entered into between the Department of the Treasury and each enterprise, as applicable; and

(B) any provision of any certificate in connection with such Agreement creating or designating the terms, powers, preferences,

privileges, limitations, or any other conditions of the Variable Liquidation Preference Senior Preferred Stock of an enterprise issued or sold pursuant to such Agreement.

**SA 806.** Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title IV, insert the following:

**SEC. 4 \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING FEDERAL FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR PROCESSING NATURALIZATION APPLICATIONS TO BE USED FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSE.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate) that would permit the Secretary of Homeland Security or any other Federal official to use funds appropriated to process and adjudicate applications for naturalization for any other purpose.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 807.** Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4 \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST USING CERTAIN FUNDS TO PROCESS APPLICATIONS FOR IMMIGRATION BENEFITS.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives) that would permit the Secretary of Homeland Security or any other Federal official to use funds to process and adjudicate immigration benefit applications for any other purpose other than to process and adjudicate that same type of immigration benefit application.

(b) **IMMIGRATION BENEFIT APPLICATION.**—In this section, the term “immigration benefit application” means any application or petition to confer, certify, change, adjust, or extend any status granted under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(c) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate

only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 808.** Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PERMANENTLY EXTEND THE INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT AND TO ESTABLISH RULES FOR TAXATION OF DIGITAL GOODS AND SERVICES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining and enhancing protections against multiple and discriminatory taxation of the Internet, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 809.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE STUDENTS' RIGHT TO PRIVACY OF EDUCATIONAL RECORDS BY ENSURING PARENTAL CONSENT OF RECORDS RELEASE IN ALL CASES AND PROHIBITING COLLECTION OF PSYCHOLOGICAL OR BEHAVIORAL DATA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to restoring students' right to privacy of educational records by developing methods to ensure parental consent of records release in all cases and prohibiting the collection of psychological or behavioral data by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 810.** Ms. COLLINS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION FOR LOW-INCOME AMERICANS THROUGH THE FEDERAL PELL GRANT PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing access to higher education for low-income Americans through the Federal Pell Grant program, which may include allowing for 1 or more additional payment periods during the same award year, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 811.** Mr. VITTER proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING WASHINGTON'S ILLEGAL EXEMPTION FROM THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to developing methods that ensure that all Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, and all political appointees of the Administration procure their health insurance on the individual exchange in the same way as Americans at the same income level, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 812.** Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADVANCE WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE INTO THE 21ST CENTURY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving women's healthcare services, which may include measures to—

(1) expand comprehensive preventive services, including full access to contraceptive coverage for all women;

(2) invest in access to women's primary care by investing in nurse practitioners and other health care providers;

(3) improve maternal safety and quality of care;

(4) provide compassionate assistance through emergency contraception and awareness for survivors of rape; or

(5) ensure that women have access, awareness, and are provided the full range of preventive services, including contraception, breast cancer screenings, mammograms, domestic violence screenings and counseling, and more as provided for by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 813.** Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY OF FOR-PROFIT COLLEGES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving oversight and accountability of for-profit institutions of higher education, which may include establishing a Federal interagency task force to better coordinate oversight activities related to for-profit institutions of higher education or providing better consumer information to parents and students seeking postsecondary education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 814.** Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary



levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING EXPLOITATION OF VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS SEEKING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing exploitation of veterans and servicemembers seeking postsecondary education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 815.** Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO PROHIBITING INVERTED CORPORATIONS FROM AVOIDING UNITED STATES TAXES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing certain corporations from avoiding United States taxes, which may include reforming the definition of an inverted corporation under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or preventing earnings stripping, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 816.** Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT CERTAIN CORPORATIONS FROM PROFITING FROM GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing certain corporations from profiting from Federal government contracts, which may include revising the definition of an inverted corporation or identifying corporations that were previously located in the United States and are now located in Bermuda or the Cayman Islands, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 817.** Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. REED) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE TAX BENEFITS TO PATRIOT EMPLOYERS THAT INVEST IN AMERICAN JOBS AND PROVIDE FAIR PAY AND BENEFITS TO WORKERS AND TO ELIMINATE TAX BENEFITS FOR CORPORATIONS THAT SHIP JOBS OR PROFITS OVERSEAS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to income taxes paid by businesses, which may include measures providing tax breaks for companies that have not inverted, have maintained or expanded their United States workforce, or have provided livable wages and health care, and may also include measures ending tax breaks that encourage businesses to ship jobs offshore, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 818.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FUNDING FOR THE OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which may include activities to limit the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 819.** Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. ALEXANDER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REPEAL OF THE EXTENSION OF THE WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the wind production tax credit, which may include the repeal of any extension of the credit to any period of calendar year 2014 before December 14, 2014, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 820.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING FUNDING FOR THE DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to minimizing wasteful spending by the Department of Defense, which may include prohibiting funding for the Defense Rapid Innovation Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.



**SA 821.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE FOREST SERVICE FROM FINALIZING AND IMPLEMENTING A CERTAIN PROPOSED GROUNDWATER DIRECTIVE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to State regulation of groundwater resources, which may include prohibiting the Forest Service from finalizing and implementing the proposed directive of the Forest Service entitled "Proposed Directive on Groundwater Resource Management, Forest Service Manual 2560" (79 Fed. Reg. 25815 (May 6, 2014)) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 822.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 81, line 12, strike "or".

On page 81, line 15, insert "or" at the end.

On page 81, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(4) the reduction of duplicative Federal green building programs;

**SA 823.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING GAO RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONSOLIDATE FINANCIAL LITERACY PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to reducing duplication in Federal programs, which may include implementing the recommendations of the Government Accountability Office to consolidate financial literacy programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 824.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TRANSPARENCY IN THE FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing transparency in the Federal crop insurance program, which may include the disclosure of the names of recipients of Federal subsidy payments for crop insurance premiums, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 825.** Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 54, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(6) vocational programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include legislation that improves vocational rehabilitation and counseling for veterans with service-connected disabilities and members of the Armed Forces with severe injuries or illness;

(7) improving research at the Department of Veterans Affairs, which may include legislation that expands research on post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, or toxic exposures;

(8) improving the delivery of health care and benefits to veterans or members of the Armed Forces, which may include legislation that improves delivery of health care and benefits to victims of military sexual trauma;

(9) improving the delivery of care and benefits to veterans, which may include legislation that enhances oversight and investigations by the Department of Veterans Affairs Office of Inspector General;

(10) maintaining and enhancing access, choice, and accountability in veterans care through the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146);

**SA 826.** Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CHANGES TO THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which may include repeal of the annual fee on health insurance providers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 827.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING THE FEDERAL REGULATORY PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) creating an effective mechanism for the review of the existing Federal regulatory burden to identify rules for repeal or modification that—

(A) impose paperwork burdens that could be reduced substantially without significantly diminishing regulatory effectiveness;

(B) impose disproportionately high costs on small businesses;

(C) could be strengthened in their effectiveness while reducing regulatory costs;

(D) have been rendered obsolete by technological or market changes;

(E) have achieved their goals and can be repealed without target problems recurring;

(F) impose the greatest opportunity costs in terms of economic growth;

(G) are ineffective;

(H) overlap, duplicate, or conflict with other Federal regulations or with State or local regulations; or

(I) impose costs that are not justified by benefits produced for society within the United States;

(2) reforming the process by which new regulations are made by Federal agencies, including independent agencies, for the purposes of—

(A) prioritizing early public outreach in the rulemaking process;

(B) ensuring the use of the best available scientific, economic, and technical data;

(C) preventing the misuse of guidance documents to skirt public input;

(D) ensuring the use of best practices for regulatory analysis, including cost-benefit analysis, into each step of the rulemaking process;

(E) facilitating the adoption by Federal agencies of the least costly regulatory alternative that would achieve the goals of the statutory authorization;

(F) ensuring more careful consideration of proposed high-cost rules;

(G) ensuring effective oversight of the Federal regulatory program, including independent regulatory commissions, by the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs;

(H) improving the consideration of adverse impacts on small businesses;

(I) providing greater transparency in the rulemaking process; and

(J) improving compliance with section 515 of the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106-554; 114 Stat. 2736A-153) (commonly known as the “Information Quality Act”), the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1501 et seq.), and chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Regulatory Flexibility Act”);

(3) enhancing accountability by facilitating fair and effective judicial review of agency actions; and

(4) ensuring that Congress can effectively exercise its appropriate role in the regulatory process through legislation and oversight;

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 828.** Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$6,772,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,408,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$9,762,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$10,362,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$10,958,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$11,280,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$11,901,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$12,540,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$13,212,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$13,814,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$6,285,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,615,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$9,741,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$10,224,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$10,829,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$11,373,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$11,787,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$12,425,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$13,096,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$13,694,000,000.

On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$6,285,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,615,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$9,741,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by \$10,224,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, increase the amount by \$10,829,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, increase the amount by \$11,373,000,000.

On page 7, line 13, increase the amount by \$11,787,000,000.

On page 7, line 14, increase the amount by \$12,425,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, increase the amount by \$13,096,000,000.

On page 7, line 16, increase the amount by \$13,694,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$6,285,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$13,900,000,000.

On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$23,641,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$33,865,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$44,694,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$56,067,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$67,854,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$80,279,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$93,375,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, increase the amount by \$107,069,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$6,285,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$13,900,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$23,641,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$33,865,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$44,694,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$56,067,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$67,854,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$80,279,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$93,375,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, increase the amount by \$107,069,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$6,695,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$6,207,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by \$9,144,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,350,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$9,140,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$9,118,000,000.

On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,329,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$9,191,000,000.

On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$9,504,000,000.

On page 29, line 12, increase the amount by \$9,374,000,000.

On page 29, line 15, increase the amount by \$9,374,000,000.

On page 29, line 16, increase the amount by \$9,467,000,000.

On page 29, line 19, increase the amount by \$9,534,000,000.

On page 29, line 20, increase the amount by \$9,419,000,000.

On page 29, line 23, increase the amount by \$9,689,000,000.

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$9,574,000,000.

On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by \$9,848,000,000.

On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by \$9,731,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$10,009,000,000.

On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$9,889,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$78,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$78,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$265,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$265,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$623,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$623,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,033,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,033,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$1,455,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,455,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$1,906,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,906,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,368,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,368,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,851,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$2,851,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,365,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$3,365,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,805,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by \$3,805,000,000.

**SA 829.** Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY) submitted an amendment

intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAINTAINING THE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES NATURAL GAS PIPELINE SYSTEM WITH RESPECT TO PHYSICAL DAMAGES OR CYBER SECURITY-RELATED IMPACTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to maintaining the critical infrastructure security of the United States natural gas pipeline system with respect to physical damages or cyber security-related impacts, which may include compromise from geologic and weather-related events, or from a physical terrorist attack, or cyber security threats and impacts to related computer systems, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 830.** Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO RESEARCHING HEALTH CONDITIONS OF THE DESCENDANTS OF VETERANS EXPOSED TO TOXIC SUBSTANCES DURING SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to researching health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 831.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary

levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ATTENDANCE AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to encouraging institutions of higher education to make college more affordable by reducing the cost of attendance for students and families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 832.** Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CONTRACEPTIVE COVERAGE FOR TRICARE BENEFICIARIES, INCLUDING EMERGENCY CONTRACEPTION FOR WOMEN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving TRICARE contraceptive coverage, which may include legislation that provides no-cost coverage of all contraceptive methods approved by the Food and Drug Administration, including long-acting reversible contraceptives and emergency contraception, provides contraception education and counseling, and ensures emergency contraception is offered to all women members of the Armed Forces who are sexual assault survivors at all military treatment facilities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 833.** Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF STATE AND LOCAL ECONOMIES FROM DROUGHT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing to States and units of local government emergency financial assistance for responding to the impacts of human-induced climate change, including extreme and exceptional drought events, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 834.** Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE OF STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing to States and units of local governments emergency financial assistance to respond to the public health impacts of human-induced climate change, including injury and death from extreme weather events and natural disasters, increases in climate-sensitive infectious diseases, increases in air pollution-related illness, and more heat-related, potentially fatal illness, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 835.** Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO OFFSETTING THE COST OF OPERATIONS AGAINST THE ISLAMIC STATE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to funding for overseas contingency operations, which may include legislation that would establish a temporary surtax, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 836.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REGULATION BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY OF GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the regulation by the Environmental Protection Agency of greenhouse gas emissions, which may include a prohibition on withholding highway funds from States that refuse to submit State Implementation Plans required under the Clean Power Plan of the Agency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 837.** Mr. ALEXANDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE PRIVACY RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the rights of employees to protect their private personal information from labor organizations by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 838.** Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to initiatives to sell or transfer to, or exchange with, a State or local government any Federal land that is not within the boundaries of a National Park, National Preserve, or National Monument, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 839.** Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 352. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING UNITED STATES CITIZENS HELD HOSTAGE IN THE UNITED STATES EMBASSY IN TEHRAN, IRAN, BETWEEN NOVEMBER 3, 1979, AND JANUARY 20, 1981.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting United States citizens held hostage in the United States embassy in Tehran, Iran, between November 3, 1979, and January 20, 1981, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 840.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES TO BE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION RELATED TO DOJ PROFILING GUIDANCE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing funding for State and local law enforcement agencies that receive Federal funds to be used for data collection related to profiling guidance issued by the Department of Justice by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 841.** Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVISION OF EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO VETERANS WHO SERVED IN THE RESERVES IN AFGHANISTAN OR IRAQ.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Veterans Benefits Administration, for the purpose of providing educational assistance that is on par with active duty veterans for veterans who served in a reserve component of the Armed Forces in Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation New Dawn, or any other contingency operation (as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code), who did not serve an aggregate of at least 24 months on active duty in the Armed Forces (excluding service in entry level and skill training), and who are currently not entitled to full educational assistance under section 3311 of title 38, United States Code, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 842.** Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND  
RELATING TO CONSUMER FINAN-  
CIAL PROTECTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to consumer financial protection, which may include measures ensuring that the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection has authority and autonomy to continue to protect consumers from predatory lending, misleading or abusive behavior in the financial marketplace, or other unscrupulous practices, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 843.** Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND  
RELATING TO REDUCING THE COST  
OF ATTENDANCE AT AN INSTITU-  
TION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND  
ENSURING THAT STUDENTS CAN AF-  
FORD TO PAY BACK STUDENT LOANS  
BY AVOIDING NEW MANDATES THAT  
STUDENTS PAY INTEREST.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the cost of attending an institution of higher education and ensuring that students who graduate can afford to pay back their student loans, which may include avoiding new mandates that students pay interest on Stafford loans while attending an institution of higher education by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 844.** Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND  
RELATING TO REDUCING THE COST  
OF ATTENDANCE AT AN INSTITU-  
TION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND  
ENSURING THAT STUDENTS CAN AF-  
FORD TO PAY BACK STUDENT LOANS  
BY AVOIDING CUTS IN FEDERAL  
PELL GRANTS AND NEW MANDATES  
THAT STUDENTS PAY INTEREST ON  
LOANS WHILE IN SCHOOL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the cost of attending an institution of higher education and ensuring that students who graduate can afford to pay back their student loans, which may include avoiding new mandates that students pay interest on Stafford loans while attending an institution of higher education or avoiding cuts to Federal Pell Grants that result in increased debt for students and families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 845.** Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND  
RELATING TO TRADE AGREEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to trade agreements, which may include measures ensuring that trade agreements put United States manufacturers on a level playing field with manufacturers in foreign countries with low environmental and wage standards, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 846.** Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,031,000,000.  
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,776,000,000.  
On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$4,147,000,000.  
On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,479,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,785,000,000.  
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.  
On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$5,404,000,000.  
On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,735,000,000.  
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$6,075,000,000.  
On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$6,387,000,000.  
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.  
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,876,000,000.  
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,577,000,000.  
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,899,000,000.  
On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,195,000,000.  
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,490,000,000.  
On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$4,784,000,000.  
On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.  
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$5,420,000,000.  
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,712,000,000.  
On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.  
On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$2,876,000,000.  
On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,577,000,000.  
On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,899,000,000.  
On page 7, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,195,000,000.  
On page 7, line 12, increase the amount by \$4,490,000,000.  
On page 7, line 13, increase the amount by \$4,784,000,000.  
On page 7, line 14, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.  
On page 7, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,420,000,000.  
On page 7, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,712,000,000.  
On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.  
On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,142,000,000.  
On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,719,000,000.  
On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$11,618,000,000.  
On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$15,813,000,000.  
On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$20,303,000,000.  
On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$25,087,000,000.  
On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$30,182,000,000.  
On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$35,602,000,000.  
On page 8, line 5, increase the amount by \$41,314,000,000.  
On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.  
On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,142,000,000.  
On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,719,000,000.  
On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$11,618,000,000.  
On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$15,813,000,000.  
On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$20,303,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$25,087,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$30,182,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$35,602,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, increase the amount by \$41,314,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,015,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,700,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by \$2,800,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,945,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,375,000,000.

On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,125,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,545,000,000.

On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,270,000,000.

On page 29, line 12, increase the amount by \$3,680,000,000.

On page 29, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,405,000,000.

On page 29, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,800,000,000.

On page 29, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,530,000,000.

On page 29, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,910,000,000.

On page 29, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,665,000,000.

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,025,000,000.

On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,795,000,000.

On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,140,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,925,000,000.

On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,250,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$76,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$76,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$202,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$202,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$354,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$354,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$515,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$515,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$690,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$690,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$874,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$874,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,070,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,070,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,462,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,462,000,000.

**SA 847.** Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. INFORMATION ON SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.**

As part of the annual update to the Budget and Economic Outlook required by section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 602(e)), the Congressional Budget Office shall include—

(1) a report on settlement agreements requiring payments of at least \$1,000,000; and  
(2) a breakdown of the amounts paid under settlement agreements described in paragraph (1) to—

(A) the General Fund of the Treasury;  
(B) a victims compensation fund of a Federal agency;  
(C) a State or local government; or  
(D) a nongovernmental entity.

**SA 848.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE MEDICARE HOME HEALTH FACE-TO-FACE DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Medicare home health face-to-face documentation requirement, which may include legislation that simplifies and streamlines such requirement, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 849.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing the practice of birth tourism and the giving of United States citizenship to children who are born in the United States and do not have a parent who is a United States citizen or a lawful permanent resident of the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 850.** Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING CARRYING OUT EXECUTIVE ACTIONS ANNOUNCED ON NOVEMBER 20 AND 21, 2014 RELATED TO IMMIGRATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting carrying out executive actions announced on November 20 and 21, 2014, related to immigration, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 851.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REIN IN FISHING REGULATIONS AND PROVIDE DISASTER RELIEF FOR FISHERIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reining in onerous regulations on the United States fishing industry or providing assistance for fishery disasters declared by the Secretary of Commerce by the



amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 852.** Ms. AYOTTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING SMALL BUSINESS REGULATORY RELIEF AND PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE REGULATIONS FOR INVESTMENT ADVISORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to alleviating regulatory burdens on small businesses, fostering small business export growth, and preventing duplicative regulations for investment advisors by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 853.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PRESERVE THE INTEGRITY OF COLLEGE ATHLETES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing any group of athletes representing an institution of higher education from being recognized as employees who can form a labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 854.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and

setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPEALING THE LIMITATION ON HEALTH FLEXIBLE SPENDING ARRANGEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing the limitation on health flexible spending arrangements imposed pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 855.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II, add the following:

**SEC. 202. LIMIT ON SENATE CONSIDERATION OF RECONCILIATION.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution reported pursuant to section 201, or an amendment to, conference report on, or amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, which would increase the public debt limit under section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, during the period of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

(b) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(c) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on the point of order raised under this section.

**SA 856.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT THE RECLASSIFICATION OF BROADBAND PROVIDERS AS COMMON CARRIERS UNDER TITLE II OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the openness of the Internet, which may include prohibiting the reclassification of broadband providers as common carriers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 857.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE INVESTIGATION AND RECOVERY OF MISSING WEAPONS AND MILITARY EQUIPMENT PROVIDED TO THE GOVERNMENT OF YEMEN BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the investigation and recovery of missing weapons and military equipment provided to the Government of Yemen by the United States Government to ensure that such items are not in the possession of or used by radical extremist groups operating in the country by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 858.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO LIMITING FUNDS FOR INSTITUTIONS OR ORGANIZATIONS ESTABLISHED BY THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to limiting funds for institutions or organizations established by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea by



the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 859.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CLARIFYING THE DEFINITION OF THE TERM "WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES".**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), which may clarify that the term "navigable waters" means waters of the United States, including the territorial seas that are navigable-in-fact or permanent, or continuously flowing bodies of water that form geographical features commonly known as streams, oceans, rivers, and lakes that are connected to waters that are navigable-in-fact by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 860.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY FROM MAKING RISKY LOANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing Federal agencies from providing direct funding or loan guarantees for energy projects to private entities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 861.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EQUALIZING THE TREATMENT OF ATTORNEY'S FEES UNDER THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973 AND THE EQUAL ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to placing the award of attorney's fees granted by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) under the same conditions found in sections 504 of title 5 and 2412 of title 28, United States Code (commonly known as the "Equal Access to Justice Act"), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 862.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPEALING THE WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing the tax credit for the production of electricity from wind, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 863.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 56, line 21, insert "would not raise new revenue and" after "legislation".

**SA 864.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING AN ACCOUNTING OF TOTAL UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to submit an annual report to Congress that lists all contributions, including in-kind contributions, of the United States Government to the United Nations, its affiliated agencies, and related bodies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 865.** Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STOP THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM FORCING STATES TO PAY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS TO MILLIONAIRES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the payment of unemployment insurance benefits to high-income individuals by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 866.** Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR THE TIGER DISCRETIONARY GRANT PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investments in the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery ("TIGER") discretionary grant program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 867.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT FOR CORPORATIONS TO SECRETLY INFLUENCE ELECTIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to campaign finance reform, including disclosure of campaign spending and the prevention and enforcement of false statements to the Government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 868.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT WOULD CAUSE MILLIONS OF AMERICANS TO LOSE THEIR HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would result in millions of Americans losing their health insurance plans without providing for alternative coverage.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 869.** Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TECHNOLOGY TRANSITIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to technology transfer investment, which may include the creation of a partnership between the Department of Energy and the Small Business Administration or the issuance of a license to a company to operate as a small business investment company that targets technology transfer start-ups, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 870.** Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXTENDING TAX PROVISIONS EXPIRING IN 2013 OR 2014 FOR 2 YEARS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to extending tax provisions that expired in 2013 or 2014 for 2 years, which may include provisions and policies like those contained in the EXPIRE Act of 2014, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 871.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE PROCESS OF EVALUATING AND ADJUDICATING BENEFIT CLAIMS OF SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS AND MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the process of evaluating and adjudicating benefit claims of survivors and dependents of veterans and members of the Armed Forces, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 872.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO EXPANDING AND ENHANCING THE SECURITY OF THE VISA WAIVER PROGRAM TO PROMOTE TRAVEL AND TOURISM TO THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Visa Waiver Program to promote travel and tourism to the United States, which may include the expansion of eligible program countries or the enhancement of the program's security requirements, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 873.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REIMBURSEMENT OF EMERGENCY MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reimbursement of emergency medical care for veterans, which may include reimbursement of veterans who have not received care from the Department of Veterans Affairs in the last 24 months, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 874.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A UNIQUE IDENTIFIER FOR AN INDIVIDUAL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to eliminating the prohibition on the use of appropriated funds to promulgate or adopt any final standard providing for the assignment of a unique health identifier for an individual and to require legislation setting standards for such assignment, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 875.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to permanent extension of the new markets tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 876.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF ALL AMERICANS REGARDLESS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION, RELIGION, RACE, COLOR, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal agencies protect the rights of all Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation, religion, race, color, sex, or national origin, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and Federal law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 877.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING COLLEGE COMPLETION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing college completion, which may include expanding Federal Pell Grant eligibility by allowing college students to use Federal Pell Grants for more than 2 semesters in an academic year by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 878.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INVESTING IN CLEAN ENERGY AND PRESERVING THE ENVIRONMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reduction of the dependence of the United States on imported energy and the investment of receipts from domestic energy production, or energy efficiency and renewable energy development, or new or existing approaches to clean energy financing, or reducing greenhouse gas emissions levels, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 879.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. —. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DENTAL COVERAGE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring dental coverage under all qualified health plans offered under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 880.** Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A STUDENT BORROWER BILL OF RIGHTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving servicing of student loans, which may include requiring additional disclosures for student loan borrowers, timely resolution of errors, a single point of access for Federal student loan borrowers, or a process for borrowers to change their Federal student loan servicer, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 881.** Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING A SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to labor reform, which may include a substantial increase in the minimum wage by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 882.** Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. COTTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF AGRICULTURAL VIRUS OUTBREAKS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the improvement of prevention and treatment measures to mitigate agricul-

tural impacts from an agricultural virus outbreak, such as the impacts seen from the avian influenza outbreak, which may include investments in vaccine development or research in pathway analysis, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 883.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING HEALTH CARE RATIONING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the use of data obtained from comparative effectiveness research to deny coverage of items or services under Federal health programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 884.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING LOCAL FLEXIBILITY IN LOW-INCOME HOUSING AND SUPPORTING LOW-INCOME HOUSING BLOCK GRANT FUNDING BY EXPANDING THE MOVING-TO-WORK PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing local flexibility in low-income housing and supporting low-income housing block grant funding by expanding the Moving-to-Work program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 885.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESSES AND ASPIRING ENTREPRENEURS THROUGH SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing technical assistance to small businesses and aspiring entrepreneurs through small business development centers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 886.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY AT THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports to ensure accountability and transparency at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 887.** Mr. HOEVEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STREAMLINE ENERGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would reform permitting processes to promote energy security, reduce natural gas flaring, and increase job creation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 888.** Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING TERRORISTS FROM OBTAINING FIREARMS OR EXPLOSIVES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preventing terrorism, including by denying the transfer of a firearm or explosive to a terrorist, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 889.** Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING COMMUNITY RELATIONS WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to community policing, which may include increasing the number of law enforcement officers who walk patrols that enable them to interact and build relationships with community members, increasing and improving training for law enforcement officers, encouraging the use of body cameras by law enforcement officers, encouraging law enforcement to de-escalate confrontations whenever feasible, and ensuring that prosecutions of law enforcement officers are fair and impartial, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of

fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 890.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 71, beginning on line 4, strike “and” and all that follows through “(3)” on line 5, and insert the following:

(3) for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak); and

(4)

**SA 891.** Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADDRESSING THE INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS OF PASSENGER RAIL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to investments benefiting the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, including funding for capital needs of the intercity passenger rail network and the Corporation, which may include state of good repair, safety improvements, and other capital projects necessary to maintain and expand current service levels and improve key performance metrics of the Nation's intercity passenger rail provider, which helps connect communities across the Nation and support regional economic development, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 892.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE SYSTEMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the impacts of climate change on the safety and reliability of the critical infrastructure systems of the United States, which include tangible economic costs that are likely to increase over time or can be mitigated by planning and actions taken now, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 893.** Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. DONNELLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO DIABETES RESEARCH, TREATMENT, AND PREVENTION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to diabetes, which may include diabetes research, treatment, prevention, or other programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 894.** Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FUNDING TO THE GLOBAL FUND.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to sustaining funding to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria at fiscal year 2015 enacted levels, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 895.** Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST BUDGET RESOLUTIONS THAT SUPPORT CUTTING OVER \$1,000,000,000,000 IN SPENDING WITHOUT IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC PROGRAMMATIC EFFECTS.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget that would reduce new budget authority or outlays during the fiscal years covered under the resolution by more than \$1,000,000,000,000 (as compared to the fiscal year before the budget year for the resolution) unless the committee print accompanying the resolution identifies the specific programmatic effects proposed to meet the recommended levels and amounts in the resolution.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 896.** Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING THE SAFETY OF OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the safety of offshore oil drilling in the United States, which may include changes to existing law to increase the liability cap with respect to offshore oil spills, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 897.** Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING CONSUMERS IN THE UNITED STATES FROM PRICE INCREASES DUE TO LARGE-SCALE NATURAL GAS EXPORTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting consumers and businesses in the United States from price increases or other impacts of large-scale natural gas exports, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 898.** Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ADDRESS CYBERSTALKING AND ONLINE HARASSMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing cyberstalking and online harassment, including the nonconsensual disclosure of sexually explicit images and videos, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 899.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE IMPORTANCE OF FINANCIAL LITERACY EDUCATION TO ALLOW INDIVIDUALS TO MAKE INFORMED AND EFFECTIVE DECISIONS WITH THEIR FINANCIAL RESOURCES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to financial literacy education,

which may include improvements to financial literacy education curricula in schools or which may improve the capacity of teachers to provide effective financial literacy education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 900.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE IMPORTANCE OF CIVICS AND GOVERNMENT EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to civics and government education, which may include improving instruction in civics and government education or which may improve the capacity of teachers to provide effective civics and government education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 901.** Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF ALL AMERICANS REGARDLESS OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, RELIGION, RACE, COLOR, SEX, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that Federal agencies protect the rights of all Americans, regardless of their sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, race, color, sex, or national origin, in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and Federal law, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.



**SA 902.** Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AUTHORIZING CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR HEALTH CARE UNDER LAWS ADMINISTERED BY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO RETAIN SUCH ELIGIBILITY UNTIL AGE 26.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to authorizing children who are eligible to receive health care furnished under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to retain such eligibility until age 26, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 903.** Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TEMPORARY PAYMENT OF DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION OR DEATH PENSION UPON DEATH OF A VETERAN.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to temporary payment of dependency and indemnity compensation or death pension upon the death of veterans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 904.** Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the Federal workforce, which may include the provision of additional sick leave to disabled veterans employed by the Federal Government, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 905.** Mr. TESTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO VETERANS HEALTH CARE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to veterans health care, which may include efforts to enhance access to care for rural veterans, to address medical workforce shortages of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and to invest in new facilities in rural areas, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 906.** Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN PRECISION MEDICINE AND BIOMEDICAL INNOVATION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investments in precision medicine and biomedical innovation, which may include biomedical research, creation of a national research cohort, or regulatory

modernization, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 907.** Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EFFECTIVE FEDERAL MANAGEMENT OF THE GRAY WOLF POPULATION IN THE WESTERN GREAT LAKES REGION.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the effective Federal management of the gray wolf population in the western Great Lakes region, which may include providing resources to Wildlife Services of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, to resolve conflicts caused by gray wolves by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 908.** Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_.** DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORT FOR THE IMPROVEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT OF THE CAPABILITIES OF THE ARMED FORCES TO PREVENT AND RESPOND TO SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE ARMED FORCES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to support for the improvement and enhancement of the capabilities of the Armed Forces to prevent and respond to sexual assault and sexual harassment in the Armed Forces, which may include the collection and retention of records to improve tracking and review of sexual assault claims in the Armed Forces, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes,



provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 909.** Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. RISC) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESERVING FUNDING FOR STATES TO DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN RECREATIONAL TRAILS AND TRAIL-RELATED FACILITIES FOR MOTORIZED AND NON-MOTORIZED RECREATIONAL TRAIL USES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving funding for States to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for motorized and non-motorized recreational trail uses by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 910.** Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ADVANCING INNOVATIONS IN LIFE SAVING TECHNOLOGIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to advancing innovations in life saving technologies which may include investment in innovative technologies at public safety answering points, including next-generation 911 technologies, or investing in such technologies, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 911.** Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE OUTDOOR ECONOMY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the outdoor economy, which may include efforts to produce economic data to accurately measure the economic benefits of public land and outdoor space in the United States or provide support for the Centennial of the National Park Service, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 912.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PERMANENTLY REFORMING EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAMS, INCLUDING THE EXTENDED BENEFIT PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE EXHAUSTED THEIR REGULAR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION DURING ECONOMIC DOWNTURNS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a permanent extended unemployment compensation program and reforming the Extended Benefits program for individuals who have exhausted their regular unemployment compensation during economic downturns by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 913.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENDING OFFSHORE TAX ABUSES BY LARGE CORPORATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to corporate income taxes, which may include measures to end offshore tax abuses used by large corporations, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 914.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT THE FEDERAL PELL GRANT MAXIMUM KEEPS PACE WITH INFLATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the maximum Federal Pell Grant award is adjusted for inflation by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 915.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING THE COSTS TO BORROWERS IN THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the cost to borrowers of Federal education loans made to students or on behalf of students, including a switch to fair value accounting rules.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 916.** Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 TO ESTABLISH ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR RESOURCE EQUITY.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require State and local educational agency accountability for providing fair, equitable, and adequate access for all students to the core resources for learning, which may include high-quality instruction teams, rigorous academic standards, appropriate class sizes, and effective school library programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 917.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FOR AN ADDITIONAL YEAR OF FEDERAL FUNDING FOR SHORT-TIME COMPENSATION PROGRAMS, WHICH PREVENT LAYOFFS AND KEEP AMERICANS EMPLOYED.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing for an additional year of Federal funding for short-time compensation programs, which prevent layoffs and keep Americans employed, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would

not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 918.** Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KING, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 81, line 10, insert before the semicolon “, which may include weatherization and energy efficiency retrofit programs for low-income individuals”.

On page 81, line 12, insert before the semicolon “, which may include seasonal assistance, crisis fuel assistance, or other assistance to low-income individuals”.

**SA 919.** Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING DEDUCTIONS FOR CORPORATE COMPENSATION IN EXCESS OF \$1,000,000.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to excessive subsidization in the tax code of corporate compensation, which may include eliminating deductions for corporate compensation in excess of \$1,000,000, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 920.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING THE GEOGRAPHIC IMBALANCE IN FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDING AND IMPROVING RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE AND CAPACITY THROUGHOUT THE STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving research infrastructure and capacity in all States through the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, which may include support for States and jurisdictions which are historically underserved by Federal research and development funding, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 921.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prescription drug costs under the Medicare program, which may include making prescription drugs more affordable for seniors and for taxpayers by requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate prescription drug costs under the Medicare program, particularly with inverted corporations that benefit from Medicare program reimbursements, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 922.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 101, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 105, line 8.

**SA 923.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING NEGATIVE SUBSIDIES IN THE FEDERAL STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM AND REDUCING COSTS FOR BORROWERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Federal student loan programs to eliminate negative subsidies and reduce costs for borrowers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 924.** Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 104, line 9, insert “, including fraud, waste, abuse, and crime resulting from legislative deregulation and Government costs of responding to such results” before the period.

**SA 925.** Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE UNITED STATES CIVIL COURTS SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the United States civil courts system, including improvements to civil discovery rules that will contribute to the speedy and efficient resolution of disputes while protecting the rights of all litigants to a trial by jury, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 926.** Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THAT VOTING RIGHTS OF CITIZENS ARE NOT DENIED OR ABRIDGED ON ACCOUNT OF RACE, COLOR, OR PREVIOUS CONDITION OF SERVITUDE.**

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 927.** Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO APPROPRIATE AND RESPONSIBLE DIETARY GUIDELINES THAT RECOMMEND LEAN RED MEAT AS A SOURCE OF PROTEIN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the administration and development of dietary guidelines, which may include changes to guidelines to clearly and accurately promote lean red meat as an important source of protein in a healthy diet and prohibition of the use of sustainability as a factor when establishing dietary guidelines, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 928.** Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the

appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO CARBON EMISSIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports related to carbon emissions, which may include prohibitions on Federal taxes or fees imposed on carbon emissions from any product or entity that is a direct or indirect source of emissions, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 929.** Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING MEDICARE ADVANTAGE BY REVERSING OBAMACARE CUTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting Medicare Advantage by reversing Obamacare's massive cuts to the program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 930.** Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PREVENTING TAX INCREASES ON FAMILIES WITH ANNUAL INCOMES UNDER \$250,000.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports

relating to the repeal of any tax increases imposed pursuant to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act that impact families earning less than \$250,000 a year, which may include repealing taxes and fees imposed on the health care industry that may be passed on to consumers in the form of higher health care costs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 931.** Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO STRENGTHENING WATERBORNE COMMERCE IN OUR PORTS AND HARBORS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening waterborne commerce in our ports and harbors, which may include increasing the amounts expended from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund that are dedicated to port infrastructure and maintenance in accordance with section 2101(b) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-121), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 932.** Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A BIENNIAL BUDGET RESOLUTION PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a biennial budget resolution process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or

the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 933.** Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 321 submitted by Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN) and intended to be proposed to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 1, strike line 2 and all that follows through page 2, line 2, and insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ESTABLISHING A BIENNIAL BUDGET RESOLUTION PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to establishing a biennial budget resolution process, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that

**SA 934.** Mr. ROBERTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING MARKETING MATERIALS RELATING TO THE PATIENT PROTECTION AND AFFORDABLE CARE ACT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal spending on health care reform promotional and marketing activities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 935.** Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 13, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 20, line 14, reduce the amount by \$7,280,000.

On page 20, line 17, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 20, line 18, reduce the amount by \$9,520,000.

On page 20, line 21, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 20, line 22, reduce the amount by \$10,640,000.

On page 20, line 25, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 1, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 4, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 5, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 8, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 9, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 12, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 13, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 16, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 17, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 20, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 21, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 24, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

On page 21, line 25, reduce the amount by \$11,200,000.

**SA 936.** Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING PROGRAMS THAT HAVE BEEN EXPIRED FOR MORE THAN 5 YEARS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that appropriates amounts for a program for which the authorizing authority has been expired for more than 5 fiscal years.

(b) POINT OF ORDER; WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, a point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)). A point of order under subsection (a) may be waived in accordance with the procedures under section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)) upon an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members duly chosen and sworn.

**SA 937.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.), which may include prohibiting the Secretary of Agriculture from issuing new exemptions for fiscal year 2016 under section 6(o)(6) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)(6)), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 938.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING THE USE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS FOR THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC SERVICES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting the use of community development block grant funds for the provision of public services (as defined in section 570.201(e) of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 939.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REQUIRING THE SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT TO DRAFT A PLAN TO CONSOLIDATE CERTAIN HOUSING PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring the Secretaries of Agriculture and Housing and Urban Development to draft a plan to consolidate housing assistance provided under sections 502 and 523 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472 and 1490c) and section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 12805 note) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to requiring the Secretaries of Agriculture and Housing and Urban Development to draft a plan to consolidate housing assistance provided under sections 502 and 523 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472 and 1490c) and section 11 of the Housing Opportunity Program Extension Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 12805 note) by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 940.** Mr. PAUL proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 14, line 2, increase the amount by \$76,513,000,000.

On page 14, line 3, increase the amount by \$48,578,000,000.

On page 14, line 6, increase the amount by \$112,990,000,000.

On page 14, line 7, increase the amount by \$87,604,000,000.

On page 14, line 11, increase the amount by \$29,603,000,000.

On page 14, line 15, increase the amount by \$11,863,000,000.

On page 14, line 19, increase the amount by \$6,396,000,000.

On page 14, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,274,000,000.

On page 15, line 19, decrease the amount by \$21,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 20, decrease the amount by \$15,750,000,000.

On page 15, line 23, decrease the amount by \$21,000,000,000.

On page 15, line 24, decrease the amount by \$19,950,000,000.

On page 16, line 3, decrease the amount by \$4,998,000,000.

On page 16, line 7, decrease the amount by \$15,498,000,000.

On page 16, line 11, decrease the amount by \$14,700,000,000.

On page 17, line 12, decrease the amount by \$14,000,000,000.

On page 17, line 13, decrease the amount by \$9,100,000,000.

On page 17, line 16, decrease the amount by \$14,000,000,000.

On page 17, line 17, decrease the amount by \$11,900,000,000.

On page 17, line 21, decrease the amount by \$4,200,000,000.

On page 17, line 25, decrease the amount by \$2,100,000,000.

On page 18, line 4, decrease the amount by \$700,000,000.

On page 20, line 13, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 14, decrease the amount by \$6,500,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, decrease the amount by \$10,000,000,000.

On page 20, line 18, decrease the amount by \$8,500,000,000.

On page 20, line 22, decrease the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 1, decrease the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 21, line 5, decrease the amount by \$500,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, decrease the amount by \$10,920,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, decrease the amount by \$13,720,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, decrease the amount by \$3,080,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, decrease the amount by \$280,000,000.

On page 33, line 19, decrease the amount by \$41,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 20, decrease the amount by \$29,520,000,000.

On page 33, line 23, decrease the amount by \$41,000,000,000.

On page 33, line 24, decrease the amount by \$41,000,000,000.

On page 34, line 3, decrease the amount by \$11,480,000,000.

**SA 941.** Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. REID) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE ACCESS TO PRIMARY CARE FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring adequate access to primary care services furnished under Medicaid through increased Federal payments for primary care services, especially those that are essential for women and children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 942.** Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ARRESTING THE SPREAD OF THE HIV/AIDS EPIDEMIC IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring adequate access to primary care services furnished under Medicaid through increased Federal payments for primary care services, especially those that are essential for women and children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing infectious disease to arrest the spread of the HIV/AIDS epidemic in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 943.** Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING THE INCIDENCE OF DIABETES AMONG PRE-DIABETIC MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing the incidence of diabetes among pre-diabetic Medicare beneficiaries by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 944.** Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST USING TAX DOLLARS TO CENSOR PUBLICLY-FUNDED CLIMATE SCIENCE.**

It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would censor or otherwise limit the ability of any Federal employee or Federal agency to use in official documents or presentations terms common in scientific literature describing atmospheric, climate, weather, or oceanic processes, including terms relevant to changes in the global climate system or other risks to human health, the environment, and the economy related to air pollution.

**SA 945.** Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the

appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, MARITAL STATUS, MILITARY OR VETERAN STATUS, RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, HANDICAP, FAMILIAL STATUS, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN IN HOUSING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting efforts to eliminate discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity, source of income, marital status, military or veteran status, race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin in housing by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 946.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING SUPPORT FOR PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS THAT HELP MAKE SMALL, MEDIUM, AND RURAL MANUFACTURERS MORE COMPETITIVE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing support for public-private partnerships that help make small, medium, and rural manufacturers more competitive by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 947.** Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to small business tax relief, which may include a permanent increase of the section 179 small business expensing allowance to \$1,000,000 or an increase in the investment limitation to \$2,500,000, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 948.** Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROHIBITING FEDERAL AGENCIES FROM IMPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STANDARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prohibiting Federal agencies from making preparations to issue, administer, or implement the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 949.** Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING GREATER DISCRETION TO STATES WITH RESPECT TO INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports



relating to providing States with greater discretion with respect to improving infrastructure, expediting infrastructure project delivery, or reducing unnecessary environmental regulatory delays with respect to infrastructure projects, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 950.** Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. CORKER, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PAUL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. KING, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BURR, Mr. COATS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE RETURN OF CHILDREN WHO HAVE BEEN LEGALLY ADOPTED BY UNITED STATES CITIZENS FROM THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the return of children who have been legally adopted by United States citizens from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 951.** Mr. SANDERS (for Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. UDALL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. SCHUMER)) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,500,000,000.  
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$2,800,000,000.  
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,100,000,000.  
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,300,000,000.  
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.  
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.  
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$3,700,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$3,900,000,000.  
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.  
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,500,000,000.  
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,800,000,000.  
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,100,000,000.  
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,300,000,000.  
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,400,000,000.  
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,500,000,000.  
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$3,700,000,000.  
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$3,900,000,000.  
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,000,000,000.  
On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.  
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,309,000,000.  
On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$5,941,000,000.  
On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$7,907,000,000.  
On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$9,508,000,000.  
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$569,000,000.  
On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$437,000,000.  
On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$302,000,000.  
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$166,000,000.  
On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$44,000,000.  
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.  
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,309,000,000.  
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$5,941,000,000.  
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$7,907,000,000.  
On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$9,508,000,000.  
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$569,000,000.  
On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$437,000,000.  
On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$302,000,000.  
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$166,000,000.  
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$44,000,000.  
On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.  
On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,809,000,000.  
On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,141,000,000.  
On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,807,000,000.  
On page 7, line 11, increase the amount by \$6,208,000,000.  
On page 7, line 12, decrease the amount by \$2,831,000,000.  
On page 7, line 13, decrease the amount by \$4,063,000,000.  
On page 7, line 14, decrease the amount by \$3,398,000,000.  
On page 7, line 15, decrease the amount by \$3,734,000,000.  
On page 7, line 16, decrease the amount by \$3,956,000,000.  
On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,125,000,000.  
On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$6,266,000,000.  
On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$11,073,000,000.  
On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$17,281,000,000.  
On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$14,450,000,000.  
On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$10,387,000,000.  
On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$6,989,000,000.  
On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,255,000,000.  
On page 8, line 5, decrease the amount by \$701,000,000.  
On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,316,000,000.  
On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,125,000,000.  
On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$6,266,000,000.  
On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$11,073,000,000.  
On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$17,281,000,000.  
On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$14,450,000,000.  
On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$10,387,000,000.  
On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$6,989,000,000.  
On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,255,000,000.  
On page 8, line 17, decrease the amount by \$701,000,000.  
On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,300,000,000.  
On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,300,000,000.  
On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,250,000,000.  
On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by \$3,250,000,000.  
On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,780,000,000.  
On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$5,780,000,000.  
On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$7,580,000,000.  
On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$7,580,000,000.  
On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$8,960,000,000.  
On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$8,960,000,000.  
On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.  
On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.  
On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$59,000,000.  
On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$59,000,000.  
On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$161,000,000.  
On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$161,000,000.  
On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$327,000,000.  
On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$327,000,000.  
On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$548,000,000.  
On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$548,000,000.  
On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$569,000,000.  
On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$569,000,000.  
On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$437,000,000.



On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$437,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$302,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$302,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$166,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$166,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by \$44,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by \$44,000,000.

**SA 952.** Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. BROWN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND  
RELATING TO TRADE AGREEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to trade agreements, which may include measures ensuring that trade agreements put United States manufacturers on a level playing field with manufacturers in foreign countries with low environmental and wage standards, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 953.** Mr. MERKLEY proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; as follows:

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$2,031,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$3,776,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$4,147,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,479,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$4,785,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$5,404,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$5,735,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$6,075,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$6,387,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,876,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,577,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by \$3,899,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,195,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,490,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by \$4,784,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by \$5,420,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by \$5,712,000,000.

On page 7, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.

On page 7, line 8, increase the amount by \$2,876,000,000.

On page 7, line 9, increase the amount by \$3,577,000,000.

On page 7, line 10, increase the amount by \$3,899,000,000.

On page 7, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,195,000,000.

On page 7, line 12, increase the amount by \$4,490,000,000.

On page 7, line 13, increase the amount by \$4,784,000,000.

On page 7, line 14, increase the amount by \$5,095,000,000.

On page 7, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,420,000,000.

On page 7, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,712,000,000.

On page 7, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.

On page 7, line 22, increase the amount by \$4,142,000,000.

On page 7, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,719,000,000.

On page 7, line 24, increase the amount by \$11,618,000,000.

On page 7, line 25, increase the amount by \$15,813,000,000.

On page 8, line 1, increase the amount by \$20,303,000,000.

On page 8, line 2, increase the amount by \$25,087,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, increase the amount by \$30,182,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, increase the amount by \$35,602,000,000.

On page 8, line 5, increase the amount by \$41,314,000,000.

On page 8, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,266,000,000.

On page 8, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,142,000,000.

On page 8, line 10, increase the amount by \$7,719,000,000.

On page 8, line 11, increase the amount by \$11,618,000,000.

On page 8, line 12, increase the amount by \$15,813,000,000.

On page 8, line 13, increase the amount by \$20,303,000,000.

On page 8, line 14, increase the amount by \$25,087,000,000.

On page 8, line 15, increase the amount by \$30,182,000,000.

On page 8, line 16, increase the amount by \$35,602,000,000.

On page 8, line 17, increase the amount by \$41,314,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,015,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 28, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,700,000,000.

On page 28, line 25, increase the amount by \$2,800,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$3,945,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,375,000,000.

On page 29, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,125,000,000.

On page 29, line 8, increase the amount by \$3,545,000,000.

On page 29, line 11, increase the amount by \$4,270,000,000.

On page 29, line 12, increase the amount by \$3,680,000,000.

On page 29, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,405,000,000.

On page 29, line 16, increase the amount by \$3,800,000,000.

On page 29, line 19, increase the amount by \$4,530,000,000.

On page 29, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,910,000,000.

On page 29, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,665,000,000.

On page 29, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,025,000,000.

On page 30, line 2, increase the amount by \$4,795,000,000.

On page 30, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,140,000,000.

On page 30, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,925,000,000.

On page 30, line 7, increase the amount by \$4,250,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, increase the amount by \$16,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, increase the amount by \$76,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, increase the amount by \$76,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, increase the amount by \$202,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, increase the amount by \$202,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, increase the amount by \$354,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, increase the amount by \$354,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, increase the amount by \$515,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, increase the amount by \$515,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by \$690,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by \$690,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by \$874,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by \$874,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,070,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,070,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,462,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,462,000,000.

**SA 954.** Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES THAT PAID TO KEEP UNITS OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM OPEN DURING THE PARTIAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN IN OCTOBER 2013.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to affirming the Federal responsibility for units of the National Park System, which may include reimbursing States that paid to keep units of the National Park System open during the partial Government shutdown in October 2013 by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 955.** Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT ALIENS WITHOUT LAWFUL STATUS IN THE UNITED STATES FROM QUALIFYING FOR FEDERAL BENEFITS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to benefits for aliens without lawful status in the United States, which may include prohibiting such aliens from qualifying for Social Security and Medicare, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 956.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT THE CONTENT OF AMERICANS' E-MAILS FROM UNWARRANTED ACCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between

the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to e-mail privacy, which may include a requirement that law enforcement agencies obtain a search warrant to access the contents of e-mail communications, or otherwise satisfy an exception to the warrant requirement such as an emergency, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 957.** Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT EACH STATE HAS NO MORE THAN ONE FEDERAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PERCENTAGE (FMAP) RATE FOR COVERAGE OF ALL OF THE STATE'S MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to addressing Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate discrepancies within States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 958.** Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. SPENDING-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING UNITED STATES WORKERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the wages and employment of United States workers, which may include measures to require employers to recruit or retain qualified United States workers before petitioning for H-1B foreign guest workers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not raise new revenue

and would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 959.** Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REFORMING THE EB-5 IMMIGRANT INVESTOR PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforms to the EB-5 immigrant investor regional center program, which may include ensuring that the adjudication of such benefits is not done under political influence or to provide preferential treatment to certain petitioners, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 960.** Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_\_. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO A MANDATORY ELECTRONIC EMPLOYMENT VERIFICATION SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to a mandatory electronic employment verification system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 961.** Mrs. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENSURE THE HEALTH AND SECURITY OF AMERICAN WORKERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to preserving employee wellness programs that both provide financial incentives to employees who take steps to improve their health and reduce health care costs, and ensure necessary employee rights and protections, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 962.** Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENHANCE PROSECUTION OF THOSE WHO TRANSFER A FIREARM KNOWING OR HAVING REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE THAT SUCH FIREARM WILL BE USED TO COMMIT AN OFFENSE UNDER CHAPTER 77 OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, (RELATING TO PEONAGE, SLAVERY, AND TRAFFICKING IN PERSONS).**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prosecuting those who supply firearms to human traffickers, which may include enhancing the prosecution of those who transfer firearms knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such firearms will be used to commit a crime of human trafficking or increasing penalties for such transfers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 963.** Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENABLE TRANSFER OF ATF ENFORCEMENT FUNCTIONS TO THE FBI.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to transferring enforcement authority over firearms laws to the Federal Bureau of Investigation by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 964.** Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENHANCE PROSECUTION OF THOSE WHO TRANSFER A FIREARM KNOWING OR HAVING REASONABLE CAUSE TO BELIEVE THAT SUCH FIREARM WILL BE USED TO COMMIT A CRIME OF VIOLENCE, AS DEFINED IN SECTION 924(c)(3) OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to prosecuting those who supply firearms to violent criminals, which may include enhancing the prosecution of those who transfer firearms knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that such firearms will be used to commit a crime of violence or increasing penalties for such transfers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**SA 965.** Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 \_\_\_\_ . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT THE INTEGRITY OF ELECTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to strengthening and reforming campaign finance laws, which may include limits on corporate campaign expenditures, or expanding disclosure and transparency of contributions and expenditures in such elections, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit

over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2016 through 2025.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "FSOC Accountability: Nonbank Designations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, at 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, at 6:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, at 2 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled "Securing the Border: Understanding and Addressing the Root Causes of Central American Migration to the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The Fight Against Alzheimer's Disease: Are We on Track to a Treatment by 2025."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT**

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee

on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWERS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 25, 2015, at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern, Robert Kollenberg, be granted the privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NATIONAL CONGENITAL DIAPHRAGMATIC HERNIA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 115, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 115) designating April 2015 as "National Congenital Diaphragmatic Hernia Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 115) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 101-509, the reappointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress: Dr. Steven Zink of Nevada.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2015

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, March 26; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 11; further, that all debate time on the budget resolution be considered expired at 12 noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GARDNER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:08 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 26, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

JEFFREY MICHAEL PRIETO, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, VICE RAMONA EMILIA ROMERO, RESIGNED.

##### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KATHLEEN ANN DOHERTY, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

HANS G. KLEMM, OF MICHIGAN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ROMANIA.

LUCY TAMLYN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BENIN.

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### *To be lieutenant general*

LT. GEN. JOSEPH ANDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ENLISTED MEMBERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

##### *To be major*

ARPANA JAIN  
KAPIL KOHLI  
RAMA KRISHNA

##### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### *To be lieutenant commander*

NAWAZ K. A. HACK  
ROBERT P. RUTTER, JR.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JAMES MARTIN CENTER FOR NONPROLIFERATION STUDIES AT THE MIDDLEBURY INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES IN MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

**HON. SAM FARR**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the twenty-fifth anniversary of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies in Monterey, California. Sixty years ago, MIIIS was founded as a graduate school that would promote international understanding through the study of language and culture. Even though our world is much more complex and interconnected, our democratic objectives of global peace and security are still best advanced when Americans understand other cultures and can speak to non-English speakers in their own language.

And the Center for Nonproliferation Studies has been at the nexus of peace and security issues for more than two decades. The Center provides professional education to both U.S. and international students on critical global issues dealing with regional security, terrorist motivations, the science and technology of weapons of mass destruction, and innovations in analytical tools and methods. As the world's first graduate degree program that teaches the knowledge and skills needed to curtail the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), CNS has been at the forefront of United States leadership on the threat that weapons of mass destruction pose against global security. CNS has safeguarded not only our nation, but also the world.

It is not enough that the United States be at the forefront of weapons technology to counter the threat of weapons of mass destruction. We must also focus on strategy and diplomacy in order to make meaningful policy that promotes nonproliferation and disarmament worldwide. CNS, under the leadership of its founding director, Dr. William C. Potter, has excelled at the nexus of global policy and diplomacy by cultivating world-class nonproliferation leaders for the classroom and providing CNS students with unique academic assignments outside the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, for twenty-five years, CNS significantly advanced the security of the nation and strengthened international partnerships that build peace. The importance of continuing that progress is even more important in today's uncertain world. Will the world be safe for our children and grandchildren? As long as rogue nations possess weapons of mass destruction, we will face challenges, but those challenges are being addressed by the James

Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies by educating nonproliferation leaders of tomorrow. I commend the Center for all its accomplishments over the last twenty-five years and I look forward to its continued distinguished service to our country into the future.

**AYLA CHARNNESS**

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Ayla Charnness for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Ayla Charnness is an 8th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Ayla Charnness is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Ayla Charnness for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING PEDERNALES ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE EMPLOYEES

**HON. LAMAR SMITH**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I want to recognize three power linemen from Pedernales Electric Cooperative in my district for their service and for putting into action cooperative principle #6—cooperation among cooperatives—in Haiti. Marshall Verette, Andrew Ridge and Mark Moreno volunteered to go to Haiti last February to work with Haiti's first electric cooperative, the Cooperative Electrique de l'Arrondissement des Coteaux (CEAC). This work was part of a rural electrification project through the NRECA International Foundation with support from the United Nations Environmental Program and USAID.

They spent two weeks in the town of Coteaux to help build a distribution system that will connect three towns. Upon comple-

tion, the diesel-solar hybrid electric system will provide safe, affordable and reliable power to 1600 consumers. Their contributions included upgrading lines, installing new lines and service drops, and training locally hired linemen in proper construction methods, pole climbing techniques, proper handline use, and important safety practices. Electricity is a critical element in improving the quality of life and in providing health care, education, access to clean water and economic opportunity. In Haiti, less than 15 percent of the population has regular access to electricity.

In appreciation of all they have done, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues join me in thanking them for their humanitarian efforts.

IN RECOGNITION OF CHUCK MAULDEN'S ACT OF KINDNESS

**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and express appreciation for the kind acts of Mr. Chuck Maulden, an emergency department nurse at the Salisbury Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

We are all well aware of the tragic backlog for benefit applications and long wait times at VA hospitals that affect so many veterans across our country.

We spend more money today on the VA than at any point before, but too much of this money is spent on the bureaucracy in Washington and not enough at our hospitals and most importantly on veterans themselves.

In spite of this problem, we are thankful for the effort and hard work by caregivers like Chuck.

Chuck recently attended to a Vietnam veteran in his 60s who had severe pain and bad blisters on his feet.

When Chuck saw the veteran's tattered shoes with holes worn through the soles he took action.

Chuck bandaged the veteran's feet and then—in an act of servanthood—gave him the brand new shoes off of his own feet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope Chuck's actions inspire us all to lend a helping hand to those in need, especially to our nation's heroes.

I hope Chuck's selflessness will inspire us to work to better serve the veterans in our communities.

I commend Chuck for his act of service. I am proud to represent him and the veterans he serves.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF THE  
JOB CORPS PROGRAM

**HON. BRUCE POLIQUIN**

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Job Corps program on 50 years of dedicated support of our young Americans. Furthermore, 2015 marks five decades of ambition and hope for our young Mainers in Bangor and Limestone, and throughout the United States of America.

Maine's Job Corps programs are vital for preparing young people in the Great State of Maine for employment and further education. It is an honor to strongly support their mission to better the lives of Mainers through technical and academic training.

Since its first class of students in 1997, the Loring Job Corps program has helped Maine students earn high school diplomas, construct careers, and obtain great jobs.

The Penobscot Job Corps has maintained the same mission for 35 years. Education and community service alike are two cornerstones of the Penobscot program, which prides itself on staff and students giving back to the community around them. The program's accreditation with the New England Association of Schools & Colleges in 2007 only enhanced its ability to reach out and enrich the lives of young Mainers.

The Job Corps Program encourages the vital education and creativity of bright young students throughout the county. It is with great pride and appreciation that I congratulate the Job Corps Program for half a century of critical work.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN  
CHARLES RUSH

**HON. MARTHA ROBY**

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday March 25, 2015*

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Charles Rush, an exceptional Alabamian who set an example of leadership for all to follow. His lifetime of dedication and service stands as a monument to the exemplary man he was, and his gallantry in battle continues to inspire future generations.

Rush was born in Greensboro, a small farming town in west Alabama. When he was seven, his family moved to Dothan, Alabama where he went to elementary and high school.

After completing high school at the Gulf Coast Military Academy in Gulfport, Mississippi, Rush was awarded an appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. Graduating in 1941, he was then assigned duty aboard a destroyer and stationed at Pearl Harbor. Later, Rush volunteered for submarine duty where he completed a total of seven patrols with the USS *Thresher* and the USS *Billfish*.

In 1943, three enemy destroyers attacked the *Billfish*, bombarding it with depth charges for twelve hours. During this terrifying attack,

the ship's commanders became unable to ensure the safety of the submarine. Then Lieutenant Rush took control of the situation, outsmarted the enemy destroyers, and helped lead the submarine and all of the men aboard to safety. Nearly sixty years after the attack, Rush was awarded the Navy Cross in 2002—an honor insisted upon by his fellow crew members of the USS *Billfish* on board during the attack.

Captain Rush was a friend, mentor, respected colleague, and gentleman to many, and will be remembered for his courage and integrity. Captain Rush passed on February 27th, 2015, just shy of his 96th birthday. He is survived by LaVonne, his wife of 39 years, children, grandchildren and great grandchildren, and a host of other family members.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY  
OF AGAT VICE MAYOR AGUSTIN  
G. QUINTANILLA

**HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO**

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Mr. Agustin "Dinga" G. Quintanilla who served as the Vice Mayor of the village of Agat. Vice Mayor Quintanilla passed away on March 19, 2015 at the age of 52.

Vice Mayor Quintanilla was born on August 8, 1962 to Jesus Taitano Quintanilla and Remedios Guzman Quintanilla. He graduated from the Guam Community College and shortly thereafter began his career with the United States Navy Guam Ship Repair Facility and U.S. Navy Public Works as a welder. He continued his career as a welder with Raytheon and then with DZSP as a combination welder.

Mr. Quintanilla was appointed the vice mayor of Agat in 2009 by Governor Felix Camacho, and was subsequently elected and reelected to the position. He has always had close ties to the community. As the vice mayor, he played a crucial role in expanding the village park and pavilion, "Sagan Bisita" and coordinating the village float entry for the annual Liberation Parade, garnering awards in 2009 and 2010.

Vice Mayor Quintanilla will always be remembered for his generosity and willingness to help those in need and the community he loved. During Chamorro Month, Vice Mayor Quintanilla would celebrate the Chamorro culture by building traditional huts at the neighboring Guam Naval Base. Always a humble and giving man, Vice Mayor Quintanilla also constructed benches for both the Agat gym and baseball field.

Prior to serving as vice mayor, Mr. Quintanilla was an active member of the Agat Municipal Planning Council since 1996. He also held numerous positions in community organizations such as the Agat Santa Ana Rancheros Association, Marcial Sablan Elementary School Parent Teacher Association, the Agat Cardinals Baseball Team, and the Western Visayas College of Science and Technology Association-Guam Chapter.

Though Vice Mayor Quintanilla stayed busy with all his duties and community organiza-

tions, he always remained an active parishioner of the Mount Carmel Catholic Church and Santa Ana Chapel in Agat. Vice Mayor Quintanilla could always be found cooking behind the scenes for both church and village events. He was even a vital part of the building of the Santa Ana Chapel as a part of the Santa Ana Association.

I am deeply saddened by the passing of Vice Mayor Quintanilla, and I join the people of Guam in celebrating his life and recognizing his dedicated service to Guam. My thoughts and prayers are with his daughters, Julianna, Alianna, and Nikita, and his loved ones and friends. He will be missed, and his memory will live on in the hearts of the people of Guam.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF  
CHRISTOPHER "CB" BOBBY

**HON. TIM RYAN**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the people of the Mahoning Valley suffered a great loss with the passing of former Tribune Chronicle reporter Christopher "CB" Bobby. CB covered the Trumbull County Courthouse for decades and was known in the area for being fair, honest, and compassionate. Mr. Bobby truly cared for the people in his stories and wrote for the purpose of informing the public of the important issues affecting the daily lives of citizens.

Brenda Linert, the editor of the Tribune Chronicle, wrote a brief story about her endearment for Chris; and I believe her sentiments express perfectly the gratitude that the people of Warren, Ohio and the Mahoning Valley have for Chris and his dedication to the people and their stories.

HONORING MEMORIES OF NEWSROOM LEGEND

(By Brenda Linert)

We buried our friend this week. If you are a regular reader, no doubt you know by now that we, at the Tribune Chronicle, are mourning the unexpected death of Christopher "CB" Bobby, the veteran Tribune Chronicle reporter who for decades has covered news originating in the Trumbull County Courthouse. CB had an air about him that made people love him as a person and as a friend. As a journalist, CB was an old-school newsmen.

Those who sat near him in the "Bobby Acres" section of the newsroom (Chris, of course, was the mayor) can attest to the fact that CB grumbled a lot, often about new demands of the newspaper industry that he had become a part of 41 years ago. Chris would begrudgingly complete extra assignments, like those for special sections, referring to them as his "term papers".

I don't believe his rants and frustrations ever came because CB disliked work. It was, rather, because he disliked work that took him away from what he felt was really important—telling his readers the stories that needed to be told. He knew the stories of court cases were come not by just quickly pulling filings off electronic court dockets or trolling social media, as many young reporters do today. Chris would tell you that's not the way to find stories about people. And he

tried his best to share that skill without ever belittling or condescending.

Throughout the decades, CB took an untold number of fresh-faced young reporters (myself included some 20 years ago) to the courthouse to teach them his secrets of covering a trial. In every instance, including mine, the cub reporter would enter the courtroom, slide into a pew beside CB and proceed to bury his or her face in a reporter notebook, scrawling away, never taking a moment to look up or even breathe.

And just like the day CB took me to court. He would shake his head, lean over and whisper something like, "What the heck are you doing? Put down the notebook and listen." With reluctance, I followed his instructions, fearing he was wrong and I'd miss something incredibly important. Each time I'd try to ease the notebook back into my hand, he'd shake his head disapprovingly. He knew, you see, the importance of simply listening and watching and understanding. That's how a good journalist is able to tell a story.

When CB told his stories they were about the people. He told them with authority, apolitically and unapologetically. David Addis, a former Trib reporter who worked with CB in the late 1970s, last week described him like this: "Even then, Chris' strongest point was that he simply cared about the story, and the people behind the story. He was the most apolitical reporter I ever worked with—he didn't give a tinker's damn about the office politics, city politics or any higher sphere of politics. It's probably why people came to trust him. He was honest, considerate, compassionate and simply wanted to get it right."

That was true until the end. As former Trib reporter Mike Scott put it, "CB was the heart and soul of the Tribune Chronicle for decades . . . and a great reporter and mentor for generations of reporters." What may be most disheartening is to consider all the new, young reporters that will join us going forward who never will have the benefit of working with CB. Sure, we will publish a newspaper every day. We will move forward, because we must. But it won't be easy, and this newsroom will never be the same. Rest in peace, my friend.

---

HONORING JIMMY "DUCK"  
HOLMES

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON, of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a talented man, Mr. Jimmy "Duck" Holmes. Jimmy has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to be a trailblazer.

Jimmy "Duck" Holmes was born to sharecroppers Carey and Mary Holmes in 1947, the year before they opened the Blue Front Café. He was one of ten children and his parents also raised four children of Mary's deceased sister.

Jimmy "Duck" Holmes is the proprietor of one of the oldest juke joints in Mississippi, the Blue Front in Bentonia. In the mid-2000s he began performing blues actively after many years of performing casually, and has already garnered several awards and many accolades. He is a practitioner and conscious advocate of a distinctive blues style from his hometown

whose most famous proponent was blues pioneer Skip James.

Holmes, who never met Skip James, studied the music of Owens, learning songs including "Cherry Ball", "Hard Times", "I'd Rather Be the Devil", but didn't perform very actively until relatively recently. He promoted blues through the founding in 1972 of the Bentonia Blues Festival, which took place annually until the mid-'90s and was revived in 2006. He took over the Blue Front in 1970 after the death of his father, and beginning in the '80s the café became a popular destination for blues tourists, including annual visits by busloads of Japanese fans. In 1995 a commercial for Levi's 501 jeans was filmed there.

Various blues researchers including Alan Lomax recorded Holmes beginning at least in the '70s, but until recently his only vocal appearance on record was one song, "Devil's Blues", that he performed together with Cornelius Bright and which appeared on the Austrian Wolf label compilation album "Giants of Country Blues" Volume 2. In 2006 the St. Louis-based record label "Broke & Hungry" released Holmes' debut CD "Back to Bentonia". He was joined on the record by Spires and drummer, Sam Carr, and in addition to some original songs, Holmes also covered the Bentonia standards "Hard Times" and "I'd Rather Be the Devil".

The CD was well received, and garnered several Living Blues Awards and to multiple festival bookings, including the Chicago Blues Festival and the Arkansas Blues and Heritage Festival. Holmes, who normally works as an educator, has traditionally been a somewhat reluctant performer, but has enjoyed the opportunity to share his music and talk about the Bentonia tradition. "You don't get nervous when you're doing your hobby," he says of performing.

In 2007 "Broke and Hungry" released a second CD, "Done Got Tired of Tryin'", which followed a similar formula, and included James' "Cherry Ball". The CD was nominated for a 2008 Blues Music Award for Acoustic Album of the Year, and National Public Radio listed it as one of the "Top 10 Blues Albums" of the year. Holmes also received national publicity in August 2007 when a Mississippi Blues Trail historic marker was dedicated in honor of the Blue Front Café.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Jimmy "Duck" Holmes a talented and creative Blues Guitarist & Vocalist.

---

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 133. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

A TRIBUTE TO BRENT MACKE

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Brent Macke for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Brent has the determination and drive to be successful in anything he does, and his exemplary work with Holmes Murphy & Associates is a testament to that. As an account executive and shareholder with Holmes Murphy & Associates, Brent realizes the importance of giving back to the community. He has dedicated his time and talents to serve others through organizations like Junior Achievement of Central Iowa, Variety—The Children's Charity, the Ankeny High School mentorship program and Easter Seals of Iowa. In all aspects of his life, Brent is a leader and an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Brent in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Brent on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

---

IN HONOR OF DR. BARRY  
SHEPHERD'S CAREER

**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Barry Shepherd for his faithful service as the Superintendent of the Cabarrus County School system in the 8th Congressional District of North Carolina.

When Dr. Shepherd became Superintendent in 2008, he brought a unique vision that transformed Cabarrus County Schools during many challenging years. In spite of reductions in funding, Dr. Shepherd continually emphasized the value of people and his students.

As a result of this approach, students from Cabarrus County Schools are scoring higher on end-of-year assessments, graduation rates



have increased, and the school system was able to open eight new schools during his tenure.

Today, Cabarrus County Schools boasts some of the most unique learning experiences offered in the country. Specifically, Cabarrus County Schools has a partnership with the Center for International Understanding at the University of North Carolina called Confucius Classrooms. This program features a reciprocal agreement where teachers and administrators from Cabarrus County visit schools in China to fine tune best practices in education. As part of this program, Chinese educators come to Cabarrus County Schools to learn from their successes as well.

Dr. Shepherd is a native of Wilkes County, North Carolina, and received a Bachelor's Degree in Music Education and a Master's Degree in Educational Leadership from Appalachian State University in Boone, North Carolina. He went on to receive his Doctoral Degree in Education from Columbia University in New York.

Dr. Shepherd served as Superintendent of Elkin City Schools and as Assistant Superintendent in the Mooresville Graded School District before arriving in Cabarrus County. He also held various administrative positions in the Iredell-Statesville Schools, Lexington City Schools, and Thomasville City Schools.

It is truly an honor to extend these remarks congratulating Dr. Shepherd on his retirement and to thank him for his esteemed service to our local community as a visionary educator.

AIREONNA JENSEN

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aireonna Jensen for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aireonna Jensen is an 8th grader at North Arvada Middle School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aireonna Jensen is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Aireonna Jensen for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO JIM McCLELLAND FOR HIS 41 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF CENTRAL INDIANA

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career and accomplishments of Jim McClelland. For more than four decades, Jim served as President and CEO of Goodwill Industries of Central Indiana. The people of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District and central Indiana are forever grateful for Jim's community leadership.

Jim has spent most of his professional life with Goodwill. After receiving his Bachelor of Industrial Engineering degree from Georgia Tech and his MBA from the Kelley School of Business at Indiana University, he served in the military for three years. He then began his career with Goodwill and has been with the company ever since. He started with the company in 1970 in Texas and moved to Indianapolis in 1973 to work with then-President and CEO Alan McNeil. Alan, a role model to Jim, tragically passed away less than a year after Jim moved to Indiana. Jim was named his successor and has been building and developing the organization ever since. Goodwill Industries of Central Indiana has only had three CEO's since its founding in 1930 and Jim has been at the helm since 1974.

Goodwill of Central Indiana has blossomed under Jim's leadership. He clearly has a true passion for Goodwill's mission and is an outstanding leader and social entrepreneur. When he first joined the Indianapolis team, the nonprofit had 558 employees, eight retail stores, and \$3 million in revenue. Today, the company has more than 3,100 employees, 55 retail stores, 10 commercial sites, 10 charter high schools, and \$310 million in revenue. All profits from the retail side go back into improving the community. With these profits, Jim launched many social services aimed at reducing the long-term effects of poverty.

He also worked tirelessly to expand job opportunities for unemployed Hoosiers and led philanthropic efforts in education and health. Two of his most notable accomplishments are the creation of the Excel Center, a program offering education to adults wanting to earn their high school diploma, and bringing the Nurse-Family Partnership to Indianapolis, a nonprofit that helps first-time, low-income mothers.

Jim is undoubtedly a savvy businessman and wise investor, but his commitment to humanitarianism is what shines through the most. He always puts others first, combining his talents to improve the future of others. His commitment to helping others extends far beyond his position with Goodwill of Central Indiana. He is involved with Goodwill Industries nationally and internationally, has served on the boards of numerous not-for-profit organizations, and been honored with awards in the nonprofit arena. Just to name a few of his accomplishments, he helped start a new Goodwill organization in South Korea, sits on the board of the Indiana Public Charter Schools

Association, and was named Nonprofit Executive of the Year by The Nonprofit Times in 2000.

On behalf of the grateful constituents of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I congratulate Jim on the occasion of his retirement. His entrepreneurial and humanitarian spirit has left an everlasting impact on the Indianapolis community and beyond. I wish the very best to Jim, his wife, Jane, and their two children as he enjoys a well-deserved retirement.

HONORING ROHIT RAINA

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Rohit Raina attends Dawson High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

A NEW NATION IS BORN

The time had come, Election Day in 2008. Republicans and Democrats were standing in anxious positions, waiting to see who would emerge victorious; Barack Obama, or John McCain. The Democrats were obviously rooting for Barack Obama, whereas the Republicans were cheering on for John McCain. However, only one could stand victorious. After a long collection of votes, the new president was declared; Barack Hussein Obama, the first African American President of the United States of America.

November 4, 2008 will be a day to remember in our American history. That day was when all tides had turned, and a movement was born. Barack Obama, a three time senate member for Illinois, became the first African American man to ever become president in the history of the United States of America. The turnout of this election was a complete change in the perspective of the American people; where people were used to "White supremacy" and social inequality. After the election, peoples' mindsets changed about socialism and the attitude toward racism in the workplace. I had read a book by Joseph E. Stiglitz, The Price of Inequality, which this book references how after Obama was elected, the whole nation changed. In the workplace, people were more respectful to the African American race, there wasn't as much racial discrimination as there previously was. In the book I had read, office employers would be somewhat racist; to a point where a Caucasian man with a critical record had a higher chance of getting a job they tried out for than an African American man without a criminal record. Socially, people were more understanding of the African American race, because they now knew

with Obama as president, the African American people were seen to have potential and were not judged any longer.

Barack Obama has honestly been one of our greatest presidents in the American nation.

Understandably, presidents such as FDR and Lincoln fought through tough times, but Obama was not any less of those two great men. By signing the economic stimulus and fighting through an economic recession, Barack Obama has led the Land of the Free out of grave trouble and into the path of success. President Obama had led us out of two wars in the Middle East, lowered gas prices, and helped the American nation by producing an amazing healthcare system called ObamaCare. By his second term, he had created a better nation, besides the 18 trillion dollar deficit the United States is currently under. With better gun control (because of the Sandy Hook shooting), the assassination of the Taliban terrorist leader Osama Bin Laden, and the search for better relations with Cuba, Obama has clearly led this nation to the path of power.

Barack Obama's election and reelection was one of the most effective changing thing in American history. For the past 15 years, America was getting better and thriving, but with Barack Obama, our nation has re-emerged as a much more powerful superpower. Who knows where we will be in 5 more years, but with Barack Obama's leadership and his effect on the future presidency line, we will be in great shape.

IN HONOR OF DR. JERRY MCGEE'S  
CAREER

**HON. RICHARD HUDSON**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Jerry McGee for his faithful service as President of Wingate University in the 8th Congressional District of North Carolina.

When Dr. McGee became President of then Wingate College in 1992, he brought visionary leadership that transformed this educational institution from college to university status. During Dr. McGee's presidency, Wingate's enrollment increased more than 125 percent. Under his leadership, Wingate went from a small college to a thriving university. Wingate University has been recognized as one of the best small liberal arts colleges in the Southeast and the premier small private university in North Carolina.

As a result of Dr. McGee's leadership, Wingate University has expanded to new campuses in Charlotte and Henderson, opened 37 new buildings, and refurbished every facility on campus. Wingate opened its School of Pharmacy in 2003, and it now offers six health-care related graduate degrees and seven pre-professional undergraduate health programs. In a ten-year period starting in 1993, the number of Wingate undergraduates pursuing degrees in science or health-care related fields quadrupled.

The Wingate University community has expressed its support and praise for Dr. McGee's leadership through an influx of millions of dollars in gifts and grants for endowments, scholarships, and campus develop-

ment. During Dr. McGee's presidency, Wingate University's endowment increased by 420 percent and its operating budget has nearly doubled.

Dr. McGee is a native of Rockingham, North Carolina, and received his Bachelor's Degree from East Carolina University and a Master's Degree from Appalachian State University. He went on to receive his Doctoral Degree from Nova Southeastern University.

Before being named President of Wingate University, Dr. McGee served as Vice President of Institutional Advancement at Meredith College and Vice President for Development at Furman College. Dr. McGee is actively involved in our local and state community, and he is the recipient of North Carolina's highest civilian honor, The Order of the Long Leaf Pine, in recognition of his exemplary service to North Carolina. Dr. McGee is also a member of the North Carolina Sports Hall of Fame for officiating 404 NCAA Division I college football games, 20 of which were bowl games.

It is truly an honor to extend these remarks congratulating my friend Dr. Jerry McGee on his retirement and to thank him for his esteemed service to our community as a visionary educator and leader.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL  
DEBT

**HON. MIKE COFFMAN**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,152,382,569,585.32. We've added \$7,525,505,520,672.24 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING JEANNE BURTON  
ISRAEL

**HON. HENRY CUELLAR**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize retiring Pleasanton City Councilwoman Jeanne Burton Israel. She has served with distinction, and is now ending her tenure after six years on the Pleasanton City Council.

A San Antonio native, Jeanne moved to Atascosa County in 1982, becoming the first female Fuel and Ash Operator at San Miguel Electric Power Plant. Two years later she relocated to her current home of Pleasanton. After twelve years at San Miguel Electric, Jeanne Israel started Errand Girl Services, a courier service in Pleasanton. Her position as a small business owner propelled her into local politics and in 2000 she served as Treasurer for the Atascosa County MHMR.

Mrs. Israel also became an active and esteemed member of her local Lions Club,

known for her initiative and dedication to the community. She founded and served as the advisor to the Lions' youth organization, the Pleasanton Leo Club from 2002 until 2006. Sitting on several City Charter Review Committees sparked her interest in local government and prompted her to run for a seat on the city council in 2009.

From 2009 to 2015 Mrs. Israel has represented the people of District 6 on the Pleasanton City Council. During her 6-year tenure, she has been an avid supporter of the arts and has backed efforts to preserve and protect county history. Mrs. Israel has also been a proponent of education and increased citizen involvement in government. She has also worked to revitalize Pleasanton's downtown area and improve city infrastructure. In recognition of her outstanding service to the City of Pleasanton and the people of District 6, she has received awards from multiple community organizations in Pleasanton including the Pleasanton Lion of the Year, the Sons of Hermann Lodge #310 Humanitarian Award, and the Pleasanton Chamber of Commerce Business Person of the Year.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Jeanne Burton Israel on the occasion of her retirement from the Pleasanton City Council. Her years of dedication and commitment to her community have made Pleasanton, Texas a better place.

CELEBRATING THE 275TH ANNI-  
VERSARY OF THE TOWNSHIP OF  
MORRIS

**HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Township of Morris as it celebrates its 275th Anniversary.

The Township of Morris, originally formed on March 25, 1740, is also known as the "doughnut" because it completely encapsulates the Town of Morristown. Morris Township was also one of the original 104 townships of New Jersey at the state's founding. Morris Township is not just known for its geography, however. This township is home to more than 22,000 people, who are very active in their community. Morris Township is also home to many historic landmarks such as Pruddentown, Alnwick Hall which is known today as "The Abbey," and Normandy Park.

Morris Township, founded in 1740, is older than the United States itself, and has changed drastically since over two hundred and seventy-five years. At the town's beginning, it encompassed nearly half of Morris County and was primarily all farmland. As time progressed, however, the township would evolve into the more 'urban' setting it has today. In addition to this urbanization, Morris Township was divided into many other towns such as Roxbury, Morristown, Mendham, and Chatham. Morris Township was also home to a number of events in American history. From the encampment of The Continental Army and George Washington during The Revolutionary War, to "Millionaires Row" which housed

many of New Jersey and New York City's millionaires until the 1940's, when income taxes led to the demolition of the houses, this township has a very rich history. Along with these historic sights are places such as, The College of Saint Elizabeth, The Seeing Eye and many other institutions which are able to call Morris Township their home.

To celebrate its 275th Anniversary, the Township will host several events, including a 5K run, family picnic, concerts, exhibits and tournaments. The Morristown and Township Library will be introducing a new exhibit to celebrate this landmark event as well. The exhibit will open April 8th and close on the 16th of August. To celebrate the opening of the exhibit, the library will host an opening ceremony on April 8th serving light refreshments for those who wish to attend. The exhibit will have on display all historical moments in the town's history, landmarks and important people to the community. The festivities will be celebrated by friends and neighbors, and will surely be a night to remember.

I commend the citizens, the Township Committee and the Mayor of The Township of Morris in honor of all of the hard work put in to keep Morris Township a culturally rich and growing community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in wishing the Township of Morris a happy 275th Anniversary.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SARA KUROVSKI

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Sara Kurovski for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Sara has the determination and drive to be successful in anything she does, and her exemplary work as Mayor of the city of Pleasant Hill is a testament to that. As Mayor, Sara utilizes a servant-leadership approach to guide Pleasant Hill in the right direction. Sara is active and passionate about volunteering and has served on the Polk County Conservation Board, Pleasant Hill's Planning and Zoning Board, Board of Adjustments and the City Facility Planning Committee. In all aspects of her life, Sara is an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Sara in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents

to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Sara on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### BRIANA PACHECO

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Briana Pacheco for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Briana Pacheco is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Briana Pacheco is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Briana Pacheco for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### TRIBUTE TO RITUPARNA MUKHERJEE

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Rituparna Mukherjee attends Seven Lakes High School in Katy, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

The way health care is provided, paid for, and measured in the United States is rapidly changing. That will continue to happen as the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, comes into full effect. Prior to health care reform, a health insurance company could charge more, deny coverage or exclude condition-specific benefits if you had a life-threatening or chronic health condition. The ACA has changed most of that

through changes in health insurance coverage however; the Affordable Care Act isn't simply about making insurance more widely available. It's also about re-engineering the health care industry, so that it operates more efficiently—providing treatment that is higher quality, less expensive, or both. The idea, as Sarah Kliff explains in the Washington Post, is to move from a system that rewards volume (i.e., the number of procedures performed) to a system that rewards value (i.e., the quality of care provided).

Beginning in 2014, no insurer can charge you more or deny you coverage based on your current health or a pre-existing condition. While an estimated 220,000 Americans who could afford it obtained alternate coverage, roughly 25 million with pre-existing conditions were uninsured. Not only that, the out-of-pocket expense kept both insured and uninsured. Americans away from preventive care, to the detriment of public health. Now, all health plans must offer a wide array of in-network preventive services and treatments for adults and children, with no out-of-pocket costs such as co pays, coinsurance or need to meet a deductible. Both of the aforementioned policies are conducive to lower healthcare costs and more importantly, awareness for preventive measures.

In accordance with the changes mentioned before, children under the age of 26 are now allowed to still be under their parents' healthcare plan. This means that there are a larger number of young adults insured as they enter the workforce. The aforementioned policy is middle- and upper-class beneficial because it implies that there are parents of adult children that are insured. Already more than two million young adults have gotten health insurance through their parents' policies.

While debate continues on both the success and the failure of managed care, one cannot deny the increased emphasis on cost containment. The results of managed care and the continuing evolution of the American health care system are both quantitative and qualitative. They range from a reduction in hospital admissions and stays to an increase in ambulatory care, out-patient surgeries, and home care; from an emphasis on prevention and better decisions by consumers about health-related behaviors to the sometimes limited choices by consumers in selecting practitioners and in utilizing benefits; from increasing limitations in coverage with higher deductibles and co-pays to the reality of a still significant portion of the population among the disenfranchised or uninsured.

While the Affordable Care Act has its positives and its negatives, as do most policies, its benefits have only just begun to be explored. Same goes for the negatives. We have to allow a few years to pass before we can pass judgment on this drastic change.

#### NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR DAY

### HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the twenty-six Congressional Medal of Honor recipients with strong ties to Oregon who will be honored in the special Oregon Medal of Honor Exhibit at the Evergreen Aviation & Space Museum in McMinnville, Oregon. On behalf of a grateful state and country, it is

my privilege to honor these heroes who served above and beyond the call of duty, earning the Congressional Medal of Honor, our nation's highest award for military valor. Their brave service spans over 108 years, from the Civil War to the Vietnam War. Their names are as follows:

Civil War (1861–1865): Alaric B. Chapin, U.S. Army; Hartwell B. Compson, U.S. Army; Nathan E. Edgerton, U.S. Army; Louis Renninger, U.S. Army. Indian Wars (1861–1898): James Jackson, U.S. Army; Meaher Nicholas, U.S. Army; Lewis Phife, U.S. Army. Philippine Insurrection (1899–1911): Frank C. High, U.S. Army; Charles E. Kilbourne, U.S. Army; Marcus W. Robertson, U.S. Army; Jacob Volz Jr., U.S. Navy. Boxer Rebellion (1900): John A. Murphy, U.S. Marine Corps. Peacetime (1903): Harry D. Fadden, U.S. Navy. World War I (1917–1918): Edward C. Allworth, U.S. Army. World War II (1941–1945): Arnold L. Bjorklund, U.S. Army; Arthur J. Jackson, U.S. Marine Corps; David R. Kingsley, U.S. Army Air Forces; Robert D. Maxwell, U.S. Army; Henry Schauer, U.S. Army; Stuart S. Stryker, U.S. Army. Korean War (1950–1953): Stanley T. Adams, U.S. Army; Loren R. Kaufman, U.S. Army. Vietnam War (1964–1975): Larry G. Dahl, U.S. Army; John N. Holcomb, U.S. Army; Gary W. Martini, U.S. Marine Corps; Maximo Yabes, U.S. Army.

These wartime heroes were either born in Oregon, entered service from Oregon, were laid to rest in Oregon, or live in Oregon. Seven of the recipients gave their lives during an act of valor. Nine of them were commissioned officers and seventeen were enlisted men and non-commissioned officers. Twenty-one served in the Army, two in the Navy, and three in the Marine Corps. They served in ten countries around the globe: the United States, China, Philippines, France, Palau, Italy, Romania, Germany, Korea and Vietnam. Two World War II recipients are living today—Mr. Robert D. Maxwell, Bend, Oregon, and Mr. Arthur J. Jackson, Boise, Idaho. Mr. Maxwell is the oldest of the 79 living Medal of Honor recipients of all wars.

Among other items, the Oregon Medal of Honor Exhibit will feature displays for each recipient, interactive digital kiosks and a large American flag flown over the U.S. Capitol on March 25, 2015, National Medal of Honor Day. This outstanding project was organized by the Bend Heroes Foundation and their partners: Evergreen Aviation & Space Museum, Pacific Standard Television, Congressional Medal of Honor Foundation, Congressional Medal of Honor Society, Medal of Honor Historical Society of the United States, my office, and BNSF Railway.

#### HONORING CHIEF DAN JONES

#### HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Chief Dan Jones of the Chapel Hill Fire Department, who will retire in May after 25 years of distinguished service to his hometown of Chapel Hill.

Chief Jones began his career with the Pinellas Park Fire Department in Florida, where he was quickly recognized as a leader and named Firefighter of the Year and Florida Fire Instructor of the Year. In 1990, he left Florida to become Fire Chief in Chapel Hill.

As soon as he arrived in our community, Chief Jones set about modernizing what was then a small-town Fire Department, most notable for its Carolina blue trucks. Today, thanks to his leadership, the Department is recognized as one of the finest in North Carolina and the country.

Chief Jones has faced his share of challenges as well—notably the Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity fire in 1996, which took the lives of five UNC students. He helped lead the community back from that tragedy, bridging the gap between students, Chapel Hill residents, and the Fire Department. He also became an advocate for new safety techniques and equipment, reforms that have saved countless lives since.

Chief Jones has received many awards from his peers for his remarkable work, including National Fire Service Person of the Year and the International Fire Chiefs Association President's Award. He has also served as President of the International Society of Fire Service Instructors, written extensively on the topic of fire safety, lectured at UNC-Chapel Hill, and taught leadership classes around the country and the world.

Chief Jones has also been quick to assist me, particularly during my time as Chairman or Ranking Member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security, giving sound policy advice and convening numerous first responder gatherings from central North Carolina.

Whenever I see a Carolina blue fire truck drive by on Franklin Street, I am thankful that Chapel Hill has been lucky enough to have Dan Jones serve as its Fire Chief. On behalf of our entire community, thank you for your service, Chief Jones. I wish you the very best in retirement.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 131. Had I been present, I would have voted YES.

#### HONORING RILEY FRANKS

#### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight

into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Riley Franks attends Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

About fourteen years ago, the United States never expected something like this to happen but on September 11, 2001, terrorism took a big turn. A series of four coordinated terrorist attacks by the Islamic terrorist group al-Qaeda were set into play in New York City and the Washington D.C. metropolitan area. Two passenger airplanes were hijacked and crashed into the North and South Towers of the World Trade Center; another was crashed into the Pentagon which caused a partial collapse of the western side, and the fourth plane was targeted at Washington D.C. but crashed into a field near Shanksville, Pennsylvania after some of the passengers tried to overcome the hijackers. A total 2,996 citizens died that day and was the deadliest incident for firefighters and law enforcement officers ever. This day has changed America for the better and the worse in these four major lasting impacts: more than a decade of war, immigration and deportation, the skies, and an increase in surveillance.

Just a few weeks after the 9/11 event, the United States invaded Afghanistan to try and dismantle al-Qaeda and stop the terrorist group. Then two years later we attacked Iraq as a part of the War on Terror. Today, the U.S. is still entangled with Afghanistan and this War on Terror is now the longest-running war in U.S. history.

The U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency was established because of this tragic event. This agency was put into place to help deport criminals and stop those from coming into the U.S. illegally. In the decade after 9/11, deportations nearly doubled and in the first two years of the Obama Administration deportations hit a record high of 400,000 annually.

Airport security took a turn for the better. Although the lines and security rules to get to your gate are outrageous, the skies have never been safer. Before all of these color-coded security threat warnings and fancy full body metal detectors and x-rays, pat downs were very uncommon, liquid was allowed, and passengers were even allowed to have knives, box cutters, and cigarette lighters on board.

Finally, as a country, the U.S. boomed as a surveillance state after 9/11. This resulted in an increase of government intrusion of phone and web networks. By 2013, the United States had enacted 16 spy agencies and more than 107,000 employees that now make up the U.S. intelligence community.

Therefore, after 9/11 the United States has improved in a lot of ways mainly in security and there can only be improvement from here on out and hopefully the U.S. will never have to go through another tragic event such as this.

# RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF LLOYD MADAY

## HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and achievements of Lloyd Maday, who passed away earlier this month.

Mr. Maday was a beloved and respected member of the Evanston, Illinois community, where he touched many lives. With his brother, he started Maday Brothers auto shop, which he operated for nearly 50 years before retiring in 1999. Maday Brothers was not just a place to get excellent mechanic services, Lloyd Maday made it a place where young people could get friendly advice and excellent counsel. Whether it was help in understanding how to repair a carburetor or how to deal with their personal problems, many Evanstonians turned to Lloyd Maday.

Mike Kennedy was one of those young people, who was mentored and got his first job from Lloyd Maday. Mr. Kennedy told The Chicago Tribune, Lloyd Maday "taught me a lot about fixing cars, but he taught me about character too. I'd watch how he treated people, the way he'd answer questions and take the time to explain things. If there was a problem, he'd be the one to handle it. He was calm and even-keeled, and his conversations always ended with a handshake."

Lloyd Maday was a master of his craft, keeping up with the many automotive and technological changes that occurred during his career. He made it a priority to listen and help those he met, to provide encouragement, and to set an example of how to live a life that gives back to the community. He was a devoted family man to his wife, and I want to express my condolences to his children and his 29 grandchildren. He will be greatly missed.

# A TRIBUTE TO JOSH INGALLS

## HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Josh Ingalls for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Josh has the determination and drive to be successful in anything that he does and his

exemplary work with Principal Financial Group is a testament to that. As the Recruiting Manager at Principal Financial Group, Josh is passionate about helping others and utilizes his abilities to place people in the jobs best suited for their professional growth. Josh has donated his time to others through his work with the Animal Rescue League and the PACE Juvenile Center. In all aspects of his life, Josh is an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Josh in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Josh on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

# HONORING FORMER SENATOR STEPHEN M. BREWER FOR BEING NAMED CITIZEN OF THE YEAR

## HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank former State Senator Stephen M. Brewer for his 26 years of service in the state Legislature and to congratulate him on being recognized as Citizen of the Year by the Mount Wachusett Community College Foundation. Senator Brewer retired last year after 26 years of service in the state Legislature. Most recently, he served as Chair of the powerful Senate Ways and Means Committee. Senator Brewer is a giant; someone who looked out not only for his constituents and his community but also for Massachusetts. For 26 years Senator Brewer was a champion for Central Massachusetts. While I know his wife Valerie and daughters April and Audrey are happy to have him home, it's safe to say that we will miss his leadership in the State House. I can think of no one finer to receive this year's Harold E. Drake Citizen of the Year award for his service to the Commonwealth and to the constituents he represented over nearly three decades of public service.

# PERSONAL EXPLANATION

## HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 16; Tuesday, March 17; Wednesday, March 18; and Thursday, March 19, 2015, I was out on medical leave for surgery and unable to be present for recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 113 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 647).

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 114 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 648),

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 115 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 876, as amended),

"No" on roll call vote No. 116 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 138),

"No" on roll call vote No. 117 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 138),

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 118 (on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1191, as amended),

"No" on roll call vote No. 119 (on agreeing to the McKinley Amendment to H.R. 1029),

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 120 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 1029 with instructions),

"No" on roll call vote No. 121 (on passage of H.R. 1029),

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 122 (on agreeing to the Edwards Amendment to H.R. 1030),

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 123 (on agreeing to the Kennedy Amendment to H.R. 1030),

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 124 (on the motion to recommit H.R. 1030 with instructions),

"No" on roll call vote No. 125 (on passage of H.R. 1030),

"No" on roll call vote No. 126 (on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 152),

"No" on roll call vote No. 127 (on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 152),

"No" on roll call vote No. 128 (on passage of S.J. Res. 8), and

"Yes" on roll call vote No. 129 (on approving the Journal).

# TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDRA REBELES

## HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Alexandra Rebeles attends Foster High School in Richmond, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, why is it important to be involved in the political process?

# AN UNDENIABLE DUTY

"One of the penalties for refusing to participate in politics is that you end up being governed by your inferiors."—Plato

The American political system is an extremely complex system that impacts the lives of every single citizen who lives in our great country. Whether it's a presidential election or an election for local lawmakers, participation is essential in order for the system to be efficient and fair. A failure to vote or a choice to be ignorant in such important matters has severe consequences. Every election that takes place in the United States has a large degree of determining if a law will be passed or if a candidate will take

the steps needed in order to create a better country and system. In a situation like a presidential election, every single vote carries great significance and could alter which candidate will win. In my opinion, it is ironic how you see various Americans who have not voted protesting over laws, representatives, or presidents they do not agree with. The majority of the protesters will admit they did not vote but still feel the need to protest. How can you protest a law or principle if you did not even care enough to vote in the first place? I think those who choose not to vote need to take a look in the mirror and realize they are doing our country a disservice. Participation is the first step in order to create a better America that can serve its citizens in more efficient ways.

I have a firm belief that ignorance towards politics creates a veil that clouds the mind and leads to apathy and a lack of participation in political procedures. Ignorance in global and American affairs is one of the reasons why various people don't know or care about politics. Education in these subjects or matters greatly alters the ways a mind perceives political events. For example, watching an evening news program like the NBC Nightly News or the ABC World News can inform a viewer on the political matters plaguing or helping our country. Education can make a huge difference.

Awareness of political matters is imperative in order for this country to keep moving forward. Without any input from citizens, how can our elected officials suggest legislation that could help America in the long run?

---

ALEX LOW

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alex Low for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alex Low is a 10th grader at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alex Low is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alex Low for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

---

RECOGNIZING J.R. GALLEGOS

**HON. HENRY CUELLAR**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pleasanton City Councilman J.R.

Gallegos on the occasion of his retirement after twenty-three consecutive years of service to the people of Atascosa County and the City of Pleasanton.

J.R. Gallegos began his career as a public servant in 1989 when he was appointed to the Pleasanton Housing Authority Board of Directors. Three years later, at the age of twenty-eight, Mr. Gallegos was first elected to the Pleasanton City Council, representing the people of District Four. Since then, he has served on the Pleasanton City Council for twenty-three years. Mr. Gallegos has also been involved in a number of other community organizations and committees in Atascosa County and the City of Pleasanton.

Over the last two decades, Mr. Gallegos has dedicated his career to improving and enriching the lives of Pleasanton residents. During his time on the City Council, he has supported the construction of a municipal airport terminal, the police and public works departments, and a sports complex. Mr. Gallegos was also involved in plans for the wastewater treatment plant expansion, the Civic Center and Library, City Hall renovations, and a variety of other infrastructure improvements. His contributions have been described as "vastly improving the quality of life" for Pleasanton citizens. It is clear that he has helped to "pave the way to a bright future" for the City of Pleasanton.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize J.R. Gallegos for his twenty-three years of outstanding service as a Pleasanton City Councilman.

---

HONORING SAMUEL MCCRAY

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor an extraordinary community advocate and activist, Samuel McCray.

He is a citizen of the Mississippi Delta, who was born on a plantation in a shack in the middle of a cotton field just South of Lambert, Mississippi. He attended the segregated schools in Quitman County, graduating in 1968 from Quitman County Industrial High School. On May 1, 1968, the infamous class of '68 led a walkout, protesting the arrest of Willie Bolden, a Southern Christian Leadership Conference organizer sent to prepare the upcoming March on Washington, the Poor People's Campaign. The first leg of the operation was to start in Marks with mule drawn wagons. An all white Mississippi Highway Patrol unit of twenty troopers attacked the gathering of over 500, and forced them off the jail lawn. For Samuel, this would be his first act of civil disobedience. After high school, he would attend Coahoma Junior College (now Coahoma Community College) and Delta State University (then Delta State College). While in the Delta, he helped to revive the Black Students Organization, becoming second in command in the organization. This organization managed to convince the administration to add African American Studies, to recruit black women to the Delta Bell Cheerleader Squad,

to increase financial assistance, and to employ more of our people in the classroom.

While out on summer break in 1973, Samuel would join the local chapter of the NAACP and was chosen to head up the voter's league, the political arm of the organization. A few years earlier, the county purged the voter rolls. His first charge was to get ready for the 1975 election so voter's registration was number one priority. During this period of history, the voter rolls and the poll books were coded by race which proved to be a valuable tool. The team discovered pretty quickly that the poll books would provide all the information needed. The consistence voters would be the priority group, believing they would be the easiest to get back on the books and to the polls on Election Day. By the deadline, the group had registered over 1500 black voters. The work had only begun; the decision was made to run a slate, a candidate for each position. Not because of the possibility of winning, there was no chance of that, the black vote was less than a third of the total. Will black voters vote for black candidates? About 80% of the black votes were cast for our candidates. The black leadership could not have been happier; we were on our way. Voter registration was a step-up, and an opportunity presented itself in 1978 with the death of the white county supervisor in District 1. The district had more black voters than another and they were concentrated in the Crenshaw and Darling Precincts. With an attractive candidate, and a good ground game we felt we could make history, and we did. The opposition accused the group of cheating; too many black voters received help with their ballot. They found themselves in court, which turned out to be a blessing. The ruling was that any voter with a physical disability, blind or illiterate could receive assistance from the person of their choosing. Another slate was put together for the Town of Lambert, which had an At-Large scheme where a voter had to case a five candidate's ballot in order for the vote to count. Again, the group looked for the most attractive candidates, one of whom was J.D. "Jake" McAdory. Everybody liked him, including both blacks and whites, and he was a standup guy. He was the first African American elected to the Board of Aldermen. As always, the group would run a slate in county elections, realizing that keeping voters engaged was the best tool to building a strong electorate.

In the late 70's Samuel would align himself with people like Attorneys: Frank Parker & Margret Carey; the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Victor McTeer & Willie Bailey, Johnnie Walls, Senator Henry Kersey, and others that were challenging the legal schemes hindering blacks from the ballot box. Sam was certified as an expert witness on white block voting, voting harassment, voter's intimidation and at-large voting. The effort would lead to redistricting or redrawing county supervisor and municipal lines to give black voters a fair chance to elect candidates of their choosing. By 1983, with creating three black majorities districts and getting rid of the at-large voting practice, they began getting much closer to achieving the goal set many years earlier. By 1987, they controlled the Quitman County Board of Supervisors. Today,



all the municipalities with the exception of two are headed by African American mayors, and all of the governing boards are black majorities. While an activist in Quitman County, Sam worked at Coahoma Opportunities, Inc. (COI) in Clarksdale where he started as a community driver, but quickly moved up in the organization into middle management. He was promoted to Coordinator of Nutrition Access and to an Equal Opportunity Officer. In those positions, the organization would open the first WIC & food bank on site and help to bring free breakfast to public school cafeterias. While with COI, Samuel was serving on the Sub-Area Advisory Council, the group that made recommendations on health facilities in the State. His works on the council led to the creation of Aaron Henry Community Health Services Center in Clarksdale.

In 1986, Michael "Mike" Alfonso Espy hired him to organize the northern counties of the district where he applied what he had learned from his work in Quitman County, and applied that to a multi-counties model, resulting in some of the best turnout. In 1988, Governor Ray Mabus named Samuel to the Mississippi Housing Finance Corporation. The board later re-named the organization to the Mississippi Home Corporation, where he was elected Chairperson of the Program Committee. In this role, Samuel worked with local nonprofits to access programs such as USDA's Community Self-Help program, the 504 repair loan/grant and the 502 home ownership, which is the program used by Samuel to purchase his home.

In 1993, Congressman Mike Espy would step down to accept the Secretary of Agriculture in the Clinton Administration, the first African American ever to hold this position. The community was happy to have one of its own, but it put the 2nd District at risk. Thankfully, the leadership agreed to a mini convention process that led to a consensus candidate, Honorable BENNIE THOMPSON, County Supervisor from Hinds County, who was one of the single most respected, elected officials in the State, black or white. THOMPSON would go on to win and take office in April of 1993. Samuel never envisioned holding office or working for a politician, but this is BENNIE THOMPSON, he's a living legend. After lobbying his District Director almost daily, Samuel was hired on June 1, 1993 as a Field Representative and Caseworker, the greatest job on the planet. The Congressman assigned him the counties he had worked over the last twenty years. Samuel's office was located in Marks, his home town. Armed with marching orders to assure Federal Agencies deliver services fairly to his constituents, Samuel served as a resource to non-profits, governmental agencies and small businesses. In the years that followed, the Clinton Administration would institute the Empowerment Zone and the Enterprise Community Initiative. Part of Samuel's assigned counties received the Enterprise Community designation. North Panola would receive a portable water system that provided safe drinking water for hundreds of families. Local limited resource farmers would get a vegetable processing plant so they could better market their produce. An unexpected benefit to an unexpected group of about fifty families living in the Cotton Street Community, got

sewer services for the first time. A street separated the town of Marks from this community, and because of their activism in the 60s, they were still being punished. The residents of Cotton Street found out and met with the governing body, and had them resubmit their application to include Cotton Street. On March 17, 2008, then candidate for President of the United States Barack Obama came to Greenville for breakfast with the Congressman and staff. Upon his election, the Congressman took his entire staff to the Inauguration of the first African-American President in his lifetime. After nineteen and a half years as a Congressional Aide being a part of some of the greatest advancements, right here in the Mississippi Delta to be a part of it is a prayer, answered. Samuel and his wife of 32 years, Bernestine, still live in Quitman County. Their three children: Barbara, Johnathan, and Shonari are all grown and gone, with their 12 grandchildren whom Samuel and Bernestine love from a distance. On December 31, 2012 Samuel retired, the time had come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Samuel McCray for his dedication in being a respected community servant.

#### A TRIBUTE TO SUZANNE HULL

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Suzanne Hull for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Suzanne has the determination and drive to be successful in anything she does, and her exemplary work with Contemporary Business Solutions is a testament to that. As the owner of Contemporary Business Solutions, Suzanne utilizes her communication skills to assist people in developing their social media presence as a networking and job-seeking tool. She also is active and passionate about organizations she believes in, donating her time to non-profit organizations like the Des Moines European Heritage Association. In all aspects of her life, Suzanne is an example of the hard work and service that makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Suzanne in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Su-

zanne on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 135TH ANNIVERSARY OF GETHSEMANE BAPTIST CHURCH OF EUSTIS, FLORIDA

#### HON. DANIEL WEBSTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to recognize the 135th anniversary of Gethsemane Baptist Church of Eustis, and commend their strong heritage of service within Lake County, Florida.

Founded in 1880, Gethsemane Baptist Church of Eustis was the first place of worship for African Americans in Eustis, and has served as a beacon of hope in our local community. Many lives have been impacted through the church's ministry, and I am honored to recognize their long history of dedication and service. This is a momentous year for Gethsemane Baptist Church of Eustis, and I am pleased to commemorate it with them.

It is my pleasure to join Reverend William Hawkins and the congregation at Gethsemane Baptist Church of Eustis in celebrating this historical milestone. It is truly an honor to serve the residents of Central Florida in the U.S. House of Representatives.

#### THE TRAGIC KILLING OF RUSSIAN OPPOSITION LEADER BORIS NEMTSOV

#### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, last month, while many of us were working late to prevent the shutdown of our own Department of Homeland Security, a tragedy occurred in Moscow.

Boris Nemtsov, famed leader of Russia's opposition, was fatally shot four times in the back near St. Basil's Cathedral and the Kremlin. He was 55 years old. That night the fateful image of his body lying dead, on a bridge, facing the Kremlin, sent shivers across our world.

Shivers of sorrow. Shivers of anger. Shivers of cold remembrance of a place with no room for real liberty. No free speech. No tolerance for contrary opinions. No experience of what it means to live in an open society.

Russia is a nation that spans eleven time zones. It holds enough nuclear arms to obliterate life on Earth. How sad that such a nation is still unsafe for a peaceful advocate of freedom and representative governance.

Boris Nemtsov was killed just hours before a non-violent demonstration he was preparing to lead, protesting Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine. What courage he showed in speaking for Ukraine, a young and energetic nation seeking peace and opportunity for its people.



Ukraine is a sister to Russia and has not deserved the brutality that Russia has heaped upon her over the past year. During that short span, more than 6,000 people have died in the fight for an independent Ukraine.

Mr. Nemtsov, a former deputy prime minister of Russia, a vice premier, fought every day for a more open society in his home country. He championed reform ever since the collapse of the old Soviet order twenty years ago. It was a valiant, if often lonely, struggle against a vast and oppressive totalitarian state. More and more, he must have felt the creeping shadow of his own mortality due to the danger in which he placed himself.

Boris Nemtsov was assassinated by cowards lurking in the shadows as he crossed a bridge in front of the Kremlin. The murderers, driven to such a craven and despicable act, were too small and too afraid to let his voice rise.

As I read the news of his tragic fate, I see the first threads of a history that will hold him up as a leader of unparalleled courage and unprecedented faith in his people. This is remarkable in the face of one of the most persistent tyrannies in the world.

Boris Nemtsov's life is prophetic, like Alexander Solzhenitsyn and others who have suffered to move Russia out of its historical imprisonment of liberty.

No part of our world has suffered more in the last century than Russia and the subjugated Soviet territories, as Dr. Timothy Snyder recounts in his extraordinary book "Bloodlands."

In the middle of Europe in the middle of the 20th century, the Nazi and Soviet regimes murdered some 14 million people . . . all victims of murderous policy rather than casualties of war.

Yet not a single one of the 14 million murdered was a soldier on active duty. Most were women, children, and the aged; none were bearing weapons; many had been stripped of their possessions, including their clothes.

The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights has called the situation a "merciless devastation of civilian lives and infrastructure."

His report points out that heavy weaponry and foreign fighters continue to pour in from Russia and that the conflict has "dramatically deteriorated" in the past two months.

In 2010 Nemtsov founded the Coalition for Russia without Lawlessness and Corruption, a party notable not only for its ambitious name but also because it was refused registration as a party by the Kremlin. In recent years, as a leader of the Russian opposition, Nemtsov had written several highly credible reports exposing corruption at the highest levels of the Russian government.

Our own Gettysburg Address, one of the most revered statements in American history, says, in part, "that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

This is a message I now commend to the people of Russia: let the sacrifice of Boris

Nemtsov inspire your own devotion to the cause of freedom.

Because of Boris Nemtsov, millions inside Russia can imagine liberty, a more democratic society, and a life better than the one now permitted to them. Ordinary citizens can make that life for themselves if they are only allowed real representative governance. Nemtsov strove to give every Russian a chance at that better life, even from inside the belly of a frozen whale. We honor his ideals and his sacrifice.

#### TRIBUTE TO SHERYL SOUNDAR

#### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Sheryl Soundar attends Manvel High School in Manvel, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

When asked for the most important event in our country's history within the past fifteen years, most people will say September 11, and not without good reason. That day launched the United States into a war that still demands American soldiers. It cost many lives, changed an entire country's outlook on foreign affairs, and put a standstill on many domestic issues. However, another event that is often forgotten in the glaring spotlight of 9/11 is Hurricane Katrina.

Personally, I have many memories of Katrina and the damage that it did to New Orleans, having lived in Houston during that time. This story occupied an entire month of evening news broadcasts and cemented into my memory the struggles that the people of New Orleans faced. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) also faced a struggle, but of a different sort. FEMA came under extreme criticism for its inability to offer assistance and for the prolonged lack of access to resources that caused in the New Orleans area. The public relations fiasco that resulted tarnished not only FEMA's reputation, but also the reputation of the already heavily criticized Bush administration. Many active duty troops were deployed to the area to assist during the recovery period in light of FEMA's failing.

As a whole, the Gulf Coast region was deeply affected by Hurricane Katrina, physically as well as mentally. New Orleans faced harsh economic conditions and harsh odds as its people began to rebuild, and surrounding states also felt this burden. However, the greatest impact Katrina had on the United States was on our collective psyche. At first, it seemed like another problem stacked on

top of the ever present war on terror, but as the worst pain subsided, the country realized that this was, more than it was a tarnish or a natural disaster, an opportunity. Americans from coast to coast were horrified by the state of affairs in New Orleans and poured out their sympathy for those in need. As a nation, we were saddened and strengthened by Katrina, finding fear in the condition of the Gulf Coast and solace in the ability of Americans to unite behind a common goal.

#### ALICIA BALDERAS

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Alicia Balderas for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Alicia Balderas is an 11th grader at Pomona High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Alicia Balderas is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Alicia Balderas for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

#### CONGRATULATING THE DEDICATED HOOSIERS OF KEM KREST CORPORATION

#### HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the dedicated Hoosiers of Kem Krest Corporation headquartered in Elkhart, Indiana.

They have recently been named the General Motors 2014 Supplier of the Year.

Kem Krest started in 1979 and since then has grown and expanded their customer base beyond the automotive industry to include the agriculture and defense industries.

The exceptional quality of products from this supplier reflects the hard work of their Hoosier employees.

They have demonstrated a clear commitment to go above and beyond as well as take the utmost pride in the products they supply.

I would like to personally thank the Hoosiers of Kem Krest Corporation for their hard work and dedication.

Kem Krest Corporation serves as another great example of a successful business in Northern Indiana and their devotion to making quality products should be recognized.

The dedication Kem Krest has shown makes me proud to represent Indiana's Second Congressional District.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 and 24, I missed a series of Roll Call votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on #130, 131, 132, 133, and 134. I would have voted "NAY" on #135.

#### A TRIBUTE TO JOEL FORTNEY

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Joel Fortney for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Joel has the determination and drive to be successful in all that he does, and his exemplary work with Principal Global Investors is a testament to that. Now the portfolio manager of Principal Mid-Cap Value Fund, Joel's success has continued. Joel and his wife are active in their community too, where they support the Blank Park Zoo by sponsoring animals. In all aspects of his life Joel's example of hard work and service makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Joel in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Joel on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### TRIBUTE TO RIDA SARWAR

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in

the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Rida Sarwar attends Pearland High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: In your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

239 years ago, the thirteen colonies declared independence from Great Britain. Since then, the United States government has always played a large role in the lives of Americans throughout history. The role of the government plays a huge part in society. The government should always cater to the needs of its citizens and provide an organized society.

In 1776, America declared its complete autonomy from Great Britain by signing the Declaration of Independence. Fifty-six men signed the document that would later become the most important document in American history and a symbol of independence. These men signed the declaration for many reasons. The most well-known reason was because of the absence of representation for the colonies in the British parliament. These universal founding principles of representation and equality have become the basis of American government. Democracy upholds these principles in the government. The government is indirectly ruled by the people through representatives. These representatives are responsible for directly seeing to the needs of the people who live in their specified region. The government's job is to accommodate the needs of the citizens. American government is "for the people, by the people". The power of the government is limited by its citizens. This is self-government in its truest form.

The government is also responsible for creating an organized society. People pay taxes to the government so that the government can generate revenue and maintain its operations. In return, the government should be responsible for providing various services to the people. The government should provide fundamental services such as basic infrastructure, security and a stable economy. A country cannot support itself without a solid infrastructure. Therefore, the government should provide adequate facilities for their citizens. They should be responsible for providing urban infrastructure such as water supply, electricity and roads. It is the government's duty to effectively utilize the resources within a country for development. This means that the government should also be able to provide other services. Tax money should be used to create better education, health facilities and social security. The American government has always provided the best safety for its citizens. A government should always protect its citizens, because they should come first. Lastly, the government is responsible for keeping a stable economy. Without a stable economy, the people cannot survive.

The American government was established to serve the best interests of its people. Its role is to provide for them. It should provide an organized society and a good government. The government's main role is to serve its people.

ROW4RICE

### HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Rice University Rowing team has taken a step to further rowing sports in the City of Houston. To help raise the funds needed to build a water sports facility on Buffalo Bayou in downtown Houston, two of the teams coaches will row 3,000 miles across the Atlantic in the Talisker Whiskey Atlantic Challenge. Coaches Mike Matson and David Alviar, attempting to be the first Texans to complete this feat, will begin this massive undertaking in the Canary Islands, and finish on the Caribbean island of Antigua.

The duo will take this challenge in a boat named after Ann McCormick Sullivan.

Ann Sullivan was a firefighter with Station 68 in Houston when on May 31, 2013 a 5-alarm fire at the Southwest Inn took the lives of 4 brave men and women, including Ann. This deadly fire completely shook the community. Ann was just 24 years old.

Coach Mike Matson was a volunteer firefighter in the City of Stafford and had the opportunity to run calls with Ann. Ann, nicknamed "mighty mouse," was a strong, resilient firefighter, who was never afraid to step into danger to help others. Mike recalls training days when Ann would extend the heavy hose full of water to its full length, a task difficult even to the largest men on the squad. Ann lived up to this name, never wavering in her determination.

Coach Mike felt that it was fitting that the boat be named after one of Houston's heroes who truly represents the spirit of resilience needed for this race. Under the name Row4Rice the two coaches will raise money to build proper facilities to host rowing, kayaking, canoeing, and other water sports. They have pledged to donate \$5,000 to the Ann McCormick Sullivan Foundation to support women in firefighting. Mike, David and the rest of the Rice rowing team are to be congratulated as they begin this massive undertaking in the spirit of one of Houston's heroes.

And that's just the way it is.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2015

### HON. MADELINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the National Guard State Partnership Program Enhancement Act of 2015, which strengthens this critical "soft power" global partnership program. The National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP) provides unique capacity building capabilities to Combatant Commanders and U.S. Chiefs of Mission via 68 comprehensive partnerships between National Guard units across the United States and 74 partner nations with the potential for further development.

For over 20 years, the SPP has directly supported the broad national interests and security cooperation goals of the United States by engaging partner nations via military, socio-political, and economic conduits at the local, state, and national levels. The program's public diplomacy effectiveness lies in its ability to leverage the full breadth and depth of U.S. defense and interagency capabilities from within the state-country relationship.

The value of the SPP lies in its ability to concentrate a small component of the U.S. defense structure—a state's National Guard—on a single country or region in support of U.S. Government policies and objectives that are coordinated between the Combatant Commander and U.S. Chief of Mission. This concentrated focus supports the development of long term personal relationships and inter-agency coordination mechanisms that would not otherwise exist. By its nature the National Guard is uniquely positioned within the military to develop these long term relationships.

The SPP is becoming an increasingly more important tool for Combatant Commanders and U.S. Chiefs of Mission in achieving long-term U.S. strategic objectives. The program has developed from assistance and partnership with primarily Eastern European nations to a program that supports all the non-CONUS combatant commanders. Recently, the long-term benefits of this program became evident. In particular, I highlight the 22-year relationship between the California National Guard and Ukraine. When the instability in Ukraine began the California National Guard got some of the clearest insight we had into the situation by virtue of the long term relationship they had forged with Ukraine's military and civil institutions.

Of additional interest to me are the opportunities that SPP poses for our rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region. I believe the SPP will further expand and strengthen relations with many Asian and Pacific nations. The program clearly demonstrates the U.S. commitment to the region and our allies. In fact, one of the newest partnerships was established last year between Tonga and the Nevada National Guard. These types of partnerships help to develop critical capacity building capabilities for allies in this critical region of the world.

Most importantly, the bill I introduce today eliminates the 2016 termination of the program. Additionally, it removes the program restriction to be primarily a humanitarian and emergency response force and expands it to support the national interests and security cooperation goals and objectives of the United States. Elimination of this restrictive language helps to recognize the true nature of SPP and acknowledges broader partnerships that already exist. Requiring the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to develop "core competencies" will help the Combatant Commanders and U.S. Chiefs of Mission more effectively use, develop and maintain partnership programs.

Further, the bill ensures that Department of Defense, a state National Guard and Department of State's equities are considered in the context of broader program goals and lays out the roles of the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and Chief of the National Guard Bureau in managing the program. The

bill puts in place critical oversight mechanisms to establish metrics through which to analyze the impact of the program. Lastly, this bill creates an accounting line within DoD that allows National Guard funds to be used in support of the program and ensures accountability of the funding. Funds for the program currently come several separate Service, Department of Defense and Department of State accounts. The Congress needs more visibility on the use of these funds and establishing a central account is critical to this endeavor and is similar to how the counterdrug program resources its activities.

The capabilities and missions outlined in this legislation leverage the capabilities inherent in the National Guard and will strengthen our relations with allies and nations across the globe. The dual role of the National Guard provides them a unique opportunity to support Combatant Commander as well as an Ambassador's needs in a given country. I believe this legislation is necessary to codify current practices and enhance the program's positive impact worldwide.

I thank Congressman TIM WALZ of Minnesota; Congressman JIM BRIDENSTINE of Oklahoma and Congressman DOUG LAMBORN of Colorado for being original co-sponsors of this legislation. Our efforts highlight the bipartisan support for SPP and need to enhance this critical capacity building tool. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this critical legislation.

---

HONORING MICHAEL BRENNAN

**HON. PETE OLSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Michael Brennan attends Seven Lakes High School in Katy, Texas. The essay topic is: in your opinion, what role should government play in our lives?

The debate on the role of government has raged in politics since the very first inception of government in Sumeria over 5500 years ago. Today's society is certainly a far cry from those long-gone times, but the discussion on governance still continues on in our very own Congress to this day. The exact issues have changes with the times, but general views on the matter can be split into two groups: those who see the government only as a stabilizing political and economic entity, and those who also see it as a tool for significant change.

Regardless of the merits of either side, there are many purposes of government which many consider inherent to its exist-

ence and for which it was originally established. In exchange for the ability to tax citizens for the money required for its operation, the government provides the critical services of public defense and order—police forces, military, civil courts, and so on. The government is usually also responsible for the universal system of standards (or at the very least, adopting and enforcing standards set by the ISO) as well as creating and maintaining transportation, a monetary system, and upholding private ownership (at least in a capitalist system). There are also a number of societal industries and organizations which could be left alone to their own mechanisms (by means of ultra-conservative *laissez-fair* policies), but governments usually take an active role in at least rudimentary regulation such as professional certification, education, basic human rights and labor laws, and controlling or mitigating the natural ebb of flow of an economy. Indeed, many of the aspects of government which allow higher society to function are great and necessary positives—the conflict arises in questions on using the government's greater powers.

The unfortunate reality of the ideological divide between so called "conservatives" and "liberals" is that neither side is particularly more correct than the other (regardless of how much they may deride each other). However, it is well known how dangerous great power can be, and it follows from this that the society-changing power that a government has should be used sparingly. The government should use its "social" power when there is little other choice due to deep-rooted ideologies which directly contradict the concept of equality or threaten the safety and well-being of citizens, as in the 1960s when segregation had to be forcibly abolished or when government intervention seemed like the only way to pull the US out of the Great Depression. Most every individual has compassion for his common individual, but "compassion" cannot simply be legislated through extensive social programs, using money from people who may not even agree with these programs. In all cases, when so much money and so many lives may be at stake, caution must necessarily trump passion.

---

AIDAN CLARK

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Aidan Clark for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Aidan Clark is an 8th grader at Moore Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Aidan Clark is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Aidan Clark for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

## A TRIBUTE TO JENNA EKSTROM

**HON. DAVID YOUNG**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Jenna Ekstrom for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Jenna has the determination and drive to be successful in all that she does, and her exemplary work with the Des Moines Art Center is a testament to that. As the Manager of Membership with the Des Moines Art Center, Jenna is passionate about her work and it shows. Jenna is an active volunteer, giving her time to support worthy causes such as the Greater Des Moines Leadership Institute, Junior League of Des Moines and Housing Tomorrow. In all aspects of her life, Jenna's example of hard work and service makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Jenna in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Jenna on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

## HONORING THE TREVINO FAMILY

**HON. HENRY CUELLAR**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Trevino family of Zapata, Texas. Six brothers—Teodoro, Antonio, Anselmo, Filiberto, Jr., Leopoldo, and Jose Manuel—proudly served the United States of America in World War II. Combined, the brothers served a total of fifteen and a half years, and by the end of the war, each was honorably discharged.

The Trevino brothers were born to the late Filiberto Trevino and Luisa Cuellar Trevino. During World War II, Teodoro, the eldest, served in the Medical Corps; Antonio served in the Coastal Artillery; Anselmo served in the Engineer Corps; Filiberto, Jr., served in the U.S. Army Air Corps; Leopoldo served in the Field Artillery; and Jose Manuel, the youngest

of the brothers, served in the Infantry. Despite the distance between them, the brothers were miraculously able to meet with one another over the course of their service; Antonio was fortunate enough to see each of his brothers.

Despite the many hardships the brothers faced during their service, each was able to overcome whatever obstacles were presented. With support from their loved ones back home—as well as one another—the Trevino brothers dutifully served their country. They were brave, fearlessly taking down enemy planes and saving fellow soldiers by covering them with their own bodies to shield them from incoming enemy fire.

After four and half years of wartime, the Trevino family was finally reunited. By June of 1946, all six of the brothers had returned home to Zapata, Texas. They were proud of their service, and it is with great pleasure that they share their experiences with their children and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize the Trevino family for their incredible service to our great nation and their fellow countrymen during World War II.

## TRIBUTE TO DR. NORMAN E.

BORLAUG

**HON. ROD BLUM**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Norman E. Borlaug, known as “the father of the green revolution,” was born on March 25, 1914 on a farm outside Cresco, Iowa. Moved during the Great Depression by the examples of hunger he witnessed, Dr. Borlaug committed his life to developing the then nascent field of plant biology to increase food production and combat world hunger. The mutation techniques he developed led to high yield, disease resistant wheat varieties suitable for planting around the globe. In honor of his work, Dr. Borlaug was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1970, the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 1977, and the Congressional Gold Medal in 2007.

Today, on what would have been his 101st birthday, I rise to honor this great native Iowan. Dr. Borlaug revolutionized agriculture and saved over one billion lives from starvation. His legacy stands as an example of American ingenuity and the impact one good man can make on the world. I encourage all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to visit Dr. Borlaug's statue in Statuary Hall to reflect on the life and achievements of this great American.

## HONORING CAPTAIN ANITRIA M.

MACK

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a resourceful and ambitious woman, Captain Anitria M. Mack.

Anitria has shown what can be done through hard work, dedication and a desire to serve others.

Captain Anitria Michelle Mack was born on April 17, 1975 in Grenada, MS. She graduated from Grenada High School, May 1993. She began her military career in May 1992, enlisting in the 254th Engineer Detachment, Camp McCain, MS, under the split option program as an Administrative Specialist. She completed Basic Training the summer of 1992 and Advanced Initial Training the summer of 1993 at Fort Jackson, SC. The 254th Engineer Detachment later reorganized and became Detachment 3 Company B 106th Support Battalion causing CPT Mack-Lewis to reclassify as a Light Wheeled Vehicle Mechanic. She enrolled in Jackson State University in August, 1993 where she graduated with a Bachelors Degree in Accounting in May, 1997 and a Masters Degree in Business Administration, May, 2000. CPT Mack-Lewis then entered the Federal Officer Candidate School, Fort Benning, GA, July 8, 2001 and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant on October 11, 2001.

CPT Mack-Lewis simultaneously served as the Executive Officer and Maintenance Control Officer of Bravo Company 106th Support Battalion from October 2001 thru December 2004, located at Camp Shelby, MS. CPT Mack-Lewis deployed to Iraq in January 2005 as the Supply and Services Officer, where she was the Officer In Charge of all Logistics Convoy Operations for six Forward Operating Bases occupied by the 155th Brigade Combat Team within the “Triangle of Death”. Upon return from Iraq, she assumed company command from April 2006–January 2008 of Alpha Company 106th Brigade Support Battalion, a Supply and Distribution Company whose headquarters is in Magee, MS with detachments at Prentiss and Taylorsville, MS. She then served as the Executive Officer of Joint Forces Headquarters, Jackson, MS from January 2008–May 2009.

CPT Mack-Lewis has received numerous awards throughout her career to include: Meritorious Service Medal, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medals, Global War on Terrorism Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, as well as other commendations and state awards.

CPT Mack-Lewis worked fulltime with the Mississippi Army National Guard from January 1999–May 2009 as a federal technician. She served as a Budget Analyst for the Director of Logistics from January, 1999–December, 2004 and as the Employee Relations Specialist for all MS Army and Air National Guard Federal Technicians from January 2005–May 2009. She was then hired on the Active Guard Reserve Program (AGR) June, 2009. She currently teaches Army ROTC to students attending Mississippi College, MS College School of Law and Hinds Community College. She also serves as ROTC Liaison for National Guard soldiers who attend school at MC, MC School of Law, UMC, JSU, Hinds CC, Belhaven, Millsaps, Delta State, and MS Valley State University. She is a member of the Recruiting and Retention Battalion, Mississippi Army National Guard. She currently serves as a Logistics Officer for the 106th Brigade Support Battalion, Monticello, MS. She is a member of

Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., Clinton (MS) Alumnae Chapter. She and her husband Paul have been married since August 31, 2002 and currently reside in Terry, MS. They are members of New Jerusalem Church, Jackson, MS.

CPT Mack-Lewis's favorite scripture comes from Psalm 27:1-3. "The Lord is my light and my salvation, whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid? When the wicked, even mine enemies and foes came upon me to eat my flesh, they stumbled and fell. Though a host should encamp against me. My heart shall not fear: though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Captain Anitria M. Mack for her passion and dedication to serving our great Country and desire to make a difference in the lives of others.

---

#### HONORING AVERY BAYHAM

#### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Avery Bayham attends Dawson High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

On September 11, 2001 four planes were hijacked by the terrorist group al-Qaeda. Two of these planes struck the World Trade Center in New York City, one of the planes hit the Pentagon, and the other was crashed into a field in Pennsylvania. Hundreds of lives were lost as this event struck fear in the hearts of millions of Americans and dramatically changed the status-quo of the United States. Today, almost fifteen years later, we are still able to see the results of this devastating event in our everyday society.

Among the most common effects of 9/11 is racism. I am a sophomore in high school, and every day as I walk down the vast halls of my very racially diverse school, I constantly hear racial jokes and stereotypes. After 9/11, the Islamic community in the United States was heavily discriminated against and criticized. These so called "jokes" aimed at certain members of our community are extremely disrespectful, immature, and absolutely unacceptable. The Declaration of Independence states that "all men are created equal" and no man has the right to place himself higher due to race. I personally believe that the racial dispute towards Muslims after the event generated and propelled forward the racism that we have in society today.

Another gargantuan effect of 9/11 was that the security of the United States dramatically increased. This was the first event that seriously caught the attention of the entire population of America since the Cuban Missile Crisis. The security at airports was probably the most noticeable change with ways to try to find bombs, background checks, and body scans. The U.S. has been on the edge of its seat ever since we sent our boys into Afghanistan to put a stop to al-Qaeda, which was defeated with the death of Osama Bin Laden. Now, there is a new group known as ISIS, who is currently executing Christians in Europe while the rest of the world is watching helplessly from the sidelines. This group needs to be neutralized as soon as possible; although it isn't directly attacking the U.S., they are constantly attacking our society and relationships with others. This group was created in response to the elimination of Osama Bin Laden, the mastermind behind 9/11. I have seen friends abandon friends just because of what members of their race have done to each other, and I would hate to have that happen to myself.

9/11 was an absolutely devastating event in America, an event that is still attacking our society today. If 9/11 wouldn't have occurred, we would have significantly less racial discrimination as well as security threats in the United States. When did the U.S. begin to allow our enemies to change us?

---

#### IN APPRECIATION OF RON LEGRAND AND HIS YEARS OF SERVICE

#### HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today, as ranking member and former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I join with my colleagues, Representative SHEILA JACKSON LEE, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and Representative ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, the former chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, in expressing our appreciation for Ron LeGrand's years of service to the committee.

Ron has enjoyed a distinguished career in service to our Nation. Prior to joining the staff of the committee, he worked for the Drug Enforcement Administration, the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, the House Select Committee on Narcotics, and the staff of Senator JOSEPH BIDEN on the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In the private sector and in public service, Ron has dedicated himself to protecting the rights of those who have been victimized by crime.

During his time with the committee, Ron worked tirelessly on the hard-fought reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, a historic law to assist victims of domestic violence and prevent future acts of domestic violence. He also worked on important legislation to protect seniors against those who would prey upon them. Ron's ability to build coalitions on both sides of the aisle and with outside stakeholders on human trafficking and

drug legislation was critical to the passage of several important bills that have since become law.

In recent years, Ron dedicated himself to the examination and reform of our criminal justice system, culminating with his work on the Over-criminalization Task Force. We appreciate his magnanimity, energy, and enthusiasm, which has helped immensely in generating a bipartisan desire to address this issue.

In these and other legislative and oversight issues, Ron has displayed a high degree of professionalism and personal commitment, providing the members of the committee and staff with wise counsel.

We thank Ron for years of selfless service and wish him the very best as he leaves public service to continue his efforts in fighting domestic violence through his new position at the National Network to End Domestic Violence. All of his colleagues will miss him dearly and continue to value his friendship into the future.

---

#### A TRIBUTE TO DANIEL HOFFMAN- ZINNEL

#### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Daniel Hoffman-Zinnel for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Daniel has the determination and talent to be successful in all that he does, and his work with Planned Parenthood of the Heartland is a testament to that commitment. As the Director of Education and Leadership with Planned Parenthood of the Heartland, Daniel is able to pursue a personal passion of his in his professional life. He maintains an active schedule outside work, volunteering for numerous organizations, including the Iowa Cancer Consortium.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Daniel in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud him for utilizing his talents to better both his community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Daniel on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

ABIGAIL ESPINOZA

**HON. ED PERLMUTTER**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Abigail Espinoza for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Abigail Espinoza is a 12th grader at Jefferson High School and received this award because her determination and hard work have allowed her to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Abigail Espinoza is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Abigail Espinoza for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt she will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of her future accomplishments.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SACRED HEART SCHOOL

**HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sacred Heart Elementary School, located in Rockaway, Morris County, New Jersey as it celebrates its 50th anniversary.

Since the school opened its doors in September of 1965, Sacred Heart School has been dedicated to fostering its students' moral development as well as their academic careers. Located in the center of the Borough of Rockaway, Sacred Heart teaches pre-kindergarten through eighth grade, and attracts students from all across Morris County. When the school was founded in 1965, were enrolled. The first class to graduate Sacred Heart in 1971 was a mere 15 people! Over the last fifty years, the student body has more than tripled to over 200 boys and girls.

Sacred Heart School is a private Catholic institution with the mission of providing academic excellence, sound instruction, and a choice of activities which permits students to explore their talents as well as their interests. They offer something more which includes academic excellence, principle leadership values, and a strong spirit of community. Sacred Heart School has the philosophy of education of the child including spiritually, academically, emotionally, socially, and physically. Their goal is not just produce good students, but well-rounded people.

The school's dedication to its students has not gone unnoticed. Sacred Heart has been recognized as a "Best Practice School" by the Home and School Federation of the Diocese of Paterson on four separate occasions. In

2004, Sacred Heart won its first Best Practice Award for its Peer Mentoring Program between 4th and 8th graders. In 2005, it received another Best Practice Award for Academics for its Career Day that it holds annually during Catholic Schools Week. In 2006, the school was recognized with a third Best Practice Award for continually surveying their community to ensure all of their needs are met, and always looking to better the way they serve their students. In 2007, the school received a fourth Best Practice Award for its Monday Lunch Program, where every Monday a new student provides a lunch based on his or her own cultural background in order to promote understanding and appreciation of cultural differences. Additionally, the Sacred Heart School was awarded the prestigious "Star School Award" by the Diocese for its outstanding Literacy for Life program. Star Schools are recognized for being on the "cutting edge" and for promoting high student achievement and outstanding performance.

Under the leadership of the qualified and credentialed teachers and faculty Sacred Heart strives to instill a deep love of God, neighbor, and country within their students. They want to nurture their spirits along with their minds, as well as create a strong supportive community built on the values of love and faith.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to recognize the 50th anniversary of this wonderful school dedicated to fostering an environment not just for students to grow in academics but in their faith as well.

## HONORING JEDD MOSKOWITZ

**HON. GRACE MENG**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Ms. MENG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of my Chief of Staff, Jedd Moskowitz, who will be retiring from Capitol Hill after 32 years of exemplary service to the constituents of New York. Thirty of these years were spent with former Congressman Gary Ackerman, and I was lucky to have benefitted from his guidance for the past two and a half years.

Jedd started his career at the Queens Tribune working as a copy editor for Congressman Ackerman. When Congressman Ackerman ran and won a seat in the New York State Senate, Jedd remained by his side. In 1983, after five years in the State Senate, Congressman Ackerman was elected to the United States Congress, and soon named Jedd his Chief of Staff.

Loyal, diligent, dedicated, hardworking all describe the model character Jedd has shown in this position. His knowledge of the House and its proceedings is unparalleled, his advice invaluable, and his willingness to help and mentor young staffers unmatched. He is currently the longest serving Chief of Staff on The Hill.

I would be remiss not to include baseball fanatic when describing him, as Jedd holds an annual tradition of inviting each member of his staff to attend a baseball game come springtime. Though his season tickets are for the

Nationals, his heart remains with his hometown team, the New York Mets. Jedd also remains active in his Synagogue, and is a devoted family man to his wife and two children.

I ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives join me and rise in recognition of Jedd's faithful service to this body, and to the countless people whose paths he has crossed and whose lives he's enriched. Jedd, I wish you the best of luck and continued success in all of your future endeavors.

## HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL TYRONE A. WILLIAMS

**HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable public servant, Lieutenant Colonel Tyrone A. Williams.

Lt. Col. Tyrone A. Williams serves as the 172d Maintenance Operations Flight's Maintenance Operations Officer, Thompson Field, in Jackson, Mississippi. He is the primary advisor to the 172d Maintenance Group Commander for Maintenance Operations, operating block 13+ and, 16/17 C-17A aircraft, providing the state of Mississippi support in the event of national emergency, maintaining peace and order, and supporting civil defense and pre-attack planning.

Lt. Col. Williams is responsible for 20 personnel, nine C-17 aircraft, two major facilities, and associated support equipment.

Lt. Col. Williams set up both the Air National Guard's first Air Education and Training Command gained training detachment and the Air National Guard's only C-17 Aircraft Maintenance Training Field Service Detachment.

Lt. Col. Williams began his military career as an enlisted member, serving as an Aircraft Maintenance Specialist on the C-141 B and C model aircraft. He received his commission in 1998, graduating from the Academy of Military Science at McGhee Tyson Air National Guard Base. He is a career logistician with a discipline in maintenance. Lt. Col. Williams has been deployed numerous times in his career in support of both the real world and the special training events. In 2009, he served as the Division Chief, Logistics Operations Division, Logistics Directorate, United States Central Command Air Force Forces Forward in Southwest Asia. Lt. Col. Williams is a veteran of Operations Just Cause, Desert Shield/Desert Storm, Noble Eagle, Enduring Freedom, Iraqi Freedom, Joint Task Force Horn of Africa and the European Strategic Inter-theater Deployment.

Lt. Col. Williams has had many assignments and prior to his current assignment; he served as the 172d Maintenance Operations Flight Commander and the Logistics Group, Executive Officer, 172d Airlift Wing, Thompson Field, Jackson, Mississippi. As executive officer he assisted the Director of Logistics in formulating, developing, and coordinating all plans, policies and programs, finances and manpower requirements affecting aircraft maintenance, fuels, logistics plans, munitions, supply and transportation.



Lt. Col. Williams has a vast knowledge of education which includes a Master of Science Degree from Air University, AL received in 2009 and most recently in 2012 completed Commander Development Course from Andrews Air Force Base, MD.

Lt. Col. Williams has major awards and decorations: Air Force Commendation Medal with 1st Oak Leaf Cluster; Air Force Achievement Medal with 2nd Oak Leaf Cluster; Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with 9 Devices; Air Reserve Forces Meritorious Service Medal with 3 Devices; and National Defense Service Medal with 1 Device.

Lt. Col. Williams has state awards that include: Mississippi War Medal; Mississippi Emergency Service Medal; Mississippi Service School Medal; Mississippi Longevity Medal; Louisiana Emergency Service Medal; Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal; Global War on Terrorism Service Medal; Air Force Expeditionary Service Ribbon with Gold Border with 1 Device; Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon with 2 Devices; Armed Forces Reserve Medal with 2 'M' Devices; and Air Force Training Ribbon with Device.

Lt. Col. Williams is affiliated with many professional memberships and associations and a Life Member of the National Guard Association of the United States, Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Lt. Col. Williams for his dedication and support to the national and state Military Services.

#### IN HONOR OF THE 194TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair and co-founder of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I rise today to celebrate the 194th anniversary of Greece's declaration of independence from the Ottoman Empire. Inspired by an intense belief in the right to self-governance, the ancient Greeks pioneered the notion of democracy. The founding of our own great nation was built upon a similar desire for self-governance. Our shared dedication to democracy unites our countries and has preserved the strength of our close relationship.

After generations of oppression, Greece's freedom was hard-fought, and the Republic of Greece has become a shining example of democracy to the world. Today, Greeks and their friends around the world celebrate March 25th as the day when the Greeks began the long, hard war for independence. It is a day of joy and pride for a great people and I'm very proud to acknowledge the remarkable contributions that the Hellenic people have made throughout the world.

As many of my colleagues know, New York City is home to the largest Hellenic population outside of Greece and Cyprus and I have the honor of representing a large community of

Greeks in Astoria, Queens. In Manhattan, we celebrate Greek Independence Day with a parade on 5th Avenue, which I have been honored to participate in over the years.

Greece and the Greek people are such critical allies and dear friends of the United States and today I'm very proud to stand with my Greek brothers and sisters to celebrate the anniversary of their independence. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Greek Independence Day.

#### A TRIBUTE TO EMILY HAMILTON

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Emily Hamilton for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, Business Record.

Since 2000, Business Record has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Emily has the determination and drive to be successful in all that she does, and her exemplary work with The Des Moines "I Have a Dream" Foundation is a testament to that. As the Executive Director of this Foundation, Emily is passionate about going the extra mile. Emily is an active volunteer, frequently giving her time to support worthy causes. In all aspects of her life Emily's example of hard work and service makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Emily in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Emily on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at Business Record for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### TRIBUTE TO HENRI DUYGULU

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight

into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Henri Duygulu attends Dawson High School in Pearland, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

#### HOW THE SEPTEMBER 11 ATTACKS HAS CHANGED THE COUNTRY

Thirteen years ago the terrorist attack of 9/11 on the Twin Towers and the Pentagon affected the United States of America greatly. Four main points were affected—first nearly a decade of war, deportation and importation, transportation, and the National Security Advisory (NSA).

Within under a month the United States (US) deployed US troops into Afghanistan and within 2 years after in Iraq. The war became harder to gain the public's approval because in 13 years the US government spent around 42 billion dollars and between 2001 and 2011, nearly 2 million troops were deployed to Afghanistan or Iraq. In that time, more than 6,000 American troops were killed, and roughly 44,000 wounded. Of returning service members, more than 18 percent have post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) or depression, and almost 20 percent reported suffering from traumatic brain injury (TBI) during deployment.

After 9/11 the Bush administration created the Department of Homeland Security in 2002. The Department of Homeland Security was meant to strengthen the US borders. After US Immigration and Customs Enforcement deportations nearly doubled. About 400,000 immigrants were being deported annually per year; only half had been convicted of a criminal crime. As you can see after 9/11 it was much harder to become a US citizen or even get into the country due to more security for the citizens.

The transportation industry had a huge impact on airports due to the hijacking of the planes directed at the towers and Pentagon. Back before the attack people could show up 30 minutes before their flight and walk through security without identification. After the attack airports became much more secure security-wise. To get threw an airport now a days it takes over an hour going through many checks and having to follow countless rules and in some cases getting patted down or arrested. Not only aviation was effected, leaving through the US borders requires a passport now and you get fully inspected. The country became safer after these changes, but made travel harder.

Over the years, mini rumors have been said about the NSA. All of this traces back to the attacks on 9/11. 9/11 was the first terrorist attack on US soil and the attack devastated the country and it helped us realize that there were a lot of holes in our security and that a lot of people wanted to kill us. Because all these factors added up, the NSA watches over very carefully looking for threats within the country. The government funded the NSA 52.6 billion dollars in 2013 to use spy agency's to look through media and communication. Some US citizens find this scary, but in the long run who cares if the government knows a secret of yours? They are using it to keep us safe.

Through these points, I have shown evidence of how the attacks of 9/11 have



changed our country, some for the better some for the worse.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 130, had I been present, I would have voted "No".

#### AUDREN WILKERSON

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Audren Wilkerson for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Audren Wilkerson is an 8th grader at Oberon Middle School and received this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Audren Wilkerson is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Audren Wilkerson for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### PRINCESS MAHA CHAKRI SIRINDHORN—60TH BIRTHDAY

### HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join millions of people in Thailand—the United States' oldest ally in Asia—to celebrate Her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn's 60th birthday, which will occur on April 2nd. Princess Sirindhorn is the third child of King Bhumibol Adulyadej, and the only foreign monarch to be born on the U.S. mainland.

Born in 1955, Maha Chakri Sirindhorn has followed closely in her parents' footsteps, traveling across Thailand to hear Thai's problems and respond with royal development projects.

By 1980, she was launching her own development projects, initially focused on disadvantaged and malnourished children. Aside from providing immediate assistance, she promoted integrated farming for overall resilience and more sustainable sources of nutrition. Public health has remained a lifelong concern: the Princess is the President of the Thai Red Cross Society and chairperson of the Prince

Mahidol Foundation, which bestows globally recognized awards for achievements in public health and medicine.

Princess Sirindhorn soon expanded her projects to encompass education, increasing access for children in need so they would have better opportunities in life. Her approach and philosophy are deeply rooted in human rights and self-sufficiency.

"Those at the margins of society have rights to a good standard of living. Access to education is a fundamental human right. Education provides opportunities to learn and live sufficiently. Knowledge can be valued resources to help others or the community," she has said.

Her more than 100 projects are aimed at improving livelihoods, raising the status of women, helping the disabled, protecting the environment and wildlife. Many have been supported by agencies such as FAO, WHO, and Johns Hopkins University.

The scholarships she grants to students are helping to nurture and create new generations of talented Thais dedicated to public service. Tech savvy and up to date on information technology, the Princess promotes Thailand's traditional culture and arts among the younger generation.

Through her hard work and dedication, the Princess has earned endearment and respect from the Thai people, who fondly called her "Princess Angel". I join them in celebrating the auspicious occasion of Her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn's 60th birthday and wishing her good health.

#### THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET

### HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on yet another horrible Republican budget. It seems like ground hog day, Mr. Speaker.

Just like last year, and the year before, and the year before that. . . . The Republican budget once again attacks our seniors, our students, workers, and middle class families—all for the sake of protecting tax breaks for the rich. Their budget proposal is another recipe for disaster at a time when too many Americans—especially people of color—are desperately struggling to make ends meet.

As a key member of the CBC's Education Task Force, I am concerned that it would outright deplete our nation's commitment to education, since Republicans included severe cuts in elementary and secondary education, as well as in early learning programs.

Just in my state of Florida alone: this budget on the House floor today would result in: (compared to President Obama's budget proposal)

1,400 fewer Florida children in Head Start; Nearly \$75 million less funding in Florida for disadvantaged students, an amount that is enough to fund 160 schools, over 1,000 teacher and aide jobs, and over 100,000 students.

Over \$18 million less funding in Florida to provide educational opportunities for students

with disabilities, representing nearly a 3 percent cut, and reduce financial aid for the more than half a million Florida students who rely on Pell Grants to afford college.

Mr. Speaker, we need to send this Republican budget back to the drawing board.

#### A TRIBUTE TO TRESSA MYRTLE EPPS

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tressa Myrtle Epps on the up-coming celebration of her 110th birthday on March 30th, 2015.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Tressa's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Tressa has lived through eighteen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Tressa in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 110th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Ms. Epps on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her continued health and happiness in the years to come.

#### CONGRATULATING THE CARMEL HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SWIM TEAM ON THEIR HISTORIC STATE CHAMPIONSHIP WIN

### HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Carmel High School Girls Swim team for winning the 2014–2015 Girls Swimming State Championship title. This state title is a momentous win for the Lady Greyhounds, as it marks their 29th consecutive state championship title, which ties the national record for the most consecutive state championship wins in any sport.

While their 29th consecutive state title is momentous on its own, what the Lady Greyhound swim team accomplished during the state championship was even more extraordinary than that. The Lady Greyhounds broke thirteen state records at the state championship meet, four of which also broke national records.

To recap their record breaking state title, six individual records were broken, four records were broken by relay teams—all four of which also broke national records—and the team as a whole broke 3 records. The team won 9 out of 11 events, breaking the state record for

most first place event wins. They also broke records for most points scored, scoring 445 out of 544 points possible, and widest margin of victory, beating the second place team by 266 points. These extraordinary achievements at the state championship speak for themselves, and have led many to refer to this team as the best team ever in high school girls swimming.

The Lady Greyhounds, under the leadership of Coach Chris Plumb, have put forth an incredible amount of hard work and dedication. The team trains year-round, puts in countless hours in the pool and weight room, and have supportive parents who are just as dedicated to helping achieve great success.

Coach Plumb has been head coach of the Lady Greyhounds since 2006, leading them to 9 of their last 29 consecutive titles. Coach Plumb leads by example and inspires his swimmers with his coaching and character. He works tirelessly to motivate, train, and push his swimmers to dream big and reach their goals. High school sports are a special experience. They teach discipline, build character, and allow young men and women to have an experience they will remember for a lifetime. This team exemplifies the wonderful attributes that high school sports teach, and I am proud to represent such a hardworking and highly regarded group of young women and coaches.

Once again, congratulations to the Carmel High School Girls Swim team. I look forward to cheering the team on through another great season next year and send my best wishes as the Lady Greyhounds work toward breaking the national record for most consecutive wins. Go Greyhounds!

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed votes on March 23, 2015, due to weather. I missed recorded votes #130 and #131. I would like to reflect how I would have voted if I were present.

On Roll Call #130, I would have voted "no" (Passage of H.R. 360, Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Reauthorization Act of 2015).

On Roll Call #131, I would have voted "yea" (Passage of H. Res. 162, Calling on the President to provide Ukraine with military assistance to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity).

#### ADAM COOK

### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Adam Cook for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Adam Cook is a 12th grader at Arvada High School and re-

ceived this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Adam Cook is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Adam Cook for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### TRIBUTE TO KATHRYN CARRABINE

### HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to interact with some of the brightest students in the 22nd Congressional District who serve on my Congressional Youth Advisory Council. I have gained much by listening to the high school students who are the future of this great nation. They provide important insight into the concerns of our younger constituents and hopefully get a better sense of the importance of being an active participant in the political process. Many of the students have written short essays on a variety of topics and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues.

Kathryn Carrabine attends Dulles High School in Sugar Land, Texas. The essay topic is: select an important event that has occurred in the past 15 years and explain how that event has changed our country.

Changes occur in our country for many reasons and sometimes the impact is detrimental. In particular, the Obamacare abortion pill mandate that requires all employers to offer insurance and must include preventive care; which includes numerous birth controls and at least four of which cause abortions. Some companies are morally opposed to this; however, if they choose to not include this provision, they would have to pay \$100 per employee every day. With this act a company is forced to follow this federal law or go bankrupt. As few companies try to go against a federal law, this one stands out to companies owned by devout Christians. As abortion is against what many Christians, as well as other religions, believe, why is this mandate included in a federal law?

One case receiving notable attention, Hobby Lobby vs. Burwell, the Supreme Court voted against Hobby Lobby which could have caused the owners of the company to pay over \$1.4 million a day. They had to contemplate bankruptcy or acting against their moral beliefs. As they were faced with a hard decision, they chose to remain in business and to provide the insurance; but what did this mean for what they believed in? Should they just sit back and hold their tongue on a very important topic to them and many more? Hobby Lobby is not the only ones who are upset with this mandate. Many Catholic hospitals and private schools are also having a hard time facing this mandate. Many have

compromised their religious beliefs that abortion is not acceptable, but they are being forced by the government in order to comply with the mandate and to stay in business. How can Christian schools teach their religion that abortion is not acceptable, when they have to provide insurance that condones preventative care resulting in abortion? Many suggest that this is going against the 1st Amendment regarding freedom of religion. Every American has the freedom to believe in what they chose to believe regarding religion. Unfortunately, freedom of religion and compliance with government mandates are causing conflict for many Americans.

The Obamacare abortion pill mandate has changed the country in a way that people are thinking for themselves and standing up for what they deem to be morally appropriate. As Americans contend with government requirements, one can only hope that government decision makers will seek to understand and respect the religious beliefs of all constituents. As younger people are growing up, isn't this what we want in the world? As Americans, we strive to do our best and respect the government, but is the government respecting everyone else? As many things run through our head, such as this controversial topic, it changes the way we think, which changes the world little by little, day by day.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS AND CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS BUDGET ALTERNATIVES

### HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, in developing the Democratic alternative budget, we sought and received input from all parts of our Democratic Caucus. The result is a budget that I believe reflects the values and priorities of our Democratic Caucus, and the values and priorities of the American public. While no budget offers each and every idea we might include as individuals, the final product is a powerful vision of how to reward Americans who are working hard to get ahead and to promote economic opportunity for all Americans.

Both the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) and the Congressional Progressive Caucus (CPC) budgets contain some important ideas and initiatives that are not included in the Democratic alternative budget. I believe that both are far superior to the Republican budgets on the Floor today.

The CBC budget contains additional investments in education and other areas that I support and believe are important to our future. While the plan includes somewhat higher revenues and spending than in the Democratic alternative and the President's request, I support the increased investment and revenue levels it provides.

The Progressive budget also contains many initiatives and policy changes I support that are not included in the Democratic alternative budget, including a 4 percent cost-of-living pay increase for federal employees to help compensate for years of pay freezes. I also support adding a public option to the ACA exchanges, a proposal that is included in the

CBC plan. In addition, I support a financial market trading fee, and have put forward an "Action Plan to Grow the Paychecks of All, Not Just the Wealthy Few" that would use the revenue to provide more tax relief to the middle class and those working to join the middle class. The tax relief includes paycheck tax credits for American workers, as well as a number of incentives for apprenticeships and training programs and for employee profit-sharing and retirement savings. One of those incentives would use tax policy to leverage higher pay for hard working employees. Specifically, the CEO-Employee Paycheck Fairness Act, which I introduced, prevents corporations from claiming tax deductions for CEO and executive bonuses and other compensation over \$1 million, unless their workers are getting paycheck increases that reflect increases in worker productivity and the cost of living. The action plan also includes a modernized and expanded Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit that goes beyond the President's proposal in important ways, including by making it refundable.

Similarly, I strongly support putting a price on carbon, and have introduced legislation—the Healthy Climate and Family Security Act—to create a cap and dividend program to reliably lower carbon emissions and auction off permits to the first-sellers of fossil fuels. I believe it is important, however, to offset potential increases in energy costs for American homeowners, so my bill provides a dividend to every American. Professor James Boyce of the University of Massachusetts—Amherst has calculated that this approach will leave about 80 percent of American families with more money in their pocket at the end of the day. This legislation has been endorsed by Bill McKibben and key organizations including the Sierra Club, the Chesapeake Climate Action Network, and Communities United (Maryland).

In the case of both of these policies, the Progressive Caucus budget spends the proceeds on other program priorities. It has \$2.7 trillion more spending than in the President's budget and the Democratic alternative, and \$2 trillion more the CBC budget. The Progressive Caucus budget has \$5 trillion more revenue over ten years than both the President's budget and the Democratic alternative budget, and almost \$4 trillion more than the CBC budget. This is in part because the CPC budget does not rebate all of the carbon tax and does not use revenue from the financial market trading fee to provide tax benefits for low- and middle-income Americans.

While I support many of the initiatives in the Progressive Caucus budget, I believe we should use the revenue generated by a financial market trading fee and a price on carbon to more directly boost family incomes and assist those struggling to find work. Like Leader PELOSI and others who share many CPC priorities, I differ on some of the details of their policy changes. But most of all I am very grateful to the CPC for their significant contribution in the development of the Democratic Alternative and for their vision—which I share—of a growing economy with more shared prosperity.

#### A TRIBUTE TO BRENNA FINNERTY

### HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and recognize Brenna Finnerty for being named a 2015 Forty Under 40 honoree by the award-winning central Iowa publication, *Business Record*.

Since 2000, *Business Record* has undertaken an exhaustive annual review to identify a standout group of young leaders in the Greater Des Moines Area that are making an impact in their communities and their careers. Each year, forty up-and-coming community and business leaders under 40 years of age are selected for this prestigious honor based on a combined criteria of community involvement and success in their chosen career field. The 2015 class of Forty Under 40 honorees will join an impressive roster of 560 business leaders and growing.

Brenna has the determination and drive to be successful in all that she undertakes, demonstrated by her exemplary work with the Blank Children's Hospital. As the Annual Giving Director with Blank Children's Hospital, Brenna actively engages with her community to make it a better place. Her passion for volunteering is evident, as is her enthusiasm in supporting a worthy cause. In all aspects of her life, Brenna's example of hard work and service makes our state proud.

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound honor to represent leaders like Brenna in the United States Congress and it is with great pride that I recognize and applaud her for utilizing her talents to better both her community and the great state of Iowa. I invite my colleagues in the House to join me in congratulating Brenna on receiving this esteemed designation, thanking those at *Business Record* for their great work, and wishing each member of the 2015 Forty Under 40 class a long and successful career.

#### HONORING BELLE FLOWER CHURCH

### HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 25, 2015*

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable historical church, Belle Flower Church of Grenada, Mississippi and the great leadership it is under.

In the year of our Lord, eighteen hundred sixty-eight (1868), the first Black Baptist Church was established in Grenada—then a part of Yalobusha County.

The newly organized church was known as the Colored Baptist Church. Members were led by Rev. Larry Patterson, who served as pastor for a number of years.

In September 1872, Lot #119 was deeded to the church by George W. Ragsdale. The lot was situated in the West Ward of Grenada. Ragsdale said that members of the Colored Baptist Church could continue to possess the

land as long as the site was used exclusively for church purposes, if members conducted themselves with good behavior and if they paid taxes. If they misbehaved in an unbecoming manner or failed to pay taxes, the land would be seized.

In 1876, the church was pregnant with many possibilities. Due to the severe labor pains of an unknown dispute among church members, Belle Flower gave birth to a daughter. She was named First New Hope Missionary Baptist Church.

A.H. Stevens was encouraged to open a high school at the church in 1888. He planned to offer the basic courses of study, as well as instrumental music.

Since its establishment in 1868, the Belle Flower flock has been led by nineteen shepherds. They are Reverends: Larry Patterson, George Wright, S.P. Martin, Jerry Weathers, Augustus Nabors, D. Higgins, A.L. Hills, Joseph Peterson, Willis Varnado, Robert Varnado, J.B. Webb, W.H. Turner, A.D. Banks, H.L. Barnes, S.T. Cunningham, Tommie Lee Miller (1968–1984), Booker T. Moore (1985–1988), Melvin Montgomery (1988–2004), and Randy Jackson (2004–present).

From the inception until 1959–60, services were held only on the second and fourth Sunday.

The church was re-built in 1917 under the leadership of Rev. Augustus Nabors and committee members: Jeff Banks, Rev. Jas Bostic and Rev. R.S. Bostic. The annex was added in 1945 led by Rev. J.E. Webb. The committee members were: Rev. L.E. Smith, A.U. Fields, W.H. Bostic, (grandfather of Belle Flower member, Mrs. Dannette Woods), F.H. Johnson, T. Person, James Clark and Rev. B.S. Bostic, who was the designer of the annex.

Belle Flower has always been a trendsetter and a trailblazer in this community. When the Civil Rights Movement came to Grenada in 1966, the church was poised to take its rightful place in history.

Because the Belle Flower Church membership believed in binding up the broken-hearted and setting the captives free, this edifice became the headquarters for the Grenada County Freedom Movement (GCFM). The Southern Christian Leadership Conference's (SCLC) local staff offices were housed in the Sunday School rooms of the church. Mass meetings were held at the church nightly. Key civil rights leaders spoke at the church, including: Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Rev. Andrew Young, Rev. Ralph Abernathy, Rev. Hosea Williams, and folk singer/activist Joan Baez.

Belle Flower's pastor, S.T. Cunningham, served as treasurer of the GCFM. Members of the congregation followed his leadership in the quest for freedom by serving in many capacities. They demonstrated and marched; provided housing for civil rights workers; and cooked for SCLC staff. Melzina Cook (sister of Belle Flower's member, Thomas Cook) served on the GCFM steering committee.

Some members went to jail (Tommy Lee Green, Melzina Cook, Estelle Lemon-Cox, Paul Williams, Andrew Hooker, and others) and some members lost their jobs (Lottie Williams, Mother of Belle Flower members, Gloria Lott and LaRita Brown; and Emma Lemon,

mother of Estelle Cox) in the struggle for their basic human rights. Night after night people marched out of Belle Flower Church to face down mobs of hate-filled racists. Their efforts and their bravery should never be forgotten.

On January 22, 1967, Belle Flower was fire bombed because of its role in the Civil Rights movement. While repairs were being made to the facility, services were held at First New Hope Church.

In 1968, several Grenada citizens participated in the Poor People's Campaign (also known as The Mule Train) to Washington, D.C. The southern leg of the Mule Train began on May 13, 1968, in Marks, Miss. The Mule Train's third stop was Grenada. The pickup point for participants was Belle Flower Church.

During the years following the Civil Rights Movement, the church made many modern improvements. They included: purchasing and bricking the parsonage, adding a new finance room, adding and remodeling the fellowship hall, refurbishing the sanctuary, (cushioning benches, carpeting floors) purchasing new pulpit furniture, purchasing a public address system and adding the conic.

In 2004, the members purchased the block adjacent to the church.

The church has added ministries over the years to meet the needs of the members. A Young Adult Choir was added to the Music Ministry in the 1970s. The Nurse's Guild was established in the 1980s. Programs for the needy provided food and clothing for area citizens. Programs for the children included: the Red Circle, YWA, Sunshine Band and Youth Brotherhood. In 1993, A Daisy Girl Scout troop was established for five-year-old girls in the community.

In 1976, the organ was purchased through the efforts of Mrs. Mary E. Caffey, who sponsored a Bicentennial Baby Contest.

Belle Flower has always had a welcoming and liberal atmosphere. The members set spiritual standards for the Belle Flower children and took pride in the success of its youth.

Knowing that they needed to leave a spiritual legacy, adults trained the churches' children according to scripture (Proverbs 22:6).

Belle Flower created an environment for its children to grow and flourish spiritually. The fourth Sunday of each month was set aside for the youth. The youths' commitment and zeal for this church was so great that college students would return home monthly to fulfill their obligation as youth choir members, musicians, junior ushers, junior deacons, youth Sunday School teachers and youth superintendent.

Church families and ministries have given their time, talents and treasures as a testament to the love they have for "The Flower". Some of these gifts included: brass candle holders, steps for the water fountain, the marquee, Bibles, choir robes and uniforms, a piano, the minor over the baptism pool, a podium for the fellowship hall, the drapes over the baptism pool, tables and chairs.

For generations, this church has stood as a pillar in the Grenada Community. It has been a shelter in the time of a storm, a rock in a weary land, and a cornerstone of the community.

Because of the love, training and support members received at Belle Flower, they have made an indelible mark on the world as medical personnel, authors, beauticians, administrators, soldiers, manufacturers, teachers and ministers. More importantly, however, for 137 years, this church has gifted the world with saved, sanctified souls dedicated to preparing others to see the kingdom of God.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Belle Flower Church for its contribution to the black community and black churches.

#### HONORING ROGER GARZA

#### HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the accomplishments of retiring City Councilman Roger Garza of Pleasanton, Texas. He has proudly represented the people of District 5 for eighteen years and has been crucial to the growth and prosperity of Atascosa County and the City of Pleasanton.

A lifelong resident of Atascosa County, Mr. Garza attended Jourdan Elementary and graduated from Pleasanton Independent Schools. After graduating, Roger enrolled in San Antonio College where he studied oil painting, still life portraits, and photography. With a keen interest in and talent for art, Mr. Garza went on to open Pleasanton Floral Photography and Tuxedo in 1975, which he still owns and operates today.

As a small business owner and Atascosa County native, Mr. Garza has long been active in local community and political affairs. Prior to his election to Pleasanton's City Council, he was a key player in the successful redistricting of Atascosa County. This success is what prompted him to run for Pleasanton City Council eighteen years ago. During his eighteen-year tenure on the city council, Roger Garza has supported and overseen the development and completion of the Pleasanton Civic Center, the cleaning of the Atascosa River, and the approval of the construction firm for a new fire station.

In addition to his exemplary career as a public servant and small business owner, Mr. Garza is a committed husband and father of five.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have the opportunity to recognize Councilman Roger Garza for his eighteen years of service to the City of Pleasanton.

#### ANGELO DIAZ

#### HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Angelo Diaz for receiving the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. Angelo Diaz is a 12th grader at Arvada High School and re-

ceived this award because his determination and hard work have allowed him to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Angelo Diaz is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Angelo Diaz for winning the Arvada Wheat Ridge Service Ambassadors for Youth award. I have no doubt he will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of his future accomplishments.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 25, 2015, my vote on the Ellison/Grijalva/Lee/Schakowsky/Conyers/McDermott Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute, known as the CPC Budget (rollcall vote 136) was recorded as a "No" vote when I intended to cast a "Yes" vote. I wish to clarify my miscast vote and express my strong support for progressive budgets that invest in everyone, not just the 1%.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus' Fiscal Year 2016 Budget—entitled the "People's Budget"—is a powerful, profound statement of American values and vision. The CPC fiscal plan recognizes that the middle class is the true engine of our nation's economy by giving working Americans a well-earned and long overdue raise with paid overtime and guaranteed sick and parental leave.

The CPC Budget charts a bold course of economic growth for America. It creates 8.4 million jobs, modernizes our nation's sagging infrastructure, makes crucial investments in education and enhances the social safety net. The Budget recognizes that comprehensive immigration reform is both a moral and an economic necessity. It is a roadmap to American success in the 21st century global economy.

The CPC Budget is aptly named; it is an economic plan that creates jobs, expands health security and guarantees a dignified retirement for everyone in America. I am proud to support the CPC "People's Budget."

#### REMEMBERING THE LIFE AND WORK OF MR. WILLIE R. BRADSHAW

#### HON. G. K. BUTTERFIELD

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and remember Mr. Willie R. Bradshaw, a friend and lifelong resident of his native Durham, North Carolina who was called to be with God on March 23, 2015 at the age of 86.

Willie R. Bradshaw was born on September 17, 1928 in Durham, North Carolina and was educated in the Durham Public Schools. He became an outstanding athlete at Hillside High School where he played on the 1943 football team that was undefeated that season. He graduated in 1945 and went on to attend North Carolina College, now North Carolina Central University. After, Mr. Bradshaw played professional baseball as a pitcher for several Negro League teams.

Mr. Bradshaw was a respected coach, having coached at I.E. Johnson in Laurinburg, Lincoln High in Chapel Hill, and Dudley High in Greensboro before returning to Hillside to coach in 1963. He served as coach and athletic director at Hillside High for 15 years, and then as athletic director for the former-Durham City Schools system, becoming the first African American athletic director in both the City and County of Durham.

Mr. Bradshaw devoted a lifetime of service to his city and his alma mater. After a successful athletic career, he joined the NCCU Athletic Hall of Fame in 1985. In 1995, Mr. Bradshaw was inducted into the North Carolina High School Hall of Fame and the National High School Hall of Fame in 2010.

A former president of both the North Carolina High School Athletic Directors Association and the North Carolina Coaches Association, Mr. Bradshaw's career record as a head football coach was 96–43–6 and 215–119 over his 14 seasons as a basketball coach. He was honored with a NCHSAA Distinguished Service Award in 1992 and was involved at the national level with the National Interscholastic Athletic Administrators' Association.

Mr. Bradshaw grew up in the Walltown Community and was a dedicated member of First Calvary Baptist Church. He cared deeply about improving the lives of young people and was committed to advocating for children and making sure they had opportunities to reach their full potential. As a champion for equality during the Jim Crow era, he is remembered as a bridge builder who brought people together for common causes.

Known for his strong leadership, and as a man of few words, Mr. Bradshaw made a difference in so many lives. The world was made a better place because of the life and work of Mr. Bradshaw.

I ask my colleagues join me in expressing our deepest condolences to "Coach" Bradshaw's wife, Shirley M. Bradshaw; daughter, Natalyn Bradshaw-Haile Selassie; and granddaughter, Fana Ruth Haile Selassie, and his extended family and friends who mourn their loss but celebrate his incredible life.

#### APPRECIATING THE SUPPORT OF OUTSIDE GROUPS ON THE DEMOCRATIC BUDGET ALTERNATIVE

#### HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, while we were crafting the Democratic alternative budget we met with organizations representing millions of Americans—from seniors to students

to hard-working families. I want to thank the many people who took the time to advocate so passionately for their cause. Many of these groups have written to Congress to publicly state their strong opposition to the Republican budget before the House today, eloquently enumerating the many hardships it will cause to working families, students, seniors and other Americans.

I also wanted to thank those who expressed support for the Democratic alternative because of its efforts to ensure broadly shared prosperity, helping middle-class families and those working their way into the middle class, and to invest in the future. I appreciate the support we have received from people working on broad range of issues. This includes groups representing those concerned with educating our children and making college affordable, such as the National Education Association and the Student Aid Alliance. We also heard from those who represent the many federal employees who provide vital services, such as the National Treasury Employees Union. The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights also wrote in to share their support for our Democratic alternatives and the policies it reflects.

I also want to thank those who are working tirelessly to protect Social Security for the growing number of seniors who depend on the program, including the strong advocacy from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare. I share the Committee's goal of ensuring a livable retirement for all seniors and the importance of Social Security as fewer Americans have defined benefit pension plans. That is why during the Budget Committee's consideration of the resolution I offered an amendment to protect Social Security benefits from the threat of privatization or benefit cuts that could result from the Republican budget. We have heard from many others who strongly oppose the harmful cuts in the Republican budget—groups as diverse as the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, the Coalition for Human Needs, Citizens for Tax Justice, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Service Employees International Union.

I appreciate the input, advice, and support of the many people who helped us design the Democratic alternative and work for its passage.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 25, 2015, my vote on the Butterfield/Scott/Lee/Moore Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute, known as the CBC Budget (Roll Call Vote No. 137) was recorded as a "No" vote when I intended to cast a "Yes" vote as well. I wish to clarify my miscast vote and express my strong support for progressive budgets that invest in everyone.

The CBC Budget is a roadmap to American success in the 21st century. The Budget proposes a comprehensive jobs program and

makes critical investments in education, infrastructure and rebuilds the social safety net. It reduces the deficit by \$1.9 trillion, while investing in American families. The Budget also contains a bold plan to combat poverty in America and keeps faith with the promises we have made to our seniors by protecting Social Security and Medicare. The CBC Budget is a powerful statement of values and vision that seeks to guarantee a share of the American dream for everyone.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, March 26, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 14

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine U.S. defense policy issues pertaining to the Asia-Pacific theater.

SD-G50

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider S. 615, to provide for congressional review and oversight of agreements relating to Iran's nuclear program.

S-116

APRIL 15

2:15 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

S-116

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

To hold hearings to examine the National Nuclear Security Administration plans and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.

SR-222

APRIL 16	9:30 a.m.	APRIL 22
<p>Time to be announced</p> <p>Committee on Appropriations</p> <p>Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2016 for military construction and military family housing for select combatant commanders and select defense agencies.</p> <p>SD-124</p>	<p>Committee on Armed Services</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2016 and the Future Years Defense Program.</p> <p>SD-G50</p> <p>10 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine the Energy Information Administration's annual energy outlook for 2015.</p> <p>SD-366</p>	<p>10 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine reauthorization of and potential reforms to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.</p> <p>SD-366</p> <p>APRIL 28</p> <p>10 a.m.</p> <p>Committee on Energy and Natural Resources</p> <p>To hold hearings to examine the Administration's Quadrennial Energy Review.</p> <p>SD-366</p>